

COURT OF JUSTICE REPORT

Alleged Conduct of Wongi's Father

Investigative allegation statement and evidence-preservation request

Document metadata	Value
Prepared from	combinedUncle.txt
Prepared	June 29, 2026
Source scope	31 substantive source units; approximately 36,236 words
Status	Allegations not adjudicated

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

Contents

- Alleged Conduct of Wongi's Father (the Complainant's Maternal Uncle)
- Important Notice
- Executive Summary
- 1. Scope and Method
- 2. Subject Identification and Attribution Boundaries
- 3. Relationship History and Chronology
- 4. Alleged Conduct Requiring Investigation
- 5. Claimed Harm and Causation
- 6. Cumulative Theory and Incrimination Factors
- 7. Defenses, Alternative Explanations, and Limiting Admissions
- 8. Potential U.S. and Illinois Legal Relevance
- 9. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests
- 10. Questions for Wongi's Father
- 11. Witness Questions
- 12. Assessment of Evidentiary Strength
- 13. Requested Disposition
- 14. Source-Unit Guide
- 15. Official Legal Sources

Important Notice

This report organizes allegations made by Joo-yeon Kim concerning the maternal uncle he identifies as Wongi's father. 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 believes," and "the source alleges" to preserve that distinction.

The source compilation contains firsthand recollections, summaries of letters and family communications, descriptions of project concepts, requests that witnesses come forward, and interpretations of online recommendations or symbolic media that Kim calls "relays." A relay, thumbnail, fictional scene, celebrity image, suggested video, perceived tone, or silence is not treated as proof that the subject authored, directed, endorsed, or even saw a communication. Such material is listed only where it identifies a question that can be tested through original records or witnesses.

The source also uses the word "uncle" for more than one person. This report concerns Wongi's father. It does not attribute to him the conduct of Mark's father, the "youngest uncle," Eileen's husband, Chloe's father, Kim's father, or any fictional character used in a relay. References to other people appear only where necessary to explain a claimed joint act, source of information, witness, defense, or alternative actor.

The requested focus is the named subject's alleged conduct. Kim's angry or defensive language is not analyzed as a separate allegation against him. Questions of criminal or civil liability and any penalty belong exclusively to competent authorities and courts. The aim is accurate preservation and fair investigation, including facts that could disprove the allegations.

Executive Summary

Kim's central allegation is that Wongi's father repeatedly exercised family authority against him without first obtaining a balanced account. The alleged pattern begins after Kim's mother's death, when Kim says he was acutely vulnerable and suicidal. Kim recalls receiving a letter from the subject that he experienced as blame for his mother's death. He further suspects that the subject participated in family communications about Kim's suicidal message, accepted a one-sided account circulated through other relatives, and then remained silent rather than asking questions or seeking assistance. The source does not include the original letter, the suicide-related message thread, or proof of who received or discussed it. Those records are therefore the first investigative priority.

Kim next describes an apparent reconciliation. During an earlier period of public family ridicule allegedly led by other relatives, Kim says Wongi's father appeared to apologize on behalf of the family. Kim states that he relied on that apparent apology and asked Elon Musk or associated persons to provide approximately three million in financial help to Wongi's family because he believed they were in poverty. Whether any payment occurred, in what currency, through whom, and on what terms is not established in the source.

Kim alleges that the subject's conduct changed again after the apparent apology and possible assistance. He says relatives produced writings or presentations that followed Kim's previously disclosed sea-

platform and labor-exchange system, including wooden ships, segmented pillars, food production, migration, education, and work-exchange components. Kim alleges that Wongi's father led, encouraged, approved, defended, or benefited from this follow-up and later mockery. The source is specific about the claimed technical chronology but less specific about the subject's own words or acts. Investigators should therefore separate: work created by Wongi or another cousin; any direct contribution by Wongi's father; any statement of authorship or permission; and any economic benefit.

The later allegation is that Wongi's father defended Kim's sister and her husband concerning events in Canada despite not being present there and without asking Kim for his account. Kim says this support recast him as the cause of the family conflict or of his mother's death, discounted his allegations of abuse and poisoning, and helped other relatives continue a campaign of mockery, exclusion, or idea reattribution. The record presently establishes Kim's perception of that alignment, not the exact communications by which the subject adopted or advanced it.

The strongest potentially verifiable issues are therefore narrow. They are the original post-death letter; the suicide-related email chain; family email and KakaoTalk records; the alleged apology; evidence of any three-million payment; original project files and relatives' presentations; direct statements by the subject about authorship, Kim's mother, the sister and husband, or Kim's credibility; and records identifying who controlled any online account attributed to him.

The source contains important limitations. Kim repeatedly uses conditional language, asks witnesses to confirm his interpretation, and acknowledges that particular relays may be wrong. He later states that Wongi was "a bit alleviated from charges," questions whether relatives intended lethal harm, prefers a proportionate response rather than capital punishment, and recognizes that some relatives may be reasonable. These qualifications are retained because they bear on reliability, attribution, and proportionality.

1. Scope and Method

The supplied compilation contains approximately 36,236 words in 31 substantive source units. Each asterisk-separated unit was treated as a complete source item. Overlapping passages were consolidated by chronology and theme rather than repeated merely because the same conclusion appeared more than once.

The review uses five evidence classifications:

1. **Claimed firsthand event:** Something Kim says he personally saw, heard, received, wrote, or did.
2. **Record-dependent assertion:** A claim that identifies a recoverable document or artifact, such as a letter, email, KakaoTalk thread, payment record, presentation, file history, or direct post.
3. **Witness-dependent assertion:** A claimed event that Kim says others observed, such as an apology, public mockery, a presentation, or a change in the subject's position.
4. **Inference:** A conclusion about agreement, motive, leadership, jealousy, prejudice, or intent drawn from a sequence of events rather than a quoted direct statement.

5. **Interpretive lead:** A conclusion drawn from a media recommendation, thumbnail, fictional scene, alias, symbolic phrase, or other relay. It has no evidentiary weight against the subject unless independent evidence connects him to it.

The report gives the greatest attention to the first two categories, identifies witnesses for the third, and labels the fourth and fifth explicitly. It does not treat repetition as corroboration. It also does not treat kinship, silence, receipt of a message, later disagreement, or support for another relative as proof of a criminal agreement.

The primary source is `combinedUncle.txt`. No original emails, certified translations, bank records, platform exports, police files, medical records, project repositories, or witness statements were supplied with it. This report therefore presents an allegation map and investigative plan, not a completed evidentiary record.

2. Subject Identification and Attribution Boundaries

Person or label	Relevance to this report	Boundary required
Wongi's father / maternal uncle	Named subject; alleged post-death blame, suicide-related family involvement, apology, later reversal, idea-related leadership or approval, mockery, and support for the sister and husband	Confirm legal name, residences, accounts, and direct acts before attributing any statement
Wongi	Subject's son; alleged participant in later project follow-up	His acts cannot automatically be attributed to his father
Kim's sister and her husband	Persons whom the subject allegedly defended or supported	Their alleged underlying conduct is not adjudicated here
Aunt Eileen	Alleged conduit for family emails and suicide-related communications	Her forwarding or statements are not the subject's acts without proof of direction or agreement
Chloe's father	Alleged initiator of a separate phase of ridicule	Do not transfer his alleged slurs or conduct to the subject
Mark's father / Illinois host uncle	Different uncle connected to a housing episode and later death	Excluded from subject attribution
Youngest uncle / Eileen's husband / "Uncle Vernon"	Separate people or relay labels	Excluded unless a direct record identifies Wongi's father
Public figures and platforms	Appear in Kim's account of relays or assistance	No relationship or payment is assumed without records

Kim should provide the subject's full legal name, Korean spelling, date of birth if known, current and former addresses, telephone numbers, email accounts, KakaoTalk identifiers, and relationship to Wongi. This is necessary to avoid a mistaken-person investigation.

3. Relationship History and Chronology

3.1 Earlier Family Relationship

Kim describes the subject as a maternal uncle and Wongi's father. The compilation suggests that the families once had a relationship close enough for Kim to remember Wongi favorably and later wish to help Wongi's household financially. Kim nevertheless says an adult-child hierarchy persisted in which the subject viewed him through family prejudice, his father's lineage, or an image of him as a troublesome younger relative.

The source does not provide a complete pre-2010 relationship history or direct examples of the subject's conduct during Kim's childhood. It should therefore not be assumed that all family conflict originated with this subject. The relevant question is whether later records show that he relied on a fixed negative image rather than verified events.

3.2 2010: Mother's Death and the Alleged Blaming Letter

After Kim's mother died, Kim recalls a letter from Wongi's father stating, in substance, "I thought everything was fine, what happened?" Kim says the tone blamed him for his mother's death. Tone is inherently interpretive, especially across Korean and English, but the letter itself may establish what was said, when it was said, what information the subject possessed, and whether he asked questions or assigned responsibility.

Kim's theory is that the letter was not an isolated expression of confusion. He believes it reflected family discussions that had already accepted his sister's or other relatives' account and treated Kim as the problem. The source does not quote the full letter or identify its date, medium, recipients, or preceding messages. A complete thread and certified translation are essential.

3.3 Suicide-Related Communications and Alleged Silence

Kim states that he sent a suicidal letter or announcement during the period after his mother's death. He alleges that relatives exchanged letters or discussed the message and that Wongi's father was part of this process. Kim says the subject's preceding letter, followed by silence, intensified his alienation and left him believing the family had accepted or agreed to his death.

The source uses stronger formulations such as "exchanging letters to agree in my suicide," but elsewhere Kim expressly frames collective participation as a guess: "my guess is that, my suicide was discussed with them." This distinction is material. The current record supports investigation of who knew what and what they did; it does not establish that the subject encouraged suicide, coerced Kim, supplied means, or joined a criminal agreement.

The appropriate questions are whether the subject received the message, responded, forwarded it, discussed it, contacted Kim or another relative, sought emergency help, or deliberately used psychological pressure. Silence alone may be painful or morally troubling, but criminal liability requires additional elements.

3.4 One-Sided Family Information and Alleged Prejudgment

Kim alleges that Aunt Eileen forwarded his emails to his sister despite his request that she not do so. He believes those emails, his angry phone calls, and other private material circulated among the extended family. Kim says Wongi's father formed conclusions from that one-sided information without asking why Kim was angry, what conduct preceded it, or whether Kim's sister and husband had harmed him.

The allegation against the subject is therefore not merely that he believed a relative. It is that he allegedly adopted and acted on a conclusion while knowing he lacked firsthand knowledge. Kim says the subject was not in Canada during the disputed events and nevertheless blamed him or defended the sister and husband. This can be tested only through the actual family communications and the subject's account of his information sources.

3.5 Apparent Apology During an Earlier Phase of Ridicule

Kim describes a later online or public phase in which Chloe's father and Eileen allegedly mocked him, involved younger relatives, and used insulting characterizations. Kim says Wongi's father then appeared to apologize on behalf of the family or on behalf of Kim's mother. The source describes this through a relay of the subject kneeling and asking forgiveness, not through a direct letter or recording.

Because the apology is itself relay-dependent, investigators should not assume that it occurred or what it covered. Witnesses should identify whether the subject directly apologized, when, to whom, and for which conduct. If authenticated, the apology could show awareness of wrongdoing by relatives, an attempt at reconciliation, or simply sympathy without admission.

3.6 Alleged Financial Assistance to Wongi's Family

Kim says that, after perceiving the apology, he asked Elon Musk or associated persons to provide approximately three million to Wongi's family because he believed the family was in poverty. He states that the request was made in gratitude for the subject's support and in remembrance of a better relationship with Wongi.

The source is uncertain whether the payment actually occurred. It does not identify currency, date, payer, recipient, account, intermediary, agreement, tax record, or acknowledgment. The report therefore calls this an alleged or requested payment, not a fact. Verification matters because Kim treats it as the event after which the subject's attitude changed and as evidence that Kim acted generously before the alleged reversal.

3.7 Alleged Follow-Up on the Sea-Platform System

Kim alleges that six months to a year after the apparent reconciliation, Wongi or other cousins produced academic writing or presentations that followed his sea-platform and labor-exchange concepts. He identifies the integrated system as including:

- modular or segmented ocean pillars;
- wooden ships used to transport pillar segments and support migration;
- a sea platform intended to operate as a bridge between nations;
- watermeal or other food production;

- food, shelter, water, transportation, and education in exchange for labor;
- education or specialization intended to help participants qualify for migration; and
- e-currency or other economic components.

Kim's authorship theory is that the integrated system and its engineering dependencies were his, even if broad ideas such as seasteading or nations on platforms already existed. He alleges that relatives polished or extended his work and then sought independent credit. He says a follow-up can be useful and improved while still depending on the originator's disclosed foundation.

The specific allegation against Wongi's father is less developed. Kim asks what the subject's attitude, goal, and role were; elsewhere he says the subject led the second phase, hijacked his ideas, revived abuse, or defended his sons' work. These statements range from a direct conclusion to an open question. Investigators must identify a specific act: instruction, authorship claim, presentation, distribution, funding request, licensing act, concealment, threat, or receipt of benefit.

3.8 Alleged Change in Position and Renewed Mockery

Kim says the subject's attitude changed after the family received or was offered assistance. He alleges that Wongi's father moved from apology to renewed mockery, competition, or support for relatives' idea claims. Kim describes this as betrayal because he had tried to help the household and had previously withdrawn or reduced demands for punishment.

The source repeatedly attributes mockery "especially" to Wongi's father, but it supplies no authenticated quotation, account name, date, or platform post. The allegation should be investigated by requiring Kim and any witness to identify the exact communication rather than by treating the relay that triggered his interpretation as the communication itself.

3.9 Defense of Kim's Sister and Her Husband

Kim alleges that Wongi's father later defended Kim's sister and her husband regarding allegations of abuse, poisoning, and events surrounding the mother's death. Kim emphasizes that the subject was not present in Canada and could not have observed those events. He says the subject blamed him, discounted what he described as repeated abuse, and preferred the sister's welfare over a neutral inquiry.

Family members are permitted to believe, support, or assist another relative, and they may report safety concerns. The potentially actionable issue would be whether the subject knowingly made a materially false factual statement, fabricated or concealed evidence, communicated a threat, joined a specific unlawful plan, or used repeated targeted communications to harass or intimidate. The present source does not establish those acts; it identifies them as questions for records and witnesses.

3.10 Later Requests to Study or Move On

Kim describes a relay in which Wongi's father told him to read or study. Kim experienced this as condescending because he believed people were monitoring what he read and exploiting ideas that followed. He also perceived fictional "teacher" or "uncle" relays as the subject speaking with authority about Kim's failures.

Without proof that the subject authored or directed a communication, these interpretations cannot support an allegation. Even a direct suggestion to read or study would ordinarily be lawful and ambiguous. It becomes relevant only if it formed part of a verified course of targeted intimidation, coercion, or misrepresentation.

3.11 Later Softening and Uncertainty

Kim later wrote that Wongi was "a bit alleviated from charges," that he did not know whether relatives were trying to kill him, and that he hoped any response would be less than capital punishment. He also said that Wongi might respect boundaries and that only a few extended-family members should be charged if they actually pursued harm.

These passages do not erase allegations against Wongi's father, but they show that Kim's conclusions evolved and that he distinguishes uncertainty from proof. Authorities should preserve the complete sequence rather than select only the most accusatory wording.

4. Alleged Conduct Requiring Investigation

4.1 Blaming a Vulnerable Relative Without Adequate Inquiry

Kim alleges that the subject's post-death communication assigned or implied blame at a time when Kim was grieving and unstable. If the actual letter contains a false factual accusation, coercive language, or evidence of prior coordination, it may be significant. If it merely asked what happened or expressed confusion, Kim's interpretation may not be supported.

The investigative question is not whether the letter hurt. It is what the subject knew, what he said, whether he presented an accusation as fact to others, and what foreseeable effect he intended.

4.2 Participation in or Knowledge of Suicide-Related Family Deliberations

Kim suspects that the subject exchanged or received letters about his suicidal message and joined a collective decision not to intervene. The allegation is serious because Kim describes the family as observing his condition while remaining silent. It is also presently uncorroborated.

Investigators should identify every recipient, response, forwarding event, call, emergency contact, and discussion. They should distinguish deliberate coercion or encouragement from uncertainty, nonreceipt, delayed receipt, inability to locate Kim, mistaken belief that another person was helping, or a decision to avoid contact for safety reasons.

4.3 Adopting a One-Sided Account and Scapegoating

Kim alleges that Wongi's father relied on information supplied by the sister, Eileen, or other relatives and treated him as responsible for the conflict without asking for his account. Kim calls this prejudice and scapegoating. The potentially relevant acts are any specific false factual statements repeated to third parties, pressure placed on others to exclude or discredit Kim, or use of private information for a harmful purpose.

Mere opinion, family alignment, dislike, or a refusal to communicate is not by itself a crime. The report therefore requests exact statements, recipients, and consequences.

4.4 Apparent Reconciliation Followed by Reversal

Kim's cumulative theory depends on an apparent sequence: apology, Kim's request for financial assistance, improved family circumstances, and renewed antagonism. If verified, this sequence may bear on motive and credibility. It does not itself establish fraud or malicious intent.

Investigators should determine whether the apology was direct, whether assistance occurred, whether any condition was attached, and whether the subject made a contradictory statement afterward. A change of opinion can be lawful; concealment of a known plan or use of a false promise to obtain money presents a different question.

4.5 Leadership, Approval, or Benefit From Project Reattribution

Kim alleges that the subject led or approved a second phase in which family members followed his project concepts and sought credit. The following distinctions are necessary:

1. Whether Wongi's father created any work himself.
2. Whether he instructed another person to use Kim's materials.
3. Whether he knew the materials came from Kim.
4. Whether he claimed original authorship or merely supported a relative.
5. Whether any protected text, diagram, code, or confidential information was copied.
6. Whether any patent, grant, investment, employment, payment, or other property was sought or obtained.
7. Whether Kim had publicly disclosed the concepts or imposed confidentiality.
8. Whether the later work was independent, licensed, collaborative, or derivative.

Without answers to those questions, "idea hijacking" is a description of the dispute rather than a legal conclusion.

4.6 Repeated Mockery or Public Humiliation

Kim says mockery continued and was especially associated with the subject. He describes the harm as psychological, reputational, and competitive. Exact words and authorship are absent from the compilation.

Investigators should request direct posts, messages, recordings, account identifiers, dates, audience size, translations, and witnesses. Insulting opinion may be protected speech. A knowingly false factual accusation, threat, repeated targeted contact, or coordinated publication to cause a defined harm requires a different analysis.

4.7 Supporting Alleged Wrongdoers Despite Lack of Firsthand Knowledge

Kim alleges that Wongi's father defended the sister and husband even after becoming aware of Kim's allegations against them. Support for an accused relative is not proof of complicity. Aiding, abetting, or conspiracy requires evidence that the subject intentionally assisted a specific unlawful act, not merely that he believed another person or argued for lenience.

The relevant evidence would include instructions, concealment, false statements, movement of funds, pressure on witnesses, deletion of records, creation of false evidence, or other affirmative assistance tied to a defined offense.

4.8 Attempts to Influence Authorities or Witnesses

Kim repeatedly asks authorities to "see through" the subject's alleged misdirection. The source does not identify a direct communication from Wongi's father to police, a court, prosecutor, agency, or witness. No obstruction allegation should be made without that nexus.

If such contact occurred, authorities should preserve the complete communication and determine whether it was advocacy, a good-faith report, an inaccurate memory, or knowing deception intended to impair a real proceeding.

5. Claimed Harm and Causation

Kim attributes the following harms to the alleged pattern:

- intensified grief, isolation, and suicidality after his mother's death;
- loss of trust in his maternal family;
- fear that relatives had collectively accepted his death;
- emotional distress from perceived blame and ridicule;
- fear of being framed through a one-sided family narrative;
- loss or dilution of credit for project concepts;
- anxiety that later work would be used to portray him as a copier;
- interference with study, creativity, relationships, and recovery; and
- continuing fear that family support for his sister and husband placed him at risk.

Causation must be person-specific. Kim's source also attributes harm to many relatives, public figures, platforms, housemates, and interpreted relays. Medical records, contemporaneous messages, project records, and a dated incident chronology are needed to isolate what harm followed a proven act by Wongi's father.

Economic harm requires an identifiable transaction or opportunity. Investigators should ask who was prepared to pay, what protected property or contractual right was involved, what statement or act changed the outcome, and what amount was lost. Loss of attribution or emotional injury, while potentially serious, does not automatically satisfy statutes requiring money or property.

6. Cumulative Theory and Incrimination Factors

Kim's cumulative theory is that the subject's acts should not be viewed as unrelated misunderstandings. He alleges a repeating cycle:

1. the subject accepted family information without hearing Kim;
2. a blaming communication arrived during a period of grief and suicidality;
3. the family allegedly discussed Kim's suicidal state but did not intervene;
4. the subject later appeared to apologize for relatives' conduct;
5. Kim responded with forgiveness and requested substantial financial help for the subject's household;
6. the subject allegedly changed position after that help;
7. relatives followed Kim's project material and sought credit;
8. the subject allegedly led, approved, defended, or benefited from the follow-up;
9. he allegedly renewed mockery and supported Kim's sister and husband without firsthand knowledge; and
10. later communications allegedly continued to cast Kim as the problem or failure.

If authenticated direct records support several links in this sequence, the repetition, notice, contradiction, and possible benefit may be relevant to intent. If the key links remain relay-based, inferred, or attributable only to other relatives, the cumulative theory weakens substantially. Several weak inferences do not become proof merely by being placed in a sequence.

The strongest incrimination factors would be an authenticated false accusation, a direct coercive suicide-related message, proof of an agreement concerning a specific unlawful act, a direct instruction to copy protected or confidential material, a false authorship claim used to obtain money or property, repeated direct harassment after notice to stop, concealment of records, or intentional deception of investigators.

7. Defenses, Alternative Explanations, and Limiting Admissions

7.1 Concern Rather Than Blame

The subject may say the post-death letter expressed confusion or concern rather than blame. The full original-language message, context, and recipient testimony should control. Kim's perception of tone is relevant to impact but not conclusive as to intent.

7.2 No Receipt or No Agreement Concerning Suicide

The subject may deny receiving the suicidal message, deny discussing it, or say he believed another relative was assisting. Receipt, timing, forwarding records, and contemporaneous calls are necessary. Kinship or silence cannot substitute for proof of knowledge and coercive conduct.

7.3 Apology Was Misinterpreted

Because the alleged apology is described through a relay, the subject may deny making it. Investigators should seek a direct recording, message, or witness. A fictional scene cannot establish an admission.

7.4 No Payment Occurred

The alleged three-million assistance may have been only Kim's proposal. If no payment occurred, no inference about changed conduct after receipt should be made. If a payment occurred, its terms and recipient must be established before inferring reliance, fraud, or benefit.

7.5 Independent Creation or Lawful Follow-Up

The subject and his family may contend that the sea-platform work was independently created, based on public seasteading concepts, or was a lawful elaboration of ideas Kim disclosed publicly. U.S. copyright law does not protect ideas, systems, methods, or concepts as such. Protectable expression, patent inventorship, trade-secret status, confidentiality, contractual obligations, and false claims for money are separate issues.

7.6 Support for Family Member or Safety Concern

The subject may say he believed Kim's sister, feared conflict, or tried to protect family members. A person may report concerns, limit contact, advise another person, or seek lawful protection. That defense would not excuse a knowing fabrication, threat, coercion, or intentional assistance to a specific offense, but those acts must first be proved.

7.7 No Authorship of Online Material

The subject may deny controlling any account or relay attributed to him. That is a substantial defense. Platform recommendations and symbolic media cannot identify a speaker. Account records, direct admissions, device evidence, or reliable witness testimony are required.

7.8 Passage of Time and Memory

Many events are placed around 2010, 2015, or an uncertain later period. The source acknowledges memory gaps and uncertain ordering. Original records should resolve chronology wherever possible. Limitation periods and the version of law in effect on each date also require review by counsel.

7.9 Kim's Own Limiting Statements

Kim repeatedly says particular interpretations may be wrong and asks witnesses to confirm them. He distinguishes Wongi from the adults, later softens his requested punishment, and states uncertainty

about whether the relatives intended lethal harm. These admissions support a measured investigation and weigh against presenting the most severe interpretation as established fact.

8. Potential U.S. and Illinois Legal Relevance

8.1 Jurisdiction and Charging Caution

The allegations span Canada, Korea, Illinois, and online activity. A U.S. statute applies only when its territorial, interstate-commerce, federal-matter, and mental-state elements are satisfied. Illinois law may be relevant if the subject acted in Illinois, communications were sent from or received there, or an Illinois court has jurisdiction. Historical versions and limitation periods must be checked for the date of each act.

Legal area	Required core showing	Present record concerning Wongi's father
Illinois inducement to commit suicide, 720 ILCS 5/12-34.5	Knowing coercion causing a suicide or attempt, with substantial control; or intentional provision of physical means/participation with knowledge	Not established. The source alleges discussion, blame, and silence but supplies no attempt caused by coercion, physical means, or direct act by the subject
Illinois stalking/cyberstalking, 720 ILCS 5/12-7.3 and 12-7.5	A qualifying course of conduct directed at a person, with required knowledge and reasonable fear or emotional distress; additional branches require specified threats or acts	Not established. Repetition and distress are alleged, but direct subject-authored acts and dates are missing
Federal stalking, 18 U.S.C. 2261A	Interstate travel or use of interstate facilities with specified intent and resulting or expected fear/substantial emotional distress	Potentially relevant only if authenticated electronic conduct is linked to the subject and all interstate and intent elements are met
Illinois intimidation, 720 ILCS 5/12-6	Intent to cause an act or omission by communicating a specified unlawful threat	No specific threat by the subject is identified in the current source
Illinois conspiracy, 720 ILCS 5/8-2	Intent that an offense be committed, agreement to that offense, and an act in furtherance	Family alignment and silence are insufficient. A specific intended offense, agreement, and overt act must be proved
Federal aiding and abetting, 18 U.S.C. 2	Intentional assistance to an underlying federal offense; it is not an independent offense	General support for the sister or sons is insufficient without an underlying federal offense and affirmative intentional assistance
Copyright, 17 U.S.C. 102 and 501	Ownership and copying of protected original expression; ideas, methods, systems, and concepts are excluded	Project priority is alleged, but copied text, diagrams, code, registration, and subject participation are not supplied
Patent inventorship, 35 U.S.C. 116 and 256	Contribution to conception of at least one claimed invention and an actual patent application or patent	Relevant only if a patent filing exists; family follow-up or polishing alone does not resolve inventorship

Legal area	Required core showing	Present record concerning Wongi's father
Trade secrets, 18 U.S.C. 1832 and 1839 / DTSA	Qualifying secret information, reasonable secrecy measures, unauthorized acquisition/use, and required intent or civil misappropriation elements	Public or broadly shared presentations may defeat secrecy; confidential drafts, access, and use must be shown
Wire fraud, 18 U.S.C. 1343	Scheme to obtain money or property by material deception and use of interstate wires	No specific transaction, misrepresentation, or property obtained by the subject is identified
Obstruction or witness tampering, 18 U.S.C. 1512/1519	Defined interference, corrupt persuasion, misleading conduct, or record falsification with the required nexus and intent	No direct contact with a real proceeding or record destruction by the subject is identified

8.2 Suicide-Related Law

Illinois's inducement statute is narrower than moral approval, cruelty, or failure to help. The coercion branch requires knowing coercion, a suicide or attempt directly resulting from it, and substantial control through physical circumstances, psychological pressure, or asserted principles. The assistance branch requires intentional provision of physical means or participation in a physical act with knowledge of the person's intent. The alleged letters warrant preservation, but the compilation does not presently establish these elements.

8.3 Stalking, Cyberstalking, and Protective Relief

Illinois stalking law addresses a knowing course of conduct directed at a specific person when the actor knows or should know it would cause a reasonable person fear or emotional distress. Cyberstalking applies related standards to electronic communications. A course generally requires at least two acts. The Illinois Stalking No Contact Order Act provides civil protective relief under its own definitions and procedures.

Kim alleges recurrence and severe distress, but the direct acts of Wongi's father are not yet identified with dates and authorship. Investigators should first isolate communications actually sent by the subject. Lawful speech, family discussion not directed at Kim, and media recommendations not controlled by the subject cannot be counted as his course of conduct.

8.4 Intimidation

Illinois intimidation requires an intent to cause another person to act or refrain from acting through a communicated threat to perform one of the acts listed in the statute, including unlawful physical harm, confinement, accusation of an offense, or exposure to hatred, contempt, or ridicule. The compilation describes perceived authority, blame, and mockery but does not quote a threat from the subject tied to a demanded act or omission.

8.5 Conspiracy and Aiding or Abetting

Illinois conspiracy requires intent that an offense be committed, an agreement to commit it, and an act in furtherance. The federal general conspiracy statute, 18 U.S.C. 371, likewise concerns an agreement to commit a federal offense or defraud the United States and ordinarily an overt act. It is not a general remedy for unfair family coordination.

Federal aiding and abetting under 18 U.S.C. 2 is not an independent crime. It makes a person punishable as a principal when the person intentionally assists an underlying federal offense. Proof that the subject sided with a relative, argued for them, or failed to accept Kim's account would not alone satisfy that standard.

8.6 Intellectual Property and Authorship

The U.S. Copyright Office states that copyright does not protect ideas, methods, or systems, although it may protect original text, diagrams, and other fixed expression. The integrated nature of Kim's system may be relevant to originality of expression or patentability, but not to copyright ownership of the ideas themselves.

If relatives copied exact presentation language, illustrations, diagrams, code, or other original expression, investigators should compare the actual works. If they filed a patent, inventorship turns on contribution to claimed conception, not status, financing, or the amount of labor. If they used confidential technical or business information, trade-secret protection depends on economic value from secrecy and reasonable measures to keep it secret. Public disclosure or unrestricted sharing may defeat that theory.

8.7 Fraud and Economic Benefit

A false authorship claim becomes more legally significant when it is used to obtain a grant, investment, patent right, employment, contract, license, or payment. Federal wire fraud requires a scheme to obtain money or property by material deception and use of interstate wires. The current source identifies a feared or alleged credit displacement but no transaction in which Wongi's father made a material false statement and obtained property.

8.8 Defamation and Privacy

A civil defamation analysis requires the exact allegedly false factual statement, unprivileged publication to a third party, fault, and legally cognizable harm. Opinion, rhetorical insult, truth, privilege, and lack of publication may defeat a claim. Privacy claims likewise depend on the particular information, method of acquisition or disclosure, audience, consent, and jurisdiction.

The present report does not identify a direct false factual statement by the subject with adequate specificity. Family emails and direct posts should be examined before any claim is characterized as defamation.

8.9 Obstruction and Evidence Integrity

Disagreement, silence, a changed memory, or deletion without the required legal nexus is not obstruction. Sections 1512 and 1519 require defined conduct and a connection to an official proceeding, federal reporting, investigation, administration of justice, or contemplated federal matter. The subject's alleged "misdirection" should be examined only if a real communication to investigators or intentional record interference is found.

9. Evidence Preservation and Investigative Requests

1. Confirm the subject's full legal identity, Korean spelling, residences, citizenship, and periods of presence in Illinois or other U.S. states.
2. Obtain the complete letter described as "I thought everything was fine, what happened?" including envelope or electronic headers, date, recipients, preceding messages, and original Korean text.
3. Commission a certified Korean-to-English translation that preserves literal wording, honorifics, ambiguity, and tone markers without adding interpretation.
4. Identify Kim's suicidal letter or announcement, every recipient, delivery time, forwarding event, reply, call, and emergency contact.
5. Preserve complete 2010-2015 email archives involving Kim, Wongi's father, Eileen, Kim's sister, Wongi's mother, and other relatives, including headers, attachments, drafts, and deleted items where lawfully recoverable.
6. Preserve KakaoTalk, text, and social-media messages among the subject and relatives concerning Kim, his mother, the sister and husband, suicide, housing, mental health, authorship, project concepts, or punishment.
7. Determine whether the subject directly apologized. Obtain the original message or recording, date, audience, and the conduct covered.
8. Verify whether any payment of approximately three million was requested, offered, or made. Identify currency, payer, intermediary, recipient, account, purpose, conditions, acknowledgment, and tax treatment.
9. Obtain Kim's earliest dated versions of the sea-platform, labor-exchange, wooden-ship, segmented-pillar, watermeal, migration, education, and e-currency materials.
10. Obtain every related work by Wongi, the subject, or another relative, including drafts, citations, metadata, cloud version history, submission records, and presentation dates.
11. Conduct a side-by-side forensic comparison separating broad ideas from copied wording, diagrams, structure, code, and confidential details.

12. Determine what material was public, privately shared, access-restricted, or governed by a confidentiality or collaboration agreement.
13. Identify any patent application, grant, investment pitch, publication, employment application, contract, license, award, or payment based on the disputed material.
14. Ask whether Wongi's father instructed, edited, funded, presented, distributed, claimed, or benefited from any work, and obtain records supporting the answer.
15. Identify each alleged act of mockery by exact words, date, medium, account, audience, and witness. Exclude symbolic relays unless account evidence connects the subject.
16. Preserve platform records through lawful process: account owner, login history, device and IP information, direct messages, posts, edits, deletions, moderation history, and referral data.
17. Obtain any direct statement by the subject concerning Kim's responsibility for his mother's death, Kim's mental health, criminality, sexuality, disability, honesty, or authorship.
18. Determine what the subject knew about events in Canada, from whom he learned it, what he attempted to verify, and what he communicated to others.
19. Interview the subject, Wongi, Eileen, Kim's sister, Wongi's mother, and other witnesses separately before group discussion can shape recollections.
20. Preserve potentially exculpatory evidence, including messages in which the subject defended Kim, discouraged mockery, denied authorship, sought help for him, or rejected use of his project material.
21. Create a dated incident ledger distinguishing firsthand events, documents, witness reports, inferences, and relay interpretations.
22. Refer the completed record to counsel in the jurisdiction of each act for limitation periods, territorial reach, and charging standards.

10. Questions for Wongi's Father

1. What is his full account of the period after Kim's mother's death?
2. Did he send the letter Kim recalls, and what did he intend by it?
3. What information did he have about the mother's death, and who supplied it?
4. Did he receive or discuss Kim's suicidal message? If so, when and with whom?
5. What steps, if any, did he take to contact Kim, another relative, police, medical services, or emergency assistance?

6. Did he believe Kim was responsible for the mother's death or dangerous to the sister? What facts supported that belief?
7. Did he ask Kim for his account before reaching or communicating a conclusion?
8. Did he directly apologize for any relative's conduct? What conduct and why?
9. Was approximately three million requested or received for his household? From whom and under what conditions?
10. Did the family discuss Kim's sea-platform or labor-exchange project before Wongi or another relative prepared a presentation?
11. What material did he personally see, retain, edit, fund, present, or distribute?
12. Did he or a relative claim original authorship? If so, what contemporaneous record supports that claim?
13. Did he tell any person that Kim copied the family, lacked authorship, or should receive no credit?
14. Did he direct, approve, or join any online account or communication concerning Kim?
15. Did he communicate with Kim's sister or husband about Kim? What was said and preserved?
16. Did he make any report to authorities, a court, a platform, employer, investor, or other third party?
17. Did he ask anyone to delete, alter, conceal, or withhold communications or project records?
18. What lawful or benign explanation does he offer for the alleged change from apology to opposition?
19. What evidence does he identify that could disprove Kim's allegations?
20. Is he willing to preserve devices and accounts pending lawful review?

11. Witness Questions

11.1 Wongi

Wongi should identify the origin of every disputed project component, what he received from Kim or others, when he began writing, whether his father advised or assisted him, what claims of authorship were made, and whether Kim objected. He should provide unedited drafts and version histories.

11.2 Aunt Eileen

Eileen should identify every email she forwarded, each recipient, what she told Wongi's father about Kim, and what occurred after the suicidal communication. She should state whether the subject agreed with, challenged, or merely received her account.

11.3 Kim's Sister and Husband

They should identify every communication with Wongi's father about Kim, the mother's death, alleged danger, project authorship, and requests for protection or lenience. Any allegation against them remains separate and unadjudicated.

11.4 Other Relatives and Platform Witnesses

Witnesses should describe direct acts, not interpretations of fictional media. Each witness should identify the exact speaker, account, words, date, audience, and basis for knowing that Wongi's father was responsible.

12. Assessment of Evidentiary Strength

Allegation	Current support	What would materially strengthen or weaken it
Subject sent a post-death blaming letter	Kim's direct recollection of wording and tone	Original letter and thread; translation; subject's response
Subject joined suicide-related family discussion	Kim's inference and description of exchanged letters	Recipient metadata, replies, calls, witness testimony; absence of receipt would weaken
Subject apologized for family conduct	Relay-based interpretation	Direct recording/message or independent witness; absence would defeat attribution
Kim requested or caused three-million assistance	Kim's recollection	Bank, contract, tax, or acknowledgment records; no payment would narrow the theory
Subject changed position after assistance	Kim's perceived chronology	Dated direct statements before and after; uncertain payment/timing weakens
Subject led or approved project follow-up	Kim's assertion and open questions about role	Instructions, edits, funding, authorship claims, benefit; son's independent work would weaken
Subject mocked Kim repeatedly	Repeated allegation without direct quotation	Authenticated posts/messages and account proof; relay-only basis is insufficient
Subject defended sister/husband without firsthand knowledge	Kim's recollection and subject's absence from Canada	Direct communications and source of knowledge; good-faith report or independent verification may weaken
Subject tried to mislead authorities	General allegation without identified official contact	Actual report/testimony and proof of knowing falsity; no contact defeats

The present record is strongest as a preservation request concerning letters, family communications, project chronology, and payment records. It is weakest where it attributes symbolic relays to the subject or infers a criminal agreement from kinship, silence, or shared preference.

13. Requested Disposition

Kim requests that authorities evaluate Wongi's father by proven acts rather than family status, later displays of concern, or Kim's reactions. The appropriate first response is to preserve records, authenticate the letter and suicide-related communications, verify the alleged apology and payment, reconstruct the project chronology, and interview participants separately.

No charge should be based on a fictional scene, recommendation feed, perceived relay, silence alone, or another relative's conduct. Conversely, a later apology, financial assistance, or family loyalty should not erase a separately proven threat, coercive act, knowing fabrication, repeated targeted harassment, or intentional assistance to a specific offense.

The report does not request or endorse a predetermined punishment. Any charge, civil remedy, protective order, or decision not to proceed belongs to the competent authority after jurisdictional review, proof of each required element, consideration of limitation periods, and an opportunity for the subject to respond.

14. Source-Unit Guide

The following source units contain the principal subject-specific material. They are internal identifiers from `combinedUncle.txt`, not independent exhibits:

Source unit	Principal relevance	Reliability caution
<code>fgseryt56456.txt</code>	Direct demand for investigation; alleged suicide-related letter exchange and repeated wrongs	Conclusion stated without underlying letters
<code>gawer312313.txt</code>	Alleged apology, requested financial assistance, renewed project follow-up, mockery, and defense of sister/husband	Mixes direct recollection with relay interpretation
<code>ge43241342.txt</code>	Detailed sea-platform chronology and questions about subject's role and attitude	Subject's role is posed partly as a question
<code>hftry45566.txt</code>	Blaming letter, suspected suicide discussion, silence, alleged second-phase leadership, and family support for sister	Expressly labels parts as guess or speculation
<code>hui7898.txt</code>	Alleged jealousy, protection of sister/husband, backstabbing, and concern about fate control	Broad intent claims require direct records

Source unit	Principal relevance	Reliability caution
hw4243412.txt	Alleged attempt to save sister/husband and misguide the court	Conditional on subject actually assisting them
hw4314231.txt	Alleged authoritative judgment and failure narrative	Primarily based on fictional relay interpretation
hwe431232341.txt	Request that subject be charged if covering for sister/husband; request for detailed witness accounts	Conditional and witness-dependent
j3oij3oi3.txt	Later softening as to Wongi and uncertainty about lethal intent	Important limiting and proportionality evidence
oiuiuy66687.txt	Request to investigate subject's stance	Relay-dependent and generalized
uguiy9769.txt	Alleged scapegoating despite absence from Canada	Conditional and lacks direct quotation
uoi89798.txt	Repeats support-for-sister theory and asks authorities to examine past conduct	Mixes subject with cousin Mark and generalized family claims

15. Official Legal Sources

- [18 U.S.C. 2261A - Federal stalking](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 2 - Principals and aiding or abetting](#)
- [U.S. Department of Justice explanation that 18 U.S.C. 2 is not an independent offense](#)
- [18 U.S.C. 371 - Federal conspiracy](#)
- [U.S. Department of Justice summary of Section 371 agreement, intent, and overt-act requirements](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/8-2 - Illinois conspiracy](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/12-6 - Illinois intimidation](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/12-7.3 - Illinois stalking](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/12-7.5 - Illinois cyberstalking](#)
- [720 ILCS 5/12-34.5 - Illinois inducement to commit suicide](#)
- [740 ILCS 21/10 - Illinois Stalking No Contact Order Act definitions](#)
- [740 ILCS 21/20 - Commencing a stalking no-contact-order action](#)
- [U.S. Copyright Office Circular 31 - Ideas, methods, and systems are not protected by copyright](#)
- [U.S. Copyright Office FAQ - Copyright protects expression, not ideas or systems](#)
- [USPTO MPEP 2109.01 - Joint inventorship and 35 U.S.C. 116](#)
- [USPTO trade-secret resources](#)

Legal sources were checked against official U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Copyright Office, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and Illinois General Assembly materials available on June 29, 2026. Counsel should verify the historical law applicable to each event.