

EXHIBIT 1

I, Nicolás Augusto Zambrano Lozada, am an Ecuadorian citizen, holder of citizenship document No. 0906018262, 57 years of age and an attorney by profession, and of the Catholic religion. Under penalty of perjury provided in the laws of Ecuador and the United States of America (which does not mean that I submit to the jurisdiction of the United States of America) in case of lacking truth, I declare under oath that this statement is authentic and true, and I give this statement based on my personal knowledge. I have not requested or received money, nor have I been offered any present or future remuneration in exchange for making this sworn declaration.

1. Since the year 1994 I have performed the duties of Prosecutor in the provinces of Sucumbios, Orellana, and Napo. In 2007 I was a candidate for Judge of the Provincial Court of Justice of Sucumbios, at that time the Superior Court of Justice of Nueva Loja (hereinafter the Court). I succeeded on the merits and was appointed Provincial Judge. I assumed the position on August 5, 2008, and I was the second in line of appointment selected as Provincial Judge.
2. According to Article 29 of the Organic Law of the Judicial Branch (now repealed), we elected Dr. Juan Núñez Sanabria as Presiding Judge of the Court. Consequently, being the oldest according to date of appointment, I was appointed Alternate Presiding Judge.
3. By mandate of the law, the process and trial of environmental lawsuit No. 02-2003 filed by the farming and indigenous communities against Chevron Corporation, also known as the Texaco lawsuit or Aguinda, et al vs. Chevron lawsuit, will be tried and processed by the Presiding Judge of the Court. Only in the event of legal impediment the case would be passed on to the Alternate Presiding Judge of the same Court. Therefore, the expected Presiding Judge of this trial would be Dr. Juan Núñez.
4. Dr. Juan Núñez Sanabria tried the environmental lawsuit No. 02-2003 beginning in August 2008; at the end of August 2009, the Chevron oil company distributed videos that had been clandestinely recorded of Judge Juan Núñez and others. After this event was reported by Chevron, Dr. Juan Núñez excused himself from trying the referenced case;

consequently by mandate of the Law, I assumed the trying of the case from October 2009 to February 2010. During that period, upon reviewing the evidence and arguments of the parties in order to process the record, I realized that the case was about to end. I therefore began to prepare the draft of the structure of the judgment, since, as it was logical, due to being the second in seniority according to appointment as Judge, I could be appointed Presiding Judge of the Court in the second period and, therefore, I would have to continue with the trying of the case.

5. During my first period as judge of case No. 002-2003, I endeavored to accelerate the proceeding, since it had been going on for several years. For that reason, I did not allow unnecessary delays. When there were differences of opinion, basically about appointment of expert witnesses, I held meetings with both parties in my office. In the presence of the parties, the expert witnesses were assigned at random or differences were resolved. Everything was transparent and in accordance with statutory law and equity.
6. When I first assumed the case, due to the massive size of the record and the status of the case, irrespective of the content of the case, I spoke to Dr. Alberto Guerra Bastidas, since he had been the first judge in the case, for information regarding the details of the events that took place during the period in which he was trying the case. Obviously, at that time he was the more informed about the case. The information he provided to me was basically a verbal summary of what he knew about the case.
7. However, on February 18, 2010, at a meeting of the Court we appointed Dr. Leonardo Ordoñez Piña Presiding Judge of the Court. Therefore it fell him to try the case against Chevron. Regardless of that, I did not throw away the notes I had made.
8. Dr. Leonardo Ordoñez tried the case until September 2010. Because the respondent, Chevron Corporation, submitted a request for recusal against him. when he was removed from the case, by mandate of the law I assumed the trying of the case. I never petitioned to try the case. It was due to extraneous circumstances, including the strategy of the respondent, the Chevron Company, that the case was definitively turned over to me in my position as Alternate Presiding Judge of the Court.

9. This was how it came about that from October 2010 to February 2011 I was for the second time the judge trying the case against Chevron Corporation.
10. By then all the evidence that the parties had requested had been heard. I therefore continued to study the case and prepare the draft of the judgment.
11. In December 2010 I entered an announcement that the record was closed and that I was considering the judgment, which does not mean that I began writing my ruling at the same time. As I said, I had been working on the preparation of the ruling for some time.
12. In January 2011, newspaper reporters frequently asked me whenever they saw me at Court when I would issue the judgment. Simply as a strategy to keep them at bay with these types of questions I told them that I still had to examine about five hundred volumes, but I had actually concluded reviewing the record and was polishing the draft of the judgment.
13. Since it was a complex and enormous case, I spent many hours working on the case, especially at night. Obviously for logical reasons I spoke to different people, especially Judges and former Judges for their points of view about certain aspects of the case. I never consulted with any of the litigant parties.
14. I confirm that I am the only author of the judgment that I issued on February 14, 2011, and of the clarification that I issued on March 4, 2011. I did not receive support or assistance from Dr. Alberto Guerra or from any other person, much less from the litigant parties. It is not true that Dr. Guerra reviewed the judgment, since neither he nor anyone else reviewed it before it was issued. It is false that Dr. Alberto Guerra worked in my home. He has never entered my house in Lago Agrio or in any other province for any reason. I have never told Dr. Guerra to approach the parties to ask them for money.
15. I composed and prepared the judgment on the computer that the Judiciary Council had assigned to me, which was in my possession prior to the analysis of the principal subject matter of the trial. For such purpose each of the documents submitted by the litigant parties was reviewed, and all evidence was analyzed as stipulated by Ecuadorian Law. I analyzed the objections

made by Chevron, one by one, without omitting any of them. Based on the evidence analyzed and submitted by the parties in the file, I concluded that Chevron was liable for the amount of damages indicated in the judgment. I never prepared one word of the judgment on any other computer.

16. I should mention that occasionally documents related to the case that were not incorporated into the process were left at the door to my office at the Court. Some folders indicated that they were courtesy of Chevron. I verified all of that information regarding the case, that is to say, I made sure that it was not false information and also that the basis for such information is in the record. This was relevant information that, as I read it, I realized it could be of use in my decision.
17. From the time I issued the judgment of the court of first instance until now I have been pursued by strangers, many of them linked to Chevron.
18. Dr. Alberto Guerra Bastida called me several times to tell me that Chevron was interested in talking to me, and I told him that I had nothing to talk to them about or to anyone else about the case.
19. On August 14, 2012, Dr. Alberto Guerra Bastidas gave me a folder of documents with the business card of an attorney, Andrés Rivero (see annex one). Dr. Guerra told me that Mr. Andrés Rivero was an attorney who worked for Chevron. He also told me that Chevron was offering me a minimum of one million dollars to start, or for me to name the amount, whatever I wanted or, if I preferred I could travel to the United States, which they would pay for, to talk to them there in exchange for a statement in favor of Chevron. I did not accept the proposal. After that, Dr. Guerra called me two more times to inquire about my answer. When I absolutely rejected the proposal, he did not ever call me again.
20. On Thursday, January 17, 2012 [sic, 2013], I received a call on my cellular phone from a person who said he was Andrés Rivero and that he worked with Chevron. Mr. Rivero told me that he was in the city of Manta and could be at my house in five minutes, and he also knew that I was not alone. He said he wanted to talk in person with me and that Dr. Guerra was already in the United States of America. I recorded the conversation, which is attached hereto on an audio compact disc.

21. On September 3, 2012, my partner was alerted by personnel at her workplace that she was being investigated and spied on by a woman who turned out to be a former policewoman by the name of Magda Enith Ramirez Benavides, who was illicitly associated with four other people, among them two former policemen of Ecuador. After we found out that my partner was being followed, we had the referenced person detained with the help of the police. She was found to be carrying two mobile phones, one hidden in her private parts. At a meeting that we had with Dr. Efraín Mendoza, an attorney for Mrs. Magda Enith Ramirez Benavides and the two former policemen, he revealed that one of them had told him that the person being watched was me and that an oil company was investigating me because I had issued a judgment in the province of Sucumbios (see audio number two).
22. From the investigation that has been carried out (inspector's directive No. 0117-2012), I deduced that Chevron Corporation was behind this, given the high cost in the logistics and legal defense utilized for the people who were charged in the offense, since there is no other justification for having us followed.

Quito. March 28, 2013

[Signature]

NICOLAS AUGUSTO ZAMBRANO LOZADA

BAR ASSOCIATION LICENSE 131982-10

REPUBLIC OF ECUADOR
BUREAU OF VITAL RECORDS
[Seal] IDENTIFICATION AND REGISTRATION

CITIZENSHIP CARD No. **090601826-2**

[Photograph] FULL NAME **ZAMBRANO LOZADA NICOLAS AUGUSTO**

PLACE OF BIRTH **GUAYAS GUAYAQUIL PEDRO CARBO/CONCEPCION**

DATE OF BIRTH **1956-04-24**

SEX **M**

MARITAL STATUS **DIVORCED**

[Bar code] [Seal]

EDUCATION PROFESSION/OCCUPATION
UNIVERSITY ATTORNEY V4344V4222

FATHER'S FULL NAME **ZAMBRANO NICOLAS** [Fingerprint]

MOTHER'S FULL NAME **LOZADA COLOMBIA** 000555419

PLACE AND DATE OF ISSUANCE **PORTOVIEJO 08-07-2012**

EXPIRATION DATE **08-07-2022**

[Signature] [Signature]

[Illegible]

JUDICIAL BRANCH OF ECUADOR
JUDICIARY COUNSEL
[Seal] BAR ASSOCIATION

SPECIAL ATTY ZAMBRANO LOZADA NICOLAS AUGUSTO

License No.: 13-1982-10

I.D. No.: 0906018262 [Photograph]

Registration Date: 08-20-2012

Former license: N

Blood Type: O+

[Signature]

Signature [Seal]

