

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Statement and Request for Investigation

Concerning the 2022-2024 Observations Regarding the Reporting Party's Sister and Her Husband

Source reviewed: Journal_work/Journal dated archive | 8,323 dated HTML files | 3,948 matched entries

Prepared July 1, 2026 from the 2022-2024 journal archive

Status: Allegation summary and investigative lead memorandum. This document does not determine guilt or punishment.

Contents

Preliminary Conditional Statement

Executive Summary

1. Scope and Method
 2. Executive Allegation Theory
 3. Alleged Joint Conduct
 4. Poisoning and Breach of Trust
 5. Mother's Medical Vulnerability and Cryonics
 6. Husband's Alleged Gloating
 7. Defamation, Framing, and Reversal of Blame
 8. Inheritance, Faked Death, and Financial Motive
 9. Ideas, Property, and False Collaboration
 10. Victim-State and Reactive-Anger Defense
 11. Legal Mapping for Authorities
 12. Evidence Requests
 13. Conclusion
- Appendix A. Source Index
- Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

Preliminary Conditional Statement

All assertions in this report are allegations and observations supplied by the reporting party. If the conduct described below occurred, it should be investigated under the law of every jurisdiction with a legitimate connection to the conduct. This report does not determine guilt, establish that an online communication came from a particular person, diagnose any person, or ask a court to substitute accusation for proof.

The source repeatedly distinguishes between events the reporting party says he directly witnessed, records he says exist or were previously displayed, and conclusions he drew from indirect online material described as relays. That distinction is retained throughout this report.

Executive Summary

The reporting party alleges a long course of conduct by his sister and her husband involving physical danger, psychological abuse, family isolation, property-related fraud, reputational attacks, alleged poisoning, and attempts to reframe his reactive anger as the origin of the conflict.

The most serious themes are alleged joint poisoning through food, alleged conduct around the mother's medical vulnerability and cryonics preservation, the husband's alleged gloating after the mother's death, alleged defamatory framing, and possible inheritance or false-death communications requiring corroboration.

Source Extraction Summary

Metric	Result
Journal files reviewed	2022-07 through 2024-12 HTML archive
Total dated HTML files in range	8,323
Entries with sister/husband/legal-context keyword hits	3,948
Joint-conduct hits	98 entries
Mother / cryonics / refund hits	1,214 entries
Poisoning hits	46 entries
Death-gloating hits	251 entries
Defamation / framing hits	1,097 entries
Suicide-pressure context hits	188 entries
Email / relay / Vanuatu context hits	2,090 entries
Ideas / presentation / property hits	1,410 entries

Scope and Method

This report is written as a formal synthesis of the reporting victim's 2022-2024 observations. It does not ask the reader to accept guilt as already adjudicated. It organizes the observations, identifies incriminating patterns, and maps them to legal questions that investigators, counsel, or a court would need to test against records, witnesses, messages, medical evidence, computer logs, and jurisdictional facts.

The present extraction prioritizes the named subjects: the user's sister and the sister's husband. Other people, public figures, relays, or platform references are included only where they help explain the alleged conduct by those two subjects, the user's state of fear, or the evidentiary logic. Violent or angry language in the raw journal is treated as distress evidence and not as a request for unlawful action.

The archive search covered dated HTML journal entries from 2022-07 through 2024-12. The report uses source IDs in month/file form, for example 2024-01/06813. These IDs point back to the local archive paths under Journal_work/Journal.

Executive Allegation Theory

Across the journal, the user's theory is that his sister and her husband acted as a joint unit during periods of extreme vulnerability: the mother's illness and death, the user's grief and suicide-risk history, later public/channel proceedings, and attempts to claim or discredit ideas. The alleged jointness is not limited to one dramatic act. It is described as a pattern of shared knowledge, shared benefit, silent approval, financial involvement, coordinated narratives, and use of family trust as a weapon.

The central incriminating logic is that the alleged conduct relied on trust and proximity. Food, family access, financial help, medical crisis, reconciliation emails, and later public narratives are alleged to have been used not for care but for control. The user repeatedly distinguishes his own reaction as verbal, distressed, and often followed by apology, while describing the subjects' alleged actions as covert, premeditated, and physically or psychologically dangerous.

The report therefore asks authorities to test whether the sister and husband used private family trust to create bodily danger, then used public or semi-public narratives to reverse blame, discredit the victim, minimize the mother's vulnerability, and shield themselves from accountability.

Alleged Joint Conduct

The strongest joint-conduct entry is 2024-01/06813. It states that the sister poisoned the user's food 'not once' but many times, that this was done with the husband, that the husband later gloated after the mother's death, and that the refund issue was tied to his money. This is not framed as a single isolated grievance; the entry presents the husband as materially and emotionally aligned with the sister's alleged wrongdoing.

Entry 2023-04/03165 similarly presents the sister and husband as a pair in multiple alleged harms: attempted harm toward the mother after brain aneurysm surgery, poisoning of the user's food, refund intent regarding the mother's cryonics account, and defamatory attacks. It describes the sister as becoming more violent in covert forms as she became older and as she acted with the husband.

Entry 2024-02/06986 states that both sister and husband were 'together in this' and asks investigators to check channel access, IP address evidence, and motives requiring the husband's approval. This matters because joint action can be proven by communications, shared access, shared planning, or shared benefit, not only by physical presence at every event.

Entry 2024-11/08706 states the theory plainly: if the husband stayed silent while the sister attempted theft or harm, that silence was supporting partnership; it also states the alleged rat poisoning was 'done together' and not separate. This is a request for investigators to examine the chat record rather than rely on family narratives.

Poisoning and Breach of Trust

The poisoning allegation appears repeatedly and with more detail than a generalized insult. Entry 2023-01/02089 states that chats contained something about 'rat poison,' that the subjects used this to make the user sick, and that the user experienced chronic bleeding in the toilet over years. Entry 2023-01/02256 estimates that if the relays and chat are true, the number of poisoned-food incidents over nine years would be immense.

Entry 2024-05/07514 explains the incriminating importance of food as trust. The user argues that even if prior verbal conflict existed, any conflict had been settled, and using food later would be a renewed act through deceit rather than a defensive response. The source asks authorities to isolate whether any chat actually states poisoning was revenge for an alleged assault, or whether that explanation is a later adaptation.

Entry 2024-10/08394 attacks a possible 'marinating' explanation as after-the-fact adaptation. The user argues that poison designed to kill a mammal remains a lethal substance regardless of later claims about dilution or diminished effect. Entry 2024-09/08171 also frames the conduct as chemical harm and contrasts it against the user's venting: the user alleges he vented verbally, while they acted physically.

If corroborated by messages, medical evidence, purchase records, witness statements, or admissions, the poisoning allegation would be the most serious bodily-harm branch of the report. If not corroborated, the repeated entries still show why the user experienced later family conduct as life-threatening and why authorities should not treat his anger as free-floating malice.

Mother's Medical Vulnerability and Cryonics

The mother-related entries contain two connected issues: alleged harm or pressure while she was medically fragile, and alleged attempts to disturb or control the cryonics/preservation process after death. The user repeatedly states that his mother had a brain aneurysm condition, that increased blood pressure could be fatal, and that the sister allegedly tried to enter or confront her after surgery.

Entry 2024-08/08049 describes the user blocking the sister from entering the mother's room after the first aneurysm surgery, with one more surgery pending. The user admits he later used a severe verbal threat toward the sister, but frames it as defense of the mother and says he returned and apologized because he feared revenge against the mother.

Entry 2024-05/07538 similarly states that the sister tried to harm the mother when she had just had surgery, and that the user's harsh reactions were responses to the sister's initiation. Entry 2024-11/08560 adds a cost motive: the sister allegedly wanted to enter the mother's room because the situation was 'costing me too much.'

On cryonics, entry 2024-01/06813 states that the user warned the cryonics facility shortly after the mother's cryonization about concern over refund attempts. The entry links refund intent, the husband's money, the user's known suicide-risk history, and the husband's alleged gloating as evidence of dangerous intent. Entry 2024-08/08049 emphasizes that removing the mother from the tank would be fatal to the user's preservation hopes and that any investigation must protect, not defile, the mother.

Husband's Alleged Gloating

The husband's alleged gloating is one of the most repeated intent markers. Entry 2024-01/06813 states that after the mother's death the husband said he knew what was coming, gloated over her death, and angrily responded that he would support the sister's wrongdoing. Entry 2023-02/02505 states the husband admitted inside their chat that he gloated in the car and knew the outcome.

Entry 2024-10/08372 gives the fullest emotional description: the user asks how a person should feel if a brother-in-law was ecstatically happy and gloating at the mother's death in the car hours later, defending the sister's deeds by yelling agreement. Entry 2023-04/03211 rejects a mother-suicide narrative and says the husband was gloating at her death, saying he knew this was coming.

The report does not treat gloating alone as proof of homicide. The incriminating value is more specific: if corroborated, the statement could show consciousness of harm, lack of remorse, knowledge of the mother's vulnerability, support for the sister's conduct, and motive to later recast the victim's reactions as the real problem.

Defamation, Framing, and Reversal of Blame

The journal repeatedly alleges that the sister and husband used sexualized defamation, assault reversal, and family narratives to destroy the user's credibility. Entry 2023-01/02278 lists slander/framing themes, including claims that the user 'slept with mother' and that he hit the sister. Entry 2023-01/02089 describes an insinuation through a Korean movie about an autistic person and his mother, which the user interpreted as a covert incest insinuation.

Entry 2024-05/07514 states that the sister could not credibly claim physical injury by the user because the mother would have reacted strongly and told others if it were true. The user says his conduct was verbal, while the sister had a history of knife threats and extreme reactions. Entry 2024-01/06738 similarly points to reconciliation emails and argues that if the user had physically harmed the sister, that would have appeared in their reconciliation communications.

Entry 2024-02/06986 states that the sister diluted events through words and made verbal anger look like physical harm. The user asks that this alleged framing be charged as well if used to mislead authorities or public judgment. The legal significance is that a false narrative can become more than family slander if it is used in an official proceeding, to obstruct

investigation, to induce official action, to obtain property, or to conceal underlying crimes.

Inheritance, Faked Death, and Financial Motive

The inheritance branch is weaker in volume but important as a possible motive requiring corroboration. Entry 2024-10/08372 asks whether the sister and husband tried faking the user's death to the clan to obtain inheritance money. The user marks it as conditional: 'IF that happened.' That conditional language should be preserved because the claim requires records.

Entry 2024-11/08535 states that a relay about faking death could connect to inheritance and rat poisoning as health-damage motive. Entry 2024-11/08560 links the sister's hierarchy in the clan, cost pressure, and inheritance motive. These entries should trigger evidence requests, not unsupported conclusions.

Relevant evidence would include estate communications, clan/family messages, banking records, insurance or beneficiary records, any document identifying the user as deceased, and any communications between the sister, husband, and extended family about the user's status, inheritance, or incapacity.

Ideas, Property, and False Collaboration

The user also alleges that the subjects may have tried to enter the later idea/property dispute by claiming collaboration or ownership. Entry 2024-05/07498 states that the user last saw them in person about 14 years earlier, avoided them, had no meaningful intellectual collaboration with them, and would treat any later claim of collaboration as a blatant lie.

Entry 2024-11/08706 refers to a repeated 'collaborative piano' relay and states that silence while the sister attempts theft is supporting partnership. The report treats this branch as secondary to bodily harm and mother-related allegations, but it matters because the user sees the same method: create doubt, exploit lack of timestamps, recast the victim as unstable or dishonest, and benefit from the confusion.

If any sister/husband claim of authorship, collaboration, or ownership was transmitted electronically, submitted to an authority, or used for money/property benefit, it becomes potentially relevant to fraud, false-statement, computer, or obstruction statutes depending on jurisdiction and evidence.

Victim-State and Reactive-Anger Defense

A major purpose of this report is to prevent the user's anger from being separated from the alleged initiating conduct. The source entries repeatedly distinguish initiative from reaction. The user admits severe verbal anger, including violent language and threats in moments of distress, but frames those as verbal reactions to alleged poisoning, threats toward the mother, gloating at death, defamation, and attempts to disturb the mother's preservation.

Entry 2024-01/06813 states the timing argument: the user's angry voice recording was only weeks before the mother's death, while the alleged poisoning was years earlier. Entry 2024-08/08049 states that the throat threat occurred after the sister allegedly threatened the mother through the user, and that the user apologized afterward because he feared

revenge against the mother.

Entries 2023-05/03650 and 2023-05/03879 explain that the user's later instability and severe conduct were tied to trauma concerning the sister and husband, not an unrelated grudge. This distinction matters for fair assessment: if the user was reacting to cumulative family harm, then his angry statements should be assessed as distress evidence and potential mitigation, not as a clean motive for unrelated aggression.

Legal Mapping for Authorities

The following statutes are not asserted as automatic charges. They are legal routing points for authorities to evaluate if jurisdictional facts exist. Some alleged conduct occurred in Canada or in family settings and may be governed by Canadian or provincial law rather than U.S. federal law. U.S. federal statutes become more relevant if conduct involved U.S. persons, U.S. proceedings, interstate or foreign wires, protected computers, federal officers, federal investigations, or matters within U.S. jurisdiction.

18 U.S.C. 241 may be relevant if two or more persons conspired to injure, oppress, threaten, or intimidate the user in the exercise of rights secured by U.S. law. 18 U.S.C. 242 is relevant only if a person acted under color of law; it is not normally a private-family statute.

18 U.S.C. 371 may be relevant if there was a conspiracy to commit a U.S. offense or defraud the United States. 18 U.S.C. 1030 may be relevant if any hacking, unauthorized access, account access, or use of protected computers is corroborated.

18 U.S.C. 1343 and 1349 may be relevant if false claims, property claims, inheritance claims, or idea/property schemes used interstate or foreign wire communications. 18 U.S.C. 1001, 1621, and 1622 may be relevant if materially false statements were made to U.S. authorities, under oath, or procured from another.

18 U.S.C. 1512 and 1519 may be relevant if subjects used intimidation, misleading conduct, or record falsification to affect testimony, communication with law enforcement, or federal investigation. 18 U.S.C. 875 and 2261A may be relevant if interstate or foreign communications contained threats, harassment, surveillance, fear of bodily injury, or substantial emotional distress.

Evidence Requests

Investigators should obtain the original chat records between the sister and husband, including any references to rat poison, food, the mother's illness, refund, cryonics, inheritance, the user's supposed death, or explanations for the user's illness. Metadata and timestamps are essential.

Investigators should review reconciliation emails, especially any admission that the user avoided the sister, any discussion of prior conflicts, any physical-harm allegations, and any contrast between the user's verbal apology and the subjects' alleged covert conduct.

Medical evidence should be reviewed for the user's claimed chronic bleeding, food-related illness, hospital visits, and any possible toxicology or symptoms consistent or inconsistent with poisoning. The report does not claim medical proof; it requests medical testing of the allegation where records remain available.

Cryonics and account records should be preserved, including any refund request, attempted account change, contact with the facility, or communication about moving, disturbing, or testing the mother's preserved remains. The report asks that preservation safety be treated as central evidence, not an obstacle.

Family and estate records should be checked for any communication suggesting the user was dead, incapacitated, disinherited, or excluded, and whether such statements were connected to inheritance, clan standing, or family reputation.

Any public/channel records should be reviewed for defamatory claims, including incest insinuations, physical-assault allegations, false collaboration claims, idea/property claims, and any statement that uses the user's distress as proof while omitting the alleged initiating conduct.

Conclusion

The 2022-2024 archive presents a coherent allegation pattern: the sister and husband are described as exploiting trust, family vulnerability, food, the mother's medical crisis, cryonics grief, and later public narratives. The husband is not peripheral in the user's theory. He is repeatedly described as a joint actor, financier, silent approver, gloating witness, and participant in or beneficiary of the sister's conduct.

The most serious factual issues for investigation are: alleged rat-poison food incidents; the mother's post-surgery vulnerability and the sister's attempted access; the alleged refund/cryonics threat; the husband's alleged gloating and support of wrongdoing; defamatory framing around incest and physical assault; and any inheritance or false-death communications. Each point must be tested against records. If corroborated, the pattern would show not mere family conflict but a sustained course of dangerous, deceptive, and coercive conduct.

The user's anger should be assessed in context. The archive repeatedly admits anger but ties it to alleged prior harm, grief, fear for the mother, and perceived reversal of blame. A lawful assessment should therefore separate verbal distress and revenge rhetoric from alleged covert bodily harm, financial/control conduct, and deliberate narrative construction by the subjects.

Source Index

Source ID	Observation Use
2023-01/02089	Rat poison chat; chronic bleeding; food/trust; hostile household context.
2023-01/02256	Alleged repeated poisoned food over years; each food event as separate act if corroborated.
2023-01/02278	Channel slander/framing themes: 'slept with mother,' assault reversal, refund/destruction.
2023-02/02505	Joint handling through their chat; husband allegedly gloated and knew the outcome.
2023-03/02835	Cryonics/hospital context; refusal of help and timing pressure after mother's death.
2023-04/03108	Poisoning, bleeding stools, reconciliation emails, avoidance, verbal reaction framing.
2023-04/03165	Enumerates alleged harm to mother, poisoned food, knives incident, refund intent, defamation.
2023-04/03211	Rejects 'mother suicide' narrative; sister recording mother; husband gloating as intent evidence.
2023-05/03650	User explains conduct after trauma as tied to sister/husband, not unrelated grudge.
2023-07/05113	Treadmill injury, food illness, sushi/bleeding, trust exploitation, car-window defense.
2024-01/06738	Reconciliation emails and denial of physical assault; sister/husband joint charge theory.
2024-01/06813	Central synthesis: repeated poisoning, husband gloating, refund, joint intent, reactive anger defense.
2024-02/06986	IP/channel check theory; both sister and husband alleged together; slander and defamation.
2024-04/07322	Support of sister/husband framed as antagonism; initiator/reactor distinction.
2024-05/07498	Possible collaborative-piano/idea claim; last in-person contact 14 years prior; no collaboration.
2024-05/07514	Knives event, no physical harm by user, poisoning excuse, food as breach of trust.
2024-05/07538	Sister's alleged psychological abuse, mother-room incident, food poisoning, refund.
2024-08/08049	Mother-room threat context; self-defense; cryonics jurisdiction; do not disturb mother.
2024-10/08372	Faking death/inheritance suspicion; brother-in-law car gloating; no direct charge without records.
2024-10/08394	Poison 'marinating' adaptation theory; poison as mammal-killing substance; image management.
2024-11/08535	Inheritance/faking death relay; rat poisoning as health-damage motive.
2024-11/08560	Mother room after first brain surgery; cost pressure; hierarchy and inheritance motive.
2024-11/08706	Jointness theory: silence/support as partnership; rat poisoning not separate; check chat.

U.S. Legal Sources

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

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

18 U.S.C. 371 - Conspiracy to commit offense or defraud the United States: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section371>

18 U.S.C. 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. 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. 1030 - Fraud and related activity in connection with computers: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?req=%28title%3A18+section%3A1030+edition%3Aprelim%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>

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=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-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>