

For Immediate Release

**MSI COMPUTER CORP. AND PARENT COMPANY MICRO-STAR INTERNATIONAL CO. LTD
AMOUNGST OTHERS, SUED FOR FRAUD, CONVERSION AND BREACH OF CONTRACT BY
FORMER DEALER AND GLOBAL BUSINESS PARTNER.**

ORANGE COUNTY, December 5, 2005 -- Dates for deposition of defendants MSI Computer Corp, and others are set to take place over the next several weeks by lawyers for plaintiff Integration Dynamics Corp. (IDC). The suit (# 04CC12623) filed in Superior Court of the State of California for the County of Orange almost a year ago, names MSI Computer Corp., and parent company Micro-Star International Co., Ltd., (MSI) (Taiwan Stock Exchange: Ticker Symbol 2377) amongst others, as co-Defendants, and claims defendants have perpetrated fraud, conversion, breach of contract, and intentional interference with prospective business.

The pending trial date of January 26, 2006, was set earlier this year by Judge Thompson of the Orange County Court. "Earlier this year, our lawyers successfully argued against and defended our position to sue, as challenges in the form of demurs by a number of defendants, were thrown out by the court." said IDC spokesman and Plaintiff Ren Condotta, "this case, which is before the courts, stands completely on it's own and has absolutely nothing to do with the previously filed Class Action suit brought against MSI for leaky capacitors or malfunctioning motherboards, also in 2004."

In April of this year, IDC filed an amendment to the claim. The amendment, in part, was to include two additional corporations as defendants; one of which was MSI Computer Corp., the Los Angeles based U.S. subsidiary of motherboard manufacturer Micro-Star International Co. Ltd. (MSI). The change brought the total number of named defendants in the suit to six, which includes four corporations and two individuals, with provisions for 1000 additional DOE defendants.

IDC first formed a relationship with MSI Computer Corp. in early 2002. "As an extension of that relationship, IDC and MSI Taiwan had also formed a relationship, having exclusive contractual agreements negotiated and signed in early 2003 providing for a global sub-distribution of IDC products through MSI and its subsidiaries," says Condotta.

During an internal audit of IDC finances, Condotta, IDC's largest creditor and only shareholder, had discovered that MSI Computer Corp. was found to be at the heart of a disconcerting matter involving fraud and conversion. Just prior to the audit, Condotta was approached by co-Defendant LuTran acting at the time as category Manager for MSI Computer Corp. newly formed Consumer Electronics Division. LuTran engaged Condotta in negotiations to have Condotta represent MSI in Canada through Condotta's Toronto-based manufacturer rep company, REPTIDE, also a Plaintiff in the case.

Upon discovery of the business improprieties, Condotta, a 22-year veteran of the computer industry, immediately severed all business relationships with MSI Computer Corp and MSI, and then notified MSI of the conflict of interest which required immediate resolution.

Condotta alleges that he had uncovered documents concerning transactions involving the sale of MSI goods by MSI Computer Corp. to customers established and held by IDC thereby circumventing IDC in the process. The sale of these goods, as alleged by Condotta, flowed through MSI Computer and co-Defendant Xcel Micro Inc. allegedly formed by then IDC Sales Manager (co-Defendant Borcsok) in conjunction with the MSI Computer Corp Sales Manager at the time (co-Defendant LuTran), for what Condotta alleges to have been for the express purpose to defraud IDC.

Further to this, Condotta alleges that since MSI entered into contractual agreements with IDC during the same time period in which MSI subsidiary MSI Computer Corp. was perpetrating fraud and conversion on IDC, and since MSI entered into such negotiations and agreements with IDC initiated by MSI Computer Corp manager (co-defendant LuTran), IDC therefore claims damages against MSI for misrepresentation, fraud, breach of contract, and both negligent and intentional interference with prospective business. As negotiations concerning MSI Computer Corp and REPTIDE took place under similar circumstances as previously mentioned, REPTIDE claims damages for same.

Condotta said, "as an ISO9000 registered company since 1994, MSI and its wholly owned subsidiaries, have virtually guaranteed, to any and all of their current and prospective business partners, that they have the necessary processes and mechanisms in place, which would not only prevent such fraudulent activities from being perpetrated within and throughout the company, but that any breach of such processes would be attended to in an expedient manner, and remedied to the satisfaction of both the victimized parties and to the ISO governing body." Condotta goes on to say, "as a publicly traded company, it stands that, MSI would be required by its board of directors, and more importantly, owes it to its shareholders, to have remedied the situation, once recognized, to the satisfaction of all concerned parties and avoid the cost of litigation and seven figure damages, as they have elected to do in their Class Action suit." (Refer to <http://www.msisettlement.com> hosted by MSI Computer Corp)

"Since having been served with our lawsuit, MSI Computer Corp. has, in a manner, openly admitted to having such a breach in its business practices. Such admission came in the form of a marketing campaign launched by only one MSI subsidiary: MSI Computer Corp." said Condotta. "The campaign in reference," continues Condotta, "was targeted to all current and future MSI resellers and dealers only in the Americas, coincidentally, the same territory believed to have been previously serviced by the MSI Sales Manager (co-Defendant LuTran)." Documents concerning the web-based campaign, can be found at the following website http://www.msi_sued_for_fraud.irocx.com

Condotta further alleges, "these are undoubtedly, the blatantly obvious and desperate reactions made by a corporation having such size, stature, and stock value, with the purpose to obfuscate the reasons for the necessary actions and expenditures that are required by the corporation in order to remedy its inadequate business and accounting practices, so as to not only retain ISO registration in good standing, but to deliberately ensure stockholder unawareness of the corporation's deficiency and lack of control of its processes and employees."

"In the interest of negotiating a good faith settlement with MSI, no previous press releases were issued on behalf of the Plaintiffs, but since MSI has made no effort to date to acknowledge our damages, I believe, that at minimum, the unsuspecting MSI Stock holders, should at least be made aware of the situation" says Condotta.

ABOUT IDC

Integration Dynamics Corporation is a specialty audio products development company. The company, the brands, and the products are the brainchild of Ren Condotta. IDC continues its legacy of developing and producing 3D audio based specialty products for the gaming and virtual reality markets, and offers new and exciting improvements on previously released products and formulation of new and exciting wired, wireless and personal listening devices. Brands developed and/or OEMed by IDC include Game'Ware, RumbleFX, IROCX, and IVOCX. Since the aforementioned MSI incident, IDC has focused on its new audio core having proprietary core technologies and refined audio sub-systems are being produced in stealth mode and currently considering offers to partner. For more information please visit our websites <http://www.irocx.com> <http://msi-sued.blogspot.com>

....