

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

# Subject: Festus

## Alleged Misrepresentation, Unauthorized Use, and Interference with Authorship and Investment Relations

---

**Prepared from:** combinedFestus.txt (file\_000000003bc8720cb3fa67d12c78695d)

**Prepared on:** June 28, 2026

**Scope:** Festus's alleged conduct only

**Status:** Conditional investigative statement; not a finding of fact or guilt

### PRELIMINARY CONDITION

If the conduct described in the source occurred, this report presents the author's allegations for impartial investigation and lawful assessment. It does not assume that disputed events occurred, authenticate anonymous online material as Festus, or decide liability, guilt, remedy, or punishment. The report distinguishes contemporaneous-record claims, recollection, inference, and unverified relay or avatar material. Other people are mentioned only when necessary to explain Festus's alleged access, role, knowledge, statements, or possible coordination.

## 1. Executive Summary

The source describes a short business interaction between the author and a person identified as Festus. According to the author, the contact began around April 27, 2021 after Festus, who reportedly held an MBA, advised Steve about an MBA path in a kitchen conversation. The author then requested an introduction because a completed website presentation needed a financial projection. The author repeatedly states that Festus was not invited to become a cofounder, coauthor, or general creative partner. The proposed compensation was a 1% commission or share interest for producing the financial projection.

The author recalls approximately two brief meetings, each described as roughly thirty minutes, during which the author explained the presentation, business model, expected next steps, and information needed for the projection. Festus's only specifically acknowledged creative suggestion was a possible use of Bitcoin. The author says Festus missed an approximately two-week deadline, reported illness, did not complete or submit the projection, and was removed from the engagement because the author had lost trust and concluded that a precise projection was unnecessary.

The principal allegation is not simple nonperformance. The author alleges that Festus later misstated or exaggerated his contribution, implied that the author had taken Festus's 'flow' or ideas, or supported Steve and others in disputing the origins of the presentation and related concepts. The source further alleges that Festus knew the presentation predated their meetings; knew the engagement was limited to financial projections; knew the author claimed direct investor contacts; and therefore would have understood that later claims of broad authorship or ownership were false. The author also alleges that Festus at one point admitted or 'confessed' to a prior misleading position, opposed claims by Steve or Laura, and later changed position again.

Those allegations are potentially serious if supported by authenticated communications, copied expression, proof of a restricted-use agreement, dissemination to investors, or materially false statements to an official body. At present, however, the combined source does not include the underlying email thread, the presentation files, Festus's alleged later statements, the screenshot or link said to show 'stole my whole flow,' a completed financial model, or a verbatim authenticated admission. The source also repeatedly acknowledges uncertainty about whether the anonymous avatar or relay was Festus. The strongest immediate task is therefore evidence preservation and authentication, not a conclusion that any offense occurred.

**Core assessment:** The record supports a focused inquiry into the scope of Festus's engagement, the permission to make a separate variation, any dissemination to the author's investors, any later claim of authorship or ownership, and any knowingly false statement made for economic or litigation advantage. It does not presently establish a criminal case.

## 2. Scope and Method

The source contains approximately 68,500 words and 57 constituent text files. Each asterisk-separated source unit was treated as a complete observation rather than as isolated sentences. Repetitive material was consolidated by issue and chronology. A statement was included only when it concerned Festus's

alleged conduct, knowledge, role, admissions, or communications. Allegations principally concerning Steve, Laura, investors, public figures, monitoring, or unrelated disputes were omitted except where needed to explain why Festus was introduced or what Festus allegedly knew.

The report uses four evidentiary categories. These categories do not decide credibility; they identify what must be authenticated before legal conclusions can be drawn.

Tier	Material	Treatment
1	Contemporaneous records	Emails, attachments, file metadata, investor communications, and preserved account logs. Highest priority for authentication.
2	Repeated first-person recollection	Consistent descriptions of the meetings, 1% arrangement, deadline, Bitcoin remark, and termination. Requires corroboration.
3	Inference from chronology	Arguments based on what Festus would likely have written or done if he were a contributor. Relevant but not independently conclusive.
4	Relay, avatar, or indirect online material	No attribution to Festus unless identity, account control, content, date, and context are independently authenticated.

### 3. Relationship and Chronology

#### 3.1 Introduction and Limited Purpose

The author places the first direct email contact on April 27, 2021 and elsewhere describes the first meeting as April 28, 2021. The one-day discrepancy should be resolved from the email headers and calendar evidence. The source states that Festus had been speaking with Steve near the kitchen and stairs about Steve's possible MBA path. Because Festus reportedly had an MBA, the author asked Steve for an introduction. The reason given for the introduction was specific: the author's website presentation was already substantially or fully prepared, and the author needed help with a financial projection.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; gre324333.txt; hiuy8779709.txt; iihuyy897.txt; joiuo889787.txt; oiu0980809.txt*

#### 3.2 Claimed Preexisting Presentation

The author repeatedly asserts that the presentation's foundation, business model, interface concepts, content-moderation approach, marketplace references, humanitarian concepts, ship concepts, and investor relationship predated Festus. The author characterizes later messages to Festus as explanations and procedural instructions derived from that preexisting presentation. The source also refers to a second revision or post-meeting review. This creates a factual distinction that must be tested: a

presentation can be complete in its core authorship while still receiving later revisions, but the version history must identify what existed before the first Festus meeting and what changed afterward.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; er3243132.txt; gugut7657.txt; hiuyi87998.txt; hoiuhiu879878.txt*

### 3.3 Compensation and Deliverable

The alleged bargain was a 1% commission or share interest in exchange for a financial projection. The source does not establish whether the 1% was immediately vested, conditional on delivery, contingent on investment, or merely proposed. The author states that no projection was delivered before termination. The source also says Festus may have sent the material to friends or overseas contacts who might assist with the projection. That transmission may have been authorized for the limited purpose of completing the requested work; recipient identities and the exact permission must be recovered before characterizing it as misuse.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; er3243132.txt; gae32332.txt; gugut7657.txt; tyguhhijo8yhu.txt*

### 3.4 Meetings, Deadline, and Termination

The author recalls approximately two meetings, described as brief and possibly about thirty minutes each. The author says Festus reported illness and failed to meet a deadline of roughly two weeks. According to the source, the author then ended the relationship before Festus could complete the projection, both because trust had diminished and because outside advice led the author to believe the projection did not need to be precise. The exact deadline, illness communication, termination message, and any work product then in progress are material evidence.

*Source references: er3243132.txt; gae32332.txt; hiuyi87998.txt; tyguhhijo8yhu.txt*

### 3.5 Acknowledged Contribution

The source consistently identifies one specific Festus suggestion: words to the effect of, 'I know there must be a way to use bitcoins here somewhere.' The author treats this as Festus's only unique idea and says it was acknowledged as such. The precise context is uncertain. This admission is important because it prevents an overbroad claim that Festus contributed nothing at all, while also allowing the scope of that contribution to be measured against the much larger preexisting presentation.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; er3243132.txt*

## 4. Festus-Specific Alleged Conduct

### 4.1 Alleged Exaggeration of Contribution

The author alleges that Festus later described his role more broadly than the contemporaneous engagement permitted. The asserted discrepancy is between a limited financial-projection assignment and an alleged later suggestion that Festus originated the presentation's 'flow,' business structure, music-related material, or other ideas. The source argues that a person with an MBA who expected ownership or partnership would ordinarily document that status in the opening email, compensation terms, meeting follow-up, or investor correspondence. The absence of such a record may be

circumstantial evidence, but it is not a substitute for obtaining Festus's actual statement and the full email thread.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; gae32332.txt; hiuyi87998.txt; nkijlhoil897.txt*

## 4.2 Alleged Misuse of Limited Permission

The author states that Festus was allowed to use the presentation as a base for a separate variation of his own, but not to present it to the author's own investors. This is a pivotal alleged boundary. If the wording is confirmed, the permission may function as a limited license or limited-purpose disclosure rather than a transfer of authorship or unrestricted right to exploit the material. If Festus did not pitch, disclose, copy, or use the work outside the permitted purpose, there may be no violation. If he did, the exact material used and recipient must be identified.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; 548256.txt; fawer21122.txt*

## 4.3 Alleged Claim That the Author 'Stole' Festus's Work

Several source units discuss a link, screenshot, avatar, or relay associated in the author's memory with Festus and containing language such as 'stole my whole flow' or 'I wrote music for an Attack on Titan game.' The author interprets these items as possible claims that the author took Festus's work. The source repeatedly qualifies the attribution with phrases such as 'if that link is Festus,' 'possibly Festus,' and apologies if the relay was misread. Therefore, this allegation must remain unverified unless account ownership, posting history, timestamp, content, and context are authenticated. The report does not attribute those statements to Festus as fact.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; 4j23j4kl23k.txt; er3243132.txt; gae32332.txt; nkijlhoil897.txt*

## 4.4 Alleged Support for a Competing Origin Narrative

The author alleges that Festus at some point supported Steve's effort to dispute the author's ownership, thereby giving credibility to a story the author describes as fabricated. The asserted harm is that Festus had direct knowledge of the limited engagement and could use that proximity to influence investors or authorities. The source does not identify the exact statement, recipient, medium, or date. It also contains contrary recollections that Festus spoke against Steve, opposed Laura's claims, or should have vouched for the author. These competing accounts make a chronological statement-by-statement reconstruction essential.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; gae32332.txt; j9iu877.txt; joiu9089.txt; oiu0980809.txt*

## 4.5 Alleged Inconsistent Positions and Admissions

The author recalls that Festus previously antagonized or misled him, later confessed or apologized, and then may have revived a contrary position. The source says witnesses, including persons who observed online events, may remember the admission. No exact words, date, recording, or authenticated witness statement appears in the combined text. A generalized recollection of a 'confession' cannot establish what was admitted. Investigators should obtain each alleged statement and determine whether it concerned authorship, support for Steve, an inaccurate relay, the MBA conversation, or some unrelated matter.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; byuuhuji.txt; gae32332.txt; oiu0980809.txt*

## 4.6 Alleged Misleading of Authorities

The source alleges that Festus may have adjusted his story after the surrounding environment changed and may have misled new authorities about the origins of the presentation. The current record does not identify an agency, proceeding, statement, date, or material decision affected. The accusation should therefore be framed as an investigative question: did Festus knowingly make a materially false statement to a government body or tribunal, and if so, what exactly was said, under what jurisdiction, and with what purpose? Without those details, the allegation is not legally chargeable merely because the author considers it false.

*Source references: 1641844894.txt; byuuhuji.txt; gae32332.txt; joiu0980908.txt*

## 4.7 Alleged Economic and Reputational Harm

The author contends that false ownership claims could divert investor support, diminish the author's credibility, convert a sole-authored project into an asserted partnership, expose the author to accusations of theft, and interfere with future work and legal protection. These are recognizable categories of potential harm, but damages must be tied to concrete events: a lost investor, delayed transaction, diverted opportunity, licensing loss, publication, or identifiable expense. The source does not presently quantify such loss as caused specifically by Festus.

## 5. Cumulative Incrimination Factors

The following factors, if corroborated together, could support an inference that a later claim by Festus was knowingly false or exceeded the permission granted. None is conclusive in isolation.

1. The presentation allegedly existed before Festus was introduced and was supplied to him for a defined financial task.
2. The alleged compensation was tied to a financial projection rather than to coauthorship, partnership, or assignment of ownership.
3. The relationship was brief, with approximately two short meetings and no completed projection before termination.
4. The author consistently acknowledges the Bitcoin suggestion, making the denial of broader contribution more specific and testable.
5. The first email and follow-up messages allegedly documented the relationship from its beginning, giving Festus an opportunity to correct the stated scope if inaccurate.
6. The author alleges a clear permission boundary: a separate variation could be developed, but the author's own investors were excluded.
7. Any later broad claim of authorship allegedly emerged after a period in which Festus did not claim shares, partnership status, or creative ownership in the business communications.
8. Festus allegedly had knowledge of the claimed investor relationship and the importance of accurately recording contributions.

9. The author recalls inconsistent positions, including possible support for the author or opposition to Steve before any contrary claim.
10. The alleged later statements, if authenticated, could have produced economic advantage for Festus or others and corresponding loss to the author.

## 6. Material Limitations and Alternative Explanations

Neutral assessment requires the following limitations to remain visible. They are not conclusions in Festus's favor; they identify the evidence needed to test the allegations fairly.

- Identity is unresolved for the link, avatar, screenshot, and relay material. The author repeatedly concedes possible misidentification.
- The combined source describes emails but does not include the full native email thread, headers, attachments, or account export.
- The source calls the presentation completed but also refers to later revisions and post-meeting instructions. Version comparison is required.
- The author granted some permission to create a variation. The exact wording may be broader or narrower than remembered.
- Festus's transmission to friends or overseas contacts may have been authorized to obtain help with the projection.
- The exact 1% terms are unclear, including vesting, deliverables, deadline, ownership, confidentiality, and termination rights.
- The alleged confession is not quoted or tied to a date, recording, witness declaration, or precise subject.
- The Bitcoin remark is a conceded contribution. Its significance depends on whether it was used and whether the parties intended it to become part of a joint work.
- Failure to complete a projection may reflect illness, unclear instructions, termination, or ordinary nonperformance rather than deceptive intent.
- Absence of a claim in email is relevant circumstantial evidence but does not by itself prove that no oral contribution occurred.
- No specific investor loss, diverted payment, profit, or government decision is presently linked to Festus.
- The governing jurisdiction is not established. State contract, defamation, and interference law cannot be selected without it.

## 7. Conditional U.S. Legal Framework

This section identifies legal frameworks that investigators or counsel may evaluate if the facts and U.S. jurisdiction are established. It is not a charging recommendation. Federal statutes must be applied element by element; labels such as theft, fraud, framing, conspiracy, or obstruction do not establish an offense by themselves.

## 7.1 Copyright: Protected Expression, Not Ideas

A fixed presentation may contain copyrightable literary, graphic, and audiovisual expression. Federal copyright law gives an owner exclusive rights including reproduction, preparation of derivative works, distribution, and public display. A person who violates an exclusive right may be liable for infringement. However, copyright does not protect an idea, procedure, process, system, method of operation, concept, principle, or discovery as such. Therefore, similarity in a business idea, a marketplace concept, a financial step, or a Bitcoin suggestion is not enough. The inquiry must compare protectable wording, arrangement, graphics, selection, coordination, and other original expression in the actual files. See 17 U.S.C. sections 102, 106, and 501.

A 'joint work' requires an intention that two or more authors' contributions be merged into inseparable or interdependent parts of a unitary whole. The alleged narrow financial assignment, the 1% deliverable-based compensation, and the author's stated refusal to accept broader creative contributions could weigh against joint authorship, but the parties' contemporaneous intent controls. For most U.S. works, registration or preregistration is required before a civil infringement action is instituted. See 17 U.S.C. sections 101 and 411(a).

## 7.2 Trade Secrets and Limited-Purpose Disclosure

The Defend Trade Secrets Act may apply only if the specific information qualified as a trade secret: the owner took reasonable measures to keep it secret, and it derived actual or potential independent economic value from not being generally known or readily ascertainable. Misappropriation can include unauthorized acquisition, disclosure, or use by a person who knew the information was obtained through improper means or under a duty to maintain secrecy or limit use. A private civil action requires a trade secret related to a product or service used in, or intended for use in, interstate or foreign commerce. See 18 U.S.C. sections 1836(b)(1) and 1839(3), (5), and (6).

Applied here, the author's alleged instruction that Festus could create a separate variation but could not approach the author's investors may support a limited-use duty if documented. Conversely, broad public disclosure, unrestricted circulation, or permission to share with unidentified contacts may defeat secrecy or expand the license. The exact presentation version, confidentiality language, recipients, access controls, and public availability are essential. The federal civil limitations period is generally three years from discovery or when misappropriation should have been discovered, with continuing misappropriation treated as a single claim. See 18 U.S.C. section 1836(d).

## 7.3 Contract, Confidentiality, and Accounting

State law may recognize an express or implied agreement concerning the projection, 1% compensation, confidentiality, permitted variation, and excluded investors. A viable claim ordinarily requires proof of definite terms, performance or excuse, breach, and damages under the selected jurisdiction. The author ended the relationship before delivery, so counsel must determine whether Festus had already breached a deadline, whether termination was authorized, whether partial work was compensable, and whether any continuing license survived. An equitable accounting or unjust-enrichment theory may be considered only if use, benefit, and lack of an adequate contract remedy are established under applicable state law.

### 7.4 Fraud and Wire Fraud

Federal wire fraud requires a scheme to defraud or obtain money or property through false or fraudulent pretenses and use of interstate or foreign wire communications to execute the scheme. A disagreement over credit, an inaccurate opinion, or deprivation of useful information is not automatically wire fraud. The alleged false statement must be identified, knowingly or intentionally false, material to a scheme, connected to traditional property, and transmitted or furthered by interstate wires. See 18 U.S.C. section 1343. On the current source alone, those elements are not established.

### 7.5 False Statements and Obstruction

A knowingly and willfully false, fictitious, or fraudulent material statement may violate 18 U.S.C. section 1001 only when made in a matter within the jurisdiction of the federal executive, legislative, or judicial branch, subject to statutory exceptions. Witness tampering or obstruction under 18 U.S.C. section 1512 requires the specified intent concerning testimony, evidence, communication with federal law enforcement, or an official proceeding. Ordinary online contradiction, deletion, silence, or misleading private speech does not automatically satisfy these statutes. The report therefore requests identification of any agency, tribunal, case, statement, record, and corrupt purpose before these provisions are considered.

### 7.6 Defamation and Interference

A false factual statement accusing the author of theft or plagiarism, published to investors or other third parties with the required degree of fault and causing legally cognizable harm, may implicate state defamation law. Intentional interference with an existing or prospective economic relationship may also be considered if the governing state recognizes the claim and the evidence proves a valid relationship, Festus's knowledge, intentional and improper interference, causation, and damages. Because state standards and privileges vary, no conclusion is possible until jurisdiction, exact words, recipient, context, and harm are known.

### 7.7 Criminal Trade-Secret Conversion

18 U.S.C. section 1832 addresses knowing theft, copying, transmission, receipt, or attempted conversion of a qualifying trade secret connected to interstate or foreign commerce, with intent to benefit someone other than the owner and intent or knowledge that the owner will be injured. The current source does not establish those elements. Referral for criminal assessment would require authenticated proof of a qualifying secret, unauthorized conduct, specific intent, and an act within the statute.

## 8. Anticipated Defenses and Focused Responses

Potential Defense	Evidence-Based Response or Required Inquiry
Festus was a coauthor or partner.	Examine the opening email, 1% terms, meeting notes, investor messages, and whether both parties intended integrated authorship. A financial task alone does not establish joint authorship.

The author gave permission to use the presentation.	Determine the exact scope. The author admits permission for a separate variation but alleges an exclusion for the author's investors. A license may be limited by purpose, audience, duration, or medium.
Festus contributed ideas orally.	Identify each idea, date, words, witnesses, and incorporation. Compare it with pre-meeting presentation versions. Separate unprotectable ideas from copied expression.
The projection deadline was missed because of illness.	Recover the deadline, illness notice, extension discussions, termination message, and any partial work. Nonperformance is not necessarily fraud.
Material was shared with contacts at the author's request.	Identify recipients and purpose. Authorized efforts to obtain projection assistance should not be recast as misappropriation without proof of excess use.
The online statements were not Festus's.	Treat this as unresolved unless identity and account control are authenticated. The author's own uncertainty supports careful attribution.
Any statement was opinion or rhetorical language.	Obtain the complete statement and context. Defamation and fraud generally require a provably false material factual representation, not loose rhetoric or opinion.
The information was public and not secret.	Map what was public, when, and to whom. Trade-secret treatment is unavailable for generally known material, though copyright may still protect original fixed expression.
No loss occurred.	Trace investor decisions, diverted opportunities, use, profits, delay, expenses, and reputational consequences specifically attributable to Festus.
The alleged confession is misunderstood.	Obtain exact words, date, medium, participants, and subject. Do not infer a broad admission from an undefined recollection.

## 9. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests

The following requests are narrowly directed to Festus's alleged conduct and the core authorship dispute.

1. Preserve the complete native email accounts of the author and Festus for April 2021 through the end of their relationship, including full headers, drafts, deleted items, attachments, labels, forwarding history, and provider metadata.
2. Recover the first introduction email described as 'Nice to meet you, Festus,' and resolve whether it was sent April 27 or April 28, 2021.
3. Collect every presentation version sent to Festus, with cryptographic hashes, file-system timestamps, cloud revision history, embedded author metadata, and comparison against pre-meeting versions.

4. Collect the alleged second revision and identify every textual, graphical, structural, financial, or conceptual change made after each meeting.
5. Recover the 1% proposal, deliverable description, deadline, confidentiality terms, permitted-use language, excluded-investor language, termination rights, and any acceptance by Festus.
6. Identify any friend, contractor, or overseas contact to whom Festus sent the presentation or project details; obtain the transmitted version, purpose, instructions, and subsequent use.
7. Recover communications concerning the approximately two-week deadline, Festus's illness, any extension, partial work, and the author's termination of the engagement.
8. Locate any financial projection, notes, spreadsheet, draft, research, or work product created by Festus or a contact, even if never delivered.
9. Authenticate the alleged Bitcoin statement and determine whether it was incorporated, how it was credited, and whether Festus claimed broader rights at the time.
10. Identify and preserve the link, screenshot, account, avatar, and post containing 'stole my whole flow' or 'I wrote music for an Attack on Titan game'; obtain platform records sufficient to establish account control and date.
11. Identify each later statement by Festus about authorship, ownership, theft, partnership, permission, or the presentation's origins, together with recipient, date, medium, and complete context.
12. Identify any communication by Festus to the author's investors, including pitches, submissions, introductions, derivative decks, financial requests, or claims of contribution.
13. Interview Festus about the kitchen MBA conversation, why Steve introduced him, the scope of the assignment, the meetings, the 1% term, the Bitcoin remark, the deadline, the illness, the recipients, the termination, and any later ownership claim.
14. Obtain separate witness statements concerning any alleged confession or retraction, using the witness's own words and prohibiting collaborative reconstruction.
15. Trace economic impact: investor decisions, diverted opportunities, payments, licensing, profits, reputational communications, delays, and legal expenses attributable specifically to Festus.
16. Preserve chain of custody. Export records in native format, calculate hashes, log collector identity and time, and retain read-only originals before creating review copies.

## 10. Questions for Festus

1. When and why were you introduced to the author, and what did Steve tell you about the requested work?
2. Did the author provide a completed or substantially completed presentation before your first substantive meeting? Which version did you receive?
3. What deliverable did you agree to produce, and what did the proposed 1% compensate?

4. Did either party intend that you become a coauthor, partner, cofounder, or owner? Identify the record supporting that intent.
5. What original material did you contribute? State each item specifically and identify when and how it was communicated.
6. Did you suggest Bitcoin or another digital-currency use? Was that the only idea you understood to be your contribution?
7. Did the author permit you to create a separate variation? What limits applied, including any restriction involving the author's investors?
8. To whom did you send the presentation or its contents, and for what purpose?
9. Did you miss a deadline or report illness? What work existed when the relationship ended?
10. Did you ever state that the author stole your 'flow,' music, business model, presentation, or another idea? If so, identify the statement and factual basis.
11. Did you communicate with Steve, Laura, or anyone else about disputing the author's ownership or credibility?
12. Did you ever retract, correct, apologize for, or admit an inaccurate statement concerning the author?
13. Did you communicate with any investor, platform, government official, law-enforcement officer, or tribunal about these matters?
14. Do you retain copies, notes, drafts, spreadsheets, attachments, messages, or cloud records concerning the engagement?

## 11. Cumulative Assessment

The source presents a coherent and testable core account: Festus entered after the presentation's creation for a narrow financial-projection role; the author offered 1%; Festus attended a small number of brief meetings; the author explained the project; Festus suggested Bitcoin; the projection was not delivered; the relationship ended; and Festus may later have claimed a much broader role or supported others in doing so. Repetition across many source units makes the author's account internally persistent, but persistence is not external corroboration.

The most incriminating version of the facts would be established if native records show that Festus accepted a limited assignment, acknowledged the author's prior ownership, received confidential material for that purpose, later copied or pitched protected material to excluded investors, and knowingly made inconsistent ownership claims for economic or litigation advantage. That combination could support civil copyright, trade-secret, contract, defamation, interference, or fraud-related analysis depending on the exact evidence and jurisdiction.

The present combined text alone does not prove that version. The alleged public statements are not authenticated; the agreement and emails are absent; permission to make a variation complicates the scope; the alleged confession is undefined; and specific loss is not shown. A fair authority should neither dismiss the allegations because Festus's role was brief nor accept them because they are repeated. The

correct next step is preservation, document comparison, targeted interviews, and an element-by-element legal review.

## 12. Requested Disposition

The author requests that the appropriate lawful authority preserve and authenticate the identified records; determine Festus's actual role and contributions; identify any unauthorized use, false ownership claim, investor contact, official statement, or coordinated conduct; and apply only those civil or criminal provisions whose elements are supported by admissible evidence. The author asks that Festus's conduct be assessed independently from the status, credibility, or alleged conduct of any other person.

## 13. Source Traceability

The principal Festus-specific allegations were synthesized from the following constituent source units embedded in combinedFestus.txt. Repeated units concerning other individuals were reviewed for context but not reproduced as separate reports or appendices.

- 1641844894.txt: limited role, 1% projection term, permitted variation, Bitcoin remark, alleged later misrepresentation, and alleged admissions.
- 4j23j4kl23k.txt; er3243132.txt; gae32332.txt; nkijlhoil897.txt: possible relay/avatar claims, brief meetings, deadline, nonperformance, and uncertainty of identity.
- 548256.txt; fawer21122.txt: permission to create a variation but alleged exclusion of the author's own investors.
- gugut7657.txt; hiuyi87998.txt; hoiuhiu879878.txt; tyguhijo8yhu.txt: author-provided instructions, procedural material, financial-projection scope, and termination before delivery.
- gre324333.txt; hiuy8779709.txt; iihuiyy897.txt; j9uouu9080.txt; joiuo889787.txt; oiou980809.txt: introduction through the MBA conversation and April 2021 chronology.
- byuuhuji.txt; j9iu877.txt; joiu0980908.txt; joiu9089.txt; oiou980809.txt: alleged contradictory positions, possible support for or opposition to others, and undefined confession or retraction.
- hiuy8997.txt: claimed dates of later delivery of ideas to Festus and chronology relevant to preexisting authorship.
- combinedFestus.txt as a whole: repetition, broader chronology, and contextual allegations reviewed under the stated Festus-only scope.

## 14. Legal Authorities

<a href="#">17 U.S.C. section 101 - Definitions, including joint work</a>	<a href="#">17 U.S.C. section 102 - Copyright subject matter and idea/expression limitation</a>
<a href="#">17 U.S.C. section 106 - Exclusive rights</a>	<a href="#">17 U.S.C. section 411 - Registration and civil infringement actions</a>
<a href="#">17 U.S.C. section 501 - Infringement</a>	<a href="#">18 U.S.C. section 1343 - Wire fraud</a>
<a href="#">18 U.S.C. section 1512 - Witness tampering and obstruction</a>	<a href="#">18 U.S.C. section 1832 - Theft of trade secrets</a>
<a href="#">18 U.S.C. section 1836 - Civil proceedings under the Defend Trade Secrets Act</a>	<a href="#">18 U.S.C. section 1839 - Trade-secret definitions</a>
<a href="#">18 U.S.C. section 1001 - Material false statements in federal matters</a>	