

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

RECEIVED
FEB 26 2025
US DISTRICT COURT
MID DIST TENN

JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,

PLAINTIFF

v.

VIRGINIA LEE STORY ET AL.,

DEFENDANTS

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-01282

**DECLARATION AND MOTION TO CORRECT AND MINIMIZE OR STRIKE
AND REMOVE REDACTIONS, WHILE UNSEALING ALL RECORDS¹**

Plaintiff brings this declaration and motion pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746 and 18 U.S. Code § 4 - Misprision of felony.

I, Jeffrey Ryan Fenton, declare under oath as follows:

1. I am the plaintiff in this federal lawsuit.
2. I am a citizen of the United States of America.
3. I was born in Washington State during 1969.
4. I am domiciled in Genesee County, Michigan.

¹ This lawsuit was originally filed on October 13, 2023, in the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan (hereinafter "MIWD") as case no. 1:23-cv-01097. On October 25, 2024, MIWD transferred this lawsuit as ordered in ECF 127 to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee (hereinafter "TNMD") as case no. 3:24-cv-01282. The language used in the file stamps of each page filed is slightly different between the two courts. MIWD uses the term "ECF No." (which I abbreviate as "ECF"), while in place of that, TNMD uses the term "Document" (which I abbreviate as "DOC"). Both courts use the term "PageID" (which I abbreviate as "PID"). Citations to the court record in this lawsuit will be notated without the case name or number, using the starting DOC/ECF number, followed by both the beginning and ending PID. The Notice of Electronic Filing for this transfer is recorded in TNMD DOC 131, at which point the DOC/ECF number from MIWD was retained and continued, but the PID was reset after DOC 130, PID 5727, to restart at zero.

BACKGROUND

5. I received an email² dated October 25, 2024, from Assistant United States Attorney Ryan Cobb, with the United States Attorney’s Office for the Western District of Michigan. This email stated: “I will be representing Judge Walker in this action. I’m writing to seek concurrence in removing Judge Walker’s private address from the pleadings filed in this matter. He has privacy and safety concerns about having that address be publicly available and we would like it redacted from the filings. If you concur, I will send you a stipulation to redact it from the filings. If not, I will go ahead and file a motion.”

6. I’ve been through a lot the past few months, as I have tried to work with both U.S. Attorneys, in Michigan³ (see attached “Exhibits A-I”), and Tennessee⁴ (see attached “Exhibits J-U”), to meaningfully address Judge Walker’s claimed “privacy and safety concerns”, without the need to block public access to any document in this lawsuit. Ultimately, neither U.S. attorney showed any interest in limiting the reach of their proposed redactions to the scope of their stated concerns, concealing defendant Walker’s home address.

7. Meanwhile the courts took the opportunity to order vastly over-reaching redactions and/or sealed records, substantially interfering with the public’s ability to research and understand this lawsuit, along with the critical justice interests involved.

8. The heart of this lawsuit is about public corruption amongst high-ranking officers of the Tennessee Court System, some of whom are literally entrusted with the oversight of the “practice of law” throughout the state. It is imperative that nothing in this lawsuit be withheld,

² See attached “Exhibit B” | https://rico.jeffenton.com/evidence/2024-10_comms-with-usat-ryan-cobb-about-redactions.pdf

³ https://rico.jeffenton.com/evidence/2024-10_comms-with-usat-ryan-cobb-about-redactions.pdf

⁴ https://rico.jeffenton.com/evidence/2024-11_comms-with-usat-anica-jones-about-redactions.pdf

redacted, sealed, or otherwise hidden from the public, except that which is absolutely critical, with a reasonable, honest, and lawful purpose; without redacting one word, page, or document more than is absolutely necessary.

9. Upon information and belief, as will be explained in other filings, I do not believe that Judge Walker ever had any “privacy and safety concerns” related to the disclosure of his home address in this lawsuit. (Based on a reasonable interpretation of Judge Walker’s actions as related to that information, independent of this lawsuit, which out of care for his privacy I am refraining from providing details about here.)

10. Upon information and belief, I believe that this was a rouse from the start and is in fact misconduct by the U.S. Attorney’s Offices in both Michigan and Tennessee. Misusing the weight and resources of their public offices to protect both the private and criminal interests of many of the defendants, seeking to hide felony crimes and corruption from the public, **which most if not all of the defendants, knowingly participated in.**

TENN. R. SUP. CT. 1.0 TERMINOLOGY⁵

(f⁶) “Knowingly,” “known,” or “knows” denotes actual awareness of the fact in question. A person’s knowledge may be inferred from circumstances (emphasis added).

(j⁷) “Reasonably should know,” when used in reference to a lawyer, denotes that a lawyer of reasonable prudence and competence would ascertain the matter in question” (emphasis added).

⁵ ECF 41, PID 3570-3608 | <https://rico.jeffenton.com/evidence/tennessee-rules-of-judicial-and-professional-conduct.pdf>

ECF 41, PID 3572 | <https://www.tncourts.gov/rules/supreme-court/8>

⁶ ECF 41, PID 3572 | Tenn. R. Sup. Ct. 1.0 TERMINOLOGY (f) “Knowingly”.

<https://www.tncourts.gov/rules/supreme-court/8>

⁷ ECF 41, PID 3572 | Tenn. R. Sup. Ct. 1.0 TERMINOLOGY (j) “Reasonably should know”.

<https://www.tncourts.gov/rules/supreme-court/8> |

18 U.S. CODE § 4 MISPRISION OF FELONY

11. These records are packed with evidence of felonies committed by Tennessee court personnel and counsel. Hiding them is a violation of 18 U.S. Code § 4 - Misprision of Felony:⁸

“Whoever, having knowledge of the actual commission of a felony cognizable by a court of the United States, conceals and does not as soon as possible make known the same to some judge or other person in civil or military authority under the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.”
(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 684; Pub. L. 103-322, title XXXIII, §330016(1)(G), Sept. 13, 1994, 108 Stat. 2147.)

12. Upon information and belief, several of the defendants and/or their counsel are twisting the facts and making material misrepresentations in their motions to dismiss, supporting briefs, and other filings, which are the equivalent of “fraud on the court by officers of the court”. Then they tax me with the burden of needing to do multiple times as much work with each filing, taking significantly more time for me and the court, so that I can try to clearly articulate, explain, and prove to the court each attorney’s misconduct taking place.

13. Once that much extra work has been done by me, depleting my critical time and resources on largely nonsense, there needs to be some sort of financial consideration or sanctions that take place, to compensate and reimburse me for my time and resources wasted to defend against what were largely frivolous claims and motions to dismiss, which were honestly **never** in the interest of justice from the start.

⁸ <https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/4>

SWORN COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 11(B), UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

14. This is why it is critical that this court grant my “AMENDED MOTION TO REQUIRE ALL FILINGS TO INCLUDE A CERTIFICATION STATING THEIR CONTENTS ARE FACTUALLY TRUE AND COMPLIANT WITH F.R.C.P. RULE 11(B), SWORN TO UNDER THE PENALTY OF PERJURY (EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION REQUESTED)” which I filed on October 10, 2024, in ECF 100, PID 5343-5353.

15. Without this motion, unless this court closely monitors good professional conduct, and proactively sanctions each violator stiffly, there is likely more incentive for many of the defendants and their counsel to lie, twist the truth, operate in bad faith, and repeatedly violate Rule 11(B) in their filings, than to operate honestly, ethically, and lawfully.

16. Upon information and belief, it is critical to the honest interests of justice in this matter, along with the timeliness of the actions in this lawsuit, that the court either grant my motion to require real accountability in each filing, under the **penalty of perjury**, or by strictly disciplining **all** attorney misconduct with **steep** sanctions, while granting me extra time to argue against their nonsense.

17. If Judge Walker does have any real “privacy and safety concerns” about the disclosure of his home address in this lawsuit, his counsel certainly failed to address that in any meaningful capacity, in either Federal Court, Michigan or Tennessee.

18. Between the two courts currently, there are literally thousands of pages of my lawsuit, which **don’t** contain defendant Walker’s address, which have been either temporarily or permanently redacted in their entirety or sealed from public access.

THE INDECENT PROPOSAL

19. In the proposed order to redact (see attached “Exhibit F”), filed in MIWD, ECF 136, PID 5735, there are **four** pages listed in **three** documents which contain Judge Walker’s home address; those are as follows:

- 1) ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293 (the court redacted 64 pages)
- 2) ECF No. 66, PageID.4874 (the court redacted 138 pages)
- 3) ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252 and 5254 (the court redacted 22 pages)

THE REAL NEED (IF EVER ONE EXISTED)

20. All that needed to be redacted from my complaint, was the following **four words** containing defendant Walker’s:

Example:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| 1) House Number | | 1234 |
| 2) Street Name | | Defendant Drive |
| 3) City | | Nashville |
| 4) +4 Code (last four) | | 0000 |

21. That’s it! Just **four words**, in *one sentence*, on only *one page* of my complaint!

22. According to Microsoft Word, my amended complaint⁹ contains:

- one hundred thirty-eight pages (138)
- six hundred ninety-one paragraphs (691)
- two thousand five hundred sixty-seven lines (2,567)
- thirty-one thousand fifteen words (31,015)

⁹ ECF 66, PID 4870-5007 | https://rico.jeffenton.com/evidence/1-23-cv-01097_fenton-vs-story-first-amended-complaint.pdf

23. All of which has been completely redacted for the alleged purpose of concealing those **four words** in defendant Walker's address, despite being information easily available on public records for anyone to find while doing a rudimentary web search from the browser of their choice.

WHAT REALLY HAPPENED BETWEEN FEDERAL COUNSEL AND COURTS

24. Upon information and belief, this appears to have been an "excuse" for some of the high-profile bad actors in this lawsuit to exploit both another *public office* (tax funded counsel) and a loophole (safety of a federal judge) by which they could reasonably argue the *need* to redact and seal *some* of the court's records. Then in the execution of that, I believe that they planned and in fact somehow obtained massively *overreaching redactions* for the real purpose of **hiding** glaring evidence and testimony about **public corruption** and numerous **felony crimes** committed by **high-ranking officers of the Tennessee Court System**.

25. Despite the obscenely overreaching redactions ordered, such as blocking **all** public access to **all one hundred and thirty-eight pages** of my amended complaint¹⁰, to allegedly conceal just *four words*, printed on only *one page*, contained within a *single line*, from the public.

26. While missing the other **fifteen documents** that contain **defendant Walker's address**, filed in this lawsuit, which have remained publicly accessible.

27. Defendant Walker's address is present on these specific pages (see correlating redacted pages attached): ECF 16-1, PID 2293; 66, PID 4874; ECF 90-2, PID 5170; ECF 90-4, PID 5172; ECF 95-1, PID 5252 & 5254; ECF 96, PID 5263; ECF 96-1, PID 5273; ECF 92-2, PID 5293; ECF 97, PID 5300; ECF 98, PID 5326; ECF 99, PID 5335; ECF 100, PID 5352; ECF 100-1, PID 5362; ECF 101, PID 5383; ECF 102, PID 5467; ECF 109, PID 5582; ECF 110, 5592; ECF 111, PID 5607.

¹⁰ DOC 66, PID 4870-5007 | https://rico.jeffenton.com/evidence/3-24-cv-01282_fenton-vs-story-first-amended-complaint.pdf

28. Still, I set out to cure the *claimed concern* as completely as I am *able*, not just on the pages the officers of the court *chose to hide from the public*, but to the best of my knowledge and ability throughout this *lawsuit*, as well as throughout multiple sections of my *website*. This has been a lot of work, no thanks to the U.S. Attorneys in Michigan and Tennessee, who both refused to work with me on the issue while limiting the scope of the redactions performed by the court to their stated concern: *defendant Walker's address*.

29. I have been working for months to cure this problem without the “unintended” consequence of limiting the public’s access to this lawsuit in any other way.

30. The current implementation by the court is “overly broad and burdensome” for me in many ways, as I told both U.S. Attorneys¹¹, while hiding the real merits of this lawsuit from the public, along with the challenges I have and continue to face in the federal courts, as an indigent *pro se* litigant seeking justice.

31. More will be said on the surrounding circumstances in other filings, but this motion is intended to **correct** this problem, hopefully once and for all, by treating the concern as legitimate and providing a real remedy, regardless of the defendant’s motives.

32. Since it is so labor intensive to try to sift back through the court records to redact defendant Walker’s address from my filings, from both Nashville and Michigan dockets online, as well as from other documents hosted on my website, wherever practical I am also redacting the **home addresses** of the other defendants, in hopes of preventing similar issues from arising again.

33. I don’t know how the court handles redactions; therefore I’ve tried my best to provide each page and document needing redactions to the court, both printed and as digital media

¹¹ See attached Exhibits: C, C-2, H, K, M, M-2, P, Q, Q-2, Q-3, and U.

(on a DVD¹²), in every document set and format, which I can envision potentially being helpful to the court in facilitating the redactions as quickly and easily as I can imagine, without compromising the public's access to any document in this lawsuit.

A REAL REMEDY REGARDLESS OF THE DEFENDANT'S MOTIVES

34. All source files were downloaded from PACER and should be identical to those recorded in the docket with the court, except for the obvious redactions which I have performed to protect the privacy of the defendants.

35. I am providing each page requiring redactions, printed on paper media, both with and without the court's case specific headers.

36. I'm assuming that the court will want to scan the redacted pages without the court's case specific headers printed on them, to then have the clerk add the headers electronically after scanning.

37. I provided each page both ways, to avoid confusion about which page is which, and for the court to use however is most beneficial to the clerk's workflow.

PACER DIGITAL MEDIA FILES—AFTER APPLYING REDACTIONS

38. I have also provided a DVD¹³ with the digital media files originally downloaded from PACER, after I applied the redactions to them, both with and without the court's case specific headers on them, for the court to use however they like.

39. Since in many cases, the redactions are only on one or two pages of a much larger document, but PACER does not provide downloads of those individual pages (to my knowledge),

¹² This DVD is included in attached "Exhibit V".

¹³ This DVD is included in attached "Exhibit V".

I have prepared these digital files in multiple different document set configurations, for the court to use however it works best with their workflow.

40. Wherever applicable, I tried to provide the digital media files on the ZIP level, the DOCUMENT level, and also on the PAGE level. I also tried to provide PAGE level redactions in two separate *variants*, one where defendant Walker's home address **alone** has been redacted (notated with "*walkers page*" in the file name), the other where the home addresses for **all** the defendants, including Walker, has been redacted, to provide improved privacy for all the defendants (notated with "*redacted pages only*" in the file name).

**MOTION TO CORRECT AND MINIMIZE OR STRIKE AND REMOVE REDACTIONS,
WHILE UNSEALING ALL DOCUMENTS IN THIS LAWSUIT**

41. It is critical to me that nothing in this lawsuit be redacted or sealed from the public except for minimal line-level redactions which can be executed, on a page-by-page basis, **without** redacting or sealing **any** full page or document in this lawsuit.

42. It is my preference that the court use all the pages which I have taken the time to redact and provide to the court herein, to protect the privacy of many of the defendants, not just defendant Walker, in hopes of preventing similar issues in the future, in as much as is both practical and possible, without significantly increasing the scope of this task.

43. However, since I cannot control whether the court elects to do the minimum for defendant Walker's benefit alone, or takes the extra steps to conceal the home addresses of the other defendants, in as much as is practical, while handling the same scope of documents, I have provided both document sets for the court to choose which is most helpful to use.

44. At the court's option, the clerk can substitute the included redacted pages, using either paper or digital media (on DVD¹⁴), or perform line-level redactions of just the sensitive residential addresses of the defendants.

45. In the event that the court is not willing to help perform, execute, or facilitate line-level redactions without any full page or document level redactions blocking the public from material matters in this lawsuit, **then please strike and remove all redactions** and/or unseal all documents, to make this lawsuit fully accessible to the public once again.

46. As will be substantiated in other filings, defendant Walker's home address **never was private**. Upon information and belief, defendant Walker has not taken some of the most basic steps necessary for privately owning real property, without which he has no reasonable expectation for privacy related to his home address. We are each responsible for creating our own privacy, and in substantive matters involving defendant Walker's home address, he has failed or refused to take actions to make the location of his home private.

47. Upon information and belief, this demand was improper from the start, apparently for the real purpose of **hiding** glaring evidence and testimony about **public corruption** and numerous **felony crimes** committed by high-ranking officers of the Tennessee Courts, against my family and the general public in Middle Tennessee.

¹⁴ This DVD is included in attached "Exhibit V".

REDACTION CORRECTIONS NEEDED

ECF 16-1

1. Please **remove** the document level redaction of ECF 16-1, PID 2271-2323, to make this document available to the public again.

2. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 16-1, PID 2271-2323, or on each of the defendant's summonses, perform a line-level redaction of just the house numbers and street names (one line per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 2293.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 16-1".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 16-1 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 16-1 (walkers page).pdf
 - 16-1.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-16.zip
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/16-1.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-16.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/16-1.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/ecf-16.zip>

ECF 66

3. Please **remove** the document level redaction of ECF 66, PID 4870-5007, to make this document available to the public again.

4. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 66, PID 4873 and 4874, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (one line only). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 4874.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 66".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 66 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 66 (walkers page).pdf
 - 66.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-66.zip

- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/66.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-66.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/66.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-66.zip>

ECF 90-2

5. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 90-2, PID 5170, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached “Exhibit V”), open the directory “ECF 90-2”.
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 90-2 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 90-2 (walkers page).pdf
 - 90-2.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-90.zip
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/90-2.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-90.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/90-2.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-90.zip>

ECF 90-4

6. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 90-4, PID 5172, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached “Exhibit V”), open the directory “ECF 90-4”.
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 90-4 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 90-4 (walkers page).pdf
 - 90-4.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-90.zip
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/90-4.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-90.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/90-4.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-90.zip>

ECF 95-1

7. Please **remove** the document level redaction of ECF 95-1, PID 5237-5258, to make this document available to the public again.

8. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 95-1, PID 5242, 5252, 5254 or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (one line per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 5252 and 5254.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 95-1".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 95-1 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 95-1 (walkers pages).pdf
 - 95-1.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-95.zip
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/95-1.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-95.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/95-1.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-95.zip>

ECF 96

9. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 96, PID 5263, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 96".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 96 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 96 (walkers page).pdf
 - 96.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-96.zip
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/96.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-96.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/96.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-96.zip>

ECF 96-1

10. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 96-1, PID 5266-5279, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (two lines per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 5273.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 96-1".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 96-1 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 96-1 (walkers page).pdf
 - 96-1.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/96-1.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/96-1.pdf>

ECF 96-2

11. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 96-2, PID 5293, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 96-2".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 96-2 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 96-2 (walkers page).pdf
 - 96-2.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/96-2.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/96-2.pdf>

ECF 97

12. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 97, PID 5300, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 97".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 97 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 97 (walkers page).pdf
 - 97.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/97.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/97.pdf>

ECF 98

13. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 98, PID 5326, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 98".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 98 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 98 (walkers page).pdf
 - 98.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/98.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/98.pdf>

ECF 99

14. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 99, PID 5335, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 99".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 99 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 99 (walkers page).pdf
 - 99.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-99.zip
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/99.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-99.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/99.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-99.zip>

ECF 100

15. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 100, PID 5352, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 100".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 100 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 100 (walkers page).pdf
 - 100.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-100.zip

- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/100.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-100.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/100.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-100.zip>

ECF 100-1

16. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 100-1, PID 5355-5368, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (two lines per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 5362.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 100-1".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 100-1 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 100-1 (walkers page).pdf
 - 100-1.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/100-1.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/100-1.pdf>

ECF 101

17. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 101, PID 5383, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 101".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 101 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 101 (walkers page).pdf
 - 101.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
 - ecf-101.zip
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/101.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/zip/ecf-101.zip>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/101.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jefffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/zip/doc-101.zip>

ECF 102

18. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 102, PID 5467, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 102".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 102 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 102 (walkers page).pdf
 - 102.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/102.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/102.pdf>

ECF 109

19. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 109, PID 5582, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 109".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 109 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 109 (walkers page).pdf
 - 109.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/109.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/109.pdf>

ECF 110

20. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 110, PID 5592, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD(see attached "Exhibit V"), open the directory "ECF 110".
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 110 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 110 (walkers page).pdf
 - 110.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/110.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/110.pdf>

ECF 111

21. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 111, PID 5607, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

- At the top-level of the DVD (see attached “Exhibit V”), open the directory “ECF 111”.
- Digital Media Files Provided on DVD:
 - 111 (redacted pages only).pdf
 - 111 (walkers page).pdf
 - 111.pdf (This is the **complete document** with the redactions applied.)
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/111.pdf>
- Redacted Online: <https://rico.jeffenton.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/111.pdf>

CONCLUSION

1. It is critical to me that nothing in this lawsuit be redacted or sealed from the public except for minimal line-level redactions which can be executed, on a page-by-page basis, **without** redacting or sealing **any** full page or document in this lawsuit.

2. Please **unseal** all documents I filed in this lawsuit, which are currently sealed for any reason.

3. Please **remove** the document level redaction of ECF 16-1, PID 2271-2323, to make this document available to the public again.

4. Please **remove** the document level redaction of ECF 66, PID 4870-5007, to make this document available to the public again.

5. Please **remove** the document level redaction of ECF 95-1, PID 5237-5258, to make this document available to the public again.

6. If this court is not willing to use line-level redactions to conceal defendant Walker’s address (just four words), instead of page and document level redactions, which are currently

significantly interfering with the public's right, access, and ability to understand substantive portions of this lawsuit, **then please strike and remove all redactions** and/or unseal all documents, to make this lawsuit fully accessible to the public once again.

7. If this court is willing to use line-level redactions to conceal defendant Walker's address instead of "overly broad and burdensome" page and document level redactions, which obstruct and interfere with the public's access and right to know, then please proceed with the remaining redactions, corrections, and changes, as outlined below.

8. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 16-1, PID 2271-2323, or on each of the defendant's summonses, perform a line-level redaction of just the house numbers and street names (one line per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 2293.

9. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 66, PID 4873 and 4874, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (one line only). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 4874.

10. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 90-2, PID 5170, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

11. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 90-4, PID 5172, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

12. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 95-1, PID 5242, 5252, 5254 or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (one line per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 5252 and 5254.

13. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 96, PID 5263, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

14. Please swap out the redacted pages provided for ECF 96-1, PID 5266-5279, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (two lines per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 5273.

15. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 96-2, PID 5293, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

16. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 97, PID 5300, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

17. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 98, PID 5326, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

18. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 99, PID 5335, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

19. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 100, PID 5352, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

20. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 100-1, PID 5355-5368, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants (two lines per page). Defendant Walker's address is shown on PID 5362.

21. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 101, PID 5383, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

22. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 102, PID 5467, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

23. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 109, PID 5582, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

24. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 110, PID 5592, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

25. Please swap out the redacted page provided for ECF 111, PID 5607, or perform line-level redactions of just the residential house numbers and street names of the defendants.

CERTIFICATION AND DECLARATION

By signing below, I, Jeffrey Ryan Fenton, certify that this document has been executed in good faith, in the honest pursuit of justice, and in strict compliance with F.R.Civ.P. 11(b).

Pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct, except as to matters herein stated to be on information and belief, and as to such matters, I certify as aforesaid that I verily believe the same to be true.

All rights reserved.

Executed on February 10, 2025



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON, PRO SE

17195 SILVER PARKWAY, #150

FENTON, MI, 48430-3426

CONTACT@JEFFFENTON.COM

(P) 615.837.1300

#TNinjustice

#iAMhuman

DOCUMENTS REGARDING (CASE: 3:24-CV-01282):

1. DECLARATION AND MOTION TO CORRECT AND MINIMIZE OR STRIKE AND REMOVE REDACTIONS, WHILE UNSEALING ALL RECORDS (with Exhibits A through V-2)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 22, 2025, I mailed the foregoing or above-named papers to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, at their address below, for filing in case number 3:24-cv-01282.

I further certify that on or before February 28, 2025, I am serving these same documents to the defendants or their counsel by first class or priority mail with postage prepaid at the addresses listed below. If for any reason beyond my control, I am unable to complete either on the date specified, I will do so on the very next business day.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT (TNMD)
719 CHURCH ST
NASHVILLE, TN 37203-6940

MEGAN CALME & SARAH MATHEWS
WILSON ELSER MOSKOWITZ EDELMAN & DICKER, LLP
3102 WEST END AVE STE 400
NASHVILLE, TN 37203-1623

PEAKO ANDREA JENKINS
TENNESSEE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
PO BOX 20207
NASHVILLE, TN 37202-4015

KATHRYN LYNN YARBROUGH
223 TOWN CENTER PKWY UNIT 1897
SPRING HILL, TN 37174-3040

LISA M. CARSON
BUERGER, MOSELEY & CARSON, PLC
4068 RURAL PLAINS CIR STE 100
FRANKLIN, TN 37064-8039

CAROLINA MARTIN & COURTNEY WILLIAMS
GORDON & REES SCULLY MANSUKHANI, LLP
4031 ASPEN GROVE DR STE 290
FRANKLIN, TN 37067-2951

ALEXANDER SERGEY KOVAL
CLARK & WASHINGTON, P.C.
1321 MURFREESBORO PIKE STE 320
NASHVILLE, TN 37217-2858

ANTHONY NOEL & LARUA BASSETT
LEITNER, WILLIAMS, DOOLEY, AND NAPOLITAN, PLLC
750 OLD HICKORY BLVD STE 200
BRENTWOOD TN 37027-4567

ANICA CLARISSA JONES
U.S. ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
719 CHURCH ST STE 3300
NASHVILLE, TN 37203-7155

SANDRA J. DENSHAM
PLUNKETT COONEY
333 BRIDGE ST NW STE 530
GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49504-5365

THOMAS E. ANDERSON
1187 OLD HICKORY BLVD STE 125
BRENTWOOD, TN 37027-4248

GREGORY BROWN & WILLIAM HICKERSON
LOWE YEAGER & BROWN, PLLC
920 VOLUNTEER LANDING LN STE 200
KNOXVILLE, TN 37915-2584

ALAN RHENEY
SPRAGINS, BARNETT & COBB, PLC
312 E LAFAYETTE ST
JACKSON, TN 38301-6220

BRET CHANESS
RUBIN LUBLIN, LLC
3145 AVALON RIDGE PL STE 100
PEACHTREE CORNERS, GA 30071-1570

R L MOORE
BANKERS TITLE & ESCROW CORPORATION
3310 WEST END AVE STE 540
NASHVILLE, TN 37203-6802

B. GOLDAMMER & D. SUEDEKUM
KAY GRIFFIN, PLLC
222 2ND AVE N STE 340M
NASHVILLE, TN 37201-1649

G. CATE & K. INGRAM-HOGAN
BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS, LLP
1221 BROADWAY STE 2400
NASHVILLE, TN 37203-7238

ERIK HALVORSON
BRADLEY ARANT BOULT CUMMINGS
1221 BROADWAY STE 2400
NASHVILLE, TN 37203-7238

ELECTRONIC SERVICE OPTIONS

These documents should also be available on the Internet, within the next few days, on my list¹ of documents filed by myself in this lawsuit, since the release of my lawsuit service package².

CERTIFICATION AND DECLARATION

By signing below, I, Jeffrey Ryan Fenton, certify that this document has been executed in good faith, in the honest pursuit of justice, and in strict compliance with F.R.Civ.P. 11(b).

Pursuant to 28 U.S. Code § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

All rights reserved.

Executed on February 22, 2025



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON, PRO SE

17195 SILVER PARKWAY, #150
FENTON, MI, 48430-3426
CONTACT@JEFFFENTON.COM
HTTPS://JEFFFENTON.COM
(P) 615.837.1300
#TNinjustice
#iAMhuman

¹ <https://jefffenton.com/digital-service-package-for-lawsuit/fenton-filings-since-service/>

² <https://jefffenton.com/digital-service-package-for-lawsuit/>

ECF 69, PID.5030-5042 | https://rico.jefffenton.com/evidence/1-23-cv-01097_fenton-vs-story-lawsuit-service-pack-details.pdf

(616) 456-2404



October 23, 2024, at 2:33 PM



Good afternoon. My name is Ryan Cobb. I'm calling for Jeffrey Fenton.

I'm an assistant United States Attorney in Grand Rapids, Michigan.

I'm calling regarding the lawsuit you've filed in the Western District of Michigan against a host of parties including Judge Walker, who is a bankruptcy judge down in Tennessee.

I'll be representing him and I'm planning on filing a motion to dismiss your claims against him.

Under local rules, I need to try to discuss that with you, which is what I'm doing now, happy to explain the basis for the motion to dismiss. If you want to return my call, my number is 616-456-2404, and then you can just ask to speak to me Ryan Cobb (ryan cobb). Again, 616-456-2404. Thank you.

I don't know how to describe the feeling, when you've been forced to accept the fact that you have been betrayed by your own government, while fighting for years against alleged "public servants" and powerful people who hold offices of public trust, when never was there any basis for trusting them in the first place, let alone placing them in charge of our lives, families, liberty, and property, with almost no meaningful mechanisms of transparency or accountability whatsoever. People who hold their own words higher than those of our creator and our federal constitution.

Then for the first time to get a phone call from a **United States Attorney**, and to think for just a split second that finally someone had seen the evidence in my case, showing the crimes committed against me and my family, under the color of law, by the conspiring Tennessee courts and counsel, and **called in the calvary to protect me**, to help hold the bad actors accountable... finally... better late than never. Only to realize a sentence or two later just how outrageously incorrect my momentary lapse from reality had been.

Instead "our" government had sent in **another attorney**, employed by our tax dollars, **seeking to defeat me and justice**, by dismissing my lawsuit with more frivolous claims. To continue cheating myself and my family out of our lives, liberty, and property, when they never had an ethical or lawful cause for touching any of it in the first place.

Sadly, this is the *"practice of law"* in the United States of America today. If truth be known, there is no greater threat to this nation or the people, either foreign or domestic, than those who pretend to *"practice law"* in our courts every day, without respect for the inalienable natural rights of every man, woman, and child; many whom have no honest interest, reverence, or concern about real justice.



00:00

00:52



Fenton v. Story et al., No. 1:23-cv-1097 (W.D. Mich.)

From Cobb, Ryan (USAMIW) <Ryan.Cobb@usdoj.gov>
Date Fri 10/25/2024 12:34 PM
To contact@jefffenton.com <contact@jefffenton.com>




Mr. Fenton,

I will be representing Judge Walker in this action. I'm writing to seek concurrence in removing Judge Walker's private address from the pleadings filed in this matter. He has privacy and safety concerns about having that address be publicly available and we would like it redacted from the filings. If you concur, I will send you a stipulation to redact it from the filings. If not, I will go ahead and file a motion.

Thank you,
Ryan Cobb

Ryan Cobb
Assistant United States Attorney | Civil Division Chief
United States Attorney's Office, Western District of Michigan
P.O. Box 208, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501
Ryan.Cobb@usdoj.gov | (616) 456-2404

 Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story et al., No. 1:23-cv-1097 (W.D. Mich.)

From Jeff Fenton

Date Sat 10/26/2024 5:24 AM

To Cobb, Ryan (USAMIW) <Ryan.Cobb@usdoj.gov>



Hello Mr. Cobb,

Unfortunately, I did not receive (or see) this email until after you filed your motion with the court yesterday.

I have absolutely no objection to your client keeping his address confidential, though it was obtained from public sources.

My only concern is the amount of work which your motion proposes taxing me with being overly broad, excessive, unnecessary, and unsustainable currently; unless the court orders a substantial stay (without jeopardizing any timelines) so that I can dig through documents, make the redactions, reprint and refile them... while this could have a very substantial, unforeseen, and difficult to calculate and predict, ripple effect by changing the page citations throughout the entire lawsuit of over 5,000 pages, which would be insane to merely redact a few sentences, which contain his street address on them. That would be extremely overburdensome for the simple outcome desired.

Additionally, the court might want me to serve the redacted documents to the defendants again, which would burden me with thousands of dollars' worth of expenses which I don't have the resources to even consider. That would require significant consideration/compensation/assistance provided by your client, the government, or the court to facilitate.

Another substantial concern is that this whole process could cost me a month of down-time, during a transition between courts, when I have no time to spare. That presents problems on several fronts, including the holding costs of suspending relief in these matters.

I understand that you said your client is concerned about his privacy and safety, though this information was publicly obtained and is readily available through other sources, while I had no idea this concern existed. I am very concerned about my privacy and safety also due to the criminal actions by many of the defendants in this case, which I have been trying to protect myself against, by seeking a protective order (ECF 17), for almost a year now, without relief. Hence, I am sympathetic to the concern and willing to work with you, but in a far less dramatic capacity, without gutting this case or causing citations problems, the full extent of which can't even be meaningfully calculated or understood without significant work.

To my knowledge, defendant Walker's address isn't listed anywhere publicly except on the FAC (literally one line) and summonses (literally two lines), along with some proofs (literally one or two lines) of defendants dodging service or refusing to confirm service by correctly signing their names per the rules for USPS restricted delivery, as required by the court. (They created the last problem themselves.) I don't know of more than a half-dozen pages this involves, out of over a 5,000-page court record currently, while of those roughly six pages, only one or two lines needs to be redacted from each.

Here is what I suggest, if you are willing to work together toward getting this done quickly, rather than arguing over it in motions and objections while waiting for the court to decide:

- If you withdraw your current motion, so we don't need to waste time and resources arguing this before the court, and instead you file a motion asking the court to simply redact his address from the very few pages it is on in the court record.
- Then I am willing to redact his street address from those documents which are available through my websites, while agreeing not to include his address on any documents which I create in the future, either produced for the public or filed in court.
- In my mind this makes far more sense and is a far more productive use of time and resources, than having the court be the arbitrator of this matter. We don't fundamentally have opposing interests, except as to the means of execution.

It would be substantially more efficient to have the court redact that which they have in their files, and I would then be happy to redact that which I provide publicly, without creating a substantial workload for anyone or making this into a major project.

I'm completely willing to cooperate, but I will need to object to your motion as it stands, unless you withdraw it, because it is unreasonably broad and burdensome upon me, while being wholly inefficient and unnecessary. I'd compare your motion to demolishing a city block to kill a fly. It's unreasonably excessive overkill.


Likewise, in the amount of time which I expect I will need to invest in filing my objections in court (with my communication disabilities), I could have already completed the task on the public side, through my website. (In the amount of time I have spent writing you this email, probably a couple of hours, I could have already accomplished a substantial portion of this.) Hence, if that is the route you insist upon proceeding, it will take me substantially longer, because I must prioritize writing my objections first, to protect my greater interests of not being ordered to do something which is overly broad and burdensome by the court, that I simply don't have the time and resources to complete, without necessary provisions and the court making special allowances.

There is no need to restrain me, I am a man of my word. I will agree not to file anything else containing defendant Walker's address, publicly or in this case, while I can think of no need to do so as long as he remains represented in this matter. I have no other interest or care in his address than compelling his appearance in this lawsuit, so that I can proceed with litigating towards a remedy. Again, we have no opposing interests or objectives in this matter, except how to facilitate the very minor changes needed.

Please let me know if you are willing to withdraw your motion and work with me as I have described, or if I need to focus my energy on drafting my objection to your motion while refiling my own motion for a protective order in this matter, in an effort to obtain the same safety for myself and my family as your client seeks. In absence of some confirmation by you, I will assume the later and continue to invest my resources accordingly.

Thanks.
Jeff Fenton

[x.com/@tninjustice](https://twitter.com/tninjustice)



17195 SILVER PKWY, #150
FENTON, MI 48430-3426



 Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story et al., No. 1:23-cv-1097 (W.D. Mich.)

From Cobb, Ryan (USAMIW) <Ryan.Cobb@usdoj.gov>

Date Mon 10/28/2024 9:58 AM

To Jeff Fenton



 1 attachment (17 KB)

Stipulation to redact v.1.docx;

Sorry—here is an updated stipulation with one additional page that needs to be redacted.

From: Cobb, Ryan (USAMIW)

Sent: Monday, October 28, 2024 9:11 AM

To: Jeff Fenton

Subject: RE: Fenton v. Story et al., No. 1:23-cv-1097 (W.D. Mich.)

Here is a draft stipulation that would resolve the issues raised in the motion, assuming the court accepts it and agrees to direct the clerk of court to make the redactions.

If it is acceptable to you, please sign it manually, scan it and return it to me (fax or email), and mail the original to me. (The court requires us to keep the original signed version in our file in case there's a question about it.) Once you've sent me the scanned version, I'll file it with the court.


Thanks you,

Ryan Cobb

Assistant United States Attorney | Civil Division Chief
United States Attorney's Office, Western District of Michigan

P.O. Box 208, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501

Ryan.Cobb@usdoj.gov | (616) 808-2031


 Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story et al., No. 1:23-cv-1097 (W.D. Mich.)

From Cobb, Ryan (USAMIW) <Ryan.Cobb@usdoj.gov>

Date Mon 10/28/2024 4:05 PM

To Jeff Fenton

 1 attachment (112 KB)

ECF 137 Order restricting access.pdf;



You can disregard. The court entered an order restricting access to those documents today.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No: 1:23-cv-01097

Hon. Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge

Hon Ray Kent
United States Magistrate Judge

_____ /

ORDER TO REDACT

The Court has reviewed Defendant Hon. Charles Walker’s expedited Motion for Redaction and Refiling of Documents (ECF No. 131) and finds good cause under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.2(e) to remove Charles Walker’s private home address from the publicly available ECF in this action. Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

The Clerk of Court shall take the steps necessary to ensure that any filings that contain Charles Walker’s private home address cannot be publicly accessed. To the extent feasible, the Clerk of Court shall redact the address from pages on which it is found and refile the redacted pages; otherwise, access to these filings shall be restricted. These pages include without limitation the following:

- ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293,
- ECF No. 66, PageID.4874,
- ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252 and 5254.

Dated:

HON. PAUL L. MALONEY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,

Plaintiff,

v.

VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:23-cv-1097

HONORABLE PAUL L. MALONEY

_____ /

ORDER


Pending before the Court is Defendant Hon. Charles M. Walker's motion for redaction and refileing of documents (ECF No. 131). Judge Walker requests the Court remove access to his home address from the public record. Upon due consideration of the motion by the Court,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the motion for redaction and refileing of documents (ECF No. 131) is GRANTED IN PART.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall restrict access to the attachment to the motion for extension of time (ECF No. 16-1), the amended complaint (ECF No. 66), and the attachment to the summons returned executed (ECF No. 95-1). Access shall be restricted to Plaintiff, counsel for the Defendants, and the Court.

Dated: October 28, 2024

/s/ Paul L. Maloney
Paul L. Maloney
United States District Judge

 Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story et al., No. 1:23-cv-1097 (W.D. Mich.)

From Jeff Fenton

Date Wed 10/30/2024 10:26 AM

To Cobb, Ryan (USAMIW) <Ryan.Cobb@usdoj.gov>


Bcc



This is not acceptable, and in fact, a felony crime by yourself and the court.

Please call me at your soonest convenience at [REDACTED]

Thanks
Jeff Fenton



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,
PLAINTIFF

V.


VIRGINIA LEE STORY ET AL.,
DEFENDANTS

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-01282

EVIDENCE TITLE:	2024-10-30_call-with-assistant-united-states-attorney-cobb.mp3
Internet URL:	https://rico.jefffenton.com/evidence/2024-10-30_call-with-assistant-united-states-attorney-cobb.mp3
RELATED DOC:	https://rico.jefffenton.com/evidence/2024-10_comms-with-usat-ryan-cobb-about-redactions.pdf
ECF LOCATION:	

Description: Recorded phone call between Plaintiff & Assistant United States Attorney Ryan Cobb, in Michigan, regarding the excessively broad & burdensome redactions proposed by Attorney Cobb and executed by the court, blocking public access to Plaintiff's entire Amended Complaint, to allegedly conceal *four words* in Walker's address.

The .mp3 audio file on this disc is evidence in this federal civil rights, conspiracy, fraud, and racketeering lawsuit.




Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>

Date Fri 11/1/2024 3:11 PM

To contact@jefffenton.com <contact@jefffenton.com>



 1 attachment (18 KB)

Joint Stipulation to Redact.docx;

Good afternoon, Mr. Fenton.

I received your voicemail, but unfortunately, I cannot return your call this afternoon because I am taking part in training. I can give you a call next week, but in the meantime, I understand that you are willing to jointly agree to remove Judge Walker's information from the docket. Please take a look at this draft motion and let me know if I can type in your signature on the signature line. Assuming you approve of this draft, I can get this filed on Monday.

Let me know if you have questions.

Thanks, and have a good weekend.

Anica




Anica C. Jones
Chief, Civil Division
Middle District of Tennessee

U.S. Attorney's Office | 719 Church Street, Suite 3300 | Nashville, Tennessee 37203

T: (615) 736-5151 | C: (615) 289-6815 | F: (615) 401-6626

E-Mail: Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov

Please be advised that any emails sent to or from this email address are subject to retention and archiving by the United States Department of Justice.

 Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton
Date Fri 11/1/2024 3:30 PM
To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>



Thank you mam.

I'm working at the moment to try to unredact the court record in Michigan, since there are only four words in my FAC which are specific to his address (street number, street name, Nashville), yet they chose to redact 32,741 words instead (my entire complaint) in lieu of just four words.

That is overly broad and unduly burdensome, that I even need to waste my time with this, but unfortunately I must.

I tried to describe that to United States Attorney Cobb, while comparing that to demolishing an entire city to kill a fly.

I'll be happy to help you squash the fly. Please don't squash the entire city or redact my FAC. 😊

I will look over your document this weekend and either have it back to you Monday, or address any outstanding concerns in the matter which we can discuss.

In an act of good faith, I will begin redacting his street address from the documents which I have hosted online regarding my lawsuit.


If I could get EVERYONE to make an appearance in the matter, and quit playing games dodging service, I would redact EVERYONE'S address... again, I have no interests contrary to their privacy. But some of them have chosen to be extremely evasive and have wasted a lot of extra time and money while trying to repeatedly serve them... with other outrageous antics such as mailing service back weeks later, etc... so forcing me to fight to get them served, and to substantiate that the service was GOOD, are my only interests regarding any of their addresses. If you are in a position to help button this up and end this needless waste of time trying to wrestle over service, I would honestly be happy to remove all of their addresses at the same time, while I could do so without requiring much more time than just redacting defendant Walker's.

Anyhow, I don't know what relationship you have with the others, if any, but I just thought I would throw that out there, in the interest of expediting past the bologna and protecting everyone's interests.

I assure you, the core issue of removing his address is of absolutely no concern to me at all. I take no issue with it. All I care about is implementation and not compromising the cohesion and comprehensibility of my lawsuit by the court or the public. (While trying not to create any more work for myself than necessary.)

Have a great weekend, and thanks for reaching out!

Thanks.
Jeff Fenton



Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>

Date Mon 11/4/2024 12:29 PM

To Jeff Fenton

Thanks for your response, Mr. Fenton. I only represent Judge Walker. Please let me know if I can move forward with filing the joint motion to redact Judge Walker's information today.





Re: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton
Date Tue 11/5/2024 2:30 PM
To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>



Hello Ms. Jones,

As previously expressed, I have no conflicts with redacting the four words comprising Judge Walker's address throughout any portion of the complaint and lawsuit, but that must be done without redacting or sealing substantial portions of any documents, otherwise I will need to seek leave from the court to resubmit the documents with just his address redacted, so not to compromise the integrity of my entire lawsuit, along with the public's interest in being able to follow the lawsuit without substantive portions missing.

Again, we are just talking about literally four words.

A stipulation limiting the redaction to the four words only (in a couple of different documents), I'd be happy to sign, but as previously stated it is overly broad and an unreasonable burdensome to redact and force me to refile entire documents.

In my mind, that is not only unreasonable, but shows motives to cover-up and hide the facts, evidence, and sworn testimony in my complaint, which are significantly contrary to the honest interests of Justice.

I'm is still needing to waste time in an attempt to correct this with the Michigan court, while it was a wholly unreasonable action on the part of the court in the first place.

Again, we are talking about the need to simply redact four words in two or three different documents.

Courts redact sensitive words and sentences all the time without redacting or sealing entire documents.

People are making this much more difficult for me than it needs to be. (Which causes me to question their motives.)

Please revise your stipulation for precise, extremely limited redactions (4 words), without any language consenting to the court performing substantive redactions of entire documents or sections, and I will be happy to join you in executing the stipulation.

Otherwise, I need to focus on explaining to both the Michigan and Tennessee courts why more substantive redactions are contrary to the honest interests of Justice while pointing out how unnecessary broad and burdensome redacting or sealing entire documents to literally redact four words is.

This seems really simple and common sense to me. If I must seek leave to refile my entire FAC, that will take me a couple of weeks to do once approved by the court.

Thank you.
Jeff Fenton

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)






Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>

Date Tue 11/5/2024 3:08 PM

To Jeff Fenton

 1 attachment (17 KB)

Joint Stipulation to Redact.docx;

Mr. Fenton, I don't know what "four words" you are talking about. If you have specific edits to the attached stipulation that I sent last week (and I am re-attaching), please send them back to me. Otherwise, I will move forward with filing a motion for the redactions.

Thanks,
Anica






Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>

Date Tue 11/5/2024 3:11 PM


To Jeff Fenton

 1 attachment (17 KB)

Joint Stipulation to Redact.docx;

That was the wrong attachment. Here is the correct one.





RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton

Date Wed 11/6/2024 2:07 PM

To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>



📎 1 attachment (3 MB)

20241106_JOINT MOTION TO REDACT PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS.pdf;

Hello Ms. Jones,

Please find that motion/stipulation attached executed.

I tweaked the language a little bit to where I was comfortable with it. I don't believe there are any material changes which will affect your client's privacy interests.

Please let me know if you are good with this or if we need to address anything else at this time.

Thanks.
Jeff Fenton

[x.com/@tninjustice](#)
jeff.fenton@live.com
Mobile: (810) 428-6500
Landline: (810) 735-7456

17195 SILVER PKWY, #150
FENTON, MI 48430-3426

3-MIN Video Intro about my Federal Lawsuit: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AaYb-f8ux4o>

FENTON v. STORY (1:23-cv-1097) <http://rico.jefffenton.com/discovery/>
<https://casetext.com/case/fenton-v-story>
Fraud on the Court by Officers of the Court: Williamson County Chancery Court Docket #48419B

SLAM the GAVEL Podcast Interview from 8/4/2024 about my RICO Lawsuit with Authors Brian Vukadinovich and Maryann Petri: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=plg5eEEnVuU>

Brian Vukadinovich is the author of [MOTION for JUSTICE](#) (I Rest My Case), and [Rogues in Black Robes](#) (Destroying Lives and Committing Crimes with No True Accountability).

Maryann Petri is the author of [RAISED BY THESE WOLVES](#) (How Family and Federal Courts are Failing our Children), [Dismantling Family Court Corruption](#) ([Why Taking the Kids Was Not Enough](#)). Maryann is also the host of [SLAM the GAVEL](#) Podcast, focused on all family court topics, trauma, and healing.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 3:24-cv-01282
JUDGE CAMPBELL
MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES

EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION REQUESTED

JOINT MOTION TO REDACT PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.03, Plaintiff and Defendant Hon. Charles Walker (Judge Walker) request that portions of filed documents be redacted, and agree as follows:

1. Judge Walker is a federal bankruptcy judge. He has expressed privacy and safety concerns relating to his private address being publicly disclosed in filings in this action.

2. There is good cause to remove judge Walker’s address from the filings in this action. Judge Walker’s privacy and security interests outweigh the public’s interest in this private information, and the details of his address are not relevant to the merits in this action. *See In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., Inc.*, 723 F.2d 470, 474 (6th Cir. 1983); *Malhan v. Grewal*, Civil Action No. 16-8495 (CCC), 2020 WL 6689753, at *2 (D. N.J. Nov. 13, 2020); *Scheffler v. City of New Hope*, Case No. 18-cv-1690 (SRN/LIB) 2018 WL 6012181, at *2 (D. Minn. Nov. 16, 2018) (recognizing that “Judges, in particular, have a critical need to maintain their privacy because of the possible threat posed by dissatisfied litigants. . . .”); *Concerned Pastors for Social Action v. Khouri*, Case No. 16-10277, 2016 WL 8261002, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 25, 2016) (finding that witnesses’ home addresses were irrelevant to the merits of the action and ordering redactions).

3. Redacting more than Judge Walker's address from the filings could have significant consequences, contrary to the interests of justice, which do not benefit the privacy interests mentioned, while potentially compromising the public's interest and ability to follow this lawsuit and understand how different elements and documents interact and relate with each other.

4. It is therefore agreed that the redactions shall be limited to a maximum of one sentence per document, and that entire pages, sections, and documents shall not be redacted or sealed in the record related to this concern.

5. It is further agreed that Judge Walker's name and state of domicile shall not be redacted or concealed in this lawsuit, but that his address number, street name, city, and zip code should be redacted by the Clerk of the Court, pursuant to this motion, for his privacy.

6. It is critical to Plaintiff and hence agreed by the parties herein, that this motion not have a broader impact than specifically intended and as is minimalistically necessary to conceal Judge Walker's residential street address from the public.

7. Accordingly, the Clerk of Court should redact the specific words in this lawsuit which contain or disclose Judge Walker's address number, street name, city, and zip code.

8. These filings include ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293; ECF No. 66, PageID.4874, and ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252, 5254.

9. The parties may not include Judge Walker's unredacted address in any future filings in this action.

Dated: November 6, 2024

/s/ Anica C. Jones
Anica C. Jones
Assistant United States Attorney
719 Church Street, Suite 3300
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 736-5151
Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov




Attorney for Defendant Charles Walker

Dated: November 6, 2024


Jeffrey R. Fenton (pro se)
17195 Silver Parkway #150
Fenton, MI 84830
(615) 837-1300
contact@jeffenton.com
Plaintiff

PROPOSED






Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>

Date Fri 11/8/2024 11:11 AM

To Jeff Fenton

 2 attachments (335 KB)

DE 158 - Motion to Redact.pdf; DE 159 - Memo ISO Motion to Redact.pdf;

Good morning, Mr. Fenton, and thank you for your response. I filed the attached motion and memorandum late on Tuesday evening (before receiving your email below on Wednesday), so there is no longer a need to enter a joint stipulation. I appreciate your edits and the time you spent on this. However, I needed to move quickly given the circumstances.



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO.: 3:24-cv-01282
)	JUDGE CAMPBELL
VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al.,)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES
)	
Defendants.)	

**EMERGENCY MOTION
TO REDACT OR SEAL PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS**

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.03, Defendant Honorable Charles Walker (Judge Walker) requests that portions of filed documents be redacted or sealed, stating as follows:

1. Judge Walker is a federal bankruptcy judge. He has expressed privacy and safety concerns relating to his private address being publicly disclosed in filings in this action.
2. There is good cause to remove judge Walker’s address from the filings in this action. Judge Walker’s privacy and security interests outweigh the public’s interest in this private information, and the details of his address are not relevant to the merits in this action. *See In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., Inc.*, 723 F.2d 470, 474 (6th Cir. 1983); *Malhan v. Grewal*, Civil Action No. 16-8495 (CCC), 2020 WL 6689753, at *2 (D. N.J. Nov. 13, 2020); *Scheffler v. City of New Hope*, Case No. 18-cv-1690 (SRN/LIB) 2018 WL 6012181, at *2 (D. Minn. Nov. 16, 2018) (recognizing that “Judges, in particular, have a critical need to maintain their privacy because of the possible threat posed by dissatisfied litigants. . . .”); *Concerned Pastors for Social Action v. Khouri*, Case No. 16-10277, 2016 WL 8261002, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 25, 2016) (finding that witnesses’ home addresses were irrelevant to the merits of the action and ordering redactions).

3. Accordingly, Defendant asks that the Clerk of Court redact from the ECF in this case any filings that include Judge Walker’s private address or, alternatively, seal the specific pages containing the information. These filings include ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293; ECF No. 66, PageID.4874; and ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252, 5254.

4. Defendant further asks the Court to order Plaintiff to refrain from including Judge Walker’s unredacted address in any future filings in this action.

5. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.01, Defendant’s counsel made attempts to consult with Plaintiff regarding this motion. Defendant’s counsel left Plaintiff a voicemail on October 31. Emails were exchanged between Plaintiff and Defendant’s counsel on November 1, 4, and 5. Defendant’s counsel left Plaintiff another voicemail on November 5. At the time of this filing, Defendant’s counsel has not secured Plaintiff’s assent to filing this motion jointly.

For the reasons discussed above, Defendant’s motion should be granted.


Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS J. JAWORSKI
Acting United States Attorney
Middle District of Tennessee

s/ Anica C. Jones
ANICA C. JONES, B.P.R. #025325
Assistant United States Attorney
United States Attorney’s Office
719 Church Street, Suite 3300
Nashville, TN 37203
Telephone: (615) 736-5151
anica.jones@usdoj.gov



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
)
 v.)
)
 VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)

CASE NO.: 3:24-cv-01282
JUDGE CAMPBELL
MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY MOTION
TO REDACT OR SEAL PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS**

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.03, Defendant Honorable Charles Walker (Judge Walker) requests that portions of filed documents be redacted or sealed, stating as follows:

1. Judge Walker is a federal bankruptcy judge. He has expressed privacy and safety concerns relating to his private address being publicly disclosed in filings in this action.

2. There is good cause to remove Judge Walker’s address from the filings in this action. Judge Walker’s privacy and security interests outweigh the public’s interest in this private information, and the details of his address are not relevant to the merits in this action. *See In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., Inc.*, 723 F.2d 470, 474 (6th Cir. 1983); *Malhan v. Grewal*, Civil Action No. 16-8495 (CCC), 2020 WL 6689753, at *2 (D. N.J. Nov. 13, 2020); *Scheffler v. City of New Hope*, Case No. 18-cv-1690 (SRN/LIB) 2018 WL 6012181, at *2 (D. Minn. Nov. 16, 2018) (recognizing that “Judges, in particular, have a critical need to maintain their privacy because of the possible threat posed by dissatisfied litigants. . . .”); *Concerned Pastors for Social Action v. Khouri*, Case No. 16-10277, 2016 WL 8261002, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 25, 2016) (finding that witnesses’ home addresses were irrelevant to the merits of the action and ordering redactions).

3. Accordingly, Defendant asks that the Clerk of Court redact from the ECF in this case any filings that include Judge Walker’s private address or, alternatively, seal the specific pages containing the information. These filings include ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293; ECF No. 66, PageID.4874; and ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252, 5254.

4. Defendant further asks the Court to order Plaintiff to refrain from including Judge Walker’s unredacted address in any future filings in this action.

5. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.01, Defendant’s counsel made attempts to consult with Plaintiff regarding this motion. Defendant’s counsel left Plaintiff a voicemail on October 31. Emails were exchanged between Plaintiff and Defendant’s counsel on November 1, 4, and 5. Defendant’s counsel left Plaintiff another voicemail on November 5. At the time of this filing, Defendant’s counsel has not secured Plaintiff’s assent to filing this motion jointly.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant requests that this motion be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS J. JAWORSKI
Acting United States Attorney
Middle District of Tennessee

s/ Anica C. Jones
ANICA C. JONES, B.P.R. #025325
Assistant United States Attorney
United States Attorney’s Office
719 Church Street, Suite 3300
Nashville, TN 37203
Telephone: (615) 736-5151
anica.jones@usdoj.gov





Outlook

Re: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton

Date Fri 11/8/2024 9:02 PM

To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>

You sent me the wrong attachment, and once you sent me the correct document I got it back to you within 24 hours executed.

I regret wasting any time on this, since I must now appeal overly broad and burdensome nonsense, contrary to the interests of Justice, under the guise of redacting four words, which I find it hard to believe have ever been the real concern, considering the actions taken.

You've created weeks more work for me, while making it sound as if I failed or refused to cooperate.


There have been a lot of people involved in covering up the multiple felony crimes committed by the courts and counsel in the preceding matters, while many of them held offices of public trust, swearing to uphold the constitution of the United States of America, while behaving like outlaws.

I will be clarifying the efforts I made to work with you on this matter, along with the real concerns I voiced, and how you chose not to care about the real interests of Justice in this matter, to instead create more work for me while helping to hide the truth from the public.

Please don't contact me directly again, but take all matters before the court for both transparency and accountability.

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)





IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

JEFFREY RYAN FENTON, PLAINTIFF v. VIRGINIA LEE STORY ET AL., DEFENDANTS

CASE NO. 3:24-cv-01282

Table with 2 columns: Field Name and Value. Fields include EVIDENCE TITLE, Internet URL, RELATED DOC, and ECF LOCATION.

Description: Redacted PDF's from ECF 16-1 (PID 2271-2323) W:2293; 66 (PID 4870-5007) W:4874; 90-2, W:5170; 90-4, W:5172; 95-1 (PID 5237-5258) W:5252, W:5254; 96, W:5263; 96-1, W:5273; 96-2, W:5293; 97, W:5300; 98, W:5326; 99, W:5335; 100, W:5352; 100-1, W:5362; 101, W:5383; 102, W:5467; 109, W:5582; 110, W:5592; 111, W:5607.

The pdf files on this disc are evidence in this federal civil rights, conspiracy, fraud, and racketeering lawsuit.



Hash List

Created by using HashMyFiles

Table with 5 columns: Full Path, File Size, Modified Time, and SHA-256. It lists numerous files with their respective paths, sizes, modification dates, and cryptographic hashes.