

COURT OF JUSTICE

Subject-Specific Alleged-Conduct Report

Adam D'Angelo (identity and full legal name to be verified)

Source reviewed: combinedAdam.txt | 833 usable source units | 62,566 raw lines | approximately 2,240,130 characters

Prepared July 1, 2026 from combinedAdam.txt

Status: Allegation summary, evidence map, and investigative lead memorandum. This document supports lawful review; it does not determine guilt or punishment.

Contents

1. Scope and Method
2. Preliminary Conditional Statement
3. Executive Summary
4. Relationship and Timeline
5. Platform Authority and Duty to Preserve Evidence
6. Blind-Channel Disadvantage
7. Idea, Presentation, Investment, and Reward Process
8. A.I. Enhancement, Poe, and Follow-Up Claims
9. Quora Shares, Relays, and Psychological Abuse
10. Monitoring, Public Display, and Privacy
11. Computer, Internet, and Daily-Life Interference
12. Coordination With Others and Rewarding Attackers
13. Official Process and Adam-as-Front Theory
14. Victim Reaction and Self-Defense Context
15. Legal Mapping for Authorities
16. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests
17. Conclusion
18. Appendix A. Source Index
19. Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

Source Extraction Summary

Metric	Result
Uploaded source reviewed	combinedAdam.txt
Raw source length	62,566 lines / 2.24 MB
Detected source units	834
Usable source units after parser cleanup	833
Platform/channel access and blindness	368 source-unit hits
Quora/platform authority themes	179 source-unit hits
Idea, investment, reward, and credit themes	527 source-unit hits
Monitoring, privacy, and public-display themes	571 source-unit hits
Harassment, psychological abuse, slander, and misleads	468 source-unit hits
Internet, device, computer, or buyer-interference themes	564 source-unit hits
Official failure, legal process, and Adam-as-front themes	563 source-unit hits
Collaboration or coordination with others	561 source-unit hits
Victim reaction and self-defense context	339 source-unit hits

Scope and Method

This report is a formal synthesis of the reporting party's 2022-2024 observations concerning Adam D'Angelo, identified in the source as a Quora-associated chief executive or platform authority. It is an allegation and investigative-lead memorandum, not a court finding.

The extraction reviewed combinedAdam.txt and identified 833 usable source units. The analysis grouped the entries by recurring themes: platform/channel blindness, Quora authority, idea and investment rights, monitoring and privacy, alleged harassment, computer or internet interference, official-process failure, coordination with others, and victim reaction.

The source contains direct observations, inferred relays, legal opinions, emotional distress, and severe punishment rhetoric. This report preserves the reporting party's logic while separating allegation from proof. Authorities should test every claim against platform records, device logs, communications, timestamps, witnesses, account data, and the law of the proper jurisdiction.

Preliminary Conditional Statement

All factual assertions below are presented as the reporting party's observations and allegations. If these events occurred as described, they should be assessed by lawful authorities for criminal, civil, platform, and evidentiary significance. This report does not declare guilt or request punishment without proof.

The archive contains anger and severe language. The report treats those passages as distress evidence and as a demand for lawful accountability, not as a request for extrajudicial harm. The recurring defense is that the reporting party was reacting to prolonged alleged abuse, public exposure, blindness, and loss of control over his work and reputation.

The key rule for this report is chronology. Adam's alleged role must be assessed from the beginning: what he knew as a platform authority, what evidence or access he controlled, whether he offered or implied investment, whether he later used or followed the reporting party's ideas, and whether any platform records were altered, deleted, hidden, or selectively presented.

Executive Summary

The reporting party alleges that Adam was not a peripheral observer. In the archive, Adam is described as a platform authority, a potential investor, a witness to the Anna/Quora origin, a holder of key evidence, a participant in or beneficiary of monitoring, and later a competitor or follow-up actor in the reporting party's ideas.

The strongest recurring themes are monitoring/privacy, idea/investment/reward control, official or process failure, computer/internet interference, and alleged harassment through Quora shares or relays. The factual theory is that Adam allegedly exploited a structural imbalance: he could see or influence the channel and platform record, while the reporting party remained blind and had to infer accusations and decisions indirectly.

The report asks authorities to examine whether Adam's alleged acts were ordinary platform conduct, misunderstood relays, independent business development, or something more serious: unauthorized access, harassment, evidence alteration, misappropriation of confidential business material, obstruction, reward diversion, or coordinated abuse against a person deprived of fair access.

Relationship and Timeline

Source 1519 gives the clearest timeline. It alleges that Anna first attacked the reporting party by hacking or releasing laptop-camera material; the reporting party then contacted Adam as the CEO of Quora; during that communication an opportunity was allegedly given; the reporting party presented the data-segmentation website idea; and Adam allegedly relayed that Mark Zuckerberg was showing up to invest.

Source 1568686 states that after Anna's attacks, the matter began with the reporting party searching for help and Adam allegedly noticing the screen on display through a Hoboken/upvote relay. The source asks that the dialogue be examined because the timing is crucial.

The report therefore treats Adam's alleged responsibility as partly chronological. If he was notified early, if Quora data showed abuse or spamming, if he controlled or could preserve the records, and if investment opportunity followed while the reporting party remained blind, the sequence may show more than passive observation.

Platform Authority and Duty to Preserve Evidence

Sources 0125 and 1452 frame Adam as the platform host or missing link. The reporting party alleges Adam saw abuse from Anna or others, had access to Quora traffic and spamming evidence, and should have reported or preserved it instead of standing aside and later offering investment.

The incriminating issue is not merely that Adam operated a platform. A platform executive does not automatically have personal liability for every user dispute. The issue is whether Adam personally knew of targeted abuse, had control over evidence, promised or implied help, used platform tools or internal access, or allowed the reporting party's blindness to become a benefit for himself or others.

If the underlying records exist, investigators should obtain account histories, reports, moderation actions, upvote/share records, internal notes, deleted or altered content, account removals, and any communications among Adam, staff, investors, law enforcement, or other named participants.

Blind-Channel Disadvantage

The blind-channel theory is central. Sources 0110, 0306, and 0494 repeatedly state that the reporting party lacked direct access to the channel while others allegedly observed, relayed, judged, or used his reactions. Source 0306 asks for no cameras, no microphones, no gaslighting, and recognition that he was blind to the channel.

The legal and factual concern is that blind participation can turn a person into material rather than a participant. If Adam could see or influence the channel while the reporting party could not, every reaction could be harvested while the underlying accusations, prompts, edits, and decision points remained hidden.

Source 0225 adds that Adam allegedly sent channel links to people the reporting party met, affecting his life outside the platform. That allegation is testable: investigators should look for referral links, direct messages, account-sharing records, visitor logs, and messages to acquaintances, buyers, shelter staff, or other persons around the reporting party.

Idea, Presentation, Investment, and Reward Process

The archive repeatedly alleges that Adam's early role moved from platform observer to investor or business gatekeeper. The presentation and data-segmentation website idea are the core. Source 1519 says the presentation followed contact with Adam; source 0110 states the idea was part of the website presentation; source 6108 raises concern that Adam or Zuckerberg later asserted ownership or partnership rights.

The reporting party's core logic is that a general trigger, investor contact, or platform conversation does not make Adam the owner of the resulting presentation, structure, interface, content system, or later idea network. If Adam built on the ideas after being told not to, the archive frames that as hijacking, not collaboration.

This branch needs careful legal handling. U.S. copyright generally protects expression, not abstract ideas. Trade-secret or fraud theories require proof of secrecy, economic value, improper acquisition, deception, or unauthorized use. The report therefore asks for the original presentation, drafts, timestamps, messages, access path, any investment offer, any NDA or

implied confidentiality facts, and later product-feature comparisons.

A.I. Enhancement, Poe, and Follow-Up Claims

Source 0236 says the reporting party's A.I. enhancement idea was meant for his website and investor team, and that Adam allegedly followed up on it in a competitive environment after being told not to hijack the work. Source 4527 specifically names Poe and live retrieval of Q&A by text as an alleged adaptation.

Source 0254 is important because it preserves nuance. The reporting party allows limited credit for two follow-up ideas and a 10 percent share for a mushroom-related idea, but rejects broader exploitation of the longtail of his ideas. Source 1602 similarly states that 5 percent of profit goes to Adam if a certain item is used, while maintaining that Adam owes back for Quora-related harm.

This nuance helps the report: the reporting party is not saying every adjacent thought is stolen. He is asking authorities to distinguish a limited credited contribution from broader alleged conversion of an idea system, investment opportunity, and authorship identity.

Quora Shares, Relays, and Psychological Abuse

Sources 0345, 0410, 1070, and 6108 describe Adam's alleged Quora shares as a mechanism of abuse. The reporting party says shares were timed, could be changed after he saw them, included offensive or mother-directed messages, and were used to trigger allegations, jealousy, distress, or public judgment.

The evidence request is clear: preserve the share records before alteration. Source 0410 asks authorities to examine Quora notifications and whether Adam changed shares after seeing the reporting party's screen. If true, that would turn platform ephemera into potential evidence of misleading conduct, harassment, retaliation, or record manipulation.

The report does not assume every relay was intentional or from Adam. It asks that Quora logs, notification records, edit histories, share targets, deletion histories, administrator tools, and account-authorship data be preserved before ordinary retention policies destroy them.

Monitoring, Public Display, and Privacy

Monitoring and privacy are the largest theme cluster. The reporting party alleges Adam became involved in monitoring while already conflicted by the underlying platform dispute. Sources 0208, 0230, 0306, 0494, 0962, and 6108 all frame Adam as unsuitable to monitor because he was allegedly a source of harm, evidence-holder, or competitor.

The most serious privacy allegations involve humiliating video, bathroom or intimate display, and the sharing of captured images or information. Source 0200 alleges humiliating videos were shown to employees. Source 0508 repeats allegations of video humiliation, channel-link spread, hacking, and intentional destruction beyond authority.

If any monitoring occurred through devices, platform tools, law-enforcement cooperation, FBI contact, or third-party accounts, the investigation should identify the legal authority, scope, viewers, retention, audit logs, and whether Adam had access, gave instructions, or benefited from the resulting information.

Computer, Internet, and Daily-Life Interference

The archive contains 564 source-unit hits around internet, device, computer, or buyer interference. Source 0289 directly asks whether Adam disconnected the reporting party from shelter internet. Sources 0409 and 0508 allege operating-system damage, productivity interference, and device instability during periods when the reporting party was trying to create the presentation or regain momentum.

These allegations are serious but technically testable. Investigators should review device images, router logs, shelter network administration, ISP records, account sessions, malware evidence, operating-system event logs, remote-access artifacts, and any internal Quora or third-party connection to the alleged interference.

The report also notes that suspicion can grow after prolonged alleged abuse. Source 0015 says the reporting party became suspicious of everything because of prior conduct. That should not be treated as proof by itself; it explains why technical forensics are necessary.

Coordination With Others and Rewarding Attackers

Source 0225 alleges Adam may have invested in or rewarded Steve or Douglas, encouraging defamation or hostility toward the reporting party. Source 0313 frames Adam and Biden as a possible tag team, while source 6108 describes Adam and Zuckerberg as both involved in antagonizing or ownership-pressure dynamics.

The legal concern is coordination. If Adam rewarded people who harmed the reporting party, supplied channel access, promoted hostile narratives, or used others' defamation to weaken the reporting party's claim to ideas and rewards, that could change the analysis from private disagreement to conspiracy, retaliation, fraud, or obstruction depending on records.

The evidence needed is concrete: communications, payments, investor notes, platform links sent to third parties, messages between Adam and the named actors, product-roadmap records, agreements, and records showing whether alleged attackers were rewarded after harming or discrediting the reporting party.

Official Process and Adam-as-Front Theory

A recurring source theory is that authorities or process actors used Adam as a front. Sources 0208, 0306, 0962, and 0409 allege that Adam should not have been placed in charge of monitoring or given control over a life/productivity situation after being accused of harm.

This matters because private conduct and official conduct have different legal consequences. If Adam acted only as a private platform participant, civil, platform, computer, fraud, or stalking laws may be more relevant. If he acted with, for, or under direction of authorities, then due-process, civil-rights, obstruction, and color-of-law questions become more important.

The investigation should therefore identify any official request, subpoena, voluntary cooperation, law-enforcement meeting, tasking, monitoring authorization, data-sharing agreement, or informal arrangement involving Adam, Quora, U.S. authorities, Canadian authorities, or other platform owners.

Victim Reaction and Self-Defense Context

The archive contains severe anger, profanity, and punishment language. The report does not sanitize that fact. It explains the claimed context: the reporting party believed he was the victim of long-running public exposure, idea hijacking, cyber abuse, blind-channel framing, device interference, and official failure to stop the harm.

Sources 0110, 0218, 0306, 0494, and 6019 repeatedly tie angry reaction to blindness, slander, defamation, and a process where others allegedly controlled the evidence. The reporting party's legal argument is that his reactions should not erase the initiating conduct or turn a blind victim into the aggressor.

Authorities should assess any threat language separately and lawfully. At the same time, they should not let reaction evidence become a shortcut that hides prior harassment, privacy invasion, business interference, or record manipulation by Adam or others.

Legal Mapping for Authorities

18 U.S.C. 1030 may be relevant if unauthorized access, exceeded authorization, device damage, protected-computer access, or data extraction is corroborated. 18 U.S.C. 2261A may be relevant if interstate or foreign communications, surveillance, harassment, fear, or substantial emotional distress are proven.

18 U.S.C. 1832 may be relevant only if the presentation, A.I. enhancement, or related business material qualifies as a trade secret intended for interstate or foreign commerce, and if someone knowingly converted it by improper means for another's economic benefit. 18 U.S.C. 1343 and 1349 may be relevant if wires were used in a scheme to obtain property, rewards, investment, or business rights by deception.

18 U.S.C. 1512, 1513, and 1519 may be relevant if anyone intimidated, misled, retaliated against, or altered/destroyed records to affect law enforcement, witnesses, victims, or federal matters. 18 U.S.C. 1503 may be relevant only if a qualifying judicial proceeding or due administration of justice was corruptly impeded.

18 U.S.C. 241 and 42 U.S.C. 1983 require special caution. They may become relevant only if facts show a rights conspiracy, state action, action under color of law, or official involvement. They should not be used as generic private-dispute labels without those elements.

Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests

Preserve Quora records: accounts, upvotes, shares, notifications, edit histories, deletion logs, moderation actions, administrator access, internal notes, and any records showing Adam's personal involvement or lack of involvement.

Preserve device and network evidence: laptop forensic images, operating-system logs, malware artifacts, shelter-router logs, ISP records, account sessions, remote-access tools, and any proof for or against internet disconnection or operating-system destruction.

Preserve business and idea records: the presentation, drafts, file metadata, emails, flash-drive or upload history, print records, messages to Adam, any investment offer, any Mark/Zuckerberg relay or correspondence, product-roadmap records, and later Poe or A.I.

feature comparisons.

Preserve monitoring records: who viewed the reporting party, what cameras or microphones existed, whether any bathroom/private display occurred, who authorized it, whether law enforcement was involved, and whether any material was shown to employees or third parties.

Preserve third-party coordination records: communications or payments involving Steve, Douglas, Anna, Mark Zuckerberg, authorities, investors, or others alleged to have been rewarded, given links, or used to pressure the reporting party.

Conclusion

The 2022-2024 Adam archive presents a sustained allegation that Adam used or benefited from a structural advantage: platform access, evidence control, possible investment leverage, blind-channel asymmetry, and later competitive follow-up of the reporting party's ideas.

The strongest investigative points are the Quora-origin timeline, the hidden channel and lack of defense access, preservation of share/notification records, allegations of monitoring and privacy invasion, alleged device or internet interference, the presentation and A.I. enhancement claims, and any coordination with other actors or authorities.

The reporting party asks to be treated as the victim whose observations require lawful testing. The law should determine what occurred, but the inquiry should not allow Adam's alleged helpfulness, platform status, or investor role to bury the claimed initiating conduct, evidence control, privacy breach, or idea/reward exploitation.

Appendix A. Source Index

Source ID	Observation Use
0015	Possible shelter internet-access disparity; the reporting party notes others had network access while he did not and identifies Adam as a suspected cause.
0070	Asks Mark Zuckerberg to identify what Adam did wrong and not cover or justify Adam's conduct.
0094	Warns that Adam may present himself as helpful while allegedly calculating benefit and misleading authorities.
0110	Connects Adam to alleged idea hijacking, the website presentation, years of slander/defamation/propaganda, and the advantage created by keeping the victim blind.
0125	Core moral-obligation theory: Adam allegedly observed abuse as platform host, used the victim's interaction for site growth and investment opportunity, and kept him blind.
0200	Alleges Adam-origin spread, humiliating-video sharing, suicide-themed relay, and official sympathy toward attackers despite repeated attacks.
0208	Requests initial authorities' evidence/data; alleges Adam used investment disguise, should not have controlled monitoring, and acted from jealousy/competition.
0218	Identity-framing and force theme; source contains severe distress language and describes repeated framing as violence and hate-based targeting.
0225	Alleges Adam invested/rewarded Steve or Douglas, sent channel links to people the reporting party met, breached privacy, and used a help loop as excuse.
0230	States Adam should not have monitored a situation where he was an alleged source of harm; alleges psychological harm and destructive intent.
0236	A.I. enhancement branch; says Adam followed up on an idea meant for the reporting party and investors, nullifying the origin by building competitively.
0254	Longtail/follow-up branch; permits limited credit for two ideas and a 10 percent mushroom-idea share while rejecting broader exploitation.
0289	Direct question whether Adam disconnected shelter internet and request that all devices be restored.
0306	Privacy and blind-channel request: no cameras, no microphones, no gaslighting, no misleads; alleges Adam was used as a front.
0313	Frames Adam and Biden as a possible tag team; alleges Adam hijacked an idea in competition and that the victim needed direct access to defend against framing.
0345	Identifies zip images as Adam's abusive shares; alleges exploitation of blindness, changing/diluting intent, hacking, and psychological abuse.
0409	Operating-system/productivity interference branch; alleges Adam was given too much control over productivity and information used as a front.
0410	Quora-notification evidence request: preserve Adam's shares before alteration; alleges host control allowed bullying.
0494	Common-ground exploitation theory; describes Quora screen observation, upvote relays, Adam/Mark investment chance, stronger monitoring, and no channel access.
0508	Alleges operating-system destruction, device instability, video humiliation, channel-link spread, hacking, and intentional destruction beyond authority.

Source ID	Observation Use
0962	Adam-as-front theory: alleges authorities used the CEO of Quora as front for monitoring/hacking against a Quoran.
1070	Quora shares and severance theory: alleges jealousy, mother-directed/offensive shares, deleted evidence, business severance, and continued follow-up of ideas.
1452	Missing-link theory: Adam allegedly held key evidence as platform host and should have come forward about Anna-related spamming and abuse.
1519	Timeline source: Anna attack, contact with Adam as Quora CEO, data-segmentation website presentation, Mark investment relay, and later competition.
1568686	Origin source: Adam allegedly noticed the reporting party's displayed screen and sent a Hoboken/upvote relay; dialogue and timeline requested.
1602	Agreement nuance: source states 5 percent of profit goes to Adam if used, while also alleging Quora profit/torture owed back.
4527	Poe branch: alleges Adam adapted live retrieval of Q&A by text from the reporting party's idea.
5480	Business-severance and follow-up branch; alleges Quora-share harassment, deleted messages, severed business dealings, and continuing idea attachment.
6019	Psychological-warfare and reward-process branch; alleges a hostile relay, competition exploitation, and midstream denial of participation.
6108	Ownership/partnership concern; alleges Adam or Zuckerberg may be asserting website-idea rights while Adam used Quora shares and monitoring to antagonize.

Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

These sources were consulted as legal routing references. They do not prove that any statute applies without jurisdictional facts and evidence.

18 U.S.C. 1030 - Fraud and related activity in connection with computers:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1030+edition%3Aprelim>

18 U.S.C. 1343 - Wire fraud:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1343>

18 U.S.C. 1349 - Attempt and conspiracy for fraud offenses:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1349>

18 U.S.C. 1503 - Influencing or injuring officer or juror; due administration of justice:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1503>

18 U.S.C. 1512 - Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1512+edition%3Aprelim%29>

18 U.S.C. 1513 - Retaliating against a witness, victim, or informant: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&f=treesort&jumpTo=true&num=0&req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1513+edition%3Aprelim%29+OR+%28granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1513%29>

18 U.S.C. 1519 - Destruction, alteration, or falsification of records: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&f=treesort&jumpTo=true&num=0&os=eelt2&req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1519+edition%3Aprelim%29+OR+%28granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1519%29>

18 U.S.C. 1832 - Theft of trade secrets:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1832>

18 U.S.C. 2261A - Stalking and cyberstalking:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=2023&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-2023-title18-section2261A>

18 U.S.C. 875 - Interstate communications containing threats:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section875>

18 U.S.C. 241 - Conspiracy against rights: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&f=treesort&num=0&req=%28title%3A18+section%3A241+edition%3Aprelim%29+OR+%28granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section241%29>

42 U.S.C. 1983 - Civil action for deprivation of rights under color of law: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=%28title%3A42+section%3A1983+edition%3Aprelim%29>