

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Statement and Request for Investigation

Concerning Joe Biden and the 2022-2024 Observations

Source reviewed: combinedBiden.txt | 542 usable source units | 51,385 raw lines

Prepared July 1, 2026 from combinedBiden.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 and Attribution Limits
5. Alleged Enhancement of Private Cyberbullying
6. Allied-Nation and Foreign-Civilian Framing
7. Court, Investigation, and Reassessment Concerns
8. Mother, Cryonics Facility, and Personal Network
9. Public Display, Privacy, and Being Kept Blind
10. Ideas, Rewards, Investment, and Economic Control
11. Political Motive, Propaganda, and Insurrection Framing
12. Mitigation, Lenience, and Responsibility Boundaries
13. Uncertainty and Relay 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	combinedBiden.txt
Raw source length	51,385 lines / 1.8 MB
Detected source units	542
Usable source units after parser cleanup	542
Biden/direct-subject source units	542 source-unit hits
Administration, authority, government, or president themes	358 source-unit hits
Treaty, ally, foreign-person, Canada, or nation themes	334 source-unit hits
Targeting, cyberbullying, harassment, isolation, or surveillance themes	268 source-unit hits
Court, charge, judge, law, evidence, trial, or punishment themes	364 source-unit hits
Mother, facility, family, personal-attack, or life-network themes	259 source-unit hits
Data, network, monitoring, investigation, contact, or blind-condition themes	271 source-unit hits
Ideas, theft, rewards, investment, money, credit, or know-how themes	243 source-unit hits
Political motive, propaganda, insurrection, prejudice, or slander themes	262 source-unit hits
Uncertainty, speculation, apology, or relay-limitation themes	474 source-unit hits
Threat, attack, violence, war, casualty, or severe-distress themes	414 source-unit hits

Scope and Method

This report synthesizes the reporting party's 2022-2024 observations concerning Joe Biden and alleged Biden-administration involvement. It is an allegation and investigative-lead memorandum, not a judicial finding.

The extraction reviewed combinedBiden.txt and identified 542 usable source units. The file is large and highly repetitive, so the report groups recurring fact patterns while preserving source IDs for follow-up.

The source contains direct accusations, relay interpretations, requests for protection, political and legal analysis, severe distress language, and speculation. This report preserves the reporting party's logic while separating direct allegations from inference and routing all legal conclusions to lawful authorities.

Preliminary Conditional Statement

All factual assertions below are the reporting party's observations and allegations. If these events occurred as described, they should be examined through records, witness testimony, communications, platform logs, agency files, and the law of the proper jurisdiction.

The report does not determine guilt, punishment, jurisdiction, or the existence of an official proceeding. It identifies alleged conduct patterns and asks investigators to test them against evidence.

The archive contains extreme anger and punishment language. This report treats that material as evidence of distress, perceived threat, and urgent need for lawful intervention, not as a request for extrajudicial harm.

Executive Summary

The central allegation is that Biden allegedly enhanced, legitimized, or politicized an existing private cyberbullying and harassment situation involving U.S. citizens, then made the reporting party into a personal target rather than protecting a foreign civilian who was trying to work with the United States.

The recurring fact patterns are: alleged abuse of authority; exclusion from an investigation or reassessment; public humiliation and privacy exposure; targeting of the reporting party's mother and cryonics facility; political or propaganda framing; economic control over ideas, rewards, and access; and fear that attackers were shielded through manipulated process.

The source also repeatedly acknowledges uncertainty. Many claims rely on relays, perceived public signals, or inferred timing. The strongest lawful request is therefore evidence preservation: identify whether any Biden, White House, federal-agency, campaign, or third-party actor gave instructions, made threats, altered records, coordinated harassment, or influenced legal/court outcomes.

Subject and Attribution Limits

The subject is Joe Biden and, where specifically alleged, people acting under or around his administration. The report should not presume that every action by a private U.S. citizen, celebrity, platform, investor, or algorithm was personally directed by Biden.

The attribution question is the center of the matter: did Biden personally act, did federal personnel act under color of law, did private actors merely claim or imply federal backing, or did the reporting party infer authority from relays? Each branch has different legal consequences.

Because the source often uses names such as Obama, Musk, Sean, Anna, Robert, Steve, Trudeau, King Charles, and various public figures, this report attributes conduct to Biden only when the source frames Biden or the Biden administration as the relevant actor, initiator, enhancer, or protector.

Alleged Enhancement of Private Cyberbullying

Source 0632 states the thesis directly: the reporting party describes himself as a Canadian citizen and foreign person cyberbullied by U.S. citizens, and alleges Biden enhanced that situation by exploiting isolation and keeping him locked in.

Sources 0050, 0494, 0951, and 1030 frame the original private actors as responsible for their own conduct while alleging that later official or political support amplified harm. The report preserves both points: private attackers are not excused by environment, and an authority figure would be separately accountable if he knowingly amplified or protected wrongdoing.

Investigators should determine whether any federal official communicated with the private actors, encouraged online harassment, influenced platform visibility, directed surveillance, or discouraged lawful reporting. Without that link, the private-actor claims remain separate from Biden-attribution claims.

Allied-Nation and Foreign-Civilian Framing

Sources 0050, 0663, 0951, and 4204 repeatedly frame the reporting party as a Canadian civilian and ally who was trying to work with U.S. persons on business or ideas. The allegation is that the United States, through Biden or people acting in his interest, treated a powerless foreign civilian as an enemy or asset rather than using ordinary communication.

The source uses treaty and allied-nation language to express that perceived betrayal. This report does not identify a specific treaty violation from the file alone. Instead, it asks authorities to identify any governmental action, cross-border communication, official request, or diplomatic channel that could make treaty, due-process, or foreign-person protections relevant.

The practical evidence question is whether the reporting party's nationality, vulnerability, and lack of U.S. political power were exploited as leverage. If official U.S. power was used against him without lawful process, that would be the branch requiring the most serious review.

Court, Investigation, and Reassessment Concerns

Source 0073 asks whether data from a prior investigation was transferred to a new assessment concerning Becky, Robert, Sean, and Anna, and asks who was hired for that reassessment. Source 0108 adds that the reporting party needed to explain relays, upvotes, timing, and offline events to assess intent.

Sources 0424, 0973, 1124, 1129, 1653, and 4420 allege that court or authority processes may have been manipulated, that attackers were dismissed or protected, that the reporting party was kept blind, and that judges or investigators may have been replaced or misled.

These claims are serious but record-dependent. The report asks for case numbers, names of investigators, reassessment orders, platform data, deletion logs, court transcripts, dismissal reasons, judge assignments, communications with federal personnel, and any records showing whether the reporting party was intentionally excluded from evidence review.

Mother, Cryonics Facility, and Personal Network

Sources 0179, 0647, 0903, 1055, 1504, 3892, 4420, 5128, 5307, and 5513 repeatedly allege that the reporting party's mother and the cryonics facility became targets. The reporting party frames this as the most personal form of harm because it exploited grief, dependency, life-extension beliefs, and suicidal history.

The report does not treat every feared facility issue as proven. It treats the pattern as an urgent protection and evidence-preservation branch. If any person threatened the mother, the facility, facility staff, stored remains, related records, or the reporting party's access to them, that should be documented.

Investigators should preserve facility communications, security logs, visitor records, legal notices, phone calls, online posts, platform relays, and any governmental or private requests touching the facility. The key question is whether actions were lawful facility regulation, unrelated events, or intentional pressure on the reporting party.

Public Display, Privacy, and Being Kept Blind

Sources 0143, 5476, 1129, and 4204 emphasize public humiliation, public display, privacy exposure, being denied a direct channel, and being forced to respond from behind a screen without seeing the accusations or evidence. Source 5476 specifically alleges exposure of bathroom privacy, residence/location, strangers, and personal movements through a hidden channel.

If corroborated, that pattern would be relevant to privacy, stalking, harassment, surveillance, and due-process review. The source repeatedly argues that timely defense was impossible because the reporting party could not see what was being said about him.

The evidence request is straightforward: identify any channels, accounts, relays, livestreams, surveillance sources, platform recommendation histories, logs, metadata, or government/private communications that exposed the reporting party's private life or prevented him from accessing allegations against him.

Ideas, Rewards, Investment, and Economic Control

Sources 0663, 0903, 1474, 4204, and 5476 connect the alleged abuse to business opportunities, ideas, rewards, investment, bank-account acknowledgement, and the reporting party's desire to negotiate directly. The reporting party alleges that isolation and denial of contact created an opportunity to extract know-how or redirect value.

This branch should be separated from personal-harm claims. It requires evidence of specific ideas, timestamps, recipients, investment discussions, compensation promises, business communications, and any attempt to divert value to another actor.

If the evidence shows a scheme to obtain money, property, confidential know-how, or business opportunity by false pretenses using interstate or foreign communications, legal routing may include fraud statutes. If the evidence only shows nonbinding political disagreement or failed negotiation, the legal conclusion would differ.

Political Motive, Propaganda, and Insurrection Framing

Sources 0494, 0951, 3817, 5034, and 5864 repeatedly use terms such as propaganda, insurrection, slander, prejudice, mass hysteria, and political motive. The reporting party argues that attackers created public reasons to destroy him after the original conduct had already made them legally vulnerable.

This report translates that into a narrower investigative question: did any person knowingly spread false allegations, manipulate public perception, or coordinate political pressure to justify prior misconduct or obstruct lawful accountability?

Political disagreement, criticism, jokes, and public commentary are not automatically unlawful. The issue becomes legally serious only if false statements, threats, coordinated harassment, official misuse of power, witness interference, evidence destruction, or fraudulent schemes can be proven.

Mitigation, Lenience, and Responsibility Boundaries

Source 0050 is important because the reporting party says people under Biden's leadership may be victims of Biden's abusive vision and may deserve lighter treatment, while his personal attackers should not use that lenience as an excuse. This is a responsibility-boundary argument, not a blanket accusation.

The report preserves this distinction. Alleged private attackers remain responsible for their own choices. Alleged officials or subordinates should be assessed by knowledge, authority, orders received, ability to refuse, actual conduct, and whether they participated in harm or only followed lawful duties.

This distinction also protects the report from overreach. It asks investigators to identify who acted, who directed, who knew, who benefited, who attempted to stop harm, and who was merely present in an abusive environment.

Uncertainty and Relay Discipline

The source contains many statements such as if, perhaps, I believe, I do not know, assuming, apologies if I am wrong, and relay-related uncertainty. The theme count found uncertainty or relay-limitation language in 474 of 542 source units.

That uncertainty should not erase the report. It means the claims must be routed as leads. Relays, upvotes, thumbnails, public signals, and inferred communications may be meaningful if records show timing, authorship, and intent. Without authentication, they should not be treated as proof.

Investigators should preserve source screenshots, URLs, account IDs, timestamps, platform logs, recommendation data, metadata, and any communications connecting relays to real people. The reporting party should be allowed to explain how he connected each relay to an event, while investigators independently verify or reject the connection.

Distress Language and Risk Handling

The archive contains severe language about death, punishment, retaliation, and war. The report does not repeat or endorse that language as a desired outcome. It treats it as evidence that the reporting party perceived himself and his mother as being in acute danger.

Sources 1504, 5128, 5307, and 5513 are especially intense. They should be reviewed with care: the distress may show impact, fear, and perceived coercion, while any specific threat or safety concern should be handled through lawful de-escalation and protection.

A lawful response should protect the reporting party, protect third parties, preserve evidence, and separate accountability from vengeance. That is the only useful path for this material.

Legal Mapping for Authorities

The Constitution Annotated sources are included because the archive frames the case as misuse of federal authority. Article II's Take Care duty is relevant only as an executive-duty reference; it does not by itself prove personal liability. The First, Fourth, and Fifth Amendments are relevant only if governmental action affected speech, religion, privacy, search/seizure, liberty, property, or process.

18 U.S.C. 241 and 242 may be relevant only if officials or people acting under color of law conspired to interfere with protected rights or willfully deprived the reporting party of rights. Because the reporting party is a Canadian civilian, jurisdiction and protected-right analysis must be done carefully.

18 U.S.C. 1512 and 1519 may be relevant if intimidation, misleading conduct, evidence destruction, record alteration, or obstruction affected an official proceeding or federal matter. 18 U.S.C. 1001 may be relevant only if materially false statements were made in a matter within U.S. federal jurisdiction.

18 U.S.C. 2261A and 875 may be relevant if interstate or foreign communications involved stalking, surveillance, threats, fear, or substantial emotional distress. 18 U.S.C. 371 and 1343 require specific proof of agreement, offense against the United States, fraud, property, money, or wire transmissions; they should not be used as generic labels.

Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests

Identify all official U.S., campaign, White House, agency, law-enforcement, court, contractor, or platform communications that mention the reporting party, his mother, the cryonics facility, his ideas, his business/investment prospects, or the named private attackers.

Preserve records of any reassessment concerning Becky, Robert, Sean, Anna, Steve, Elon Musk, Adam, or related private actors, including assignment records, judge/investigator changes, dismissal reasons, evidentiary files, deletion logs, and internal communications.

Preserve all communications and logs involving alleged public display, private-location exposure, bathroom/privacy exposure, monitoring channels, recommendation relays, upvotes, thumbnails, and account-owner information.

Preserve evidence involving the mother and cryonics facility, including visitor records, threats, regulatory contacts, facility communications, security logs, social-media posts, and any governmental or private pressure touching the facility.

Preserve business and idea records: presentations, timestamps, emails, investment discussions, compensation or reward statements, bank-contact records, and any communications suggesting the reporting party's know-how or rights were being extracted without consent.

Interview the reporting party with access to his source materials so he can explain the relay logic, while independently testing each claimed relay against records and witness testimony.

Conclusion

The Biden archive presents a broad allegation of official amplification: a private harassment situation allegedly became a political, governmental, or quasi-governmental campaign of targeting, isolation, public humiliation, family/facility pressure, and economic control.

The report's strongest points are not the most extreme phrases. They are the repeated, testable requests: identify who reassessed the private attackers; determine whether prior data was transferred; verify whether the reporting party was excluded from evidence; preserve records of facility/mother threats; and authenticate any federal or Biden-administration role.

The requested lawful outcome is separation and verification: separate private attackers from public officials, personal inference from authenticated records, political speech from unlawful coercion, and distress language from evidence. If corroborated, the allegations should be assessed under the proper constitutional, civil-rights, obstruction, stalking, threat, and fraud frameworks.

Appendix A. Source Index

Source ID	Observation Use
0050	Opening thesis: private attackers remain responsible; Biden allegedly breached allied-nation trust, personalized the targeting, and created suffering through an abusive vision.
0073	Investigation/reassessment concern: asks whether prior data was transferred, who reassessed Becky/Robert/Sean/Anna, and whether the reporting party was excluded from explaining relays.
0103	U.K. shift/timing branch: says Biden's attitude changed after the reporting party said he wished to live in the U.K.; frames the reporting party as made into a target despite helpful work.
0108	Jury/judge analysis branch: argues involvement by Becky/Robert/Sean can only be judged with relay evidence and claims Sean/Biden-related relays involved threats toward mother/facility.
0143	Dementia/forgetfulness rebuttal: says the matter continued for years, Biden knew the public humiliation and gaslighting conditions, and hostile force amplified the abuse.
0179	Protection plea: asks authorities to protect the reporting party, his mother, and the cryonics facility from Biden and associates.
0191	Escalation warning: says vulnerability and being kept blind enabled exploitation; fears Biden may attack again and make matters personal.
0424	ICC/foreign-authority branch: alleges personal intervention, dismissal of attackers' conduct, blind-condition knowledge, and rights violations.
0494	Insurrection/defense distinction: says later actors created reasons to destroy him while he remained a bystander defending against prior attacks.
0632	Concise abuse-of-power statement: Canadian citizen/foreign person allegedly cyberbullied by U.S. citizens and Biden allegedly enhanced isolation and harassment.
0647	Mother-threat question: asks why anyone would joke about harming the mother or destroying the reporting party's life while knowing his vulnerability.
0663	U.K./sea-platform timeline: says Biden had no political reason to attack, allegedly exploited U.S.-citizen cyberbullying, and worked against allied business interests.
0903	Facility/support branch: alleges attacks, targeting, disinformation, denial of support, and control over financial recognition or bank acknowledgement.
0951	Political and moral wrong branch: alleges propaganda, slander, accusations, and targeting against an ally trying to work with the United States.
0973	Responsibility branch: distinguishes misinformed support from knowing defense of attackers and asks whether Biden knowingly attacked the reporting party to defend them.
1030	Origins of private attackers branch: states Anna/Becky/Robert/Sean began before later allegations and asks authorities not to accept later excuses.
1055	Facility-as-target branch: says alleged attacks on cryonics or life-extension goals targeted defenseless people instead of comparable domestic industries.
1124	Canadian authority/court restructuring branch: alleges willful negligence and says Biden speculation is based on valid questions rather than attack.
1129	Lockdown/scapegoat branch: rejects a state-initiated war frame and says the reporting party was deprived of the ability to answer accusations in real time.
1474	Economic-control branch: asserts access to business, ideas, rewards, investment, and negotiation was blocked by political control or forced secondary issues.
1504	Mother/facility emergency branch: intense distress language and plea not to harm the mother or facility; must be handled as risk and preservation material.

Source ID	Observation Use
1653	No-arrest/authorities branch: fear that crimes and intent will be erased by mood-management, charm, or dismissal of real dangers.
1788	Obama/Biden-adjacent branch: alleges supportive words were used to dismantle the situation; useful mainly as expansion/context, not proof against Biden alone.
3817	Large synthesis branch: warns of insurrection, unreasonable destruction, public control, exploitation, and denial of direct channel or rights.
3892	Senator/facility branch: asks U.S. authorities to protect the facility and frames facility targeting as unnecessary personal retaliation.
4204	Equal-rights and know-how branch: asks why he was not given equal rights, access, support, or normal civilian procedures.
4420	Malice/timeline branch: alleges complaints to Biden were exploited, threats toward mother/facility were followed up, and public humiliation became personal attack.
5034	Authority-cruelty branch: says presidency increases accountability because official power should not be exercised for entertainment, cruelty, or public humiliation.
5128	Severe-risk branch: claims facility attack would be psychological attack intended to drive conflict; contains violent rhetoric that should be treated as distress evidence.
5307	Civil-rights analogy branch: uses slavery and religious-choice analogies to describe humiliation, exploitation, threats, and mother/facility targeting.
5476	Public-display/privacy branch: alleges bathroom/privacy exposure, location exposure, strangers relayed into a channel, and lack of fair hearing.
5513	Belief/liberty branch: alleges Biden attacked beliefs and mother/facility vulnerability after prior threats, making the conduct personal rather than political.
5864	Religion/liberty branch: argues liberty means nonintervention in beliefs and frames the attacks as oppressive exploitation of a powerless civilian.
gerte654634	Prior GPT legal-defense branch: argues no judicial or executive authority can commit fraud and still remain within rule-of-law limits.

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.

U.S. Const. art. II, sec. 3 - Take Care duty and executive responsibility: <https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/article-2/section-3/>

U.S. Const. amend. I - Speech, religion, assembly, and petition protections:
<https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-1/>

U.S. Const. amend. IV - Protection against unreasonable searches and seizures:
<https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-4/>

U.S. Const. amend. V - Due process and property protections against federal action:
<https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-5/>

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

18 U.S.C. 242 - Deprivation of rights under color of law:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&f=treesort&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section242>

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>

18 U.S.C. 1512 - Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1512+edition%3Aprelim%29>

18 U.S.C. 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. 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. 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. 1343 - Wire fraud:
<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1343>