

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Alleged Conduct of Adam D'Angelo

Investigative allegation statement and evidence-preservation request

Document metadata	Value
Prepared from	combinedAdam.txt
Prepared	June 30, 2026
Source scope	331 Adam/Quora source units; approximately 299,822 words
Status	Allegations not adjudicated

This document presents allegations for fair investigation. It is not a finding of guilt.

Contents

- Alleged Conduct of Adam D'Angelo
- Important Notice
- Executive Summary
- 1. Scope and Method
- 2. Subject Identification and Attribution Boundaries
- 3. Relationship History and Chronology
- 4. Alleged Conduct Requiring Investigation
- 5. Claimed Harm and Causation
- 6. Cumulative Theory and Incrimination Factors
- 7. Defenses, Alternative Explanations, and Limiting Admissions
- 8. Potential U.S. Legal Relevance
- 9. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests
- 10. Questions for Adam D'Angelo
- 11. Witness Questions
- 12. Assessment of Evidentiary Strength
- 13. Requested Disposition
- Official Legal Sources
- Source-Unit Guide

Important Notice

This report organizes allegations made by Joo-yeon Kim concerning Adam D'Angelo. It is not a judicial finding, charging instrument, or declaration of guilt. Every disputed allegation requires authentication, corroboration, jurisdictional review, and an opportunity for Adam D'Angelo to respond. The report uses terms such as "Kim states," "Kim alleges," "Kim believes," "Kim interprets," and "the source asserts" to preserve that distinction.

The source compilation contains direct recollections, chronology statements, demands for records, descriptions of Quora activity, indirect online "relays," earlier AI-generated analysis, legal theories, and emotional reactions. Earlier AI-generated reports inside the source file are not treated as independent evidence. They are used only as secondary summaries when the same theme appears in primary source notes.

The requested focus is Adam D'Angelo's alleged conduct. References to Anna, Mark Zuckerberg, Biden, Steve Choe, Elon Musk, Sean Kernan, Jeff Bezos, Festus, Suhail, or other persons appear only where necessary to explain the alleged Adam-specific conduct, an asserted joint act, a witness, a source of evidence, or an alternative actor. Kim's angry or threatening language is not analyzed as a separate accusation because the requested scope is the named subject's alleged conduct.

A relay, share, media recommendation, thumbnail, fictional character, song, celebrity image, account upvote, symbolic phrase, or perceived algorithmic response is not treated as proof that Adam authored, directed, endorsed, or even saw a communication. Relay-based material is included only where it points to a verifiable question: account records, URLs, timestamps, recommendation logs, message logs, platform archives, witnesses, or direct communications.

Executive Summary

Kim's allegations against Adam D'Angelo are organized around informational control, investment disclosure, later silence, alleged idea exploitation, and alleged psychological harassment. The core claim is not that every online item Kim perceived was an authenticated Adam communication. The core claim is that Adam allegedly held several positions of leverage that could have clarified the truth and reduced harm, but instead allegedly used, withheld, or allowed those advantages to deepen Kim's vulnerability.

First, Kim states that he never met Adam in person and that their interaction occurred online through Quora, upvotes, shares, comments, or indirect communication. Kim alleges that Adam, because of his relationship to Quora, held or could preserve key platform records concerning Anna, Sean Kernan, abusive upvotes, shares, account interactions, and the broader channel Kim believed was being used against him. Kim says he needed help and evidence while authorities were absent or dismissive, but Adam allegedly did not provide the direct link, records, or ordinary contact path that could have let him defend himself.

Second, Kim alleges that Adam later became involved in an investment or reward framework, described repeatedly as approximately four million dollars per accepted idea. Kim says he prepared presentations, including wooden ships, fishing ships, a website/platform concept, and other inventions, because he believed there was an investment opportunity and a basic rule: once an originator's idea was accepted,

follow-up development belonged to the originator, the investor, and the investor's team, not to competing participants seeking to erase origin.

Third, Kim alleges that Adam's generic trigger about Quora, search engines, content, and user-created content helped prompt the website/platform idea, but that the specific synthesis, presentation, layout, operational plan, financial logic, rollout thinking, and broader organized-data concept were Kim's. The report preserves that limiting admission: Kim credits Adam with a broad trigger and rejects only the alleged conversion of that trigger into ownership, control, or authority to continue after severance.

Fourth, Kim alleges that the presentation's private investment purpose was later concealed or misrepresented during political or legal accusations that reframed him as a spy, invader, spammer, economic threat, or danger. Kim alleges that Adam and Mark Zuckerberg knew how the presentation began and could have explained that it was a private business pitch intended to help build value, not a hostile act. The potentially incriminating allegation is not mere silence in the abstract; it is alleged silence or participation by a person with relevant exculpatory knowledge while Kim says he faced severe legal and life consequences.

Fifth, Kim alleges that, after he withdrew consent and redirected the business opportunity toward Jeff Bezos or other potential partners, Adam continued attaching himself to Kim's ideas or allowed others to do so. Kim repeatedly states that he was not working with Adam, that Adam and Mark were severed from his ideas, and that attackers of his life could not become permitted follow-up partners. This notice matters even where intellectual-property law may not protect a general idea: it bears on consent, partnership, reliance, confidentiality, motive, and any alleged post-severance use.

Sixth, Kim alleges a course of psychologically harmful relays and shares attributed to Adam, including dead or preserved bodies, content involving Kim's mother, women cheating, provocative images, comments about Kim's looks, and courtroom-irrelevant emotional triggers. If authenticated as direct targeted communications after notice to stop, those materials could bear on harassment, stalking, intentional infliction of distress, or intimidation. As currently supplied, many of these events are relay-dependent and require platform authentication before they can be attributed to Adam.

Seventh, Kim alleges monitoring, screen observation, possible hacking, recommendation manipulation, buyer interference, shelter or soup-kitchen proximity issues, and a monitoring method allegedly suggested or enabled by Adam. These are among the most serious factual allegations, but also among the least proven in the supplied text. They require device forensics, account logs, provider data, surveillance records, witness testimony, and direct communications before any firm attribution can be made.

The strongest potentially verifiable questions are therefore specific: What Quora records exist? Did Adam personally know of Anna-related abuse and Kim's requests? Did he have or withhold a link or account records? What did Adam communicate about the investment opportunity? What were the exact 4-million-per-idea terms, if any? What did Adam receive, forward, develop, or discuss concerning Kim's presentations? What did he say to Mark Zuckerberg or others when the presentation was reframed as dangerous? What records show Kim's severance and Adam's conduct afterward? Which alleged shares or relays are linked to Adam-controlled accounts? What technical evidence, if any, supports monitoring or unauthorized access?

1. Scope and Method

The attached source file contains approximately 299,822 words in 331 Adam/Quora source units. Each unit was treated as a source item. Repetition was consolidated rather than counted as independent corroboration. Direct Adam, D'Angelo, or Quora references appear throughout because the source file is organized under Adam D'Angelo.

The review applies six evidence classifications:

1. **Claimed firsthand recollection:** Something Kim says he personally saw, heard, wrote, received, sent, prepared, or did.
2. **Record-dependent assertion:** A claim that points to a recoverable record, such as Quora account logs, upvote history, shares, emails, presentation files, receipts, screenshots, device logs, or message archives.
3. **Witness-dependent assertion:** A claim Kim says other people observed, such as public upvote exchanges, presentation context, alleged admissions, investment expectations, or changes in stance.
4. **Commercial or technical inference:** A conclusion about investment terms, idea origin, use, enhancement, or attribution that must be tested against dated files, access evidence, and product comparisons.
5. **Relay-based interpretive lead:** A conclusion drawn from recommended content, symbolic media, thumbnails, algorithmic displays, or indirect shares. These leads are not treated as proof until account control and intent are independently established.
6. **Secondary prior analysis:** Earlier AI-generated reports contained in the source. These are not independent proof and are used only to identify issues that the primary notes also support.

The report gives strongest weight to direct recollection and record-dependent assertions. It preserves limitations, including Kim's repeated statements that he might have misread relays, that he did not always know who was acting, that some matters required witnesses, and that Adam may have helped in certain periods. It does not treat ambiguity as proof against Adam or as proof against Kim. It treats ambiguity as a reason for targeted evidence preservation.

2. Subject Identification and Attribution Boundaries

Person or label	Relevance to this report	Attribution boundary
Adam D'Angelo / Adam	Named subject; alleged Quora evidence control, investment involvement, presentation-origin knowledge, post-severance idea attachment, relay harassment, monitoring involvement, and silence during framing	Attribute only direct acts, authenticated account activity, records, or proved agreements to Adam

Person or label	Relevance to this report	Attribution boundary
Quora	Platform through which Kim says early interactions, upvotes, shares, account evidence, and communication occurred	Platform records may be evidence; platform status alone does not prove Adam's personal knowledge
Anna	Original alleged abuser in Kim's timeline; central to Quora evidence and alleged failure to intervene	Anna's conduct is not Adam's unless Adam knowingly assisted, concealed, or coordinated it
Sean Kernan and other Quora accounts	Alleged sources of abusive messages, upvotes, or relays	Must identify actual account control and content before assigning meaning
Mark Zuckerberg	Alleged later business participant introduced through or after Adam; presentation framing and platform-use issues	Mark's acts cannot automatically be attributed to Adam
Biden or government actors	Alleged political/legal reframing of presentation as invasion, spying, or danger	Requires direct communications before alleging Adam-government coordination
Steve Choe, Festus, Suhail	Alternative actors or witnesses in idea chronology	Their claims are used only to test Adam-related chronology and presentation origin
Jeff Bezos	Person to whom Kim says he redirected the opportunity after severance	Relevant to consent and withdrawal; no assumption of Bezos participation

3. Relationship History and Chronology

3.1 No Ordinary Offline Relationship

Kim states that he never met Adam in person. He describes the relationship as online, through Quora, upvotes, shares, comments, and perceived relays. This limits the strength of any claim based solely on tone or perceived symbolic communication. It also supports Kim's repeated complaint that he lacked equal access to the channel and therefore needed direct records, direct contact, and platform verification.

Kim denies being Adam's accomplice, employee, agent, or collaborator in any hidden experiment. His stated purpose was to obtain help with Anna-related abuse, pursue investment or rewards for ideas, and defend himself when his presentation or writings were allegedly reframed against him.

3.2 Anna and Quora as the First Phase

Kim places Anna and related Quora events before the Adam investment dispute. He says the first approximately two years involved Anna, Quora activity, abusive messages or upvotes, public humiliation, and his inability to secure useful evidence. Kim alleges that Adam entered roughly one year into that phase or somewhere close to it.

The Adam-specific allegation is that Adam allegedly knew, or had access to records showing, that Kim was being abused or placed into a damaging online situation. Kim repeatedly asks why Adam did not

give him the link, send evidence, contact police, or provide a direct communication path when authorities were absent. The source does not itself provide Adam's response, internal Quora records, or proof of Adam's personal knowledge at the relevant moments. Those records are central.

3.3 The Alleged Quora Evidence Key

Kim's recurring phrase is that Adam "held the key" because the events happened on or through Quora. He describes upvote sections, following sections, shares, spaces, comments, and deleted or unavailable accounts as possible evidence. He asks investigators to check Sean Kernan's relays through upvotes, Anna's upvotes, account deletions, and historical Quora interactions.

This allegation has two distinct forms:

1. **Evidence preservation and access:** Adam or Quora allegedly had data that could identify abuse, prove Kim's account, or prevent later misframing.
2. **Personal culpability:** Adam allegedly sided with Anna, watched the abuse, or failed to intervene despite knowing the consequences.

The first form can be tested by preservation requests. The second requires proof of Adam's knowledge, control, intent, and duty. A CEO title alone does not prove personal participation in platform abuse, but it may identify a custodian or a person with unusual access if records show personal involvement.

3.4 Investment Prospect and Four-Million-Per-Idea Framework

Kim repeatedly states that there was an investment or reward framework involving approximately four million dollars per idea. He says this was established while he lived upstairs and before he moved downstairs into closer contact with Steve Choe. He identifies emails, Quora exchanges with Adam, and presentation records as the evidence that should verify this timing.

Kim's account is that he joined without fear of copyrights or patents because there were fundamental rules. He believed that other competitors should not follow up on his accepted ideas and that development belonged to the originator, investor, and investor's team. The legal enforceability of that understanding is unknown. The factual question is what Adam actually represented, what Kim reasonably relied on, and whether there were promises, implied confidentiality, reward terms, or business expectations.

3.5 Presentation Development and Website/Platform Concept

Kim describes a multi-part presentation for a content-curation or organized-knowledge platform. He distinguishes the broad trigger from the specific presentation. He says Adam's relay concerning search engines, content, and Quora's user-created content helped trigger the website idea. He then claims that the actual synthesis came from his own internet-marketing background, Quora observations, content moderation thinking, Photoshop or UI/UX layout work, cost projections, HR/moderation plans, and organization of data into actionable meaning.

Kim's limiting admission is important: he does not deny all external influence. He credits Adam with a generic trigger. He credits Facebook as a marketplace inspiration. He mentions Festus as potentially tied

only to financial projection help and a bitcoin comment. He says Mark and Adam were investors or prospective investors, not authors of the full concept. The allegation is that limited influence was later inflated into control, ownership, or the right to proceed without him.

3.6 Mark Zuckerberg's Later Role

Kim alleges that Adam introduced or bridged Mark Zuckerberg into the business opportunity. He says the presentation was for Adam and later Mark, or for Adam and Mark's eyes only. He further alleges that Adam and Mark later shared a stance that gave credit to their skill, experience, and capacity to implement rather than to Kim's origin of the idea.

Because this report concerns Adam, Mark's alleged acts are included only where Kim claims Adam jointly knew, agreed, introduced, remained silent, or benefited. Investigators should not assume that Adam is liable for every alleged Zuckerberg act unless communications or coordinated conduct establish a link.

3.7 Presentation Framing as Danger

Kim alleges that the presentation was later reframed as invasion, spying, economic sabotage, spamming, or threat to the United States. He says this framing exposed him to extreme legal danger and that Adam and Mark knew the presentation's private investment origin. The strongest version of the allegation is that Adam had exculpatory context and failed to correct the record when correction was necessary.

The source does not provide a government charging document, Adam statement, or authenticated Adam-Biden communication. Therefore the issue should be framed as a records request: What did Adam know, what did he say, who received the presentation, what was shown or hidden, and did he correct or endorse any dangerous mischaracterization?

3.8 Severance and Redirection to Bezos

Kim says he later backed out of the Adam/Mark arrangement and gave the opportunity to Jeff Bezos or another partner. He states that he was not working with Adam, that Adam should stay out of his life and ideas, and that Adam and Mark were severed. These notices recur throughout the later source units.

The legal effect of severance depends on the existence of rights, agreements, confidentiality, and protectable material. But the factual effect is clear: Kim repeatedly withdrew consent for Adam to continue as a participant. Any later Adam use, solicitation, claim of ownership, product development, or relay suggesting continued involvement must be measured against that notice.

3.9 Alleged Continued Idea Attachment

Kim alleges that Adam continued to latch onto or follow up on ideas despite being told not to. He describes a "skill over ideas" narrative in which technically or commercially powerful actors allegedly tried to reduce the originator's role by building better versions or adding quality after the fact. Kim argues that such follow-up is still dependent on the initiating idea and cannot be used to erase origin in an investment or contest environment.

This is partly a legal claim and partly a moral/commercial claim. U.S. law does not protect abstract ideas by copyright, and general business concepts are not automatically property. A legal claim would require protected expression, trade secrets, patentable invention, confidential material, contract, fraud, or unjust enrichment. The report therefore preserves the allegation without converting every idea overlap into a statutory violation.

3.10 Alleged Relays, Shares, and Psychological Harassment

Kim alleges that Adam sent or arranged relays and shares even after being asked to stop or to keep communications court-relevant. Examples in the source include dead or preserved bodies, dried or frozen people, comments about Kim's mother, women cheating, provocative images, comments about Kim's looks, cancer references, and content Kim experienced as taunting or misleading.

The report treats these as serious if authenticated. Repeated targeted unwanted electronic content intended to harass or cause substantial emotional distress can be legally relevant. But the current source does not reliably establish which account sent each item, whether Adam controlled the account, whether the content was algorithmic, or whether a reasonable recipient would understand the same meaning. Original URLs, account logs, recommendation histories, timestamps, and witness testimony are required.

3.11 Monitoring, Screen Observation, and Technical Access Claims

Kim alleges that Adam could see his screen, understood monitoring methods, or suggested a monitoring method to Biden or others. He also alleges hacking, surveillance, recommendation manipulation, and being left blind while others could observe him. These claims describe profound privacy harm if true. They cannot be resolved from the source text alone.

The necessary evidence includes device forensic images, browser history, Quora session logs, IP logs, account access history, malware reports, security-camera logs, lawful process records, internal platform records, and any direct statement by Adam or others describing surveillance. Without that evidence, the report can only preserve the allegation as an investigative lead.

3.12 Proximity, Buyer, and Channel-Link Allegations

Kim alleges that Adam or someone using Adam-linked relays exposed a channel to buyers, shelter residents, soup-kitchen patrons, or people near him. He describes a soup-kitchen line and a person in a blue shirt as an example of allegedly deliberate proximity references. He says buyers stopped responding after the channel was relayed to them.

These allegations require event-by-event proof: person identified, account that sent the link, recipient testimony, exact communication, date, content, transaction at stake, and whether Adam directed or knew of it. Without that chain, economic or physical-risk harm cannot fairly be assigned to Adam.

4. Alleged Conduct Requiring Investigation

4.1 Failure to Provide Direct Quora Evidence or Link

Kim alleges that Adam could have provided the link, records, or direct access that would have let him prove the Anna-related abuse and defend himself. He repeatedly asks why Adam did not contact police, provide evidence, or allow access when authorities were absent. This is the most concrete Quora-specific accusation because it points to records that should exist if the events occurred.

The critical questions are:

1. Did Adam personally know Kim was requesting evidence or help?
2. What specific account, post, share, upvote, space, or channel was Kim asking for?
3. Did Adam have access, custody, or practical ability to provide it?
4. Was there a legal, privacy, platform-policy, or safety reason not to provide it directly?
5. Were records preserved, deleted, restricted, or unavailable?
6. Did Adam communicate with Anna, Sean Kernan, moderators, or others about Kim?

If Adam knowingly withheld exculpatory evidence while inducing reliance or participating in abuse, the inference against him strengthens. If he had no personal knowledge, no legal ability, or no identified channel, the allegation weakens.

4.2 Alleged Favoring of Anna and Shifting Responsibility to Kim

Kim alleges that Adam sided with Anna, treated Kim as responsible for solving an abuse situation Adam could verify, and later shifted responsibility onto him. The source says Adam's alleged negligence toward Anna's abuse was one of the beginning points of later harm.

This claim must be separated from platform moderation generally. A platform CEO is not automatically criminally responsible for a user's misconduct. The relevant issue is personal knowledge and intentional assistance: Did Adam knowingly communicate with Anna, protect her, suppress evidence, encourage continued abuse, or blame Kim while holding contradictory records?

4.3 Inducement to Disclose Ideas Under an Investment Framework

Kim alleges that Adam induced or participated in a framework where Kim disclosed valuable ideas and prepared presentations in expectation of investment or reward. If Adam represented that ideas would be considered for payment or development and then used them outside that purpose, the issue could implicate fraud, confidentiality, trade-secret, unjust-enrichment, or contract theories depending on the records.

The source presently establishes Kim's asserted belief and his repeated statement that emails or Quora exchanges can prove the terms. It does not supply a signed agreement or direct Adam quote establishing a definite contract. The strongest investigative path is to obtain the full communication history and all presentation files.

4.4 Rule-Changing After Disclosure

Kim alleges that Adam and others changed the environment from an origin-credit investment process into a competition where stronger implementers could take, enhance, and dominate ideas. Kim repeatedly rejects the idea that "skill" or later enhancement defeats the originator's role.

This may not create liability unless tied to a specific legal right. However, it is relevant to intent if records show Adam knew Kim disclosed under one framework and later used a different framework to avoid payment, credit, or partnership.

4.5 Concealment of Presentation Origin During Dangerous Framing

Kim's most serious non-technical allegation is that Adam and Mark knew the presentation was a private investment pitch but stayed silent or acted adversely when it was framed as hostile. If true, Adam's knowledge of the presentation's origin would have been materially exculpatory.

The key records are Adam's communications with Mark Zuckerberg, any government or law-enforcement communications, Quora/Meta exchanges, presentation receipt records, and any statements made about Kim's purpose. Investigators should determine whether Adam corrected the record, failed to correct it, or affirmatively supplied a misleading version.

4.6 Use or Benefit From Kim's Presentation or Ideas

Kim alleges that Adam and Mark used or built upon his presentation, website concept, wooden ships, fishing ships, sea-platform system, and other ideas without consent or fair attribution. The report does not assume that every idea is legally protectable. It asks for a disciplined comparison:

1. What exactly did Kim create?
2. When did he create it?
3. Who received it?
4. What confidentiality or investment terms applied?
5. What exactly did Adam or an Adam-linked entity later create, publish, fund, or use?
6. What protected expression, confidential information, trade secret, patented subject matter, or contract right was involved?
7. What independent-development evidence exists?

4.7 Post-Severance Attachment to Ideas

Kim repeatedly states that Adam was no longer permitted to follow up on his ideas. He says "I am not working with Adam" and "if he latches on to it, please kick him out." He also alleges that Adam and Mark were trying to create a forced bind to him through his ideas.

If there was no enforceable right, the notice still matters to consent and relationship status. If there was an enforceable right, the notice may be critical to willfulness and damages. The report requests

preservation of all communications after severance that refer to Kim's ideas, presentations, opportunities, shares, investment, or follow-up development.

4.8 Psychological Harassment Through Relays and Shares

Kim alleges that Adam repeatedly sent or arranged irrelevant, emotionally destabilizing relays, including references to death, preserved bodies, his mother, cheating, and personal appearance. He says Adam did not listen when told to stop or to relay only court-relevant information.

To evaluate this, investigators need:

1. the exact item, URL, account, platform, and timestamp;
2. whether Adam controlled or directed the account;
3. whether the content was targeted to Kim or algorithmic;
4. whether Kim requested that it stop;
5. whether the sender continued afterward;
6. whether a reasonable person would expect substantial emotional distress; and
7. whether the content contained threats, intimidation, or merely offensive ambiguity.

4.9 Monitoring or Unauthorized Access

Kim alleges screen watching, monitoring, hacking, or a technical method that made him visible while leaving him blind. If authenticated, this could be severe. The current source does not include forensic reports or direct access logs.

Investigators should not rely on perceived responsiveness alone. They should obtain device images, access logs, account-login history, API logs, cloud-session records, malware scans, Wi-Fi/router records, and any lawful surveillance authorization. They should also ask Adam directly whether he ever viewed Kim's screen, account activity, files, device, or location through any system not available to ordinary users.

4.10 Interference With Buyers, Shelter Safety, or Nearby Persons

Kim alleges that Adam referred people into his environment or relayed a channel to buyers, causing nonresponse and placing him at risk around vulnerable or unstable people. These allegations are actionable only if a chain of proof exists.

For each alleged incident, investigators should require: buyer or person's name; contact history; the link or message received; sender account; timestamp; testimony; lost transaction value; and proof of Adam direction or knowledge. Without that chain, the allegation remains a harm report rather than an attribution.

4.11 Altered Quora Features or Disappearing History

Kim complains that a Quora following or upvote-observation feature changed and that accounts or histories disappeared. He also apologizes in places for speculation and acknowledges uncertainty about whether Adam deliberately changed a feature to hide evidence.

This should be handled as a platform-preservation question, not a conclusion. Investigators should ask Quora to preserve and explain product changes, account deletions, data-retention policy, moderation actions, and exportability of historical upvotes/shares during the relevant period.

4.12 Minimization, Help, and Attempted Reset

Kim alleges that Adam sometimes helped, sometimes misled, and sometimes tried to reset the situation as if prior harm were merely a prank, mistake, or misunderstanding. The record therefore supports a mixed picture rather than a single fixed motive.

If Adam did help expose other wrongdoing, that may mitigate intent or support a defense. If Adam used help to regain access, dilute charges, or continue idea attachment, that may support the cumulative theory. The distinction depends on authenticated communications.

5. Claimed Harm and Causation

Kim attributes the following harms to Adam's alleged conduct:

- loss of access to exculpatory Quora evidence during the Anna phase;
- prolonged inability to defend himself before authorities or witnesses;
- intensified isolation caused by indirect relays instead of direct communication;
- loss of control over the investment/presentation context;
- risk that a private business pitch was reframed as spying, invasion, or danger;
- fear of capital-punishment or extreme legal consequences from that framing;
- loss or dilution of idea credit and business opportunity;
- inability to choose his own partners after severance;
- emotional distress from alleged death, mother, corpse, cheating, appearance, and personal relays;
- fear of monitoring, screen observation, and being watched in private;
- interference with sales or buyers if channel links were sent to them; and
- feeling forced into a bind with a person he considered an attacker.

Causation must remain actor-specific. Kim's source also attributes harm to Anna, Zuckerberg, Biden, Musk, Steve Choe, other platform actors, public figures, family members, and ambiguous relays. Adam should be assigned only harms that follow from authenticated Adam acts or agreements.

6. Cumulative Theory and Incrimination Factors

Kim's cumulative theory is that Adam's alleged conduct should not be viewed as isolated mistakes. The alleged pattern is:

1. Adam allegedly had Quora-linked visibility into Anna-related abuse.
2. Adam allegedly did not provide the link, evidence, or direct contact that Kim needed.
3. Adam allegedly entered or maintained an investment relationship while Kim remained vulnerable and blind to the full channel.
4. Kim allegedly disclosed ideas and prepared presentations under a 4-million-per-idea or similar framework.
5. Adam allegedly knew the private and benign origin of the presentation.
6. Adam and Mark allegedly failed to correct, or participated in, later framing that made the presentation look hostile.
7. Kim later severed the relationship and redirected opportunity away from Adam and Mark.
8. Adam allegedly continued trying to attach himself to Kim's ideas or life despite notice.
9. Adam allegedly used relays and shares to destabilize Kim or keep him engaged.
10. Adam allegedly benefited from ambiguity, missing records, or Kim's inability to see the channel.

The strongest incrimination factors would be direct records showing: personal knowledge of abuse; deliberate withholding of evidence; false investment representations; receipt and use of confidential presentation material; communications encouraging others to mischaracterize the presentation; post-severance use after notice; repeated targeted electronic harassment after stop requests; unauthorized technical access; or efforts to influence witnesses or buyers.

The cumulative theory weakens if the records show: no personal Adam knowledge; ordinary platform policy constraints; no definite investment promise; no confidentiality; independent development; no Adam involvement in political/legal framing; algorithmic rather than targeted relays; no unauthorized access; or no chain connecting buyer/proximity incidents to Adam.

7. Defenses, Alternative Explanations, and Limiting Admissions

7.1 No Personal Knowledge or Duty

Adam may argue that he did not personally know about Anna's alleged conduct, did not receive actionable requests, had no legal duty to provide private user data, and could not disclose records without process. That defense should be tested against logs, messages, support tickets, direct exchanges, and internal communications.

7.2 Platform Privacy and Moderation Limits

Even if Quora held relevant evidence, disclosure to Kim may have been limited by privacy law, terms of service, retention policy, or safety concerns. The proper remedy may have been preservation or legal process rather than direct release. Investigators should distinguish failure to preserve from refusal to disclose without process.

7.3 No Enforceable Investment Contract

Adam may deny any 4-million-per-idea agreement or say that any discussion was informal, aspirational, conditional, or misunderstood. Kim identifies emails and Quora exchanges as proof. The full record is necessary before calling the arrangement contractual, fraudulent, or merely ambiguous.

7.4 Ideas Versus Protectable Material

Adam may argue that many concepts were abstract ideas, public-domain inspiration, obvious extensions, or independently developed. Copyright does not protect ideas, methods, or systems. Patent, trade secret, contract, and fraud theories require separate elements. Kim's claim is strongest where he can show nonpublic material, protected expression, confidential disclosure, detailed technical files, or specific copied elements.

7.5 Relay Misinterpretation

Kim repeatedly admits that relays may be misread. He says "apologies if I got that relay wrong" and similar language across the file. Adam may argue that shares were algorithmic, unrelated, generated by others, or misunderstood. This defense is strong unless account-control and targeting records connect specific items to Adam.

7.6 Mixed Help and Possible Mitigation

Kim sometimes says Adam helped, spoke out, or may deserve less severe punishment than others. He opposes capital punishment for Adam in some passages and describes Adam as possibly less capable of extreme harm than others. These statements are relevant to motive, proportionality, and credibility. They do not erase allegations, but they prevent the report from presenting Adam as uniformly malicious in every event.

7.7 Timeline Uncertainty

Kim sometimes states that he may be wrong about whether Adam offered investment before or after Anna's video release, or about the order of certain relays and platform events. The report therefore recommends reconstructing the timeline from original metadata rather than memory.

7.8 Third-Party and Algorithmic Actors

Many harms could have been caused by Anna, Sean Kernan, Zuckerberg, Musk, Steve Choe, other users, platform algorithms, recommendation systems, or unrelated public content. Adam should not be assigned third-party acts without proof of direction, agreement, adoption, or knowing assistance.

8. Potential U.S. Legal Relevance

This section is issue-spotting only. It does not conclude that any statute was violated.

Legal issue	Potential relevance if facts are proved	Current evidentiary gap
Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030	Relevant only if Adam or an agent intentionally accessed a protected computer without authorization, exceeded authorized access, obtained information, caused damage/loss, trafficked passwords, or conspired/attempted to do so.	No forensic proof yet of unauthorized access, password trafficking, device compromise, or Adam-specific access.
Wire fraud, 18 U.S.C. § 1343	Relevant if electronic communications were used in a scheme to obtain money, property, confidential information, or business opportunity through false promises or misrepresentations.	Need the exact investment communications, false statements, reliance, property obtained, and intent at the time.
Trade-secret theft, 18 U.S.C. § 1832	Relevant if nonpublic business or technical information qualified as a trade secret, was related to interstate commerce, and was knowingly taken or used without authorization for another's economic benefit.	Need proof of secrecy measures, nonpublic value, unauthorized acquisition/use, and Adam's knowledge.
Federal stalking, 18 U.S.C. § 2261A	Relevant if Adam used an interstate electronic service in a course of conduct intended to harass, intimidate, injure, or surveil, causing fear or substantial emotional distress.	Need authenticated account control, repeated targeted communications, intent, stop notice, and distress evidence.
Federal conspiracy, 18 U.S.C. § 371	Relevant if Adam agreed with another person to commit a federal offense and an overt act was taken to advance it.	Need agreement and overt act tied to a specific federal offense, not merely parallel conduct or shared silence.
Conspiracy against rights, 18 U.S.C. § 241	Potentially relevant only if two or more persons conspired to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate Kim in the free exercise of a federally protected right.	Need a specific federally protected right, agreement, intent, and overt conduct; current allegations are broad.
Witness/victim tampering, 18 U.S.C. § 1512	Relevant if Adam corruptly persuaded, intimidated, threatened, or misled a witness or victim, or caused record destruction, with a qualifying proceeding or investigation nexus.	Need direct communications to witnesses, buyers, authorities, or custodians and evidence of corrupt intent.
Copyright limits	The Copyright Office states that copyright does not protect ideas, methods, or systems; it can protect particular expression.	Need side-by-side comparison of copied expression, not just overlap in general ideas.
Patent inventorship and ownership	If patentable subject matter exists, inventorship depends on contribution to claimed invention; ownership depends on assignment or law.	Need patent applications, claims, dated invention records, and contribution evidence.

Legal issue	Potential relevance if facts are proved	Current evidentiary gap
Civil theories: fraud, negligent misrepresentation, breach of confidence, unjust enrichment, interference, IIED, defamation	May be more practical than criminal statutes if records show false promises, misuse of confidential materials, interference with buyers, or targeted distress.	Need jurisdiction, limitations analysis, damages, and authenticated records.

9. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests

9.1 Quora Records

Preserve and produce, by legal process where required:

1. Kim's Quora accounts, account history, deletions, suspensions, login records, comments, answers, messages, shares, upvotes, spaces, and profile-page interactions.
2. Adam-controlled or Adam-linked account activity involving Kim, Anna, Sean Kernan, Mark Zuckerberg, or the relevant presentation topics.
3. Anna-related posts, upvotes, shares, messages, abusive communications, account deletions, and moderation logs.
4. Sean Kernan upvote/share history and any abusive messages or titles Kim identified.
5. Product changes affecting individual following lists, upvote visibility, share visibility, spaces, and account history.
6. Internal communications or support tickets discussing Kim, Anna, account abuse, privacy, law enforcement, or the requested link/channel.

9.2 Investment and Presentation Records

Preserve and produce:

1. All communications between Kim and Adam concerning investment, rewards, 4 million per idea, presentation review, ownership, development rights, or confidentiality.
2. Quora exchanges with Adam's profile or account where Kim says the deal and presentation links were discussed.
3. All presentation files, attachments, receipts, file links, timestamps, metadata, prior versions, and mailing or upload records.
4. Communications between Adam and Mark Zuckerberg concerning Kim, the presentation, website/platform concepts, investment, shares, or development.

5. Records showing whether Adam or any Adam-linked entity built, funded, sold, licensed, patented, published, or used material derived from Kim's presentations.

9.3 Framing and Government/Authority Records

Request:

1. Any communications between Adam, Mark Zuckerberg, government actors, law enforcement, or intermediaries concerning Kim's presentation, alleged invasion, spying, spamming, or danger.
2. Any statement Adam made to correct, endorse, challenge, or conceal the presentation's private investment origin.
3. Records showing whether the operational portion of the presentation was withheld, hidden, or separated from the abstract content-curation portion.
4. Any evidence that Adam knew Kim believed he faced severe legal consequences.

9.4 Relays, Shares, and Harassment Records

For each disputed relay or share:

1. URL, title, screenshot, platform, account, timestamp, and device where seen.
2. Account owner and access logs.
3. Recommendation-system records showing whether content was targeted, organic, sponsored, or algorithmic.
4. Records of any request from Kim to stop or to keep communications court-relevant.
5. Whether the same account continued after notice.

9.5 Technical and Surveillance Records

Preserve:

1. Kim's device images, browser and account logs, router logs, cloud-session records, and malware scans.
2. Quora session and API logs connected to Kim and disputed accounts.
3. Any monitoring authorization, internal demo, surveillance request, or technical access report involving Kim.
4. Provider logs showing unusual login, screen-sharing, remote access, or unauthorized data access.

9.6 Buyer, Shelter, and Proximity Records

For each alleged buyer or proximity incident:

1. Identify the buyer/person, transaction, expected response, and date.
2. Obtain the communication that allegedly sent the channel or adverse material.
3. Identify sender account and any Adam connection.
4. Obtain recipient testimony on why they stopped responding.
5. Preserve shelter/soup-kitchen incident details only where a specific person, date, and communication can be identified.

10. Questions for Adam D'Angelo

1. Did you personally know of Kim's allegations against Anna during the early Quora phase?
2. Did Kim ever ask you, directly or indirectly, for a link, evidence, or access to a Quora channel involving Anna, Sean Kernan, or other users?
3. What Quora records existed concerning Kim, Anna, Sean Kernan, upvotes, shares, comments, spaces, or deleted accounts?
4. Were any such records deleted, hidden, restricted, preserved, exported, or provided to anyone?
5. Did you ever communicate with Anna, Sean Kernan, moderators, support personnel, or other Quora users about Kim?
6. Did you offer, discuss, imply, or accept any 4-million-per-idea, investment, reward, or presentation-review framework with Kim?
7. What presentations, files, links, drafts, receipts, or ideas did you receive from Kim?
8. What was your understanding of ownership, confidentiality, follow-up rights, and development rights for those materials?
9. Did you introduce Mark Zuckerberg or anyone else to Kim's presentation or business opportunity?
10. Did you communicate with Mark Zuckerberg about using, developing, rejecting, or reframing Kim's presentation?
11. Did you ever describe Kim's presentation as spying, invasion, economic sabotage, spam, danger, or anything similar?
12. Did you ever correct any person who described the presentation that way?
13. When did you understand that Kim had severed any business relationship with you or redirected the opportunity to Jeff Bezos or another partner?

14. Did you or any entity connected to you continue developing any idea, product, platform, or investment opportunity derived from Kim's disclosed material after severance?
15. Did you send or cause to be sent any share, relay, message, or recommendation concerning death, preserved bodies, Kim's mother, cheating, appearance, or other personal topics to Kim?
16. Did Kim ask you to stop such communications or restrict them to court-relevant matters?
17. Did you ever view Kim's screen, device, location, accounts, private files, or communications through any nonpublic technical method?
18. Did you ever suggest, demonstrate, authorize, or request a monitoring method involving Kim?
19. Did you ever send a channel link or adverse information about Kim to buyers, shelter residents, soup-kitchen contacts, or people near him?
20. What records are you willing to preserve and produce to confirm or disprove these allegations?

11. Witness Questions

Witnesses should be asked separately before being shown Kim's interpretations.

1. What did you personally observe on Quora concerning Kim, Anna, Sean Kernan, Adam, upvotes, shares, spaces, or deleted accounts?
2. Did you see Kim ask Adam or Quora for help, records, a link, or direct access?
3. Did you see any Adam-controlled account communicate with Kim?
4. Did you hear or see any discussion of a 4-million-per-idea investment or reward framework?
5. Did you see Kim's presentation before it became disputed?
6. Who received the presentation and under what stated purpose?
7. Did anyone describe the presentation as invasion, spying, spamming, or danger?
8. Did Adam correct, support, or remain silent about that characterization in your presence?
9. Did Kim clearly sever the relationship with Adam and Mark?
10. Did Adam or Adam-linked persons continue referring to Kim's ideas after severance?
11. Can you authenticate any alleged relay, share, upvote, or message attributed to Adam?
12. Did you receive a channel link or adverse material about Kim from Adam or an Adam-linked account?
13. Did you observe any monitoring, unauthorized access, or technical method involving Kim?

12. Assessment of Evidentiary Strength

Allegation cluster	Current strength from source	Why
No in-person relationship and Quora-only contact	Moderate	Kim states this clearly and repeatedly; can be tested by communications and witness records.
Adam/Quora held relevant evidence	Moderate as a preservation lead; unproven as personal culpability	Quora records are inherently plausible as platform evidence, but Adam's personal knowledge and duty require proof.
4-million-per-idea investment framework	Moderate as Kim's asserted understanding; unproven as contract	Repeated source references identify emails/Quora exchanges, but the source does not include the actual agreement.
Website/presentation private business purpose	Moderate	Repeated chronology and presentation descriptions support Kim's claimed purpose; original files needed.
Adam concealed presentation origin during dangerous framing	Serious but currently unproven	Requires communications showing Adam knew and either misled or failed despite a legal or factual duty.
Idea theft or post-severance misuse	Mixed	Strong notice of Kim's no-consent position; legal claim depends on protected material, confidentiality, and use evidence.
Relays/shares harassment	Weak to moderate depending on authentication	Many examples and distress reports, but account control and targeting are not yet proved.
Monitoring, hacking, screen observation	Weak on current text; high severity if proved	Requires forensic and provider evidence absent from the source.
Buyer/channel/proximity interference	Weak on current text	Needs named recipients, messages, and Adam-linked sender evidence.
Conspiracy with Mark/Biden/others	Unproven	Needs agreement and overt acts tied to specific unlawful conduct.

13. Requested Disposition

Kim's allegations should be preserved and investigated through records rather than resolved through assumption. The recommended disposition is:

1. Issue preservation requests to Quora and relevant custodians for the Adam, Kim, Anna, Sean Kernan, and presentation-related records.
2. Obtain the complete Kim-Adam communication history, including Quora exchanges, emails, presentation links, file receipts, and any record of the alleged investment terms.

3. Authenticate the presentation files and reconstruct a precise creation, transmission, receipt, and publication timeline.
4. Obtain Adam and Mark Zuckerberg communications concerning the presentation, investment, origin, use, and any later framing.
5. Authenticate any alleged Adam relays or shares before treating them as communications.
6. Conduct device and account forensic review before making any monitoring or hacking finding.
7. Interview witnesses separately and require exact dates, words, accounts, and saved artifacts.
8. Preserve exculpatory material as actively as incriminating material, including records showing no Adam knowledge, no Adam access, no agreement, independent development, algorithmic relays, or lawful platform constraints.
9. Avoid charging language until the element-specific evidence is obtained.
10. Keep the focus on Adam's alleged conduct, not on unrelated actors or Kim's reaction language.

The central investigative question is whether Adam D'Angelo knowingly used his platform, business position, and presentation access to exploit Kim while withholding or distorting context that could have protected him. The supplied source raises that question with substantial detail. It does not, by itself, answer it.

Official Legal Sources

- [18 U.S.C. § 1030 - Computer fraud and unauthorized access](#)
- [18 U.S.C. § 1343 - Wire fraud](#)
- [18 U.S.C. § 1832 - Theft of trade secrets](#)
- [18 U.S.C. § 2261A - Stalking using interstate facilities or electronic services](#)
- [18 U.S.C. § 371 - Federal conspiracy](#)
- [18 U.S.C. § 1512 - Witness, victim, or informant tampering](#)
- [18 U.S.C. § 241 - Conspiracy against rights](#)
- [U.S. Copyright Office Circular 31 - Ideas, methods, and systems are not protected by copyright](#)
- [USPTO MPEP § 2109.01 - Patent inventorship requires contribution to the claimed invention](#)

Source-Unit Guide

The combined file contains 331 Adam/Quora source units and approximately 299,822 words. The parser identified 1,483 direct Adam, D'Angelo, or Quora references. All 331 units contain Adam or Quora references because the source file is organized under Adam D'Angelo.

The following source units carried the most report weight because they contain direct Adam/Quora/presentation allegations, chronology, or limiting admissions. Unit 27, `adamanalysis.txt`, is treated as a secondary prior-analysis unit rather than primary proof.

Source unit	File	Report use
2	1486486.txt	No in-person relationship; alleged Quora-only contact; upvotes and alleged early responsive statements.
3	1515grg.txt	Alleged Adam shares/relays; aviation-idea authorship; alleged political and competitive bias with Zuckerberg.
5	154854.txt	Contest or investment rules; alleged expectation that follow-up belonged to investor/team rather than competitors.
6	154864.txt	Timeline separation: Anna period, Adam entry, and later investment prospect.
9	156458466.txt	Timeline defense that Adam/Mark presentation framing came later than Steve-house period.
10	15648646.txt	Alleged rule change: presentation and ideas allegedly used to advantage Adam/Zuckerberg over originator.
11	1584584636.txt	Post-notice allegation that Adam tried to involve himself in ideas after being told not to.
12	1641844894.txt	Alleged Adam/Mark fronting Biden; Quora following-section concern; later apology for speculation.
16	181484645.txt	Quora CEO/evidence-key allegation: Adam allegedly held evidence needed for authorities.
17	184866.txt	Adam investment and 4-million-per-idea chronology; presentation predated closer Steve contact.
31	er3243132.txt	Website presentation, Festus financial projection, Adam/Mark exchange, and uncertainty limits.
42	fnewn33l.txt	Website idea origin, Quora/content trigger, investment agreement claim, Bezos redirection, presentation framing.
63	gert34534.txt	Direct communication/link and negligence themes; Adam/Mark alleged control at early stage.
87	gregq234243.txt	Competition and investment/idea authorship themes with substantial Adam references.

Source unit	File	Report use
127	he4341423.txt	Adam/Mark responsibility, direct access, and communication evidence themes.
130	he534141.txt	Presentation, framing, and responsibility themes; includes uncertainty and witness requests.
142	hi3uh4i234.txt	High-density Adam/Quora/investment allegations and limitations.
180	hiuy8997.txt	Extended source unit with multiple Adam/Quora/presentation allegations.
182	hiuyi798.txt	Adam/Quora and repeated-relay allegations.
190	hjty7iu768568.txt	High-density unit on Adam, investment, Quora, relays, and claimed harm.
210	hssrter234434.txt	High-density unit on investment, presentation, and relationship boundary issues.
223	hwe3544234.txt	High-density unit on Adam/Quora/investment and surveillance claims.
255	j03ij2o3i3j.txt	Claims concerning Adam, relays, monitoring, and evidence preservation.
266	joi3jo2i332.txt	Extended unit with multiple Adam allegations and uncertainty language.
268	joi8089.txt	Adam/Quora, investment, and claimed interference themes.
272	joiu098098.txt	Soup-kitchen/proximity allegation; alleged failure to contact police; link request; relays about mother/corpses.
278	jr53454523.txt	Buyer/channel-link allegation; alleged shelter/proximity relays and monitoring-method suspicion.
292	oiu0980809.txt	4-million-per-idea timing; Adam deal before move downstairs; Quora exchange evidence request.
318	uiyio7t679.txt	Email-timeline claim that follow-up presentations after Adam deal confirm authorship before downstairs disclosures.
323	vcgvuhijoiy67890.txt	Severance: Adam and Mark allegedly not permitted to follow up on ideas after attacker status.

Source unit	File	Report use
330	yw345223412.txt	Bind/force theory; alleged idea hijacking, skill-over-origin theory, and post-severance no-permission position.
331	zuckerberg.txt	Prior Zuckerberg report block; secondary but relevant to Adam as business bridge and alleged presentation-origin silence.

Theme Coverage

Quora evidence, Anna, upvotes, link, direct access, CEO/control allegations: units 1-12, 16-19, 21-29, 31-46, 48-49, 51-52, 54-71, 73-81, 83-87, 89-99, 101-104, 106, 108, 110, 112-117, 120-131, 133-135, 137-138, 141-145, 147-153, 155, 158-159, 161-165, 168, 171, 174-175, 177-184, 186-188, 190-191, 194-195, 200-210, 213-225, 227-231, 233, 236-237, 240-244, 246-251, 254-257, 259-264, 266-270, 272, 274-280, 282-288, 290-292, 294-296, 300, 302-304, 306-308, 310-311, 315-318, 321-323, 325-327, 329-331.

Investment, 4-million-per-idea, presentation, Adam/Mark/Zuckerberg business process: units 1, 3-7, 9-23, 25-28, 30-43, 45, 48-49, 51-54, 57, 59-65, 67-71, 73-77, 79-88, 91-101, 103, 105-106, 112-113, 115-116, 121-122, 124-125, 127-137, 139, 141-142, 144-148, 150-153, 155, 158, 161, 163-165, 171, 173-175, 179-180, 182, 184-186, 188-191, 194, 196-197, 200-202, 204-211, 213-219, 221-231, 235-236, 238, 241-245, 248-250, 254-258, 260-264, 266-270, 272, 274-276, 278-280, 282-286, 288-295, 300, 302-304, 306-307, 310-312, 314-318, 320, 323-331.

Idea origin, follow-up, hijacking, platform/website, ships, vehicles, technical concepts: units 1, 3-7, 9-13, 17-28, 31-33, 37-39, 41-43, 45-51, 53-54, 57-60, 62-75, 77-88, 90-96, 98-106, 110-116, 119, 121-122, 124-125, 127-131, 133, 136-137, 139, 141-145, 147, 149-153, 155, 157-158, 160-162, 164, 166, 169-170, 174-175, 177-180, 182-194, 196, 200-204, 206-219, 221-225, 227-231, 236, 238, 240-254, 256-257, 260-269, 271, 273, 275-276, 278, 280, 282-287, 290-292, 295, 297, 299-300, 302-308, 310-315, 317-327, 329-331.

Presentation allegedly reframed as spying, invasion, political danger, or death-penalty exposure: units 1, 3-7, 9-13, 15-19, 21-23, 25-28, 31-37, 39-40, 42-43, 45-52, 54-55, 57, 59-65, 67, 69-71, 73-81, 83-87, 89-101, 103-106, 112-113, 115-116, 121-122, 124-125, 127-139, 141-148, 150-151, 153, 158-159, 161-166, 169, 171, 174-175, 177-182, 184, 186, 188-191, 194, 196, 200-202, 204-214, 216-217, 219, 221-232, 235-236, 238, 240-251, 254-258, 260-262, 264-268, 270-276, 278-280, 282-286, 288-292, 295, 300, 303-304, 306-308, 310-312, 314-318, 323-325, 327, 329-331.

Relays, shares, alleged taunting, mother/death imagery, personal comments, psychological harassment: units 2-13, 15-51, 53-55, 57-60, 63-67, 69-75, 77-85, 87-94, 96, 98-99, 102-119, 121-131, 133, 135, 137-145, 147-164, 166-172, 174, 176-188, 190-194, 196-198, 200-214, 216, 218-225, 227-241, 243-244, 246-249, 251-257, 260-268, 270-275, 277-278, 280-284, 286-288, 290, 292-295, 297, 299-304, 306-308, 310-327, 329-331.

Monitoring, screen observation, hacking, surveillance, proximity, and technical-access claims: units 1-2, 4-6, 9, 11-12, 16-17, 19, 21, 24, 26-29, 33-36, 39, 43, 45-46, 48, 54, 60, 62, 69, 71, 73, 79-81, 83, 87,

91-94, 99, 102, 106, 112-113, 116, 119, 123-126, 131, 133-135, 142, 144-145, 147-148, 150-153, 159-160, 166, 174-175, 177, 180-181, 183, 186-187, 190-191, 194, 200-202, 204, 206-208, 212, 216, 218-219, 223-224, 227, 229, 231, 236, 242, 246, 254-255, 257, 261-263, 266-267, 272, 274-275, 278-279, 282, 284-285, 290, 292, 295, 303, 310-311, 314-315, 318, 324, 327, 329-331.

Withdrawal, Bezos redirection, no-permission notices, cut-off/stay-out-of-life statements: units 3-7, 9-13, 16-23, 25-28, 31-34, 36-37, 39-46, 48-51, 53-55, 57-59, 62-65, 67, 71-73, 75, 77-79, 81, 83-85, 87-88, 90-97, 99, 103, 105-106, 108-109, 115-116, 121-125, 127-128, 130-131, 133-135, 137-139, 142-146, 148-153, 155, 157-159, 161-163, 167, 169, 174-175, 177-178, 180-182, 185, 188-191, 194, 196, 198, 200, 202-203, 206-214, 216, 218, 221-224, 227-229, 231, 233-234, 236, 240-241, 243-244, 246, 248, 251, 254-257, 260, 264, 266-268, 270-272, 278-280, 285-287, 289, 291-293, 295, 299-300, 302-306, 310-311, 313-327, 329-331.

Speculation, apology, uncertainty, possible misread relays, mixed-help admissions: units 1-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-21, 23-26, 28-37, 39-46, 49-51, 53-55, 57-60, 62-65, 67, 71-75, 77-81, 83-88, 90-103, 105-106, 108, 112-113, 115-117, 119-125, 127-131, 133-134, 137-139, 141-142, 144-151, 153, 155-159, 161-163, 165-171, 174-178, 180-183, 185, 187-191, 194, 196-198, 200-211, 213, 216-219, 221-225, 227-231, 233-234, 236-238, 242-244, 246, 248, 251-252, 254-257, 262-264, 266-268, 270, 272-278, 280, 282, 284-286, 288-290, 292-295, 297, 300, 302-304, 306-308, 310-311, 314-318, 320-330.