



THE LAW OFFICE OF ZACHARY A. WESTENHOEFER

30 WALL STREET, 8TH FLOOR, NEW YORK, NY 10005-2205

T: (646) 397-2656 E: ZACK@WESTENHOEFERLAW.COM

July 24, 2026

VIA Email

Rossmann Repair Group Inc.

Attn: Louis Rossmann

2410 San Antonio Street

Austin, TX 78705

help@rossmanngroup.com

Re: Your July 13, 2026 letter; correction and clarification; confirmation of evidence preservation; constructive path forward

Dear Mr. Rossmann,

I write on behalf of WeRecoverData.com, Inc. (“WRD”) in response to your letter dated July 13, 2026. At the outset, WRD wants to be clear about the purpose of this response: WRD is not presently pursuing litigation against you concerning the publications at issue. Although this letter formally responds to the correction and preservation issues raised in your letter, it is not intended as a threat, ultimatum, or demand that you remove criticism. Its purposes are to correct WRD’s own inaccurate statement, confirm preservation, explain how the June 19 correspondence arose, and propose a direct, evidence-based way to address any remaining factual disagreements.

I. The review-reply statement has been removed, and WRD corrects it.

Removal. On July 15, 2026, WRD removed the owner reply containing the statement “Before publishing his video, he did not contact WeRecoverData to verify the facts or request our response” from the Google Business Profile listing identified in your letter, together with every other owner reply containing that statement or a substantially similar statement on the listings WRD controls. Copies of the replies were preserved before removal, consistent with WRD’s preservation obligations.

Correction. The statement was incorrect as written, and WRD corrects and retracts it. WRD does not contend that you failed to respond to this office’s June 19, 2026 letter. You responded by letter dated June 26, 2026, transmitted by email that day and by USPS Priority Mail delivered on June 29, 2026, and in that response you invited WRD to identify any specific statement it contended was false. The narrower point WRD intended to make was that you did not contact WRD before publishing the video released on or about July 12, 2026 to request WRD’s comment on that video specifically. The owner replies did not

express that narrower point accurately. As written, they conveyed that you had never contacted WRD at all, which is not accurate, and WRD does not stand by that statement.

Published correction. In addition to this written correction addressed to you, WRD has published a statement on its website at <https://www.werecoverdata.com/blog/public-statement> that acknowledges this error in plain terms. This letter and that publication together constitute WRD's correction, clarification, and retraction in response to your request under Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 73.055, made within the period provided by § 73.057.

One point of context, offered as an explanation rather than an excuse: the replies were drafted and posted by WRD personnel responding, over a short period, to a large volume of new one-star reviews submitted by individuals who were not WRD customers. The error was WRD's own, and it was a wording error made in haste. The replies were not written, reviewed, or approved by me, as WRD's counsel.

II. Context regarding WRD's June 19 correspondence.

WRD's June 19 letter was not prepared or sent as an isolated response directed only to you. At approximately the same time, WRD, through counsel, sent cease-and-desist correspondence to several competitors and other industry participants concerning public statements that WRD believed were inaccurate, misleading, or materially incomplete. The letter to you was part of that broader effort.

That context does not eliminate WRD's responsibility for the manner in which it chose to respond. In retrospect, WRD should have begun by identifying the specific statements it disputed, providing the supporting records, inviting direct dialogue, and distinguishing criticism it believed was inaccurate from criticism it could accept and learn from. Instead, WRD led with legal correspondence. WRD recognizes that this was the wrong first approach and that it could reasonably have appeared to be an effort to suppress criticism rather than answer it. Whatever WRD's intention at the time, it could and should have handled the matter differently, and it is stepping away from that legal-first approach here.

WRD welcomes good-faith criticism, including criticism that is pointed, public, or uncomfortable. Legitimate criticism can expose unclear language, outdated presentation, inconsistencies, or procedures that warrant correction. WRD is reviewing those matters, intends to acknowledge valid criticism, and is making appropriate changes. Where WRD believes a claim is false or materially incomplete, it intends to respond with specific evidence and a request for a specific correction, not with a generalized effort to silence criticism.

III. Preservation.

WRD confirms that it is preserving, in native form and with metadata intact, the categories of records identified in your letter: the werecoverdata.com site as it existed on and after the relevant 2026 dates, including native HTML and source files; backend server and access logs, to the extent they exist and are within WRD's possession, custody, or control; content-management-system and database records; historical versions of the robots.txt file, together

with records reflecting the date and manner of changes to that file, including deployment and hosting-provider records; terms-of-service and pricing pages; and the owner replies addressed in Part I, which, as noted, were preserved before removal.

You asked when the robots.txt directives disallowing ia_archiver and archive.org_bot were added to werecoverdata.com. For purposes of correcting the public record, WRD states only that the suggestion in your video that WRD changed the robots.txt file after the June 19, 2026 cease-and-desist letter, or in response to that letter, is incorrect. WRD is not setting out the precise technical chronology in this letter. The relevant historical files, deployment records, and hosting-provider records have been preserved and establish the chronology independently.

Two further points bear on preservation. First, a robots.txt directive affects the Internet Archive's public display of its own snapshots; it does not delete, alter, or render inaccessible anything in WRD's possession, custody, or control. Second, WRD's own site records, including native files, database records, and change history, are the material evidence of the site's prior form, and they are preserved. Nothing within WRD's possession, custody, or control has been altered, deleted, or rendered inaccessible in derogation of any preservation obligation.

IV. A constructive path forward.

Your June 26, 2026 letter stated that if WRD identifies a specific statement and shows you that it is false, you will correct it promptly and in good faith. WRD has taken you at your word. WRD is preparing a factual response to your original March 2026 publication and the subsequent videos published in recent weeks. That response will address the issues point by point, identify the specific items WRD believes are incorrect or materially incomplete, provide the supporting records, and candidly acknowledge the criticisms WRD accepts and the changes it is making. WRD asks only that you review those items under the standard you described.

WRD is not asking you to remove the webpage or videos, stop criticizing WRD, or make any concession unsupported by the evidence. It asks only that both sides address concrete statements with concrete records and correct material errors when they are demonstrated. WRD's present objective is to resolve these matters through direct communication, factual clarification, and appropriate correction, not litigation. This letter is not a threat, deadline, or pre-suit demand. WRD hopes the correction in Part I resolves the issue raised in your July 13 letter and that any remaining disagreement can be handled constructively. Nothing in this letter is intended to waive, prejudice, or limit any rights, claims, defenses, or remedies of either party. That reservation is included solely to avoid an unintended waiver and does not alter WRD's present preference to resolve the matter without litigation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Zachary A. Westenhofer
Counsel for WeRecoverData.com, Inc.