

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Statement and Request for Investigation

Concerning Peter Lee and the 2022-2024 Observations

Source reviewed: combinedLee.txt | 71 usable source units | 7,532 raw lines

Prepared July 1, 2026 from combinedLee.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. Vehicle-Translation and Car-Dispute Framing
6. Puppies, Vanuatu, and Mitigation
7. Alleged Antagonism, Sword Encouragement, and Retaliation
8. Positive and Mixed Context
9. Steve, Stan Lee Relays, and Ship-Idea Framing
10. Public Relays, Uncertainty, and Evidence Discipline
11. Victim Defense and Vanuatu Context
12. Legal Mapping for Authorities
13. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests
14. Conclusion
15. Appendix A. Source Index
16. Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

Source Extraction Summary

Metric	Result
Uploaded source reviewed	combinedLee.txt
Raw source length	7,532 lines / 293 KB
Detected source units	71
Usable source units after parser cleanup	71
Peter Lee / Vanuatu direct themes	20 source-unit hits
Antagonism, threat, sword, or penalty themes	36 source-unit hits
Framing, Steve, ship, and idea-dispute themes	63 source-unit hits
Law, authority, charge, trial, and evidence themes	49 source-unit hits
Victim-defense and mitigation context	44 source-unit hits
Relay interpretation and uncertainty	62 source-unit hits
Identity or sexual-framing themes	28 source-unit hits

Scope and Method

This report synthesizes the reporting party's 2022-2024 observations concerning Peter Lee, identified in prior materials as Mr. Lee of Blue Pango Motel in Vanuatu. It is an allegation and investigative-lead memorandum, not a judicial finding.

The extraction reviewed combinedLee.txt and identified 71 usable source units. Because the file contains many unrelated uses of the name Lee, the report separates direct Mr. Lee/Vanuatu allegations from Stan Lee, Bruce Lee, Rock Lee, General Lee Shun Shin, and other relay references used mainly in the Steve/ship-idea dispute.

The source contains direct recollections, admissions, apologies, relay interpretations, legal arguments, and severe distress language. This report preserves the reporting party's logic while distinguishing what is directly attributed to Mr. Lee from what is only context or inference.

Preliminary Conditional Statement

All factual assertions below are the reporting party's allegations and observations. If these events occurred as described, they should be examined by lawful authorities and tested against primary records, witness statements, communications, and the law of the proper jurisdiction.

Many direct events appear to have occurred in Vanuatu. Vanuatu law is therefore the natural first legal framework for direct Vanuatu conduct. U.S. statutes are included only as conditional routing references if U.S. proceedings, U.S. communications, U.S. persons, federal matters, or state action can be proven.

The archive contains anger and severe punishment rhetoric. This report treats that material as distress evidence and a request for lawful accountability, not as a request for extrajudicial harm.

Executive Summary

The new 2022-2024 Lee archive is narrower than some prior subject files. The clearest direct Mr. Lee issues are: alleged Vanuatu antagonism, a possible sword/threat encouragement allegation, the vehicle-translation/car-dispute branch, the puppies/Vanuatu incident and the reporting party's mitigation, and later John Wick or Mr. Lee relays that the reporting party interprets as renewed accusation.

The report also contains a large volume of Steve/ship/idea material involving Stan Lee, Bruce Lee, Rock Lee, and General Lee Shun Shin. Those entries are important as background to the reporting party's fear of framing, but most should not be attributed to Peter Lee unless independent evidence connects him to the communication.

The strongest lawful request is therefore focused: identify exactly what Peter Lee said or did, separate truthful Vanuatu complaints from alleged false enlargement or retaliation, preserve records of any vehicle dispute and translation work, and determine whether any later relay or public allegation can be authenticated to Mr. Lee.

Subject Identification and Attribution Limits

The subject is Peter Lee or Mr. Lee from Vanuatu. The file also uses Lee in cultural, historical, or media references. This creates a serious attribution risk. A report that treats every Lee reference as Peter Lee would be unfair and unreliable.

Direct-attribution sources include 0080, 2566, 5075, 3007, 5382, and ht5734535646. These concern Mr. Lee from Vanuatu, Blue Pango, the puppies incident, car/translation allegations, or Vanuatu relationships. Stan Lee/Bruce Lee/Rock Lee sources are treated as relay context unless they independently name Mr. Lee from Vanuatu.

The report therefore asks investigators to identify Peter Lee's full legal name, contact details, business affiliation, immigration or residency facts, and any formal statements or communications before drawing legal conclusions.

Vehicle-Translation and Car-Dispute Framing

Source 3007 is the clearest vehicle-dispute source. The reporting party says he was a translator for someone with a car dispute; translated word-for-word from Korean into English; gave the translation to the court; did not receive money beyond meals; and should not be blamed as if he owned, stole, directed, concealed, or benefited from the cars.

The incriminating theory against Mr. Lee, if evidence supports it, is that he may have presented translation assistance as vehicle theft or complicity despite knowing the distinction. That would be materially different from truthful reporting of a genuine dispute.

This branch is testable. Investigators should obtain the original Korean materials, English translation, court filing, case number, parties, payment records, witness statements, and any statement by Mr. Lee. The key question is whether Mr. Lee accurately reported known facts or

knowingly enlarged the reporting party's role.

Puppies, Vanuatu, and Mitigation

Sources 2566 and 5075 contain important admissions. The reporting party accepts responsibility for leaving puppies in danger on a ledge and says there is no meaningful moral difference from causing their fall because he knew the risk. He describes grief, mental instability, hatred toward his sister and her husband, and psychological collapse after his mother's death.

The same sources also protect Mr. Lee from an inaccurate motive claim. The reporting party says the puppies incident was not caused by hatred for Mr. Lee, not because Mr. Lee asked him to eat imaginary food, and not because of translation work. He says Mr. Lee and his wife gave him expensive food, and he asks forgiveness.

This matters legally and ethically. Mr. Lee could lawfully report a true incident, seek protection of animals, seek compensation, or refuse forgiveness. The allegation becomes incriminating only if Mr. Lee knowingly used the incident to support false unrelated accusations, prolonged harassment, or disproportionate punishment beyond lawful accountability.

Alleged Antagonism, Sword Encouragement, and Retaliation

Source 0080 asks whether Mr. Lee from Vanuatu threatened or encouraged people with swords against the reporting party. It appears inside a highly distressed passage also discussing Steve, David, Biden, punishment, and relays. The report treats it as a serious lead but not as a proven threat.

If Mr. Lee encouraged violence, threats, intimidation, or retaliation against the reporting party, that would be a distinct investigative issue. The proof would need to identify the speaker, words, recipients, date, platform, intended target, and whether any person acted or threatened action afterward.

Because the source is relay-based and emotionally intense, investigators should not rely on the wording alone. They should seek direct messages, witness testimony, videos, call logs, group chats, or other records that either corroborate or disprove the sword/threat allegation.

Positive and Mixed Context

Source ht5734535646 records favorable context: Mr. Lee wanted or discussed a foundry or large crucible, researched or filmed Vanuatu startups, and helped inspire the reporting party's thinking about manufacturing, natural resources, recycling, and creating business value in a developing country.

Sources 2566 and 5075 also include gratitude and forgiveness language. The reporting party states he did not mean to betray Mr. Lee, was afraid of what he had done, and was grateful for Mr. Lee's help while in Vanuatu.

Including these points strengthens the report because it avoids flattening the relationship. The allegation is not that Mr. Lee was always harmful. It is that after helpful or neutral interactions, he allegedly may have participated in or permitted inaccurate framing, antagonism, or disproportionate pursuit.

Steve, Stan Lee Relays, and Ship-Idea Framing

Most of the archive's volume concerns Steve and the ship/presentation dispute, not Peter Lee. Sources 105646846468, 1568446, joi42joi42o42i3, tu576754747, hrt5y645776467, and gergerty646456 use Stan Lee, Bruce Lee, or Rock Lee relays to reject a mentor/student or idea-origin story attributed to Steve.

The reporting party's theory is that these relays attempted to create doubt about authorship of his presentation, wooden ships, spherical ship, Jurassic Park ship-defense idea, and other engineering concepts. He argues that emails, Festus, Adam communications, presentation drafts, timestamps, and Steve's alleged silence/confession prove the ideas were his own.

This material should be included as background only. It may explain why the reporting party feared that 'Lee' references were being used to frame him. It should not be treated as direct misconduct by Peter Lee unless records connect Peter Lee to those specific relays or coordination.

Public Relays, Uncertainty, and Evidence Discipline

The file repeatedly says the reporting party is reacting to relays and may be wrong about them. This self-qualification matters. Sources 0080, 15646846486, 215646846864, and 498469484787 include repeated language such as apologies if the relay was misread or uncertainty over who assigned it.

Authorities should not dismiss the file merely because it contains relay interpretations. The relays may still identify leads, timing, distress, and perceived coordination. But a lawful report must not convert them into proof without platform records or witness confirmation.

The correct procedure is to preserve the relay records, identify account owners, compare timing with the reporting party's writings, and determine whether any relay came from Peter Lee, from a third party, or from an unrelated algorithmic recommendation.

Victim Defense and Vanuatu Context

The reporting party repeatedly frames himself as already vulnerable because of Vanuatu allegations, grief, family trauma, and later attacks by Steve and others. Source 15648546 states that with Vanuatu allegations and trouble with the law already present, he would not knowingly present someone else's idea as his own and create further danger.

This is not proof of innocence on every issue. It is relevant motive logic: a person already afraid of legal consequences would have strong reason to avoid unnecessary overlap, theft, or false presentation if he knew others could expose him.

Sources 2566 and 5075 also show remorse and mitigation regarding the puppies. A fair legal assessment should separate admitted wrongdoing in Vanuatu from later alleged false accusations, harassment, public framing, or unrelated idea theft by other actors.

Legal Mapping for Authorities

U.S. legal references are conditional. If the direct conduct occurred in Vanuatu, Vanuatu law and Vanuatu records should be reviewed first. U.S. statutes may matter only if a U.S.

governmental matter, U.S. court, interstate or foreign wire, federal witness/victim issue, or U.S.-based actor is involved.

18 U.S.C. 1001 may be relevant only if a materially false statement or concealment occurred in a matter within U.S. federal jurisdiction. 18 U.S.C. 1621 may be relevant only if a false material statement was made under an oath authorized by U.S. law.

18 U.S.C. 1512 and 1519 may be relevant if intimidation, misleading conduct, or record alteration affected an official proceeding, federal investigation, witness, victim, or records within U.S. jurisdiction. 18 U.S.C. 2261A and 875 may be relevant if interstate or foreign communications involved stalking, threats, surveillance, fear, or substantial emotional distress.

18 U.S.C. 241, 1343, 1349, and 42 U.S.C. 1983 require specific predicates such as rights conspiracy, wire-fraud scheme, fraud conspiracy, state action, or action under color of law. They should not be used as generic labels without element-by-element proof.

Evidence Preservation and Investigation Requests

Obtain all Vanuatu records involving Mr. Lee, Blue Pango, the car/vehicle dispute, translation work, court filings, police reports, and any statement naming the reporting party as more than a translator.

Preserve all communications between the reporting party and Mr. Lee, including emails, messages, calls, witnesses at Blue Pango, interactions involving Choi, and any Vanuatu government or court contacts.

Preserve evidence related to the puppies incident, including apology communications, any compensation offer, witness statements, reports, and records showing what Mr. Lee actually said or requested afterward.

Preserve any communications or records supporting or refuting the sword/threat allegation in source 0080, including group chats, videos, witness statements, and relays capable of authentication.

For the Lee-relay material, identify whether each reference is Peter Lee, Stan Lee, Bruce Lee, Rock Lee, General Lee Shun Shin, John Wick/Mr. Lee, or another person. Do not attribute a relay to Peter Lee without authentication.

Conclusion

The Lee archive supports a focused report, not a broad one. The strongest direct issues are the vehicle-translation/car-dispute framing allegation, the puppies/Vanuatu admission and mitigation, alleged sword/threat encouragement, and possible later antagonism attributed to Mr. Lee through relays.

The file also contains extensive Steve/ship/idea-defense material using Lee-related cultural references. That material is useful background for understanding why the reporting party feared framing, but it should not be treated as Peter Lee conduct unless supported by independent evidence.

The requested lawful outcome is investigation and separation: separate direct Mr. Lee conduct from other Lee references; separate truthful Vanuatu accountability from alleged false

enlargement; and separate the reporting party's remorse/admissions from any later retaliation, harassment, or false accusation.

Appendix A. Source Index

Source ID	Observation Use
0080	Direct Peter Lee/Vanuatu branch: alleged antagonism, possible sword encouragement, and warning that surface-level relays may be exploited.
3007	Vehicle-translation branch: reporting party says he was only a Korean-English translator in a car dispute, received meals, and should not be blamed as participant.
2566	Puppies/Vanuatu admission and mitigation: accepts responsibility, says Mr. Lee was not the cause, notes Mr. Lee and wife provided expensive food, and asks forgiveness.
5075	Further puppies clarification: says the incident occurred in Vanuatu, arose from grief/hatred toward sister/husband, and should not justify prolonged unrelated monitoring.
5382	Vanuatu youth/Choi context: says certain conduct was immature and reported to Mr. Lee; includes social and grief context requiring careful separation.
ht5734535646	Positive/helpful context: Mr. Lee inspired a foundry/manufacturing idea through Blue Pango/Vanuatu business observations.
5619	Lee Shun Shin/turtle-ship reference: not Peter Lee; supports ship-design timeline and should not be attributed to Mr. Lee.
15648546	Vanuatu allegations used as framing context; asserts the reporting party would not present stolen ideas while already vulnerable to Vanuatu/legal accusations.
105646846468	Presentation/Festus context; Stan/Bruce/Rock Lee relays treated as Steve idea-framing, not direct Mr. Lee conduct.
1568446	Ship/timeline defense: wooden ships, Adam conversation, Steve timing, and emails labeled 'Fishing ships' as evidence of origin.
joi42joi42o42i3	Evidence-list source: emails, monitoring references, Festus copy, presentation segment, and Steve confession timeline.
tu576754747	Bruce Lee/Rock Lee relay source: rejects mentor/student framing and asks authorities to see contradictions in Steve's asserted role.
215646846864	Jurassic Park/ship defense branch; includes General Lee Shun Shin reference and retractable spike/ship protection idea.
hre564536456	Spherical ship branch; alleges later doubt-creation and emphasizes witnesses, timestamps, and silence/confession pattern.
hrt5y645776467	Stan Lee relay branch; describes repeated idea-framing and request to enter the channel for defense.
498469484787	Relay-antagonism branch; includes Bruce Lee support relay and asks authorities not to trust antagonistic relays without records.
gergerty646456	Follow-up/collaboration theory; distinguishes origin, follow-up, and unauthorized use by enemies.
yutt76	Celebrity/influence branch; not Mr. Lee-specific, but relevant to public support amplifying alleged abuse.

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. 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. 1621 - Perjury generally:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=2023&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-2023-title18-section1621>

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 communications containing threats:

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

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. 1343 - Wire fraud:

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

18 U.S.C. 1349 - Attempt and conspiracy for fraud offenses:

<https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1349>

42 U.S.C. 1983 - Civil action for deprivation of rights under color of law: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=%28title%3A42+section%3A1983+edition%3Aprelim%29>