

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Alleged Conduct of the Extended-Family Group

Prepared from: combinedExtendedfamily.txt

Subject: Named extended-family members and the group conduct attributed to them

Scope: Allegations, chronology, defenses, legal issue-spotting, and evidence requests

Prepared: June 28, 2026

Status: Unverified complainant statement for impartial investigation; not an adjudication

Foundational qualification: The following is a structured presentation of the complainant's allegations and observations. If the described events occurred as alleged, they warrant investigation under the legal standards identified below. The report does not treat disputed claims as adjudicated facts, does not infer guilt from family association, and does not recommend a predetermined sentence. Each person's responsibility must be established separately through admissible evidence, jurisdiction, and the required mental state.

1. Purpose and Method

This report isolates conduct attributed to the complainant's maternal extended family. It excludes allegations directed solely at the complainant's sister, brother-in-law, father, public figures, platform operators, or other third parties except where their conduct supplies necessary context for an extended-family member's alleged decision, communication, or assistance.

The source is a large contemporaneous-style compilation containing direct memories, summaries of emails, interpretations of online material described as relays, requests for witnesses to confirm events, and changing views about punishment. The report therefore distinguishes four evidentiary levels: claimed firsthand events; claimed communications whose records should exist; inferences about coordination or motive; and interpretations drawn from ambiguous online content. Only the first two categories can presently support a concrete factual chronology, and even those require authentication and response from the named person.

The source repeatedly requests that authorities assess acts rather than status, appearance, or later displays of care. This report follows that principle. It organizes overlapping statements by theme and chronology, avoids duplicating the same allegation merely because it recurs, and identifies exculpatory possibilities and legal limitations alongside the incriminating theory.

Primary record reviewed: combinedExtendedfamily.txt, including the source units identified within that compilation. No independent witness interviews, platform exports, police records, probate files, or authenticated communications were supplied with this report.

2. Executive Summary

The central allegation is not simply that relatives failed to provide affection or assistance. It is that several adults allegedly used their family position, private information, and group communications to exclude the complainant, accept a one-sided account supplied by closer relatives, and later participate in public ridicule, idea reattribution, or efforts to discredit him. The complainant describes this as a progression from prejudgment and abandonment to competitive interference and collective self-protection.

The most concrete allegations suitable for immediate verification are: an arranged six-month stay in Illinois that allegedly ended within approximately one week after Aunt Eileen told the host uncle that the complainant masturbated; the absence of a response to a later housing request directed to Wongi's mother; emails surrounding the complainant's suicidal communication after his mother's death; a letter from Wongi's father perceived as blaming him for his mother's death; alleged sharing of the complainant's emails among relatives and with his sister; derogatory statements attributed to Chloe's father, including a Korean slur translated as 'mutt' or 'mixed-breed' and an accusation concerning sexual orientation; alleged circulation of nude toddler photographs by Eileen for humiliation; an apology attributed to Wongi's father; later writings or presentations by cousins allegedly derived from the complainant's sea-platform and labor-exchange materials; and later attempts allegedly to deny or reverse the chronology of authorship.

The broader collective theory is that the relatives allegedly treated the complainant as aligned with his father rather than as an individual, favored his sister's account despite not having lived in Canada during the disputed family events, and used ridicule and intellectual competition to reinforce his exclusion. The complainant asserts that later 'care' or assistance did not cure the earlier conduct and that some relatives renewed antagonism after an apology and after he sought financial help for them.

The record also contains substantial uncertainty. Many claimed online acts are inferred from videos, screenshots, symbolic relays, silence, or perceived changes in tone. The source sometimes retracts or softens allegations, particularly as to Wongi and other younger family members, and alternates between believing the family intended lethal harm and believing imprisonment rather than capital punishment would be proportionate. These variations do not erase the underlying requests for investigation, but they make neutral corroboration and person-specific attribution essential.

3. Persons and Attribution Boundaries

Person or group	Conduct attributed in the source	Attribution caution
Wongi's father / uncle	Blaming or judgmental correspondence after the mother's death; alleged participation in suicide-related family discussion; later apology; alleged renewed mockery, defense of the complainant's sister, and leadership or approval of idea follow-up.	Some intent and leadership claims are inferred. Obtain the actual letters, emails, and direct statements.
Wongi	Alleged follow-up on the sea-platform or labor-exchange material; alleged participation in later denial or reframing; occasional derogatory judgment such as portraying disability as laziness.	The complainant repeatedly distinguishes Wongi from the adults, states contact was minimal, and sometimes asks that his culpability be reduced.

Person or group	Conduct attributed in the source	Attribution caution
Mark, cousin	Alleged follow-up on ideas, later authorship claims or concealment, and renewed hostility connected to his father's death.	The source is conditional and often asks witnesses to verify whether Mark actually made the inferred claims.
Chloe's father	Initiating or leading public antagonism; using a Korean mixed-blood slur and a sexual-orientation accusation; involving younger relatives in mockery or competition.	Exact words, audience, platform, date, and context must be established.
Aunt Eileen	Privacy disclosures, email forwarding, alleged suicide encouragement, public humiliation, toddler-photo circulation, alleged conservatorship request, and participation in family alignment.	Eileen is the subject of separate allegations; only conduct relevant to the group pattern is summarized here.
Host uncle / Mark's father	Ending the planned Illinois stay after receiving private allegations; later death following discussion of that event.	No causal allegation concerning his death should be drawn from the complainant's speech without medical evidence.
Wongi's mother and other adults	Nonresponse to a housing request, silence after suicidal communications, acceptance of one-sided family accounts, and group-level exclusion.	Silence, kinship, or receipt of a message alone does not establish agreement or criminal intent.
Younger relatives / cousins as a group	Joining ridicule or producing derivative presentations.	No collective liability; age, knowledge, independent creation, and individual acts must be assessed separately.

4. Relationship History and Chronology

4.1 Childhood Trust and Later Division

The complainant describes warm childhood memories of his maternal relatives and states that they were the principal extended family he knew. He alleges that an unspoken division nevertheless existed: the family identified him with his father's lineage, disliked his father, and treated the complainant as outside the maternal clan. He attributes later prejudice to ancestry, surname pride, academic status, disability, and comparison with the relatives' sons. This claimed background is relevant as a possible motive, but it requires direct communications or witness testimony; it cannot be inferred merely from later estrangement.

4.2 2010: Mother's Death, Illinois Stay, and Exclusion

After the complainant's mother died in 2010, he states that he arranged to stay with an uncle in Illinois for approximately six months while attempting to stabilize his life and return to school. He alleges that Aunt Eileen told the uncle that he masturbated, despite the complainant's denial that this occurred in the home. He states that the uncle then cited financial difficulty and required him to leave within roughly one week.

The complainant further states that he asked Wongi's mother whether he could stay with that family for six months and received no answer. He says relatives instead provided some money, after which he went to Vanuatu. The incriminating theory is that private and allegedly false sexual information was used to defeat an agreed housing arrangement at an exceptionally vulnerable time, while financial assistance functioned as a substitute for hearing him or providing a stable placement. The alternative explanation is that the host

independently changed the arrangement for legitimate financial or household reasons. That explanation can be tested through contemporaneous messages and testimony.

4.3 Suicide-Related Communications and Family Silence

The source states that, while isolated after the mother's death, the complainant sent a suicidal letter or announcement to Aunt Eileen. He alleges that Eileen agreed that he should die and that relatives exchanged or received communications about the matter. He also identifies a preceding letter from Wongi's father that he experienced as blame for his mother's death, followed by silence from other relatives. He interprets the sequence as a collective decision that his death was acceptable.

The record does not supply the actual messages, recipients, dates, proof of delivery, or evidence that every relative agreed. Silence after receipt of a message may be morally significant but is not itself proof of conspiracy or inducement. The priority is to retrieve complete threads, including headers and attachments, identify who knew of an imminent risk, determine whether anyone contacted emergency services or another relative, and establish whether any person used coercive pressure or supplied means.

4.4 2010-2015: Information Flow Through Eileen

The complainant alleges that he asked Eileen not to forward his emails to his sister, but Eileen did so for approximately five years and later disclosed this in Korea in 2015. He states that his messages concerned abuse, his mother's death, inheritance, and his fear of his sister and brother-in-law. He claims the forwarding placed the recipient he feared inside his confidential channel, allowed others to coordinate their account, and deprived him of a neutral family contact.

As a group allegation, the relevant issue is not only whether Eileen forwarded messages, but who requested, received, discussed, or acted on them. Complete email metadata and Korean messaging records could distinguish unilateral conduct by Eileen from a broader agreement among relatives.

4.5 Public Antagonism, Apology, and Claimed Financial Assistance

The complainant describes an early online phase in which Chloe's father and Eileen allegedly led public ridicule and involved their children. Chloe's father allegedly called him a Korean term translated as 'mutt' or 'mixed-breed' and accused him of being homosexual. Eileen allegedly displayed nude photographs of him as a toddler, mocked his education, relationship status, and economic condition, and portrayed him as the least successful male child. The complainant characterizes the atmosphere as humiliating rather than fearful or protective.

He states that Wongi's father later apologized on behalf of the family. In reliance on that perceived reconciliation, the complainant says he asked Elon Musk or others to provide approximately three million in financial assistance to Wongi's family, which he believed was in poverty. The existence, source, recipient, conditions, and amount of any payment are unverified. The alleged apology and assistance are important because the complainant treats them as the dividing line between a resolved first phase and a later renewed course of conduct.

4.6 Later Follow-Up on Sea-Platform and Labor-Exchange Material

The complainant alleges that, after the apology and financial assistance, cousins produced writings or presentations based on his sea-platform, labor-exchange, wooden-ship, segmented-pillar, migration, food-

production, and training concepts. He states that he had publicly or semi-publicly presented the underlying system first, was occupied with other disputes, and intended to develop later. He says he forgave an initial follow-up, warned Wongi in Korean not to continue, and also forgave Mark during a period of grief following Mark's father's death.

The more serious allegation is not merely that relatives discussed similar ideas. It is that they allegedly concealed the chronology, claimed or implied original authorship, used better-polished academic presentations to displace the complainant, and later denied that their work had followed his. The complainant views this as attempted reattribution for recognition or financial reward and as a means of making him appear to be the copier. He repeatedly asks platform witnesses to confirm who presented what first and whether the relatives' stance changed after earlier acknowledgments.

This allegation requires exact artifacts. General concepts and systems may not be protected by copyright, and publicly disclosed information may not qualify as a trade secret. The legally significant questions are whether any protectable expression was copied, whether confidential technical information was taken in breach of a duty, whether false authorship claims were used to obtain money or property, and whether records were altered or concealed in anticipation of a real proceeding.

4.7 Later Reframing and Support for the Complainant's Sister

The source states that extended-family adults were not present in Canada during the events involving the complainant's immediate family, did not ask him for his account, and nevertheless adopted his sister's version. The complainant alleges that Wongi's father later defended the sister and brother-in-law, reversed initiative and reaction, and portrayed the complainant as the origin of danger. He also alleges that relatives used his emotional reactions as justification for their earlier acts, even though he says those reactions followed family betrayal and were suitable for lawful assessment rather than private punishment.

The cumulative theory is that the group repeatedly selected a side first and constructed a justification afterward: initially by family loyalty and prejudice; later by competitive gain; and finally by self-preservation when their own conduct was questioned. The evidentiary challenge is to identify specific statements and acts rather than converting perceived alignment or silence into group guilt.

5. Alleged Conduct Requiring Investigation

5.1 Use of Private or Sexual Information to Cause Housing Loss

If Eileen knowingly supplied a false sexual allegation to the Illinois host for the purpose of ending the complainant's stay, and the host acted on it, that would be evidence of deliberate interference at a moment of dependency. Investigators should determine whether the statement was made, whether it was presented as firsthand knowledge, whether the complainant had notice or a chance to respond, and whether the host's financial explanation was genuine or pretextual.

The alleged circulation of nude toddler photographs belongs to the same privacy-and-humiliation theme, but the legal significance depends on the image, audience, context, and purpose. A childhood family photograph is not automatically unlawful. Its use to falsely sexualize, ridicule, or commercially exploit a person may support different civil theories, but the report does not assume such elements without the actual post or transmission.

5.2 Suicide Encouragement, Coercive Pressure, or Deliberate Abandonment

The source alleges an affirmative response approving suicide, blame immediately before the suicidal communication, redistribution of the message, and coordinated silence. The decisive factual distinction is between morally callous nonresponse and legally actionable coercion or assistance. Investigators should identify exact wording, temporal proximity, the complainant's actions after the message, the relatives' knowledge of immediate risk, any control over his location or circumstances, and whether anyone provided physical means or exerted substantial psychological control.

5.3 One-Sided Information Sharing and Scapegoating

The complainant alleges that relatives treated his sister's account as conclusive, forwarded his private messages to her, and refused to ask about violence, family conflict, or the events surrounding his mother's illness and death. The claimed wrong is not ordinary disagreement. It is the use of undisclosed information flow and group authority to create consequences for him while excluding him from the process.

Proof would require communications showing what each relative was told, whether contrary facts were available, whether a decision was coordinated, and what concrete harm followed. A person's belief in another relative's account, without more, is not a crime. Knowing fabrication, targeted harassment, fraud, or interference may be legally relevant if the required elements and jurisdiction are shown.

5.4 Discriminatory Ridicule and Public Humiliation

The alleged mixed-blood slur, sexual-orientation accusation, attacks on disability or employability, status comparisons, toddler-photo use, and group mockery may establish motive, intent, and emotional impact. The complainant also alleges younger family members were recruited into the antagonism. Investigators should preserve the original Korean language, obtain certified translations, identify every audience and republication, and distinguish factual allegations from insults or protected opinion.

5.5 Unauthorized Derivation, False Attribution, and Economic Interference

The complainant alleges that cousins received or observed his presentations, created derivative writings, sought credit or reward, ignored a request to stop, and later concealed their status as followers. If verified, the most probative evidence would be timestamped drafts, platform uploads, email attachments, presentation histories, version metadata, communications acknowledging the complainant's authorship, and later inconsistent claims.

The report deliberately avoids calling all idea follow-up 'theft.' U.S. copyright law protects original expression fixed in a tangible medium, not the underlying idea, procedure, process, system, method of operation, concept, principle, or discovery. Trade-secret protection likewise requires reasonable secrecy measures and independent economic value from secrecy. Fraud or false designation theories may still arise from intentional false claims used to obtain money or property, but independent development, public disclosure, and ordinary commentary are complete or substantial defenses.

5.6 Alleged Framing, Record Manipulation, and Obstruction

The complainant asserts that relatives later denied earlier acknowledgment, encouraged others to portray him as the copier, and supported deletion or concealment of the past. These claims are presently inferential. Obstruction is not established by inconsistency, silence, deletion under ordinary retention policies, or

advocacy for a relative. It requires proof tied to an actual or contemplated official matter and the specific intent required by the governing statute.

5.7 Attempts to Exercise Control

The source refers to an alleged conservatorship request by Eileen and describes relatives as acting like the complainant's managers while he lacked direct access to the disputed online environment. Any filed petition, financial authorization, power of attorney, or communication proposing control should be obtained. A lawful request for protective proceedings is not itself wrongdoing; the issue would be whether material facts were knowingly falsified, private information was misused, or the process was pursued for personal gain rather than protection.

6. Cumulative Incrimination Theory

Viewed cumulatively, the complainant's theory has six components. First, the family allegedly held preexisting prejudice based on lineage, disability, and social status. Second, after his mother's death, adults allegedly used private information and one-sided communications to exclude him from housing and family support. Third, during a suicidal crisis, they allegedly blamed, approved, or silently accepted his death rather than investigate or intervene. Fourth, they later allegedly ridiculed him publicly and compared him unfavorably with their children. Fifth, after an apology and requested assistance, some cousins allegedly followed his intellectual work and attempted to obtain credit. Sixth, when challenged, adults allegedly protected themselves and the complainant's sister by reversing chronology and portraying his reactions as the original cause.

If supported by authenticated records, these components could make apparently isolated incidents probative of knowledge, motive, and intent. For example, an acknowledgment that the complainant originated the sea-platform framework followed by a later contrary claim would be more significant than simultaneous independent development. A private message approving suicide would be more serious if paired with proof of coercive pressure or active steps to prevent help. A derogatory slur would be more probative if linked to a coordinated decision affecting housing, reputation, or financial opportunity.

The same cumulative method has an important restraint: weak inferences do not become strong merely because they are numerous. Symbolic videos, perceived tones, silence, family association, and ambiguous online recommendations cannot substitute for proof of who communicated, what was said, what act followed, and what mental state accompanied it. The report therefore treats the cumulative theory as an investigative hypothesis, not a finding.

7. Anticipated Explanations and Fair Assessment

7.1 'We Were Trying to Help'

Relatives may point to money, housing discussions, later expressions of care, intellectual contributions, or attempts to calm conflict. Assistance is relevant mitigation and may disprove malicious intent. It does not, however, answer a distinct allegation of knowingly false disclosure, coercion, unauthorized copying of protected material, or deliberate public humiliation. Each act must be assessed separately and then in context.

7.2 Fear, Safety, or Protection of Another Relative

A person may report a perceived threat, limit contact, refuse housing, or seek lawful protective relief. Those actions can be reasonable even if the perceived threat is later disputed. They do not authorize fabricated evidence, harassment, theft, or coercion. Investigators should compare the relatives' claimed fear with their contemporaneous conduct, including alleged laughter, taunting, renewed engagement, or economic competition, while recognizing that behavior after fear is not always consistent or easily interpreted.

7.3 Independent Creation and Publicly Available Ideas

The relatives may contend that their work was independently developed, derived from public information, or merely elaborated on unprotected ideas. That defense is legally substantial. The complainant's priority and the relatives' access must be established through records, and the protectable material must be separated from broad concepts. Similarity alone does not prove copying; access plus substantial similarity of protected expression, confidential acquisition, or a false claim for economic gain would be materially stronger.

7.4 No Group Agreement

Some relatives may have received messages without endorsing them, remained silent because they did not know how to respond, or acted independently. The source itself sometimes attributes responsibility tentatively and distinguishes adults from younger relatives. A collective label cannot replace proof of agreement, participation, assistance, or a legal duty to act.

7.5 Online Ambiguity and Mistaken Attribution

Many later allegations arise from symbolic media described as relays. The complainant openly acknowledges that individual interpretations may be wrong and asks witnesses to confirm them. No adverse finding should rest on those interpretations unless platform records or direct testimony connect a named relative to the content and establish its intended meaning.

8. Potential U.S. Legal Relevance

Jurisdiction and charging caution: Most family events are alleged to have occurred in Canada, Korea, Vanuatu, online, or across borders. U.S. criminal statutes apply only when their territorial, interstate-commerce, federal-matter, and mental-state elements are satisfied. Illinois law may be relevant to the Illinois housing episode or Illinois-based communications, but choice of law, limitation periods, and personal jurisdiction require counsel. The provisions below are issue-spotting standards, not conclusions that an offense occurred.

8.1 Interstate or Cyberstalking - 18 U.S.C. Section 2261A

Section 2261A can reach a course of conduct using interstate facilities when undertaken with the specified intent to kill, injure, harass, intimidate, or place a person under surveillance, and when it causes or would reasonably be expected to cause substantial emotional distress or specified fear. Repeated targeted electronic conduct, if directly tied to a named relative and the statutory intent, could be examined under this

standard. Family conflict, isolated insults, protected speech, or ambiguous recommendations do not automatically satisfy it.

8.2 Illinois Cyberstalking and Electronic Harassment

Illinois's cyberstalking statute, 720 ILCS 5/12-7.5, addresses specified courses of electronic conduct directed at a person that cause reasonable fear or emotional distress, as well as repeated harassment combined with threats or other listed acts. Illinois's electronic-harassment provisions define electronic communications broadly and cover particular threatening or obstructive uses. Investigators must match actual communications to the precise version of the statute in force on the date of conduct.

8.3 Inducement to Commit Suicide - 720 ILCS 5/12-34.5

Illinois law requires more than approval, cruelty, or silence. The coercion branch requires knowing coercion, a suicide or attempt directly resulting from it, and substantial control through physical circumstances, psychological pressure, or asserted principles. The assistance branch requires intentional provision of physical means or participation in a physical act, with knowledge of the person's intent. The alleged messages should be investigated, but the present record does not establish these statutory elements.

8.4 Defamation and Privacy Under Illinois Law

Illinois defamation requires a false statement about the plaintiff, unprivileged publication to a third party, and damage. Certain accusations, including commission of a crime or specified professional incapacity, may be defamatory per se; other claims require proof of special damages. Exact words matter, and opinion, rhetorical insult, truth, privilege, and lack of publication are potential defenses. Illinois generally imposes a one-year limitation period for defamation and publication-based privacy claims, subject to fact-specific accrual and other doctrines. The alleged mixed-blood slur may be reprehensible yet nonactionable opinion; an objectively false accusation of criminal or sexual conduct presents a different question.

8.5 Copyright - 17 U.S.C. Sections 102 and 501

Copyright can protect the complainant's original written presentations, diagrams, and other fixed expression. Section 102(b) expressly excludes ideas, procedures, processes, systems, methods of operation, concepts, principles, and discoveries from copyright protection. A claim therefore requires comparison of actual works, ownership, access, and copying of protected expression. Registration rules and limitation periods also affect available remedies.

8.6 Trade Secrets - 18 U.S.C. Sections 1832 and 1839

Federal trade-secret law covers qualifying technical, scientific, business, or engineering information only if the owner took reasonable measures to keep it secret and it derived economic value from secrecy. Section 1832 additionally requires knowing unauthorized acquisition, copying, receipt, attempt, or conspiracy, with intent to benefit someone other than the owner and intent or knowledge of injury. The source repeatedly describes presentations made to an online audience; if the material was public, trade-secret status may fail. Confidential drafts, restricted channels, nondisclosure commitments, or unauthorized account access could change the analysis.

8.7 Wire Fraud - 18 U.S.C. Section 1343

Wire fraud requires a scheme to defraud or obtain money or property by false pretenses and an interstate or foreign wire communication used to execute it. A false authorship claim submitted to obtain a payment, investment, or property interest may warrant examination. Harm to dignity, reputation, or attribution alone is not enough under the statutory money-or-property requirement.

8.8 Unauthorized Computer Access - 18 U.S.C. Section 1030

The Computer Fraud and Abuse Act addresses specified unauthorized access to protected computers, fraud, and computer damage. Observing public posts, receiving forwarded emails, or appearing in a recommendation feed is not unauthorized access. This provision becomes relevant only if forensic evidence shows access without authorization, acquisition of protected information, fraud, damage, or another defined statutory result.

8.9 Obstruction and Record Falsification - 18 U.S.C. Sections 1512 and 1519

Section 1512 addresses witness tampering, corrupt persuasion, misleading conduct, evidence impairment, and specified harassment tied to an official proceeding or federal reporting. Section 1519 addresses knowing alteration, destruction, concealment, or falsification of records with intent to impede a federal matter or in contemplation of one. Ordinary disagreement, memory conflict, or deletion without the required nexus and intent is not obstruction. These provisions should be considered only if a genuine federal investigation or contemplated matter and intentional evidence interference can be shown.

9. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests

The following requests are designed to test both the allegations and the relatives' possible defenses. Preservation should be lawful, targeted, and person-specific.

1. Obtain the complete 2010-2015 email archive involving the complainant, Eileen, Wongi's father, the complainant's sister, and other recipients, including full headers, forwarding chains, drafts, attachments, and deleted-item recovery where lawfully available.
2. Identify the exact suicidal letter or announcement, every recipient and forwarding event, the relatives' responses, any emergency contact, and any contemporaneous steps to locate or assist the complainant.
3. Retrieve the letter from Wongi's father described as blaming the complainant for his mother's death and obtain a certified Korean-to-English translation if needed.
4. Collect communications concerning the planned six-month Illinois stay, the stated financial reason for ending it, Eileen's alleged sexual disclosure, and the later housing request to Wongi's mother.
5. Preserve KakaoTalk, text, and email discussions among extended-family members concerning the complainant, his mother, inheritance, housing, suicide, disability, lineage, or reputation.
6. Identify and preserve the alleged toddler photographs, posts, captions, recipients, audience settings, and comments; determine whether the images were used to humiliate, make a factual allegation, or for another purpose.
7. Obtain the original-language recording or post containing the alleged mixed-blood slur and sexual-orientation accusation, together with the full surrounding conversation and audience list.

8. Create a forensic authorship timeline for the sea-platform, labor-exchange, wooden-ship, segmented-pillar, migration, and related materials. Compare first drafts, version histories, uploads, presentations, citations, and communications acknowledging access or authorship.
9. Determine whether the complainant gave any license, permission, collaboration invitation, or confidentiality restriction, and whether any relative received payment, credit, employment, investment, or other property based on the material.
10. Verify the alleged apology by Wongi's father and the alleged three-million financial assistance, including currency, payer, recipient, purpose, conditions, and whether any conduct changed afterward.
11. Search for any conservatorship, guardianship, power-of-attorney, probate, inheritance, or financial-control filing connected to Eileen or another extended-family member; obtain certified copies rather than relying on inference.
12. Preserve platform records only through lawful process. Identify account owners, login history, message authors, edits, deletions, and direct links before attributing symbolic relays or recommendation content to a relative.
13. Interview each adult and younger relative separately before permitting group memory contamination. Ask for their account of the complainant's family history, what they learned from the sister, what they verified, and what actions they personally took.

10. Person-Specific Questions

- **Wongi's father:** What did he write after the mother's death? Who discussed the complainant's suicidal communication? What did his apology cover? Did he approve, lead, or benefit from the later presentations? What facts supported his defense of the sister and brother-in-law?
- **Wongi:** What material did he receive, write, present, or claim? Was he warned to stop? Did he acknowledge the complainant's earlier work? Did he later deny it, and if so, on what evidence?
- **Mark:** What was the chronology of his own work? What did he say concerning his father's death? Did he initially support the complainant, later change position, or claim original authorship? What source documents support either account?
- **Chloe's father:** Did he use the alleged Korean slur or sexual-orientation accusation? Who heard it? Why were younger relatives involved? Was the conduct intended as ridicule, factual accusation, or commentary?
- **Eileen:** What did she tell the Illinois uncle? Why did she forward emails after being asked not to? What exactly did she say in response to the suicidal communication? Did she circulate toddler photographs, seek conservatorship, or discuss inheritance or authorship with the group?
- **Other adults:** Which messages did they receive? Did they agree, object, seek help, or remain unaware? What independent information did they have, and what concrete action did each take?

11. Harm and Causation to Be Documented

The source alleges acute emotional distress, renewed suicidality, medical distress during later conflicts, loss of housing stability, family isolation, reputational injury, interference with education or work, loss of intellectual credit, and prolonged fear of being framed. A legal assessment should separate harm caused by a

particular person's act from harm caused by unrelated family conflict, public figures, platform content, or the complainant's interpretations. Medical records, housing records, employment or educational records, financial records, and contemporaneous communications are necessary for that analysis.

Where economic loss is claimed, the report should identify a specific transaction or opportunity: who was prepared to pay; what property or protected work was involved; what false statement or interference changed the outcome; and the amount lost. Where emotional distress is claimed, the chronology should identify the triggering communication, symptoms, treatment, and duration. This precision protects the complainant's strongest claims from dilution by broader unverified theories.

12. Requested Disposition

The complainant requests a fair investigation of the extended-family members' conduct rather than acceptance of family status, later displays of care, or the complainant's reactions as a substitute for examining the initiating acts. The appropriate legal response is to preserve records, authenticate communications, interview participants separately, identify jurisdiction, and compare each proven act to the elements in force when it occurred.

No person should be charged because another relative acted wrongfully, because the person remained in contact with the family, or because the complainant perceived a symbolic online relay. Conversely, later assistance or reconciliation should not automatically erase a prior actionable act. Responsibility and mitigation both belong to the individual record.

The report does not request or endorse a predetermined punishment. The source itself varies on punishment and often asks that younger relatives or those who later helped receive lesser treatment. Any charging or sentencing decision belongs to the competent authority after proof beyond the applicable standard, consideration of limitation periods, and an opportunity for each named person to respond.

13. Legal Sources

- [18 U.S.C. Section 2261A - Stalking](#)
- [18 U.S.C. Section 1030 - Fraud and related activity in connection with computers](#)
- [18 U.S.C. Section 1343 - Wire fraud](#)
- [18 U.S.C. Section 1512 - Witness tampering and evidence interference](#)
- [18 U.S.C. Section 1519 - Falsification of records in federal matters](#)
- [18 U.S.C. Sections 1832 and 1839 - Theft and definition of trade secrets](#)
- [17 U.S.C. Section 102 - Copyright subject matter and idea-expression limit](#)
- [17 U.S.C. Section 501 - Copyright infringement](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/12-34.5 - Inducement to commit suicide](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/12-7.5 - Cyberstalking](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/26.5-3 - Harassment through electronic communications](#)
- [740 ILCS 145 - Illinois Slander and Libel Act](#)
- [735 ILCS 5/13-201 - Illinois limitation period for defamation and publication-based privacy claims](#)
- [Illinois official opinion summarizing defamation elements and pleading requirements](#)

Legal sources were checked against official U.S. Code, Illinois General Assembly, and Illinois Courts materials available on June 28, 2026. Counsel should verify the historical version applicable to each alleged event.