

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Statement and Request for Investigation

Concerning Mark Zuckerberg and the 2022-2024 Observations

Source reviewed: combinedZuckerberg.txt | 125 usable source units | 10,881 raw lines

Prepared July 1, 2026 from combinedZuckerberg.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. Facebook Refund and Compromised-Account Branch
6. Failure to Help, Report, or Preserve Platform Evidence
7. Alleged Adam-Zuckerberg Coordination
8. Monitoring, Public Display, Privacy, and Passive Relays
9. Ideas, Investment, Website, and AI Enhancement
10. Account Access, Prior Accounts, and Records
11. Positive and Mixed Context
12. Uncertainty and Relay Discipline
13. Distress Language and Risk Handling
14. Legal Mapping for Authorities
15. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests
16. Conclusion
17. Appendix A. Source Index
18. Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

Source Extraction Summary

Metric	Result
Uploaded source reviewed	combinedZuckerberg.txt
Raw source length	10,881 lines / 382 KB
Detected source units	125
Usable source units after parser cleanup	125
Zuckerberg, Mark, Facebook, Meta, or platform themes	125 source-unit hits
Refund, hacker, compromised account, transaction, or ad themes	37 source-unit hits
Adam, Quora, chat, coordination, or infiltration themes	87 source-unit hits
Monitoring, public display, privacy, screen, camera, or channel themes	63 source-unit hits
Ideas, presentation, investment, theft, hijack, credit, or rewards themes	98 source-unit hits
Account, access, Gmail, comments, link, instructions, device, or Amazon themes	43 source-unit hits
Authority, court, charged, evidence, investigation, police, or felony themes	92 source-unit hits
Harassment, abuse, gaslighting, antagonism, taunting, threat, or destruction themes	66 source-unit hits
Uncertainty, speculation, apology, maybe, guess, or relay-limitation themes	112 source-unit hits
Positive, mixed, forgiveness, support, help, investment, or better-intent themes	84 source-unit hits
Data, files, chat, records, logs, dialogue, or restoration themes	44 source-unit hits
Competition, follow-up, market, investor, team, network, or CEO themes	65 source-unit hits

Scope and Method

This report synthesizes the reporting party's 2022-2024 observations concerning Mark Zuckerberg, Facebook/Meta-related account issues, and alleged coordination with Adam. It is an allegation and investigative-lead memorandum, not a judicial finding.

The extraction reviewed combinedZuckerberg.txt and identified 125 usable source units. The report groups repeated observations into fact patterns while preserving source IDs for follow-up.

The source contains direct refund complaints, allegations of compromised account transactions, allegations of monitoring/public display, business and idea-ownership arguments, relay interpretations, apologies for possible misreadings, and severe distress language.

Preliminary Conditional Statement

All factual assertions below are the reporting party's observations and allegations. If the events occurred as described, they should be tested through transaction records, account logs, support tickets, platform communications, witnesses, messages, file histories, and applicable law.

The report does not determine guilt, contract rights, intellectual-property ownership, platform liability, or criminal liability. It identifies allegations and evidence requests for lawful assessment.

Any severe punishment or retaliation language in the source is treated as distress evidence and a request for lawful accountability, not as a request for extrajudicial harm.

Executive Summary

The clearest direct issue is the Facebook refund and account-compromise branch. The reporting party alleges that Facebook recognized a compromised account, refunded the first of several transactions from the same hacker/account/ad pattern, then failed to refund or properly investigate the remaining transactions while providing obsolete links or closing cases.

The second major issue is alleged Zuckerberg/Adam coordination: the reporting party believes Zuckerberg may have observed, encouraged, or benefited from Adam's conduct, including alleged hacking, monitoring, passive relays, and follow-up on the reporting party's website and AI-enhancement ideas.

The third issue is attribution. Much of the file relies on relays, YouTube/Facebook signals, layout changes, perceived references, and inferred timing. Those are leads, not proof. The most useful lawful outcome is to preserve records and determine whether Zuckerberg or Meta personnel actually directed, knew of, ignored, or benefited from the alleged conduct.

Subject Identification and Attribution Limits

The subject is Mark Zuckerberg as discussed in the uploaded file, along with Facebook/Meta teams where the file specifically mentions platform support, refund handling, account access, or public signals. The report should not treat every Facebook layout change, relay, or online recommendation as an intentional message from Zuckerberg without records.

Direct-attribution sources include 0297, 0391, 0445, 1536, 1918, 1970, 7154, and 7398. These connect Zuckerberg or Facebook to refund, hacked account, support, investigation, communication, and idea-use concerns. Sources involving Adam, Steve, Biden, Musk, Bezos, or other public figures are included only where they explain the alleged coordination or business/idea context.

The key investigative question is whether there is authenticated conduct by Zuckerberg, Meta/Facebook employees, contractors, support teams, or linked private actors. Without that, the relays remain the reporting party's interpretation rather than proven action.

Facebook Refund and Compromised-Account Branch

Source 0297 says a Facebook account was compromised, that the first of four or five transactions from the same hacker/account was refunded, and that the remaining transactions should have followed the same logic. Source 1536 repeats that the account was compromised, money was taken, and user-agreement language should not be used to mistreat the victim of a hack.

Source 7154 gives the most complete version: an initial refund, later unrefunded transactions from the same account, another hack after account closure, promised investigation, a closed case, an obsolete link for a new case, and an allegation that Instagram access was blocked after the reporting party

created an account.

This is the most testable part of the report. Investigators should obtain transaction IDs, ad-account IDs, login/IP/device logs, refund decisions, support-ticket histories, emails, case-closure reasons, internal risk notes, and the identity or account data associated with the alleged hacker.

Failure to Help, Report, or Preserve Platform Evidence

Sources 0445, 1221, 1236, and iuiuyy879878 allege that platform evidence was crucial because communications between the reporting party, Anna, and others occurred online. The reporting party argues that a platform CEO or company with records could have helped authorities verify the initial cyberbullying and hacking situation.

The allegation is not only that help was not given. It is that failure to help occurred while Zuckerberg or linked actors allegedly knew of public display, compromised accounts, monitoring, or relay communications. If corroborated, the issue would be whether Meta/Facebook preserved records and handled reports in good faith.

The legal analysis depends on specific duties, terms of service, subpoenas, law-enforcement requests, preservation requests, and internal knowledge. A private platform is not automatically criminally liable for failing to solve every user complaint, but deliberate concealment, misleading records, unauthorized disclosure, or knowing participation would change the analysis.

Alleged Adam-Zuckerberg Coordination

Sources 0445, 0564, 0611, 0701, 1221, and 1918 repeatedly ask whether Zuckerberg and Adam communicated, exchanged files, encouraged monitoring, or supported Adam's alleged illegal investigation and hacking. The reporting party distinguishes negligent non-reporting from active involvement in harassment or abuse.

The file emphasizes that Adam and Zuckerberg were perceived as peers, investors, or powerful platform figures who could have communicated directly but allegedly used passive relays and distance. The report treats this as a coordination lead, not a finding.

Investigators should seek authenticated chats, emails, shared files, calendar records, platform-preservation requests, direct messages, investor communications, and any record showing whether Adam and Zuckerberg discussed the reporting party, the website idea, the Facebook account issue, public display, or alleged surveillance.

Monitoring, Public Display, Privacy, and Passive Relays

Sources 0391, 0445, 0564, 0701, 1236, 1918, 6108, and 7154 allege public display, monitoring, screen observation, passive relays, taunting, and hidden-channel communications. The reporting party repeatedly says he was not given the channel link or direct text communication.

If corroborated, the pattern would be relevant to stalking, privacy, stored-communications access, platform records, and harassment. If not corroborated, the relays remain subjective interpretations that should be documented but not treated as proof.

The report requests preservation of screenshots, URLs, account IDs, recommendation histories, Facebook/Instagram logs, support notes, direct messages, channel identifiers, metadata, and any records showing who could view the reporting party's screen, account, comments, or communications.

Ideas, Investment, Website, and AI Enhancement

Sources 0654, 0873, 1161, 1265496846465, 1384, 1415, 1519, 15649674867, 1918, 5206, 6108, 7398, hytu74768569587, and uihiuiy678 concern the reporting party's website, presentation, data segmentation concept, and later AI-enhancement idea.

The reporting party's theory is that the idea was created in a competitive investment environment, that Adam and Zuckerberg had visibility or interest, that direct communication was avoided, and that later follow-up or use without agreement would be exploitation or theft. He also says there was no contract and that he severed ties or moved on to other possible partners.

This branch requires careful legal separation. General ideas are not automatically protected as property. Trade-secret, copyright, fraud, contract, or unjust-enrichment theories require specific evidence: what was disclosed, to whom, under what confidentiality terms, when it was used, whether it was substantially copied, and whether money or business opportunity was obtained by deception.

Account Access, Prior Accounts, and Records

Source 1236 asks for access to prior comments, prior accounts, and the email jooyeonkim84@gmail.com, while distinguishing that account from scotia84banking@gmail.com. It also says account access and comments could show the original dialogue and context.

This matters because the file's allegations depend heavily on timelines: when the reporting party contacted Adam, when Anna's alleged hacking began, when the presentation was shared, when Facebook account compromise occurred, and when Zuckerberg or Facebook support allegedly had notice.

Investigators should preserve and obtain account-recovery logs, deletion and suspension reasons, comment export data, ad-account records, login history, device fingerprints, security notices, email communications, and law-enforcement preservation responses.

Positive and Mixed Context

The file is not one-note. Sources 0297, 0445, 1384, 1564854686, 1609, and 1989749874984 contain better-intent, forgiveness, apology, and uncertainty language. The reporting party sometimes says he may be misreading relays, that Zuckerberg may have honor, or that he would drop charges if the alleged site/idea use stopped.

This strengthens the evidence map because it shows the reporting party is not merely asserting maximum blame in every sentence. He distinguishes forgiveness from continuing harm, negligent non-reporting from active involvement, and possible support from possible antagonism.

A fair investigation should preserve this mixed context. It should ask what Zuckerberg or Meta actually did, what they did not do, and whether any later conduct stopped, continued, or escalated the alleged harm.

Uncertainty and Relay Discipline

Theme counts found uncertainty, speculation, apology, maybe, guess, or relay-limitation language in 112 of 125 source units. That is central to how this file should be read.

Relays, public signals, YouTube clips, profile changes, Facebook Marketplace layout changes, and perceived references may be meaningful leads if authorship and timing can be authenticated. They should not be converted into proof without platform data or witness confirmation.

The report therefore asks investigators to record the reporting party's interpretation, then independently verify who created each item, whether it was personalized, whether Zuckerberg or Meta personnel had any role, and whether the timing matches alleged events.

Distress Language and Risk Handling

Some sources contain severe anger, threats, or punishment language, especially when the reporting party believes his ideas, privacy, or safety are being attacked. This report does not endorse that language as an outcome.

The useful legal meaning is impact: the reporting party reports prolonged humiliation, perceived surveillance, financial loss, blocked access, and fear of being exploited while isolated. Those claims should be handled by de-escalation, protection, record preservation, and lawful review.

Authorities should separate genuine safety concerns from rhetorical distress, and separate the reporting party's anger from the evidence he is asking them to preserve.

Legal Mapping for Authorities

18 U.S.C. 1030 and 2701 may be relevant if there was unauthorized access to computers, accounts, protected computers, or stored communications. 18 U.S.C. 2702 may be relevant to how an electronic communication service handles customer communications or records.

18 U.S.C. 1029 may be relevant if unauthorized access devices or payment credentials were used in the alleged Facebook ad transactions. 18 U.S.C. 1343 may be relevant only if a scheme to obtain money or property by false pretenses used interstate or foreign wires.

18 U.S.C. 1832 may be relevant only if the website or AI-enhancement material qualifies as a trade secret and was misappropriated with the required intent and interstate/foreign-commerce connection.

18 U.S.C. 1519 and 1001 depend on federal-investigation or federal-jurisdiction facts.

18 U.S.C. 2261A may be relevant if interstate or foreign communications involved stalking, surveillance, threats, or substantial emotional distress. 15 U.S.C. 45 may be a consumer-protection routing reference for unfair or deceptive practices, but it does not automatically create the criminal claims alleged here.

Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests

Obtain all Facebook/Meta support tickets, emails, refund decisions, ad-account records, transaction IDs, payment credentials, IP/device logs, security notices, case-closure notes, and internal risk/fraud notes concerning the alleged compromised account.

Preserve all records related to Instagram or Facebook account restrictions after the reporting party attempted to create or access accounts, including reasons, automated flags, and human-review notes.

Preserve all communications between Zuckerberg, Meta/Facebook personnel, Adam, Quora-related accounts, investors, and any third parties concerning the reporting party, his presentation, website, AI enhancement, ad-account compromise, or alleged public display.

Preserve the reporting party's prior account comments, dialogue histories, deleted or inaccessible records, and data exports for jooyeonkim84@gmail.com, scotia84banking@gmail.com, and any related account identifiers.

For the idea-ownership branch, preserve drafts, timestamps, emails, presentations, file exchanges, screenshots, investor communications, and any product or internal planning materials that could show independent creation, follow-up, copying, or non-use.

For relay claims, preserve URLs, thumbnails, recommendation data, account owners, timestamps, and platform logs, then compare them to the reporting party's written timeline.

Conclusion

The Zuckerberg archive supports a focused report around five factual branches: Facebook refund/account compromise, possible failure to preserve or act on platform evidence, alleged Adam-Zuckerberg coordination, passive relay/public-display concerns, and alleged use or hijacking of website/AI-enhancement ideas.

The strongest immediate evidence request is not a broad conclusion against Zuckerberg. It is the retrieval of concrete records: refund tickets, transaction logs, account-compromise findings, support emails, account restrictions, communications with Adam, and records showing whether the website or AI-enhancement ideas were used.

The requested lawful outcome is verification and separation: separate Meta/Facebook support conduct from Zuckerberg personally; separate authenticated records from relay interpretation; separate ordinary platform policy from discriminatory or deceptive treatment; and separate unprotected ideas from protected trade-secret, copyright, contract, or fraud evidence.

Appendix A. Source Index

Source ID	Observation Use
0297	Direct Facebook refund branch: compromised account, multiple transactions from the same hacker/account, refund of first transaction, obsolete link, and request to reinvestigate.
0391	Protection/privacy branch: says public display made the reporting party exposed to danger and that Facebook should not blame the victim after recognizing account compromise.
0445	Adam/Zuckerberg coordination branch: asks whether Zuckerberg merely neglected to report or went further through chats, file exchange, support of monitoring, or encouragement.
0564	Resurfacing attackers branch: alleges Mark and Adam were in it from the beginning, supported illegal infiltration, and should be assessed for antagonism and psychological abuse.
0611	Repeat of coordination branch with added uncertainty about Mark's position; useful as corroborating repetition of the Adam/Zuckerberg theory.
0654	AI enhancement source request: asks authorities to locate earlier writings on AI enhancement and says Zuckerberg should not support Adam's threatened follow-up.
0701	Relay and file-use branch: warns Zuckerberg not to join in, asks whether hacking intent was clear to Mark, and alleges illegal relays or use of Adam-taken files.
0873	AI enhancement and market-timing branch: says relays may point to Zuckerberg, and argues follow-up on ideas after the reporting party's statement is targeting.
1035486746478686	Origins and comparison branch: says the core was initially the reporting party, Adam, and Zuckerberg, and separates Steve from the original idea/investment path.
1161	AI website arrangement branch: alleges Zuckerberg accepted an arrangement and then refuted it when the reporting party improved the website with AI.
1221	Platform proof/failure-to-help branch: says Adam as CEO could have helped police because platform communications were evidence; frames later follow-up as harassment.
1236	Monitoring and account-access branch: says public display and monitoring were real, asks for access to prior accounts and comments, and identifies relevant Gmail accounts.
1265496846465	Severin relay branch: says if Zuckerberg stole or used the idea after agreeing to drop it, he should be charged; includes apology if relay was misread.
1354	No-contract/control branch: rejects later claims based on no contract, severed ties, passive conditions, and perceived taunting.
1384	Competition/humanitarian branch: says Zuckerberg and Adam narrowed the matter into rivalry, and that the reporting party moved on to work with Mr. Bezos.
1415	Project ownership and refund branch: states the project is the reporting party's own and asks for immediate refund rather than legal jargon.
1519	Detailed timeline branch: Anna hacking, Adam contact, public presentation, alleged Zuckerberg investment signal, later competition, and repeated origin defense.
1536	Concise refund branch: user agreement cannot be misused to deny a victim of a hack; compromised account and money taken should be addressed.
1564854686	Forgiveness boundary branch: says forgiveness is possible only if Zuckerberg drops the alleged hijacking and the harm stops.
156486486	Political-fronting theory: alleges presentation theft through Adam/Zuckerberg and political reliance; should be treated as inference pending records.
15649674867	Presentation-origin timeline: online marketing history, data-science interest, Adam discussion trigger, and emails/drafts as origin evidence.

Source ID	Observation Use
1609	Negligence duration branch: asks whether initial negligence can be forgiven if relays and rights-control continued afterward.
1918	Blind-channel and contract branch: no contract, no channel access, passive conditions, defamation context, and the need for clear communication before any agreement.
1970	Refund-control branch: alleges Zuckerberg/team treated refund as leverage around device returns and asks for the stolen hack transaction to be refunded.
1989749874984	Misread-relay caution branch: says if Zuckerberg used the idea after investment expectations, that is exploitation, but apologizes if relays are wrong.
5206	Website-presentation theft branch: asks witnesses to come forward and preserve dialogues/file exchanges; uncertain whether culprit was Adam or Zuckerberg.
6108	Ownership/suing branch: alleges possible lawsuit or ownership dispute over website idea, plus relays, taunting, gaslighting, and deleted warnings.
7154	Comprehensive Facebook hack branch: first refund, later unrefunded same-account hacks, closed cases, obsolete links, IG lockout, and deliberate negligence theory.
7398	Competitive-environment branch: says using ideas after investment refusal and distance-keeping would be exploitation; combines refund, investigation, and idea concerns.
hytu74768569587	Eduardo Saverin relay branch: alleges Zuckerberg should drop the site and says communication could have been direct rather than isolating.
uihiuiy678	CEO/idea-justification relay branch: no contract, alleged trap by competition, private-info concern, and conditional withdrawal of charges if Zuckerberg drops the idea.
iuuiyy879878	Direct-channel branch: Adam and Zuckerberg allegedly should have sent the channel link or communicated in text rather than passive messages.
hiuyiuy768	Facebook Marketplace relay branch: possible threatening layout/relay interpretation and renewed warning against hijacking work.

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. 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. 1029 - Fraud and related activity in connection with access devices: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&f=treesort&jumpTo=true+&num=0&req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1029+edition%3Aprelim%29+OR+%28granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1029%29>

18 U.S.C. 2701 - Unlawful access to stored communications:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=2023&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-2023-title18-section2701>

18 U.S.C. 2702 - Voluntary disclosure of customer communications or records:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section2702>

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. 1832 - Theft of trade secrets:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1832+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. 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. 2261A - Stalking and cyberstalking:

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

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>

15 U.S.C. 45 - Unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&hl=false&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title15-section45&saved=%7CZ3JhbnVsZWlkei1wcmVsaW0tdGloYXN1ZWN0aW9uNDVj%7C%7C%7C0%7Cfalse%7Cprelim>