

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Alleged Conduct of Steve Choe

Investigative allegation statement and evidence-preservation request

Document metadata	Value
Prepared from	combinedSteve.txt
Prepared	June 28, 2026
Source scope	638 source-note units; approximately 537,879 words
Status	Allegations not adjudicated

This document presents allegations for fair investigation. It is not a finding of guilt.

Contents

- Important Notice
- Executive Summary
- 1. Scope and Method
- 2. Subject and Relationship Background
- 3. Chronology of Material Events
- 4. Alleged Conduct
- 5. Complainant's Defenses and Provenance Account
- 6. Alleged Harm
- 7. U.S. Legal Issue Analysis
- 8. Elements-to-Evidence Matrix
- 9. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Plan
- 10. Investigative Questions for Steve Choe
- 11. Requested Actions
- 12. Cumulative Assessment
- Appendix A. Consolidated Allegation Inventory
- Appendix B. Principal Provenance Categories
- Appendix C. Principal Source Notes
- Appendix D. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted
- Closing Certification of Scope

Important Notice

This report organizes allegations made by Joo-yeon Kim concerning Steve Choe. It is not a judicial finding, charging instrument, or declaration of guilt. Every disputed allegation requires authentication, corroboration, jurisdictional review, and an opportunity for the named subject to respond. The report uses phrases such as "Kim states," "Kim recalls," "Kim interprets," and "the source alleges" to preserve that distinction.

The source compendium contains raw notes, repeated observations, descriptions of screenshots and online "relays," and earlier AI-generated drafts. Earlier drafts are not independent evidence and are not adopted merely because they appear in the compendium. Statements inferred from media recommendations, thumbnails, aliases, symbolic imagery, or third-party posts are treated as investigative leads only. They should not be attributed to Steve Choe unless platform records, account records, witnesses, or other reliable evidence establish authorship, adoption, direction, or knowing participation.

This report focuses on Steve Choe's alleged conduct. References to other people appear only where necessary to explain a claimed joint act, witness, source of evidence, or alternative actor. The complainant's angry or defensive language is not analyzed here because the requested scope is the named subject's conduct. Questions of criminal liability, civil liability, and penalty belong exclusively to the competent authorities and courts.

Executive Summary

Kim describes Steve Choe as a former housemate who allegedly converted limited physical proximity and knowledge of Kim's presentations into a continuing effort to attach himself to Kim's work, reputation, and identity. The central theory is not merely that Choe copied one idea. Kim alleges a repeated pattern: Choe learned that Kim was preparing presentations for prospective investors; remained silent while having multiple opportunities to document any ownership or contribution; moved away; appeared in an online environment that Kim could not directly access; allegedly worked with his brother and later others to portray Kim as a thief or collaborator; and repeatedly adopted new explanations whenever earlier explanations became inconsistent with the chronology.

The account begins with a hostile first interaction involving Kim's assistance to Choe with Library Genesis. Kim recalls that the two then had little meaningful contact for approximately two years. Kim moved to the lower floor of the shared house in early September 2020. He says that only after moving downstairs did he tell Choe about alleged monitoring, his contact with Adam, and an anticipated arrangement involving presentations reportedly valued at approximately \$4 million per idea. Kim says Choe was pursuing an MBA path, not participating in Kim's business. Kim further recalls asking whether Choe had ideas and seeing Choe shake his head no. [Source notes: 184866.txt; oiu0980809.txt; iihuyy897.txt; joiuo889787.txt]

Kim relies heavily on the absence of ordinary records. He says a real partnership, idea exchange, or contribution would have produced emails, messages, presentation edits, payment terms, acknowledgments, or communications to the persons allegedly monitoring the house. The available notes identify an April 27, 2021 introduction to Festus, a May 8, 2021 email to Choe describing Kim's

investment story as "unbelievable," and a July 5, 2021 message shortly before Choe moved out. Kim places Choe's departure on or about July 18, 2021. He argues that these communications show distance, uncertainty, and separate paths rather than a concealed joint venture. [Source notes: [iihiuuyy897.txt](#); [hbgthy656.txt](#); [joiuo889787.txt](#)]

Kim alleges that after Choe moved to a nearby house, Choe and his brother began an online campaign involving idea attribution, sexual-orientation slurs or insinuations, intimidation, and character attacks. Kim states that Choe moved out of the nearby house within roughly two weeks rather than confronting him directly. He later describes an encounter at Walmart, allegedly captured on camera, in which Kim accused Choe of taking his work, Choe denied it, and Choe left. Kim says a broad public admission or "confession" occurred months later and was followed by a period of silence, but he does not supply a direct recording or transcript in the combined text. These points are therefore material leads requiring authentication, not established admissions. [Source notes: [he534141.txt](#); [bghubhbh.txt](#); [jio3joi23jo2.txt](#); [1641844894.txt](#)]

The alleged idea-attribution campaign covers numerous subject areas, including wooden and metal ships, interlocking modular structures, spherical vehicles, a space-escalator concept, sea platforms and segmented pillars, tree-cutting machinery, submersibles, rapid prototyping, government-supported homesteading systems, cryonics and memory-restoration concepts, AI-assisted research, vehicles, mining, and related follow-on designs. Kim's recurring defense is chronological: he says the core concepts predated close contact with Choe, were presented to Adam or others before Kim moved downstairs, arose live in view of an audience, or evolved from traceable earlier concepts. He further argues that Choe's alleged claims appeared only after Kim disclosed each new development and lacked a contemporaneous list or independent record. [Source notes: [184866.txt](#); [poi09i-9-09.txt](#); [iihiuuyy897.txt](#); [mining.txt](#); [oiu0980809.txt](#)]

Kim also alleges a broader identity campaign. He describes online material that he understood as falsely portraying him as gay or bisexual, suicidal, schizophrenic, addicted to alcohol or drugs, dishonest, violent, or dependent on Choe as a mentor or partner. He says these portrayals were designed to reduce his credibility, damage relationship prospects, and recast Choe's alleged appropriation as collaboration or assistance. Because many of these attributions arise from ambiguous online material, investigators must first identify the actual speakers and accounts. [Source notes: [fafaf.txt](#) (earlier draft, secondary only); [fewr332132.txt](#); [ferrw3321.txt](#); [joiuo889787.txt](#)]

The strongest potentially verifiable issues are therefore not the symbolic relays themselves. They are the underlying records: the housing and move timeline; the email chain; earlier presentations and metadata; the Walmart footage; any direct communications from Choe or accounts linked to him; witness recollections of the claimed admission; records of any use, submission, sale, or attribution of Kim's protected materials; and evidence of coordination with identified persons.

1. Scope and Method

The source file contains approximately 537,879 words divided into 638 source-note units, all collected under a Steve Choe folder. The review indexed the notes by chronology and recurring themes, then consolidated overlapping statements. Repetition was retained only when it bears on duration, recurrence, notice, alleged intent, or the complainant's continuing harm.

The report uses four evidence classifications:

1. **Direct recollection:** An event Kim says he personally saw, heard, wrote, sent, or did, such as the shared-house interactions, emails, the move, and the Walmart confrontation.
2. **Document-supported assertion:** A recollection that identifies a potentially recoverable record, such as an email date, presentation version, housing record, CCTV recording, or message account.
3. **Witness-dependent assertion:** A claimed event that Kim says others observed, including the alleged public admission and online activity.
4. **Interpretive lead:** An attribution derived from a thumbnail, recommendation, symbolic phrase, avatar, celebrity image, upvote, or "relay." These leads require independent authentication before they can support an allegation against Choe.

This distinction is essential. The source repeatedly acknowledges uncertainty with phrases such as "if this is Steve," "I believe," "I may be reading the relay wrong," and "ask the witnesses." Those limitations are preserved rather than removed.

2. Subject and Relationship Background

2.1 First Interaction and Estrangement

Kim recalls that his first substantive interaction with Choe involved helping Choe obtain or use Library Genesis. Kim says he went downstairs several times to assist, after which Choe abruptly told him to leave the room in a manner Kim experienced as exploitative and domineering. Kim responded angrily. He says they then did not speak meaningfully for roughly two years. [Source note: 184866.txt]

This history matters because Kim rejects later narratives of mentorship, close friendship, partnership, or longstanding idea exchange. His account is that the relationship began with conflict and remained distant until practical circumstances brought them into closer proximity.

2.2 CNC Equipment and Limited Practical Contact

Before moving downstairs, Kim says he sought permission from lower-floor tenants, including Cesar, Robert, and Choe, to place CNC or prototyping equipment in shared space in exchange for shared use. He characterizes those exchanges as formal and wary, not collaborative. He traces his interest in prototyping and film equipment to film school, earlier contacts, and purchases made before his relationship with Choe. [Source notes: 184866.txt; oiu0980809.txt]

2.3 Move Downstairs in September 2020

Kim places his move to the lower floor in early September 2020, after another tenant left and a cheaper room became available. He recalls Choe discouraging the move. Kim says he did not immediately disclose his investment narrative. Approximately two months later, he told Choe that he believed

monitoring was occurring and that he was preparing presentations connected to Adam and prospective investors. [Source notes: 184866.txt; oiu0980809.txt]

Kim estimates that Choe then knew of the monitoring and investment account for about eight months before leaving. He argues that this prolonged period is inconsistent with Choe later claiming ownership or contribution without creating any direct record.

2.4 Separate Career Paths

Kim says Choe was interested in an MBA and that Festus advised Choe about that path in the kitchen. Kim states that this conversation prompted him to ask Choe for an introduction to Festus because Kim needed help with financial projections for an already completed presentation. The first email to Festus is dated April 27, 2021. Kim treats the event as proof that Choe and Kim were following separate professional paths and that Choe was not the person working on Kim's presentation. [Source notes: 1641844894.txt; joiuo889787.txt; iihuyy897.txt]

2.5 No Formal Business Relationship Alleged

Kim states there was no contract, partnership, authorship agreement, revenue share, joint presentation, or recorded idea assignment between him and Choe. He says business practice would have required email documentation and points to his written dealings with Festus as an example. Kim also recalls asking Choe whether he had any ideas and seeing Choe shake his head from side to side. [Source notes: oiu0980809.txt; oiu0989.txt]

This is a central factual issue. It can be tested by obtaining the complete communications of both parties, presentation edit histories, cloud records, and any documents Choe identifies as contemporaneous proof of contribution.

3. Chronology of Material Events

Approximate date	Event alleged or documented	Evidence status
Before shared-house contact	Kim traces homesteading, manufacturing, film-equipment, prototyping, and related interests to earlier school, loan, domain, marketplace, blog, and personal records.	Document-supported assertion; records to collect.
First substantive interaction	Kim helps Choe with Library Genesis; dispute follows; meaningful contact largely stops.	Direct recollection; Choe and house witnesses may respond.
Following period, roughly two years	Kim says the two are not in meaningful speaking terms.	Direct recollection; communications can test.
Before September 2020	Kim says he develops and discusses core wooden-ship and related presentation concepts while living upstairs and dealing with Adam.	Document-supported assertion; requires timestamped versions and messages.
Early September 2020	Kim moves downstairs.	Housing records and witnesses.
Around November	Kim says he tells Choe about monitoring, presentations, Adam,	Direct recollection; emails may

Approximate date	Event alleged or documented	Evidence status
2020	and prospective investment.	corroborate awareness.
April 27, 2021	First identified email to Festus after Choe's introduction; Kim says the presentation already existed and he sought financial projections.	Email and attachment metadata.
May 8, 2021	Kim emails Choe that his story and investment amount sound "unbelievable" and reassures Choe he will not enter Choe's room.	Quoted email; original headers required.
July 5, 2021	Kim sends a message he interprets as apologizing for speaking too much about his current events; he says it shows distance and Choe's lack of involvement.	Email/message and attachment required.
Around July 18, 2021	Choe moves out of the shared house.	Housing, landlord, and witness records.
Same day or next day	Kim visits the nearby residence while Choe is moving in and withdraws an earlier proposed \$2,000 gift, reduced from \$20,000.	Direct recollection; Choe's mother and property witnesses.
Within roughly one week	Kim says he begins perceiving online attacks involving Choe and Choe's brother.	Interpretive lead unless direct account evidence exists.
Within roughly two weeks	Kim says Choe leaves the nearby house rather than confronting him.	Housing and property-owner records.
Roughly eight to twelve months later	Kim describes Walmart encounter: Choe allegedly follows him; Kim confronts him about taking ideas; Choe denies it and leaves.	CCTV, transaction, location, and witness evidence.
Months later, around May 2022 in some notes	Kim says Choe makes a broad public admission that there was no idea exchange or business relationship.	Witness-dependent; transcript or platform record required.
After claimed admission	Kim says idea-related attacks stop for a substantial period, though reputation attacks continue, and Choe later moves to the United States.	Platform, travel, residence, and witness records.
Later period	Kim alleges Choe renews idea claims, adopts new explanations, and coordinates with additional persons after prior records disappear.	Interpretive and witness-dependent; requires account-level proof.

The source contains inconsistent estimates of whether the period from Choe's departure to the claimed admission was about 300 days, 400 days, or more than a year. The dates should be reconstructed from original records rather than resolved by memory. [Source notes: iihuyy897.txt; hbgthy656.txt; jio3joi23jo2.txt; jo98090.txt]

4. Alleged Conduct

4.1 Use of Proximity and Access

Kim alleges that Choe's physical proximity gave him access to conversations, a printed presentation, and knowledge of Kim's plans. Kim recalls lending Choe a printed presentation and being asked, in substance, where the ideas came from. Kim says he answered that they came from his own mind. Kim interprets this episode as Choe learning the scope and potential value of the work before later attaching himself to it. [Source note: gert34534.txt and repeated passages in the compendium]

The fact to investigate is not merely whether Choe saw a presentation. Investigators should determine what he saw, when he saw it, whether any confidentiality expectation was stated or reasonably understood, whether he copied or retained anything, and what he later communicated to others.

4.2 Silence Despite Notice of Investment and Monitoring

Kim's most repeated circumstantial point is Choe's alleged silence. Kim says Choe knew for months that presentations were being made for investors and that screens or communications were being observed. Kim argues that a contributor seeking credit or compensation would predictably have sent an email, asked to be named, demanded a share, contacted Adam or Festus, produced earlier records, or objected before leaving.

Silence alone does not prove misappropriation. It is nevertheless relevant when combined with a later ownership claim, particularly if the claimed contributor had notice of commercial use and routine access to written communication. The complete communication record should show whether Choe ever asserted contribution contemporaneously.

4.3 Alleged Post-Departure Online Attack

Kim says that Choe obtained access to an online channel shortly after moving out and then began attacking from a distance rather than communicating directly. He describes the campaign as a reversal from Choe's prior silence. The alleged tactics included claiming or following Kim's ideas, portraying Kim as having stolen them, implying a hidden arrangement, and using third parties or culturally recognizable media references to influence an audience.

Attribution remains a threshold problem. The combined text does not provide authenticated Choe account records or a direct archive of the alleged posts. Investigators must identify the platform, accounts, dates, URLs, device and IP records, private messages, moderation history, and any witnesses who knew who controlled the relevant accounts.

4.4 Alleged Coordination With Choe's Brother

Kim states that he had never spoken to Choe's brother and saw him only from behind while the brother helped Choe move. Kim therefore rejects any later claim of a three-person plan, partnership, pact, or shared idea development. He alleges that Choe and the brother instead acted together online after Choe's move. [Source notes: 184866.txt; jio3joi23jo2.txt]

Kim describes phrases and imagery that he interpreted as identity-based intimidation, including a phrase rendered in the notes as "clipping faggot wings." The source does not establish who authored the phrase. If an original communication is recovered and linked to either man, it may be relevant to intent, bias, intimidation, and the relationship between later sexual-orientation portrayals and the original attack.

4.5 Alleged Identity-Based Harassment

Kim alleges that Choe repeatedly assigned him a gay or bisexual identity, sexualized the relationship, or suggested sexual activity that did not occur. Kim views this as more than an insult. He says it was used to recast the conflict, humiliate him publicly, damage relationship prospects, and rationalize the alleged conduct with Choe's brother.

The notes also describe material Kim understood as portraying him as suicidal, schizophrenic, an alcoholic or drug user, violent, dishonest, or socially dependent on Choe. Kim denies those portrayals and supplies contextual rebuttals, including his account that he did not drink in the shared house, had GERD, used sleep medication, and generated his ideas without Choe's assistance. *[Source notes: fewr332132.txt; ferrw3321.txt; iihuyy897.txt]*

For legal and evidentiary purposes, each alleged statement should be separated into: exact words; speaker; account; date; audience; whether the statement was fact or opinion; whether it was republished; whether it caused identifiable loss; and whether Choe authored, approved, or distributed it.

4.6 Alleged False Collaboration, Mentorship, or "Pact" Narrative

Kim repeatedly rejects an alleged story that he and Choe had a secret collaboration, freedom pact, mentoring arrangement, staged conflict, or agreement under which Choe could attack him or contribute ideas. He refers to online "Erlang and Wukong," "signed and delivered," and similar relays, but acknowledges that he is interpreting symbolic material.

The core factual defense is concrete: no contract, no business email, no revenue allocation, no joint editing history, no shared investor communication, no contemporaneous list of Choe's contributions, and no direct relationship with the brother or Laura. Kim also argues that staged attacks would have exposed him to legal and reputational harm with no rational benefit.

4.7 Alleged Appropriation of Idea Origins

Kim alleges that Choe's conduct followed a recurring sequence:

1. Kim disclosed or developed a concept.
2. Choe or material attributed to Choe later appeared to claim the concept, a variation, or a foundational principle.
3. No earlier Choe record or contemporaneous objection appeared.
4. When one explanation failed, another was introduced, including oral disclosure, thwarted ideas, digital storage, extraordinary memory, hidden collaboration, or group involvement.

5. Choe allegedly made partial concessions or admissions, became silent, and later revived the claim.

The source calls this "follow-up copycatting." That label remains an allegation. A reliable comparison requires side-by-side versions, dates, access evidence, technical similarities, and proof that the claimed similarities are not generic, independently derived, or dictated by function.

4.8 Wooden Ships and Metal-Ship Evolution

The wooden-ship concept is the most frequently discussed example. Kim says he challenged himself to devise a boat using subtractive or CNC-like construction before moving downstairs and while not speaking meaningfully with Choe. He says he presented the concept to Adam, later told Choe about it in the kitchen, and developed metal-plated or modular variants in response to environmental concerns.

Kim points to Segment 8 of a presentation, earlier blogs, search activity, SketchUp work, communications with Choi and a friend, and messages to Adam as provenance evidence. He alleges that Choe's supposed wooden-ship presentation appeared years later, potentially used interlocking cubes in a technically awkward way, and reflected elements from Kim's later metal-ship work. [Source notes: 184866.txt; poi09i-9-09.txt; hiu987998.txt]

Investigators should obtain both parties' earliest complete files, including creation metadata, prior versions, attachments, cloud history, hash values, software autosaves, and recipients. Technical experts should compare expressive and engineering details, not merely the generic concept of a wooden boat.

4.9 Interlocking Cubes and Modular Principles

Kim alleges that Choe or Choe's supporters later claimed interlocking-cube principles that Kim says were used in metal ships, hollow courtyards, rockets, structures, mining, and other designs. Kim argues that a wooden-ship design made entirely from universal cubes would waste irregular timber and therefore looks like a superficial adaptation of his metal modular approach.

This allegation needs a claim chart: each allegedly copied feature, Kim's earliest dated expression, Choe's earliest dated expression, access, independent-development evidence, and whether the feature is functional, commonplace, patented, confidential, or copyrightable expression.

4.10 Spherical Ship and Space-Escalator Concepts

Kim states that the spherical-ship concept existed before Choe's claimed broad admission and that Choe directly conceded the space-escalator concept. He references an earliest identified spherical-ship record sent to Festus in September 2021, while stating that the idea was presented earlier. He also says witnesses recognized the concepts as his. [Source notes: hoii98089.txt; hiu987998.txt; repeated passages concerning the claimed admission]

Because the supposed concessions are not transcribed in the combined source, investigators should seek the original posts, recordings, witness statements, and platform logs. A witness's interpretation of symbolic media is less probative than a direct statement linked to Choe.

4.11 Sea Platforms, Segmented Pillars, and Related Logistics

Kim describes wooden ships being reused to transport segmented pillars for sea platforms and links later designs to an evolving system. He says Choe's stance at the time was silent or supportive and only changed later. This claimed change in position is offered as circumstantial evidence that later attribution was opportunistic.

The evidence should be organized as a development tree showing how each later component arose from earlier documented concepts. That would allow investigators to distinguish genuine continuity from broad thematic overlap.

4.12 Tree-Cutting Machinery and Submersibles

Kim says a ring-based tree-cutting machine preceded his ship evolution and that wooden submersibles reused the same materials or principles. He argues that anyone who truly originated the earlier concept would have identified obvious follow-ons when they first appeared, rather than claiming them years later.

This is a testable prediction only if the original records and the alleged later claims can be authenticated. The absence of a claim is relevant but not conclusive; the content and timing of actual communications matter more.

4.13 Homesteading, Housing, and Government-Supported Kits

Kim traces his homesteading and housing interests to a CALA loan, conversations with Dennis, a shared-land tiny-house proposal, discussions with caseworker Michelle Bernstein, unorganized-township research, wood and mineral rights, and a broader history of poverty and housing insecurity. He alleges that Choe later tried to convert general discussions about building a house into authorship of a detailed government-supported kit or settlement system.

Kim acknowledges that Choe studied civil engineering and that Choe's brother worked in construction. He therefore concedes the possibility of generic overlapping interest while maintaining that the distinctive system and detailed methods were his. This is an important limiting admission and should be retained. *[Source note: 184866.txt]*

4.14 Rapid Prototyping, CNC, and Manufacturing

Kim says his interest in CNC equipment, 3D printing, film gear, manufacturing, and prototyping predates Choe. He references film-school experiences, student-loan purchases, the hephaestus.ca domain, earlier equipment purchases, and discussions with third parties. He alleges that Choe's proximity was later used to create a false impression that these interests originated with Choe.

The relevant evidence includes purchase receipts, school enrollment dates, domain registration, marketplace messages, emails to classmates, equipment serial numbers, CAD files, and earlier public posts.

4.15 Cryonics, Memory Restoration, and AI-Assisted Research

Kim denies that Choe contributed to cryonics, brain preservation, memory-restoration, Bekenstein-bound, or AI-enhancement concepts. He says these developed later through disputes with Biden, his effort to protect his mother's prospects, and his use of GPT after moving to another Ecuhomes residence. He notes that he had not known generative AI in the shared house and argues that his earlier labor-intensive book-research method would make little sense if Choe had already supplied an AI solution.

These claims require careful separation between original scientific or technical contribution, use of public information, AI-assisted drafting, and protectable expression. General scientific principles cannot be privately owned, but a specific confidential design, patentable invention, or copied presentation may receive protection under the appropriate law.

4.16 Vehicles, Helicopters, Motorcycles, Mining, and Follow-On Designs

The source contains further allegations concerning helicopter blade-removal concepts, parachute systems, motorcycles, sea mining, material handling, and other vehicle or industrial designs. Kim sometimes acknowledges that similarities may be procedural coincidence or commonplace engineering. That distinction should guide expert review. Only detailed, nontrivial, access-linked similarity should be treated as potential misappropriation.

4.17 Alleged Walmart Following and Confrontation

Kim repeatedly describes a Walmart encounter as an important checkpoint. He alleges Choe followed him there, that the store had cameras, that Kim confronted Choe about stealing his work, and that Choe denied the accusation and left. Kim argues that if Choe believed Kim had stolen from him, Choe would have counter-accused or preserved a complaint rather than simply denying wrongdoing.

The event can potentially be tested by identifying the store, date, time range, payment records, transit or phone location records, and surviving CCTV. Because commercial CCTV is often overwritten quickly, the age of the event may make direct video recovery difficult. Witnesses, contemporaneous notes, police reports, and account messages may still establish the encounter. [Source notes: bghubhbh.txt; he534141.txt; jio3joi23jo2.txt]

4.18 Claimed Public Admission and Period of Silence

Kim describes what he understood as a major public confession roughly 300 to 400 days after Choe entered the online environment. He says the admission established that there was no idea exchange or business relationship and was followed by a lengthy period in which he could work without Choe challenging idea ownership. Kim also claims more specific concessions involving the space escalator, spherical ship, wooden ships, and absence of a digital archive.

The source itself repeatedly asks witnesses to reconstruct these admissions, showing that Kim does not possess a direct transcript in the compendium. The report therefore treats the admission as a high-priority evidence question. Investigators should ask each witness separately for exact words, date,

account, platform, surrounding discussion, and any saved copy before comparing accounts. [Source note: 1641844894.txt]

4.19 Alleged Adaptation After Records Disappeared

Kim alleges that older platform history was deleted and that Choe then adopted new explanations: oral idea transfer, a secret pact, thwarted ideas, digital files, extraordinary memory, a group collaboration, or a protective mission. The source more directly attributes deletion decisions to others, not to Choe. This report therefore does not allege that Choe personally deleted evidence absent proof. It does allege that, according to Kim, Choe knowingly exploited the loss of history by presenting accounts inconsistent with his earlier silence or admissions.

4.20 Alleged Coordination With Laura and Others

Kim says Laura was another housemate with whom he had only brief interactions, principally a warning about alleged monitoring and a note concerning shared space. He alleges that Laura became associated with Choe later and supported a false collaboration or romantic-triangle narrative. Kim calls additional supporters "acolytes," but often cannot identify the specific actor behind a relay.

Investigators should avoid assuming a conspiracy from similarity or social association. A joint-action allegation requires communications, shared plans, synchronized posts, financial links, account access, instructions, or other evidence of agreement and action.

4.21 Continuing Attachment to Kim's Identity and Work

Kim's description of Choe as a "parasite" refers to an alleged pattern of attaching to each new idea, personal trait, relationship, joke, motivation, or public narrative in order to remain relevant to Kim's life. Professionally restated, the allegation is one of continuing unwanted association and appropriation despite Kim's repeated denial of partnership or consent.

The legal significance depends on authenticated acts. Repeated unwanted electronic communications or surveillance-like conduct may be relevant to stalking or harassment laws. False factual statements may be relevant to defamation. Unauthorized use of confidential technical information may be relevant to trade-secret law. The metaphor itself is not evidence.

5. Complainant's Defenses and Provenance Account

5.1 Preexisting Interests and Records

Kim identifies numerous pre-Choe sources: film school; equipment ideas discussed with Eugene; CALA and homesteading efforts; discussions with Dennis and caseworker Michelle Bernstein; earlier attempts to build boats; communications with Adam; blogs; searches; equipment purchases; the hephaestus.ca domain; and early SketchUp or MS Paint work. These should be collected in native format.

5.2 Presentation Before Close Contact

Kim says the wooden-ship and related presentation work predated his September 2020 move downstairs. If attachment metadata and recipient records verify that sequence, it would materially rebut a later claim that Choe supplied the concept after Kim moved down.

5.3 Emails as a Relationship Record

Kim relies on emails showing that he was trying to persuade Choe that the investment situation was real, apologizing for discussing his current events, requesting help from Festus rather than Choe, and speaking as someone working alone. He argues that the tone and content are inconsistent with a concealed partnership.

5.4 Separate MBA Path

Kim states that Choe's stated path was an MBA and ordinary employment. Festus and the kitchen discussion may corroborate that point. A separate career plan does not rule out contributions, but it undermines a narrative that Choe was continuously co-developing Kim's technical portfolio.

5.5 No Contemporaneous Claim or Paper Trail

Kim emphasizes no emails claiming authorship, no edits, no invoices, no revenue share, no investor contact, no patent filing, no copyright deposit, and no third-party record. Investigators should confirm whether that claimed absence is accurate across both parties' devices and accounts.

5.6 Live and Incremental Development

Kim says the ideas emerged incrementally, often in response to a problem in an earlier design, and were written or drawn live rather than copied from a hidden collection. He describes using post-it notes to count new ideas and later moving from MS Paint to SketchUp. Platform archives and file-version history could test this account.

5.7 Disclosed Triggers and Public Sources

Kim frequently records what prompted a later idea, including a public article, video, wildfire concept, scientific principle, or engineering roadblock. He treats those disclosures as evidence of candor. Investigators should distinguish lawful inspiration and public-domain input from confidential contribution.

5.8 Acknowledged Generic Overlap

Kim sometimes admits that housing interests, helicopter mechanics, common gadgets, construction, and other broad topics may overlap independently. This improves the precision of his complaint: the claim should concern detailed methods and traceable expression, not ownership of a broad field or ordinary solution.

5.9 Lack of Direct Access to Alleged Channel

Kim says he was isolated from the online channel and could not see the alleged case against him directly. This is relevant both as a vulnerability and a limitation. It may explain delayed responses, but it also means that many attributions are second-hand or interpretive and require independent verification.

5.10 Express Uncertainty

The notes contain many corrections and admissions of uncertainty about dates, identities, and the meaning of relays. Those qualifiers should not be erased. They identify which claims can be presented as recollection and which remain hypotheses.

6. Alleged Harm

6.1 Psychological Harm

Kim describes years of preoccupation, fear, sleep disruption, anger, exhaustion, and inability to disengage from online material because he believed each new item could affect his legal safety and ownership. He says the repeated need to defend every idea consumed time and destabilized his life.

6.2 Reputational and Relationship Harm

Kim alleges that sexuality, addiction, mental-health, violence, dishonesty, and collaboration narratives were aimed at changing how potential partners, witnesses, investors, and the public saw him. Any damages analysis requires proof of publication, audience, falsity, fault, and concrete consequences.

6.3 Economic and Professional Harm

Kim alleges loss of investment prospects, dilution of authorship, interference with presentations, and inability to commercialize or continue developing ideas freely. Economic analysis should identify actual offers, contracts, valuations, lost opportunities, and uses by others. A proposed value per idea is not itself proof of market value.

6.4 Privacy and Autonomy Harm

Kim describes the alleged monitoring and relay environment as a loss of privacy in which personal conduct, searches, and unfinished thoughts could be converted into public narratives. The specific actor responsible for each alleged intrusion must be identified; the source does not establish that Choe controlled the monitoring system.

6.5 Safety Concerns

Kim understood some posts and slurs as threats of physical violence and viewed the Walmart encounter as stalking. These concerns warrant neutral assessment, but threat analysis must use the original words, speaker, context, delivery mechanism, intent, and resulting fear. Symbolic imagery alone should not be treated as a true threat without corroboration.

7. U.S. Legal Issue Analysis

7.1 Jurisdiction Comes First

Much of the direct relationship occurred in Canada. U.S. federal law does not apply merely because a platform is based in the United States or because a person later entered the United States. Each offense requires its own territorial or interstate-commerce connection. Canadian, provincial, state, or local law may be the principal law for some events. This section identifies U.S. issues for authorities to assess if the necessary jurisdictional facts are proven.

7.2 Interstate or Cyberstalking, 18 U.S.C. Section 2261A

Section 2261A can cover a person who uses an interactive computer service, electronic communication service or system, mail, or another facility of interstate or foreign commerce, with the required intent, in a course of conduct that causes, attempts to cause, or would reasonably be expected to cause substantial emotional distress, or creates the specified fear of death or serious bodily injury.

Potential fit: authenticated repeated posts, messages, surveillance, or coordinated communications intentionally directed at Kim to harass, intimidate, or cause substantial emotional distress, particularly if sent from the United States or through interstate or foreign systems.

Missing proof: the accounts and exact communications; Choe's control or direction; a course of conduct rather than isolated content; the statutory intent; the interstate or foreign-commerce nexus; and evidence of the required fear or emotional distress. Ambiguous recommendations or media relays cannot supply these elements without attribution.

7.3 Interstate Threats, 18 U.S.C. Section 875(c)

Section 875(c) concerns a communication transmitted in interstate or foreign commerce containing a threat to kidnap or injure another person. If the alleged violent slurs or intimidation can be recovered as direct communications authored or transmitted by Choe, authorities may assess the statute and the constitutionally required mental state.

Missing proof: exact words, speaker, transmission, recipient, context, intent or knowledge, and whether the statement was a genuine threat rather than advocacy, insult, metaphor, or third-party content.

7.4 Theft of Trade Secrets, 18 U.S.C. Sections 1832, 1836, 1837, and 1839

Section 1832 criminalizes specified knowing acts involving a trade secret related to a product or service used or intended for use in interstate or foreign commerce, with intent to convert it for another's economic benefit and intent or knowledge that the owner will be injured. Section 1839 requires information that derives economic value from not being generally known and that was subject to reasonable secrecy measures. Section 1836 provides a private civil action and generally a three-year discovery limitations period. Section 1837 supplies limited extraterritorial reach where the offender is a U.S. citizen or permanent resident, a qualifying U.S. organization is involved, or an act in furtherance occurs in the United States.

Potential fit: specific nonpublic technical plans, drawings, prototypes, processes, or presentation content shown to Choe under circumstances supporting confidentiality, followed by unauthorized copying, disclosure, or use for economic benefit.

Missing proof: identification of each trade secret with particularity; economic value from secrecy; reasonable measures to keep it secret; Choe's access; unauthorized acquisition, disclosure, or use; intent; injury; and the U.S. nexus. Information publicly presented, posted without restriction, or generally known may not qualify.

7.5 Copyright, 17 U.S.C. Sections 102, 106, and 501

Copyright protects original expression fixed in a tangible medium, including text, drawings, graphics, and sufficiently original presentation material. It does not protect an idea, procedure, process, system, method of operation, concept, principle, or discovery. A claim therefore must identify copied expression or a protectable selection and arrangement, not merely a similar idea.

Potential fit: copying of Kim's actual drawings, text, slides, diagrams, images, or other fixed expression.

Missing proof: ownership, access, substantial copying of protectable expression, and the accused work. Patent, trade-secret, contract, or unfair-competition law may be more relevant to technical concepts themselves.

7.6 Wire Fraud and Fraud Conspiracy, 18 U.S.C. Sections 1343 and 1349

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 the scheme. Section 1349 covers attempts and conspiracies to commit offenses in the same chapter.

Potential fit: an authenticated plan to obtain investment, payment, ownership, or other property by knowingly making false authorship claims through electronic communications.

Missing proof: a concrete money-or-property object, material false representation, fraudulent intent, wire transmission in execution of the scheme, identified victim, and causation. Reputational injury or false credit standing alone does not automatically establish federal wire fraud.

7.7 Federal Conspiracy, 18 U.S.C. Section 371

Section 371 is not a general ban on people acting together. It requires an agreement to commit a federal offense against the United States or to defraud the United States or an agency, plus an overt act. A social group, similar posts, or mutual support is insufficient by itself.

Potential fit: only if evidence establishes an agreement whose object was a specific federal offense or fraud on a U.S. agency and an act in furtherance.

Missing proof: the agreement, federal object, participant knowledge and intent, and overt act.

7.8 Witness Tampering and Record Obstruction, 18 U.S.C. Sections 1512 and 1519

Section 1512 addresses, among other conduct, intimidation, threats, corrupt persuasion, misleading conduct, evidence impairment, and harassment undertaken with the required intent to affect an official

proceeding or communication to federal law enforcement. Section 1519 addresses knowing alteration, destruction, concealment, or falsification of records with intent to impede a matter within U.S. department or agency jurisdiction or in contemplation of such a matter.

Potential fit: authenticated efforts by Choe to pressure witnesses, cause evidence deletion, falsify records, or prevent reporting of a federal offense.

Missing proof: a qualifying federal proceeding or matter, the required nexus and intent, an identified witness or record, and Choe's personal participation. The source alleges that records disappeared but does not presently establish that Choe deleted or ordered deletion of them.

7.9 Federal Hate-Crime Statute, 18 U.S.C. Section 249

Section 249 covers specified bias-motivated violence. For sexual orientation and other listed categories, it requires willfully causing bodily injury or attempting to cause bodily injury through fire, a firearm, a dangerous weapon, or an explosive or incendiary device, along with a statutory jurisdictional circumstance. The statute expressly excludes solely emotional or psychological harm from its definition of bodily injury.

The alleged slurs and sexual-orientation targeting may be relevant evidence of bias or motive. On the present source, however, the report does not identify bodily injury or an attempted bodily injury using one of the listed means by Choe. The federal hate-crime elements are therefore not established by the current record. Other harassment, threat, stalking, defamation, or local hate-crime laws may have different elements.

7.10 State and Civil Claims Requiring a Location

Depending on where Choe acted and where publication or harm occurred, the conduct may implicate state-law defamation, false light where recognized, intrusion upon seclusion, intentional infliction of emotional distress, civil harassment, tortious interference, unfair competition, or trade-secret law. These claims vary significantly by state, including limitations periods and privileges. A state-specific analysis requires Choe's location, the platform conduct location, the publication audience, and the location of injury.

7.11 Limitations and Preservation Urgency

The general federal limitations period for noncapital offenses is five years unless another statute provides otherwise. A federal civil trade-secret action generally must be filed within three years after discovery or when reasonable diligence should have led to discovery; continuing misappropriation is treated as a single claim under that provision. Other claims have different periods. Because the source reaches back to 2020 and 2021, immediate legal review of dates, tolling, continuing conduct, and preservation is important.

7.12 Charges Not Established by the Present Source

The current record should not be presented as establishing murder, attempted murder, treason, perjury, identity theft, obstruction, or a capital offense merely because Kim perceived severe consequences from alleged framing. Each such offense has specific act, intent, jurisdiction, and causation elements. Earlier

AI-generated passages in the compendium that equated reputational or idea-attribution conduct with those offenses are not reliable legal conclusions. Authorities may investigate any properly supported offense, but the report does not predetermine charge or sentence.

8. Elements-to-Evidence Matrix

Issue	Evidence presently described	Evidence still required	Assessment
Course of online harassment	Repeated notes describing relays, identity portrayals, and idea claims.	Original posts, accounts, dates, URLs, logs, and proof of Choe's authorship or direction.	Serious allegation; attribution presently incomplete.
Walmart following	Kim's repeated direct recollection; claimed cameras.	Store/date identification, CCTV, receipts, location data, witnesses, police report.	Concrete and potentially corroborable.
Threatening or bias language	Phrase and imagery remembered from relays.	Original communication, speaker, context, recipient, platform records.	Investigative lead only until authenticated.
Idea access	Shared house, printed presentation allegedly borrowed, conversations.	Exact materials seen, dates, copies, witnesses, confidentiality facts.	Access may be provable; scope uncertain.
Trade-secret use	Alleged later claims and follow-up designs.	Particularized secret, secrecy measures, accused use, economic benefit, U.S. nexus.	Elements not yet assembled.
Copyright copying	Presentations, drawings, text, diagrams.	Side-by-side accused work and protectable-expression comparison.	Possible only for expression, not ideas.
Fraud for property	Alleged effort to obtain idea credit and rewards.	Specific property target, false statements, wires, intent, victim, transaction.	Requires substantial additional proof.
Claimed admission	Kim's memory and anticipated witnesses; alleged silence afterward.	Transcript, recording, direct post, independent witness statements.	High-priority lead, not yet authenticated.
Joint action with brother or others	Timing, social association, parallel alleged narratives.	Communications, shared accounts, instructions, plans, overt acts.	Association alone is insufficient.
Evidence deletion or falsification	Kim states older platform history disappeared and narratives changed.	Audit logs, deletion records, actor identity, federal-proceeding nexus and intent.	No current proof that Choe performed deletion.
Reputational publication	Alleged sexuality, mental-health, addiction, violence, and theft narratives.	Exact statements, audience, falsity, fault, republication, damages, jurisdiction.	Potential civil issue if authenticated.

9. Evidence Preservation and Investigation Plan

9.1 Communications

Preserve the complete Gmail and Hotmail mailboxes used by Kim and Choe, including original headers, attachments, drafts, trash, and server export. Priority dates include April 27, May 8, July 5, and July 18, 2021, plus the months surrounding the Walmart event and claimed admission.

9.2 Presentations and Technical Files

Collect all versions of Segment 8 and related presentations; MS Paint, SketchUp, CAD, text, and image files; autosaves; cloud version history; local metadata; hashes; email attachments; recipient copies; and backups. Preserve the files read-only before analysis.

9.3 Online Platform Records

Identify the platform or platforms called "the channel." Preserve account identifiers, display-name history, linked email and phone data, login IP records, device identifiers, private messages, posts, edits, deletes, moderation actions, upvotes, follower and following lists, and content-recommendation logs where available. Send preservation requests before retention periods expire.

9.4 Housing and Movement Timeline

Obtain leases, rent records, landlord files, address changes, moving records, and witness statements establishing Kim's September 2020 move downstairs, Choe's July 2021 departure, Choe's nearby address, and the alleged move from that address within two weeks.

9.5 Walmart Event

Determine the store location and narrow the date through receipts, bank statements, transit history, phone records, emails, and contemporaneous notes. Ask Walmart about archived CCTV or incident records. Interview any identified employee or customer witness separately.

9.6 Witnesses

Interview Adam, Festus, the landlord, Cesar, Robert, Laura, Choe's brother, Choe's mother, the nearby property owner, and the persons Kim listed as observing the online activity or admission. Each witness should first give an unaided account before being shown Kim's narrative.

9.7 Claimed Admission

For every witness who recalls an admission, record: exact words; platform; account; date and time; surrounding posts; whether Choe was visibly or cryptographically linked to the account; whether the statement concerned all idea claims or only one; and whether a copy exists.

9.8 Idea-Provenance Comparison

For each disputed concept, create a neutral claim chart with:

1. A precise description of the allegedly protected feature.
2. Kim's earliest authenticated record.
3. Choe's earliest authenticated record.
4. Evidence of access.
5. Similarities and differences.
6. Public-domain or commonplace sources.
7. Whether the information was secret.
8. Any patent, copyright, contract, or commercial use.

9.9 Financial and Commercial Evidence

Collect communications with Adam and any investors, proposed valuations, offers, contracts, pitch records, payment discussions, and evidence of actual commercial exploitation. Determine whether Choe or another person received money, equity, employment, credit, or access based on the disputed work.

9.10 Police and Government Records

Request any Toronto police occurrence reports, complaints, wellness records, or communications concerning Choe, the Walmart encounter, the alleged online threats, or the claimed admission. If a U.S. federal referral occurred, preserve agency correspondence and case identifiers.

9.11 Authentication and Alternative Explanations

Digital forensics should test authorship rather than assume it. Investigators should consider impersonation, shared accounts, recommendation algorithms, independent creation, generic overlap, mistaken identity, and retrospective memory error. A fair investigation can test these alternatives without dismissing Kim's allegations.

10. Investigative Questions for Steve Choe

1. What was the complete nature of Choe's relationship with Kim from first meeting through July 2021?
2. Did Choe contribute any idea, text, drawing, calculation, presentation, or business plan to Kim? If so, identify each item, date, medium, and witness.
3. Why is there allegedly no contemporaneous email, message, contract, edit, invoice, or ownership demand?
4. What did Choe know about Adam, the presentations, the alleged monitoring, and prospective investment?

5. Did Choe review or retain a printed presentation? Did he copy, photograph, scan, or transmit it?
6. What was discussed when Choe introduced Kim to Festus?
7. Was Choe pursuing an MBA, and did that path have any connection to Kim's work?
8. Did Choe control or contribute to any account in the online channel? Identify all account names and collaborators.
9. Did Choe or anyone acting with him publish claims about Kim's sexuality, mental health, substance use, violence, dishonesty, or idea ownership?
10. Did Choe communicate with his brother, Laura, Festus, or others about Kim's presentations or reputation?
11. Why did Choe leave the nearby residence soon after moving in, if the timeline is accurate?
12. What occurred at Walmart? Did Choe follow Kim, speak with him, deny taking ideas, or leave after confrontation?
13. Did Choe ever make a public or private admission concerning Kim's ideas or the absence of a business relationship?
14. Did Choe move to the United States, and did any allegedly relevant online conduct occur from there?
15. Did Choe request, encourage, or benefit from deletion, concealment, or alteration of platform history?
16. Has Choe used, submitted, sold, licensed, patented, copyrighted, published, or received compensation for any disputed material?
17. What independent records predate Kim's work for each concept Choe claims?

11. Requested Actions

1. Preserve first and investigate second, particularly online account data and old communications.
2. Authenticate every statement attributed to Choe before relying on it.
3. Reconstruct the 2020-2022 chronology from records rather than memory estimates.
4. Separate direct acts by Choe from acts attributed to his brother, Laura, platform operators, public figures, or unknown users.
5. Obtain neutral technical review of the disputed designs and their provenance.
6. Interview witnesses independently concerning the Walmart event and claimed admission.

7. Determine the location of each alleged act before selecting U.S., Canadian, state, provincial, or local law.
8. Assess immediate safety using concrete communications and conduct, not symbolic media alone.
9. Provide Choe an opportunity to identify his own contemporaneous records and respond to each specific allegation.
10. Refer only substantiated conduct for charging or civil action and leave penalty to the lawful decision-maker.

12. Cumulative Assessment

Taken at its strongest, Kim's account describes a potentially serious pattern: a former housemate allegedly learned of commercially valuable work, made no contemporaneous contribution claim, attacked from a distance after leaving, used or tolerated identity-based intimidation, followed Kim in public, participated in repeated online attribution and character narratives, made a broad concession, and later revived the claims after the older record became difficult to access.

Taken at its present evidentiary level, the record has significant gaps. The most severe online allegations often depend on inference from relays rather than direct communications. The claimed admission lacks a transcript in the compendium. The accused works are not placed side by side. No financial receipt by Choe is documented. Choe's role in alleged deletion is not established. These are reasons for disciplined investigation, not reasons either to declare guilt or to discard the complaint.

Kim's account provides concrete anchors that can resolve much of the dispute: dated emails, housing records, presentation versions, a known Walmart location, named witnesses, identified technical concepts, and a claimed period of silence after an admission. The proper course is to secure those materials, test authorship and chronology, and evaluate each alleged act under the elements of the law that actually governs it.

The central question is therefore precise: did Steve Choe knowingly use access, online communications, coordinated narratives, or protected materials to appropriate Kim's work, intimidate him, damage his reputation, or cause substantial distress, and is there reliable evidence linking Choe to those acts? That question can be answered only through authenticated records and fair process.

Appendix A. Consolidated Allegation Inventory

1. Choe allegedly used Kim's assistance during the first Library Genesis interaction and then treated him with abrupt hostility.
2. Choe allegedly maintained only limited contact for roughly two years, contradicting a later close-partnership narrative.
3. Choe allegedly knew of Kim's presentations, Adam, prospective investment, and claimed monitoring after Kim moved downstairs.

4. Choe allegedly pursued a separate MBA path and did not work on Kim's presentations.
5. Choe allegedly reviewed a printed presentation and questioned the origin of Kim's ideas.
6. Choe allegedly made no contemporaneous ownership or contribution claim despite months of opportunity.
7. Choe allegedly introduced Kim to Festus for financial projection help but did not himself participate in that work.
8. Choe allegedly showed no ideas when Kim asked him directly.
9. Choe allegedly permitted Kim to continue speaking and presenting as sole originator without written correction.
10. Choe allegedly became resentful or jealous as Kim described prospective success.
11. Choe allegedly engaged in passive-aggressive acts around the house, including the disputed handling of dishes and room privacy.
12. Choe allegedly began attacking Kim online shortly after moving out.
13. Choe allegedly acted with his brother despite Kim never having spoken with the brother.
14. Choe allegedly used or adopted violent sexual-orientation slurs or imagery to intimidate Kim.
15. Choe allegedly sought to portray Kim as gay or bisexual against Kim's stated identity.
16. Choe allegedly promoted stories portraying Kim as suicidal, mentally ill, addicted, violent, dishonest, or abnormal.
17. Choe allegedly portrayed the relationship as collaboration, mentorship, a pact, or staged conflict without records.
18. Choe allegedly claimed or followed up on wooden-ship and metal-ship concepts.
19. Choe allegedly claimed or followed up on interlocking-cube and modular principles.
20. Choe allegedly claimed or followed up on spherical-ship and space-escalator concepts.
21. Choe allegedly claimed or followed up on sea-platform, segmented-pillar, submersible, mining, vehicle, and other derivative systems.
22. Choe allegedly attempted to attach himself to homesteading, housing, CNC, prototyping, cryonics, AI, and other interests that Kim says predated or postdated their contact.
23. Choe allegedly relied on generic overlap while lacking Kim's distinctive technical details.
24. Choe allegedly changed explanations when chronology or prior conduct contradicted an earlier explanation.

25. Choe allegedly followed Kim at Walmart, denied taking his work when confronted, and left.
26. Choe allegedly made a broad public admission months later that ended the ownership dispute for a period.
27. Choe allegedly remained silent concerning idea ownership after the admission but continued or later resumed reputation attacks.
28. Choe allegedly moved to the United States and continued conduct across borders.
29. Choe allegedly coordinated later narratives with Laura and other supporters.
30. Choe allegedly exploited deletion or loss of earlier platform history to introduce new accounts.
31. Choe allegedly continued attaching himself to new ideas and personal traits despite Kim's repeated objection.
32. Choe allegedly caused psychological, reputational, professional, privacy, and safety harm through the cumulative campaign.

Appendix B. Principal Provenance Categories

Category	Kim's stated earlier source or development path	Key material to authenticate
Wooden and metal ships	Boat-building challenge, Adam presentation, Segment 8, earlier blog and search history, later environmental adaptation.	Earliest files, Adam messages, recipients, metadata, SketchUp and MS Paint history.
Modular and interlocking structures	Metal-ship modules, hollow courtyard, rockets, later mining and construction uses.	Dated diagrams and technical claim chart.
Spherical ship	Developed and presented before claimed admission; September 2021 Festus record identified.	Earlier drafts, Festus attachment, platform records.
Space escalator	Developed through prior structural and material concepts; claimed direct concession by Choe.	Original presentation and exact concession record.
Sea platform and pillars	Follow-on system using ships to transport segmented structures.	Development sequence and dated drawings.
Tree cutting and submersibles	Ring cutting machine and reuse of wood/metal ship principles.	Earliest design, technical differences, recipient copies.
Homesteading and housing	CALA, Dennis, caseworker, tiny-house and township research, lived housing insecurity.	Loan records, correspondence, caseworker notes, dated proposals.
CNC and prototyping	Film school, Eugene, student-loan equipment purchases, domain and marketplace history.	Receipts, messages, domain data, equipment records.

Category	Kim's stated earlier source or development path	Key material to authenticate
Cryonics and memory restoration	Mother's preservation goals, later research, public scientific principles, GPT assistance.	Dated notes, GPT history where available, source citations.
Generative AI and AI enhancement	First use after leaving shared house; adaptation of labor-intensive research process.	Account history, device records, dated drafts.
Vehicles and mining	Follow-ons arising from design constraints and earlier systems; some generic overlap acknowledged.	Feature-specific charts and expert review.

Appendix C. Principal Source Notes

The following source-note files contain the clearest consolidated passages. They are internal references within `combinedSteve.txt`, not independent exhibits:

1. `184866.txt`: relationship history, move downstairs, monitoring disclosure, no ideas from Choe, brother and Laura limitations, post-move allegations, housing and wooden-ship discussion.
2. `oiu0980809.txt`: September 2020 move, preexisting Adam arrangement, email-record defense, Festus introduction, limited relationship, monitoring awareness.
3. `iihiuuyy897.txt`: May 8, 2021 email, MBA path, SSD chronology, incremental idea-development account, claimed admission timing.
4. `hbgthy656.txt`: July 5 message, departure 13 days later, alleged jealousy, Walmart confrontation, relationship distance.
5. `he534141.txt`: nearby-house encounter, withdrawal of proposed gift, alleged attacks with brother, move within two weeks, Walmart and U.S. relocation claims.
6. `jio3joi23jo2.txt`: limited contact with brother, move-day details, nearby-house and Walmart sequence, collaboration rebuttal.
7. `1641844894.txt`: requested reconstruction of claimed admissions, period of silence, alleged later narrative changes.
8. `bghubhbh.txt`: concise Walmart and camera allegation.
9. `poi09i-9-09.txt`: wooden-ship, metal-ship, and cube provenance analysis.
10. `joiuo889787.txt`: relationship summary, MBA path, April 27 and July 18 dates, lack of business or idea exchange.
11. `fafaf.txt`: earlier AI-generated report embedded in the source; useful only as a map of allegations and not as evidence or reliable legal analysis.

Appendix D. Official U.S. Authorities Consulted

1. 18 U.S.C. Section 2261A, Stalking: [OLRC official text](#)
2. 18 U.S.C. Section 875, Interstate communications: [OLRC official text](#)
3. 18 U.S.C. Section 1832, Theft of trade secrets: [OLRC official text](#)
4. 18 U.S.C. Section 1836, Civil proceedings: [OLRC official text](#)
5. 18 U.S.C. Section 1837, Conduct outside the United States: [OLRC official text](#)
6. 18 U.S.C. Section 1839, Definitions: [OLRC official text](#)
7. 17 U.S.C. Section 102, Copyright subject matter and idea-expression limit: [OLRC official text](#)
8. 17 U.S.C. Section 106, Exclusive rights: [OLRC official text](#)
9. 17 U.S.C. Section 501, Infringement: [OLRC official text](#)
10. 18 U.S.C. Section 1343, Wire fraud: [OLRC official text](#)
11. 18 U.S.C. Section 1349, Attempt and conspiracy: [OLRC official text](#)
12. 18 U.S.C. Section 371, Federal conspiracy: [OLRC official text](#)
13. 18 U.S.C. Section 1512, Witness tampering: [OLRC official text](#)
14. 18 U.S.C. Section 1519, Record obstruction: [OLRC official text](#)
15. 18 U.S.C. Section 249, Hate crime acts: [OLRC official text](#)
16. 18 U.S.C. Section 3282, General limitations period: [OLRC official text](#)

Closing Certification of Scope

This report presents Kim's allegations against Steve Choe in organized form, preserves material uncertainties, and identifies evidence capable of confirming or refuting them. It does not adopt allegations against unrelated persons, does not treat repeated notes as independent corroboration, and does not ask the reader to substitute symbolic inference for authenticated proof. Its purpose is to enable fair investigation of Choe's alleged conduct, the harm claimed by Kim, and any offense or civil wrong that reliable evidence and applicable law may support.