

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Statement of Allegations Concerning Barack Obama

Prepared for review by competent legal and investigative authorities

| FIELD | REPORT INFORMATION |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Named subject | Barack Obama |
| Date | June 28, 2026 |
| Primary source | combinedObama.txt |
| File identifier | file_000000002038720c970e4cf702062625 |

EVIDENTIARY STATUS

Conditional presentation of the submitter's observations. Facts, attribution, jurisdiction, legal elements, and any remedy require independent investigation and lawful adjudication.

I. PURPOSE, SCOPE, AND EVIDENTIARY STATUS

The following statement conditionally presents the submitter's observations and allegations concerning Barack Obama. If the described events occurred, the conduct should be examined under the legal principles identified below. The statement does not ask the reader to treat disputed inferences as established facts. It asks investigators to test them through authenticated communications, government and platform records, witness interviews, financial documents, technical evidence, and a complete chronology. Ultimate factual findings, charging decisions, defenses, immunities, jurisdiction, and punishment belong exclusively to competent authorities and courts.

This report focuses solely on the named subject's alleged conduct. Other people are identified only where their alleged acts are necessary to explain Obama's claimed role, knowledge, coordination, motive, or effect. The report consolidates recurring descriptions rather than repeating every source entry. It preserves important qualifications in the source, including the submitter's repeated uncertainty about the meaning of online "relays," his acknowledgment that Obama may initially have intended to help, and his request that the law determine what actually occurred.

The primary source is a compilation of contemporaneous or near-contemporaneous personal notes. Many allegations arise from videos, thumbnails, screenshots, symbolic media references, perceived relays, and indirect communications rather than authenticated direct statements from Obama. Those materials may identify investigative leads, but they cannot establish attribution by themselves. The central evidentiary question is whether independent records connect Obama or persons acting at his direction to the alleged monitoring, isolation, communications, policy efforts, interference, or use of the submitter's ideas.

II. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The submitter alleges that Obama first became involved during an early period in which the submitter was communicating ideas in response to an informal reward opportunity associated with Elon Musk. According to the source, Obama may initially have viewed monitoring or an informational "wall" as a way to contain conflict, allow the submitter to continue generating ideas, and produce a beneficial outcome for multiple parties. The submitter expressly treats this possible initial motive as mitigating and states that Obama could not have predicted the later course of events.

The alleged wrongdoing is said to arise from what followed. The submitter claims that Obama maintained or supported a system that left him intensely monitored yet unable to see the accusations, evidence, decision makers, or proceedings affecting him. He alleges that this one-sided structure allowed hostile parties to repeat accusations, revise narratives, attack his reputation, and contest ownership of his ideas while he was forced to infer events from media "relays." He further alleges that Obama later used his status and persuasive influence to justify the arrangement, protect political allies, reduce accountability for prior attacks, characterize the submitter as dangerous or unworthy of ordinary rights, and pressure a transfer of economic value from the submitter's ideas under a "greater good" or open-source rationale.

The alleged course of conduct falls into six related areas:

1. initiating or maintaining an asserted monitoring and isolation structure;
2. denying meaningful access to accusations and a fair opportunity to respond;
3. coordinating with, defending, or relieving the alleged conduct of Biden, Trudeau, and others;
4. promoting shifting narratives that allegedly framed the submitter and influenced decision makers;
5. attempting to diminish, reclassify, or obtain the submitter's idea-related rights and compensation; and
6. supporting or continuing measures allegedly threatening the submitter's mother, a cryonics facility, preserved patients, and the submitter's psychological and economic security.

If supported by objective evidence, the alleged pattern would require more than a policy disagreement analysis. Authorities would need to determine whether any participant used governmental power or interstate communications to deprive protected rights, obstruct a proceeding or investigation, conduct unauthorized surveillance, obtain property through fraud or coercion, or misappropriate protected confidential information. If records do not establish attribution, agreement, governmental action, a protected property interest, or the required criminal intent, the relevant statutes would not be satisfied.

III. RELATIONSHIP HISTORY AND ALLEGED CHRONOLOGY

A. Early setting

The submitter places Obama's initial involvement near the period when a space-elevator concept and an informal ideas-for-rewards arrangement were being discussed. He states that there was not yet a mature business, formal competition, or stock-market threat. He describes himself at that time as a civilian in Canada, on social assistance, attempting to respond to an opportunity and already experiencing online humiliation and conflict caused by other people. He alleges that federal political attention was therefore disproportionate to the actual circumstances. (`combinedObama.txt`, lines 14759-14775.)

The source distinguishes an informal reward arrangement from a later commercial venture. The submitter maintains that the initial exchange was based on personal wealth and humanitarian value, while later business use, shares, royalties, taxes, and licensing would be separate questions. This distinction is central to his allegation that political actors later merged unrelated categories to gain control over the economic outcome.

B. Alleged creation of a "wall" and amplified monitoring

The submitter alleges that Obama "apparently ordered" a wall or barrier and maintained it with Biden. He recalls that monitoring intensified after Sean Kernan was allegedly found responsible for harmful conduct. In the submitter's account, a security measure that might have been described as protective instead became a means of keeping him outside the information flow while others discussed and adjudicated matters affecting him. (`combinedObama.txt`, lines 14759-14772.)

The word "wall" is not defined by objective documentation in the source. It may refer to restricted communication, platform controls, surveillance, social isolation, denial of access to a channel, or a combination of these. Investigators should not assume which meaning is correct. They should identify the actual systems, orders, accounts, agencies, contractors, warrants, platform contacts, and access restrictions, if any.

C. Possible initial beneficial motive

The submitter repeatedly attempts to be fair about Obama's initial intent. He hypothesizes that Obama believed the arrangement might allow the submitter to gain fame or compensation from his ideas while giving alleged attackers time to correct or resolve their conduct. He also records perceived indications of support from Michelle Obama and Obama's daughter, and elsewhere states that Obama may have helped oppose some of Biden's alleged actions. He characterizes the beginning as possible "mischievous good will" rather than an original plan to destroy him. (`combinedObama.txt`, lines 4658-4789 and 14773-14784.)

This qualification matters. The report's cumulative theory is not that every early act necessarily carried criminal intent. It is that liability, if any, may have arisen when the alleged harms, lack of due process, economic pressure, and danger to third parties became apparent but the subject allegedly continued, expanded, justified, or concealed the same structure.

D. Alleged change from support to self-protective antagonism

The submitter claims the situation changed as his ideas grew more valuable, Biden and others allegedly escalated their conduct, and potential accountability increased. He interprets Obama's changing public or indirect messages as a progression from support to increasingly serious accusations: racism, danger to the economy, disloyalty, espionage, immigration-based insinuations, misuse of technology, and threats associated with transhumanism or cryonics. He alleges these explanations were adaptations rather than the original reason for intervention. (`combinedObama.txt`, lines 13809-13932 and 14775-14792.)

The submitter further alleges that Obama alternated between support and antagonism strategically: first seeking compassion or lenience, then reviving adverse narratives once the submitter lowered his guard. This is an inference, not a proven event. It should be tested by comparing dated communications, decisions, witnesses, and changes in access or policy. (`combinedObama.txt`, lines 13809-13932.)

IV. CONSOLIDATED ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING THE NAMED SUBJECT

A. Alleged responsibility for monitoring, isolation, and restricted access

1. **Initiating or maintaining the asserted barrier.** The submitter alleges that Obama ordered or supported the "wall" that restricted his access to people and information. He contends that the measure was imposed on a civilian before any legitimate basis for treating him as a major economic or security threat existed.

2. **Amplifying monitoring while withholding reciprocal access.** The source repeatedly describes extensive observation of the submitter's home, communications, public displays, and even private spaces, while the submitter allegedly could not see who was communicating about him or what accusations required an answer. He claims he was monitored without being meaningfully informed, heard, or permitted to participate. (combinedObama.txt, lines 3292-3394, 8408-8560, and 13678-13808.)
3. **Treating isolation as punishment without process.** The submitter alleges that decision makers treated his segregation as a form of jail or punishment, despite no notice of a charge, visible tribunal, hearing, or normal opportunity to challenge the deprivation. He describes the arrangement as psychological punishment and a deprivation of liberty, dignity, and legal participation. He includes Obama among those allegedly supporting the structure. (combinedObama.txt, lines 14447-14758.)
4. **Applying U.S. influence to a foreign civilian in Canada.** The submitter emphasizes that he is a Canadian civilian outside U.S. territory. He alleges that U.S. political actors intervened in matters already connected to Canadian or Vanuatu jurisdiction and then used the resulting uncertainty to deny him ordinary procedural protection. This allegation raises serious jurisdictional questions and cannot be resolved without identifying the legal authority invoked for each act.
5. **Blocking direct communication that could have reduced harm.** The submitter claims that open communication would have resolved accusations rapidly, reduced escalation, and allowed him to correct falsehoods. He alleges the continued refusal to provide direct access was not neutral because it systematically benefited people accusing him.
6. **Interfering with education, work, and ordinary livelihood.** The source states that constant monitoring and fear of theft prevented the submitter from learning CAD, SolidWorks, programming, microcontrollers, and prototyping; recycling materials into products; selling locally; and developing a lawful livelihood. He alleges that Obama continued to rationalize restrictions even after these ordinary goals were made clear. (combinedObama.txt, lines 3292-3394.)

B. Alleged manipulation of a one-sided adjudicative environment

7. **Influencing authorities without confronting the submitter directly.** The submitter describes Obama's communications as a "debate" conducted with decision makers while the person whose rights were at issue could not see or answer it. He alleges that Obama's status allowed unsupported interpretations to become default conclusions. (combinedObama.txt, lines 14817-14991.)
8. **Creating repeated cycles after issues were allegedly resolved.** The source claims that accusers received repeated opportunities to revise or renew claims after contradictions or adverse findings, while the submitter's defenses were treated as temporary or invisible. The submitter

alleges that Obama justified or encouraged these cycles, thereby converting lenience into additional exposure to harm. (combinedObama.txt, lines 13157-13391 and 13678-13808.)

9. **Using narrative and perspective to displace written rules.** The submitter alleges that Obama relied on philosophical or political reasoning, including appeals to collective benefit, to persuade authorities away from ordinary legal standards. In the submitter's theory, the wrong is not disagreement itself but the use of political influence to alter the practical rules governing a vulnerable individual.
10. **Providing preferential protection to political allies.** The source repeatedly alleges that Obama attempted to alleviate or defend Biden, Trudeau, and other political figures after previously criticizing or distancing himself from their conduct. The submitter considers this evidence of preferential treatment and self-preservation rather than consistent legal analysis. (combinedObama.txt, lines 13316-13391.)
11. **Remaining silent about known conduct and later justifying it.** The submitter alleges that Obama's silence concerning Biden's asserted actions, followed by later arguments defending the resulting structure, made him a participant or facilitator. Mere silence does not ordinarily establish criminal liability. Investigators would need evidence of a legal duty, agreement, assistance, concealment, or intentional action that furthered an offense. (combinedObama.txt, lines 13678-13808.)

C. Alleged coordination with Biden, Trudeau, and other actors

12. **Joint action with Biden.** The source alleges that Obama helped maintain isolation, dismissed Biden's conduct, and later adopted rationales designed to protect Biden. It asks authorities to compare the timing and content of Obama's positions with the specific actions attributed to Biden. The submitter nonetheless distinguishes their alleged motives, stating that Biden's conduct became more directly hostile and lethal while Obama's may have begun with a mixed or paternalistic purpose.
13. **Joint action with Trudeau.** The submitter interprets repeated "dudeplomacy" references as possible evidence of cooperation between Obama and Trudeau. He alleges that this cooperation supported lockdown, taxation, Canadian control of funds, and the dilution of Trudeau's separate attempts to obtain control. The source also contains express apologies if the relay was misunderstood and acknowledges prior help from Obama. (combinedObama.txt, lines 4399-4816 and 9976-10023.)
14. **Merging taxation with alleged total control.** The submitter insists that legitimate taxation of a commercial transaction is legally and factually different from taking complete control of an award or fund. He alleges that Obama used a tax or public-benefit rationale to blur this distinction and reduce accountability for Trudeau's alleged efforts. Whether any taxable event, gift, contract, trust, or government fund existed must be established from documents, not assumed.

15. **Supporting or using third-party accusers.** The submitter sometimes interprets symbolic "Mace Windu" relays as suggesting Obama hired or used Steve, Steve's brother, and Laura to oppose him. He is explicit that he may have misunderstood those relays. This allegation should be treated as a lead only. It requires contracts, payments, communications, tasking records, or credible witness testimony before it can support a finding. (combinedObama.txt, lines 7451-7556.)

D. Alleged framing, gaslighting, and reputational manipulation

16. **Denying events that witnesses could confirm.** The submitter alleges that Obama used UFO- or alien-themed references to suggest that events did not occur, exploiting the submitter's inability to see direct communications. He asks witnesses to identify each point on which Obama's account was allegedly false. (combinedObama.txt, lines 4817-4953 and 13422-13526.)
17. **Assigning stigmatizing identities.** The source alleges shifting portrayals of the submitter as racist, a spy, an invader, an illegal immigrant, a threat to children, an economic menace, a supervillain, irrational, untrustworthy, or dangerous because of technological ideas. The submitter argues that these labels were not responses to proven conduct but tools used to justify pre-existing control.
18. **Using race, nationality, and alien status.** The submitter cites a perceived Obama relay stating that everyone except Native Americans came from elsewhere. He interprets it as an effort to weaken his rights as a foreign or immigrant person and to convert individual creative contribution into communal property. He separately rejects "one-drop rule" and racial-identity arguments allegedly used to excuse differential treatment. (combinedObama.txt, lines 3223-3231, 13678-13808, and 14261-14436.)
19. **Reviving a past Vanuatu incident as a pretext.** The submitter alleges that Obama repeatedly raised a past episode in Vanuatu after the submitter had provided a contextual defense. The report does not adjudicate that separate incident. Its relevance here is limited to the claim that it was selectively revived to sustain isolation or prejudice without a fair forum. (combinedObama.txt, lines 14144-14190.)
20. **Using indirect entertainment and social-media references.** The source attributes meaning to film clips, thumbnails, celebrity posts, and recurring fictional characters. Examples include "Mace Windu," "that kid's long gone," Seinfeld references, UFO imagery, and debates involving John McCain. The submitter alleges these were coordinated signals intended to shape a hidden proceeding. Authentication is essential: investigators must determine whether the content was targeted, recommended algorithmically, created independently, or directed by the named subject.
21. **Characterizing continued harm as humor or harmless persuasion.** The submitter alleges that Obama and supporters laughed at or trivialized his situation. He argues that charm, civility, or

humor cannot excuse conduct that knowingly maintains severe deprivation. Objective evidence should distinguish actual communications from the submitter's interpretation of tone.

E. Alleged interference with ideas, ownership, credit, and compensation

22. **Attempting to force an open-source status.** The most developed economic allegation is that Obama sought to make the submitter's ideas open source under a "greater good" rationale. The submitter argues that only the owner may choose to disclose or license protected material and that forced open sourcing would destroy future royalties, market position, secrecy, and bargaining power. (*combinedObama.txt*, lines 14191-14446.)
23. **Discrediting novel combinations because components already existed.** The submitter alleges that Obama treated the use of known or patent-expired components as proof that the submitter contributed nothing protectable. The source responds that a new solution, configuration, process, or application may have value even when individual components are old. Examples attributed to the submitter include atmospheric water production, portable river-energy systems, a space escalator, balloon-supported wind generation, sea mining, wooden vessels, and aircraft layouts. (*combinedObama.txt*, lines 14261-14436.)
24. **Replacing legal analysis with a political preference for communal use.** The submitter alleges that Obama did not merely dispute novelty but attempted to alter ownership and compensation through moral persuasion, treating public benefit as superior to the creator's choice. The report treats this as an allegation about coercion and misuse of influence, not a conclusion that every idea was patentable or legally owned.
25. **Interfering with a proposed exchange.** The source refers to proposals including \$1.5 trillion for broad open-source use, a separate \$200 billion ideas-for-rewards amount, or ongoing shares and royalties. The amounts are the submitter's asserted proposals, not established contractual entitlements. The alleged misconduct is that Obama sought the benefit of the ideas while diminishing the submitter's right to negotiate, withdraw, or receive agreed consideration. (*combinedObama.txt*, lines 13392-13421 and 14191-14446.)
26. **Using economic policy as leverage over personal autonomy.** The submitter alleges that restrictions on credit, taxes, compensation, and access worked together: if his earning rights were reduced while he remained isolated and monitored, he would become dependent and easier to control. He characterizes that combination as forced subjugation rather than ordinary policy disagreement. (*combinedObama.txt*, lines 9976-10023.)
27. **Supporting the use of follow-up variations by alleged adversaries.** The submitter claims that others repeatedly produced variations of his concepts after seeing them and that Obama supported those variations to weaken origin claims. Any legal conclusion would require dated records of conception, disclosure, confidentiality, access, independent development, patent status, and the exact material allegedly used.

F. Alleged interference involving the cryonics facility and family

28. **Supporting closure or destruction of a cryonics facility.** The submitter alleges that Obama supported continued efforts to close a facility, cut supplies, or destroy preserved patients. He argues that the families knowingly chose preservation services and that ideological disagreement cannot justify physical interference with the facility or its property. (combinedObama.txt, lines 13630-13647 and 14817-14991.)
29. **Persisting after the claimed stakes were explained.** The source repeatedly states that the facility's role was preservation, not a guarantee of revival, and that future technology was the families' hope and choice. The submitter alleges that once Obama understood the foreseeable devastation caused by destruction of preserved remains, continued interference could no longer be characterized as an innocent policy debate.
30. **Justifying Biden's alleged attacks on the facility.** The submitter claims Obama transformed earlier alleged attacks into a continuing philosophical debate and thereby protected Biden. He asks investigators to separate a lawful regulatory decision from intentional resource deprivation, sabotage, destruction of property, or conduct designed to cause psychological injury.
31. **Alleged involvement in danger to the submitter's mother.** Several entries accuse Obama of supporting or failing to prevent attacks involving the submitter's mother. The source does not provide a sufficiently concrete act, date, location, or mechanism to support a factual conclusion. This allegation should be preserved but treated as uncorroborated unless medical, facility, communication, travel, or agency records establish a connection.

G. Alleged continuation after notice and refusal to use less harmful alternatives

32. **Notice through repeated objections.** The submitter repeatedly demanded direct access, withdrawal of monitoring, recognition of idea rights, protection of the facility, and separation of his case from political agendas. He alleges that these objections placed Obama on notice of the claimed harm.
33. **Availability of alternatives.** The source identifies less restrictive options: direct communication; ordinary court or police procedures; private lawful investigation; a defined end date; neutral review of ideas; conventional contracts; permitting the submitter to leave the relationship; and protecting preserved patients while resolving any regulatory dispute.
34. **Persistence as evidence of intent.** The submitter's cumulative argument is that conduct may begin negligently or paternalistically but become intentional when a person understands the harm, has lawful alternatives, and continues for self-protection or economic benefit. This is the principal theory by which the source distinguishes possible early good intent from alleged later culpability.

V. ALLEGED EFFECTS ON THE SUBMITTER

The source attributes the following harms to the alleged course of conduct:

1. prolonged psychological distress from being observed while unable to see or answer the people discussing him;
2. loss of autonomy and a feeling of de facto confinement without ordinary process;
3. inability to receive a clear accusation, evidence disclosure, neutral hearing, or timely resolution;
4. repeated reputational injury through allegations of racism, espionage, danger, sexual misconduct, illegality, and untrustworthiness;
5. reduced ability to learn, work, sell products, build prototypes, or develop a business;
6. loss or threatened loss of idea credit, patent opportunities, trade-secret value, royalties, shares, and negotiating leverage;
7. fear for his mother, preserved patients, facility personnel, and people in his personal network;
8. distrust of U.S. institutions and resistance to employment, political office, or relocation to the United States;
9. damage to proposed international, commercial, and personal relationships; and
10. years of escalating conflict that the submitter believes direct communication could have prevented.

These are claimed effects. Causation must be established separately for each harm. Medical records, financial records, platform data, dated idea files, employment history, witness evidence, and records of actual governmental action would be necessary.

VI. THE SUBMITTER'S RELEVANT DEFENSES AND MITIGATING ADMISSIONS

A. Civilian status and willingness to cooperate

The submitter states that he was not a political actor, combatant, spy, or established economic power. He describes himself as a civilian already visible to authorities and willing to communicate. He argues that treating him as an extreme threat was unnecessary because ordinary investigation and open legal process were available.

B. Humanitarian and commercial purposes

The submitter characterizes his ideas as attempts to solve practical problems involving water, energy, transportation, mining, preservation, medicine, and access to technology. He states that he sought both

public benefit and fair personal compensation. The combination of humanitarian purpose and economic interest is not inherently inconsistent.

C. Rejection of racial and immigration pretexts

The submitter denies being racist and rejects the suggestion that foreign citizenship or immigration status reduces his right to property, dignity, or fair legal treatment. He emphasizes that he resided in Canada and did not invade the United States; any U.S. involvement allegedly came to him through monitoring, platform activity, or an invitation to contribute ideas.

D. Rejection of economic-threat framing

The submitter argues that the alleged wall predated his most valuable ideas and therefore could not originally have been justified by later concerns about markets, stock prices, or industrial disruption. He treats the later economic-threat narrative as a post hoc justification.

E. Distinguishing words, jokes, speculation, and capability from unlawful acts

The source states that dark jokes, speculative technology discussions, or imaginative scenarios were used to label the submitter as dangerous. His defense is that he was visibly monitored, lacked the organization or capability to carry out mass harm, proposed defensive medical ideas, and repeatedly sought negotiation and lawful review. Whether any statement constituted a true threat or evidence of intent is a fact-specific legal question; the source asks authorities to consider context rather than isolated language.

F. Express uncertainty and willingness to correct

The submitter repeatedly writes that he may have misunderstood a relay, apologizes where attribution may be wrong, and asks witnesses and authorities to determine the truth. He also acknowledges that Obama may have helped him and may initially have intended a better outcome. These admissions weigh against presenting every perception as certain and support an evidence-first investigation.

G. Request for a clean exit

The submitter repeatedly states that he did not want to be compelled into U.S. employment, office, mentorship, or political alignment. He sought either a voluntary economic exchange or a complete end to U.S. use and control of his ideas. This is relevant to the allegation that continued pressure interfered with personal autonomy.

VII. CONDITIONAL U.S. LEGAL ANALYSIS

The statutes below identify potential investigative categories only. Their inclusion is not a conclusion that Obama violated them. Most require proof of specific intent, jurisdiction, an agreement or overt act, an official proceeding, state action, a protected right or property interest, and reliable attribution. Conduct occurring while Obama was President also requires an official-act immunity analysis; private or post-presidential conduct presents different questions.

A. Constitutional due process and privacy

The Fifth Amendment prohibits the federal government from depriving a person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Procedural due process generally requires a protected interest, government action, and appropriate notice and opportunity to be heard. The Fourth Amendment protects people against unreasonable government searches and seizures and ordinarily requires lawful authority, probable cause, and particularity unless an exception applies.

If federal actors actually imposed a restrictive regime, intercepted private activity, seized communications or property, or deprived an established property or liberty interest, investigators should identify the authority, process, location, warrant, notice, review mechanism, and opportunity to challenge the action. The submitter's presence in Canada and status as a non-U.S. citizen create significant territorial and jurisdictional questions. Constitutional protection cannot be assumed merely because a U.S. person was allegedly involved.

Authorities should also distinguish protected interests from expectations that the law does not recognize. An informal belief that a hidden "court" exists is not itself proof of a judicial proceeding or a constitutional entitlement. The investigation must first identify whether any actual agency process, court matter, surveillance program, platform restriction, or official decision existed.

B. Conspiracy against rights and deprivation under color of law

Under 18 U.S.C. section 241, two or more persons may be criminally liable if they conspire to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate a person in the exercise of a right secured by the Constitution or federal law. Section 242 concerns willful deprivation of protected rights under color of law and expressly addresses differential punishment on account of alienage, color, or race.

These statutes would become relevant only if evidence establishes: (1) a specific federal right applicable to the submitter and location; (2) an agreement or official action; (3) willful intent; and (4) acts causing or attempting the deprivation. General unfairness, political persuasion, private disagreement, or silence is not enough. The source's allegations of a coordinated wall, denial of access, race or alienage rationales, and deliberate continuation after notice identify questions for investigation but do not prove the elements.

C. Electronic surveillance and stored communications

18 U.S.C. section 2511 generally prohibits intentional interception, use, or disclosure of wire, oral, or electronic communications except as authorized by statute. Section 2701 prohibits intentional unauthorized access to a communications service facility resulting in access to, alteration of, or prevention of access to communications in electronic storage. Sections 2707 and 2712 provide civil remedies in specified circumstances, including a route for certain willful violations by the United States.

The source's descriptions of home monitoring, bathroom observation, platform access, missing communications, and a hidden channel should be tested through device forensics, account logs, provider records, lawful-process records, and surveillance authorizations. Observation of public posts, consensual monitoring, ordinary recommendation algorithms, or lawfully authorized interception would not satisfy the same theory. Evidence must connect the named subject to procurement, authorization, use, or disclosure.

D. Interstate stalking or surveillance intended to harass

18 U.S.C. section 2261A addresses specified interstate or foreign conduct and use of interstate facilities undertaken with intent to kill, injure, harass, intimidate, or place a person under surveillance with such intent, where the statutory harm requirements are met. The submitter alleges a repeated, targeted course of monitoring and indirect messaging causing substantial distress and fear.

Application would require proof of the actor, the course of conduct, the required intent, use of interstate or foreign commerce, and statutory harm. Political speech, independent commentary, algorithmic recommendations, or merely offensive content is not automatically stalking. Attribution to Obama is therefore indispensable.

E. Obstruction, witness interference, false statements, and records

18 U.S.C. section 1512 prohibits specified forms of witness, victim, or informant tampering connected to an official proceeding or communication to federal law enforcement. Section 1519 prohibits knowingly altering, destroying, concealing, or falsifying records with intent to impede a federal matter or investigation. Section 1001 prohibits materially false statements or concealment in matters within federal jurisdiction, subject to statutory limits. Section 371 covers agreements to commit a federal offense or defraud the United States when an overt act is performed.

These provisions could matter if authenticated evidence shows that Obama or others intentionally prevented witnesses from speaking, concealed monitoring or communication records, submitted material falsehoods to a federal agency, manipulated evidence, or coordinated to corrupt an actual federal process. The source's references to hidden witnesses, rewritten history, repeated cycles, and one-sided persuasion are not sufficient without an identifiable proceeding, material act, and corrupt intent.

F. Wire fraud, extortion, and property schemes

18 U.S.C. section 1343 applies to schemes to obtain money or property by materially false or fraudulent pretenses using interstate or foreign wire communications. Section 1951 applies to robbery or extortion affecting commerce, including obtaining property with consent induced by wrongful force, fear, or under color of official right.

If a real ideas-for-rewards agreement, fund, award, licensing negotiation, or commercial exchange existed, investigators should determine whether anyone made material promises without intent to perform, used false accusations to obtain property, or conditioned safety or legal access on surrender of economic rights. The source's very large proposed amounts do not establish value, entitlement, or loss. A wire-fraud or extortion theory would require concrete property, causation, material deception or coercion, and proof that the named subject participated with the required intent.

G. Patents, copyright, contracts, and trade secrets

Federal intellectual-property law requires careful separation of ideas from legally protected assets:

1. **Copyright.** Under 17 U.S.C. section 102(b), copyright does not protect an idea, procedure, process, system, method, concept, principle, or discovery. It may protect original expression fixed in a tangible medium, but not the underlying functional idea.
2. **Patents.** Under 35 U.S.C. section 154, an issued patent grants the patentee a right to exclude others from specified acts in the United States. Under section 261, patents and patent applications have attributes of personal property and assignments must be in writing. Novelty, nonobviousness, enablement, inventorship, filing dates, ownership, and territorial scope must be evaluated idea by idea.
3. **Trade secrets.** Under 18 U.S.C. sections 1832, 1836, and 1839, qualifying confidential technical or business information may be protected if the owner took reasonable measures to keep it secret and the information derived independent economic value from secrecy. The Defend Trade Secrets Act permits a private civil action for qualifying misappropriation connected to interstate or foreign commerce. Section 1837 provides limited extraterritorial reach.
4. **Contracts and confidential submissions.** An ideas-for-rewards promise, nondisclosure agreement, implied-in-fact contract, contest rule, joint-development arrangement, or fiduciary relationship may create rights under applicable state or foreign law even when no patent has issued. The governing law, offer, acceptance, consideration, definite terms, authority, and proof of disclosure must be established.

The submitter's strongest legal framing is therefore not that every useful idea automatically belongs to him forever. It is that no person should use political pressure or deception to bypass whatever patent, trade-secret, contractual, attribution, or negotiation rights actually existed. A neutral technical and legal review should determine which concepts were public, confidential, patented, patentable, independently developed, contractually submitted, or voluntarily offered as open source.

H. Presidential immunity and official-versus-private conduct

In *Trump v. United States* (2024), the Supreme Court held that a former President has absolute immunity from criminal prosecution for conduct within the President's exclusive constitutional authority, at least presumptive immunity for other official acts, and no immunity for unofficial acts. The distinction is act-specific.

Accordingly, investigators must identify what Obama personally did, when he did it, whether he was President, what authority he used, and whether the conduct was official or private. The existence of immunity for an act does not establish that the alleged event occurred or that it was lawful in every civil, administrative, political, or evidentiary sense. It determines whether and how criminal prosecution may proceed.

VIII. CUMULATIVE THEORY OF ALLEGED RESPONSIBILITY

The source's cumulative theory can be stated without adopting its disputed factual assumptions:

First, Obama allegedly participated in establishing a controlled environment around a vulnerable civilian. Second, the environment allegedly allowed observation of the submitter but denied him reciprocal access to the accusations and decision makers affecting him. Third, hostile third parties allegedly used that asymmetry to repeat accusations, revise history, and contest idea ownership. Fourth, Obama allegedly used political stature and indirect narratives to justify the structure, protect allied actors, and promote collective use of the submitter's ideas. Fifth, after repeated notice of psychological, economic, family, and facility-related harm, Obama allegedly continued because withdrawal would expose prior decisions and reduce the economic or political benefits of control.

If evidence established all five stages, authorities could reasonably investigate agreement, knowledge, intent, benefit, concealment, and continuation rather than viewing each disputed message in isolation. If the evidence establishes only that the submitter saw unrelated media and inferred coordination, the cumulative theory would fail. The investigation must therefore move from symbolic interpretation to verifiable acts.

The source also supplies a meaningful alternative explanation: Obama's early involvement may have been intended to help, the media relays may have been misunderstood, later events may have been driven by other actors, and the submitter may have attributed institutional decisions to Obama without direct evidence. A fair investigation should test both explanations against the same records.

IX. PRIORITIZED EVIDENCE AND INVESTIGATION REQUESTS

A. Authority, chronology, and identity of decision makers

1. Identify every actual U.S., Canadian, platform, private, or international process that concerned the submitter.
2. Determine whether any "wall," isolation order, access restriction, monitoring directive, security measure, or no-contact instruction existed.
3. Obtain the date, legal authority, duration, scope, approving official, reviewing official, and termination criteria for each measure.
4. Establish whether Obama personally authorized, recommended, received briefings on, renewed, or used information from any such measure.
5. Separate acts during Obama's presidency from later private or political activity.

B. Communications and coordination

6. Preserve and lawfully obtain relevant communications among Obama, Biden, Trudeau, executive-branch personnel, security agencies, contractors, platform representatives, Elon Musk, and persons alleged to have opposed the submitter.
7. Search for communications using the submitter's name, known usernames, email address, project names, idea titles, "wall," "channel," "open source," "greater good," "facility," "cryonics," and the reward or compensation proposals.

8. Identify meetings, briefings, calls, informal intermediaries, and post-presidential organizations through which decisions may have been influenced.
9. Determine whether "dudeplomacy," "Mace Windu," UFO, or other symbolic references were coordinated signals or unrelated content.

C. Platform and surveillance evidence

10. Preserve recommendation logs, targeting criteria, ad records, moderation actions, account-access logs, device sessions, geolocation records, and government request records for relevant accounts and dates.
11. Conduct forensic examination of the submitter's devices for malware, unauthorized access, account compromise, interception, or manipulated content.
12. Obtain lawful-process records, warrants, national-security orders, subpoenas, preservation requests, or agency certifications, if any.
13. Determine whether alleged private-space monitoring occurred and, if so, identify the equipment, operator, authorization, storage location, recipients, and purpose.

D. Court, agency, and witness evidence

14. Identify any real court case, grand jury, administrative matter, intelligence assessment, or law-enforcement investigation corresponding to the submitter's references to a hidden court.
15. Preserve filings, exhibits, internal memoranda, witness statements, recordings, rulings, and access notices.
16. Interview witnesses the submitter claims could confirm or contradict Obama's statements.
17. Determine whether witnesses were discouraged, directed, rewarded, threatened, or prevented from communicating.
18. Audit whether resolved allegations were repeatedly reopened and identify who requested each reopening.

E. Ideas, contracts, and financial evidence

19. Create a dated idea ledger showing conception, fixation, disclosure, recipients, confidentiality, public release, follow-up use, patent filings, and commercialization.
20. Obtain the exact rules and communications for every alleged ideas-for-rewards arrangement, contest, investment, award, licensing proposal, or partnership.
21. Identify any actual fund, escrow, award, trust, stock allocation, royalty stream, or government proposal connected to the asserted \$200 billion or \$1.5 trillion figures.
22. Compare each allegedly used concept with prior art and independent-development records.

23. Determine whether Obama advocated open-source treatment, taxation, transfer, compulsory use, or denial of credit, and whether any action followed.

F. Cryonics facility and family-related evidence

24. Identify the facility, patients, property, governing contracts, regulators, supply interruptions, closure efforts, and dates.
25. Preserve communications concerning funding, supplies, utilities, licensing, patient transfer, destruction, or political pressure.
26. Determine whether any actor intentionally created physical risk or whether the dispute was lawful regulation unrelated to Obama.
27. Obtain medical, facility, and communication records relevant to the alleged danger to the submitter's mother, subject to lawful consent and privacy procedures.

G. Harm and causation

28. Collect medical and mental-health records documenting distress and functional impairment.
29. Collect income, employment, education, sales, and business-development records.
30. Document lost patent deadlines, disclosure consequences, trade-secret measures, licensing opportunities, and provable economic loss.
31. Construct a causation timeline distinguishing harm attributable to Obama, other actors, platform algorithms, independent events, or the submitter's interpretations.

X. REQUESTED LEGAL TREATMENT

The submitter asks for an impartial investigation in which Obama's former office, reputation, political relationships, and public image neither protect him from scrutiny nor create a presumption of guilt. The same evidentiary rules should apply to the named subject and to every other person. Where the source alleges direct conduct, investigators should seek corroboration. Where it alleges inference from relays, investigators should authenticate the content and attribution before relying on it. Where the submitter acknowledges possible good intent or error, that evidence should be preserved alongside evidence of continuation after notice.

The appropriate initial remedies are preservation of evidence, identification of the actual proceedings and decision makers, restoration of lawful access to any process affecting the submitter, neutral technical review of the idea claims, and protection against retaliation. Any criminal referral should specify the act, date, actor, jurisdiction, protected right or property, intent, and supporting evidence. Any civil claim should likewise identify a recognized cause of action, a non-immunized defendant, timeliness, causation, and provable damages.

XI. CONCLUSION

The source presents a serious but substantially unverified allegation that Obama used political influence to help create and later preserve a system of monitoring, isolation, narrative control, ally protection, and economic pressure around the submitter. Its strongest internal feature is the alleged pattern of continuation after repeated notice of harm and the availability of less restrictive alternatives. Its principal evidentiary weakness is attribution: many conclusions are drawn from symbolic online content rather than authenticated statements or records.

The fair response is neither automatic acceptance nor dismissal. It is a disciplined investigation focused on verifiable acts. If records establish that Obama knowingly directed or joined unlawful monitoring, deprivation of protected rights, obstruction, coercive acquisition of property, or misappropriation, the conduct should be assessed under the applicable law without preferential treatment. If those records do not exist or do not connect him to the conduct, the allegations should be corrected accordingly. The submitter expressly leaves that determination to lawful authorities.

XII. AUTHORITATIVE U.S. LEGAL SOURCES

1. U.S. Constitution, Fourth Amendment: <https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-4/>
2. U.S. Constitution, Fifth Amendment: <https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-5/>
3. 18 U.S.C. section 241, Conspiracy Against Rights: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section241>
4. 18 U.S.C. section 242, Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section242>
5. 18 U.S.C. section 2261A, Stalking: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section2261A>
6. 18 U.S.C. section 2511, Interception and Disclosure of Communications: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section2511>
7. 18 U.S.C. section 2701, Unlawful Access to Stored Communications: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section2701>
8. 18 U.S.C. section 2707, Civil Action: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section2707>

9. 18 U.S.C. section 2712, Civil Actions Against the United States:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section2712>
10. 18 U.S.C. section 1512, Witness, Victim, or Informant Tampering:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section1512>
11. 18 U.S.C. section 1519, Destruction, Alteration, or Falsification of Records:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section1519>
12. 18 U.S.C. section 1001, Material False Statements: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section1001>
13. 18 U.S.C. section 371, Conspiracy to Commit an Offense or Defraud the United States:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section371>
14. 18 U.S.C. section 1343, Wire Fraud: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section1343>
15. 18 U.S.C. section 1951, Interference With Commerce by Threats or Violence:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title18-section1951>
16. 17 U.S.C. section 102, Copyright Subject Matter and Idea-Expression Limit:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title17-section102>
17. 35 U.S.C. section 154, Patent Rights and Term: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title35-section154>
18. 35 U.S.C. section 261, Patent Ownership and Assignment:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&req=granuleid:USC-prelim-title35-section261>
19. 18 U.S.C. sections 1832, 1836, 1837, and 1839, Trade Secrets:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&path=/prelim@title18/part1/chapter90>
20. *Trump v. United States*, 603 U.S. 593 (2024):
https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/23pdf/23-939_e2pg.pdf