

EXHIBIT B

I, MILTON EFRAIN JAQUE TARCO, Ecuadorian citizen, declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true according to my knowledge and experience.

1. I work in the Department of Criminology of the Judicial Police of Pichincha, in my capacity as an expert in the area of forensic information. I have experience in forensic information analysis since 2009.

2. My work as an expert was required by the State Attorney General's Office – Prosecutor of Nueva Loja, to analyze the computer equipment of the President of the Provincial Corte of Justice of Sucumbíos, that was used by Dr. Nicolas Augusto Zambrano Lozada. I conducted my expert analysis with Mr. Tulio Patricio Simba Chuquimarca, and the product of our work is set out in a report that was filed with the Prosecutor of Nueva Loja.

3. Specifically, our work consisted of locating and analyzing in said computers the existence or inexistence of a digital file that contains the text of the February 14, 2010 judgment, on the hard drive of the computer that was used by the author of the judgment (Judge Nicolas Zambrano) in the exercise of his duties as the President of the Provincial Court of Justice. Later corrected by the prosecutor of Sucumbíos, Dr. Carlos Jimenez T, that the year of the judgment was 2011. In order to facilitate our work, the Clerk of said Court provided us with an official copy of the judgment, and the request for amplification and clarification of same. Herein I will describe the work performed together with various conclusions with respect to the analysis of the operability of the equipment and the files located on the computers used by Dr. Zambrano while he was in office in the Provincial Court.

4. Upon arrival at the offices in the Provincial Court of Justice of Sucumbíos, we were informed that during the time that Dr. Zambrano held the Presidency of the Court, he utilized two distinct computers (in distinct moments) for the performance of his work and the adjudication of judicial proceedings while in office. At the time when the forensic copy was processed (as explained in the following paragraph) in the Provincial Court of Justice of Sucumbíos, representatives were present from both parties of the litigation as well as technician representatives of the Provincial Court of Justice of Sucumbíos. Those present were: Dr. Carlos Moreno, provisional judge of Sucumbíos, Dr. Enrique Carvajal, Dr. Ramiro Garcia Falconi, Daniel Moncayo, y Verónica Asimbaya.

5. The first equipment (CPU) used by Dr. Zambrano possesses serial number, MXJ64005TG, and was catalogued in our analysis as "PC-02." The second computer utilized by Dr. Zambrano has the serial number MXL038123D and has been catalogued as PC-01. The first step we took was to create two sets of "forensic copies" of each one of the hard drives housed in the two computers (CPU'S). By "forensic copy" is meant the exact image that is created of all of the data and information in the hard drive of a computer at a certain moment

in time. Together with the copies, a hash code was generated for the copy of each computer. A “hash code” is an alphanumeric sequence of approximately 80 characters that identifies the content of each computer at a certain moment in time. If any modification is made to the files of a computer, the hash code that will be generated by a later copy will be different. In that way, the use of the hash code serves to guarantee the integrity and the digital chain of custody of the information generated or forensic copies.

6. The information relevant to the present document was found on the computer PC-02. For this reason, going forward, I will make reference only to that equipment.

7. The computer named PC-02 has been operative (amount of time that has passed between the first time it was turned on and the last time it was turned on) from July 14, 2010 until September 13, 2012. When the forensic copy of its contents was carried out it generated the following hash code:

```
SHA 1 57d663672e6cafa349ae12c264c729eccc1b7043  
MD5 e90b8084eaad444cf13678d800e3ebe8
```

8. Once the forensic copies were made, the expert from the Sucumbíos Criminology Support Unit, Mr. Cbop. Fernando Villacis Barrera, took over the custody of the copies of the hard drives (hereafter “Copy 1”). He also took physical custody of the two computers that were the subjects of our analysis. Mr. Cbop. Fernando Villacis Barrera proceeded to turn over both the two computers (CPU’s) as well as Copy 1 to custodian of the warehouse of the Judicial Police of Sucumbíos, where they are currently located. We proceeded to take another copy (hereafter “Copy 2”) to the offices of Criminology de Pichincha located in Av. Mariana de Jesus and Av. Occidental in Quito, where we performed our analysis.

9. Shortly after beginning our analysis, the hard drive that contained Copy 2 was rendered illegible and inaccessible due to a power surge. Through official legal channels, we requested the creation of a third forensic copy (hereafter “Copy 3”) of PC-02. As a final process, we proceeded to verify and validate that the computer PC-02 was not modified nor altered in any way, with the generation of a hash code for Copy 3. The hash code originally generated for PC-02 is identical to the hash code for Copy 3 of PC-02. This means that the computers were neither manipulated nor modified nor altered during the time that transpired between creation of the different forensic copies.

10. On the hard drive of computer PC-02 a file was found by the name of PROVIDENCIAS.docx, which contains several hundred pages. At about page 24, text begins that is very similar to the Judgment and to the Clarification Order that was given to us by the Court; at the end of this are other documents in the same file.

11. The differences between the text found in the file PROVIDENCIAS.docx mentioned hereabove and the text of the Judgment and Clarification and

Amplification Order against which they were compared are, according to our brief analysis, minimal.

12. During the time that the Judgment was issued, Judges were supposed to upload them to the system known as "Automatic System of Ecuadorian Judicial Adjudication" (SATJE). In the City of Quito the Criminal Court of Pichincha pursuant to a PROOF OF DATA permitted the automatic insertion of initial and final headers with dates and hours of the user regarding rulings or judgments uploaded by functionaries. In this way, via the SATJE system functionaries can edit text directly (judgments, resolutions, and others) before recording and service.

13. Upon analyzing the metadata of PROVIDENCIAS.docx, we can conclude that the file was created on computer PC-02 on the 11th of October 2010, by the user, "CPJS". This is just one of the users of the operating system installed on said computer. The last date that the file was modified is the 18th of March, 2011 and the last date that it was opened was September 10, 2012.

14. The analysis of the metadata of the forensic copies, uploaded to the forensic software ACCESS DATA FTK available, also allowed us to conclude that the total editing time for the file PROVIDENCIAS.docx was 3571 hours. By "editing time" is understood as the total time the file was open, not exclusively the time that the file was actively being written or modified.

15. At the same time, the review of the files of the Operating System specifically the record or LOG of events of the USB ports, allowed us to see the history of the connectivity of USB ports, with dates of insertion and extraction of the device during the year 2012 and to establish and there existed no connections to external USB devices with dates before that year on the equipment catalogued as PC-02.

16. Through this forensic analysis adopted, it was determined that the computers were not protected by any kind of operating system password. The file PROVIDENCIAS.docx was not protected by any kind of password.

Signed in Quito, the 21st of October of the year 2013.

[MILTON EFRAIN JAQUE TARCO]
CC 0502339815