

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Statement and Request for Investigation

Concerning Extended Family and the 2022-2024 Observations

Source reviewed: combinedExtended.txt | 95 substantive source units | 8,726 raw lines

Prepared July 1, 2026 from combinedExtended.txt

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

Contents

1. Scope and Method
2. Preliminary Conditional Statement
3. Executive Summary
4. Subject Identification and Attribution Limits
5. Family Alienation, Prejudice, and Social Subjugation
6. Sister, Sister's Husband, and One-Sided Family Narratives
7. Mother, Hospital, Cryonics, and Facility Context
8. Relays, Channel Conduct, and Public-Display Concerns
9. Idea-Origin, Rewards, and Competitive Exploitation
10. Steve, Adam, Musk, and External Actor Overlap
11. Framing, Slander, Defamation, and Bias-Based Harm
12. Money, Support, Leverage, and Control
13. Uncertainty and Interpretive Discipline
14. Distress Language and Risk Handling
15. Legal Mapping for Authorities
16. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests
17. Conclusion
18. Appendix A. Source Index
19. Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

Source Extraction Summary

Metric	Result
Uploaded source reviewed	combinedExtended.txt
Internal source period detected	2022-2024
Raw source length	8,726 lines / 331 KB
Detected source units	95
Substantive source units	95
Extended family, uncle, aunt, cousin, Wongi, Mark, Chloe, Eileen, or family-member themes	75 source-unit hits
Sister or sister's husband themes	26 source-unit hits
Mother, death, hospital, cryonics/facility, refund, or aneurysm themes	48 source-unit hits
Steve, Adam, Elon/Musk, Zuckerberg, Bezos, Gates, Biden, or Mark themes	63 source-unit hits
Relay, channel, YouTube, thumbnail, Twitter, screen, message, or email themes	66 source-unit hits
Framing, slander, defamation, lie, mislead, false, or plagiarism themes	64 source-unit hits
Violence, hit, kill, death, harm, attack, abuse, threat, danger, destroy, or hostility themes	64 source-unit hits
Ideas, rewards, investment, competition, presentation, prototype, or work themes	66 source-unit hits
Court, law, judge, authority, evidence, charged, criminal, or trial themes	65 source-unit hits
Monitoring, public display, screen, camera, privacy, or being blind themes	47 source-unit hits
Money, payment, support, rent, welfare, buy, funding, or financial themes	69 source-unit hits
Maybe, perhaps, guess, believe, doubt, speculation, unsure, or I think themes	88 source-unit hits
Apology, sorry, fair, fairness, forgive, peace, please, or understand themes	66 source-unit hits
Suicide, pain, torture, hell, suffer, anguish, or ruinous themes	36 source-unit hits

Scope and Method

This report synthesizes the reporting party's 2022-2024 observations concerning extended family members, including alleged relays, public-channel conduct, family alienation, support for sister and sister's husband, idea/reward disputes, and privacy harms.

The extraction reviewed combinedExtended.txt and identified 95 substantive source units. This report groups recurring fact patterns and uses representative source IDs rather than reproducing the full archive.

This is an allegation and investigative-lead memorandum. It supports preservation and lawful assessment; it does not determine guilt, punishment, ownership, or liability.

Preliminary Conditional Statement

All factual assertions below are the reporting party's observations, interpretations, and allegations. If these events occurred as described, they should be tested through family communications, platform records, channel logs, emails, medical/facility records, idea drafts, and witness statements.

The archive includes severe distress, anger, punishment language, and verbal retaliation. This report treats that material as evidence of perceived danger and impact, not as a request for extrajudicial harm.

Relay-based claims must be authenticated. A relay, thumbnail, public post, perceived signal, or recommendation is an investigative lead until records prove authorship, audience, timing, targeting, and intent.

Executive Summary

The central allegation is that extended family members alienated the reporting party, accepted or repeated sister/sister-husband narratives, joined public relays or channel conduct, and later benefited from or competed against his ideas while he was blind to the channel.

The most repeated branches are: family prejudice and mockery; alleged defense of sister/husband; Steve/Adam/Musk-related relays; public display and lack of access; idea/reward disputes involving sea-platform and other concepts; and fear that evidence was being cherry-picked while the reporting party could not respond in real time.

The strongest lawful request is preservation of a chronology: who said what, who saw what, who relayed what, which family members had access to channel material, and what idea/reward records existed before any follow-up by relatives or public figures.

Subject Identification and Attribution Limits

The subject is the extended family group as named or described in the archive. The file references Wongi's family, Eileen, Mark, Chloe's father, sister, sister's husband, father, Steve, Adam, Musk, and public authorities; this report includes those actors only where they explain the alleged extended-family pattern.

The archive mixes direct memories, family-history allegations, relay interpretations, idea-origin disputes, public display claims, and legal conclusions. Each must be separated before a fair legal assessment.

The key attribution questions are which relatives directly acted, which merely knew or stayed silent, which relayed or amplified material, which benefited from help or ideas, and which events were inferred from ambiguous public signals.

Family Alienation, Prejudice, and Social Subjugation

Sources 1173, 1197, 1705, 2368, 3852, 5544, 6773, and 6944 describe long-running alienation, assumptions, family pride, prejudice, and the reporting party's belief that he was treated as lesser until he could prove himself.

The reporting party says extended family members did not verify facts, failed to understand childhood fear or father-related violence, and then returned through relays or public channels to judge, mock, or compete.

Investigators should preserve family communications, emails, public posts, social-media comments, any channel access records, and witness statements showing what family members knew about childhood violence, mother-related events, and sister-related claims.

Sister, Sister's Husband, and One-Sided Family Narratives

Sources 0029, 5244, 5549, 5574, 6078, and 6979 repeatedly warn that extended family may accept sister or sister-husband narratives without evidence. Source 0029 specifically rejects the claim that the reporting party hit his sister and points to reconciliation emails.

The reporting party argues that family support for sister or sister's husband becomes incriminating if relatives knew of alleged sister/husband harm, mother-related danger, or false accusations and still used those narratives against him.

A fair assessment should compare sister/husband communications, reconciliation emails, alleged threats or violence records, family relay records, and any statements that contradict the reporting party's account.

Mother, Hospital, Cryonics, and Facility Context

Sources 0214, 2777, 3556, 5244, 5549, 6078, and 6566 connect extended-family conflict to the mother's medical crisis, cryonics/facility issues, hospital decisions, and later support for sister/husband.

The reporting party frames this as more than family conflict. He alleges that people who knew or should have known the mother's vulnerability and his trauma still used the situation to attack, diminish, or control him.

Investigators should preserve hospital and facility records where legally available, cryonics payment/refund records, family emails, records of who was present or informed, and any messages about mother-related allegations.

Relays, Channel Conduct, and Public-Display Concerns

Sources 0029, 12698484486, 2076, 265456876476, 2858, 5419, 6566, and 7345 describe relays, channel access, public display, being blind to proceedings, and repeated cycles of accusation or defense.

The reporting party says relatives or others could see him and his work while he could not see them, creating an unfair evidentiary and idea-development environment.

Investigators should identify whether a channel existed, who had access, what was displayed, whether private material or work was shown, and whether any family member used relays or recommendations to affect him.

Idea-Origin, Rewards, and Competitive Exploitation

Sources 1534564486464684, 165486748694, 2076, 2368, 2481, 2854, 3556, 5212, 5547, 5654, 7110, and 7345 concern ideas, rewards, and alleged follow-up by extended family or public figures.

The reporting party's central idea claim is not that no one may independently work. It is that relatives allegedly saw his methods, instructions, presentation logic, or concepts while he was blind and then used those ideas after prior harassment and alienation.

Investigators should preserve drafts, timestamps, diagrams, presentation files, platform prompts, public posts, communications about Musk/rewards/support, and any family project records that overlap with the reporting party's ideas.

Steve, Adam, Musk, and External Actor Overlap

Sources 0029, 5212, 5654, 5862, 5880, 5990, and yiy6876 show that extended-family allegations overlap with Steve, Adam, Musk, Zuckerberg comparisons, and broader public-figure conduct.

This report does not merge those actors into one finding. It identifies the overlap as a routing issue: if extended family relays, idea access, or public-display conduct depended on outside platforms or public figures, those records should be preserved together.

Investigators should separate direct family conduct from Steve/Adam/Musk conduct, then compare timestamps to determine whether relatives followed, amplified, benefited from, or were used by outside actors.

Framing, Slander, Defamation, and Bias-Based Harm

Sources 0029, 1459, 3404, 5100, 5574, 5621, 5862, and 5990 describe alleged framing, slander, defamation, prejudice, and efforts to present the reporting party as violent, dangerous, plagiarizing, or socially inferior.

The reporting party repeatedly asks investigators to differentiate myth from fact. He says accusations should be tested against dialogue, records, reconciliation emails, and objective evidence rather than preference or family status.

Relevant evidence includes defamatory posts, family statements, relay records, screenshots, legal submissions, communications about alleged violence, and any records showing whether claims were knowingly false or recklessly repeated.

Money, Support, Leverage, and Control

Sources 1236, 1534564486464684, 3556, 5212, 5419, 6566, 6979, and 7110 describe money, support, compensation, apartment requests, control over earnings, and concern that relatives used leverage or benefited together.

The reporting party says support requested for others, including extended family, was later used against him. He also rejects any scheme where someone else controls his earnings or rewards on his behalf.

Investigators should preserve payment records, assistance records, reward promises, communications about who would receive money, and any family communications showing leverage, control, or benefit from the reporting party's work.

Uncertainty and Interpretive Discipline

Theme counts found uncertainty language in 88 of 95 source units. The reporting party often identifies a claim as speculation, doubt, or relay interpretation.

That uncertainty is an important guardrail. The file should not be dismissed because it contains uncertainty, and it should not be treated as proof without authentication.

The fair process is to preserve the raw chronology, let the reporting party explain his relay logic and source IDs, then verify against platform data, family records, and witness statements.

Distress Language and Risk Handling

The archive includes severe anger, retaliation language, and punishment rhetoric. The report does not endorse threats or violence.

The lawful significance is impact: the reporting party perceived extended family conduct, sister/husband defense, public display, and idea exploitation as threats to safety, livelihood, and dignity.

Authorities should de-escalate, preserve records, prevent further targeting, and separate the reporting party's distress language from the underlying evidence he asks them to test.

Legal Mapping for Authorities

18 U.S.C. 2261A and 875 may be relevant only if authenticated interstate or foreign communications show stalking, surveillance, threats, fear, or substantial emotional distress with required jurisdictional facts and intent.

18 U.S.C. 1030 may be relevant only if unauthorized computer or account access occurred. The file alleges monitoring/public display and being blind to a channel, but application requires access records, authorization facts, obtained information, loss, or damage.

18 U.S.C. 1343 and 371 may be relevant only if a wire-fraud scheme or agreement to commit a federal offense or defraud the United States can be proven. Idea/reward disputes require records of promises, wires, deception, agreement, and property or money interests.

18 U.S.C. 1512, 1519, and 1001 require official-proceeding, federal-investigation, federal-record, or federal-jurisdiction predicates. If evidence was altered, deleted, concealed, or misrepresented, investigators should identify the actor, forum, materiality, and intent.

Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests

Preserve family emails, reconciliation emails, chats, public posts, screenshots, channel links, relays, thumbnails, comments, uploads, deletion histories, and any communications among extended family, sister, sister's husband, Eileen, Wongi's family, Mark, and Chloe's father.

Preserve platform and privacy records: viewer lists, account handles, device/IP logs, recommendation histories, moderation histories, public-display records, and any evidence showing who could see the reporting party or his work.

Preserve idea/reward records: presentation drafts, diagrams, timestamps, file histories, Musk/reward/support communications, family project records, and follow-up work that overlaps with the reporting party's concepts.

Interview the reporting party with the source archive available so he can map direct memories, relays, and idea timelines. Then independently interview family members and platform witnesses with the records in chronological order.

Conclusion

The extended-family archive supports a focused investigation into alleged alienation, prejudice, family support for sister/husband narratives, public-display/channel conduct, idea/reward exploitation, and framing or defamation.

The strongest lawful next step is preservation of records and independent chronology before accepting any family narrative, platform narrative, or relay interpretation.

A fair process should separate direct family acts from sister/husband conduct, external platform conduct, public-figure involvement, and ambiguous relays, while recognizing the severe impact the reporting party describes.

Appendix A. Source Index

Source ID	Observation Use
0029	Sister/framing and Steve-relay branch: rejects a claim that he hit his sister, points to reconciliation emails, and says relays defending Steve are misleading.
0214	Mother-treatment branch: criticizes doctors and hospital staff for extended intellectual debate when his only intention was to save his mother.
1173	Father-violence and Wongi-family branch: says relatives would not accept their own sons being beaten as he was and asks why his childhood suffering was minimized.
1197	Cherry-picked childhood branch: says pleasant memories are being used to erase years of fear, threats, and father-related violence.
1236	Earnings/control branch: rejects any middleman controlling his livelihood and frames outside control over money as rights suppression.
1308	Extended-family charge branch: says Mark and any extended family who participated in harm should face applicable charges.
1459	Public enemy/defamation branch: says jokes and technical skill were exploited to make him appear dangerous and to justify condemnation.
1534564486464684	Borrowing/support branch: says he was on assistance, meant well, and wanted Musk to support people he owed or tried to help.
165468546646465	Father-violence witness branch: says Wongi's father and Eileen knew what the father was like and that sister hid father violence from the law.
1705	Wongi's mother relay branch: describes quiet rage over a perceived claim that he deserved childhood beatings.
2076	Work-visibility branch: says extended family could see his work while he could not see theirs, creating unfair idea comparison and reward conditions.
2368	Competition branch: alleges extended family mocked, alienated, then competed against him using his research methods and instructions.
2481	Sea-platform idea branch: distinguishes general seasteading ideas from his sea-pillars, transport, and education-system concepts.
265456876476	Blindness/court-loop branch: says defenses should be searched rather than revived repeatedly while he is blind to the proceeding.
2829	All-together branch: asks the court to judge fairly and says if one extended-family actor is charged, the connected participants should be assessed too.
2854	Backstabbing/longtail branch: worries extended family may be using his information and ideas against him through a longtail of follow-up work.
2858	Public-display branch: says privacy/public display was wrong and that extended family may have been buying time to join the situation.
3404	Stalking/defamation branch: asks that Clark, Monica, and involved actors be charged for repeated controversy, defamation, and pursuit of harm.
3556	Musk/help misuse branch: says Musk helped extended family and they misused help to continue a competitive effort initiated by Chloe's father and Eileen.
3852	Eileen/Wongi-family bitterness branch: contrasts genuine former love with family ambiguity, silence, and perceived betrayal after mother's death.
5100	Prejudice-to-subjugation branch: links bias, slurs, violence, stalking, theft, slander, humiliation, and defamation to a continuing social-subjugation pattern.

Source ID	Observation Use
5212	Musk deadline branch: asks the court to impose a deadline on idea assessment/rewards so delay does not continue with harassment.
5244	Support-for-sister branch: warns that any extended family support for sister/husband comes from prejudice and antagonism, not truth.
5419	Restored-chat branch: asks for support and says repeated attacks after warnings show continuing intent rather than one-time opinion.
5544	Bullying-grandmother branch: says childhood remarks cannot justify later abuse, exclusion, or family blame.
5547	Extended-family attack branch: alleges slurs, humiliating child nudity, idea follow-up, and family hijacking after help was requested for them.
5549	Sister-history branch: recounts alleged sister knife threats and mother-harm attempts as context for rejecting one-sided family narratives.
5574	Law myth-versus-fact branch: says the law should focus on evidence and dialogue rather than misdirected myths defending sister or Steve.
5621	Additional-assault branch: says renewed harassment after prior wrongdoing should be treated as a new or escalated charge, not protected repetition.
5654	Idea-origin/Musk-Steve branch: says if spherical ship ideas were given to Steve, Musk knew they were his and should be investigated.
5862	Good-cop/bad-cop branch: describes Steve and brother as using contradictions, threats, theft, and channel tactics to create doubt and subjugation.
5990	Bias-related conduct branch: frames prejudice-based violence, fear, theft, slander, humiliation, and defamation as connected to social subjugation.
6078	Korean extended-family branch: says extended family supported sister despite what she allegedly did and asks that charges proceed.
6566	Public-display/compensation branch: says continued public display and delay of support created exposure and negligence concerns.
6773	Silent-slavery branch: says extended family blamed him while he had not severed contact first and feared enduring judgment until he could prove himself.
6944	Power/leverage branch: says extended family sought leverage, false moral superiority, and power while making him a discussion topic.
6979	Royal-family caution branch: asks King Charles not to listen to extended family because they remained strangers and may speak through sister's narrative.
7110	Helping-one-helps-all branch: says helping one relative helps the group because they were together while he was segregated.
7345	Sea-platform hijack branch: says extended family may have tried to hijack the sea-platform idea after prior harassment and abuse.
yy6876	Assange/Zuckerberg comparison branch: discusses perceived comparisons around public labeling, villainization, and uneven treatment.

Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

18 U.S.C. 371 - Conspiracy to commit an offense or defraud the United States:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section371>

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

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&path=%2Fprelim%40title18%2Fpart1%2Fchapter73>

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

18 U.S.C. 1001 - False statements in matters within U.S. jurisdiction:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1001>