

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

# Statement and Request for Investigation

Concerning the Alleged Conduct of the Reporting Party's  
Elder Sister and Her Husband

Named subjects: Inhee (surname not supplied) and Son Young-seok  
Source reviewed: combinedSisterandherhusband.txt | 193 source units  
Prepared June 28, 2026

**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. Relationship History and Alleged Pattern

3. Alleged Physical Danger to the Reporting Party

4. Alleged Conduct Concerning the Mother

5. Alleged Interference With Cryonics Preservation

6. Alleged Inheritance and Identity Fraud

7. Alleged Defamation, False Accusations, and Social Destruction

8. Alleged Monitoring, Gaslighting, and Manipulation of Communications

9. Alleged Appropriation and Reattribution of Ideas

10. The Husband's Alleged Independent and Joint Conduct

11. Claimed Justifications and the Reporting Party's Response

12. Applicable U.S. Legal Issues, Subject to Proof and Jurisdiction

13. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests

14. Reliability, Corroboration, and Fairness Safeguards

15. Cumulative Assessment

16. Requested Lawful Action

Conclusion

Appendix A. Source-Unit Cross-Reference

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. Its purposes are to preserve the reporting party's account, organize the alleged conduct by event and theory, identify material capable of confirming or disproving the allegations, and request a fair investigation. Every charging decision, factual finding, and sentence remains exclusively for competent investigators, prosecutors, and courts applying the required burden of 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. An allegation grounded only in an interpreted relay is not treated as proof of authorship, participation, motive, or criminal conduct. It is listed as an investigative lead only when it connects to a specific, independently verifiable record.

## Executive Summary

The reporting party alleges a long course of conduct by his elder sister and her husband involving physical danger, psychological abuse, deception, family isolation, property-related fraud, reputational attacks, and alleged appropriation of his technical concepts. The central allegations are not that the subjects merely argued with him or failed to support him. They are that they allegedly used trust, family access, private communications, and an information imbalance to cause or threaten concrete harm while later presenting his angry reactions as the origin of the conflict.

The most serious allegation is that the subjects jointly placed rat poison or another toxic substance in food provided to the reporting party while he lived separately. He identifies sushi or California rolls among the foods and states that the husband worked as a sushi chef. He says the poisoning occurred on multiple occasions, caused severe illness including blood in his stool, and preceded the later statements the subjects may use to portray him as dangerous. He further says a private chat between the subjects discussed or admitted the poisoning. This allegation requires immediate preservation and forensic examination of the original chat data, devices, backups, and any contemporaneous medical or witness evidence. The source compilation by itself does not establish what substance, if any, was used.

The reporting party also alleges conduct directed at his mother during a period of grave vulnerability following brain-aneurysm surgery. He describes personally blocking his sister from entering their mother's room because he believed the sister intended to confront or violently scold her, thereby raising her blood pressure while another aneurysm remained. He alleges that the sister later recorded their mother during transport to the hospital rather than candidly explaining what preceded the emergency. He does not present direct proof in this compilation that either subject caused the mother's death. He asks investigators to examine that possibility because of the prior episode, the sister's alleged later communications, and the husband's alleged statement immediately after the death that he “knew this was going to happen,” delivered in a happy or excited tone while defending the sister's conduct. The

death-related allegation must therefore be divided into what is directly asserted as witnessed, what may be documented, and what remains a suspicion requiring medical and documentary review.

The report further alleges that the sister sought or threatened a refund from the mother's cryonics account, despite knowing that preservation was central to the reporting party and that interruption could permanently defeat its purpose. The source is inconsistent on whether the earliest conduct was an actual refund request, a threat, or an insinuation. Later passages describe an attempted refund as fact. The proper resolution is to obtain the cryonics provider's complete account, billing, authorization, communication, and access history.

Additional allegations concern: a knife incident during the siblings' youth; repeated ridicule of the reporting party's body and intelligence; deliberate provocation followed by selective retelling of his reactions; false claims that he beat his sister; false sexual and incestuous accusations involving the sister, the husband, and the mother; portrayal of the reporting party as mentally or intellectually deficient; disclosure or circulation of private communications; a false report that he was dead in order to divert inheritance; and efforts to claim ownership of or credit for technical concepts after years of observing his work.

The husband's alleged responsibility is not based on marriage alone or on silence in the abstract. The source attributes independent conduct to him: participation in the alleged poisoning chat and food delivery; passive-aggressive conduct followed by denial; the hospital-day statement; express defense of the sister's actions; alleged participation in online monitoring; alleged involvement in inheritance and idea-credit claims; and continued support for particular defamatory statements in which he was himself a participant in the story. Where the only alleged act is silence, that fact alone cannot establish criminal liability. Where evidence shows knowing assistance, agreement, inducement, concealment, or an overt act, however, his responsibility should be assessed independently rather than erased by treating him as a passive spouse.

The reporting party acknowledges that the subjects provided some financial help after their mother became ill and that the husband paid or helped pay cryonics expenses. He disputes the scale and meaning of that support, stating that his mother had previously earned income by teaching art and that the subjects' assistance lasted for a limited period. More importantly, financial assistance does not answer whether later poisoning, fraud, defamation, intimidation, or interference occurred. It is relevant context, not immunity.

The requested outcome is a lawful, evidence-based investigation. The report does not request a predetermined punishment. It asks authorities to preserve evidence, test the allegations, separate direct records from interpretation, and charge only offenses whose elements and jurisdiction can be proved.

## 1. Scope and Method

### 1.1 Complete-source review

The compilation was reviewed as 193 complete source units rather than as isolated quotations. The units contain substantial repetition and considerable material about people other than the named subjects. Unrelated material has been excluded. Repeated statements have been synthesized into the distinct allegations below, while variations that materially affect reliability have been retained.

## 1.2 Evidentiary classifications

This report uses four classifications:

1. **Directly recalled event:** an event the reporting party says he personally saw, heard, experienced, sent, or received.
2. **Asserted record:** an email, chat, account action, photograph, video, medical record, platform log, or other item the reporting party says exists or was previously shown.
3. **Corroborated inference sought:** a conclusion drawn from a recalled event plus one or more records, requiring independent confirmation.
4. **Relay-based inference:** a conclusion drawn substantially from an online recommendation, thumbnail, cultural reference, or other indirect signal. Such material is not treated as proof that a subject authored, controlled, or endorsed it.

## 1.3 Limits

The compilation is a witness statement and lead index, not a substitute for original evidence. It does not contain toxicology results, authenticated exports of the alleged chats, the full email headers, certified hospital records, probate records, cryonics account logs, or verified platform attribution. It also spans conduct said to have occurred in South Korea, Canada, the United States, Vanuatu, and online.

Governing law and jurisdiction must be determined event by event.

## 2. Relationship History and Alleged Pattern

The reporting party describes the relationship as one in which conflict repeatedly appeared to be resolved, after which the subjects allegedly revived hostility privately or through indirect acts. He says he often lived separately, sought distance, apologized after angry exchanges, and relied on family gestures such as receiving food as signs of reconciliation. In his account, this made the alleged use of food as a delivery method especially significant: the harm would have depended on a renewed appearance of trust rather than on an immediate confrontation.

He alleges a recurring sequence:

1. the sister initiated ridicule, provocation, threats, or harmful conduct;
2. the husband presented himself as neutral or understanding while privately supporting her;
3. the reporting party reacted verbally and then attempted to reconcile or withdraw;
4. the subjects allegedly preserved or circulated only the reaction, omitting the preceding conduct;
5. the omitted context was then used to isolate him from relatives, depict him as dangerous, or justify further measures; and
6. when challenged, the subjects allegedly denied intent, characterized sustained conduct as a joke, or relied on their financial support as moral credit.

This alleged pattern is not proved merely because it is repeated in the source. It is testable. Investigators should compare the complete chronology of communications, not selected excerpts, and identify who contacted whom, what each person knew at the time, whether reconciliation occurred, and whether later acts were defensive, retaliatory, opportunistic, or unrelated.

## 2.1 Working chronology to be verified

The source supplies the following approximate sequence. Dates other than the mother's death are not treated as established:

1. During the reporting party's teenage years, the sister allegedly confronted him with two kitchen knives.
2. Years before the mother's death, while the reporting party lived separately, the subjects allegedly provided food containing rat poison or another toxic substance on multiple occasions.
3. Approximately six months before the mother's death, the reporting party confronted the husband at a relative's home in South Korea about passive aggression; the husband allegedly denied hostile intent.
4. After the mother's first aneurysm surgery and while another aneurysm allegedly remained, the reporting party says he blocked the sister from entering the mother's room to confront her.
5. Roughly one week before the mother's death, an angry telephone conversation between the reporting party and his mother was allegedly recorded and later circulated. The source places the mother's death in July 2010.
6. During the final emergency, the sister allegedly filmed the mother as she was transported into the hospital.
7. On the day of the death, the husband allegedly made the statement outside the hospital that he knew the death would occur and defended the sister's conduct.
8. After the reporting party left for Vanuatu, the sister allegedly sent the email invoking her husband in a manner the reporting party understood as gloating or insinuating joint responsibility.
9. In later years, the reporting party alleges interference with cryonics preservation, inheritance or identity fraud, sustained defamation, online monitoring, and delayed claims over his technical ideas.

This working chronology should be replaced by a document-supported chronology showing exact dates, locations, participants, and source records.

### 3. Alleged Physical Danger to the Reporting Party

#### 3.1 Youth knife incident

The reporting party alleges that, during his teenage years, his sister approached or attacked him with two kitchen knives. The source gives little chronological detail and no identified police or medical record. Because of its age, the allegation may face evidentiary and limitation issues, but it remains relevant as a claimed prior act if independently corroborated and if admissible for a lawful purpose. Investigators should seek family witnesses, contemporaneous statements, photographs, treatment records, or admissions rather than relying on repetition alone.

#### 3.2 Alleged poisoning through food

The reporting party alleges that the sister and husband jointly contemplated and carried out poisoning by placing rat poison or another toxic chemical in food. His account includes the following particulars:

- he was living separately and trying to avoid conflict;
- food was provided in a context that appeared reconciliatory;
- sushi or California rolls were among the foods, and the husband was a sushi chef;
- the conduct occurred more than once and well before the final family crisis surrounding the mother's death;
- the reporting party became severely ill and at one point passed blood in his stool, which he then attributed to obesity or poor health rather than poisoning;
- he says a chat between the subjects later revealed discussion, reminiscence, planning, or admission of the poisoning; and
- he alleges that both subjects knew of and covered for the conduct regardless of which person physically prepared a particular item.

The reporting party's use of the term "rat poison" must be verified. Rodenticides vary materially in mechanism, symptoms, detectability, and treatment. The report therefore does not infer a substance or a medical causal chain from symptoms alone. The allegation should be tested through the original messages, purchase history, food-source information, pharmacy or retail records if available, contemporaneous witnesses, and medical records. If preserved biological samples or old clinical records exist, a qualified toxicologist should determine whether any testing remains meaningful.

#### 3.3 Why chronology matters to the asserted defense

The subjects may reportedly rely on later angry statements, a recorded telephone exchange, a car-window incident, or an allegation that the reporting party struck his sister. The reporting party denies striking her and states that any car-window contact was an angry gesture after ridicule, not an attack on a person. Most importantly, he says the alleged poisonings occurred years before the final recorded statements and before the events near the mother's death.

This is an objectively verifiable issue. Investigators should place every food delivery, illness, message, recording, and alleged threat on one timeline. If the poisoning preceded the stated justification, the later statement could not have caused the earlier act. Even if the subjects genuinely feared the reporting party at another time, fear would not by itself authorize secret poisoning. The availability of police, protective orders, physical separation, and ordinary refusal of contact would also bear on whether an alleged covert poisoning was protective conduct or a distinct act of harm.

### 3.4 Claimed use of trust and reconciliation

The reporting party emphasizes that receiving food ordinarily communicates peace. He says he accepted the food because the relationship appeared reconciled. If a toxic substance was deliberately placed in food, this context would be relevant to premeditation, concealment, opportunity, and intent. Conversely, if no toxic substance was used, the same context may help identify an innocent explanation. The point should be resolved by evidence rather than assumed in either direction.

## 4. Alleged Conduct Concerning the Mother

### 4.1 Post-surgery doorway incident

The reporting party describes a specific event after his mother's first brain-aneurysm surgery, while he understood that another aneurysm remained. He says his sister was angry about money and intended to enter the mother's room to scold or confront her violently. He alleges that the sister knew emotional escalation and elevated blood pressure could be dangerous. He recalls standing in the doorway with his arms extended to block entry, after which the sister returned to her room smiling in a manner he perceived as menacing.

The reporting party admits that he then confronted his sister verbally and made an angry gesture, but says he apologized within seconds because he feared escalation. The report does not repeat the threatening words because they are not conduct attributed to the named subjects. Their relevance is limited to chronology: the reporting party says the statement followed his attempt to protect his mother, was immediately retracted, and occurred long after the earlier alleged poisoning.

Investigators should obtain the mother's operative notes, discharge instructions, blood-pressure warnings, prognosis, household timeline, and testimony from anyone present. Medical experts, not family members, should assess whether the alleged confrontation created a clinically material risk.

### 4.2 Final emergency and recording

The reporting party alleges that his sister recorded their mother while she was being transported into the hospital. He interprets this as an effort to build an alibi or narrative. Recording an emergency does not, by itself, prove wrongdoing. Its significance depends on what the video shows, when it began, what the sister knew, whether she disclosed medications or preceding events to clinicians, and whether the original file metadata and surrounding communications support or contradict the reporting party's interpretation.

The source also raises the possibility that medication, drugs, or another cause was withheld from hospital staff. This is expressly an unverified suspicion. Investigators should compare the emergency

intake history, ambulance report, laboratory results, medication lists, toxicology, imaging, and statements made by each person. Any claim that information was concealed must identify the actual information, the duty to disclose it, materiality, and the speaker's knowledge.

### 4.3 Husband's hospital-day statement

The reporting party directly recalls that, in a car outside the hospital on the day his mother died, the husband said in Korean, "I knew this was going to happen" (romanized: *ireoke doel jul arasseo*). He describes the delivery as happy, excited, or gloating. He further recalls that the husband defended the sister's conduct and, when asked whether she had the right to act as she had, responded emphatically in the affirmative several times.

This is a material alleged admission about state of mind, but its meaning is disputed by context. It may mean foreknowledge of a medical decline, a fatalistic prediction, resentment toward the mother, knowledge of misconduct, or something else. The statement should be investigated through every person present, the exact Korean wording, the full conversation, any contemporaneous account, and later admissions or denials. Tone is relevant but should not replace the words and surrounding facts.

### 4.4 Vanuatu email

The reporting party states that after he had gone to Vanuatu and accused his sister of monitoring a telephone conversation and possibly harming their mother, she wrote words to the effect of, "You don't know my husband, do you?" He perceived the message as gloating and as insinuating that the couple had done something to the mother. He says he described the communication contemporaneously to people in Vanuatu while walking in distress.

The original email is essential. Investigators should obtain the native message with headers, server records where lawfully available, attachments, surrounding thread, and any contemporaneous messages to third parties. Without the full thread, the sentence cannot safely be treated as an admission of homicide.

### 4.5 Causation and the mother's death

The reporting party believes the subjects may have contributed to or caused his mother's death. The present compilation does not establish medical causation or identify a specific lethal act. The responsible formulation is therefore:

- there are directly alleged precursor events and statements requiring investigation;
- there may be medical, digital, and witness evidence capable of confirming or excluding misconduct;
- the husband's statement and the sister's email may be probative of attitude or knowledge but are not, standing alone, proof of causation; and
- no homicide allegation should be charged without competent proof of act, intent, causation, identity, and jurisdiction.

## 5. Alleged Interference With Cryonics Preservation

The reporting party arranged cryonics preservation for his mother and regarded it as the remaining means of protecting her. He alleges that his sister sought, threatened, or encouraged a refund from the account, and that the husband supported or failed to oppose this effort despite knowing the intended consequence.

The source contains an important qualification: one passage says the sister did not directly threaten a refund at the beginning but may have insinuated it, while later passages describe an actual attempted refund. This discrepancy should not be hidden. It defines the records needed:

1. every refund request or inquiry;
2. the requesting identity, authentication method, and claimed authority;
3. dates, times, IP logs, call recordings, emails, and account notes;
4. who owned the funds and who held contractual authority;
5. whether any refund was processed or preservation was endangered;
6. notices sent to the reporting party; and
7. communications showing purpose or knowledge.

If the sister or husband merely objected to cryonics, that is not equivalent to unlawful interference. If either knowingly impersonated an authorized person, falsified authority, or attempted to divert funds or terminate services without legal right, the legal analysis would be different.

## 6. Alleged Inheritance and Identity Fraud

The reporting party alleges that the subjects falsely represented him as deceased to family members or in records so they could take inheritance intended for him. He also alleges that the sister asserted entitlement based on being the oldest sibling and that the husband participated. Some passages present the allegation as fact; others candidly say the reporting party became suspicious only after interpreting online relays stating that a sibling had hired an estate lawyer, that he had been labeled deceased, or that inheritance was owed.

Because the origin is partly relay-based, the report does not state that a forged death record or fraudulent probate filing exists. It requests a targeted records inquiry:

- identify every estate, decedent, asset, trust, account, or property involved;
- identify the governing jurisdiction and actual succession law;
- obtain certified probate, family-register, vital-statistics, banking, tax, and title records;
- determine whether the reporting party was listed as living, deceased, missing, disclaimed, or excluded;

- obtain every document bearing his name or signature and conduct forensic examination if disputed;
- trace distributions and beneficial ownership; and
- determine what the sister and husband submitted, knew, received, or concealed.

The source's statement that Korean law automatically favors the oldest male should not be accepted as a legal conclusion. Succession rights depend on the applicable law, dates, family relationships, wills, and property. The alleged falsification, not a family assumption about inheritance priority, is the issue requiring proof.

## 7. Alleged Defamation, False Accusations, and Social Destruction

### 7.1 Alleged false claim of physical abuse

The reporting party alleges that his sister falsely claimed he beat or physically assaulted her, possibly using staged or misleading photographs or makeup. He denies striking her and identifies one youth incident in which he tried to lift a chair she occupied and dropped it a short distance, which he says was accidental and later acknowledged in reconciliation emails.

The allegation should be resolved by obtaining the exact words, audience, date, medium, images, metadata, medical evidence, and the sister's complete account. A vague perception that a media “relay” refers to staged photographs is not proof that such photographs exist. A direct statement by the sister to police, relatives, a court, an employer, or an investor would be materially different and should be authenticated.

### 7.2 Incest and sexual allegations

The reporting party alleges that the subjects circulated false and degrading claims that he had sexual or incestuous relations with his mother or sister, or that a sexual triangle existed among himself, the sister, and the husband. He maintains that these claims were designed to destroy his standing with relatives, potential partners, investors, and authorities.

These allegations are especially serious reputationally but require exact publication evidence. Investigators should identify the speaker, precise statement, recipient, date, platform, republication, and resulting harm. The husband's alleged responsibility cannot rest solely on being married to the speaker. It may be supported if he authored, repeated, encouraged, coordinated, knowingly supplied false content, or agreed to use the allegation as part of another unlawful scheme. His presence or silence may be contextual evidence but is not automatically a crime.

### 7.3 Intelligence, disability, sexuality, and identity smears

The reporting party further alleges ridicule or false portrayal of him as intellectually disabled, mentally incompetent, gay or transgender contrary to his stated identity, or incapable of creating his own work. He attributes some statements to the sister, some to the husband, and some only to interpreted online content. The report treats only attributable communications as potential evidence. Insulting opinion,

although harmful, is not the same as a false assertion of verifiable fact, a true threat, stalking, fraud, or obstruction.

#### **7.4 Body-based ridicule and provocation**

The reporting party recalls repeated derogatory comments and laughter about his weight and appearance. He says this produced shame, contributed to an unhealthy relationship with food, and provoked isolated angry gestures later retold without context. Such ridicule may establish relationship history, motive, or intentional emotional abuse under applicable local law, but it is not automatically a federal offense.

#### **7.5 “Prank” characterization**

The source rejects any later characterization of the alleged conduct as a prank. That argument has factual force only if the underlying communications are authenticated and show a sustained campaign, serious audience, damaging content, or connection to legal and financial decisions. Duration, repetition, concealment, refusal to correct, and the subjects' knowledge of likely harm would distinguish a continuing campaign from a brief joke. The label used by either side is not controlling.

### **8. Alleged Monitoring, Gaslighting, and Manipulation of Communications**

The reporting party alleges that approximately six months before his mother's death, he directly asked the husband at a relative's home in South Korea why the husband was acting with passive aggression rather than stating his concern openly. He says the husband denied any hostile intent. The reporting party interprets the denial, in light of later events, as gaslighting.

He further alleges that the subjects watched or participated in an online channel through their phones or computers, saw his communications, coordinated responses privately, and used his blindness or information disadvantage to frame events. He requests examination of ISP and platform records.

The term “gaslighting” is descriptive, not a criminal element. The investigation should translate it into provable acts: false statements, concealment, selective editing, impersonation, unauthorized access, coordinated publication, destruction of records, intimidation, or fraudulent use of information. Monitoring public posts is not unlawful by itself. Accessing nonpublic accounts without authorization, intercepting communications, impersonating another person, or using surveillance with the intent and effects specified by law may be.

No platform attribution should be made from a recommended video, thumbnail, metaphor, timing coincidence, or “relay.” Attribution requires account records, device evidence, IP and session information, message content, witness testimony, or admission.

## 9. Alleged Appropriation and Reattribution of Ideas

### 9.1 The reporting party's account

The reporting party alleges that after years of observing his presentations, the subjects began claiming that his technical and business ideas were theirs, his mother's, his father's, or collaborative family work. He identifies the wooden-ship or subtractive-manufacturing concept and the space-escalator concept as examples. He says the sister initially praised or encouraged the work, particularly the space-escalator concept, and did not claim ownership. He describes the later ownership claim as arising only after the alleged poisoning chat was exposed and after a change in the online environment.

His principal chronology argument is that he had not seen the subjects since his mother's death in 2010, that the ideas developed later through his experiences in Vanuatu, Toronto, Quora, CNC and fabrication research, and investor presentations, and that the subjects produced no timely records or reminders when they first observed the work. He argues that their seafood business or general familiarity with boats cannot establish authorship of his particular method of forming a whole wooden mass and removing material in a manner analogous to CNC subtractive manufacturing.

### 9.2 Evidence required

The idea-credit dispute should be reconstructed through dated materials rather than memory contests:

- original design files and metadata;
- emails, cloud versions, presentation uploads, comments, and download logs;
- sketches, CAD history, notebooks, photographs, and device backups;
- communications with third parties before the subjects' alleged claim;
- the subjects' earlier chats and business records;
- the first date each side articulated each specific feature;
- evidence of access to nonpublic information;
- evidence of copying, disclosure, commercial use, or claimed ownership; and
- any agreement governing confidentiality, credit, rewards, or collaboration.

### 9.3 Legal precision

An idea is not automatically protected merely because it is original or valuable. U.S. copyright law expressly excludes ideas, procedures, processes, systems, methods of operation, concepts, principles, and discoveries from copyright protection. A specific expression, drawing, text, or model may be protected; a qualifying invention may be patentable; and nonpublic technical information may qualify as a trade secret if statutory requirements are met. The report therefore does not label every alleged follow-up or similar concept “theft.” It asks whether the subjects obtained and used protected

expression, patent rights, confidential information, or a trade secret through improper means, or used false ownership claims as part of a provable fraud.

## 10. The Husband's Alleged Independent and Joint Conduct

The husband's potential responsibility must be assessed act by act. The source attributes the following conduct directly or jointly to him:

1. working as a sushi chef and allegedly participating in conversations and conduct concerning poisoned food;
2. providing or helping provide food in which poison was allegedly placed;
3. engaging in passive aggression and then denying hostile intent when confronted months before the mother's death;
4. making the alleged hospital-day statement that he knew the death would occur, in a tone the reporting party perceived as celebratory;
5. expressly defending the sister's harmful conduct in the same conversation;
6. paying or helping pay cryonics expenses while allegedly using that support to secure silence or moral leverage;
7. allegedly observing and supporting defamatory online statements, including stories in which he was cast as part of an incestuous triangle;
8. allegedly participating in, covering, or benefiting from inheritance activity;
9. allegedly participating in later claims over the reporting party's technical ideas; and
10. allegedly coordinating with the sister through private chats and online monitoring.

Several of these allegations are currently supported only by the reporting party's recollection or relay-based inference. The report does not infer guilt from marriage, financial support, shared residence, or silence alone. It asks investigators to determine whether there was an agreement, knowledge of the unlawful objective, assistance, an overt act, concealment, benefit, or intentional encouragement. If the evidence shows that the husband opposed, lacked knowledge of, or did not assist particular conduct, he should not be attributed that conduct. If the evidence shows active participation, his role should not be minimized as mere spousal loyalty.

## 11. Claimed Justifications and the Reporting Party's Response

### 11.1 Alleged fear of the reporting party

The reporting party anticipates that the subjects will present him as dangerous based on angry words, a telephone recording, or later conduct. He argues that the relevant question is not whether every reaction was appropriate but whether it authorized the specific acts alleged. He points to physical

separation, periods of reconciliation, apologies, public rather than secret expression, and the availability of police and courts.

The investigation should not presume either party's position. It should determine whether a subject genuinely and reasonably perceived an imminent threat at the time of each act, whether the response was legally proportionate, and whether the asserted threat preceded the response. Covert poisoning, forged identity records, false public accusations, and appropriation of property would ordinarily require independent legal justification; they do not become lawful merely because a family relationship was difficult.

### **11.2 Later reactive speech**

The reporting party characterizes his later hostility as a reaction to devastation, particularly his mother's death and his belief that the subjects had harmed her. He says he ranted openly, sought reconciliation and investigation, and left final judgment to law. The report does not ask authorities to ignore relevant speech. It asks that no excerpt be used without the initiating events, full thread, timing, retraction, intended audience, and subsequent conduct. Most importantly, a later statement cannot retroactively justify an earlier act.

### **11.3 Financial assistance**

The subjects' financial assistance is relevant and should be documented. It may bear on opportunity, relationship, credibility, motive, or mitigation. It does not logically disprove a separate act. The questions are what was paid, by whom, under what agreement, for how long, and whether payment was later used to exert control, threaten withdrawal, claim ownership, or excuse unrelated conduct.

### **11.4 Family unity and children**

The existence of children and the social cost of prosecution cannot establish or negate the elements of an offense. At the same time, no adverse family action should occur based solely on accusation. Any protective decision concerning children belongs to competent authorities applying the proper standard and current evidence.

### **11.5 Money, motive, and public reaction**

The reporting party states that money was not his motive for hostility or revenge. He describes his anger as arising from the alleged poisoning, conduct toward his mother, the mother's death, and later efforts to portray him as the aggressor. He also argues that his most extreme reactions were expressed openly while he continued seeking reconciliation and legal investigation, rather than being concealed steps toward private harm. Openness and later reconciliation may be relevant to intent, but they are not conclusive and do not immunize any threatening communication or conduct that independently satisfies a legal offense.

Money may nevertheless be relevant to the subjects' alleged conduct if evidence shows an effort to obtain inheritance, redirect cryonics funds, secure idea-related rewards, or use financial assistance as leverage. That possible gain must be proved from records. It should not be inferred merely because the subjects had money, helped the family, or operated a business.

## 12. Applicable U.S. Legal Issues, Subject to Proof and Jurisdiction

### 12.1 Jurisdiction first

Many core events are alleged to have occurred in South Korea or Canada. Ordinary homicide, assault, poisoning, defamation, inheritance, probate, and property offenses are generally prosecuted under the law of the place where the conduct occurred. U.S. federal law does not apply merely because the reporting party refers to a U.S. court or because an online service crossed a U.S. server. A federal charge requires the statute's territorial, commerce, governmental, or proceeding nexus. Foreign and state/provincial authorities may be the proper recipients for much of the conduct.

### 12.2 Consumer-product tampering - 18 U.S.C. § 1365

If a person tampered with food or another consumer product affecting interstate or foreign commerce, with reckless disregard for risk of death or bodily injury and extreme indifference to that risk, 18 U.S.C. § 1365 may be implicated. The statute also addresses attempts, specified threats and false tainting claims, and conspiracy. Application would depend on what product was used, whether it was a “consumer product,” the commerce nexus, the defendant's state of mind, and territorial jurisdiction. Privately prepared food abroad may instead fall exclusively under local poisoning, assault, or attempted-homicide law.

### 12.3 Aiding and abetting - 18 U.S.C. § 2

For an underlying federal offense, a person who aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, procures, or willfully causes its commission may be punished as a principal. This provision does not make association, marriage, or mere presence a crime. Evidence must connect the husband to a specific federal offense and show the required intentional assistance.

### 12.4 Federal conspiracy - 18 U.S.C. § 371

Section 371 applies when two or more persons agree to commit an offense against the United States or defraud the United States or an agency, and one commits an act to effect the object. It is not a general federal family-conspiracy statute. If the alleged objective was only a foreign or state offense with no federal object, § 371 would not supply jurisdiction. Some substantive statutes, including § 1365, contain their own conspiracy provisions.

### 12.5 Wire fraud - 18 U.S.C. § 1343

Section 1343 requires a scheme to defraud or obtain money or property by false pretenses and use of interstate or foreign wire communications to execute it. If authenticated electronic communications were used to divert inheritance, obtain account funds, impersonate the reporting party, or secure money or property through materially false ownership claims, investigators should test each element. Defamation, emotional cruelty, or lying unconnected to money or property is not wire fraud.

## 12.6 Identity-document and identity-information fraud - 18 U.S.C. § 1028

If the reporting party's means of identification was knowingly used without lawful authority in connection with a qualifying federal offense or state/local felony, § 1028(a)(7) may be relevant, subject to the circumstances listed in § 1028(c). A family rumor that he died is not enough. Investigators would need a specific document, identifier, use, unlawful purpose, and jurisdictional nexus.

## 12.7 Computer access - 18 U.S.C. § 1030

Section 1030 may apply to specified intentional access to a protected computer without authorization or in excess of authorized access. Merely reading public posts, receiving forwarded messages, or using one's own account is not enough. Any allegation of account intrusion requires provider logs, authorization boundaries, accessed information, loss or damage, identity of the accessor, and the precise subsection.

## 12.8 Interstate or foreign stalking - 18 U.S.C. § 2261A

Section 2261A may apply to qualifying interstate or foreign travel or use of mail, an interactive computer service, or electronic communication with specified intent, where the course of conduct causes, attempts to cause, or would reasonably be expected to cause substantial emotional distress or fear of death, serious bodily injury, or other listed harms. Repetition and emotional impact alone do not eliminate the need to prove intent, attribution, and the statutory nexus.

## 12.9 Interstate threats - 18 U.S.C. § 875

Section 875 covers specified threats transmitted in interstate or foreign commerce, including threats to kidnap or injure and certain extortionate threats. The First Amendment requires a sufficient culpable mental state for “true threat” prosecutions; in *Counterman v. Colorado*, the Supreme Court held that recklessness regarding a statement's threatening character is constitutionally required at minimum. Insults, metaphors, predictions, and unpleasant opinions are not automatically true threats.

## 12.10 Witness tampering, retaliation, and records - 18 U.S.C. §§ 1512, 1513, and 1519

If a person knowingly intimidated, threatened, corruptly persuaded, or misled another with intent to affect testimony, evidence, or communication about a possible federal offense, § 1512 may apply. Retaliation for federal testimony or providing federal-law information may implicate § 1513. Knowing destruction, concealment, alteration, or falsification of records with intent to impede a matter within federal agency jurisdiction may implicate § 1519. These statutes require the specified federal proceeding, investigation, communication, or contemplated matter. Mere denial, silence, family loyalty, or deletion for an unrelated reason is not enough.

## 12.11 False statements to the U.S. government - 18 U.S.C. § 1001

Section 1001 concerns knowing and willful material falsification, concealment, or false statements in a matter within the jurisdiction of the U.S. executive, legislative, or judicial branch, subject to statutory limitations. A lie to a relative or the public is not converted into a § 1001 offense without this federal-government nexus.

## 12.12 Trade secrets and idea claims - 18 U.S.C. §§ 1832, 1836, and 1839; 17 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Section 1832 criminalizes specified intentional conversion, unauthorized taking, copying, receipt, attempt, or conspiracy involving a trade secret related to interstate or foreign commerce, with intent to benefit someone other than the owner and intent or knowledge of injury. Sections 1836 and 1839 provide a civil cause of action and define trade secrets and misappropriation. The reporting party would need to identify the exact nonpublic information, his ownership, reasonable secrecy measures, independent economic value, improper acquisition or use, and the required commerce connection. Under 17 U.S.C. § 102(b), copyright does not protect an idea, method, system, process, or concept as such. This distinction is critical to a credible assessment.

## 12.13 Defamation and emotional harm

Defamation and intentional infliction of emotional distress are principally matters of state, provincial, or foreign civil law. Elements, privileges, limitation periods, damages, and defenses vary. Criminal defamation is not a general U.S. federal offense. Exact statements and publication evidence must be identified before legal conclusions are drawn.

# 13. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests

## 13.1 Highest-priority preservation

Authorities should consider prompt, lawful preservation requests for:

1. the complete native chat history between the subjects, including KakaoTalk or other Korean messaging applications, device databases, cloud backups, deleted-message artifacts, attachments, and account identifiers;
2. the sister's and husband's devices used during the relevant periods, subject to lawful process and forensic imaging protocols;
3. the Vanuatu email thread, reconciliation emails, original headers, attachments, server metadata, forwarding records, and copies sent to relatives;
4. the alleged telephone recording made shortly before the mother's death and evidence of when it was created, copied, or sent;
5. the mother's hospital, ambulance, laboratory, medication, toxicology, imaging, and death records;
6. the original video of the mother's hospital transport with unaltered metadata;
7. cryonics provider contracts, payment records, refund communications, account notes, authorization documents, call recordings, login history, and IP records;

8. probate, family-register, vital-statistics, estate, title, banking, tax, trust, and distribution records relating to the alleged inheritance;
9. platform account records for any directly identified defamatory publication, subject to legal availability and retention;
10. dated design files, presentation archives, email records, cloud histories, and third-party communications for each disputed technical concept; and
11. any alleged photographs depicting injuries, including original files, EXIF metadata, editing history, medical correlation, and chain of custody.

### 13.2 Witnesses

Potential witnesses should be approached with non-leading questions and separated where practicable. Categories include:

- persons present in the car outside the hospital;
- persons present during the post-surgery doorway incident;
- hospital and ambulance personnel;
- cryonics provider staff who received concerns or refund communications;
- people in Vanuatu to whom the reporting party contemporaneously described the sister's email;
- relatives who received statements that the reporting party was deceased or excluded from inheritance;
- persons who saw the subjects' chats or online participation;
- recipients of alleged incest, assault, disability, or idea-ownership claims;
- the mother's art students or financial recordkeepers, limited to verifying income and support claims; and
- third parties who received the reporting party's technical concepts before the subjects allegedly claimed them.

### 13.3 Toxicology and medical review

A qualified expert should review the alleged symptoms without being told to assume poisoning. The expert should identify plausible substances, expected timing, clinical markers, alternative causes, and whether retrospective testing is scientifically defensible. The mother's records should be reviewed separately by an appropriate specialist for cause of death, aneurysm risk, medication disclosure, and the medical significance of the alleged stress event.

### 13.4 Digital attribution

The investigation must distinguish direct messages from algorithmic recommendations. A screenshot of a thumbnail or coincidental media reference should not be attributed to the subjects absent provider data, device evidence, a linked account, a direct communication, or admission. Native exports and provider-certified records are preferable to screenshots alone.

### 13.5 Financial and property tracing

Any inheritance theory should begin with a named estate and asset. Investigators should trace the chain from decedent to legal beneficiaries to actual recipient. Any cryonics-fund theory should similarly identify ownership, payment source, refund recipient, and authority. Conclusions should not be based on assumptions about family hierarchy.

## 14. Reliability, Corroboration, and Fairness Safeguards

### 14.1 Factors supporting investigation

The source supplies several concrete, falsifiable anchors: quoted words in Korean, an identified hospital-day setting, a particular post-surgery incident, an alleged food type and occupational connection, claimed chat admissions, a specific Vanuatu email, a telephone recording, cryonics account activity, probate status, and dated idea-development records. These are capable of confirmation or disproof and justify focused inquiry if authorities have jurisdiction.

### 14.2 Factors requiring caution

The compilation also contains intense repetition, conclusions stated with varying certainty, long time gaps, acknowledged memory limitations, and extensive interpretation of online relays. Some passages move from suspicion to certainty without adding new evidence. These features do not prove that the allegations are false, but they require investigators to rely on original records and independent witnesses rather than rhetorical confidence.

### 14.3 No guilt by association

Neither subject should be held responsible for a third party's conduct without proof of agreement or assistance. The husband should not be deemed an accomplice merely because he remained married to the sister. Conversely, he should not be treated as uninvolved merely because the sister appears to have led particular acts. The same evidence-based rule applies in both directions.

### 14.4 No selective chronology

The subjects' accusations and the reporting party's reactions should be reviewed in full chronological order. This protects both sides. It prevents a later reaction from being used to justify an earlier act, while also preventing an earlier wrong from being treated as unlimited permission for later misconduct.

## 15. Cumulative Assessment

If the alleged poisoning chat is authentic and shows knowing joint participation, it would materially strengthen the reporting party's central claim that the subjects used trust to inflict physical harm. If the cryonics records show unauthorized refund activity, the inheritance records show false death or identity representations, and the platform records show coordinated false accusations, those separate acts could establish a broader course of deliberate exploitation rather than isolated family conflict.

The hospital-day statement, Vanuatu email, and post-surgery incident would then be relevant to knowledge, attitude, and relationship context, but medical causation would still require independent proof. Likewise, a history of defamation could support motive or intent but would not prove poisoning or homicide.

If, by contrast, the original chat does not concern poisoning, the cryonics provider shows no unauthorized request, probate records show no false death representation, and platform evidence cannot attribute the alleged statements to the subjects, major portions of the theory would remain uncorroborated. A fair investigation must be capable of reaching that conclusion as well.

The cumulative issue is therefore not whether the subjects are sympathetic, financially helpful, disliked, or forgiven. It is whether specific acts occurred, who committed them, with what intent, causing what harm, and under which jurisdiction.

## 16. Requested Lawful Action

The reporting party respectfully requests that competent authorities:

1. preserve the identified digital, medical, financial, cryonics, and probate records before loss or alteration;
2. obtain and authenticate the alleged poisoning chat and Vanuatu email;
3. construct a single chronology covering the alleged poisonings, recordings, mother's medical events, hospital-day statement, later communications, cryonics activity, and inheritance activity;
4. interview the subjects separately and obtain their complete explanations;
5. conduct independent toxicology, medical, digital-forensic, and financial review where evidence supports it;
6. identify the jurisdiction governing each event and refer matters to the appropriate country, state, province, or federal authority;
7. distinguish direct evidence from relay-based inference in every investigative memorandum;
8. assess the husband on evidence of his own acts and intentional assistance, neither immunizing nor incriminating him because of marriage alone;
9. charge only offenses whose elements can be proved by admissible evidence; and

10. leave guilt, penalty, restitution, and protective relief to the lawful court.

## Conclusion

The source presents serious allegations that should not be dismissed as ordinary family hostility, but seriousness does not reduce the need for proof. The reporting party identifies a core set of records capable of resolving much of the dispute: the alleged poisoning chat, complete emails, hospital records and video, cryonics account history, probate and identity records, platform attribution, and dated technical materials. A disciplined investigation of those records can protect the reporting party if the allegations are substantiated and protect the subjects from unsupported attribution if they are not.

The essential request is equality before the law: no preference based on family status, financial assistance, social image, disability, anger, wealth, or sympathy; no selective use of chronology; and no substitution of narrative for authenticated evidence.

## Appendix A. Source-Unit Cross-Reference

The following source units contain the principal subject-specific allegations synthesized in this report. They are listed to assist later retrieval, not as proof that the allegation is true.

- 0235566 . txt: husband's alleged hospital-day statement; poisoning chat; cryonics refund; inheritance; post-surgery conduct; knife allegation; Vanuatu email context.
- 156456413 . txt: alleged gaslighting by the husband approximately six months before the mother's death; chronology and reconciliation.
- 1648546516 . txt: separation after 2010 and argument concerning lack of prior records for later idea claims.
- biout876787 . txt: detailed post-surgery doorway account; chronology of recording and alleged poisoning; inheritance theory; defamation categories.
- ge423442 . txt: alleged sustained defamation and framing; claimed joint conduct by the husband; rejection of the "prank" characterization.
- gwer324334 . txt: alleged joint poisoning, sushi/California-roll detail, husband's occupation, hospital-day conversation, incest allegations, and cryonics issue.
- h4123424332 . txt: inheritance-related relay and truth-reporting context.
- heaw3143231 . txt: concise assertion of joint online and offline conduct.
- hrew45324234 . txt: consolidated list of alleged joint acts and rebuttal to financial-help justification.
- hiyy898789 . txt: poisoning chronology, trust, absence of urgency, and separation of physical allegations from idea-credit ambiguity.
- jnoe423jo34ioijr5 . txt: alleged change from support to idea framing; request to compare earlier silence and later claims; husband-specific allegations.
- jhr67467367 . txt: condensed allegation categories: defamation, inheritance fraud, poisoning, and framing.
- joiuoi79879 . txt: financial-support rebuttal; mother's income; cryonics refund allegation; requested account evidence.
- jr53454523 . txt: long-term psychological effects and restatement of the alleged hospital and family conduct.
- srtt23134132 . txt: relay-based allegation concerning the wooden-ship idea and the stated absence of ideas in 2010.
- yvguioh7980 . txt: cumulative discussion of autonomy, framing, and the need to separate factual evidence from narrative.

## Appendix B. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

The following authorities were checked in their current official form for the conditional legal analysis. They do not establish that any element is met.

1. 18 U.S.C. § 2, Principals: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section2>
2. 18 U.S.C. § 371, Conspiracy to commit offense or to defraud United States: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section371>
3. 18 U.S.C. § 1001, Statements or entries generally: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1001>
4. 18 U.S.C. § 1028, Fraud and related activity in connection with identification documents and information: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1028>
5. 18 U.S.C. § 1030, Fraud and related activity in connection with computers: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1030>
6. 18 U.S.C. § 875, Interstate communications: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section875>
7. 18 U.S.C. § 1343, Fraud by wire, radio, or television: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1343>
8. 18 U.S.C. § 1365, Tampering with consumer products: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1365>
9. 18 U.S.C. § 1512, Tampering with a witness, victim, or informant: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1512>
10. 18 U.S.C. § 1513, Retaliating against a witness, victim, or informant: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1513>
11. 18 U.S.C. § 1519, Destruction, alteration, or falsification of records in Federal investigations and bankruptcy: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1519>
12. 18 U.S.C. §§ 1832, 1836, and 1839, trade secrets: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1832> ; <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1836> ; <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section1839>
13. 18 U.S.C. § 2261A, Stalking: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title18-section2261A>
14. 17 U.S.C. § 102(b), exclusion of ideas, methods, processes, and systems from copyright protection: <https://uscode.house.gov/view.xhtml?edition=prelim&num=0&req=granuleid%3AUSC-prelim-title17-section102>
15. *Counterman v. Colorado*, 600 U.S. 66 (2023): [https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/22pdf/600us1r51\\_g3bi.pdf](https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/22pdf/600us1r51_g3bi.pdf)