

From: Danny de Hek danny@dehek.com
Subject: Re: Playglobal SA and Playglobal Digital Limited [CP-DMS.FID15435]
Date: 23 September 2026 at 1:06 AM
To: Kate Muirhead Kate@cuncannon.nz
Cc: Tom Cleary tom.cleary@millslane.co.nz



Dear Ms Muirhead,

I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated **16 September 2026** concerning PLAYGLOBAL SA and PLAYGLOBAL Digital Limited.

I take the matters raised seriously. I have reviewed your letter against my publications, the underlying recordings, correspondence and source material.

I do not accept your characterisation of my reporting as portraying PLAYGLOBAL as part of, or responsible for, the MHT Trading Bot operation.

My investigation began because an **MHT investor contacted me concerning losses associated with MHT**. I was subsequently provided with an invitation to an MHT recovery Zoom meeting. The invitation itself described work being undertaken **"together with PLAYGLOBAL"** and referred to official PLAYGLOBAL contacts in India.

I attended that meeting and asked questions in real time concerning the representations being made. Those questions included requests for the legal registration of the proposed Super Asset Fund, its regulator, fund manager, auditor, custodian, capital raised, audited accounts, token contract address, smart-contract audit, token-holder rights, liquidity arrangements, compensation arrangements and evidence of completed projects.

Those were due-diligence questions. They were not declarations that PLAYGLOBAL was fraudulent.

My subsequent reporting concerned what I witnessed, what was represented, what could independently be verified, and what remained unsupported by documentary evidence available to me.

The Alleged MHT Meaning

Paragraph 5.1 of your letter alleges that my publications convey that PLAYGLOBAL is itself part of, or a vehicle for, a cryptocurrency scam or fraud. Paragraph 5.2 goes further and alleges that I portrayed PLAYGLOBAL as knowingly connected with or complicit in the MHT scheme.

I do not accept that this fairly represents my reporting.

I have expressly distinguished **MHT Trading Bot from PLAYGLOBAL**.

Indeed, in my correspondence with Mr Daniel Baumgartner I stated:

"My published article does not state that PLAYGLOBAL and MHT Trading Bot are the same company. In fact, it expressly records PLAYGLOBAL's position that they are separate entities. Nor does it accuse PLAYGLOBAL of criminal conduct."

Mr Baumgartner subsequently confirmed PLAYGLOBAL's position that it had supported members of the harmed MHT community using **"available contacts and local connections in India"**, while maintaining that this assistance did not create a legal, operational or regulatory connection between the entities.

That distinction has formed part of my reporting.

The legitimate subject of investigation was therefore not whether PLAYGLOBAL operated MHT. It was **why PLAYGLOBAL and its representatives had become involved in an MHT recovery process, what was being presented to those investors, and what independently verifiable evidence supported the representations being made**.

The PLAYGLOBAL Digital And Fund Questions

Your paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 allege that I represented PLAYGLOBAL Digital's proposed token offering as fraudulent and PLAYGLOBAL's business, assets, project portfolio and proposed asset fund as fabricated or a sham.

Again, I do not accept that characterisation.

My reporting asked for evidence supporting substantial representations that were being made.

Among the questions I put to participants were:

- What is the legal registration number of the PLAYGLOBAL Super Asset Fund?
- Which regulator oversees it?

- Who is its regulated fund manager?
- Who is its independent auditor?
- Which bank or custodian holds its assets?
- How much capital has actually been raised?
- What legal rights does a PGD token holder acquire?
- What blockchain is the token deployed on?
- What is the smart-contract address?
- Has that contract been independently audited?
- How is liquidity provided?
- What assumptions support representations concerning potential increases in value?
- What completed projects have generated returns?
- What assets has the proposed fund already acquired?
- What committed capital supports the stated scale of the proposed fund?

These questions are capable of straightforward documentary answers where the relevant structures and documents exist.

My reporting has consistently invited PLAYGLOBAL to provide evidence enabling me to correct or update anything that is inaccurate.

Opportunity To Respond

I also do not accept any suggestion that PLAYGLOBAL was denied an opportunity to respond.

There has been extensive correspondence between Mr Baumgartner and me.

I specifically invited him to identify individual factual errors, quote the relevant passage and provide evidence establishing the error. I stated that **if I had made a factual error, I would correct it.**

I also invited PLAYGLOBAL to provide licences, audits, regulatory documentation and other evidence relevant to its public representations.

Mr Baumgartner instead advised that PLAYGLOBAL would not provide what it described as non-public internal corporate, regulatory, fund, investor, legal, technical or commercial documentation.

That is PLAYGLOBAL's entitlement. Equally, my reporting is entitled to distinguish between information that has been independently verified and information that remains a representation by the company or its representatives.

YouTube Publications

Your Schedule requires some clarification.

It lists four YouTube URLs, notwithstanding paragraph 3.4 referring to **five videos**.

Two of the URLs identified in your Schedule — cU-3vcLr2KY and PBnxfUkL9H0 — contain the **same substantive investigative programme**, with privacy-related editing/blurring distinguishing the versions following YouTube privacy processes.

RCz_y9AI0lc is a separate long-form investigative programme.

D0Dori0t51U is a separate **long-form podcast published on YouTube**, approximately three hours in duration.

Accordingly, the Schedule should not be understood as identifying four separate substantive investigations containing four independent sets of allegations.

Some earlier YouTube versions were restricted following privacy complaints and were subsequently edited. YouTube's communications available to me concerning those restrictions did not identify the complainant or establish that PLAYGLOBAL was responsible for making those complaints.

I therefore do not accept that the existence of edited or re-uploaded versions establishes the inference apparently advanced in paragraph 7 of your letter.

The Advisory Board Resignations

Paragraph 9 alleges that my publications caused serious harm, **“including the resignation of three board members and the loss of business and investment.”**

That is a significant assertion of causation.

On **31 July 2026**, former PLAYGLOBAL Advisory Board member **Dr Stephan Schimpf contacted me directly and unsolicited**. He informed me:

“For the record, I would like to inform you that I have resigned from PLAYGLOBAL's advisory board with immediate effect.”

He further stated that it appeared other board members had followed his step and specifically asked me to take this development into account in my ongoing reporting.

I replied asking what had led to his resignation and expressly asked whether it was connected to my investigation and publicity or whether it arose for entirely separate reasons.

I have no evidence establishing that my reporting caused Dr Schimpf's resignation.

Your letter provides no particulars supporting the causal assertion in paragraph 9.

If your clients maintain that my publications caused three board members to resign, please identify the three individuals concerned and provide the factual basis upon which your clients contend that each resignation was caused by my reporting.

Likewise, if your clients maintain that identifiable business or investment was lost because of particular statements made by me, please identify the relevant publication and statement and explain the asserted causal connection.

New Zealand And Alleged Economic Loss

Danny : De Hek Limited is a New Zealand company and I operate from New Zealand.

I am presently unaware of PLAYGLOBAL SA or PLAYGLOBAL Digital Limited conducting business in New Zealand, soliciting investment in New Zealand, maintaining operations here, or otherwise having a material commercial presence in New Zealand.

Your letter alleges that my publications have caused your clients loss of business and investment.

Given that your clients are corporate entities, please identify with reasonable particularity the **pecuniary loss said to have been caused, or likely to be caused, to each respective corporate entity**, including the relevant business, investment or commercial opportunity relied upon and the jurisdiction in which that loss is said to have arisen.

The Meanings Alleged In Paragraph 5

I do not accept that the six meanings pleaded in paragraph 5 accurately or fairly characterise the publications.

Your letter largely states the alleged meanings globally across a Schedule containing an article, report, social-media republications, podcast material, long-form video material and an edited version of one video.

If your clients maintain their position, please identify **for each of paragraphs 5.1 to 5.6**:

1. the particular publication relied upon;
2. the exact words, images or passages said to convey the meaning;
3. whether the meaning is alleged to arise naturally and ordinarily or by innuendo;
4. where an innuendo is alleged, the extrinsic facts relied upon; and
5. any factual statement within those passages that your clients contend is false.

That will enable the actual words published to be addressed rather than broad characterisations of my investigation.

Preservation Of Evidence

I acknowledge paragraph 13 of your letter.

Relevant materials will be preserved pending resolution of this matter, including correspondence, recordings, publication material and associated records.

For the avoidance of doubt, that confirmation should not be understood as agreement to disclose confidential journalistic sources or source-identifying material absent an appropriate legal basis requiring such disclosure. I reserve all rights concerning source confidentiality and privilege or other protections that may apply.

Undertakings

I am not prepared to sign the undertakings enclosed with your letter in their present form.

They would require the permanent deletion of extensive investigative material, an undertaking preventing publication of undefined **“same or substantially similar allegations”**, and an apology in terms yet to be drafted and approved by your clients.

Nor do I presently accept that there is a proper basis for retracting reporting merely because PLAYGLOBAL disputes its implications.

I am also concerned by the **breadth of the relief demanded**. The proposed undertakings extend beyond correction of any specifically identified factual error and seek permanent removal of substantial investigative reporting, deletion of copies and derivative material, restrictions upon future reporting described broadly as the “same or substantially similar allegations”, and publication of an apology in terms to be approved by your clients.

In circumstances where your letter has yet to identify the precise words within each publication said to be false, or particularise the pecuniary loss said to have resulted from them, I am concerned that the practical effect of the demands would be to **remove and inhibit investigative reporting concerning matters of legitimate public interest before the underlying factual disputes have been properly identified or addressed**.

I therefore invite your clients to identify the particular statements they contend are factually incorrect and provide the evidence upon which that contention is based.

As stated above, I remain willing to correct **demonstrable factual errors**.

If your clients identify such an error and provide evidence establishing it, I will consider that material carefully and make an appropriate correction where warranted.

My investigation remains evidence-led. I remain equally willing to publish material supplied by PLAYGLOBAL that answers outstanding factual questions and materially changes the position reported.

Given the **seriousness and breadth of the relief sought in your letter**, please ensure that all further correspondence identifies with precision the particular publication and words complained of rather than treating materially different publications as though they contain identical statements.

Nothing in this response should be treated as an admission, waiver or exhaustive statement of my position, and all rights are reserved.

Yours sincerely,

Danny de Hek

WEBSITE: dehek.com
PODCAST: podcast.dehek.com
BOOKINGS: calendly.com/dehek
YOUTUBE: youtube.com/@dehek
LINKEDIN: linkedin.com/in/dehek/

Phone: +64 21 199 1652
Email: danny@dehek.com

Exposing scams and protecting everyday investors takes a lot of time and resources, and I fund most of this work myself. If you'd like to support what I do, even a small donation makes a big difference. Ko-fi: ko-fi.com/dehek Buy Me a Coffee: buymeacoffee.com/dehek Your support is truly appreciated.

NYT Featured Investigative Journalist | OSINT | Cult Survivor | Exposing Scams, Ponzi Schemes & MLMs | I Name & Shame the Bad Actors Behind the Lies

On 16 Sep 2026, at 10:43 AM, Kate Muirhead <Kate@cuncannon.nz> wrote:

Dear Danny

We act for Playglobal SA and its subsidiary Playglobal Digital Limited.

Please see our **attached** letter.

Kind regards

Kate

Kate Muirhead

Partner

[+64 22 413 7757](tel:+64224137757)

[<image001.png>](#)

This email is intended solely for the use of the addressee and may contain information that is confidential or subject to legal professional privilege. If you receive this email in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete the email.

[<2026 09 16 Letter to Danny De Hek.pdf>](#)

