

COURT OF JUSTICE

Subject-Specific Alleged-Conduct Report

Sean Kernan (identity and full legal name to be verified)

Prepared for review by competent investigators, counsel, or other lawful authorities

Source reviewed: combinedKernan.txt | 16,523 raw lines | approximately 608,541 characters

Prepared July 1, 2026 from combinedKernan.txt

Conditional premise. Every factual assertion below is presented as the submitter's allegation or observation. Unless expressly identified as independently verified, it must be read conditionally: if the described conduct occurred and is attributable to Sean Kernan, it warrants investigation and evaluation under the law. This report does not determine guilt, authenticate a communication, establish that a perceived relay referred to the submitter, or recommend a predetermined punishment.

This report focuses solely on conduct attributed to Sean Kernan. It does not adopt accusations concerning other named people, does not infer guilt from association, and does not analyze unrelated conduct by the submitter. References to other people are included only where necessary to explain the alleged sequence, knowledge, coordination, or source of evidence relevant to Kernan.

The report is an investigative presentation, not legal advice. Federal statutes are used as screening frameworks. Jurisdiction, venue, limitation periods, admissibility, identity, intent, and the applicability of Canadian or state law require advice from qualified counsel and findings by the proper authorities.

1. Executive Summary

The source compilation presents a sustained allegation that Sean Kernan participated in an online pattern of targeted psychological provocation and then escalated that conduct after learning of the submitter's precise fear that his mother's cryonically preserved remains could be damaged by removal from controlled temperature. The alleged communications were not described as straightforward messages alone. They were said to appear through Quora posts, upvotes, shares, and subject-matched media references that the submitter calls 'relays.' The principal alleged examples include a question about hearing 'white noise' during a period of sexual humiliation, imagery of a fish transported in a briefcase, references to decomposing brains, tetanus and bodily damage, and references to a short trip between the United States and Canada.

The compilation further alleges that Kernan later went to, entered, contacted, or otherwise engaged with the cryonics facility after those messages and attempted to trigger an investigation or removal of the submitter's mother from her tank. The source gives several formulations of the event, ranging from relaying an online channel to facility personnel to going there 'to get her out of the tank.' These formulations are serious but not yet reconciled. They require facility records, platform records, travel evidence, and witness interviews before a conclusion can be drawn.

A second recurring theory concerns motive and rationalization. The source says Kernan had been rejected in connection with an investment opportunity, supported Anna in an existing dispute, and later portrayed the alleged bullying as a way to make the submitter fearless, callous, changed, or cured. If accurately attributed, those later statements could be probative of knowledge and a claimed purpose, but only if the underlying accounts and communications are authenticated.

The strongest investigative path is digital and chronological rather than rhetorical. Investigators should reconstruct what the submitter disclosed, when Kernan could have learned it, what Kernan's accounts posted or upvoted afterward, whether he communicated with the identified group, whether he contacted or visited the facility, what he said there, and whether the conduct continued after the submitter attempted to forgive or disengage. The result may corroborate the alleged pattern, narrow it substantially, or disprove key attributions.

2. Scope, Method, and Evidentiary Posture

2.1 Source reviewed

The sole factual source supplied for this report was combinedKernan.txt, approximately 51,000 words and 7,311 lines. It combines numerous dated or undated text fragments stored under a Sean Kernan folder. The compilation contains extensive material about other people. Only Kernan-specific passages and the minimum surrounding context necessary to understand them were used here.

2.2 Synthesis method

Each asterisk-separated source segment was treated as a complete observation unit. Repeated descriptions were compared for common elements, variations, internal qualifications, and proposed evidence. Overlapping statements were consolidated into distinct allegations. Repetition was treated as evidence of emphasis, not independent corroboration.

2.3 Attribution categories

- Direct attribution: the source expressly names Sean Kernan as the speaker, account holder, visitor, or actor.
- Contextual attribution: the source attributes a message to Kernan through an upvote, share, avatar, matching algorithm, or thematic relay. These claims require account-level authentication.
- Group attribution: the source refers to Anna, Becky, Robert, Kernan, or 'the gang' collectively. No act is assigned to Kernan merely because the source places him in that group.

- Third-party amplification: the source says later actors repeated or amplified conduct initiated by Kernan. Those later acts are outside this report except as possible evidence of what Kernan allegedly initiated.

2.4 Material limitations

- The compilation does not attach the original Quora posts, account exports, URLs, timestamps, screenshots with metadata, or platform certifications.
- Many events are undated, and the submitter repeatedly acknowledges uncertainty about exact order, memory, and whether a relay was interpreted correctly.
- The phrase 'entered the facility' is used, but the source does not supply a visitor log, correspondence, travel record, staff statement, or other independent proof.
- The compilation describes prior convictions, charges, or court decisions without providing docket numbers, orders, judgments, or the identity of the tribunal. Those statements are not treated as established procedural facts.
- No independent identity evidence links every referenced account, avatar, upvote, or media item to Kernan. Similar names and indirect content make misattribution a material possibility.

3. Chronological Reconstruction

The source does not permit a calendar-date chronology. The following sequence is therefore relative and should be tested against platform and facility records.

1. The submitter describes an online environment centered on Quora in which Anna, Becky, Robert, Kernan, and others allegedly communicated by posts, upvotes, shares, and indirect references.
2. During an early relationship-related conflict, Kernan allegedly sent or caused the message 'Do you hear a white noise?' while Becky and Kernan allegedly insinuated that Anna was having sex or making a baby with another person. The submitter describes this as deliberate humiliation directed at a known emotional vulnerability.
3. The submitter later says he pursued settlement, then dropped charges or demands against the group and attempted to forgive them. No formal record of a charge or dismissal is included.
4. An investment opportunity involving Adam is then described. Kernan allegedly visited a Quora office, competed for the opportunity, and was rejected or 'thwarted.' The compilation treats this as a possible motive but provides no direct communication proving retaliation.
5. The submitter disclosed fears that an investigation into his mother's death could cause her cryonically preserved remains to be removed from the tank or exposed to damaging temperature change. The source also says Kernan knew of the submitter's prior suicidal vulnerability following his mother's death.
6. After that disclosure, Kernan allegedly used Quora posts, upvotes, shares, or relays involving a fish in a briefcase, decomposing brains, tetanus or a person breaking a back, and a short United States-Canada trip. The submitter interpreted the cluster as threats concerning transport, thawing, or damage to his mother's remains.

7. Kernan allegedly then traveled to, entered, contacted, or engaged with the cryonics facility. The claimed purpose varies across the compilation: to relay the online channel, cause conflict, trigger an investigation, exploit the submitter's fear, or get the mother out of the tank.
8. The source alleges further threatening or abusive relays both before and after the facility contact, followed by framing narratives intended to portray the submitter as the wrongdoer and to minimize Kernan's responsibility.
9. Kernan allegedly later admitted the abuse or defended it by claiming that he had changed, toughened, made fearless, or cured the submitter. The source connects this rationale to a story that Kernan's father had broken Kernan's arm and that Kernan transferred a similar theory of harshness to the submitter.
10. The submitter continued to request preservation of Kernan's Quora upvotes and messages, comparison of their timestamps with facility records, and production of group chats and statements to facility staff.

4. Detailed Allegations Concerning Sean Kernan

4.1. Early participation in targeted online humiliation

Allegation. Kernan participated in an early online campaign designed to intensify the submitter's distress concerning Anna's sexual relationship and the breakdown of their relationship prospect.

- The source directly attributes the phrase 'Do you hear a white noise?' to Kernan and describes it as an abusive message.
- The phrase is placed beside allegations that Becky and Kernan insinuated Anna was having sex or making a baby while camping with another person.
- The source says the timing and subject matter were calculated to exploit a known emotional wound rather than communicate a legitimate concern.
- The submitter says he had never met Kernan and experienced the communication through an asymmetric online environment in which Kernan could observe his reactions.

Why it matters. If authenticated, the message and its timing may establish an early pattern of personalized targeting, knowledge of vulnerability, and coordinated communication. Standing alone, however, an insulting or cruel message ordinarily does not establish a federal offense.

Verification required. Obtain the original post, message, share, or upvote; identify the account and device; establish the date; and compare it with contemporaneous posts by Anna and Becky and the submitter's reactions.

Source basis: 154864.txt; gaer4525424123.txt; yut7889.txt.

4.2. Use of a supportive public posture with intermittent abusive relays

Allegation. Kernan maintained posts that appeared cooperative or supportive while allegedly using upvotes, shares, or indirect media references to deliver disturbing messages that were less visible or deniable.

- The source repeatedly distinguishes ordinary posts from upvotes or shares that allegedly carried the threatening meaning.
- The submitter describes the pattern as intermittent: Kernan would appear supportive and then send a chilling, offensive, or cruel relay.
- A 'Free Guy' character is described as a designated Kernan avatar in a matching algorithm, but the source supplies no technical documentation of that attribution.
- The alleged method would permit plausible deniability because a public article, image, or upvote could be characterized as general content rather than a directed message.

Why it matters. A repeated pattern of personalized, context-dependent references may be probative when the account holder's knowledge and the sequence are independently shown. The same ambiguity also creates a serious risk of over-attribution, making platform data and contemporaneous witness interpretation essential.

Verification required. Preserve the complete account history, not selected screenshots. Compare posting time, audience settings, prior interactions, linked content, accompanying text, and whether other viewers independently understood the same reference before being told the submitter's interpretation.

Source basis: few34322.txt; ftiugygo6786.txt; yut7889.txt.

4.3. Knowledge of the submitter's mental-health vulnerability

Allegation. Kernan knew that the submitter had social anxiety, depression, insomnia, and prior suicidal thoughts following his mother's death, yet used that knowledge to intensify fear and psychological destabilization.

- The compilation expressly says Kernan and others knew the submitter had contemplated suicide in Vanuatu and knew how strongly his mother's preservation affected him.
- It says Kernan spoke as though the submitter were a child who needed to be changed, despite being approximately the same age.
- The source characterizes the alleged conduct as deliberate installation of fear rather than accidental insensitivity.

Why it matters. Proof that Kernan knew a specific vulnerability before choosing related imagery would strengthen an inference of intent to harass or cause substantial emotional distress. The knowledge must be established through communications, access to posts, admissions, or reliable witnesses rather than assumed from the public availability of information.

Verification required. Identify the exact posts or conversations revealing the vulnerability, when Kernan accessed them, and any communications in which he discussed the submitter's likely reaction.

Source basis: fewqr31323213.txt; uyiut7ty8.txt; yut7889.txt.

4.4. Targeting of the cryonics-related fear through symbolic communications

Allegation. After learning that removal or warming of the submitter's mother's remains was the submitter's greatest fear, Kernan deliberately selected content symbolizing transport, thawing, decomposition, and bodily destruction.

- The most repeated alleged reference is a fish being transported in a briefcase or suitcase.
- Other alleged references include rotting brains from an archaeological dig, tetanus, a painting involving bodily injury or a broken back, and a road or short trip between Canada and the United States.
- The source says these items appeared after the submitter expressed fear of an investigation that might remove his mother from cryogenic temperature.
- The submitter interprets the combination as a threat of transport or damage, not as independent current-events content.

Why it matters. Context can convert otherwise ambiguous content into evidence of targeted harassment, but only if identity, timing, knowledge, repetition, and intended audience are shown. The report does not treat the imagery itself as an authenticated threat.

Verification required. Recover the exact linked articles or images, metadata, captions, account activity, and sequence relative to the disclosure of the fear. Determine whether the subject matter was already part of Kernan's normal posting history.

Source basis: fewqr31323213.txt; yut7889.txt; pjo3kpo3k3.txt.

4.5. Alleged travel to or intervention at the cryonics facility

Allegation. Kernan escalated from online communications to contact with, entry into, or intervention at the cryonics facility, with the alleged purpose of causing conflict, triggering an investigation, or facilitating removal of the submitter's mother from the tank.

- The source repeatedly says Kernan 'entered the facility' and asks investigators to compare his threatening upvotes with what he said to facility personnel.
- One passage says he went there to relay the online channel and cause more trouble; another says he went to get the mother out of the tank.
- The compilation alleges threatening relays both before and after the facility event, including a post-event reference to travel between the United States and Canada.
- The source claims Kernan understood that the submitter regarded complete removal from the tank as devastating and unnecessary.

Why it matters. Verified cross-border travel or facility contact could materially change the legal analysis. Under 18 U.S.C. 2261A(1), travel in interstate or foreign commerce undertaken with the specified intent, followed by qualifying conduct that causes fear or substantial emotional distress, may fall within the federal stalking framework. A visit for a benign purpose would not satisfy that statute.

Verification required. Obtain visitor logs, access-control records, surveillance footage, emails, telephone logs, staff notes, identity documents used at entry, border or travel records available through lawful process, and statements from every staff member who interacted with Kernan.

Source basis: faewr324322.txt; 1647846.txt; fewqr31323213.txt; gret44232.txt; hwe431232341.txt; jijij3oii2ji.txt.

4.6. Attempt to trigger or exploit an investigation concerning the mother

Allegation. Kernan used the submitter's suspicions about his mother's death to provoke an investigation that he knew could threaten the preservation arrangement and psychologically devastate the submitter.

- The source distinguishes a carefully controlled sampling procedure, with the submitter present, from complete removal of the remains.
- It alleges Kernan attempted to trigger the more dangerous course after sending threatening relays.
- The alleged harm was not limited to physical risk to preserved remains; the source repeatedly describes the intended result as destruction of the submitter's psyche and life.

Why it matters. Requesting a lawful investigation is not itself wrongful. The material question is whether Kernan knowingly provided false information, used threats or deception, sought unauthorized access, or acted with a specific intent to harass or injure. The source does not yet provide the content of any report to the facility or authorities.

Verification required. Identify the recipient, content, date, and basis of every complaint or request Kernan made; determine whether any factual representation was knowingly false; and document what action, if any, the facility considered or took.

Source basis: 1213243.txt; gret44232.txt; pjo3kpo3k3.txt; joi980809.txt.

4.7. Renewed conduct after forgiveness or withdrawal of complaints

Allegation. Kernan and associated individuals resumed or escalated their conduct after the submitter says he dropped prior cyberbullying complaints, settlement requests, or charges and attempted to help them.

- The source consistently places the facility episode after an asserted effort to forgive the group.
- It says the submitter advocated for a lesser outcome for Kernan even after the alleged facility conduct, but the attacks continued.
- The report does not adopt the source's references to criminal sentences because no formal record is supplied; the relevant point is the alleged notice and opportunity to stop.

Why it matters. Continued conduct after an explicit request to stop, forgiveness, or withdrawal from conflict can support an inference that the communications were purposeful rather than inadvertent. It also helps define a course of conduct rather than an isolated exchange.

Verification required. Locate the communications in which the submitter withdrew demands or asked for the conduct to cease, then compare them with later Kernan account activity and facility contact.

Source basis: 154864.txt; 1647846.txt; faewr324322.txt; gaer4525424123.txt; hwe431232341.txt.

4.8. Coordination with Anna, Becky, Robert, or others

Allegation. Kernan acted in coordination with other members of an online group, sharing knowledge of the submitter's vulnerabilities and using group communications to plan or justify the alleged facility intervention and later framing.

- The source says members lived together or communicated closely and refers to chats explaining why they went to the facility.
- It attributes related relays to Becky shortly before Anna allegedly released humiliating videos and says Kernan's communications should be evaluated in the same timeline.
- It alleges the group later blamed one another or changed their story after attempts to portray the submitter as the wrongdoer did not succeed.
- The source itself sometimes says 'I believe' or 'if I got the relays correct,' making the alleged agreement a subject for proof rather than a finding.

Why it matters. Agreement and coordinated acts could be relevant to conspiracy or aiding-and-abetting theories only if investigators identify a specific underlying offense, intentional participation, and, where required, an overt act. Association, shared residence, similar content, or parallel hostility is not enough.

Verification required. Preserve group chats, direct messages, email, call records, shared links, travel arrangements, and communications with the facility. Interview participants separately before disclosing the full evidentiary theory.

Source basis: 1647846.txt; few34322.txt; yut7889.txt; gaer4525424123.txt.

4.9. Rationalization of abuse as changing, toughening, or curing the submitter

Allegation. Kernan later claimed that the abusive conduct made the submitter fearless, changed him for the better, or cured his social anxiety and depression, thereby asserting control over the submitter and minimizing the harm.

- A segment titled 'How Sean changes Will' says Kernan repeatedly claimed credit for making the submitter fearless.
- Another passage says Kernan claimed to have cured the submitter by pushing him into insanity through abuse.
- The source says Kernan justified his theory by referring to his father breaking his arm and treating suffering as a method of producing strength or callousness.
- The submitter rejects the claimed benefit and says any improvement came from his own efforts while the alleged conduct left him stuck and preoccupied.

Why it matters. An authenticated admission or justification may show knowledge that the conduct was distressing and a deliberate purpose to alter the target through intimidation. It may also be hyperbole, misinterpretation, or a later argument disconnected from the original conduct; the exact wording is critical.

Verification required. Obtain the complete communication containing the alleged claim, including preceding and following messages. Determine who used the phrase, whether 'Sean' referred to Kernan, and whether the statement acknowledged any specific act.

Source basis: fewqr31323213.txt; ftiugygo6786.txt; uyiut7ty8.txt.

4.10. Competitive or retaliatory motive connected to investment rejection

Allegation. Kernan's hostility intensified after he competed for or sought an investment opportunity involving Adam, visited a Quora office, and was rejected or disfavored by Kelly Battles.

- The source places the investment episode before the cryonics-facility escalation, although it acknowledges uncertainty about the broader timeline.
- It says Kernan was represented by an 'Arnold Schwarzenegger' reference and that Kelly Battles expressed dislike or rejected that presentation.
- The source also remembers Kernan calling the submitter crazy while the submitter worked on a boat concept later associated with the investment.

Why it matters. A documented setback can supply motive, but motive does not prove conduct. This theory should be retained only if communications show Kernan knew of the decision, connected it to the submitter, and expressed retaliatory intent.

Verification required. Obtain investment communications, visitor records from the Quora office, statements from Adam and Kelly Battles, and any Kernan communications about the submitter immediately before and after the decision.

Source basis: gaer4525424123.txt; jou9u8098.txt; hwe431232341.txt; gret45646.txt; joi3jo2i332.txt.

4.11. Misleading narratives and attempted reversal of victim and offender roles

Allegation. After the conduct was challenged, Kernan supplied misleading explanations, reframed the submitter as dangerous, and attempted to make the alleged abuse appear therapeutic, justified, or responsive to the submitter.

- The source repeatedly asks investigators to compare Kernan's threatening upvotes with what he said to the facility and his team.
- It says Kernan admitted abuse but then made excuses, and it alleges story changes, blame shifting, and framing by the group.
- The submitter specifically asks witnesses to identify what had previously incriminated Kernan and what later statements were misleading.

Why it matters. Inconsistent accounts may affect credibility, but inconsistency is not obstruction by itself. A federal obstruction theory would require the elements of a specific statute, such as corrupt intent and a sufficient nexus to an official federal proceeding or investigation.

Verification required. Secure each account in its original form; identify the audience and date; compare it with objective records; and determine whether any statement was made under oath, to investigators, or with intent to alter or conceal evidence.

Source basis: 1647846.txt; giyu6768.txt; gret44232.txt; gyuut656.txt.

4.12. Resulting fear, emotional distress, and life disruption

Allegation. Kernan's alleged course of conduct caused sustained fear for the mother's preservation, severe emotional distress, compulsive monitoring of online relays, interruption of daily functioning, and a sense that the submitter's legal and personal future was trapped by an unseen process.

- The source describes the cryonics threat as directed simultaneously at the mother's remains and at the submitter's continued will to live.
- It says the submitter became preoccupied with screens and relays, repeatedly revisiting old events to prevent the allegations from being forgotten or misrepresented.
- It connects the situation to worsening insomnia, depression, social isolation, loss of productivity, and difficulty building an independent life.
- The compilation also contains many stressors unrelated to Kernan, so medical or functional causation cannot be assigned to Kernan without careful differential assessment.

Why it matters. Substantial emotional distress is an express component of 18 U.S.C. 2261A, but the government would need to prove the statutory intent, qualifying use of interstate facilities or travel, a course of conduct, causation, and the required mental state. Clinical evidence may corroborate impact but cannot establish who sent a communication.

Verification required. Collect contemporaneous journals, medical and counseling records with informed consent, communications to third parties made before later reinterpretation, and objective evidence of work or daily-life interruption. Separate Kernan-related effects from other alleged events.

Source basis: fewqr31323213.txt; gert3421323.txt; uyiut7ty8.txt; yut7889.txt.

5. Cumulative Pattern Assessment

The allegation is stronger as a sequence than as a collection of isolated images. The proposed sequence is: access to personal information; testing of a humiliating message; awareness of an unusually specific fear; selection of symbolic content tied to that fear; alleged travel or contact with the facility; continued communications after the visit; and later claims that the resulting distress changed or cured the submitter. If objective records verify that sequence, the combination could support an inference of intentional psychological targeting.

The same sequence is vulnerable to a central evidentiary challenge: most communications are described as indirect relays rather than explicit statements. A fish, archaeological article, film character, road, or news item may have many innocent meanings. Cumulative inference becomes legitimate only when the evidence establishes that Kernan selected the item, knew the private context, directed it to the submitter, repeated the pattern, and then took an external act consistent with the implied message.

The alleged facility contact is therefore the pivotal event. If no contact occurred, or if contact was unrelated and benign, the report's most serious inference weakens substantially. If facility records establish a visit closely following the messages, show that Kernan raised the mother's case, and corroborate a request that risked removal or warming, the online content would acquire materially greater contextual significance.

The later 'changed' or 'cured' rationale is potentially important but must not be paraphrased into an admission. Investigators should use the exact language. A statement that a public controversy made someone stronger is not equivalent to admitting deliberate harassment. A statement claiming responsibility for applying fear to cure a known condition would be more probative. The distinction can only be resolved from the complete record.

6. Federal Legal Screening Framework

Legal caution. The provisions below identify issues for investigation; they do not establish that a crime occurred. Federal jurisdiction and statutory mens rea are indispensable. State and Canadian offenses or civil claims may differ and are outside the defined U.S.-law scope of this report.

6.1 Interstate or cyberstalking - 18 U.S.C. 2261A

Section 2261A(1) addresses qualifying travel in interstate or foreign commerce undertaken with intent to kill, injure, harass, intimidate, or place another under surveillance with such intent, followed by conduct that causes specified fear or substantial emotional distress. Section 2261A(2) addresses use of the mail, an interactive computer service, electronic communication service or system, or another facility of interstate or foreign commerce, with the specified intent, to engage in a course of conduct producing the statutory fear or distress.

Potential fit: authenticated use of Quora or another interactive service, repeated targeted communications, prior knowledge of the submitter's vulnerability, alleged foreign travel to a Canadian facility, and documented substantial distress could be relevant. Missing proof includes the identity of the account holder, a course of conduct, the subject's intent, actual or reasonably expected statutory harm, the purpose of any travel, and the causal link between Kernan's acts and the distress.

6.2 Interstate threats - 18 U.S.C. 875(c)

Section 875(c) prohibits transmitting in interstate or foreign commerce a communication containing a threat to kidnap a person or injure another person. The alleged relays are highly contextual and may not contain an express threat to a living person. References to preserved remains, transport, or thawing do not automatically satisfy the statutory text. Investigators would need the complete communication, its context, the target, and evidence of the required mental state.

Constitutional and mens rea limits are central. *Elonis v. United States*, 575 U.S. 723 (2015), rejected conviction under section 875(c) based solely on how a reasonable person would understand the communication. *Counterman v. Colorado*, 600 U.S. 66 (2023), held that true-threat prosecutions require proof that the speaker had some subjective awareness of the threatening nature of the communication, with recklessness constitutionally sufficient. Ambiguous content cannot be criminalized merely because it distressed the recipient.

6.3 Conspiracy and aiding or abetting - 18 U.S.C. 371 and 18 U.S.C. 2

Section 371 applies when two or more people agree to commit an offense against the United States or defraud the United States and at least one performs an act to effect the object. Section 2 treats a person

who aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, procures, or willfully causes a federal offense as a principal. The source's references to a group, shared chats, and coordinated travel justify preservation requests, but they do not by themselves establish an agreement, a federal object, intentional assistance, or an overt act.

6.4 Witness tampering or obstruction - 18 U.S.C. 1512 and 1519

Section 1512 can reach intimidation, threats, corrupt persuasion, or misleading conduct used with specified intent concerning testimony, evidence, or communication to federal law enforcement. Section 1519 concerns knowingly altering, destroying, concealing, covering up, or falsifying records with intent to impede or influence a matter within federal jurisdiction or in contemplation of such a matter. The compilation's generalized references to a court, framing, or changing stories are insufficient. Investigators must identify an actual or contemplated federal matter, the relevant act, the statutory nexus, and corrupt intent.

6.5 Computer access - 18 U.S.C. 1030

The Computer Fraud and Abuse Act addresses specified unauthorized access to protected computers and related conduct. The compilation alleges hacking by other people but does not presently set out a particular unauthorized access by Kernan. His use of an ordinary account to post or upvote content, even if malicious, would not by itself establish a section 1030 offense. This statute should be retained only if forensic evidence links Kernan to unauthorized access, credential misuse, data acquisition, or intentional computer damage.

6.6 Preservation and lawful acquisition of platform evidence - 18 U.S.C. 2703

Section 2703(f) permits a governmental entity to require a service provider to preserve records and evidence in its possession for 90 days, renewable for an additional 90 days, pending legal process. Section 2703 specifies the different process required for content and non-content records. A private submitter can request voluntary preservation from counsel or a provider, but compulsory disclosure ordinarily requires authorized governmental process. Because the alleged events are old, providers may no longer retain the records; preservation should nevertheless be requested promptly for any remaining account data.

7. Alternative Explanations and Fairness Checks

- Misidentified speaker or account. 'Sean' may not always mean Sean Kernan, and an avatar, algorithmic association, share, or upvote may not prove authorship. Identity must be independently established for every material communication.
- Unrelated public content. News about fish, archaeology, tetanus, travel, films, or cryonics may have been posted for general reasons. Investigators should compare Kernan's ordinary posting themes before and after the alleged period.
- Retrospective pattern formation. The compilation was written years after at least some events. Memory can preserve central experiences while losing exact order and context. Contemporaneous records should control where recollection conflicts with metadata.

- Benign facility contact. Kernan may have contacted or visited the facility for a lawful purpose, or the facility reference may concern a different location. Staff accounts and records should be obtained before inferring hostile intent.
- Lawful complaint or investigation request. Providing truthful information or asking authorities to investigate is not criminal merely because the request distressed another person. Liability would depend on falsity, threats, deception, unauthorized conduct, or the elements of a specific offense.
- No agreement among associates. Friendship, shared housing, parallel posting, or common hostility does not establish conspiracy. An agreement and intentional participation in a particular unlawful objective must be shown.
- Protected speech. Cruelty, ridicule, or offensive commentary may remain constitutionally protected. A criminal threat or stalking theory must meet statutory and First Amendment mental-state requirements.
- Causation from multiple stressors. The source describes many unrelated actors and events. Distress should not be attributed to Kernan without evidence separating his alleged conduct from other causes.
- Later justification not an admission. A claim that adversity made someone stronger may be boastful or insensitive without admitting responsibility for a threat or facility intervention. The complete wording and context are indispensable.

8. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Plan

8.1 Immediate preservation

- Preserve the submitter's original devices, local archives, browser history, exported Quora data, email, screenshots, downloaded media, and file-system timestamps. Work from forensic copies and retain originals unchanged.
- Send a narrowly tailored preservation request identifying Kernan accounts, suspected aliases, relevant date ranges, URLs, post IDs, upvotes, shares, direct messages, login records, subscriber information, IP logs, deletion history, and linked-content metadata.
- Request that the cryonics facility preserve visitor logs, telephone and email records, access-control data, surveillance, incident reports, staff notes, correspondence about the mother, and any communication referring to an online channel or investigation.
- Preserve communications held by Adam, Kelly Battles, Anna, Becky, Robert, facility personnel, and any witness who contemporaneously interpreted the relays or observed the visit.
- Record chain of custody for every item, including who collected it, when, from which device or account, how it was transferred, and its cryptographic hash where feasible.

8.2 Chronology protocol

- Anchor the timeline with objective dates: investment communications, the disclosure of fear about removal from the tank, each alleged upvote or relay, travel, facility contact, any request to stop, and later 'changed' or 'cured' statements.
- Use UTC timestamps and retain time-zone information. Do not rely on screenshot display time without obtaining the platform's underlying record.
- Separate publication time, time viewed by the submitter, time interpreted, and time later documented. They are not necessarily the same.
- Test both directions of inference: whether Kernan posted after learning the private detail, and whether the submitter had publicly discussed the same imagery before Kernan posted it.

8.3 Witness interviews

- Facility personnel: Did Kernan visit or communicate? What identity did he use? What did he ask for? Did he mention the mother, an investigation, tank removal, transport, or an online channel? What action did staff take?
- Adam and Kelly Battles: Was Kernan involved in an investment opportunity? Was he rejected? Did he express anger toward the submitter? Did he later provide or preserve the alleged Quora relays?
- Online-group participants: What did each person understand by 'white noise,' fish in a briefcase, the short trip, and other references before learning the submitter's later interpretation? Was there an agreement to target the mother's preservation?
- Kernan: Which accounts were his? Did he know of the submitter's fears and mental-health history? Why did he post or upvote each item? Did he contact the facility? What did he mean by claims of changing or curing the submitter?

8.4 Authentication questions

- Can the account be tied to Kernan by provider records, verified email or phone, payment data, IP history, device identifiers, or admissions?
- Is the item complete, or has surrounding text, linked material, audience selection, or a later edit been omitted?
- Was the alleged message directed to the submitter, publicly posted, or merely encountered through a recommendation algorithm?
- Can an independent witness confirm the interpretation from contemporaneous knowledge rather than retrospective explanation?
- Do the facility and platform records corroborate one another without relying on the submitter's inference?

9. Allegation-to-Evidence Matrix

Issue	Current source support	Decisive evidence	Present status
White-noise taunt	Repeated direct attribution in the compilation.	Original account record, timestamp, recipient context, related group messages.	Unverified; high authentication value.
Coded threatening relays	Repeated descriptions of fish, decomposition, tetanus, and travel imagery.	Complete posts/upvotes, account ownership, knowledge of the private fear, sequence.	Unverified and interpretation-dependent.
Knowledge of vulnerability	Source says Kernan knew of suicide risk, anxiety, depression, and cryonics fear.	Messages showing receipt or discussion of those facts before the alleged relays.	Unverified but potentially provable.
Facility visit/contact	Many repeated statements, with varying descriptions of purpose.	Visitor logs, staff testimony, surveillance, calls, emails, travel records.	Pivotal disputed fact.
Attempted tank removal	Express allegation, but no attached request or facility record.	Exact statement to staff or authorities and resulting facility action.	Serious; presently unsupported by primary evidence.
Coordination	References to group chats, shared relays, and collective activity.	Chats, travel planning, common objective, individual acts.	Association alleged; agreement not shown.
Changed/cured admission	Two source segments attribute this rationale to Kernan.	Complete original communication and identity proof.	Potentially probative; wording uncertain.
Investment motive	Source places rejection before facility escalation.	Investment records and retaliatory communications.	Possible motive only.
Emotional harm	Extensive first-person descriptions of fear and life disruption.	Contemporaneous journals, medical evidence, third-party observations, causal analysis.	Impact alleged; attribution requires separation.

10. Requested Findings and Lawful Next Steps

The compilation supports a focused request for investigation, not a final adjudication. A competent authority should determine:

- whether the relevant accounts, upvotes, shares, and messages were controlled by Sean Kernan;
- whether Kernan knew of the submitter's specific fear and mental-health vulnerability before the alleged communications;
- whether the alleged content was directed to the submitter and formed a repeated course of conduct;

- whether Kernan traveled to or contacted the cryonics facility, what he said, and what action he intended or requested;
- whether any communication constituted a true threat under the applicable subjective-awareness standard;
- whether Kernan acted with others pursuant to an agreement to commit a defined offense, or intentionally aided a defined offense;
- whether any misleading statement, deletion, concealment, or falsification was connected to a federal proceeding or matter with the required corrupt intent; and
- what emotional and practical harm can be causally attributed to authenticated Kernan conduct.

Pending those findings, the proportionate next steps are evidence preservation, authentication, neutral witness interviews, and assessment by counsel familiar with cross-border electronic evidence. The report does not support assigning a sentence or other punishment before proof, charging authority, jurisdiction, and adjudication are established.

11. Conclusion

If the core sequence is verified, the alleged conduct would not be a collection of harmless jokes. It would describe purposeful use of personal information and online services to exploit an acute vulnerability, followed by an external intervention at the location connected to that vulnerability and later rationalization of the resulting distress. The alleged knowledge, timing, repetition, cross-border component, and claimed facility act are the cumulative factors that make the matter worthy of serious investigation.

At present, however, the primary evidence has not been produced. The decisive questions are concrete: who controlled the accounts, what exactly was communicated, when Kernan learned the private facts, whether he went to or contacted the facility, what he asked staff to do, and whether the later statements acknowledged intentional abuse. The integrity of the submission depends on answering those questions without presuming either guilt or innocence.

Appendix A - Source Segment Index

The following component filenames contain the principal Kernan-specific passages relied upon. They are internal labels from the supplied compilation, not independent exhibits:

- 154864.txt: White-noise message; sexual-humiliation context; alleged continuation after forgiveness.
- 1647846.txt: Threatening upvote; knowledge of cryonics fear; alleged facility statements and group framing.
- faewr324322.txt: Relative order: cyberbullying complaints dropped, facility entry alleged, continued attacks.
- few34322.txt: Request to recover Kernan upvotes; alleged chilling messages; group chats and facility timeline.
- fewqr31323213.txt: Changed/fearless rationale; father's broken-arm reference; fish-in-suitcase and travel relays; facility entry.
- ftiugygo6786.txt: Supportive-post versus abusive-upvote pattern; alleged admission and rationale.
- gaer4525424123.txt: Investment rejection; alleged entry into cryonics facility; attempt to forgive group.
- gret44232.txt: Alleged pre-visit threats, admission, facility purpose, and post-forgiveness timing.
- gyuut656.txt: Claims of repeated framing and later misleading accounts.
- hwe431232341.txt: Alleged alarming taunts followed by facility contact; investment rejection timing.
- jijij3oii2ji.txt: Express allegation that cruel relays preceded facility conduct and were intended to affect the mother and psyche.
- jou9u8098.txt: Timeline qualification and investment-competition allegation.
- pjo3kpo3k3.txt: Alleged attempt to trigger investigation after Quora threats.
- uyiut7ty8.txt: Claim that Kernan portrayed abuse as curing the submitter.
- yut7889.txt: Most detailed inventory of alleged cryonics-related relays and express uncertainty about timeline and interpretation.

Appendix B - Federal Authorities

- [18 U.S.C. 2261A - Stalking](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 875 - Interstate communications](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 2 - Principals](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 371 - Conspiracy to commit offense or defraud United States](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 1030 - Fraud and related activity in connection with computers](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 1512 - Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 1519 - Destruction, alteration, or falsification of records](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 2703 - Required disclosure and preservation of electronic records](#)
- [Counterman v. Colorado, 600 U.S. 66 \(2023\)](#)

Appendix C - Submission Integrity Checklist

- Do not replace original files with edited copies. Preserve originals and work from duplicates.
- Do not crop screenshots in a way that removes account name, URL, time, surrounding context, or device clock.
- Label recollection separately from documentary proof and record confidence in exact wording and order.
- Do not attribute a group act to Kernan without evidence of his individual participation.
- Do not describe a charge, conviction, court, or sentence as established without a docket or certified record.
- Provide exculpatory material and benign explanations together with inculpatory material.
- Ask investigators to preserve evidence and determine facts; do not ask a platform employee or private witness to disclose material unlawfully.
- Update this report if primary records contradict the chronology or show that a relay was unrelated or misattributed.