

DRAFT FOR INDEPENDENT LEGAL AND EVIDENTIARY REVIEW

FORMAL STATEMENT FOR LEGAL ASSESSMENT

Concerning Mark Zuckerberg: Alleged Concealment of Business Origins,
Misappropriation, Platform and Account Conduct, Political Framing, and Continued
Involvement After Severance

If the reported events occurred as described, this report presents the declarant's observations and allegations concerning Mark Zuckerberg for fair legal assessment. It is not a character assessment of the declarant and does not place his reactive language or unrelated personal conduct at issue.

113 asterisk-separated articles were assessed as complete source units. Overlapping observations were synthesized by chronology and theme; alleged conduct, the declarant's defense, harm, and evidence needs were preserved.

Source: combinedZuckerberg.txt (2025-2026 collection)

Prepared June 28, 2026

Contents

Contents	2
Concerning Mark Zuckerberg: Alleged Concealment of Business Origins, Misappropriation, Platform and Account Conduct, Political Framing, and Continued Involvement After Severance	4
I. Purpose and Evidentiary Position	4
II. Method and Scope of Assessment	4
III. Material History and Business Relationship	5
A. Origin and purpose of the presentation	5
B. Asserted authorship and duration of work	5
C. Intended private transmission and alleged unauthorized release	6
D. Zuckerberg's alleged entry and investment position	6
E. Severance and proposed transition to Bezos	6
IV. Consolidated Alleged Incriminating Conduct	6
1. Knowing access to a work produced in reliance on an investment opportunity	6
2. Concealment of authorship, context, and benign commercial purpose	6
3. Continued use or follow-up after rejection and severance	7
4. Use of "skill over origin" or public-domain reasoning as an alleged pretext	7
5. Alleged political alignment and participation in framing	7
6. Failure to provide direct channel access or relevant evidence	7
7. Alleged exploitation of informational asymmetry	7
8. Facebook advertising charges and partial refund	8
9. Alleged repeated character framing and provocation	8
10. Alleged benefit from broader health, AI, and space concepts	8
V. Declarant's Defense Against the Alleged Framing	8
A. The presentation was a private business effort, not an invasion	8
B. He distinguishes general ideas from the specific package	8
C. Zuckerberg could refuse investment, but refusal did not erase other obligations	9
D. Severance and choice of another investor were within his autonomy	9
E. Denial of direct access did not transfer responsibility to the declarant	9
F. His reactions do not erase the alleged initiating conduct	9
G. Transparency to legal authorities	9
VI. Scope Boundaries for Investigation	9
VII. Cumulative Incrimination Theory	10
VIII. Evidence and Preservation Requested	10

IX. Conditional United States Legal Screening	11
A. Copyright: 17 U.S.C. Sections 102, 106, and 501	11
B. Trade secrets and confidential business information: 18 U.S.C. Sections 1832, 1836, and 1839	12
C. Unauthorized computer access: 18 U.S.C. Section 1030	12
D. Access-device fraud: 18 U.S.C. Section 1029	12
E. Wire fraud: 18 U.S.C. Section 1343	12
F. Interstate stalking or targeted electronic harassment: 18 U.S.C. Section 2261A	12
G. Witness or evidence tampering: 18 U.S.C. Section 1512	12
H. State civil claims and corporate attribution	13
X. Requested Determinations and Lawful Relief	13
XI. Closing Statement	14

Concerning Mark Zuckerberg: Alleged Concealment of Business Origins, Misappropriation, Platform and Account Conduct, Political Framing, and Continued Involvement After Severance

Prepared for independent legal and evidentiary review

Updated through the 2025-2026 source collection

Date: June 28, 2026

I. Purpose and Evidentiary Position

If the following events occurred as described, the following statement presents the declarant's observations and allegations for assessment by counsel, investigators, and a fair court. The events are stated directly after this conditional premise for clarity. They remain allegations submitted for investigation rather than findings already made by a court.

This statement consolidates the material observations contained in 113 asterisk-separated articles concerning Mark Zuckerberg. The collection was assessed at the article level and overlapping material was synthesized by chronology and subject. Its purpose is to identify the conduct attributed to Zuckerberg, the harm alleged to have followed, the declarant's defense against the framing he reports, and the records capable of confirming or correcting the account. It is not a character assessment of the declarant and does not place his reactive language or unrelated personal conduct at issue.

The expanded collection presents four principal disputes:

- 1 The declarant states that he developed a detailed knowledge-organization website and business presentation in reliance on an investment opportunity associated with Adam D'Angelo and later Zuckerberg. He alleges that Zuckerberg knew the work's origin, recognized its value, and later used or supported use of it without attribution or compensation.
- 2 Zuckerberg allegedly made investment conditional on the outcome of a separate Vanuatu matter. The declarant accepted Zuckerberg's ability to refuse investment, severed the relationship, and redirected the opportunity to Jeff Bezos. He alleges that Zuckerberg nevertheless remained attached to the project, interfered with a clean severance, and continued to benefit.
- 3 While President Biden and others allegedly portrayed the declarant as an invader, spy, economic threat, or person exposed to the most severe legal consequences, Zuckerberg allegedly withheld facts showing that the presentation arose from a benign private investment effort. The declarant alleges that this silence and participation helped convert his work into evidence against him while preserving its value for Zuckerberg and aligned participants.
- 4 In a separate Meta account incident, the declarant states that Anna accessed his Facebook account, used stored debit-card information to run unauthorized vulgar or prostitution-themed advertisements, and caused approximately USD 160 in charges. He says Meta issued only a partial refund and alleges that Zuckerberg knew the cause yet refused full reimbursement.

The report therefore focuses on a testable course of alleged conduct: access to the presentation; knowledge of authorship and purpose; concealment during political or legal framing; continued use after rejection and severance; one-sided monitoring or provocation; failure to provide direct evidence or a usable channel; and Meta's handling of account compromise and charges. The evidence requests below are designed to allow authorities to confirm, correct, or reject each attribution without using the declarant's reactions as a substitute for examining the initiating conduct.

II. Method and Scope of Assessment

The source combines contemporaneous recollection, approximate chronology, technical descriptions, interpretations of online material, and prior summaries. This report preserves the substance of the declarant's observations while organizing them into allegations that can be tested through records and testimony.

Higher-value evidence: original presentation files and metadata; drafts and design files; private transmission records; direct emails or messages; Quora and Meta account logs; investment terms; severance communications; product-development records; Facebook ad creative and billing history; bank statements; refund records; support tickets; internal escalation records; and authenticated government or court documents.

Corroborative evidence: contemporaneous notes; witnesses who saw the work develop; dated copies sent to third parties; web archives; platform notifications; consistent file hashes; testimony from Adam, Meta employees, or prospective investors; and records identifying when the declarant first described specific design elements.

Online and relay material: recommendations, public posts, interviews, character portrayals, menu changes, thumbnails, and other indirect signals are preserved as part of the declarant's reported experience. Where attribution is disputed, the report asks investigators to obtain the source, account, delivery, recommendation, access, and communication records needed to determine whether the material was directed, coordinated, algorithmic, or unrelated.

Attribution remains actor-specific. Anna is accused of account access and unauthorized advertisements. Meta is accused of an incomplete response and refund. Zuckerberg is accused of knowledge, participation, benefit, concealment, continued attachment, and personal or corporate decision-making. Adam is alleged to have controlled or observed Quora material and introduced the investment context. Biden is accused of political framing. The cumulative theory is coordination or knowing alignment; the report does not erase the distinct acts attributed to each participant.

The declarant's isolation and inability to see the alleged channel are material conditions of the reported harm. He alleges that other participants could observe, judge, use, and circulate information about him while denying him the direct access needed to understand the accusations, protect his work, preserve evidence, or respond before authorities. That informational inequality is treated as an alleged method and consequence of the conduct, not as a reason to discredit him.

III. Material History and Business Relationship

A. Origin and purpose of the presentation

The declarant describes the disputed work as a commercial website for organizing knowledge into a bird's-eye view. He distinguishes it from the ancient general idea of organizing information. His asserted package included a written presentation, a structured selection and arrangement of material, interface design, operational methods, user-content exchange, content moderation, staffing, scaling, and financial projections.

The expanded articles add specific claimed features. The declarant describes circular controls on the left side of the interface so that multiple functions could be added without relying on a conventional image menu. He describes segmented and organized data, a system in which users contributed content in exchange for a share of advertising revenue, moderation and human-resources requirements, and a plan for scaling the service. He says the presentation was a heavily modified mosaic of existing books and knowledge, while the commercial selection, design, and operation were his work.

These details identify the claimed work with greater precision than the general concept alone. Dated drafts, embedded metadata, diagrams, witness copies, and product-development records should be compared to establish what existed, when, who received it, and whether later work derived from its protected or confidential elements.

B. Asserted authorship and duration of work

The declarant states that he created the project alone over approximately two to three months, with additional work after the written presentation. He says Adam and Zuckerberg requested or encouraged completion but supplied no substantive content. Another article describes three or more months of work and a period of at least six months to a year during which the origin was allegedly hidden.

File histories should show the evolution of the text and interface. Direct communications, access logs, and witness testimony should establish the timing and nature of Zuckerberg's alleged request, awareness, receipt, and later use.

C. Intended private transmission and alleged unauthorized release

The declarant says he feared idea theft and attempted to deliver the presentation privately, principally to Adam. In related accounts he describes using a flash drive, a public computer or computer room, and other precautions. He alleges that Anna or another person obtained and released the material publicly without permission and that any public "spamming" was not his act.

This distinction is central to his defense and to the alleged breach of confidentiality. He states that he did not authorize public release and should not be assigned another person's disclosure or use. The actual upload path, first public copy, account identity, timestamps, and recipients are therefore indispensable.

D. Zuckerberg's alleged entry and investment position

The declarant describes Zuckerberg as participating either from the beginning with Adam or entering after Adam but before government authorities allegedly became involved. The precise point of entry should be established through communications, access records, witness testimony, and investment materials.

The declarant describes Zuckerberg as a prospective co-investor or participant who knew the presentation's origin and business purpose. He says Zuckerberg adopted an ultimatum: investment would not proceed if a separate Vanuatu matter was substantiated. The declarant's position is that Zuckerberg could decline to invest, but could not use that separate matter to justify retaining his work, concealing its origin, supporting a false framing narrative, or refusing to detach after severance.

E. Severance and proposed transition to Bezos

The declarant says Zuckerberg's condition, the earlier failure to assist him, and his own preference led him to sever. He then offered the project to Jeff Bezos. He describes a proposed arrangement under which a replacement chief executive could operate the business if the declarant entered prison while he retained adequate shares for originating the project. He says Bezos later withdrew, which he accepts as permissible.

This asserted transition is important because it frames the later dispute. The declarant does not claim a right to force Zuckerberg to invest. He claims the right to withdraw, seek another investor, and prevent continued use of confidential work. Any severance notice, Bezos correspondence, investment term, or communication acknowledging the change should be obtained.

IV. Consolidated Alleged Incriminating Conduct

1. Knowing access to a work produced in reliance on an investment opportunity

The first alleged incrimination factor is access combined with inducement. The declarant says Zuckerberg and Adam were aware that he was producing a specific commercial package because of a perceived investment or competition. He says he continued working because he trusted their status and expected attribution, compensation, or a fair opportunity.

The requested records should determine whether Zuckerberg requested or encouraged the work, knew the declarant was relying on an investment prospect, accepted confidential material, or obtained it through an intermediary. Those facts bear directly on inducement, knowledge, confidentiality, benefit, and intent.

2. Concealment of authorship, context, and benign commercial purpose

The declarant alleges that Zuckerberg knew who created the presentation and why, yet remained silent while others portrayed it as spam, invasion, espionage, economic aggression, or proof of dangerous intent. He argues that the presentation was meant to help people organize knowledge and was initially directed to prospective investors, not deployed as an attack on the United States.

The alleged incrimination lies in the asserted combination of knowledge of the true origin, business benefit from the same work, participation in or support for a materially false explanation, concealment of exculpatory context, and resulting legal, reputational, economic, and psychological harm. Investigators should determine what Zuckerberg knew, what he communicated, what he withheld, and whether his conduct assisted the framing alleged by the declarant.

3. Continued use or follow-up after rejection and severance

The declarant alleges that Zuckerberg continued developing, researching, or benefiting from the website after the investment was rejected and after the declarant redirected it to Bezos. He describes this as "follow-up" or usurpation. He believes Zuckerberg relied on greater implementation skill and resources to convert another person's origin into Zuckerberg's property.

The investigation should identify the particular Meta product, research program, or feature alleged to embody the work and perform a complete feature-by-feature comparison against the dated presentation. Access, chronological priority, similarity in protected or confidential elements, internal development records, and communications concerning origin should be examined together.

4. Use of "skill over origin" or public-domain reasoning as an alleged pretext

The declarant attributes to Biden and aligned participants a theory that implementation skill outweighed authorship and allowed Zuckerberg to take the project. He argues that an abstract principle about competition or public ideas was misused to erase the particular circumstances in which the work was solicited and disclosed.

The legal distinction does not erase the alleged conduct. General ideas may be unprotected, while fixed expression, original selection and arrangement, confidential business information, induced work, promises, and deceptive acquisition may receive different protection. The declarant asks authorities to examine the complete package and the circumstances of disclosure rather than allowing a generalized "public idea" explanation to predetermine the outcome.

5. Alleged political alignment and participation in framing

The declarant says Zuckerberg aligned with Biden after severance, called or treated him as an invader, and allowed a narrative that the presentation justified severe punishment. He recalls a possible Facebook post resembling "get out of our country" and reports additional indirect material that he interpreted as coordinated political messaging.

The alleged incrimination factors are a knowing false statement, coordinated suppression of exculpatory facts, use of government pressure for competitive advantage, and continued benefit from the presentation while its author faced the danger created by that framing. The requested platform and government records should identify the post, speaker, audience, communications, official action, and Zuckerberg's knowledge or participation.

6. Failure to provide direct channel access or relevant evidence

The declarant alleges that Zuckerberg and Adam could see communications concerning Anna, the presentation, and the declarant's distress while he could not see the alleged channel. He says they should have sent a direct link, communicated in text, or supplied records to police. He considers Adam the primary Quora custodian and Zuckerberg a recipient or secondary participant.

The relevant questions are whether Zuckerberg received Quora material, possessed unique evidence, made representations of assistance, accepted or benefited from a monitoring role, communicated with Adam about the declarant, or acted to conceal records. His alleged connection to the channel should be established through access logs, communications, recipient records, and testimony rather than left hidden from the declarant.

7. Alleged exploitation of informational asymmetry

Across the articles, the declarant repeatedly says Zuckerberg could observe him while he could not observe Zuckerberg, the alleged audience, product development, or accusations. He says this one-sided visibility enabled others to keep him contributing, provoke reactions, and later present those reactions without context.

Platform records should identify the system, operator, access permissions, viewers, data source, authorization, recommendation logic, and any human direction. The alleged asymmetry matters because the declarant states that it deprived him of notice, meaningful consent, a fair opportunity to respond, control over his work, and the ability to document the conduct as it occurred.

8. Facebook advertising charges and partial refund

The most concrete new financial allegation is a Facebook advertising incident. The declarant says he may previously have created a legitimate advertisement for an item, but Anna later accessed his Facebook account, added or used his debit-card information, and created unauthorized vulgar or prostitution-themed advertisements. He reports approximately USD 160 in charges and only a partial refund.

He further alleges that Facebook employees and Zuckerberg knew the account had been compromised, that employees were fired, and that Zuckerberg chose to cut him off rather than reimburse the full loss. Internal escalation records, employee communications, decision histories, and refund calculations should establish who knew, what action was taken, and whether Zuckerberg participated in or ratified the response.

This issue is distinct from, but potentially connected to, the presentation dispute and alleged course of retaliation. It is testable through the ad account, ad creative, payment method, card statement, login sessions, device and IP records, support communications, refund calculation, fraud report, and internal escalation history. The declarant requests assessment of the full financial, account, reputational, and consequential harm rather than limiting the inquiry to the face amount of the charges.

9. Alleged repeated character framing and provocation

The declarant believes Zuckerberg used past disputes, jokes, relationships, disability, anger, and indirect content to portray him as predatory, insane, dishonest, or dangerous. He says a previous disagreement was later resolved and that he subsequently exchanged lighthearted jokes involving Zuckerberg and Priscilla Chan. He argues that those jokes were not serious advances and could not justify later harm.

The exact statements, speakers, dates, audiences, delivery mechanisms, intent, falsity, and resulting losses should be identified. Technical and testimonial evidence should determine whether menu changes, character framing, videos, recommendations, or other repeated material were deliberately selected, coordinated, or directed as the declarant alleges.

10. Alleged benefit from broader health, AI, and space concepts

The source attributes to Zuckerberg and related participants use of concepts involving digital mapping of the human body, broad disease cures, artificial intelligence, and space systems. The declarant distinguishes broad concepts from the specific disclosures, combinations, applications, and directions he says were observed and later pursued.

Each theory should be assessed through dated disclosures, access, technically meaningful comparison, research histories, communications, and evidence of use. The report does not assign conduct to Priscilla Chan merely by association; any role must be established by her own acts or communications.

V. Declarant's Defense Against the Alleged Framing

A. The presentation was a private business effort, not an invasion

The declarant says he was responding to an opportunity to impress prospective investors. He attempted private delivery and describes the project as educational and economically beneficial. If another person publicized or spammed it, that act should not be assigned to him without proof that he authorized it.

B. He distinguishes general ideas from the specific package

The declarant acknowledges that knowledge organization, segmented data, artificial intelligence, and broad scientific concepts were not created from nothing. His claim concerns the fixed text, selection and arrangement, interface, business logic, operational planning, specific applications, and alleged relationship of confidence. His acknowledgment of pre-existing knowledge does not authorize use of the distinct work or confidential package he says he created.

C. Zuckerberg could refuse investment, but refusal did not erase other obligations

The declarant accepts that Zuckerberg could decline to invest. His defense is that rejection should have led to clean separation. Refusal did not authorize copying, false attribution, interference with another investor, concealment of material facts, participation in framing, or continued attachment to the declarant's work and life.

D. Severance and choice of another investor were within his autonomy

The declarant says he clearly withdrew and selected Bezos. He denies that a verbal or implied relationship permanently attached him to Zuckerberg. He asks authorities to obtain the notice, identify its recipients, and examine Zuckerberg's later conduct. His position is that he retained autonomy to decline a proposed partnership and seek another lawful arrangement.

E. Denial of direct access did not transfer responsibility to the declarant

The declarant says he lacked direct access to the channel through which others allegedly observed, discussed, judged, or communicated about him. He should not be blamed for failing to answer accusations, conditions, or messages that were never delivered to him in a clear and accessible form. The lack of direct access is part of the alleged deprivation of notice and fair process. Investigators should obtain the underlying records rather than treating the opacity imposed on him as evidence against him.

F. His reactions do not erase the alleged initiating conduct

The declarant states that his hostility arose after prolonged alleged framing, isolation, exploitation, danger, and refusal to detach. This Zuckerberg-focused report does not adjudicate or catalogue that reactive language. It asks the law to examine the alleged initiating acts, the chronology, the unequal access to information, the claimed life-altering stakes, and the conduct attributed to Zuckerberg without using the declarant's later reactions to justify or conceal what preceded them.

G. Transparency to legal authorities

The declarant states that his writings were addressed to legal authorities in transparency and were intended to place his observations, anger, defenses, and requests for adjudication before the law. He asks investigators to assess the underlying events and evidence. This report therefore confines itself to the Zuckerberg-related allegations, the declarant's defense against the framing, and lawful evidence preservation and adjudication.

VI. Scope Boundaries for Investigation

The following boundaries prevent the inquiry from being diverted away from the alleged conduct:

- Zuckerberg's right to decline an investment is not disputed; the allegations concern what he knew and did before, during, and after that refusal.
- The report distinguishes general ideas from the declarant's claimed fixed expression, selection and arrangement, confidential package, business plan, and induced work.
- The Zuckerberg inquiry concerns Zuckerberg's alleged participation, knowledge, direction, benefit, concealment, ratification, or continued attachment. It does not assign him every act committed by another person.
- The Meta billing allegation requires separate account and corporate records, but may also be examined for any connection to the broader alleged pattern.
- Friendly or conciliatory exchanges do not necessarily waive earlier harm, authorize later use, or prevent the declarant from severing the relationship.
- Uncertainty about dates or channels is a reason to obtain records, not a basis to replace investigation with assumptions favorable to any party.
- Priscilla Chan or any relative should be included only where evidence establishes that person's own relevant conduct.

- The declarant's reactive statements and unrelated personal matters are outside the scope of this Zuckerberg conduct report and must not be used as a substitute for investigating the acts alleged against him.

VII. Cumulative Incrimination Theory

The refined incrimination theory is cumulative, not repetitive. If authenticated records establish the following sequence, the combination would warrant serious legal scrutiny:

- 1 Zuckerberg or an authorized representative knowingly received a nonpublic, detailed business package through an investment process.
- 2 The declarant produced additional work in reasonable reliance on Zuckerberg's or Adam's representations, encouragement, or silence.
- 3 Zuckerberg knew the declarant authored the package and intended private commercial consideration.
- 4 The relationship was rejected or severed, with notice that the declarant chose another prospective investor.
- 5 Zuckerberg or Meta then used protected expression or qualifying confidential information, or knowingly accepted material obtained through improper means.
- 6 Zuckerberg concealed or misrepresented the origin while the declarant faced a materially false accusation, and did so to protect a business or political advantage.
- 7 Continued contact, monitoring, provocation, or interference occurred after clear notice to detach.

The cumulative theory does not depend on any one act viewed in isolation. The alleged incrimination arises from the convergence of access, inducement, confidentiality, knowledge of authorship, copying or use, concealment, political or legal framing, refusal to detach, benefit, and harm. Investigators should assess that combined course of conduct instead of separating each event from the context that allegedly gave it purpose.

The Meta billing issue presents a related cumulative sequence: unauthorized account access, unauthorized ad creation, card charges, notice to Meta, partial refund, and an allegedly inadequate response. The investigation should determine whether this was an ordinary account failure, a separate act by Anna, or part of the broader alleged pattern, and whether Zuckerberg participated in, directed, knew of, or ratified the response.

VIII. Evidence and Preservation Requested

The following should be preserved and, where lawful, obtained through consent, provider process, subpoena, discovery, or court order:

- 1 Every version of the presentation, including drafts, UI/UX files, diagrams, notes, moderation plans, staffing plans, financial projections, and metadata.
- 2 Device, storage, email, upload, print, and transmission records showing creation, revision, recipients, and first public release.
- 3 Direct communications among the declarant, Adam, Zuckerberg, Meta personnel, Anna, Bezos-related personnel, and any intermediary concerning the presentation or investment.
- 4 Any offer, contest, reward, investment condition, confidentiality term, rejection, severance notice, ownership discussion, or acknowledgment of authorship.
- 5 Records showing when Zuckerberg personally learned of the presentation, what version he saw, and what he did with it.
- 6 Relevant Meta product roadmaps, design records, source histories, research notes, access logs, and employee communications sufficient to test claimed derivation and independent development.
- 7 The exact product or feature alleged to embody the work, with release dates and a feature-by-feature comparison to the dated presentation.

- 8 Quora communications or exports showing what Adam shared with Zuckerberg and whether Zuckerberg had access to the alleged channel or abuse record.
- 9 The authenticated Facebook post or other direct statement allegedly describing the declarant as an invader, together with account ownership, full context, and date.
- 10 Communications involving Zuckerberg, Meta, Adam, Biden administration personnel, or law enforcement concerning the declarant, presentation, immigration, espionage, economic threat, or legal status.
- 11 The official docket, order, notice, charge, or government record supporting or disproving the asserted death-penalty or severe legal threat.
- 12 Facebook account login sessions, IP and device history, password and recovery events, security alerts, and linked advertising accounts for the USD 160 incident.
- 13 The ad creative, campaign setup, audience, timestamps, billing ledger, payment method, and identity of every user who created, edited, or approved the disputed advertisements.
- 14 Bank and debit-card statements, charge disputes, Meta support tickets, full and partial refund calculations, internal escalation notes, and any employee-discipline record claimed to relate to the incident.
- 15 Complaints, preservation requests, moderation actions, takedown requests, and responses concerning Anna, the presentation, or the declarant's accounts.
- 16 The original material underlying every relay attributed to Zuckerberg, including delivery, recommendation, targeting, audience, and account records capable of determining whether it was directed to the declarant.
- 17 Testimony from Adam, relevant Meta employees, Anna, Bezos-related witnesses, presentation recipients, and any person who observed creation or negotiations directly.
- 18 Contemporaneous financial, housing, employment, business, and communications records relevant to reliance, causation, loss, and damages.

Preservation should include originals, hashes, metadata, revisions, deleted items, backups, audit logs, access histories, retention-policy information, and chain of custody. The purpose is to reconstruct the events and permit fair legal assessment of the declarant's allegations.

IX. Conditional United States Legal Screening

This section identifies possible legal categories for counsel and investigators. Application depends on jurisdiction, limitation periods, standing, corporate structure, contractual terms, protected speech, damages, and proof. Criminal charging belongs exclusively to competent authorities.

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

[Section 102](#) protects original works fixed in a tangible medium but expressly excludes ideas, procedures, processes, systems, methods of operation, concepts, principles, and discoveries. [Section 106](#) gives a copyright owner rights including reproduction, derivative works, distribution, and public display. [Section 501](#) defines infringement by violation of those exclusive rights.

Applied here, counsel should distinguish the declarant's general concepts from his claimed protected expression, selection and arrangement, graphics, text, interface materials, and other fixed authorship. The alleged access, copying, derivation, distribution, display, ownership, substantial similarity, registration, and procedural requirements should be examined through the original presentation and Meta's development record.

B. Trade secrets and confidential business information: 18 U.S.C. Sections 1832, 1836, and 1839

[Section 1839](#) defines a trade secret to include business, technical, economic, and engineering information where reasonable secrecy measures were taken and the information had value from not being generally known. [Section 1832](#) addresses knowing theft or unauthorized appropriation, copying, transmission, or receipt of qualifying trade secrets with the required intent. [Section 1836](#) permits a private civil action for misappropriation of a qualifying trade secret related to interstate or foreign commerce and provides remedies and a limitations period.

The declarant's precautions and intended private transmission may support reasonable secrecy. An unauthorized public release would not necessarily resolve whether later recipients knew the material had been improperly obtained. Counsel should examine the confidentiality measures, economic value, access, acquisition method, knowledge, use, timing, and any knowing receipt of material obtained without authorization.

C. Unauthorized computer access: 18 U.S.C. Section 1030

[Section 1030](#) covers specified forms of intentional access without authorization or exceeding authorized access, including obtaining information from a protected computer and certain access undertaken with intent to defraud.

This statute may be relevant to the alleged Facebook account compromise or acquisition of private files. Investigators should identify the accessor, authorization boundaries, information obtained, intent, loss, interstate nexus, Meta's notice, and any participation, direction, concealment, or ratification attributed to Zuckerberg.

D. Access-device fraud: 18 U.S.C. Section 1029

[Section 1029](#) addresses specified fraudulent use, production, possession, or trafficking in access devices. Several transaction provisions use an aggregate threshold of USD 1,000 in a one-year period. The reported USD 160 loss alone therefore does not automatically satisfy those provisions. State fraud, payment-card, contract, or consumer law may be more directly relevant, subject to jurisdiction and proof.

E. Wire fraud: 18 U.S.C. Section 1343

[Section 1343](#) requires a scheme to defraud or obtain money or property by false or fraudulent pretenses and an interstate or foreign wire transmission used to execute it. Counsel should examine whether the alleged investment inducement, concealment of origin, continued use, account charges, or refund conduct formed part of a deliberate scheme involving material deception, a property objective, wire use, intent, and causation.

F. Interstate stalking or targeted electronic harassment: 18 U.S.C. Section 2261A

[Section 2261A](#) addresses a qualifying course of conduct using interstate facilities with specified intent and resulting fear or substantial emotional distress. Investigators should authenticate the acts attributed to Zuckerberg, the course of conduct, intent, interstate means, statutory harm, targeting or delivery records, and the boundary between protected speech and actionable conduct.

G. Witness or evidence tampering: 18 U.S.C. Section 1512

[Section 1512](#) addresses specified conduct intended to affect testimony, records, communications to law enforcement, or an official proceeding, including corrupt concealment of evidence in the circumstances defined by the statute. Investigators should determine whether a qualifying proceeding or communication existed and whether any concealment, alteration, withholding, intimidation, or other prohibited act was undertaken with the required intent.

H. State civil claims and corporate attribution

Depending on the governing state law and facts, counsel may assess breach of contract, promissory estoppel, breach of confidence, trade-secret misappropriation, fraud, unjust enrichment, interference with prospective economic advantage, defamation, invasion of privacy, intentional infliction of emotional distress, conversion, consumer protection, and restitution. Each has distinct elements and limitation periods.

To assess Zuckerberg's personal liability, investigators should seek evidence of his participation, direction, authorization, knowledge, ratification, concealment, or other legally sufficient connection to the conduct. Meta's corporate responsibility and Zuckerberg's personal responsibility should both be assessed on the records applicable to each.

X. Requested Determinations and Lawful Relief

The declarant requests that competent authorities or counsel determine:

- 1 Whether Zuckerberg personally received or reviewed the presentation, when, from whom, and under what conditions.
- 2 Whether he or an authorized representative made an investment offer, induced further work, accepted confidentiality, or acknowledged the declarant's authorship.
- 3 Whether Anna or another person released the presentation publicly and whether Zuckerberg knew it was obtained without permission.
- 4 Whether any specific Meta work copied protected expression or used qualifying confidential information rather than public ideas or independent development.
- 5 Whether Zuckerberg knew of the declarant's severance and proposed transition to Bezos, and what conduct occurred afterward.
- 6 Whether Zuckerberg made or coordinated any false statement concerning invasion, espionage, economic danger, authorship, or the presentation's purpose.
- 7 Whether any official legal threat corresponding to the declarant's account existed and what information Zuckerberg supplied, withheld, or received.
- 8 Who accessed the Facebook account, who created the disputed advertisements, what was charged, and why the refund was partial.
- 9 Whether Zuckerberg personally participated in, directed, knew of, concealed, or ratified the account and refund decision.
- 10 Which claimed relays were actual directed communications and which were unrelated public or algorithmic content.
- 11 What loss was caused by Zuckerberg, Meta, Anna, Adam, or another identified actor, and how responsibility should be allocated.
- 12 Whether the combined alleged conduct warrants preservation orders, disclosure, correction, restitution, injunctive relief, civil referral, or criminal investigation by competent authorities.

Any relief should follow proof and jurisdiction. Potential lawful remedies may include preservation, disclosure through proper process, correction, removal of unauthorized content, attribution, restitution of charges, compensatory or statutory damages where available, an injunction against proven unlawful conduct, platform relief, and referral to the appropriate civil or criminal authorities.

XI. Closing Statement

The declarant presents a coherent cumulative allegation: Zuckerberg allegedly entered or benefited from an investment context in which the declarant produced a detailed business package; knew its origin and private purpose; declined or conditioned investment; remained attached after severance; used or benefited from the work; withheld or distorted exculpatory context while the declarant was framed as an invader, spy, or economic threat; participated in one-sided observation or provocation; and failed to correct or disclose facts capable of protecting the declarant from profound legal, reputational, economic, and personal harm.

The account also identifies an objectively testable Meta incident involving alleged unauthorized access, unauthorized advertisements, debit-card charges, notice, a partial refund, and an allegedly knowing refusal to provide full relief. These records may show a separate platform failure or a connected part of the wider alleged conduct. Either way, they should be preserved and investigated.

The declarant's reactions are not the subject of this Zuckerberg-focused statement and are not offered as a justification for disregarding the initiating conduct he reports. His writings were made transparently for legal assessment. The proper inquiry is what Zuckerberg knew, what he received, what he used, what he said or withheld, what occurred after severance, how Meta handled the account incident, and whether the combined conduct violated the declarant's rights.

The requested next step is disciplined preservation, authentication, comparison, and testimony. The declarant asks the law to confirm or correct his observations through the underlying records and to impose only the lawful findings and remedies supported by that evidence. This statement is not legal advice or a judicial finding.