INCIDENT NARRATIVE REPORT

Prepared Regarding: **Rodney S. Sprawling**

Subject of Allegations: **Andrei George Dunca and Co-Conspirators**

Date Prepared: May 11, 2026 | Prepared By: EsRā of Dunca-Sprawling Inc.

Prepared For: Advisors, Investigators, and Support Services

CONFIDENTIAL – FOR INVESTIGATIVE USE ONLY

NOTICE:

This document is a narrative summary prepared for informational and investigative purposes. It is not a legal filing, complaint, or court document. All factual assertions reflect the account of Rodney S. Sprawling and are presented for the purpose of facilitating review, investigation, and advisement. Named individuals other than the Subject are referred to as alleged participants unless otherwise noted. No finding of liability or guilt is expressed or implied herein.

▶ TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1 Executive Summary

Section 2 Background

Section 3 Relationship and Abandonment

Section 4 Coordinated Financial Actions

Section 5 Cyberattack and Surveillance

Section 6 Psychological and Physical Effects

Section 7 Property and Eviction Issues

Section 8 Law Enforcement Interactions

Section 9 Alleged Organized Activity and Hate Crime Component

Section 10 Power of Attorney and Conflicts

Section 11 Legal Proceedings and Appeals

Section 12 Outstanding Evidence and Requests for Assistance

Appendix Key Facts, Dates, Persons, Addresses, and Financial Figures

SECTION 1 — EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Incident Narrative Report documents a multi-year, multi-state pattern of alleged misconduct directed at Rodney S. Sprawling (hereinafter referred to as "the Subject"). The allegations encompass financial manipulation, abandonment of a recognized common-law marital relationship, coordinated cyberattack and electronic surveillance, physical and psychological abuse, false imprisonment, sexual exploitation, conduct alleged to constitute hate-crime targeting, and interference with both law enforcement processes and ongoing judicial proceedings.

The events described herein involve named alleged participants across three primary jurisdictions: Houston, Texas; San Francisco, California; and Los Angeles, California. The timeline of alleged conduct spans approximately 2014 through 2025, with the most acute and documented period beginning in August and September of 2022. The primary alleged participant, Andrei George Dunca, is a technology entrepreneur with significant resources, professional networks, and access to advanced digital infrastructure. The Subject, Rodney S. Sprawling, is a Black, gender-fluid, Native American entrepreneur, producer, and actor who describes himself as having experienced the events documented in this report firsthand.

The following direct quotations are drawn verbatim from source materials provided by the Subject and are included here to establish the nature and framing of the underlying relationship and the cyberattack alleged to have been perpetrated:

▶ DIRECT QUOTE FROM SOURCE DOCUMENT — Regarding the

Relationship:

"For a substantial period prior to the events herein alleged, Plaintiff Rodney S. Sprawling and Defendant Andrei George Dunca were deeply committed partners, having established an informal marriage under the laws of the State of Texas."

▶ DIRECT QUOTE FROM SOURCE DOCUMENT — Regarding the Cyberattack:

"This cyberattack involved: Disabling Plaintiff's electronic communication devices, rendering them unable to connect with friends, family, professional networks, and even emergency services for assistance."

This report has been compiled to provide investigators, legal advisors, victim advocates, and support services with a structured and comprehensive account of the Subject's allegations. It is organized thematically to facilitate cross-referencing with independent evidence, court filings, and witness accounts. All factual assertions herein reflect the Subject's account and are presented without adjudication of their merits.

SECTION 2 — BACKGROUND

2.1 The Relationship Between the Subject and the Named Primary Alleged Participant

Rodney S. Sprawling and Andrei George Dunca are alleged by the Subject to have established a common-law marriage under the laws of the State of Texas, commencing approximately in 2012. According to the Subject, this relationship was characterized by mutual agreement to the marital relationship, continuous cohabitation over an extended period, and consistent public representation as married partners. The Subject states that both individuals referred to each other as

"PARTNERS (DOMESTIC)" and that the relationship was conducted openly and with acknowledgment in both personal and professional circles.

The couple maintained shared residences in multiple locations, including San Francisco, California; Los Angeles, California; and Houston, Texas. The domestic partnership is supported by an Affidavit of Domestic Partnership notarized on April 2, 2025.

2.2 Professional Profile of the Named Primary Alleged Participant

Andrei George Dunca is described as a prominent technology entrepreneur with a substantial professional history in digital media, artificial intelligence, and venture-backed technology ventures. He is identified as the co-founder and Chief Technology Officer (CTO) of LiveRail, a video advertising platform that was acquired by Facebook in 2014 for a reported sum of between $400 million and $500 million. He is further identified as co-founder and CTO of Bluefish AI, and as an investor in Ezra, a company offering AI-driven early cancer detection utilizing whole-body MRI imaging.

Dunca's professional background encompasses cybernetics, digital networks, and engineering leadership. The Subject asserts that Dunca maintained an extensive professional network that included individuals with deep knowledge of digital infrastructure and cybersecurity, including connections to major technology corporations such as Meta and Google. This background is noted by the Subject as material context for the cyberattack allegations described in Section 5 of this report.

2.3 Joint Property Interests and Legal Instruments

The Subject and the named primary alleged participant jointly acquired real property at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069, which was intended to serve as the primary residence and homestead for the Subject's parents: Martha A. Sprawling and Rodney Sprawling (Master Sergeant, United States Marine Corps, Retired; a 30-year disabled veteran).

On January 18, 2019, Andrei G. Dunca executed a Statutory Durable Power of Attorney appointing Rodney S. Sprawling as Agent with authority over all powers designated (A) through (M), including authority over real property transactions. This instrument was e-filed and e-recorded in the Official Public Records of Harris County, Texas on January 25, 2019, for the specific purpose of purchasing and financing real property located in Harris County, Texas.

The couple's shared primary residence in San Francisco was located at 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, California — a property described as an architectural masterpiece with an estimated value of approximately $5 million. The Subject states that the property was renovated over three years with significant design input from the Subject and architect John Lum.

SECTION 3 — RELATIONSHIP AND ABANDONMENT

3.1 Cessation of Communication and Financial Support

In or around September 2022, the named primary alleged participant, Andrei George Dunca, abruptly ceased all communication and financial support to the Subject without prior explanation, warning, or negotiated transition. This cessation coincided with Dunca's abandonment of his duties as managing member and co-founder of businesses previously established jointly with the Subject, directly resulting in the Subject's unemployment. At or around the same time, Dunca severed the Subject's access to medical insurance, credit card accounts, and all other established financial means. The Subject states that his average monthly expenses at the time of abandonment were approximately $35,000.

Prior to the complete cessation of communication, a small number of messages from Dunca were described by the Subject as uncharacteristic in tone. The last known substantive communication from Dunca is reported to have occurred immediately after the Subject shared findings from a psychological evaluation — specifically, the assessment of Dr. Richard Austin Heafey — with Dunca. After receiving that report, Dunca ended all contact.

3.2 Evidence of Extramarital Relationship and Motive

The Subject alleges that Dunca was engaged in an extramarital affair and that the concealment of this relationship served as a significant motivating factor in Dunca's abandonment of the Subject and his alleged participation in the broader scheme described in this report. The Subject reports that Dunca had relocated to Germany and was cohabitating with a male individual in the shared San Francisco residence at 565 Ortega Street prior to his full disappearance. Dunca additionally took the Subject's companion animal, known as "The Captain," with him upon relocation.

The Subject states he was not directly informed of any of these developments by Dunca and discovered the new cohabitation arrangement via social media observation. Dunca had previously made plans to visit the Subject in Los Angeles County and failed to communicate for weeks thereafter without explanation.

3.3 Alleged Threat of Financial Ruin and Retaliatory Conduct

The Subject states that, prior to the abandonment, Dunca made a direct verbal threat to "bankrupt" the Subject if he did not comply with Dunca's demands. The Subject further alleges that the subsequent foreclosure of the Houston property at 13339 Balmore Circle — which resulted in $200,000 in lost proceeds for the Subject — was retaliatory in nature, triggered by the Subject making contact with the individual Dunca is alleged to have been having an affair with. The Subject characterizes these events as coordinated acts of financial coercion rather than incidental outcomes.

3.4 Eviction from San Francisco Residence

The Subject alleges that Dunca unlawfully evicted him from the shared primary residence at 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, California. According to the Subject, Dunca represented that he was cleaning the garage in anticipation of shipping the Subject's belongings to a temporary residence at 420 N Camden, Los Angeles, where the Subject was in the process of launching a new business. The Subject alleges this representation was false and was used as a pretextual mechanism to effectuate his displacement from the shared property.

3.5 Psychological Evaluation and Its Role in the Timeline

At Dunca's suggestion, the Subject consulted with Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, a licensed psychologist. According to the Subject, Dr. Heafey clinically concluded that the Subject was not exhibiting symptoms of psychosis, was "otherwise sane," and was "suffering anxiety" triggered by "a real source." Dr. Heafey reportedly further stated that Dunca appeared financially controlling and emotionally manipulative. When the Subject communicated these findings to Dunca, Dunca permanently ended all contact.

NOTE — Regarding Dr. Heafey's Role:

Additional allegations regarding Dr. Heafey's professional conduct and alleged conflicts of interest are described in Section 6.5 of this report. Dr. Heafey is identified as a named alleged co-conspirator in Section 9.

3.6 Communication Routed Through Assistant — Inability to Confirm Dunca's Identity or Welfare

Following the cessation of direct communication, Victoria Garcia Winder — described as Dunca's personal assistant — became the sole point of contact between the Subject and any party claiming to represent or have access to Dunca. Winder is reported to have been the last known individual to have seen Dunca. She has declined to provide details that would allow for confirmation of Dunca's location or well-being. During a police wellness check, Winder provided Dunca's new primary address as her own personal residence, despite the fact that Dunca co-owns a home with the Subject in close proximity to that address.

The Subject states that he has been unable to confirm Dunca's identity through direct interaction, has not heard Dunca's voice or seen his face in over two years, and that Dunca has not independently confirmed his identity or welfare through any direct means during this period.

3.7 Law Firms Claiming Representation

Two law firms — Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP and Mudd Law Offices (inclusive of attorney Katherine Leslie Stahl) — contacted the Subject claiming to represent Andrei George Dunca. Both firms instructed the Subject not to report Dunca as a missing person. However, according to the Subject, neither firm was able to provide documentation of their representation, nor could they confirm Dunca's identity, current whereabouts, or physical well-being. The Subject characterizes this conduct as consistent with the broader alleged scheme to isolate him and suppress inquiry into Dunca's disappearance.

SECTION 4 — COORDINATED FINANCIAL ACTIONS

4.1 Unauthorized Deposit and Alleged Financial Manipulation

Without the Subject's prior knowledge or consent, the named primary alleged participant deposited $500,000 into the Subject's bank account. The Subject characterizes this act not as a good-faith transfer of funds but as a component of an unlawful financial manipulation scheme. The Subject alleges that this sum originated from a forced buyout of property located at 7711 Mulholland Drive, in which Dunca compelled the Subject to sign over the property by threatening him with bankruptcy if he refused to comply.

4.2 Financial Demands by Yuri Richard Spiro

The Subject reports that financial demands from Yuri Richard Spiro — a named alleged co-conspirator — totaled approximately $500,000, comprising the following components:

Financial Component	Amount
Personal loan (Spiro to Subject)	$385,000
Security deposit	$70,000
Temporary residence rent	$45,000
Total	**~$500,000**

The Subject notes that this total amount suspiciously mirrors the proceeds of the alleged Mulholland Drive forced buyout, which he characterizes as unlikely to be coincidental and as evidence of a coordinated financial extraction scheme.

4.3 Winder's Alleged Role in Recovery Failures

Dunca and Winder represented to the Subject that they were handling legal matters concerning the Subject's financial disputes with Spiro, including a specific promise to pursue recovery of the $385,000 personal loan. According to the Subject, no genuine effort was made on his behalf: $0 was recovered by Winder; no funds were returned to the Subject from either the security deposit or the personal loan. The Subject asserts that this inaction was deliberate and served to facilitate Spiro's breach while advancing the alleged conspiratorial goal of rendering the Subject financially destitute.

4.4 Denial of Financial Access and Records

The Subject states that he was denied access to vital financial documents, business information, and identification materials necessary for his financial recovery. This denial is alleged to have been a coordinated act intended to prevent the Subject from taking independent corrective action.

4.5 Financial Outcome for the Subject

As a direct result of the abandonment and the coordinated financial scheme described above, the Subject experienced the following documented financial conditions:

- Monthly income: $0
- Cash on hand: $0
- Bank account balance: approximately $0.08
- Monthly expenses substantially exceeding income
- Loss of primary housing due to foreclosure of 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas
- Homelessness as a direct consequence of the foregoing

SECTION 5 — CYBERATTACK AND SURVEILLANCE

5.1 Alleged Technical Capability and Professional Network

The Subject asserts that the named primary alleged participant's background as co-founder and CTO of LiveRail and Bluefish AI provided him with direct access to advanced technology and a professional network capable of planning and executing a sophisticated, multi-layered cyberattack. Named alleged colleagues alleged to be involved in these activities include Jing Fan (also referenced as Jing Feng), Alex (also referenced as Alex Sherman), and Mark Edwards, among other individuals associated with the founding team of Bluefish AI.

Additionally, Dunca's investment in Ezra — a company specializing in AI-driven whole-body MRI imaging — is noted by the Subject as demonstrating expertise in AI, advanced data processing, and medical imaging technologies. The Subject asserts

that such expertise could, in other contexts, be adapted for surveillance applications and the production of targeted physical or sensory effects.

5.2 Elements of the Alleged Cyberattack

The Subject describes the following components as constituting the alleged cyberattack:

- Disabling of the Subject's electronic communication devices, preventing him from establishing contact with friends, family, professional networks, and emergency services.
- Conversion of speakers, cameras, and microphones on the Subject's devices into weaponized surveillance instruments capable of monitoring the Subject's speech, movements, and private communications.
- Systematic blocking, rerouting, and interception of the Subject's communications, including the use by alleged participants of voice modulators and AI-generated audio to impersonate the Subject's legitimate contacts.
- Active prevention of the Subject's escape from controlled environments and denial of medical assistance or external contact beyond the alleged operators' network.

5.3 Evidence of Premeditated Surveillance

The Subject reports having discovered receipts indicating that the named primary alleged participant allegedly purchased hidden cameras and surveillance equipment through Amazon. The Subject states these purchases may date as early as 2014, suggesting a premeditated, long-term surveillance operation that predates the acute phase of the alleged scheme beginning in 2022.

The shared primary residence at 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, California is alleged by the Subject to have served as a hub and command center for the planning and execution of crimes, including financial manipulation, false narrative propagation, cyberattacks, and the Subject's false imprisonment. The home security systems at the Houston property at 13339 Balmore Circle are separately alleged to have been tampered with and disabled as part of this activity.

SECTION 6 — PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PHYSICAL EFFECTS

6.1 False Imprisonment

The Subject reports that since approximately September 2022, he has been held in a state of false imprisonment at his home and place of business. He describes this condition as ongoing and as maintained through the coordinated use of technology, surveillance, coercion by alleged co-conspirators present in his physical environment, and systematic control over his ability to communicate externally or exit his environment freely.

6.2 Reported Physical Methods of Abuse

The Subject describes the following physical methods alleged to have been employed against him:

- Sleep deprivation and interrogation techniques applied over extended periods.
- Low-voltage electrical shocks sustained for prolonged durations.
- High-frequency noise targeted at the Subject's genitals, causing forced physical response that the Subject characterizes as constituting sexual assault.
- Pressure sensations causing plugged ears, disorientation, and impairment of hearing and balance.
- Introduction of foul scents into rooms occupied by the Subject or placed directly on the Subject's person.
- Demands directed at controlling the Subject's basic bodily functions, including bowel movements on command, resulting in physical trauma and swelling to anal tissue of sufficient severity to obstruct normal biological function.
- Placement of physical debris on the Subject's clothing and skin as part of a sustained program of psychological degradation.

6.3 Reported Sexual Abuse and Exploitation

The Subject reports the following forms of sexual abuse and exploitation:

- Manipulation of the Subject into performing sexual acts that were documented and subsequently used for extortion purposes, with threats to expose the material publicly and to terminate the Subject's professional career as a producer and actor.
- Systematic sexualization of basic human functions — including showering and bowel movements — used as mechanisms of control, coercion, and humiliation.
- Sleep deprivation and interrogation employed to extract false confessions, with the cessation of physical abuse made conditional upon sexual compliance by the Subject.
- Named alleged co-conspirators engaging in sexual acts with the Subject under circumstances the Subject characterizes as coercive and non-consensual; each such act is characterized by the Subject as rape by design.
- References by alleged perpetrators to an "audience" and use of the phrase "Tonomi performing" during instances of bowel movements, suggesting deliberate sexualized surveillance and systematic humiliation.
- Threats of revenge pornography and video release used as tools of isolation, extortion, and denial of freedom of movement and personal autonomy.
- The use of promises of sexual favors as inducement for compliance, and denial of basic autonomy as punishment for non-compliance.

6.4 Manufactured Sensory Experiences

The Subject reports sensory experiences alleged to have been technologically manufactured to simulate symptoms associated with drug intoxication, including the sensation of insects crawling on and beneath the skin — an experience commonly associated with methamphetamine intoxication. The Subject states that a medical professional at an emergency clinic examined these symptoms and reported that, in her entire professional career, she had never encountered the described symptoms in association with drug intoxication or psychosis. This medical

observation is characterized by the Subject as significant in the context of the false narrative propagated about him by alleged co-conspirators (see Section 6.5).

6.5 Psychological Manipulation and Gaslighting Tactics

The Subject describes a systematic campaign of psychological manipulation directed at undermining his sense of reality and eroding his credibility with third parties. Alleged tactics include:

- Attempts to convince the Subject that he was: (a) a subject in a documentary; (b) an actor participating in a film or television production; (c) undergoing addiction or mental health treatment; (d) engaged in couples therapy for reconciliation with Dunca; or (e) being interrogated as a suspect in the disappearance of named individuals Kyle Egan and Richie Vetter.
- Placement of alleged plants and co-conspirators in the Subject's physical environment who impersonated friends, family members, and professional contacts.
- Children previously close to the Subject — who had referred to him as "uncle" — observed hiding from and refusing to answer the door to him, consistent with alleged instructions or social conditioning by conspiratorial actors.
- Victoria Garcia Winder allegedly contacted members of the Subject's family by telephone to report that the Subject required hospitalization for mental illness and drug use — characterizations directly contradicted by the Subject's primary care physician's assessments and drug test results.
- The husband of Victoria Winder initially reported having heard that the Subject was "going crazy in California" but withdrew this characterization after personally meeting with the Subject.
- The alleged group's consistent use of the phrase "no one is going to believe a meth head" — characterized by the Subject as a deliberate gaslighting strategy designed to exploit societal bias and preemptively undermine his credibility with investigators, family, and support services.

6.6 Alleged Misconduct by Dr. Richard Austin Heafey

The Subject alleges that Dr. Richard Austin Heafey engaged in the following conduct during and after the clinical relationship:

- Violated patient confidentiality by discussing the Subject's treatment with Victoria Garcia Winder.
- Disclosed a personal relationship with Dunca while failing to recuse himself from the clinical relationship.
- Invited the Subject to "chem sex" in his office.
- Applied pressure on the Subject to self-admit to a hospital and sign documents placing him under Heafey's medical care.
- Refused to provide copies of invoices to the Subject.
- Attempted to leverage patient information to compel the removal of negative reviews posted by the Subject.
- When a panic attack and suicidal ideation were triggered during a session, responded primarily with concern about the negative reviews rather than the Subject's immediate safety.
- Subsequently accused the Subject of extortion, characterizing the Subject's demand for a refund as extortionate, and stated that the funds would be recovered directly from the Subject's spouse.

The Subject states that a formal complaint against Dr. Heafey was submitted to the Board of Psychology for the abusive practices described above.

6.7 Confirmed Health Impacts

The Subject reports the following confirmed and documented health consequences arising from the described events:

- Formal diagnosis of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).
- Daily panic attacks requiring medication for management.
- Prolonged depression.

- Anxiety medication required at elevated doses, including for the Subject's mother, Martha A. Sprawling, as a result of distress caused by the circumstances.
- Self-harm.
- Systematic dismantling of family and friendship support networks through alleged conspiratorial interference.

The Subject's father, Rodney Sprawling (MSgt USMC Ret.), and mother, Martha A. Sprawling, have each experienced significant documented emotional distress. The Subject seeks $35,000 per individual in additional relief on their behalf.

SECTION 7 — PROPERTY AND EVICTION ISSUES

7.1 Houston Property — 13339 Balmore Circle

The property at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069 was jointly acquired by the Subject and the named primary alleged participant and was intended to serve as the homestead for the Subject's elderly, disabled veteran parents. The Subject states that Dunca consistently ignored written communications and telephone calls regarding the property's sale — a transaction that would have yielded Dunca a $200,000 return — leading ultimately to foreclosure and the loss of the property.

The Subject further alleges that the lender, Newrez/Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing, breached an agreement to postpone the foreclosure auction. The foreclosure of this property rendered the Subject's parents at risk of homelessness and caused the Subject a documented loss of $200,000 in potential proceeds.

7.2 Eviction Lawsuit — Cause No. 1248656

An eviction lawsuit styled AMDRE LLC v. Rodney S. Sprawling, Cause No. 1248656, was filed concerning the property at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069. An eviction judgment was rendered on May 6, 2025, by Associate Judge Jermaine Thomas, granting possession of the property to AMDRE LLC.

The Subject alleges that this lawsuit may have been filed in error, or with intent to commit fraud, due to an undisclosed conflict of interest between AMDRE LLC, its counsel Barry and Sewart PLLC, and Andrei George Dunca. The Subject notes that

Dunca uses multiple aliases — including Andrei Trust Dunca, G Andrei Dunca, and George Andrei Dunca — and that his surname is also erroneously spelled "Duncan" in certain records, which may complicate tracing of these relationships.

7.3 San Francisco Residence — 565 Ortega Street

The shared primary residence at 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, California — estimated at a value of approximately $5 million — was the site of the Subject's alleged unlawful eviction as described in Section 3.4 of this report. The Subject alleges that the property may have been sold for approximately $2 million above comparable properties in the surrounding area, which he characterizes as a further financial irregularity warranting investigation.

7.4 Mulholland Drive Property

The property at 7711 Mulholland Drive is alleged by the Subject to have been the subject of a forced buyout orchestrated by the named primary alleged participant. As described in Section 4.1, the Subject asserts that he was compelled to sign over this property under threat of bankruptcy, with the resulting $500,000 in proceeds deposited into his account as part of an alleged financial manipulation scheme.

7.5 Alleged Mortgage Fraud and Coordinated Displacement

The Subject alleges that mortgage fraud and coordinated illegal eviction attempts were orchestrated by named co-conspirators with the specific intent of displacing the Subject and his family, causing financial hardship, and seizing assets. These allegations are supported, in the Subject's account, by the timing of the eviction proceedings and the concurrent disappearance of individuals with alleged knowledge of the underlying transactions.

SECTION 8 — LAW ENFORCEMENT INTERACTIONS

8.1 Wellness Check

A law enforcement wellness check was conducted in response to the Subject's concerns regarding the named primary alleged participant's disappearance. According to the Subject, the responding officer was provided Dunca's new primary address by Victoria Garcia Winder — which was, in fact, Winder's own personal residence. The officer did not identify Dunca in person during this check and

subsequently declined to take a missing person's report, despite what the Subject characterizes as clear and documented inconsistencies in the information provided by Winder.

8.2 False Arrest Under Incorrect Name

The Subject reports that he was arrested under the name "Anthony Sprawling" — a name the Subject characterizes as an intentional case of mistaken identity. This arrest was precipitated by a complaint filed by landlord Yuri Richard Spiro, who had previously described the Subject as "family" and who, as his only tenant and source of investment, had unambiguous knowledge of the Subject's correct identity. The Subject characterizes the use of an incorrect name as a deliberate act consistent with the broader alleged conspiracy.

8.3 Denial of Legal Counsel During Detention

The Subject reports that he was held for three days following the arrest and was repeatedly denied access to legal counsel, despite making multiple explicit requests — including immediately upon processing and during subsequent interrogation conducted by an officer the Subject identifies as "Detective Geoff," described as wearing an ill-fitting suit. The Subject states that his immediate reports of false imprisonment, made during processing and questioning, were ignored by arresting officers.

8.4 Coordinated Eviction at Time of Arrest

The Subject states that, at the same early morning hour during which his arrest occurred, movers were present at the property and immediately proceeded to pack and remove his belongings. The Subject characterizes the simultaneous occurrence of the arrest and the moving activity as confirming the existence of a coordinated, pre-planned illegal eviction operation.

8.5 Harris County Constable — Deputy C. Diaz (Badge 4C96)

Harris County Constable Deputy C. Diaz, assigned to Badge Number 4C96 under the Office of Constable Mark Herman, Harris County Precinct 4, is identified by the Subject as having engaged in the following alleged conduct:

- Refusing to properly investigate the Subject's reports regarding Dunca's disappearance.

- Questioning the Subject's claimed spousal status in a manner the Subject characterizes as reflecting homophobic bias.
- Relying upon unverified information provided by Victoria Garcia Winder without establishing direct contact with or sight of Dunca himself.
- Improperly closing the inquiry without adequate investigation.
- Targeting the Subject's parents at 13339 Balmore Circle and applying undue pressure for their removal, despite an active eviction appeal being pending.

The Subject raises the additional possibility that the individual presenting as Deputy C. Diaz may have been an impersonator acting in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, and requests formal verification of this officer's identity and badge assignment.

SECTION 9 — ALLEGED ORGANIZED ACTIVITY AND HATE CRIME COMPONENT

9.1 Named Alleged Co-Conspirators

The Subject identifies the following individuals as alleged co-conspirators in the described events. All individuals are named as alleged participants and are entitled to the presumption of innocence; their inclusion herein reflects the Subject's account only:

Yuri Richard Spiro; Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder (residing at 5823 Queensgate Drive, Houston, TX 77066); Richard Austin Heafey; Kyle Joseph Egan; Richard "Richie" Alan Vetter (Richard Alan Vetter II); Sean Richard Spiro; Maya Miller Estes; Edwin Ortega; Taylor McCarthy; Daniel Forero; Johnny; Isaiah Brown; Paige Hill; Pablo Gomez; Donovan Andrews; Danielle Fletcher; Jay Alonzo; Rick Silver; Brie Jasmin; Sergio Santos; Jeremy Gail; Justin Konda; Joey Varsanik; Ryan Flores; Brian Qualls; Jessica Graham; Shane Galindo; Joe Mac; Adrian Michael Hernandez (Pearland City Council Member); Ilulia Shuvkashvili; and Dimitri Barsukov.

9.2 Disappearances of Associated Individuals

The Subject notes that Kyle Joseph Egan had previously reported being held against his will by individuals alleged to be involved in drug and human trafficking, including an individual identified as Javier "Xavier Ortiz" Ortega. Egan's fiancé, Kory Lamar

Word, reported Egan as having been taken by "Mexican gangsters." Contemporaneously, in or around September 2022, Kyle Joseph Egan, Richard "Richie" Alan Vetter, and Yuri Spiro all disappeared without explanation. The Subject characterizes these concurrent disappearances as significant and potentially interconnected.

9.3 Organizational Pattern

The Subject characterizes the alleged group's conduct as exhibiting an organizational pattern consistent with structured criminal enterprise activity, including:

- A discernible hierarchical structure.
- Continuity of operation across an extended period and multiple jurisdictions.
- Reliance on intimidation and physical coercion as standard tools.
- Systematic engagement in unlawful acts for financial profit and/or control over the Subject.
- Widespread recruitment of participants across multiple states.
- Utilization of a physical hub and command center, identified by the Subject as 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, California.

9.4 Alleged Hate Crime Component

The Subject alleges that the severity and nature of the dehumanization he experienced would not have been inflicted had he been a white, cisgender woman; a heterosexual male or female; or a white cisgender male. The Subject describes himself as a Black, gender-fluid, Native American young entrepreneur. The following specific examples are cited as evidence of a hate crime dimension to the alleged conduct:

- The Subject was referred to by group members as "meth head," "nimcompoop" (alleged to have been used as a substitute for the racial slur "nigger"), and directly addressed as "nigger faggot."
- Constant racial attacks, shaming directed at the Subject's skin color, and derogatory comparisons of the Subject to his romantic partners — describing

the Subject as "nasty," "dirty," and undesirable due to his skin color and mannerisms.

- Repeated questioning as to why white males would choose to be with the Subject; false claims that Dunca had used the Subject to establish citizenship and that Vetter had been compensated for sex, with the further claim that Vetter had been paid to feign romantic feelings for the Subject.
- Exploitation of racial conditioning and racist depictions of Black individuals in pornographic media to shame and humiliate the Subject.
- Persistent references to the Subject's hair and extensions as a wig, despite the Subject having educated group members on the racial insensitivity of such characterizations.
- The Subject was dragged from his residence and business at peak hours of activity; clothing was denied during a misdemeanor incident without warrant or evidentiary basis.
- Group members verbalized a "slave owner mentality" and employed psychological techniques described as designed to systematically "break" a person. The Subject was stripped of his name and referred to only by derogatory substitutes. The Subject characterizes this system as deliberately mirroring conditions of enslavement.
- The Subject's wealth, professional success, and perceived social status were stated to offend group members, who verbalized disgust and treated the Subject, in his characterization, "like an animal caged and poked at."
- Alleged exploitation of racial conditioning within the gay community, with the group describing "the standard" as masculine and white.

9.5 Alleged Collusion with Law Enforcement

The Subject alleges that elements within law enforcement may have been subject to coercion or manipulation by conspiratorial actors, allowing the alleged crimes to be carried out in the open while actively undermining the Subject's ability to obtain justice. The Subject further alleges the involvement or manipulation of influential

individuals, including legal professionals and potentially elected officials, as part of this effort.

SECTION 10 — POWER OF ATTORNEY AND CONFLICTS

10.1 Statutory Durable Power of Attorney

On January 18, 2019, Andrei G. Dunca executed a Statutory Durable Power of Attorney appointing Rodney S. Sprawling as Agent. This instrument was e-filed and e-recorded in the Official Public Records of Harris County, Texas on January 25, 2019. The Power of Attorney grants all powers enumerated in categories (A) through (M), including real property transactions. The Special Instructions contained in the instrument specify that it was executed "FOR THE PURPOSE OF PURCHASING AND FINANCING THE PURCHASE OF THE REAL PROPERTY LOCATED IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS." The instrument became effective immediately upon execution and is not affected by the principal's subsequent disability or incapacity.

10.2 Alleged Conflict of Interest — AMDRE LLC

Despite the existence of the valid Power of Attorney described above, the eviction suit styled AMDRE LLC v. Rodney S. Sprawling (Cause No. 1248656) was filed and prosecuted against the Subject concerning 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069. The Subject alleges that AMDRE LLC has an undisclosed and significant conflict of interest arising from an unreported relationship between AMDRE LLC, its counsel Barry and Sewart PLLC, and Andrei George Dunca. The Subject further alleges that AMDRE LLC and its counsel failed to disclose this relationship during the course of discovery, failed to respond to properly issued discovery requests, and failed to respond to a Motion to Compel, thereby prejudicing the Subject and preventing a full and fair adjudication of the matter.

10.3 Winder's Alleged Power of Attorney and Medical Misrepresentation

Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder is alleged to have held a Power of Attorney for Andrei George Dunca during periods relevant to this report. Medical notes from Dr. Naheed Ali reflect that Winder presented herself as the Subject's Power of Attorney when requesting a medical consultation on the Subject's behalf. The Subject states that

he was pressured into granting Winder a Power of Attorney, which was subsequently revoked by the Subject.

10.4 Additional Allegations Regarding Winder

The Subject characterizes Winder as a disgruntled former employee with a documented history of making false claims of a romantic relationship with Dunca. The Subject additionally alleges that Winder engaged in unauthorized use of the SutroLab.com internet domain — a domain associated with a business entity that was dissolved in 2021 — as part of the broader alleged conspiratorial activity.

SECTION 11 — LEGAL PROCEEDINGS AND APPEALS

11.1 Eviction Judgment and Grounds for Appeal

An eviction judgment in Cause No. 1248656 was rendered on May 6, 2025, by Associate Judge Jermaine Thomas, granting possession of 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069 to AMDRE LLC. The Subject filed a Notice of Appeal on May 12, 2025. The Subject identifies the following specific grounds for appeal:

1. **Failure to Adjudicate Motion for Continuance:** The Subject filed a Motion for Continuance approximately April 29, 2025, seeking postponement based on documented medical disability, extreme emotional distress arising from the case and from Dunca's disappearance, and the overall complexity of the circumstances. The Court did not adjudicate this motion, and no valid, signed judicial order ruling on it appears on the official court docket.
2. **Failure to Adjudicate Motion to Join Necessary Party:** The Subject filed a Motion to Join Andrei George Dunca as a Necessary Party Defendant approximately April 29, 2025, seeking to include the missing co-borrower on the underlying mortgage as an indispensable party. The Court did not adjudicate this motion, and no valid signed judicial order appears on the docket.
3. **Discovery Quashed Without Valid Order:** Discovery was quashed, potentially based upon an unsigned, plaintiff-filed template rather than a

validly issued judicial order, thereby preventing the Subject from developing evidentiary support for his defense.

4. **Statement of Inability to Afford Court Costs:** The Subject filed a Statement of Inability to Afford Payment of Court Costs approximately April 29, 2025, detailing severe financial hardship and the inability to engage legal counsel or pay court costs.
5. **Supersedeas Bond:** The Court ordered a supersedeas bond in the amount of $24,700.00 as a condition of staying the judgment pending appeal.
6. **In-Person Hearing Request:** The Subject filed a Motion to Request In-Person Hearing, citing alleged ongoing cyberattacks disrupting essential electronic communications.

11.2 Motion to Compel Discovery

The Subject filed a Motion to Compel Discovery from AMDRE LLC in Cause No. 1248656. The motion sought production of the following categories of documents and communications:

- Documentation of AMDRE LLC's formation, good standing, and identification of all current members and/or managers.
- All documents and communications regarding any association between AMDRE LLC and Andrei George Dunca.
- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Mudd Law firm, including Katherine Leslie Stahl, relating to the Subject, Dunca, or the subject property.
- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Stewart Title Company beyond standard closing services.
- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Newrez LLC / Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing regarding the subject property or Dunca.
- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Victoria Garcia Winder.

- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Richard Alan Vetter II.
- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Kyle Joseph Egan.
- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Richard Austin Heafey.
- All documents and communications between AMDRE LLC and Yuri Richard Spiro.

AMDRE LLC failed to respond to these discovery requests by the applicable deadline.

11.3 Counterclaim Lawsuit Against the Subject

The Subject identifies a separate lawsuit — Case No. 202517063, filed in Harris County — in which Andrei George Dunca is named as the plaintiff, asserting claims of defamation and stalking against the Subject. The Subject characterizes this lawsuit as a further act in furtherance of the alleged conspiracy, functioning as legal harassment and as an attempt to silence the Subject and suppress his efforts to report and document the described events.

SECTION 12 — OUTSTANDING EVIDENCE AND REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE

12.1 Outstanding Evidence to Be Located, Preserved, or Forensically Examined

Item	Description / Significance
Amazon Purchase Receipts	Receipts allegedly showing the named primary alleged participant purchased hidden cameras and surveillance equipment; may date as early as 2014; indicative of premeditated long-term surveillance.
Affidavit of Domestic Partnership	Notarized April 2, 2025; supports common-law marital relationship between Subject and Dunca.

Item	Description / Significance
Statutory Durable Power of Attorney	Executed January 18, 2019; e-recorded in Harris County, Texas January 25, 2019; grants Subject authority over real property transactions.
Dr. Heafey's Clinical Notes	Notes reflecting clinical conclusions that Subject was "otherwise sane," suffering anxiety from "a real source," and that Dunca appeared financially controlling and emotionally manipulative.
Dr. Naheed Ali's Medical Notes	Notes reflecting that Winder presented herself as the Subject's Power of Attorney; relevant to the unauthorized POA claim and false narrative propagation.
Court Filings — Cause No. 1248656	All filed motions: continuance, joinder, compel, in-person hearing, and statement of inability to afford costs; docket for absence of valid judicial orders.
Notice of Appeal	Filed May 12, 2025; basis for ongoing appellate proceedings.
Digital Forensics of Compromised Devices	Examination of Subject's electronic devices for evidence of unauthorized access, rerouting, blocking, or surveillance.
Arrest and Booking Records	Documentation of false arrest under name "Anthony Sprawling"; booking records from the three-day detention.
Coordinated Eviction Evidence	Evidence confirming the simultaneous presence of movers at the subject property at the time of the Subject's arrest, supporting the coordinated illegal eviction theory.
Wellness Check Records	Records of the responding officer's report; documentation of Winder's provision of her own address as Dunca's; records of the officer's failure to take a missing person's report.
Dunca/Winder Communications	Communications showing representations made by Dunca and Winder regarding recovery of the $385,000 loan and legal representation.
Social Media Evidence	Evidence of Dunca's cohabitation in Germany discovered by the Subject through social media observation.
SutroLab.com Domain Records	Records reflecting unauthorized use of the SutroLab.com domain by Winder following the entity's dissolution in 2021.

12.2 Formal Requests for Investigative Assistance

⚠ **PRIORITY INVESTIGATIVE REQUESTS**

The following formal requests for investigative action are made on behalf of the Subject:

7. **Location and Welfare Check — Andrei George Dunca:** The Subject requests a formal investigation into the location and welfare of Andrei George Dunca, who may be residing in Germany. Known aliases: Andrei Trust Dunca; G Andrei Dunca; George Andrei Dunca; surname also spelled "Duncan."
8. **Cyberattack and Surveillance Investigation:** A formal investigation into the alleged cyberattack, electronic surveillance, and communications interception described in Section 5 of this report.
9. **Forensic Device Review:** Forensic examination of the Subject's electronic devices for evidence of unauthorized access, surveillance software, rerouting, or remote manipulation.
10. **AMDRE LLC Connections:** Investigation of the relationship(s) between AMDRE LLC, Barry and Sewart PLLC, and Andrei George Dunca; review for undisclosed conflicts of interest and discovery non-compliance.
11. **Deputy C. Diaz Investigation:** Formal review of the conduct of Harris County Constable Deputy C. Diaz (Badge 4C96, Precinct 4, Mark Herman's Office), including verification of officer identity and badge assignment.
12. **Board of Psychology Complaint — Heafey:** Follow-up on the Subject's previously filed complaint against Dr. Richard Austin Heafey with the Board of Psychology.
13. **False Arrest and Illegal Eviction Coordination:** Investigation of the false arrest under the name "Anthony Sprawling" and the simultaneous, coordinated eviction activity.

14. **Mortgage Fraud Review:** Review of alleged mortgage fraud and undisclosed financial transactions concerning 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069, and the roles of Newrez/Shellpoint and Stewart Title Company.

APPENDIX — KEY FACTS, DATES, PERSONS, ADDRESSES, AND FINANCIAL FIGURES

A. Key Individuals

Individual	Role / Description
Rodney S. Sprawling	Subject of this report; common-law spouse; producer and actor; Black, gender-fluid, Native American entrepreneur.
Andrei George Dunca	Former partner/common-law spouse; technology entrepreneur; co-founder/CTO LiveRail (Facebook acquisition, 2014); co-founder/CTO Bluefish AI; investor in Ezra. Aliases: Andrei Trust Dunca; G Andrei Dunca; George Andrei Dunca; surname also spelled "Duncan."
Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder	Dunca's assistant; alleged key co-conspirator; resides at 5823 Queensgate Drive, Houston, TX 77066.
Yuri Richard Spiro	Landlord; personal loan originator ($385,000); alleged co-conspirator; disappeared September 2022.
Richard Austin Heafey	Psychologist; consulted at Dunca's suggestion; alleged co-conspirator; subject of Board of Psychology complaint.
Kyle Joseph Egan	Former friend; disappeared September 2022; alleged co-conspirator; previously reported being held against his will.
Richard "Richie" Alan Vetter II	Former friend; disappeared September 2022; alleged co-conspirator.
Kory Lamar Word	Fiancé of Kyle Joseph Egan; reported Egan's disappearance.
Martha A. Sprawling	Subject's mother; senior citizen; occupant of 13339 Balmore Circle; $35,000 emotional distress relief sought.

Individual	Role / Description
Rodney Sprawling (MSgt USMC Ret.)	Subject's father; 30-year disabled veteran; occupant of 13339 Balmore Circle; $35,000 emotional distress relief sought.
Adrian Michael Hernandez	Pearland City Council Member; alleged co-conspirator.
Deputy C. Diaz (Badge 4C96)	Harris County Constable, Mark Herman's Office, Precinct 4; alleged subject of misconduct and possible impersonation.
Katherine Leslie Stahl	Attorney, Mudd Law Offices; contacted Subject claiming to represent Dunca; unable to produce documentation.
Associate Judge Jermaine Thomas	Rendered eviction judgment in Cause No. 1248656 on May 6, 2025.
Dr. Naheed Ali	Subject's primary care physician; drug testing and clinical assessments contradicted false narrative propagated by alleged co-conspirators.
Jing Fan / Jing Feng	Alleged Bluefish AI colleague; named as alleged participant in cyberattack.
Alex / Alex Sherman	Alleged Bluefish AI colleague; named as alleged participant in cyberattack.
Mark Edwards	Alleged Bluefish AI colleague; named as alleged participant in cyberattack.

B. Key Addresses

Address	Significance
13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069	Joint marital property; intended homestead of Subject's parents; subject of eviction (Cause No. 1248656); foreclosed.
565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA	Shared primary residence; estimated value ~$5 million; alleged command center; site of alleged unlawful eviction of Subject.
7711 Mulholland Drive	Property alleged to have been subject of forced buyout; proceeds allegedly used in financial manipulation scheme.
420 N Camden, Los Angeles County, CA	Subject's temporary residence and location of business launch; destination for Subject's belongings per Dunca's representations.

Address	Significance
5823 Queensgate Drive, Houston, TX 77066	Residence of Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder; provided by Winder as Dunca's address during wellness check.

C. Key Dates

Date	Event
Circa 2012	Common-law marriage between Subject and Andrei George Dunca established under Texas law.
Approx. 2014	LiveRail acquired by Facebook ($400–500M reported); alleged early surveillance activity begins.
January 18, 2019	Statutory Durable Power of Attorney executed by Dunca, appointing Subject as Agent.
January 25, 2019	POA e-recorded in Official Public Records of Harris County, Texas.
August / September 2022	Dunca ceases all communication and financial support; surveillance and stalking first noticed; false imprisonment begins.
September 2022	Egan, Vetter, and Spiro disappear without explanation; physical perpetrators' presence first noticed.
April 2, 2025	Affidavit of Domestic Partnership notarized.
Approx. April 29, 2025	Subject files Motions for Continuance, Joinder, Motion to Compel, Motion for In-Person Hearing, and Statement of Inability to Afford Court Costs in Cause No. 1248656.
May 6, 2025	Eviction judgment rendered by Associate Judge Jermaine Thomas in Cause No. 1248656.
May 12, 2025	Notice of Appeal filed by Subject.
May 11, 2026	Date of preparation of this Incident Narrative Report.

D. Key Financial Figures

Amount	Description
$500,000,000 – $400,000,000	Reported acquisition price range of LiveRail by Facebook (2014), establishing scale of named alleged participant's financial resources.
$5,000,000 (approx.)	Estimated value of 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA — shared primary residence.
$500,000	Amount deposited by Dunca into Subject's account, alleged to originate from the Mulholland Drive forced buyout.
$385,000	Personal loan from Yuri Spiro to Subject; delegated to Winder for recovery; $0 returned.
$70,000	Security deposit paid to Yuri Spiro; $0 returned.
$45,000	Temporary residence rent at Spiro's building.
~$500,000	Total financial demands associated with Yuri Spiro; mirrors Mulholland Drive proceeds.
$35,000/month	Subject's approximate average monthly expenses at time of abandonment.
$200,000	Lost proceeds from foreclosure of Houston property at 13339 Balmore Circle.
$24,700	Supersedeas bond ordered by the Court to stay the eviction judgment pending appeal.
$35,000 each	Emotional distress relief sought for Subject, Martha A. Sprawling, and Rodney Sprawling respectively.
$0.08	Subject's reported bank account balance as a result of the described financial devastation.

E. Legal Case References

Case / Cause Number	Caption	Jurisdiction	Status / Note
Cause No. 1248656	AMDRE LLC v. Rodney S. Sprawling	Harris County, Texas	Eviction proceeding; judgment May 6, 2025; Notice of

Case / Cause Number	Caption	Jurisdiction	Status / Note
			Appeal filed May 12, 2025.
Case No. 202517063	Andrei George Dunca v. Sprawling	Harris County, Texas	Defamation and stalking claims; characterized by Subject as retaliatory harassment.

PART II: FORENSIC INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS FROM BHPD AND HARRIS COUNTY RECORDS

Compiled from Independent Investigative Reports — For Investigative and Advisory Use Only

SECTION A — MANUFACTURED ARRESTS, FRAUD, COLLUSION, AND ILLEGAL EVICTION: BEVERLY HILLS

(BHPD Case Nos. 22-50765, 23-1079, 23-1437, 23-18335)

A.1 — Overview and Enterprise Structure

A forensic examination of Beverly Hills Police Department (BHPD) discovery files across four case numbers reveals profound procedural anomalies, irreconcilable physical contradictions, and documented evidence of a coordinated scheme. The BHPD discovery packet does not record legitimate criminal activity by Rodney Samuel Sprawling (also known as EsRā Dunca-Sprawling, professionally known as Sean Sprawling). Instead, the packet itself constitutes primary evidence of a multi-jurisdictional enterprise designed to defraud, bankrupt, and physically dispossess Sprawling.

The enterprise operated through four interconnected branches:

- **Financial and Corporate Actors:** Andrei George Dunca, Victoria Garcia Winder, and associated legal counsel (including Mudd Law Offices), utilizing manufactured insolvency, an unauthorized $500,000 deposit, and forced property buyouts (including 7711 Mulholland Drive) to separate Sprawling from the marital estate.
- **Local Operational Nexus:** Landlord Yuri Richard Spiro, who manufactured criminal pretexts to bypass lawful civil eviction processes, seize a $70,000 security deposit, and conceal the fraudulent encumbrance of a $385,000 promissory note secured by a 1990 Ferrari F40. Prior to the first staged incident, Spiro stated his intent to make Sprawling the “king of horror” in a secret movie and announced a new production venture referred to as “Hyper Stream” or “Fear Stream.”
- **Street-Level Operatives:** Individuals including Kyle Joseph Egan and synthetic identities executing vehicular stalking, physical intimidation, and staging of “crime scenes” under a malicious media “production” pretext.
- **Compromised Law Enforcement:** BHPD Officer J. Lyga and Detective Goff, who actively shielded stalkers, denied constitutional due process, manipulated bail schedules, forced a false alias identity (“Anthony Sprawling”), and orchestrated the strategic incarceration of Sprawling to enable the illegal eviction.

A.2 — The Manufactured Scooter Vandalism (BHPD Case #22-50765)

The alleged vandalism of a scooter belonging to Nicholas Griffin was initiated immediately after Spiro hinted at filming Sprawling without his knowledge. A forensic review of digital, geographic, and physical evidence indicates this incident was staged.

The alleged victim, Nicholas Griffin (email: ; listed address: 939 Larrabee St Apt 1), is highly suspect. Griffin used a 415 area code telephone number (415-699-6425) matching primary conspirators including Dr. Richard Heafey and Andrei Dunca. Background database searches (Truthfinder) link this exact phone number to Eric S. Clarkson at 3507 S. Washtenaw Ave, Chicago, IL — the exact location of Mudd Law Offices. A closely associated number (707-494-6425)

traces directly to 1147 Ozbourn Ct, Unit E, Treasure Island, San Francisco — a verified former residence of Sprawling — and lists “Donkey Punch Productions” and “Wahl Media” as associated businesses, corroborating the “production” pretext allegation.

Evidentiary chain of identification is entirely corrupted: Griffin did not independently identify Sprawling from surveillance footage. Griffin obtained footage directly from Spiro and relied on Spiro’s building manager for identification. The building manager falsely told Griffin that Sprawling was “in the midst of being evicted,” establishing financial and personal motive to frame Sprawling. Police relied exclusively on this circular third-party hearsay; Griffin looked up Sprawling’s Instagram and reported a “match” with zero independent police verification.

Physical and documentary contradictions:

- **The “Rain” Contradiction:** Griffin claimed gloves and helmet were ruined by rain in a second incident involving the same scooter. Detective Goff’s own official investigatory notes state these same gloves and helmet were found inside Sprawling’s apartment. The official report ultimately admits “at this point in the investigation there is no evidence that Sprawling was involved with the second incident.”
- **Suppression of Exculpatory Footage:** The scooter was parked in a rear lot behind privacy hedges and a dumpster. Any footage of the vandalism would require Spiro’s cameras to capture it; exculpatory footage appears to have been actively suppressed by the landlord.
- **The Kyle Egan Admission:** After the police report, the allegedly vandalized scooter appeared fully repaired in the lot of Sprawling’s business at 420 N. Camden Drive. Security camera footage captured Kyle Joseph Egan (DOB 05/01/2000) riding the scooter toward the camera and taunting, “haha Sean we got you!” — a direct admission of the setup.
- **Misleading Discovery Packaging:** The discovery packet contains a photograph of an unidentifiable masked individual labeled “suspect sprawling police contact on 12/29/22 (inc#22-55820)” — a date unrelated to either Griffin incident — intentionally mixed with photos of Sprawling’s ID and the

damaged scooter to mislead the court by implying visual identification where none exists.

- **Arbitrary Felony Elevation:** No professional quote or invoice was provided for scooter repair. Police relied on Griffin's unverified financial estimate to arbitrarily elevate the charge to a felony.

A.3 — The Staged Battery and Confirmed Stalking (BHPD Case #23-1079)

On January 9, 2023, Sprawling confronted a group making repeated suspicious laps around his building. One individual pointed directly upward to Sprawling's specific window (covered in privacy film, rendering the interior invisible from the street) and stated, "Why don't you go back up there and watch like usual" — confirming the group possessed intimate surveilled knowledge of his exact residence and habits.

Sprawling recognized the alleged victim, Olivia Conoscenti, from a prior incident: he had previously investigated a building across the alley (the Hideaway, where Griffin also reportedly worked) and discovered Conoscenti in what appeared to be a staging "green room," reading a script. One alleged victim shares the surname "Davila" — the maiden name of Sprawling's grandmother — a highly improbable coincidence indicative of deeply researched psychological targeting.

The BHPD reporting for this incident is fatally flawed:

- **The Arrest Paradox:** The official police report lists the battery suspect as an "Unknown Transient." The same discovery packet contains a signed Statement of Private Person's Arrest dated 1/9/23, executed by Olivia Conoscenti, explicitly naming "Rodney Sprawling," with Detective Goff listed as the receiving officer. It is procedurally and legally impossible to execute a targeted named citizen's arrest while simultaneously claiming the suspect is an unknown transient who has never been questioned.
- **Impossible Timeline:** The incident occurred at 12:25 AM. Claimants stated they were "walking to their vehicle." Beverly Hills commercial businesses in that area close between 7:00 PM and 8:00 PM. Claimants were under 21 years of age, precluding attendance at late-night bars. No parking stubs or legitimate business reason were provided.

- **Location Discrepancies:** The police report lists the incident location as 400 N Camden Drive. Video stills in the same report list 440 N Camden. Neither address matches the actual location of the 4-on-1 confrontation in front of Sprawling's building, indicating fabricated locational data.

A.4 — Interior Vandalism and Physical Impossibilities (BHPD Cases #23-1437 and #23-18335)

Allegations of interior vandalism relied on digitally manipulated imagery, impossible physics, and inflated invoices designed to bypass civil eviction processes and steal the $70,000 security deposit.

The Chair Incident — Impossible Physics: Surveillance stills imply Sprawling picked up a chair and threw it from the top of the stairs, creating a hole in the lower drywall. The stairwell contains a sharp turn. A downward-traveling chair could not navigate this turn to embed into the opposing lower wall with such force. The photograph shows the chair in an upward-facing position, suggesting upward travel. Sprawling had already photographed this pre-existing hole prior to the allegation while documenting black mold and investigating suspicious sounds in the ceiling (which Spiro falsely claimed were water pipes).

Image Manipulation: Video stills allegedly showing Sprawling committing vandalism demonstrate clear inconsistencies: the suspect's shoe soles change spontaneously from solid black to black-and-white between frames; the head covering does not match the distinct mustard-yellow Louis Vuitton silk scarf worn by Sprawling during verified altercations; and a piece of mail appears on the floor in some frames and completely vanishes in subsequent stills — proving the environment was manipulated or images were digitally altered.

Unverified Artwork Damage and Inflated Invoices:

- Spiro's assistant, Jesseca Harvey, claimed Sprawling damaged custom-made picture frames worth $4,000 each. A security camera was pointed directly at the wall where these frames were located, yet no video footage was ever produced showing the damage.
- Spiro reported an initial repair cost of $1,800 for drywall. A subsequent invoice from Manuel Lopez — an employee of Spiro's Sabo Properties —

fraudulently inflated the cost to $3,800 for a drywall hole the size of a silver dollar.

- **The $70,000 Security Deposit Bypass:** Any legitimate property damage would have been handled by deducting from the massive deposit in civil court. Escalating a disputed drywall hole to a felony arrest was a calculated pretext to execute an illegal eviction and steal the deposit.

A.5 — Yuri Richard Spiro — The Operational Nexus

On September 10, 2021, Sprawling and Spiro entered into a secured promissory note for $385,000, secured by a 1990 Ferrari F40. Instead of honoring the agreement, Spiro allegedly created an unauthorized UCC filing on October 3, 2022, fraudulently encumbering the Ferrari collateral. Spiro failed to repay the loan by the December 31, 2022 deadline, triggering a 29.9% compounding interest rate. By manufacturing felony charges and forcing Sprawling into the criminal justice system, Spiro effectively eliminated his primary creditor and avoided repaying the multi-hundred-thousand-dollar debt.

Parallel to the loan default, Spiro extorted a revised commercial lease, demanded the additional $70,000 security deposit, withheld original lease documents, and refused to return funds after the forced eviction. Spiro proactively fed false narratives to BHPD and emergency services characterizing Sprawling as mentally ill and drug-addicted, ensuring Sprawling’s reports of stalking would be dismissed. Spiro falsely claimed the building was securely locked at all times; in reality, the building had no onsite receptionist, doors were frequently left unlocked, and Sprawling had repeatedly reported transients to Spiro.

The Premeditated “Production” Pretext: Shortly before Spiro abruptly stopped coming into the 420 N. Camden Drive office, and just prior to the first staged scooter vandalism, Spiro announced he had launched a new production company called “Hyper Stream” or “Fear Stream.” He asked Sprawling: “What would you think if someone were making a movie that included you but you didn’t know it?” and explicitly told Sprawling he wanted to make him the “king of horror.” This premeditated confession — combined with the Donkey Punch Productions/Wahl Media addresses linked to Griffin, Conoscenti’s script-reading “green room,” and security footage showing uniformed individuals loading video equipment from the premises — strongly indicates the conspirators were intentionally gathering staged,

unauthorized footage to justify the eviction, gaslight Sprawling, generate illicit media content, and systematically terrorize him.

A.6 — Weaponization of Law Enforcement: BHPD Collusion

Officer J. Lyga — January 2, 2023 Psychological Intrusion: On January 2, 2023, uniformed BHPD officers arrived at 420 N. Camden Drive. Upon entering, an officer was recorded stating, “OKAY WHAT’S LEFT IN OUR LITTLE GAME” — destroying any presumption of a lawful welfare check. A male stalking suspect (not a police officer) was present alongside the officers and taunted Sprawling through glass doors, claiming Sprawling was watching “Kyle porn” (a threatening reference to operative Kyle Egan). Sprawling observed green laser pointers and a remote-controlled drone ramming his door; the officers explicitly refused his repeated demands to arrest or remove the stalker. Suffering a severe panic attack, Sprawling requested EMS, took prescribed Xanax, and lost consciousness. Officers did not summon medical aid. Instead, they abandoned the medically distressed victim, unlocked all exterior doors to the commercial premises, and deliberately rearranged interior furniture to create an unobstructed path to his unconscious body. Security footage later captured uniformed individuals loading video equipment from the premises. Dr. Richard Heafey — a named co-conspirator involved in manipulating Sprawling’s medical records — has independently identified Officer J. Lyga as a personal friend, creating a catastrophic conflict of interest.

Detective Goff — Custodial Abuse and Identity Manipulation: Sprawling was arrested and booked under the entirely fabricated alias “Anthony Sprawling,” despite the complaint being initiated by Spiro, who knew his legal name — confirming intentional misidentification. Arresting officers deliberately failed to check Sprawling’s ID, which would have immediately voided any corresponding warrant. “Anthony Sprawling” is entirely absent from the BHPD discovery packet yet appears as the official name on the court docket. Court records show “Anthony Sprawling” attended subsequent hearings that Sprawling was never notified of, indicating the conspirators either fabricated a person to attend proceedings or hijacked an unrelated case. During the arrest, Detective Goff refused to present a warrant — stating, “it’s not like on TV” — and denied access to a telephone or legal counsel. Sprawling was held for three days as the sole occupant of the facility, a deliberate psychological torture tactic. He was ultimately released on his own recognizance, having never appeared before a judge and never been shown a

warrant to date. Overnight, Sprawling's bail was manipulated from the standard $20,000 to $100,000 — providing the exact time window for Spiro's pre-staged movers to illegally clear 420 N. Camden Drive and change the locks. Seized items during the arrest included phones, a laptop, an iPad, a passport, driver's license, Social Security card, credit cards, and an engagement ring — items entirely inconsistent with a vandalism charge, evidencing a targeted identity erasure operation. Critical communication devices were missing or withheld for days after Sprawling's release.

SECTION B — MANUFACTURED ADMINISTRATIVE ROADBLOCKS, FRAUD, COLLUSION, AND ILLEGAL EVICTION: HARRIS COUNTY PRECINCT 4

(Case Nos. 20244069284, 2507-00573; Cause No. 1248656)

B.1 — Overview and Enterprise Structure

A forensic examination of Harris County Constable Precinct 4 official returns and corresponding civil court filings reveals profound procedural anomalies, irreconcilable physical contradictions, and documented evidence of an orchestrated conspiracy. The official law enforcement records do not document legitimate civil process; they constitute primary evidence of a coordinated enterprise designed to defraud, medically neglect, silence, strip between $250,000 and $1,000,000 in property equity, and physically dispossess Sprawling.

Related pending legal matters include:

- AMDRE LLC v. Rodney Sprawling, et al., County Civil Court at Law No. 2, Docket No. 1248656 (underlying eviction).
- Appellate Case No. 14-25-00369-CV (appeal of eviction judgment).
- Justice Court Cause No. 254100033877 (underlying Justice Court action).
- Original Petition for Civil Conspiracy and Quieting of Title against AMDRE LLC, NewRez LLC, Adrian M. Hernandez, and Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, seeking monetary relief of up to $1,000,000.

The enterprise operated through three interconnected branches:

- **Financial and Corporate Actors:** The conspiracy utilizes actors such as Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, Adrian M. Hernandez, AMDRE LLC, NewRez LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing, and legal counsel (including Mudd Law, Burrus Law Group, and Anna C. Sewart) to utilize fraudulent civil litigation to quiet title, strip between $250,000 and $1,000,000 in equity, and separate Sprawling from the marital estate while actively suppressing evidence of Dunca's disappearance.
- **Local Operational Nexus:** Adverse parties utilizing fraudulent court mechanisms — including uncertified deeds and obstructed discovery under a Level 3 Discovery Control Plan — and procedurally defective writs to bypass lawful civil eviction processes. This resulted in the violent dispossession of Sprawling and his elderly, disabled veteran parents at 13339 Balmore Circle.
- **Compromised Law Enforcement and Institutional Cover-Up:** Deputy C. Diaz, Deputy Ramon Ruiz (Badge #104), and Deputy D. Jones of Harris County Constable Precinct 4, who denied constitutional due process, neglected acute medical crises, suppressed mandatory missing person reports, and ignored documented stalking. Subsequent ratification and cover-up by Sgt. Mathieu, Capt. Jim Sharman (Civil/Writ/Warrant/CID/Training), and Asst. Chief Kenneth Key through a coordinated administrative blockade.

B.2 — Causal Linkage Between Police Action and Civil Litigation Strategy

Deputy C. Diaz initiated a chain of suppression on December 15, 2024, by refusing to conduct a standard missing person intake. This created a false official administrative record countering the narrative of spousal disappearance, insulating the subsequent foreclosure and eviction proceedings involving Dunca's property. Escalation occurred on June 24 and July 5, 2025, when deputies explicitly threatened Sprawling with arrest for making a "false police report" if he persisted. By leveraging state authority to suppress protected reporting, Precinct 4 effectively provided a procedural shield to AMDRE LLC and NewRez LLC.

B.3 — The Manufactured Missing Person Obstruction (Precinct 4 Case #20244069284)

On December 15, 2024, Deputy C. Diaz (Badge #4C96) refused to follow standard missing person intake protocols for Andrei George Dunca, who had been missing since August 2022. Instead of relying on Sprawling's documentary evidence, Diaz improperly relied exclusively on unverified third-party hearsay from Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder — a named co-conspirator. Diaz actively questioned the legitimacy of Sprawling's domestic partnership, displaying a dismissive tone indicative of anti-LGBTQ+ bias. By refusing to file a formal report, Diaz artificially manufactured an "administrative basis" allowing opposing counsel to continuously assert in civil court that Dunca was capable and available, insulating the title fraud from judicial scrutiny.

B.4 — The Staged Writ Execution and Procedural Impossibilities (June 24, 2025)

The underlying claim to 13339 Balmore Circle was engineered through title fraud: the eviction action was predicated on an uncertified, "unofficial copy" of a Substitute Trustee's Deed wielded by AMDRE LLC and facilitated by NewRez LLC and Adrian M. Hernandez. Sprawling sent a Demand Letter to AMDRE LLC on February 25, 2025, citing an Opendoor Affiliated Business Arrangement Disclosure Statement (February 20, 2025). This unverified document was weaponized to bypass a legitimate, superseding Special Warranty Deed conveying the property to Sprawling's entity, EsRa Dunca-Sprawling Inc. To conceal this fraud, AMDRE LLC filed a Motion to Quash Discovery on May 1, 2025.

Impossible Notice Timeline — The 33-Day Contradiction: The Writ of Possession was issued on May 19, 2025, by County Clerk Teneshia Hudspeth, requested by attorney Anna C. Sewart. Deputy Jambi Rerry posted a "FINAL notice" warning on May 22, 2025 at 10:26 AM. Deputy Ramon Ruiz (Badge #104) executed the writ on June 24, 2025 — a 33-day lapse rendering the original 24-hour notice completely stale and procedurally ineffective under Texas Property Code § 24.0061(d)(1). Upon arrival, Deputy Ruiz outright refused to produce the court-signed Writ of Possession for inspection.

Chain of Custody Fraud — The Phantom "Representative Herbert's": Ruiz's official return states possession was "returned back to representative Herbert's." No authorized representative was physically present; the Writ of Possession was simply

taped to the front door. This directly contradicts the official return, exposing a massive fraudulent gap in the chain of custody.

Medical Crisis and Retaliatory Threats: The forced eviction triggered a severe medical crisis for Sprawling's elderly disabled veteran mother and diabetic father. Deputy Ruiz's own notes confirm: "EDS 11 BOX 404 ARRIVED AND FEMALE DECLINED TO BE TRANSPORTED." When Sprawling attempted to re-initiate a missing person report that same day, responding deputies threatened arrest for making a "false police report."

B.5 — Weaponization of Law Enforcement and Custodial Abuse (Case #2507-00573, July 5, 2025)

Sprawling called 911 to report a break-in at his own property. Despite being the 911 caller and immediately presenting documentary proof of ownership, responding deputies placed Sprawling in handcuffs based entirely on an unverified telephone conversation with an unidentified "third party." Deputies physically confiscated Sprawling's working key to the premises and transferred it directly to the individual Sprawling had called 911 to report — transitioning from law enforcement into active participants in the theft.

Medical Abandonment and Documented Custodial Abuse: While detained in the back of a patrol vehicle, Sprawling suffered an acute panic attack. Deputy D. Jones refused to allow Sprawling's father to administer prescribed life-saving medication. When EMTs arrived, they required law enforcement authorization to transport, which Deputy Jones actively delayed. The After Visit Summary from Houston Methodist Willowbrook Hospital Emergency Department, overseen by Dr. Mag de La Cruz, confirms Sprawling presented with Blood Pressure of 161/73, Pulse of 110, Respiration of 16, and an official diagnosis of Anxiety and Panic Attack. While Sprawling lay in the ambulance visibly suffering, Deputy Jones leaned in and falsely informed him that criminal charges had been filed, taunting him to "just turn himself in."

B.6 — Internal Affairs Cover-Up (Complaint #25120107)

On December 8, 2025, Assistant Chief Kenneth Key issued a final disposition letter closing the investigation as "Unfounded," limiting the scope exclusively to the "complaint on Deputy Ruiz" reviewed by the "Writ Division Administration" — completely ignoring Deputy Diaz's refusal to take a missing person report, the

medical neglect by Deputy Jones, the weaponized Mudd Law harassment warning, and the confiscation of physical keys.

Sergeant David Mathieu, identified as the assigned investigator, contacted Sprawling and requested the full complaint. Sprawling submitted comprehensive documentation on December 3, 2025. Forensic tracking confirms Mathieu never opened the files. He refused to return follow-up calls or acknowledge receipt. In February 2026, Captain Jim Sharman summarily denied a request to reopen the complaint, falsely asserting in writing that “Your entire complaint was reviewed and your complaint in its entirety was found to be unfounded” — directly contradicted by Assistant Chief Key’s own letter limiting the scope to Ruiz alone, and by the undeniable fact that the evidence files were never opened.

SECTION C — BAD FAITH LITIGATION AND PROFESSIONAL COMPLICITY: MUDD LAW OFFICES

C.1 — Overview

This section documents allegations of litigation misconduct by Mudd Law Offices (MLO), specifically lead counsel Joshua Pagan and Charles Lee Mudd Jr. The evidentiary record indicates MLO is utilizing the Texas judicial system as an operational tool to execute a campaign of bad faith litigation, procedural sabotage, and discovery obstruction. The reporting party alleges MLO’s conduct raises the probability that “MLO either knew or should have known that the user was a victim of a sophisticated digital crime, such as digital kidnapping.”

C.2 — The Plausibility of Non-Participation by Andrei George Dunca

The conduct of Mudd Law Offices stands in stark contrast to the documented historical patterns of Andrei George Dunca’s decade-long relationship with Sprawling. Dunca’s historical conduct included:

- Monthly financial support exceeding $35,000; shared ownership of multiple properties; joint investments in film and hospitality ventures.
- $10,000 in monthly support during a brief separation; continued payment of $5,500/month for shared apartment rent; plus $5,000/month for personal expenses.

- Access to a Platinum American Express card and Dunca’s personal checking account (Sprawling remained an authorized signatory).
- Pre-signed blank checks from Dunca’s account provided to Sprawling for emergency use.
- Entrusting Sprawling with a Statutory Durable Power of Attorney (executed January 18, 2019, recorded January 25, 2019) which was never formally revoked.

By stark contrast, MLO’s litigation tactics have been marked by procedural avoidance, strategic obstruction (including use of a Temporary Restraining Order to suppress Sprawling’s lawful inquiries), intentional infliction of emotional distress through filings mischaracterizing Sprawling’s disability, and complete silence — the submission of remote affidavits, digital signatures, and filings devoid of any evidence of Dunca’s personal involvement. These tactics are not only inconsistent with Dunca’s historical conduct; they are diametrically opposed to it.

Critically, Dunca’s non-revocation of the Power of Attorney — while MLO simultaneously pursued a Motion for Contempt against Sprawling for exercising the rights that same POA confers — is legally and factually implausible if Dunca were engaged in and directing the suit. Furthermore, Dunca’s phone number (415-706-2984) remains publicly listed, associated with shared business entities including Sean Sprawling Productions and Teak Stage Productions, and has not been deactivated — undermining any claim that Sprawling’s contact constituted harassment and supporting the inference that Dunca is not directing this litigation.

C.3 — MLO: Architects of Bad Faith Litigation and Discovery Obstruction

Charles Lee Mudd Jr. is a recognized expert in AI, cybersecurity, and identity theft. The reporting party alleges MLO deployed technical defenses — including remote notarizations, non-native ESI (Electronically Stored Information) production, and anonymity motions — to deliberately prevent forensic review of contested digital materials. Counsel “relied on remote notarizations and unauthenticated digital signatures while refusing to produce wet signature retainer agreements and fiduciary disclosures.” The litigation is prosecuted by at least eight professionals across two firms; the collective failure to produce verified retainer agreements raises a compelling inference that MLO is operating without lawful client authority.

Joshua Pagan is specifically alleged to be the “procedural enabler” whose acceptance and presentation of contested digital evidence allowed the purported conspiracy to gain legal traction. Specific acts attributed to Pagan include:

- Filing remote affidavits, video notarizations, and digital signatures lacking contemporaneous biometric liveness checks or adequate identity verification.
- Withholding intake notes, billing records, and communications showing how client identity was confirmed.
- Continuing to prosecute claims despite documented, credible concerns about digital impersonation and client incapacity.
- Temporal correlation: the timing of filings corresponds with reported windows of digital isolation, suggesting coordination with concealment of a digital kidnapping operation.
- Filing Pro Hac Vice from Chicago and centralizing control over local Houston counsel. The eService certificate for the March 13, 2025 Petition logs deliveries to key parties as “NOT SENT,” indicating an intentional effort to secure an ex parte advantage.
- MLO deployed wholesale boilerplate objections to suppress relevant financial data regarding the marital estate, resulting in the collapse of shared production projects budgeted at over $28 million.

The Evidentiary Challenge: Sprawling formally offered to submit to independent psychological and drug testing. MLO’s refusal to accept this neutral verification confirms the narrative is a bad-faith fabrication.

The DARVO Strategy: MLO’s filings execute a textbook DARVO (Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender) approach, adopting defamatory tropes used by individuals who physically and digitally abused Sprawling. Pleadings repeatedly advanced claims of “cognitive impairment” and “substance misuse” that contemporaneous medical records (including negative drug tests and clinician notes) directly contradict. MLO’s attempt to pursue “Indirect Civil Contempt” charges for Sprawling publishing his memoir constitutes a direct First Amendment violation designed to criminalize whistleblower testimony.

C.4 — Specific Alleged Offenses for Investigative Consideration

The following are documented as areas requiring independent review:

- **Conspiracy to obstruct justice** through coordination to conceal or destroy evidence or use the litigation process to impede investigation.
- **Accessory or aiding and abetting** by providing legal services or procedural cover with knowledge those services would facilitate criminal concealment.
- **Fraud on the court / filing false instruments** by submitting filings or notarizations without proper client authority or with fabricated supporting evidence.
- **Evidence tampering / spoliation** through failure to preserve digital evidence or submission of unauthenticated digital exhibits.
- **Professional misconduct rising to criminality,** including criminal deception, forgery, or conspiracy.

C.5 — Key Documentary Evidence and Witnesses (MLO Investigation)

Documents identified:

- Amended Motion for Investigation into Joshua Pagan, Charles Mudd, and Mudd Law Offices (full text and exhibits).
- Communications log — texts, emails, and carrier notes showing service loss and account lockouts coincident with remote filings.
- Court filings and remote notarization certificates — copies of contested affidavits, REN certificates, and produced PDF/screenshot exhibits.
- Power of Attorney and property records — unrevoked POA documents and title/escrow records.
- Medical and lab records — clinician notes and negative drug test results contradicting litigation narratives.

- Evidence of timing and movers — contemporaneous notes, witness statements, and photographs documenting movers present at the eviction and seizure of identity items.

Witnesses identified:

- Reporting party (declarant): preserved contemporaneous records and declarations.
- Counsel of record at Mudd Law Offices: Joshua Pagan; Charles Mudd Jr.; and other listed attorneys (for testimony and production of internal files).
- Designated local counsel and opposing counsel: for testimony about intake, retainer processes, and communications.
- Clerical and notary personnel or REN platform operators: to produce session logs and authentication records for remote notarizations.
- Carrier and platform custodians: mobile carriers, REN providers, and platform administrators who can produce CDRs, SIM change logs, and session tokens.
- Third-party witnesses: movers, building staff, Keith Fraser, Nicholas Griffin, and any employees who handled security footage or deliveries.

Probative questions for investigative consideration:

15. Was a valid, wet-ink retainer or other contemporaneous client authorization ever executed and retained by MLO for the nominal plaintiff?
16. Did MLO possess, review, or receive documentation indicating account compromise, SIM swap activity, or synthetic media prior to or during the litigation?
17. Were remote notarization session logs, REN platform recordings, and native exhibit files requested and withheld by counsel?
18. Did counsel knowingly submit or rely upon unauthenticated digital evidence or representations of identity?
19. Is there evidence that counsel coordinated with third parties to time filings during windows when the reporting party’s communications were compromised?

20. Do billing records, intake notes, or internal communications reflect awareness of the reporting party's claims of digital coercion and a decision to proceed regardless?

PART II: FORENSIC INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS FROM BHPD AND HARRIS COUNTY RECORDS

Compiled from Independent Investigative Reports — For Investigative and Advisory Use Only

SECTION A — MANUFACTURED ARRESTS, FRAUD, COLLUSION, AND ILLEGAL EVICTION: BEVERLY HILLS

(BHPD Case Nos. 22-50765, 23-1079, 23-1437, 23-18335)

A.1 — Overview and Enterprise Structure

A forensic examination of Beverly Hills Police Department (BHPD) discovery files across four case numbers reveals profound procedural anomalies, irreconcilable physical contradictions, and documented evidence of a coordinated scheme. The BHPD discovery packet does not record legitimate criminal activity by Rodney Samuel Sprawling (also known as EsRā Dunca-Sprawling, professionally known as Sean Sprawling). Instead, the packet itself constitutes primary evidence of a multi-jurisdictional enterprise designed to defraud, bankrupt, and physically dispossess Sprawling. The enterprise operated through four interconnected branches: (1) **Financial and Corporate Actors** — Andrei George Dunca, Victoria Garcia Winder, and legal counsel including Mudd Law Offices, utilizing manufactured insolvency, an unauthorized $500,000 deposit, and forced property buyouts including 7711 Mulholland Drive to separate Sprawling from the marital estate. (2) **Local Operational Nexus** — Landlord Yuri Richard Spiro, who manufactured criminal pretexts to bypass lawful civil eviction processes, seize a $70,000 security deposit,

and conceal the fraudulent encumbrance of a $385,000 promissory note secured by a 1990 Ferrari F40; prior to the first staged incident, Spiro stated his intent to make Sprawling the “king of horror” in a secret movie and announced a new production venture called “Hyper Stream” or “Fear Stream.” (3) **Street-Level Operatives** — Individuals including Kyle Joseph Egan and synthetic identities executing vehicular stalking, physical intimidation, and staging of crime scenes under a malicious media production pretext. (4) **Compromised Law Enforcement** — BHPD Officer J. Lyga and Detective Goff, who actively shielded stalkers, denied constitutional due process, manipulated bail schedules, forced a false alias identity of “Anthony Sprawling,” and orchestrated the strategic incarceration of Sprawling to enable the illegal eviction.

A.2 — The Manufactured Scooter Vandalism (BHPD Case #22-50765)

The alleged vandalism of a scooter belonging to Nicholas Griffin was initiated immediately after Spiro hinted at filming Sprawling without his knowledge. A forensic review of digital, geographic, and physical evidence indicates this incident was staged. The alleged victim, Nicholas Griffin (email: ; listed address: 939 Larrabee St Apt 1), is highly suspect. Griffin used a 415 area code telephone number (415-699-6425) matching primary conspirators including Dr. Richard Heafey and Andrei Dunca. Background database searches via Truthfinder link this exact phone number to Eric S. Clarkson at 3507 S. Washtenaw Ave, Chicago, IL — the exact location of Mudd Law Offices. A closely associated number (707-494-6425) traces directly to 1147 Ozbourn Ct, Unit E, Treasure Island, San Francisco — a verified former residence of Sprawling — and lists “Donkey Punch Productions” and “Wahl Media” as associated businesses, corroborating the production pretext allegation. The evidentiary chain of identification is entirely corrupted: Griffin did not independently identify Sprawling from surveillance footage. Griffin obtained footage directly from Spiro and relied on Spiro’s building manager for identification. The building manager falsely told Griffin that Sprawling was “in the midst of being evicted,” establishing financial and personal motive to frame Sprawling. Police relied exclusively on this circular third-party hearsay; Griffin looked up Sprawling’s Instagram and reported a “match” with zero independent police verification.

Physical and documentary contradictions include the following. **The “Rain” Contradiction:** Griffin claimed gloves and helmet were ruined by rain in a second

incident involving the same scooter; Detective Goff's own official investigatory notes state these same gloves and helmet were found inside Sprawling's apartment; the official report ultimately admits "at this point in the investigation there is no evidence that Sprawling was involved with the second incident." **Suppression of Exculpatory Footage:** the scooter was parked in a rear lot behind privacy hedges and a dumpster; any footage of the vandalism would require Spiro's cameras to capture it; exculpatory footage appears to have been actively suppressed by the landlord. **The Kyle Egan Admission:** after the police report, the allegedly vandalized scooter appeared fully repaired in the lot of Sprawling's business at 420 N. Camden Drive; security camera footage captured Kyle Joseph Egan (DOB 05/01/2000) riding the scooter toward the camera and taunting, "haha Sean we got you!" — a direct admission of the setup. **Misleading Discovery Packaging:** the discovery packet contains a photograph of an unidentifiable masked individual labeled "suspect sprawling police contact on 12/29/22 (inc#22-55820)" — a date unrelated to either Griffin incident — intentionally mixed with photos of Sprawling's ID and the damaged scooter to mislead the court by implying visual identification where none exists. **Arbitrary Felony Elevation:** no professional quote or invoice was provided for scooter repair; police relied on Griffin's unverified financial estimate to arbitrarily elevate the charge to a felony.

A.3 — The Staged Battery and Confirmed Stalking (BHPD Case #23-1079)

On January 9, 2023, Sprawling confronted a group making repeated suspicious laps around his building. One individual pointed directly upward to Sprawling's specific window — covered in privacy film, rendering the interior invisible from the street — and stated, "Why don't you go back up there and watch like usual," confirming the group possessed intimate surveilled knowledge of his exact residence and habits. Sprawling recognized the alleged victim, Olivia Conoscenti, from a prior incident: he had previously investigated a building across the alley (the Hideaway, where Griffin also reportedly worked) and discovered Conoscenti in what appeared to be a staging green room, reading a script. One alleged victim shares the surname "Davila" — the maiden name of Sprawling's grandmother — a highly improbable coincidence indicative of deeply researched psychological targeting.

The BHPD reporting for this incident is fatally flawed. **The Arrest Paradox:** the official police report lists the battery suspect as an "Unknown Transient"; the same

discovery packet contains a signed Statement of Private Person's Arrest dated 1/9/23, executed by Olivia Conoscenti, explicitly naming "Rodney Sprawling," with Detective Goff listed as the receiving officer; it is procedurally and legally impossible to execute a targeted named citizen's arrest while simultaneously claiming the suspect is an unknown transient who has never been questioned. **Impossible Timeline:** the incident occurred at 12:25 AM; claimants stated they were "walking to their vehicle"; Beverly Hills commercial businesses in that area close between 7:00 PM and 8:00 PM; claimants were under 21 years of age, precluding attendance at late-night bars; no parking stubs or legitimate business reason were provided. **Location Discrepancies:** the police report lists the incident location as 400 N Camden Drive; video stills in the same report list 440 N Camden; neither address matches the actual location of the 4-on-1 confrontation in front of Sprawling's building, indicating fabricated locational data.

A.4 — Interior Vandalism and Physical Impossibilities (BHPD Cases #23-1437 and #23-18335)

Allegations of interior vandalism relied on digitally manipulated imagery, impossible physics, and inflated invoices designed to bypass civil eviction processes and steal the $70,000 security deposit. **The Chair Incident — Impossible Physics:** surveillance stills imply Sprawling picked up a chair and threw it from the top of the stairs, creating a hole in the lower drywall; the stairwell contains a sharp turn; a downward-traveling chair could not navigate this turn to embed into the opposing lower wall with such force; the photograph shows the chair in an upward-facing position, suggesting upward travel; Sprawling had already photographed this pre-existing hole prior to the allegation while documenting black mold and investigating suspicious sounds in the ceiling, which Spiro falsely claimed were water pipes. **Image Manipulation:** the suspect's shoe soles change spontaneously from solid black to black-and-white between frames; the head covering does not match the distinct mustard-yellow Louis Vuitton silk scarf worn by Sprawling during verified altercations; a piece of mail appears on the floor in some frames and completely vanishes in subsequent stills, proving the environment was manipulated or images were digitally altered. **Unverified Artwork Damage and Inflated Invoices:** Spiro's assistant Jesseca Harvey claimed Sprawling damaged custom-made picture frames worth $4,000 each; a security camera was pointed directly at the wall where these frames were located, yet no video footage was ever produced showing the damage; Spiro reported an initial repair cost of $1,800 for drywall; a subsequent

invoice from Manuel Lopez — an employee of Spiro's Sabo Properties — fraudulently inflated the cost to $3,800 for a drywall hole the size of a silver dollar. **The $70,000 Security Deposit Bypass:** any legitimate property damage would have been handled by deducting from the massive deposit in civil court; escalating a disputed drywall hole to a felony arrest was a calculated pretext to execute an illegal eviction and steal the deposit.

A.5 — Yuri Richard Spiro — The Operational Nexus

On September 10, 2021, Sprawling and Spiro entered into a secured promissory note for $385,000, secured by a 1990 Ferrari F40. Instead of honoring the agreement, Spiro allegedly created an unauthorized UCC filing on October 3, 2022, fraudulently encumbering the Ferrari collateral. Spiro failed to repay the loan by the December 31, 2022 deadline, triggering a 29.9% compounding interest rate. By manufacturing felony charges and forcing Sprawling into the criminal justice system, Spiro effectively eliminated his primary creditor and avoided repaying the multi-hundred-thousand-dollar debt. Parallel to the loan default, Spiro extorted a revised commercial lease, demanded the additional $70,000 security deposit, withheld original lease documents, and refused to return funds after the forced eviction. Spiro proactively fed false narratives to BHPD and emergency services characterizing Sprawling as mentally ill and drug-addicted, ensuring Sprawling's reports of stalking would be dismissed. Spiro falsely claimed the building was securely locked at all times; in reality, the building had no onsite receptionist, doors were frequently left unlocked, and Sprawling had repeatedly reported transients to Spiro.

The Premeditated "Production" Pretext: shortly before Spiro abruptly stopped coming into the 420 N. Camden Drive office, and just prior to the first staged scooter vandalism, Spiro announced he had launched a new production company called "Hyper Stream" or "Fear Stream." He asked Sprawling: "What would you think if someone were making a movie that included you but you didn't know it?" and explicitly told Sprawling he wanted to make him the "king of horror." This premeditated confession — combined with the Donkey Punch Productions and Wahl Media addresses linked to Griffin, Conoscenti's script-reading green room, and security footage showing uniformed individuals loading video equipment from the premises — strongly indicates the conspirators were intentionally gathering staged,

unauthorized footage to justify the eviction, gaslight Sprawling, generate illicit media content, and systematically terrorize him.

A.6 — Weaponization of Law Enforcement: BHPD Collusion

Officer J. Lyga — January 2, 2023 Psychological Intrusion: On January 2, 2023, uniformed BHPD officers arrived at 420 N. Camden Drive. Upon entering, an officer was recorded stating, “OKAY WHAT’S LEFT IN OUR LITTLE GAME” — destroying any presumption of a lawful welfare check. A male stalking suspect who was not a police officer was present alongside the officers and taunted Sprawling through glass doors, claiming Sprawling was watching “Kyle porn,” a threatening reference to operative Kyle Egan. Sprawling observed green laser pointers and a remote-controlled drone ramming his door; the officers explicitly refused his repeated demands to arrest or remove the stalker. Suffering a severe panic attack, Sprawling requested EMS, took prescribed Xanax, and lost consciousness. Officers did not summon medical aid. Instead, they abandoned the medically distressed victim, unlocked all exterior doors to the commercial premises, and deliberately rearranged interior furniture to create an unobstructed path to his unconscious body. Security footage later captured uniformed individuals loading video equipment from the premises. Dr. Richard Heafey — a named co-conspirator involved in manipulating Sprawling’s medical records — has independently identified Officer J. Lyga as a personal friend, creating a catastrophic conflict of interest.

Detective Goff — Custodial Abuse and Identity Manipulation: Sprawling was arrested and booked under the entirely fabricated alias “Anthony Sprawling,” despite the complaint being initiated by Spiro, who knew his legal name — confirming intentional misidentification. Arresting officers deliberately failed to check Sprawling’s ID, which would have immediately voided any corresponding warrant. “Anthony Sprawling” is entirely absent from the BHPD discovery packet yet appears as the official name on the court docket. Court records show “Anthony Sprawling” attended subsequent hearings that Sprawling was never notified of, indicating the conspirators either fabricated a person to attend proceedings or hijacked an unrelated case. During the arrest, Detective Goff refused to present a warrant — stating “it’s not like on TV” — and denied access to a telephone or legal counsel. Sprawling was held for three days as the sole occupant of the facility, a deliberate psychological torture tactic. He was ultimately released on his own

recognizance, having never appeared before a judge and never been shown a warrant to date. Overnight, Sprawling's bail was manipulated from the standard $20,000 to $100,000 — providing the exact time window for Spiro's pre-staged movers to illegally clear 420 N. Camden Drive and change the locks. Seized items during the arrest included phones, a laptop, an iPad, a passport, driver's license, Social Security card, credit cards, and an engagement ring — items entirely inconsistent with a vandalism charge, evidencing a targeted identity erasure operation. Critical communication devices were missing or withheld for days after Sprawling's release.

SECTION B — MANUFACTURED ADMINISTRATIVE ROADBLOCKS, FRAUD, COLLUSION, AND ILLEGAL EVICTION: HARRIS COUNTY PRECINCT 4

(Case Nos. 20244069284, 2507-00573; Cause No. 1248656)

B.1 — Overview and Enterprise Structure

A forensic examination of Harris County Constable Precinct 4 official returns and corresponding civil court filings reveals profound procedural anomalies, irreconcilable physical contradictions, and documented evidence of an orchestrated conspiracy. The official records do not document legitimate civil process; they constitute primary evidence of a coordinated enterprise designed to defraud, medically neglect, silence, strip between $250,000 and $1,000,000 in property equity, and physically dispossess Sprawling. Related pending legal matters include: AMDRE LLC v. Rodney Sprawling, et al., County Civil Court at Law No. 2, Docket No. 1248656; Appellate Case No. 14-25-00369-CV; Justice Court Cause No. 254100033877; and an Original Petition for Civil Conspiracy and Quieting of Title against AMDRE LLC, NewRez LLC, Adrian M. Hernandez, and Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, seeking monetary relief of up to $1,000,000.

The enterprise operated through three interconnected branches: (1) **Financial and Corporate Actors** — Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, Adrian M. Hernandez, AMDRE LLC, NewRez LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing, and legal counsel including Mudd Law, Burrus Law Group, and Anna C. Sewart, utilizing fraudulent civil litigation to quiet title, strip equity, and separate Sprawling from the marital estate while suppressing evidence of Dunca's disappearance. (2) **Local Operational Nexus** —

Adverse parties utilizing fraudulent court mechanisms including uncertified deeds and obstructed discovery under a Level 3 Discovery Control Plan, and procedurally defective writs to bypass lawful civil eviction processes, resulting in the violent dispossession of Sprawling and his elderly disabled veteran parents at 13339 Balmore Circle. (3) **Compromised Law Enforcement and Institutional Cover-Up** — Deputy C. Diaz, Deputy Ramon Ruiz (Badge #104), and Deputy D. Jones of Harris County Constable Precinct 4, who denied constitutional due process, neglected acute medical crises, suppressed mandatory missing person reports, and ignored documented stalking; subsequent ratification and cover-up by Sgt. Mathieu, Capt. Jim Sharman (Civil/Writ/Warrant/CID/Training), and Asst. Chief Kenneth Key through a coordinated administrative blockade.

B.2 — Causal Linkage Between Police Action and Civil Litigation Strategy

Deputy C. Diaz initiated a chain of suppression on December 15, 2024, by refusing to conduct a standard missing person intake. This created a false official administrative record countering the narrative of spousal disappearance, insulating the subsequent foreclosure and eviction proceedings involving Dunca’s property. Escalation occurred on June 24 and July 5, 2025, when deputies explicitly threatened Sprawling with arrest for making a “false police report” if he persisted. By leveraging state authority to suppress protected reporting, Precinct 4 effectively provided a procedural shield to AMDRE LLC and NewRez LLC.

B.3 — The Manufactured Missing Person Obstruction (Precinct 4 Case #20244069284)

On December 15, 2024, Deputy C. Diaz (Badge #4C96) refused to follow standard missing person intake protocols for Andrei George Dunca, who had been missing since August 2022. Instead of relying on Sprawling’s documentary evidence, Diaz improperly relied exclusively on unverified third-party hearsay from Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder — a named co-conspirator. Diaz actively questioned the legitimacy of Sprawling’s domestic partnership, displaying a dismissive tone indicative of anti-LGBTQ+ bias. By refusing to file a formal report, Diaz artificially manufactured an “administrative basis” allowing opposing counsel to continuously assert in civil court that Dunca was capable and available, insulating the title fraud from judicial scrutiny.

B.4 — The Staged Writ Execution and Procedural Impossibilities (June 24, 2025)

The underlying claim to 13339 Balmore Circle was engineered through title fraud: the eviction action was predicated on an uncertified “unofficial copy” of a Substitute Trustee’s Deed wielded by AMDRE LLC and facilitated by NewRez LLC and Adrian M. Hernandez. Sprawling sent a Demand Letter to AMDRE LLC on February 25, 2025, citing an Opendoor Affiliated Business Arrangement Disclosure Statement dated February 20, 2025. This unverified document was weaponized to bypass a legitimate, superseding Special Warranty Deed conveying the property to Sprawling’s entity, EsRa Dunca-Sprawling Inc. To conceal this fraud, AMDRE LLC filed a Motion to Quash Discovery on May 1, 2025.

Impossible Notice Timeline — The 33-Day Contradiction: The Writ of Possession was issued on May 19, 2025, by County Clerk Teneshia Hudspeth, requested by attorney Anna C. Sewart. Deputy Jambi Rerry posted a “FINAL notice” warning on May 22, 2025 at 10:26 AM. Deputy Ramon Ruiz (Badge #104) executed the writ on June 24, 2025 — a 33-day lapse rendering the original 24-hour notice completely stale and procedurally ineffective under Texas Property Code Section 24.0061(d)(1). Upon arrival, Deputy Ruiz outright refused to produce the court-signed Writ of Possession for inspection.

Chain of Custody Fraud — The Phantom “Representative Herbert’s”: Ruiz’s official return states possession was “returned back to representative Herbert’s.” No authorized representative was physically present; the Writ of Possession was simply taped to the front door. This directly contradicts the official return, exposing a massive fraudulent gap in the chain of custody.

Medical Crisis and Retaliatory Threats: The forced eviction triggered a severe medical crisis for Sprawling’s elderly disabled veteran mother and diabetic father. Deputy Ruiz’s own notes confirm: “EDS 11 BOX 404 ARRIVED AND FEMALE DECLINED TO BE TRANSPORTED.” When Sprawling attempted to re-initiate a missing person report that same day, responding deputies threatened arrest for making a “false police report.”

B.5 — Weaponization of Law Enforcement and Custodial Abuse (Case #2507-00573, July 5, 2025)

Sprawling called 911 to report a break-in at his own property. Despite being the 911 caller and immediately presenting documentary proof of ownership, responding

deputies placed Sprawling in handcuffs based entirely on an unverified telephone conversation with an unidentified third party. Deputies physically confiscated Sprawling's working key to the premises and transferred it directly to the individual Sprawling had called 911 to report — transitioning from law enforcement into active participants in the theft.

Medical Abandonment and Documented Custodial Abuse: While detained in the back of a patrol vehicle, Sprawling suffered an acute panic attack. Deputy D. Jones refused to allow Sprawling's father to administer prescribed life-saving medication. When EMTs arrived, they required law enforcement authorization to transport, which Deputy Jones actively delayed. The After Visit Summary from Houston Methodist Willowbrook Hospital Emergency Department, overseen by Dr. Mag de La Cruz, confirms Sprawling presented with Blood Pressure of 161/73, Pulse of 110, Respiration of 16, and an official diagnosis of Anxiety and Panic Attack. While Sprawling lay in the ambulance visibly suffering, Deputy Jones leaned in and falsely informed him that criminal charges had been filed, taunting him to "just turn himself in."

B.6 — Internal Affairs Cover-Up (Complaint #25120107)

On December 8, 2025, Assistant Chief Kenneth Key issued a final disposition letter closing the investigation as "Unfounded," limiting the scope exclusively to the "complaint on Deputy Ruiz" reviewed by the "Writ Division Administration" — completely ignoring Deputy Diaz's refusal to take a missing person report, the medical neglect by Deputy Jones, the weaponized Mudd Law harassment warning, and the confiscation of physical keys. Sergeant David Mathieu, identified as the assigned investigator, contacted Sprawling and requested the full complaint. Sprawling submitted comprehensive documentation on December 3, 2025. Forensic tracking confirms Mathieu never opened the files. He refused to return follow-up calls or acknowledge receipt. In February 2026, Captain Jim Sharman summarily denied a request to reopen the complaint, falsely asserting in writing that "Your entire complaint was reviewed and your complaint in its entirety was found to be unfounded" — directly contradicted by Assistant Chief Key's own letter limiting the scope to Ruiz alone, and by the undeniable fact that the evidence files were never opened.

SECTION C — BAD FAITH LITIGATION AND PROFESSIONAL COMPLICITY: MUDD LAW OFFICES

C.1 — Overview

This section documents allegations of litigation misconduct by Mudd Law Offices (MLO), specifically lead counsel Joshua Pagan and Charles Lee Mudd Jr. The evidentiary record indicates MLO is utilizing the Texas judicial system as an operational tool to execute a campaign of bad faith litigation, procedural sabotage, and discovery obstruction. The reporting party alleges MLO's conduct raises the probability that "MLO either knew or should have known that the user was a victim of a sophisticated digital crime, such as digital kidnapping."

C.2 — The Plausibility of Non-Participation by Andrei George Dunca

The conduct of Mudd Law Offices stands in stark contrast to the documented historical patterns of Andrei George Dunca's decade-long relationship with Sprawling. Dunca's historical conduct included: monthly financial support exceeding $35,000; shared ownership of multiple properties; joint investments in film and hospitality ventures; $10,000 in monthly support during a brief separation with continued payment of $5,500/month for shared apartment rent plus $5,000/month for personal expenses; access to a Platinum American Express card and Dunca's personal checking account on which Sprawling remained an authorized signatory; pre-signed blank checks from Dunca's account provided to Sprawling for emergency use; and the Statutory Durable Power of Attorney executed January 18, 2019, recorded January 25, 2019, which was never formally revoked.

By stark contrast, MLO's litigation tactics have been marked by procedural avoidance, strategic obstruction including use of a Temporary Restraining Order to suppress Sprawling's lawful inquiries, intentional infliction of emotional distress through filings mischaracterizing Sprawling's disability, and complete silence — the submission of remote affidavits, digital signatures, and filings devoid of any evidence of Dunca's personal involvement. These tactics are not only inconsistent with Dunca's historical conduct; they are diametrically opposed to it. Critically, Dunca's non-revocation of the Power of Attorney — while MLO simultaneously pursued a Motion for Contempt against Sprawling for exercising the rights that same POA confers — is legally and factually implausible if Dunca were engaged in

and directing the suit. Furthermore, Dunca's phone number (415-706-2984) remains publicly listed, associated with shared business entities including Sean Sprawling Productions and Teak Stage Productions, and has not been deactivated — undermining any claim that Sprawling's contact constituted harassment and supporting the inference that Dunca is not directing this litigation.

C.3 — MLO: Architects of Bad Faith Litigation and Discovery Obstruction

Charles Lee Mudd Jr. is a recognized expert in AI, cybersecurity, and identity theft. The reporting party alleges MLO deployed technical defenses — including remote notarizations, non-native ESI (Electronically Stored Information) production, and anonymity motions — to deliberately prevent forensic review of contested digital materials. Counsel "relied on remote notarizations and unauthenticated digital signatures while refusing to produce wet signature retainer agreements and fiduciary disclosures." The litigation is prosecuted by at least eight professionals across two firms; the collective failure to produce verified retainer agreements raises a compelling inference that MLO is operating without lawful client authority.

Joshua Pagan is specifically alleged to be the "procedural enabler" whose acceptance and presentation of contested digital evidence allowed the purported conspiracy to gain legal traction. Specific acts attributed to Pagan include: filing remote affidavits, video notarizations, and digital signatures lacking contemporaneous biometric liveness checks or adequate identity verification; withholding intake notes, billing records, and communications showing how client identity was confirmed; continuing to prosecute claims despite documented, credible concerns about digital impersonation and client incapacity; temporal correlation — the timing of filings corresponds with reported windows of digital isolation, suggesting coordination with concealment of a digital kidnapping operation; filing Pro Hac Vice from Chicago and centralizing control over local Houston counsel, with the eService certificate for the March 13, 2025 Petition logging deliveries to key parties as "NOT SENT," indicating an intentional effort to secure an ex parte advantage; and deploying wholesale boilerplate objections to suppress relevant financial data regarding the marital estate, resulting in the collapse of shared production projects budgeted at over $28 million.

The Evidentiary Challenge: Sprawling formally offered to submit to independent psychological and drug testing. MLO's refusal to accept this neutral verification confirms the narrative is a bad-faith fabrication.

The DARVO Strategy: MLO's filings execute a textbook DARVO (Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender) approach, adopting defamatory tropes used by individuals who physically and digitally abused Sprawling. Pleadings repeatedly advanced claims of "cognitive impairment" and "substance misuse" that contemporaneous medical records — including negative drug tests and clinician notes — directly contradict. MLO's attempt to pursue "Indirect Civil Contempt" charges for Sprawling publishing his memoir constitutes a direct First Amendment violation designed to criminalize whistleblower testimony.

C.4 — Specific Alleged Offenses for Investigative Consideration

The following are documented as areas requiring independent review: **conspiracy to obstruct justice** through coordination to conceal or destroy evidence or use the litigation process to impede investigation; **accessory or aiding and abetting** by providing legal services or procedural cover with knowledge those services would facilitate criminal concealment; **fraud on the court and filing false instruments** by submitting filings or notarizations without proper client authority or with fabricated supporting evidence; **evidence tampering and spoliation** through failure to preserve digital evidence or submission of unauthenticated digital exhibits; and **professional misconduct rising to criminality,** including criminal deception, forgery, or conspiracy.

C.5 — Key Documentary Evidence and Witnesses (MLO Investigation)

Documents identified for investigation: Amended Motion for Investigation into Joshua Pagan, Charles Mudd, and Mudd Law Offices (full text and exhibits); communications log showing texts, emails, and carrier notes reflecting service loss and account lockouts coincident with remote filings; court filings and remote notarization certificates including contested affidavits, REN certificates, and produced PDF/screenshot exhibits; Power of Attorney and property records including the unrevoked POA documents and title/escrow records; medical and lab records including clinician notes and negative drug test results contradicting litigation narratives; and evidence of timing and movers including contemporaneous notes,

witness statements, and photographs documenting movers present at the eviction and seizure of identity items.

Witnesses identified: the reporting party (declarant) with preserved contemporaneous records and declarations; counsel of record at Mudd Law Offices including Joshua Pagan, Charles Mudd Jr., and other listed attorneys for testimony and production of internal files; designated local counsel and opposing counsel for testimony about intake, retainer processes, and communications; clerical and notary personnel or REN platform operators to produce session logs and authentication records for remote notarizations; carrier and platform custodians including mobile carriers, REN providers, and platform administrators who can produce call detail records, SIM change logs, and session tokens; and third-party witnesses including movers, building staff, Keith Fraser, Nicholas Griffin, and any employees who handled security footage or deliveries.

Probative questions for investigative consideration: (1) Was a valid, wet-ink retainer or other contemporaneous client authorization ever executed and retained by MLO for the nominal plaintiff? (2) Did MLO possess, review, or receive documentation indicating account compromise, SIM swap activity, or synthetic media prior to or during the litigation? (3) Were remote notarization session logs, REN platform recordings, and native exhibit files requested and withheld by counsel? (4) Did counsel knowingly submit or rely upon unauthenticated digital evidence or representations of identity? (5) Is there evidence that counsel coordinated with third parties to time filings during windows when the reporting party’s communications were compromised? (6) Do billing records, intake notes, or internal communications reflect awareness of the reporting party’s claims of digital coercion and a decision to proceed regardless?

SECTION D — FORENSIC LINGUISTIC AND LEGAL ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATIONS: REBUTTAL OF THE TRO APPLICATION AND EVIDENTIARY REVIEW OF TEXT RECORDS

D.1 — Executive Overview and Scope of Analysis

The evidentiary record — comprising an extensive corpus of telephonic, SMS, and MMS communications spanning from August 2022 through February 2026 —

presents a highly complex narrative of financial entanglement, severe psychological trauma, and physical endangerment. An exhaustive forensic and legal review of these primary source communications stands in direct contradiction to the claims asserted in the Verified Original Petition and Application for Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) filed by Andrei Dunca (“Petitioner”) against Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr., also known as Sean Sprawling (“Respondent”), in Harris County, Texas, on March 13, 2025.

The Petitioner’s filing alleges defamation per se, intrusion upon seclusion, Chapter 85 stalking, and intentional infliction of emotional distress (IIED). The foundational premise characterizes the Respondent as a malicious actor conducting a unilateral, unprovoked campaign of harassment. However, a meticulous examination of the underlying communication logs reveals that the Petitioner’s narrative is predicated upon verifiable chronological falsehoods, the deliberate decontextualization of the Respondent’s communications, and the omission of the Petitioner’s own highly damaging conduct.

Rather than substantiating claims of stalking or harassment, the documentary evidence supports the conclusion that the Respondent was subjected to extreme, sustained abuse, false imprisonment, sexual assault, and digital extortion. The communications characterized by the Petitioner as “harassment” are, upon forensic review, desperate exigent pleas for rescue directed at his common-law spouse and legal business partner. The evidence strongly supports severe counterclaims against the Petitioner for marital abandonment, breach of fiduciary duty, and the intentional infliction of emotional distress through systematic psychological manipulation, commonly referred to as gaslighting.

This analysis deconstructs the Petitioner’s allegations, mapping the factual record against Texas statutory frameworks and case law to demonstrate that the TRO application operates not as a legitimate shield against harassment, but as a preemptive legal strategy designed to obfuscate the Petitioner’s own liability for abandoning a dependent domestic and business partner to violent victimization.

D.2 — Deconstruction of the Petitioner’s Factual Allegations and Timeline

D.2.1 — The Fallacy of the March 2021 Separation

The Petitioner asserts that the eight-year relationship ended in San Francisco in March 2021 and that he subsequently withdrew from shared LLCs and properties, finalizing his detachment before moving to Berlin, Germany in early 2022. If this narrative were factually accurate, communications in August and September 2022 would reflect the distant, administrative tone of divested former partners. Instead, the communication logs reveal a highly active, emotionally enmeshed, and operationally integrated relationship.

During August 2022, the Respondent was actively managing a joint business venture referred to as “Gion.” The communications show the Respondent dealing with severe personnel crises concerning an associate named Eitaro who was demanding back pay and refusing to work. The Petitioner did not communicate as a divested third party. He offered direct, granular strategic business counsel, suggesting the Respondent “offer [Eitaro] a share of the business” and advising on the precise allocation of future earnings toward current debt obligations. The Petitioner actively inquired about the financial health of the enterprise, asking, “Is Gion making any money, when is it going to get to breakeven?” Furthermore, the Petitioner critiqued day-to-day operational management, reprimanding the Respondent that “wasting time on details like paper doors when you just need to get customers in is counter-productive.” This level of operational oversight is entirely inconsistent with the Petitioner’s sworn claim of a finalized separation eighteen months prior.

D.2.2 — Persistent Financial Interdependence

The financial records embedded within the text messages prove the Petitioner and Respondent were sharing highly integrated financial accounts long after the alleged dissolution of their partnership. In August 2022, the Petitioner transferred $4,000 to the Respondent to alleviate business debts and operational costs. In September 2022, the Respondent was actively utilizing the Petitioner’s American Express card (ending in 62003) for daily survival, business operations, and the retention of security and investigative services. The Petitioner explicitly consented to this usage, stating on September 2, 2022: “Yeah you can use it.”

The sheer volume of these transactions further belies the claim of separation. By September 12, 2022, the Petitioner noted that $20,000 had been charged to his credit profile in a mere twelve-day period — charges including Airbnb accommodations, Uber rides, PayPal transfers to contractors, and concierge medical

services. No reasonable individual allows a purportedly estranged ex-partner to charge $20,000 to their personal credit card over twelve days without an underlying structure of mutual obligation and shared resources.

The following summarizes the forensic contradictions between the TRO's claims and the documentary record:

Claim in Petition	Evidentiary Record	Forensic Implication
"Relationship definitively ended in March 2021, followed by infrequent communication."	Extensive, near-daily communication regarding shared business operations, emotional support, and physical safety throughout the second half of 2022.	The Petitioner has significantly misrepresented the timeline to the Court, likely to distance himself from subsequent liability.
"Petitioner divested from all properties and LLCs by March 2023, functioning independently."	Petitioner provided active operational directives for the "Gion" business in August 2022 and managed shared financial crises.	The parties were functioning as active business partners long past the date alleged in the TRO application.
"Respondent unilaterally intruded upon the Petitioner's life and finances."	Petitioner explicitly authorized use of his American Express card on September 2, 2022, and voluntarily sent thousands of dollars to the Respondent.	The financial entanglement was mutual, consensual, and continuous until the Petitioner abruptly severed it.

D.2.3 — Abdication of Fiduciary Duties in Joint Enterprises

The Petitioner claims to have formally withdrawn from Sean Sprawling Productions LLC (SSP LLC) in March 2023. However, the communications indicate that the Petitioner functionally abandoned his fiduciary obligations to the entity and his partner during a period of extreme corporate crisis in late 2022, resulting in catastrophic losses. Under the Texas Business Organizations Code, members and managers of a Limited Liability Company owe strict fiduciary duties of care, loyalty, and good faith to both the company and its constituent members.

On November 4, 2022, the Respondent formally notified the Petitioner that criminal actors possessing unauthorized audio and video recordings were actively jeopardizing two $15 million studio projects owned by SSP LLC. The Respondent explicitly invoked the Petitioner's legal duties, writing: "as part owner of the production company that produced these projects it is indeed your obligation to do something… Failing to address this issue especially after you promised to offer your

assistance… is negligent on your part.” The Respondent correctly identified that these illicit recordings could damage the production companies, resulting in the loss of revenue and the destruction of relationships with sales agents and financiers.

The Petitioner’s response on November 5, 2022 — “There’s nothing for me to address, I don’t want to get involved in your personal affairs” — represents a stark and actionable abdication of fiduciary duty. The crisis affecting SSP LLC’s flagship projects was not a “personal affair”; it was an existential threat to the jointly owned corporate entity. The subsequent collapse of these multi-million dollar projects and the resulting financial ruin of the Respondent are direct consequences of this abandonment.

D.2.4 — The Falsified 2021 Property Sale and Implications of Third-Party Interference

The Verified Original Petition asserts under oath that “[i]n August 2021, Mr. Dunca and Defendant sold the property in Houston, Texas.” This claim is a verifiable falsehood. The property located at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas, was not voluntarily sold in 2021. It fell into severe delinquency as a direct result of the Petitioner’s financial abandonment and was ultimately foreclosed upon and sold at a foreclosure auction on December 3, 2024. The Respondent’s contemporaneous communications corroborate this grim reality; on November 26, 2024, he texted: “Me and my parents will be homeless in 7 days. We don’t have the money to find another place. The house will be sold at auction.”

The inclusion of this glaring factual error in a sworn legal document carries profound implications. A co-signer and purported co-owner of a property would undeniably possess actual knowledge of whether an asset was voluntarily sold in 2021 or subjected to a catastrophic foreclosure auction three years later. The presence of this fabrication strongly suggests that Andrei Dunca did not draft, review, or verify the contents of the Petition. Consequently, this discrepancy raises the alarming prospect that the litigation is directed by the third-party actors the Respondent has consistently accused of digital kidnapping, identity theft, and extortion, utilizing the judicial system as a tool for continued harassment and silencing.

D.3 — Legal Affirmation of the Common-Law Marriage

A central pillar of the Petitioner’s defamation claim is the assertion that the parties were never married, either formally or informally, and that the Respondent’s public

and private claims of being his “husband” are defamatory falsehoods. However, an analysis of Texas law regarding informal marriages, applied to the facts evidenced in the communications, strongly supports the Respondent’s assertions of a legally binding marital union.

D.3.1 — Statutory Requirements Under the Texas Family Code

Texas is one of the few jurisdictions in the United States that fully recognizes common-law (informal) marriage. Under Texas Family Code § 2.401(a)(2), a common-law marriage is established if three elements are satisfied concurrently: (1) the parties agreed to be married; (2) they lived together in Texas as spouses after the agreement; and (3) they represented to others that they were married (“holding out”). Texas jurisprudence explicitly imposes no durational requirement — the relationship can be legally established quickly if all three elements are simultaneously present. Once proven, an informal marriage holds the exact same legal status as a ceremonial marriage and cannot be dissolved by mere physical separation or verbal renunciation; it requires a formal judicial divorce decree, subjecting all assets and debts acquired during the marriage to Texas community property division.

While California abolished the creation of new common-law marriages within its borders in 1895, it adheres to the Full Faith and Credit Clause of the U.S. Constitution, recognizing and enforcing a common-law marriage validly established in a permitting jurisdiction such as Texas.

D.3.2 — Evidentiary Proof of “Holding Out” and Mutual Consent

The communications supply substantial evidence for the existence of an informal marriage. The parties maintained an admitted eight-year relationship and co-owned significant real property in both Los Angeles, California, and Houston, Texas. Notably, the Petitioner admits to co-signing the mortgage for a house purchased for the Respondent’s parents in Houston — the assumption of a massive, long-term financial liability on behalf of a partner’s extended family demonstrates an extraordinary level of familial integration characteristic of a marital union.

The “holding out” element is heavily supported by the Respondent’s consistent assertions of his marital rights throughout the communication logs. The Respondent repeatedly identifies himself as the Petitioner’s “common law husband” and partner of over 15 years. In August 2024, the Respondent formally stated: “I am your common law husband and I will exercise my rights given to me as your husband by

the State of California and those which are equivalent in the state of Texas… I want a divorce."

The Petitioner attempts to frame the Respondent's use of the hyphenated surname "Dunca-Sprawling" as defamatory. However, within the context of a fractured common-law marriage, this is standard legal and social behavior for a spouse attempting to assert their legitimate identity, secure marital property rights, and demand a formal dissolution. The Respondent explicitly notes that the Petitioner "did not file for a separation from our marriage to mutually end the relationship" and that he was "not removed from shared bank accounts." Truth — or a reasonable, good-faith belief in the truth based on the legal elements of informal marriage — is an absolute defense to defamation.

Element of Texas Common-Law Marriage	Supporting Evidence from the Record
(1) Agreement to be married	Long-term (8–15 year) commitment, pooling of massive financial resources, and joint real estate acquisition.
(2) Living together in Texas as spouses	Co-ownership of the Houston property; Petitioner co-signing the mortgage for Respondent's parents in Texas.
(3) Representing to others as married ("Holding Out")	Respondent's consistent use of the "Dunca-Sprawling" surname on public platforms, emails, and legal demands for a formal divorce.

D.4 — The Tort and Statutory Fault of Abandonment

The Petitioner's abrupt withdrawal of financial support, physical presence, and communication constitutes a textbook case of marital abandonment under Texas jurisprudence and is the catalyst for the Respondent's subsequent financial ruin and emotional collapse.

D.4.1 — The Legal Standard for Marital Abandonment in Texas

Under Texas Family Code § 6.005, a court may grant a divorce in favor of one spouse if the other spouse left the complaining spouse with the intention of abandonment and remained away for at least one continuous year. Establishing this fault can heavily influence a judge's discretion to order a disproportionate division of the community property estate in favor of the abandoned spouse, and serves as

a critical factor in awarding spousal maintenance or alimony. Legal abandonment requires more than a mutual decision to live apart; it requires a unilateral departure, an intent not to return, and the withdrawal of emotional and financial support.

D.4.2 — Evidentiary Proof of Financial and Physical Desertion

The communication logs chronicle the precise, calculated mechanics of the Petitioner's abandonment. Throughout August and early September 2022, the Respondent repeatedly communicated his extreme vulnerability, isolation, and physical fear, begging the Petitioner for support. On September 17, 2022, at the height of the Respondent's crisis, the Petitioner issued a chilling ultimatum: "the card will stop working any day now because I couldn't pay my bill… Your expenses messed up my finances and I'll have to get them back on track… I no longer trust you to spend it."

The Respondent's immediate reaction highlights the devastating, life-threatening reality of this desertion: "Andrei if there's no amex then there's no protection no hotel no lawyer no investigation I lose all my mkney and life in danger… Idk what to do." The Petitioner not only cut off the financial resources necessary for the Respondent's physical safety but also physically abandoned him, relocating thousands of miles away to Berlin, Germany. Compounding the psychological cruelty of this departure, the Respondent alleges that the Petitioner took the couple's shared dog, "The Captain," in secret, depriving the Respondent of his primary source of emotional comfort without allowing him the opportunity to say goodbye.

D.4.3 — Consequences of Abandonment on the Respondent's Well-Being

Left without access to shared marital assets, locked out of joint accounts, and unable to sustain the business operations they had built together, the Respondent faced total financial devastation. By November 2024, the ripple effects of this abandonment culminated in the Respondent and his disabled veteran parents facing foreclosure and imminent homelessness. The Respondent noted the grim reality: "Me and my parents will be homeless in 7 days. We don't have the money to find another place. The house will be sold at auction."

The Petitioner's actions fulfill every statutory requirement for legal abandonment in Texas: a voluntary, unilateral departure; the explicit intent not to return or engage; the total cessation of financial and emotional support; and the resulting severe

prejudice, financial ruin, and endangerment to the dependent spouse. The Respondent's repeated messages seeking contact and financial redress are not the actions of a stalker; they are the desperate, legally justified attempts of an abandoned spouse seeking equitable relief, property division, and survival.

D.5 — Rebutting the Claims of Intrusion Upon Seclusion and Chapter 85 Stalking

D.5.1 — Statutory Elements and the "Legitimate Purpose" Defense

Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code § 85.003 defines civil stalking as behavior on more than one occasion that is reasonably likely to harass, annoy, alarm, or abuse, causing the claimant to reasonably fear for their safety. Intrusion upon seclusion requires an intentional intrusion upon another's solitude or private affairs that would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.

Both constitutional free speech frameworks and statutory interpretations explicitly protect communications serving a "legitimate purpose," even if frequent, highly emotional, or annoying to the recipient. Courts have consistently held that reaching out to a spouse, a business partner, or an authority figure to seek rescue from ongoing physical abuse, sexual violence, false imprisonment, or extortion is the absolute epitome of a legitimate communication. A victim pleading for their life cannot form the requisite malicious mens rea necessary to sustain a civil stalking charge; their intent is survival.

D.5.2 — Contextualizing the Communications as Exigent Pleas for Rescue

When stripped of the Petitioner's sanitized narrative, the text logs from 2022 through 2026 read not as a calculated campaign of harassment, but as a real-time, escalating chronicle of a severe hostage and abuse situation.

False Imprisonment and Surveillance: In August and September 2022, the Respondent details a highly sophisticated surveillance operation targeting his residence. He reports coordinated vehicle movements outside his window, the hacking of his local Wi-Fi network to track his physical movements within the apartment, and individuals staging in hallways to prevent his exit. On August 19, 2022, the Respondent texted: "Andrei I swear pls believe me I'm not crazy rn or high. There are people outside for the past 3 days watching me." On the same date he reported: "Kyle txted me things saying I went to the station to file a restraining order but I never did and never told anyone — that's what police told me to do. So I

figured he could hear me.” On August 24, 2022, he wrote: “I don’t think it’s as simple as Kyle or Richie. There’s something going on here and they’re mad I saw. Again I’m not crazy. It’s something straight out of a movie and I don’t feel safe.”

Petitioner’s Active Role in Dismissal: Crucially, throughout these disclosures, the Petitioner’s responses were dismissive rather than protective. On August 19, 2022, Dunca responded: “I believe you. But you also make some assumptions that you’re not sure about” and recommended Sprawling take his phone to the Apple Store. On August 19, 2022, Dunca wrote: “Your doors are locked. You can put some music on and ignore it.” Rather than alerting authorities or taking protective action on behalf of his common-law spouse and business partner who was describing active surveillance, the Petitioner trivialized the reports — conduct that is itself consistent with the pattern of gaslighting described throughout this analysis.

Sexual Abuse and Torture: The Respondent repeatedly detailed being “sexually abused daily,” “raped,” and subjected to psychological and physical torture, including the forced insertion of objects and the use of vibrating electronic devices to inflict pain and humiliate him. He reported being “dragged… out of my apt naked” and held against his will while his abusers laughed at his suffering.

Financial Desperation and Abandonment: The texts document the chronological dismantling of every financial resource available to the Respondent. On August 2, 2022: “I’m going to lose everything.” On August 3, 2022: “I’m all alone. I don’t want to live.” On August 6, 2022, Sprawling wrote: “I want to come home I’m so tired my body is so heavy I’m all alone I can’t take it Andrei. I’m in pain. I miss you and the captain. I can’t take it. Will you come see me please will you come get me you can have everything I don’t want any money I just don’t want to be here. I want to wake up in San Francisco or I don’t want to wake up anymore.” On August 8, 2022, after receiving $4,000, Sprawling wrote: “Andrei I love you. You are a friend no matter what you say.” On September 2, 2022, when the Respondent’s dog was taken: “Someone took my dog… The cops think I’m crazy. They wouldn’t even take a report. They asked me if I had slept and if I want to hurt myself or anyone else.”

Forensic Evaluation of the Petitioner’s Characterizations:

Petitioner's Characterization	Actual Communication	Forensic Finding
"Vulgar and sexual language" as harassment.	"I've been sexually abused daily. I've been raped here. They put things inside of me."	Reporting sexual assault to a spouse/partner; seeking medical or police intervention. **Legitimate purpose.**
"Unrelenting emails and messages" intended to annoy.	"Please help me I know I don't have you but you're all I have Andrei please… I'm going to die here."	Desperate pleas for exigent rescue from false imprisonment. **Legitimate purpose.**
"Threats to harm/kill others" as stalking.	"I'm going to kill the people you had do this to me… I want them dead."	Expressions of extreme trauma, self-defense ideation, and psychological breakdown resulting from ongoing torture — not premeditated stalking.

D.5.3 — The Impact of Digital Kidnapping and Cyber Extortion

The Respondent's communications describe a textbook case of digital subjugation. He notes that his social media accounts (Instagram), transportation apps (Uber), and financial platforms (PayPal) were systematically locked out by his abusers, rendering him immobile and penniless. Most critically, he states that the perpetrators had achieved control over his telecommunications, intercepting his outgoing calls: "I tried calling police and actors come bc my calls are rerouted to them" and "They have faked texts and emails." In an environment where a victim believes their phone is cloned and their calls to 911 are being intercepted by their captors, sending frantic, repetitive messages to an overseas partner may represent their only perceived viable strategy for survival.

D.5.4 — Law Enforcement Reporting as a Protected Activity

The Petitioner frames the Respondent's contact with the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) as "false missing person reports" filed maliciously. However, the communications reveal a fundamentally different reality. The Respondent, physically isolated, subjected to severe abuse, and experiencing digital isolation where his calls were being spoofed or ignored, genuinely believed the Petitioner had also been abducted, compromised, or coerced. He communicated this fear explicitly: "I can't get proof of life from you… You are suspect for ignoring. Your silence is alarming and justifies missing persons report which would prove involvement."

Under Texas law, there is no liability for intentional infliction of emotional distress or invasion of privacy when an actor simply insists on or exercises their legal rights. Texas courts have explicitly held that “the reporting of activity to the police does not constitute extreme and outrageous behavior.” Attempting to locate a missing, unresponsive common-law spouse through official federal law enforcement channels is a legally protected activity and completely negates the Petitioner’s claim that these reports were filed maliciously as a form of stalking.

D.6 — Petitioner’s Liability for Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED)

D.6.1 — The “Extreme and Outrageous” Standard in Texas Jurisprudence

To successfully claim IIED in Texas, a plaintiff must prove: (1) the defendant acted intentionally or recklessly; (2) the defendant’s conduct was extreme and outrageous; (3) the actions caused the plaintiff emotional distress; and (4) the resulting emotional distress was severe. The threshold requires behavior “so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.” Within the context of a domestic partnership or marital relationship, Texas courts analyze the power dynamics at play; abusing a position of trust and confidence to torment a vulnerable partner who lacks the power to stop it routinely satisfies the requirement for extreme and outrageous conduct.

D.6.2 — Psychological Manipulation and Gaslighting as Outrageous Conduct

The communication logs reveal that the Petitioner engaged in a sustained, calculated campaign of psychological manipulation (gaslighting) against the Respondent. When the Respondent reported terrifying instances of stalking, surveillance, and physical assault — providing specific details, video evidence via Arlo camera links, and the identities of alleged perpetrators (Kyle, Yuri, Richie) — the Petitioner systematically invalidated the Respondent’s reality. Instead of investigating or offering aid, the Petitioner continually and baselessly attributed the Respondent’s terror to mental illness, delusions, or “meth induced psychosis.”

This psychiatric diagnosis was levied despite the Respondent presenting contradictory empirical medical evidence. The Respondent repeatedly urged the Petitioner to speak with his treating physician, Dr. Ali Dilshad, whose medical office

was located mere blocks from the apartment: “My doctor has been here and seen it with her own eyes… Ask my doctor — why aren’t you doing this?” Furthermore, the Respondent acquired and provided proof of a negative 14-panel drug test and underwent a psychiatric evaluation. On August 29, 2022, Sprawling texted: “I have a new psychologist. He’s an ex Olympian. My doctor referred me. They confirmed I wasn’t crazy and documented what was happening. They talked about hospitalizing me before they spent more time with me and decided it wasn’t necessary and actually wonder how I’m so high functioning with everything going on and having to cope with PTSD.”

The Petitioner entirely ignored this objective medical evidence. Instead, he weaponized the false diagnosis, propagating the narrative to third parties, friends, and business associates that the Respondent was a drug-addicted, delusional schizophrenic whose claims of abuse should be disregarded. Using one’s position of marital and fiduciary trust to convince a victim of severe abuse that their trauma is merely a hallucination, while simultaneously utilizing that false narrative to destroy their professional reputation and isolate them from rescue, represents the zenith of atrocious, intolerable conduct in a civilized society.

D.6.3 — Reckless Disregard for the Respondent’s Severe Trauma and Suicidality

The severity of the emotional distress inflicted upon the Respondent is tragically well-documented throughout the text logs. The Respondent repeatedly expressed active suicidal ideation directly resulting from the trauma of the abuse combined with the Petitioner’s gaslighting and abandonment. The communications include declarations such as: “I’m going to kill myself if you do nothing to stop this… I’m going to kill myself bc you won’t acknowledge what’s happening to me after you had me wait for your help”; “I’m just laying here crying no one will help me… Why do you hate me so much”; “They’ve watched me as I hanged myself and cut myself. I bled and they just laughed. A cord around my neck, plastic bag around my head did not stop them.”; and “I want to die. I don’t know what’s happening. No one will talk to me. It’s killing me.”

The Petitioner’s response to these explicit, graphic threats of suicide and detailed reports of active sexual violence was cold, calculated silence, interspersed with legalistic dismissals such as “I don’t owe you anything” and “Leave me out of it.” Within the context of an established 15-year partnership, a common-law marriage,

and a fiduciary business relationship, this deliberate indifference to a partner's imminent death, torture, and mental collapse is not merely uncharitable; it constitutes reckless, extreme, and outrageous behavior designed to inflict maximum psychological suffering. The Petitioner was fully aware that his silence and refusal to validate the Respondent's trauma was exacerbating the Respondent's suicidality, yet he chose to maintain the psychological pressure.

D.7 — Synthesis and Strategic Legal Implications

A forensic linguistic and legal evaluation of the complete evidentiary record demonstrates that the Verified Original Petition and Application for Temporary Restraining Order filed by Andrei Dunca relies on a highly curated, sanitized, and factually inaccurate version of events.

The Petitioner's foundational claims of an early 2021 breakup are provably false, undermined entirely by his own financial transfers, credit card authorizations ($4,000 Zelle transfer on August 8, 2022; $300 cash app transfer on August 16, 2022; $1,400 cash app transfer for geisha plane tickets on August 30, 2022; explicit card authorization on September 2, 2022 with $20,000 in charges within twelve days), and granular business directives issued in late 2022. Furthermore, the claim that the Houston property was voluntarily sold in 2021 is a glaring falsehood — the property at 13339 Balmore Circle was foreclosed upon and sold at auction on December 3, 2024. A true property owner and participant in this litigation would have firsthand knowledge of this catastrophic financial event. The presence of this fabrication strongly suggests the true Andrei Dunca is completely disconnected from this litigation, and that the lawsuit is being weaponized by the very third parties the Respondent has been warning about.

The characterization of the Respondent's communications as civil "stalking" or "harassment" deliberately ignores the vital, exigent context of those messages: they are the digital footprint of an isolated individual attempting to survive severe physical, sexual, and psychological abuse and digital extortion. Seeking rescue, attempting to locate an unresponsive spouse through proper federal law enforcement channels, and demanding an accounting from a fiduciary business partner all serve legitimate, legally protected purposes under Texas law, thereby neutralizing the claims of stalking and intrusion upon seclusion.

Conversely, the evidentiary record robustly supports severe affirmative claims against the Petitioner. By abruptly withdrawing vital financial support during a life-

threatening crisis, refusing to act on behalf of shared LLCs to prevent extortion, and actively gaslighting the Respondent by dismissing his medically documented abuse as drug-induced hallucinations, the Petitioner committed marital abandonment under Texas Family Code § 6.005, breached his corporate fiduciary duties under the Texas Business Organizations Code, and intentionally inflicted severe emotional distress.

The TRO application appears to be a preemptive legal maneuver designed to manipulate the judicial system. By painting the victim of abuse as a stalker, the petitioners seek to permanently silence the Respondent, sever any remaining financial obligations of their common-law marriage, and entirely obfuscate their own profound liability for abandoning a spouse and business partner to violent victimization and subsequent homelessness.

D.8 — Key Exhibits from Text Communication Log

(Exhibit A: Declaration of Andrei Dunca — Conversation with +14159906942, August 2022 through February 2026)

The following representative entries from the authenticated SMS/MMS log are noted as high-priority evidentiary exhibits. All messages marked *Received* originate from telephone number +14159906942 (attributed to Andrei George Dunca). All messages marked *Sent* originate from Respondent Rodney Samuel Sprawling.

Date / Direction	Message Content	Evidentiary Significance
Aug 2, 2022 — 2:49 AM (Received)	“I took out a loan on some Chanel at a pawn shop so I could print my parents mortgage up to date but it will still report as late. We opened a dispute to see if they will reverse it. I had to refund my customers from square as they deactivated my account… so i still don’t have cash to send you.”	Documents active financial co-management of shared obligations.
Aug 2, 2022 — 8:00 AM (Received)	“I’m going to lose everything.”	Documents early financial desperation communicated directly to the Petitioner.
Aug 2, 2022 — 8:14 AM (Received)	“Amd I have no one.” / “You said we could talk.”	Documents ongoing emotional interdependence contradicting the claimed March 2021 separation.

Date / Direction	Message Content	Evidentiary Significance
Aug 3, 2022 — 8:21 AM (Received)	“I’m all alone. I don’t want to live.”	Documents early suicidal ideation communicated directly to the Petitioner.
Aug 3, 2022 — 12:47 PM (Received)	“Idk what to do I haven’t been able to cope for a while I’m losing my mind.”	Documents escalating psychological distress prior to Petitioner’s withdrawal.
Aug 4, 2022 — 8:45 AM (Received)	“Can’t you come get me Please come see me.”	Documents Respondent’s continued reliance on Petitioner as primary support and safety resource.
Aug 5, 2022 — 11:52 AM (Sent by Dunca)	“I’m still super tight on cash, Mulholland still hasn’t sold, so idk if I can help, but lmk if there’s a minimum immediate need and I’ll see what I can do. But yeah, wasting time on details like paper doors when you just need to get customers in is counter-productive.”	Documents Petitioner’s continued active business co-management and financial involvement.
Aug 6, 2022 — 1:21 PM (Sent by Dunca)	“I can’t do as much as 10k, I can maybe send you a few thousand next week… Please don’t use my credit card, I can’t budget for your bills and expenses anymore.”	Documents Petitioner’s acknowledgment of the shared credit arrangement and attempt to limit it.
Aug 6, 2022 — 1:27 PM (Received)	“It’s a dream you sold me on. It’s an idea you kept alive when you told me two or three years. You said you’d always pick up. You said you wouldn’t throw me away.”	Documents Respondent’s reliance on promises of support made by the Petitioner.
Aug 6, 2022 — 10:57 PM (Received)	“I want to come home I’m so tired my body is so heavy I’m all alone I can’t take it Andrei. I’m in pain. I miss you and the captain. I can’t take it. Will you come see me please will you come get me you can have everything I don’t want any money I just don’t want to be here. I want to wake up in San Francisco or I don’t want to wake up anymore.”	Documents suicidality and total isolation disclosed directly to Petitioner.
Aug 8, 2022 (Sent by Dunca)	“I can zelle you $4k today, I can’t do the full 10k. Hope	Documents $4,000 transfer confirming active financial

Date / Direction	Message Content	Evidentiary Significance
	it’ll help.”	support.
Aug 15, 2022 — 10:26 AM (Received)	“Stop ignoring me. Stop doing this to me. I want to fucking die. Does this make you feel powerful you can prove a point?”	Documents escalation of psychological distress in response to Petitioner’s deliberate silence.
Aug 19, 2022 — 11:15 AM (Received)	“Andrei I swear pls believe me I’m not crazy rn or high. There are people outside for the past 3 days watching me.”	Documents initial disclosure of surveillance to Petitioner.
Aug 19, 2022 — 12:31 PM (Sent by Dunca)	“Sorry it’s been such a hard day, I don’t know what these people would want from you but if you feel unsafe you should call the cops.”	Documents Petitioner’s awareness of the surveillance claims and dismissive response.
Aug 19, 2022 — 12:58 PM (Sent by Dunca)	“I believe you. But you also make some assumptions that you’re not sure about, that’s why I was suggesting to get your phone checked for example, to know for sure if it’s hacked or not.”	Documents the Petitioner’s own acknowledgment that he believed the Respondent — directly contradicting the TRO’s characterization of the communications as delusional.
Aug 22–23, 2022 (Received)	“I’ve been having my doctor walk over she’s just two blocks away. She’s been documenting everything.”	Documents contemporaneous medical documentation of the described events.
Aug 29, 2022 — 5:17 PM (Received)	“I have a new psychologist. He’s an ex Olympian. My doctor referred me. They confirmed I wasn’t crazy and documented what was happening… They are going to start me on a Ketamine treatment they think I’m a great candidate.”	Documents independent medical confirmation of Respondent’s mental competency and the reality of his distress.
Sep 2, 2022 — 4:25–4:28 PM (Received)	“I need help. Idk if I’m safe. Someone took my dog. And he was inside there’s no way he could get out… The cops think I’m crazy. They wouldn’t even take a report.”	Documents escalation of abusive activity and continued law enforcement dismissal.
Sep 2, 2022 — 6:16 PM (Sent by Dunca)	“Yeah you can use it.”	Explicit Amex authorization. Documents consensual ongoing financial interdependence as late as September 2022.

SECTION E — Kyle Joseph Egan: Fraud, Emotional Manipulation, and Suspected Criminal Involvement

E.1 Subject Identification and Background

Kyle Joseph Egan (DOB: 05/01/2000) is identified as a former associate and central figure in a sustained pattern of fraud, emotional manipulation, extortion, and suspected coordination with individuals believed responsible for the broader conspiracy documented in this report. He operated under numerous aliases and online identities, including: **dacherub, kybootsxx, kyb00ts, kyboots, bbyk69, ddsledge, fagboots, white suede, kaja, Naomi Egan, kiel vex lee, dakerber, kerber1, lovetonomi, champagne cherub, dababycherub**, and was associated with the account **@arianlavish**.

Egan was known to the complainant prior to the events documented in this report and had previously committed fraudulent activities against the complainant for financial gain. Prior incidents included blackmail threats, use of false police reports to manipulate and create a false narrative, stalking, intentional infliction of emotional distress with intent to cause self-harm, and a pattern of emotional abuse. Egan was secretly engaged to **Kory Lamar Word** (also reported as Ward) throughout the entirety of his dealings with the complainant, a fact he actively concealed.

E.2 The Valentine's Day Recording and Documented Deception Plan

A Valentine's Day argument between Egan and his secret fiance was captured on audio recording. In the recording, Egan can be heard stating he intended to "go handle some shit" — a phrase his fiance, Kory Word, later confirmed was part of a deliberate plan: Egan's purpose in visiting the complainant was to perform as if he would resume their relationship, while actually using the complainant for financial support. Word confirmed that the plan was for Egan to "do what he does" and use the complainant to sustain the appearance of an available relationship.

This documented deception spanned approximately 60 consecutive days during which Egan provided a new excuse daily as to why he could not stay with the complainant. Relying on Egan's repeated promises to "come home," the

complainant broke an existing penthouse lease and subsequently signed a new lease at Egan's direction at a rate of **$18,000 per month** for a one-year term. On the day the complainant moved into that apartment — having had a haircut, purchased flowers, and prepared Egan's favorite meal (ham, southern green beans, and cornbread) — Egan did not appear, contact the complainant, or provide any explanation. The complainant later discovered through a third party's social media account that Egan was with his secret fiance that evening.

E.3 Concealed Engagement and Use as Alibi

Egan maintained a concurrent engagement to Kory Lamar Word throughout his dealings with the complainant. He described Word to the complainant as a hated roommate who slept in the living room and was abusive, framing his visits to the complainant as escapes from a dangerous domestic situation. In reality, Word later stated that he had no objection to Egan visiting the complainant, believing him to be a trusted friend: "I knew he was safe and with someone who cared about him. I thought I was being a good bf trusting him to go see his friend." The complainant was routinely used as an alibi to cover Egan's affairs from his fiance. Egan would instigate arguments with the complainant on each visit to create a pretext to leave and return to Word or others.

When Egan did spend one night at the complainant's residence, it was only after contacting the complainant in apparent crisis, claiming Word would not stop hitting him and sending a video of the argument. That video revealed, for the first time, that Word had referenced buying an engagement ring — exposing the full extent of the concealment. The complainant, now aware of the engagement, held Egan while he cried over another person through the night. Egan left the following morning, claimed he would return with the rest of his belongings, and never came back.

E.4 Blackmail, Extortion, and Threatening Conduct

Egan engaged in documented blackmail threats. On one occasion, he demanded diamond earrings through a "strong-armed" threat. He stated that he knew things "not conducive to" the complainant's career. On a separate occasion, Egan threatened to allege that illegal content existed on the complainant's phone — content that Egan himself had sent — and, for the first time, asserted that he had been underage in the materials at the time they were created. The complainant had no prior knowledge of or basis for this assertion.

E.5 Scooter Admission — Security Camera Evidence

Security camera footage captured Egan riding a repaired scooter — a scooter that had previously been the subject of a police report (BHPD Case #22-50765) — and saying, audibly: "haha Sean we got you!" This footage directly corroborates the conclusion in Section A of this report that the scooter vandalism incident was staged as part of a coordinated scheme.

E.6 Vehicle Intimidation and Physical Surveillance

The complainant reported that a blue SUV and a black Jeep were observed in proximity and would audibly rev their engines specifically at moments when the complainant spoke Egan's name aloud, suggesting active audio surveillance and real-time coordination by operatives monitoring the complainant's location.

E.7 AV System Harassment, Deepfakes, and Augmented Reality Imagery

The complainant reported hearing Egan's voice transmitted through the building's audio-visual system and through phone speakers. The complainant further reported that Egan's face and voice were swapped onto pornographic content posted on websites. Additionally, disturbing sexual imagery — including depictions of individuals in states of decomposition and videos of persons the complainant had romantic feelings for — was projected on walls in a manner consistent with augmented reality, viewable in enhanced detail through a phone in video mode with the lens zoomed in or out. Egan appeared frequently and prominently in this imagery.

On one occasion, while the complainant was packing, a voice that sounded like Egan said: "What about your Goyard duffel" — a bag only Egan knew the complainant owned, and which had been sold prior to the current events. This reference to a non-public, previously disposed item is treated as significant corroborating evidence of active surveillance. When the complainant subsequently called Egan to confront him about suspected involvement, Egan referenced a picture he had posted online, calling it "old" — before the complainant had mentioned knowing about the picture — indicating Egan possessed advance knowledge of the complainant's private communications or surveillance logs.

E.8 Kory Lamar Word/Ward — Conduct and Obstruction

Kory Lamar Word (also reported as Ward), Egan's secret fiance, reported to the complainant that Egan had been removed from their apartment on one occasion. On a later occasion, Word suggested that Egan had been sold and sex-trafficked across the border. Word made plans for a dinner meeting among the three parties but, immediately before departure, contacted the complainant to say that he and Egan had experienced a "heated moment," after which Egan became unreachable by FaceTime or in person. Word's mother, **Vallory Ward**, had previously agreed to take the complainant to visit Egan and Word at their apartment in Sherman Oaks, California. When the complainant returned her call after an extended wait, she appeared to be crying and was unable to explain why she no longer wished to proceed with the visit.

During a visit, Word was observed speaking into a device; the resulting audio feedback sounded like Egan's voice. Word stated it was a "voice app" and changed the subject. Egan had previously described his relationship with Word as violent and abusive, and stated he was afraid to leave.

E.9 Javier "Xavier" Ortiz — Intimidation and Warning

An individual identified as **Javier "Xavier" Ortiz** is reported to have intimidated and physically removed Egan from a location. When the complainant later contacted Ortiz in an attempt to understand Egan's whereabouts, Ortiz stated: "stop digging before you piss off the people usually responsible for the digging." This statement is treated as a direct threat intended to deter the complainant's investigation.

E.10 Documented Communication from Egan and Health Impact

Egan sent the complainant a text message reading: "It all just got too scary and out of control." This message is understood as an acknowledgment of involvement in events beyond Egan's own control. The complainant documented extensive health impacts: a weight loss of over **70 pounds**, clinical-level anxiety and depression documented by treating physicians, panic attacks, self-harm (including pulling hair and digging into skin until bleeding), suicidal ideation, and substance abuse. The complainant reported spending up to 14 hours at a time waiting for a single text response from Egan. The complainant's therapist and treating physician both noted these conditions as responses to trauma.

E.11 Legal Theories and Investigative Referral

Legal theories identified with respect to Kyle Joseph Egan and associated parties include: human trafficking; extortion and blackmail; harassment and stalking; fraud and conversion; civil conspiracy; and obstruction of justice. Investigative referral has been made to relevant authorities. A separate civil damages action is pending. Note: Richie Vetter (Richard Alan Vetter) is also identified as having employed similar tactics; a civil damages action against Vetter is not currently being pursued pending investigation into his involvement in criminal activity.

SECTION F — Yuri Richard Spiro: Financial Fraud, Unlawful Eviction, and Coordinated Conspiracy

F.1 Subject Identification

Yuri Richard Spiro is identified as the landlord of commercial premises at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210, and a resident of 31740 Broad Beach Road, Malibu, CA 90265. Spiro is named as a defendant in a Fifteenth Amended Complaint for Damages (Breach of Contract, Fraud, Unjust Enrichment, Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress, and Breach of Lease/Unlawful Eviction) filed in the Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles. The plaintiff in that action is Esra Dunca-Sprawling (formerly Rodney S. Sprawling, also known as Rodney Sprawling-Dunca).

F.2 The $385,000 Secured Promissory Note and UCC Fraud

On or about **September 10, 2021**, the complainant and Spiro entered into a secured promissory note for a loan of **$385,000**, secured by a lien on a **1990 Ferrari Model F40**. The note explicitly prohibited Spiro from selling or encumbering the collateral until the principal was fully repaid. The loan was due on **December 31, 2022**.

In early-to-mid 2022, the complainant was informed by an employee of Spiro's that Spiro was having the vehicle loaded onto a truck for transport. This was confirmed by a UCC Filing (Original) dated **October 3, 2022**, Filing Number **220232028322**, filed with the Secretary of State/UCC Division, Sacramento, California. The collateral is listed as "Unknown Vehicles Unknown," with debtors listed as Yuri Richard Spiro at both addresses. The secured party is listed as **Financial Bank I, 47 Sherman Hill Rd, Woodbury, CT 06798**. Spiro had secretly encumbered the already-

pledged collateral to secure a separate loan, in direct breach of the promissory note's terms.

Repayment demands were made in 2022 and 2023. On or about **February 8, 2025**, the complainant formally demanded immediate payment. Spiro ignored this demand and has made no payments. As of **July 28, 2025**, the total amount owed — principal of $385,000 plus accrued interest at **29.9% per annum** since September 10, 2021 — is approximately **$831,898.51**. Spiro had initially explained the 29.9% rate by stating it was a "scare" because "his whole life people never had a problem fucking over someone like me," and promised: "I will never make you feel that way." An IC3 (Internet Crime Complaint Center) complaint was filed reporting the wire transfer of $385,000 on September 10, 2021, to First Republic Bank.

F.3 The $125,000 Prior Loan and Lost Liquor License Revenue

Prior to the $385,000 note, the complainant extended a separate loan of **$125,000** to Spiro, with an explicit agreement that repayment would occur in under two weeks. Spiro failed to repay within the agreed period. Repayment was only eventually made after a direct confrontation, at which point a pre-signed cashier's check — already made out to the complainant and sitting in Spiro's assistant's office — was retrieved. The deliberate withholding of funds that were demonstrably already available caused the liquor license to remain in legal proceedings; the license holder's assets were taken in bankruptcy proceedings that might have been avoided with timely payment. Neighboring businesses reported revenues from beer and wine sales alone of $60,000 or more per month. For the period September 2021 through September 2022, the complainant estimates a resulting loss of revenue of **$720,000**.

F.4 The "Gion Beverly Hills" Failed Partnership

Spiro induced the complainant to open a restaurant and entertainment business called "Gion Beverly Hills" at 420 N. Camden Drive by promising: (a) rent-free use of unused commercial space as his equity contribution; (b) full use of his on-site staff; and (c) a partnership stake. The complainant committed substantial cash to the project in reliance on these representations. Spiro subsequently withdrew all support, claiming financial distress, without ever providing the promised staff or resources. Spiro's wife, **Malgosia Migdal**, was paid **$10,000** for interior design work, approved by both Spiro and Migdal. On the scheduled first day of construction, Migdal directed her contractor not to begin work, stating "I wouldn't

have allowed him to work for anyone else," indicating she pulled the contractor at Spiro's direction. This left the complainant with approximately **$300,000 in debt** before the business ever opened.

F.5 The $70,000 Security Deposit — Coercion and Bad-Faith Retention

The complainant was a commercial tenant at 420 N. Camden Drive, occupying two ground-floor commercial spaces. The **$70,000 security deposit** — $35,000 for Space 1 and $35,000 for Space 2 — was not part of the original lease agreement. Spiro demanded a lease revision incorporating the deposit and withheld the signed original lease until the demand was met, a tactic confirmed by the involvement of Spiro's assistant **Susan Weiss**. The original lease was returned only after UK-licensed producer and lawyer **Rhian Williamson** intervened via email, with all parties copied, advising Spiro to do so.

On **March 29, 2025**, the complainant formally demanded the immediate return of the $70,000 deposit. Spiro ignored this demand. He had previously claimed he was awaiting damage estimates from contractors but never provided an itemized accounting. Under California Civil Code Section 1950.5, a landlord must return a security deposit within 21 days of the tenant vacating with itemization; Spiro's failure constitutes bad-faith retention entitling the complainant to up to two times the deposit amount in additional statutory damages.

F.6 False Arrest, False Identity, and Unlawful Eviction

The complainant was arrested at 420 N. Camden Drive under the false name **"Anthony Sprawling."** The complainant was held for three days under this false identity and was denied access to legal counsel throughout that period. Movers are alleged to have been waiting at the property at the hour of the arrest, indicating pre-coordination. Spiro is alleged to have circulated a false narrative to law enforcement — characterizing the complainant as mentally ill, drug-addicted, and experiencing a mental breakdown — and boasted of close relationships with law enforcement personnel. This narrative caused responding officers to treat the complainant as a person in mental crisis rather than a crime victim or lawful tenant.

Witness **Keith Fraser**, a tenant in the same building, initially provided corroborating accounts of the harassment. He subsequently became uncooperative; when approached by the complainant, he physically fled the area. The complainant

was later informed that Fraser's lease was being terminated, attributed to a "wrongfully described confrontation." The complainant had previously overheard Spiro dismiss Fraser's corroborating account as evidence of the complainant's mental illness.

F.7 Coordinated Financial Scheme and False Promises

Spiro assured the complainant at various points that he was "family," that the complainant would "always have a place to live," and that he was "a man of his word." On one occasion he expressed in tears: "I don't want anyone to think I'm a piece of shit." These assurances are alleged to have been manipulative tactics designed to induce the complainant's continued financial contribution with no genuine intent to honor obligations. Spiro disappeared without explanation approximately one month before the $385,000 loan was due.

The total of Spiro's financial demands against the complainant — approximately $385,000 (loan), $70,000 (security deposit), and $45,000 (temporary rent) — summed to approximately **$500,000**, precisely mirroring the amount Andrei Dunca deposited into the complainant's account from the forced Mulholland Drive property buyout. Mid-December communications confirmed that Dunca and his assistant Victoria Garcia Winder were in direct contact with Spiro during this period, having promised to handle the recovery of the loan — a promise that was never acted upon.

F.8 Summary of Damages Sought

Damages sought against Yuri Richard Spiro include: approximately **$831,898.51** (principal and interest on the $385,000 note as of July 28, 2025); **$125,000** (prior loan); **$720,000** (estimated lost revenue from liquor license failure); **$10,000** (design payment to Malgosia Migdal); **$300,000** (debt incurred from contractor withdrawal); **$325,000** (security deposit, statutory penalties under Cal. Civ. Code section 1950.5, and temporary rent); plus restitution for unjust enrichment, punitive damages, prejudgment interest, and costs of suit.

SECTION G — Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, PsyD: Abuse of Professional Position, Ethical Violations, and Criminal Conspiracy

G.1 Subject Identification and Referral Agencies

Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, PsyD holds California License #PSY30807 and operates through **Unfold Psychology, A Heafey Practice**, with a business address at 1955 Mountain Blvd, Suite 101, Oakland, CA 94611 and a residential address at 226 Ritch Street, #302, San Francisco, CA 94197. A Criminal Complaint and Multi-Agency Referral, submitted by Rodney Samuel Sprawling, President of Dunca-Sprawling Inc. (also known as Esra Dunca-Sprawling), dated **August 14, 2025**, has been submitted to: the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI); the Department of Homeland Security (DHS); the Internal Revenue Service (IRS); the San Francisco Police Department; the California Board of Psychology; and the Superior Court of California.

G.2 Criminal Conspiracy and Abuse of Professional Position

Dr. Heafey is alleged to have used his professional position as a licensed psychologist to manipulate and control the complainant. He is accused of fabricating a diagnosis of "drug-induced psychosis" to discredit the complainant and provide professional credibility to a broader scheme of abuse. This fabricated diagnosis was used to justify the complainant's false imprisonment to third parties and to prevent credible reports of ongoing abuse from being taken seriously by law enforcement and emergency responders.

The scheme's financial motive is indicated by the timing of a specific inquiry: Dr. Heafey questioned the complainant about his husband Andrei Dunca's wealth **one day before** the complainant lost communication with Dunca — an alignment treated by investigators as highly significant. The combined net worth of the complainant and Dunca is estimated to exceed $500 million.

G.3 Sexual Misconduct and Predatory Conduct

Text communications attributed to Dr. Heafey included graphic sexual propositions: invitations to come to his office before early-morning clients for sex, offers to bathe the complainant in a newly installed steam shower, a request for anal sex, inquiries about "chem sex" involving GHB, and requests to arrange a threesome. Dr. Heafey provided the complainant with his office address and entry code. When the complainant declined, Dr. Heafey expressed being "very disappointed," called the complainant a "flake," and employed guilt as a coercive tool. A formal complaint also references an allegation of indecent exposure during a video conference. Yelp

reviews from other former clients corroborate a pattern of sexual misconduct, with multiple reviewers explicitly identifying Dr. Heafey as a "sexual predator."

G.4 Gaslighting, Psychological Manipulation, and Documented Quotes

Dr. Heafey engaged in systematic gaslighting throughout his interactions with the complainant. The following statements, attributed to Dr. Heafey in text message transcripts and communications, are documented verbatim:

- "It's easier to imagine when others do things 'against us' because then we don't have any responsibility: we are the victim." — Dismissal of the complainant's reported experiences of abuse.
- "he is not in danger" — Stated as an "ethical opinion" regarding the missing Andrei Dunca, without evidentiary basis.
- "say I let you get raped" — Profoundly abusive statement invalidating the complainant's reported trauma.
- "I find [your demands] consistent with a highly immature personality." — Pathologizing the complainant's distress.
- "Breakups are very difficult... rather than try and get back with a very, very wealthy man..." — Reducing the complainant's reported experiences of kidnapping, abuse, and a missing spouse to a romantic breakup.
- "You are just switching, pivoting, creating whatever narrative you think might persuade a person to help you." — Systematic undermining of the complainant's credibility.
- "Sean - I am not supposed to be talking with you. My fear is you think we have a clinical relationship. Let me be absolutely clear, we have NO clinical relationship. I am not your doctor." — Denial of a two-year clinical relationship while simultaneously confirming continued two-year post-termination contact.

G.5 Diagnostic Reversal Without Evidence

Dr. Heafey's initial clinical assessment characterized the complainant as "suffering anxiety triggered by a real source" and "otherwise sane." Without an in-person

evaluation and in contradiction of an administered **14-panel drug test** that returned negative results for all substances, Dr. Heafey subsequently reversed this assessment, stating: "In my clinical opinion you are suffering from delusions and possibly hallucinations: whether they are driven by methamphetamine misuse or were exacerbated by methamphetamines, I do not know." This reversal is directly contradicted by a corroborating letter from **Dr. Naheed Dilshad**, a concierge medicine physician in Beverly Hills, who thoroughly evaluated the complainant and documented that the complainant reported being harassed, with no finding of psychosis or drug involvement.

The complainant had deliberately staged a false representation of drug use in order to identify suspected surveillance operatives. Dr. Heafey's insistence on drug-induced psychosis — following and despite the negative drug test — is treated as evidence of his participation in or coordination with the surveillance apparatus monitoring the complainant.

G.6 Denial of Clinical Relationship and Post-Termination Contact

The complainant asserts that Dr. Heafey was terminated as a treating therapist. Despite this termination, Dr. Heafey continued to initiate contact for approximately two years post-termination, including late-night messages ("Are you up?") and the sexually explicit propositions described above. Dr. Heafey subsequently denied having initiated any of this contact, stating: "I haven't reached out to you in years. You keep contacting me" and "That is categorically untrue." These denials are directly contradicted by timestamped message logs and the complainant's documented communications.

G.7 Confidentiality Breaches and Collusion

Dr. Heafey admitted to discussing the complainant's treatment with **Victoria Garcia-Winder** (Andrei Dunca's assistant) and with Andrei Dunca himself — a direct violation of APA Code Standard 4.01 (Confidentiality). His communications contain references to financial and legal matters the complainant had never disclosed to him, including a specific reference to **"$200,000 stolen from Dunca"** — a sum the complainant had not raised with Dr. Heafey. Dr. Heafey also stated that "Victoria filed a restraining order" against the complainant, when in fact no restraining order existed in Victoria Garcia-Winder's name. This erroneous claim is treated as evidence of insider access to legal proceedings and coordination with opposing parties.

Dr. Heafey's communications also contained references to Andrei Dunca as "my friend" and to "Andrei's home" — language that both denies the complainant's marital status and reveals a pre-existing personal relationship with Dunca that was never disclosed, constituting a direct conflict of interest that should have precluded the therapeutic relationship.

G.8 Pressured Hospitalization and Document Signing

When confronted about his relationship with Dunca and suspected ties to the complainant's abusers, Dr. Heafey pressured the complainant to sign documents that would place the complainant under Dr. Heafey's care and grant Dr. Heafey authority to hospitalize the complainant and medicate him as Dr. Heafey saw fit. The complainant did not sign these documents.

G.9 Financial Fraud, Tax Evasion, and Bribery Attempts

Dr. Heafey made inconsistent financial representations, claiming limited financial means while owning a condominium valued at over **$1.1 million**. He allegedly attempted to bribe the complainant, with offers escalating from **$5,000** to a suggested **$600,000**, to induce the complainant to remove negative online reviews. An **IRS Form 3949-A** (Information Referral) has been filed by the complainant alleging tax evasion and financial fraud, based on the discrepancy between Dr. Heafey's claimed financial status and his actual assets and undisclosed income streams.

G.10 Restitution Sought and Total Damages

The complainant's Criminal Complaint and Multi-Agency Referral enumerates the following restitution demands directed at Dr. Heafey and the broader conspiracy: **$2,750,000** (half the value of marital community property at 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco); **$400,000** (last verifiable offer on marital community property at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas); **$835,299** (Spiro loan principal and interest); **$70,000** (Camden Drive security deposit); **$200,000** (Gion BH investment capital); **$720,000** (Gion BH estimated lost revenue); **$1,000,000** (property loss for refusal to return "The Captain"); **$2,000,000** (pain and suffering, special damages); **$30,000,000** (loss of production projects due to destruction of production companies); plus full service fees and attorney's fees. The enumerated total is **$7,975,299** plus additional amounts.

SECTION H — Andrei George Dunca (Expanded): Principal Financier, Technical Enabler, and Evidentiary Analysis

H.1 Role Summary

Andrei George Dunca is identified as the principal financier and technical enabler of the conspiracy documented throughout this report. His alleged acts include orchestrating coercive property transfers, depositing funds without consent to create leverage, making threats of bankruptcy, failing to recover assets despite explicit promises to do so, coordinating with co-conspirators, and ultimately disappearing — leaving the complainant without support or access to the marital estate. As stated in the underlying complaint: "Plaintiff alleges that Defendant Spiro's actions were part of a multifaceted and coordinated conspiracy with other individuals, including but not limited to Andrei G. Dunca and his assistant Victoria Garcia Winder, specifically designed to defraud, bankrupt, and defame Plaintiff."

H.2 Forced Property Buyout and Unauthorized Deposit

Dunca is alleged to have compelled the complainant to sign over property at **7711 Mulholland Drive**, Los Angeles, California, through threats of bankruptcy. Following this forced transfer, Dunca caused **$500,000** to be deposited into the complainant's bank account without the complainant's consent. As stated in the underlying complaint: "Andrei Dunca, without Plaintiff's consent, deposited $500,000 into Plaintiff's account." The complainant explicitly objected; Dunca refused to consider these objections. The $500,000 deposit is alleged to have originated from the Mulholland Drive forced buyout proceeds. Investigative requests have been issued for: subpoena of bank records associated with this deposit; title and escrow documentation for 7711 Mulholland Drive; forensic imaging of relevant devices; and interviews of escrow and bank personnel.

H.3 Bankruptcy Threats as Coercive Leverage

Dunca is alleged to have used the threat of bankruptcy as an active coercive instrument to compel property transfers and to justify the financial demands made by co-conspirators, including Spiro. The threat is alleged to have been carried out in coordination with Spiro's demands: specifically, Spiro's cumulative financial demands against the complainant totaled approximately $500,000 — mirroring exactly the amount Dunca had deposited. The threat of bankruptcy was later

described as having been "carried out" during the period when the complainant was being held under false imprisonment at 420 N. Camden Drive and attempting to contact Dunca.

H.4 Failure to Recover the $385,000 Loan — Promised Action Never Taken

In mid-December of the relevant year, Dunca and his assistant Victoria Garcia Winder were in direct communication with Yuri Spiro. Dunca specifically assured the complainant that he would personally handle the recovery of the $385,000 loan from Spiro and tasked Winder with executing this recovery. After weeks of waiting, it was revealed that no genuine recovery effort had been made. Dunca subsequently disappeared, leaving the complainant without funds, without the recovered loan proceeds, and without the marital support structure that had been in place for the duration of the relationship.

H.5 Evidence of Non-Participation in the Mudd Law Litigation

A critical forensic finding in this investigation concerns the conduct of Mudd Law Offices (MLO) litigation allegedly brought on Dunca's behalf. The litigation tactics employed by MLO are characterized as diametrically opposed to Dunca's documented historical conduct toward the complainant. Prior to the events documented in this report, Dunca provided monthly financial support exceeding **$35,000**, granted the complainant access to a Platinum American Express card, designated the complainant as an authorized signatory on a checking account, and provided pre-signed blank checks. Critically, Dunca never revoked the complainant's Power of Attorney (POA).

MLO filed a Motion for Contempt against the complainant for exercising rights under that POA — a legal maneuver that is described as legally implausible if Dunca himself were directing the litigation and had chosen not to revoke the POA. This discrepancy is treated as a significant indicator that Dunca may not be the actual directing party in the MLO litigation, or that the litigation is being conducted in a manner that does not reflect Dunca's informed or voluntary participation.

Additionally, the phone number **(415) 706-2984**, publicly listed and associated with both Sean Sprawling Productions and Teak Stage Productions, remains active and has not been deactivated — a fact inconsistent with a permanent and voluntary severance of the relationship and business interests.

H.6 Joshua Pagan / Mudd Law Offices — Procedural Irregularities

The following procedural irregularities have been identified in the MLO litigation conducted by Joshua Pagan:

- Remote affidavits lacking biometric verification.
- Withholding of intake notes from the complainant.
- Pro Hac Vice admission from Chicago, Illinois.
- eService certificates logging deliveries as "NOT SENT."
- Boilerplate objections used to suppress financial disclosures containing more than **$28 million** in marital estate financial data.
- Adoption of a DARVO (Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender) litigation strategy.
- Filing of Indirect Civil Contempt charges against the complainant for publishing a memoir — identified as a potential First Amendment violation.

H.7 Outstanding Investigative Requests

The following investigative actions have been formally requested with respect to Andrei George Dunca and associated parties:

- Subpoena of bank records documenting the $500,000 deposit transaction.
- Subpoena of title and escrow documents for 7711 Mulholland Drive, Los Angeles, California.
- Forensic imaging of devices held by Dunca, Winder, Pagan, and associated MLO personnel.
- Interviews of escrow officers and bank personnel involved in the Mulholland Drive transaction.
- Subpoena of wet-ink retainer originals held by Mudd Law Offices.
- Review of REN platform logs for communications relevant to the litigation strategy.
- Correlation of court filing timestamps with documented SIM swap events affecting the complainant's communications.

H.8 Central Coordinating Role

Across all sections of this report, Andrei George Dunca is identified as the central node connecting the financial, legal, digital, and physical tactics deployed against the complainant. His background in technology and investments is alleged to have provided the operational capacity and technical knowledge enabling the sophisticated digital and financial components of the scheme. His disappearance — following the execution of forced property transfers, the deposit of $500,000, the failure to recover the Spiro loan, and the commencement of MLO litigation — is treated as an intentional evasion of accountability and as further evidence of coordinated, pre-planned conduct.

SECTION I — OFFICER J. LYGA: ALLEGED MATERIAL ACTOR IN COORDINATED LAW ENFORCEMENT MISCONDUCT (BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT)

I.1 — Subject Identification and Alleged Relationship to Co-Conspirators

Officer J. Lyga is identified as a Beverly Hills Police Department (BHPD) officer alleged to be a material actor in the coordinated scheme to displace, discredit, and dispossess the complainant (Rodney Samuel Sprawling). Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, PsyD — a named co-conspirator documented in Section G of this report — has independently identified Officer J. Lyga as a personal friend. This personal relationship between Dr. Heafey and Officer J. Lyga is alleged to have direct relevance to witness bias and investigatory integrity in all matters touching the complainant's reports. Note: Detective Goff, also identified in this report, is not alleged to have a personal relationship with Dr. Heafey; the personal relationship alleged is specific to Officer J. Lyga.

I.2 — Incident of January 2, 2023: 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California

On or about January 2, 2023, individuals dressed in Beverly Hills Police Department uniform and driving marked BHPD squad cars approached the rear of the complainant's commercial premises at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210 — the former "Solon," which the complainant was in the process of

converting into "Gion Beverly Hills." The complainant was present in the rear of the premises when he observed uniformed individuals entering from the parking lot.

Upon their entry, an officer was audibly recorded stating: **"OKAY WHAT'S LEFT IN OUR LITTLE GAME."** Officers then called out: "Mr. Sprawling are you here, the door was open we wanted to see if you were okay." A male individual whom the complainant recognized as one of the stalking suspects — and who was not a police officer — spoke from the side of the glass doors and told the uniformed individuals that the complainant was watching "Kyle porn," a statement treated as a threatening reference to operative Kyle Joseph Egan (documented in Section E of this report).

The complainant observed green laser points directed down the hallway and directly saw a remote-controlled drone on the other side of the glass door that rammed the door repeatedly. He did not see the officers at the door but heard pounding on the walls and door, which is audible on the premises' security camera footage. The complainant locked the door, took cover, and repeatedly informed the uniformed individuals that the male individual was stalking and harassing him and demanded that the officers remove or arrest that individual. The officers refused.

I.3 — Failure to Provide Medical Aid and Abandonment of Scene

During the incident, the complainant informed the responding uniformed individuals that he was experiencing a severe panic attack and explicitly requested medical assistance. No emergency medical services or fire personnel were called. The officers did not render aid. The complainant was instructed to exit the premises with nothing in his hands. Fearing for his life, he refused, retreated to another room, experienced an escalating panic attack, took his prescribed Xanax, and lost consciousness.

When the complainant regained consciousness, the uniformed individuals had departed. All doors to the premises had been left unlocked. The interior of the premises had been rearranged to create a clear, unobstructed path directly to the complainant's position. The complainant alleges that the officers left him asleep and unattended despite: (a) his reported medical distress and explicit request for medical services; and (b) his multiple, repeated reports of the presence of an identified stalking suspect on the premises.

I.4 — Post-Incident Security Camera Evidence

Subsequent review of security camera footage from the premises captured uniformed individuals interacting with persons who appeared to be actors and an individual loading what appeared to be video equipment from the premises. The nature and purpose of this interaction and the removal of video equipment remain unexplained. This footage is identified as a high-priority evidentiary exhibit.

I.5 — BHPD Confirmation of Officer Identity

The complainant later provided the Beverly Hills Police Department with a photograph of the officer that Dr. Heafey had independently identified as a personal friend. BHPD confirmed that the individual depicted was a BHPD officer. However, it remains unclear and unconfirmed whether that officer was acting in an official law enforcement capacity during the January 2, 2023 interaction at 420 N. Camden Drive, or whether the interaction represented an unauthorized use of a police uniform, marked vehicles, or official authority.

I.6 — How These Acts Fit the Broader Theory of the Case

The complainant alleges that Officer Lyga's presence during the January 2, 2023 incident and the responding officers' refusal to remove an identified stalking suspect — together with the failure to provide or summon medical aid, the departure leaving the premises unsecured with all doors unlocked, the rearrangement of the interior, and the post-departure removal of what appeared to be video equipment — were not isolated errors or omissions. Rather, these acts are alleged to constitute part of a pattern of coordinated conduct that:

(a) Enabled the continued false imprisonment and harassment of the complainant by allowing a known stalking suspect to remain on or near the premises without intervention;

(b) Facilitated the removal and dispossession of the complainant's property and business by leaving the premises unsecured and accessible;

(c) Produced irregularities in evidence handling and scene control, including the unexplained departure with video equipment and the rearrangement of the interior;

(d) Contributed to the broader campaign to discredit and isolate the complainant by ensuring no official record of the stalking suspect's presence was made and no medical report was generated from the incident.

The personal relationship between Dr. Richard Austin Heafey and Officer J. Lyga is identified as a critical nexus point in the alleged conspiracy: Dr. Heafey is the treating clinician alleged to have spread the false "drug-induced psychosis" narrative used to preemptively discredit the complainant's reports to law enforcement and emergency services. Officer Lyga's personal friendship with Dr. Heafey, combined with his alleged conduct on January 2, 2023, raises substantive questions regarding whether law enforcement responses to the complainant's reports were coordinated with or influenced by Dr. Heafey's false clinical narrative.

I.7 — Key Evidence Identified for Investigation

The following items are identified as high-priority evidentiary materials relevant to this section:

- Security camera footage from 420 N. Camden Drive capturing the January 2, 2023 incident, including: the audible pounding on the doors and walls; the statement **"OKAY WHAT'S LEFT IN OUR LITTLE GAME"**; the stalking suspect's statement regarding "Kyle porn"; the remote-controlled drone; and the post-departure interaction involving uniformed individuals and the removal of what appeared to be video equipment.
- BHPD dispatch and unit logs for January 2, 2023, including records of which officers were dispatched to 420 N. Camden Drive, their arrival and departure times, and the official reason for the welfare check.
- BHPD internal affairs records related to any complaint filed by the complainant arising from this incident.
- The photograph provided by the complainant to BHPD and BHPD's written or recorded confirmation that the individual depicted was a BHPD officer.
- Communications between Dr. Richard Austin Heafey and Officer J. Lyga, including text messages, emails, phone records, and any records reflecting coordination regarding the complainant.
- Any BHPD incident report generated from the January 2, 2023 response, and documentation of whether a report was filed or suppressed.
- Personnel records and duty logs for Officer J. Lyga for the period including and surrounding January 2, 2023.

I.8 — Legal Theories Identified for Investigative Consideration

Based on the documented evidence and allegations, the following legal theories are identified for investigative consideration with respect to Officer J. Lyga and the responding uniformed individuals: deliberate indifference to serious medical need while acting under color of law (42 U.S.C. § 1983); failure to render aid; facilitation of stalking and harassment through willful inaction; conspiracy to deprive of civil rights (18 U.S.C. § 241); obstruction of justice; official misconduct; and abuse of authority. The personal friendship between Officer Lyga and Dr. Heafey is additionally identified as a basis for investigation into potential witness intimidation, investigatory bias, and coordinated civil rights violations.

SECTION II — SERGEANT DAVID MATHIEU: HARRIS COUNTY CONSTABLE PRECINCT 4 — INVESTIGATOR NON-RESPONSE AND INTERNAL REVIEW CONTRADICTION

II.1 — Subject Identification

Sergeant David Mathieu is identified as the assigned internal affairs investigator for IA Complaint #25120107 within Harris County Constable Precinct 4. Contact identifiers on record: email ****; phone **346-209-0656**.

II.2 — Allegation and Summary of Conduct

Sergeant Mathieu was assigned as the investigator for the complainant's internal affairs complaint. He contacted the complainant and specifically requested the full complaint package and all supporting exhibits. The complainant submitted comprehensive documentation on **December 3, 2025**. Forensic tracking of the transmitted materials confirms that Sergeant Mathieu never opened the files after receipt. He provided no follow-up, no status updates, and no acknowledgment of receipt. He refused to return follow-up calls.

This alleged inaction directly contradicts the subsequent representation made by Precinct 4 leadership — specifically, Assistant Chief Kenneth Key's letter dated December 8, 2025 — asserting that the complaint was “reviewed in its entirety.” The contradiction is central to the complainant's formal request to reopen IA Complaint #25120107, which the complainant asserts was closed without genuine review of the submitted evidentiary record.

II.3 — Evidentiary Record

The evidentiary record supporting this allegation includes: (a) the complainant's submission log dated December 3, 2025, transmitting the full complaint and all exhibits to Sergeant Mathieu; (b) forensic tracking metadata confirming the files were never opened; (c) the absence of any follow-up communication from Sergeant Mathieu; (d) the December 8, 2025 disposition letter from Assistant Chief Kenneth Key closing the complaint as “Unfounded” and limiting the scope of review exclusively to “the complaint on Deputy Ruiz” reviewed by the “Writ Division Administration” — a scope that, by its own terms, excluded review of Deputy Diaz's conduct, Deputy Jones's conduct, and the other allegations in the complaint; and (e) correspondence from the complainant preserving these facts and requesting supervisory review and reopening of IA Complaint #25120107.

II.4 — Broader Pattern and Connection to Civil Proceedings

The complainant contends that Sergeant Mathieu's non-response is not an isolated administrative failure but forms part of the broader pattern of Precinct 4 conduct documented in this report — a pattern that, as stated in the underlying court filing, “produced material omissions and procedural deficiencies affecting related civil matters.” As the complainant states: *“Deputy C. Diaz, on December 15, 2024, initiated this chain of suppression by refusing to conduct a standard missing person intake.”* Sergeant Mathieu's failure to act on the complaint, and the subsequent false representation that it was reviewed in its entirety, are alleged to have extended and perpetuated that chain of suppression into 2026.

II.5 — Legal Theories and Investigative Requests

The following legal theories are identified for investigative consideration with respect to Sergeant David Mathieu: obstruction of justice; deliberate suppression of a civil rights complaint; official misconduct; failure to perform statutory duties; and making or ratifying false representations in official capacity. Investigative requests include: forensic examination of Sergeant Mathieu's email and file-access logs for the period surrounding December 3–8, 2025; interview of Sergeant Mathieu regarding the basis for his failure to open the submitted materials; and production of all internal Precinct 4 communications regarding IA Complaint #25120107 from the date of filing through the date of the “Unfounded” disposition.

SECTION III — DEPUTY C. DIAZ: HARRIS COUNTY CONSTABLE PRECINCT 4 — REFUSAL OF MISSING PERSON INTAKE (CASE NO. 20244069284, DECEMBER 15, 2024)

III.1 — Subject Identification

Deputy C. Diaz is identified as a Harris County Constable Precinct 4 deputy whose conduct on December 15, 2024 is documented under **Case No. 20244069284**. Badge and entry identifiers are associated with that case number.

III.2 — Allegation and Summary of Conduct

On December 15, 2024, Deputy C. Diaz refused to accept a missing person report for Andrei George Dunca despite the complainant's presentation of documentary proof of standing — including the complainant's status as Dunca's common-law spouse and as agent under a recorded Statutory Durable Power of Attorney — and despite evidence of prolonged non-contact spanning over two years. Deputy Diaz allegedly: dismissed documentation offered by the complainant without review; relied exclusively on unverified third-party statements from an individual the complainant identified as Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, a named co-conspirator; failed to document standard intake elements, including identifiers, last-seen information, and welfare check attempts; and closed the intake without creating a formal missing person record.

The complainant contends that this refusal was not an isolated procedural failure but the initiating event in a chain of suppression, as stated verbatim in the complainant's court filings: *“Deputy C. Diaz, on December 15, 2024, initiated this chain of suppression by refusing to conduct a standard missing person intake.”*

III.3 — Procedural Consequences

The absence of a formal missing person record created an administrative gap that was subsequently exploited in civil litigation. Opposing parties cited the absence of a formal SFPD or Precinct 4 missing person record to contest the complainant's characterization of Andrei George Dunca's status and to assert that Dunca was not missing and was capable of directing litigation — arguments that the complainant contends are undermined by the evidentiary record but were procedurally facilitated by Diaz's refusal to conduct the intake. Had the intake been conducted

and a formal record created, the complainant asserts that opposing counsel's representations in civil court would have been subjected to greater scrutiny.

III.4 — Key Evidence

Evidence identified for investigation includes: the complainant's contemporaneous account of the December 15, 2024 interaction; the Power of Attorney recorded in Harris County on January 25, 2019, which the complainant presented as documentary proof of standing; any body camera or dash camera footage from Deputy Diaz's assigned vehicle for December 15, 2024; any radio or CAD (Computer-Aided Dispatch) records from that date reflecting the complainant's contact with Precinct 4; and the internal affairs complaint filed as IA Complaint #25120107, which included the December 15, 2024 intake refusal as a constituent allegation.

III.5 — Legal Theories and Investigative Requests

Legal theories identified for investigative consideration: failure to perform mandatory statutory duties in connection with a missing person report; deliberate indifference to serious safety risk under color of law; civil rights violations (42 U.S.C. § 1983); anti-LGBTQ+ bias in the exercise of official duties; and facilitation of civil fraud through administrative obstruction. Investigative requests include: interview of Deputy C. Diaz regarding the basis for the intake refusal; production of all CAD, body camera, and radio records for December 15, 2024; and review of Precinct 4's missing person intake procedures and training to assess whether the intake was conducted consistent with departmental policy.

SECTION IV — SERGEANT JOSEPH SIRAGUSA (#741): SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT, TARAVAL STATION — VIDEO CONFERENCE CLOSURE OF MISSING PERSON CASE (SFPD CASE NO. 240555714, SEPTEMBER 5, 2024)

IV.1 — Subject Identification

Sergeant Joseph Siragusa, **Badge #741**, is identified as a San Francisco Police Department officer assigned to Taraval Station. He is identified in court filings as the SFPD officer who conducted a video conference with Andrei George Dunca on

September 5, 2024, in connection with **SFPD Missing Person Case No. 240555714**.

IV.2 — Allegation and Summary of Conduct

On September 5, 2024, Sergeant Siragusa conducted a remote video interaction with an individual presented as Andrei George Dunca. Following this interaction, SFPD closed the missing person case with an administrative disposition of "Unfounded." The complainant alleges that this closure was procedurally deficient and potentially susceptible to manipulation because it relied solely on a single remote video interaction, without: (a) in-person verification of the subject's identity or well-being; (b) independent authentication of the identity of the individual appearing on the video call; (c) chain-of-custody documentation for the video contact; or (d) corroborating welfare checks or in-person confirmation by SFPD or another law enforcement agency.

The disposition is directly quoted in the court record of the opposing party's motion: *"On September 5, 2024, Mr. Dunca participated in a video call with an SFPD Officer (Sgt. Joseph Siragusa #741) to confirm that Mr. Dunca is not missing."* The opposing party cited this SFPD closure as evidence that Dunca was not missing and was capable of directing the litigation brought in his name.

IV.3 — Procedural Concerns

The complainant raises the following procedural concerns regarding the closure of SFPD Case No. 240555714:

(a) A missing person inquiry cannot reliably be resolved through a single remote video interaction without corroborating in-person verification. The individual appearing on a video call cannot be definitively identified without biometric or independent authentication.

(b) The complainant has documented throughout this report that sophisticated voice modulation and AI-based deepfake technology were alleged to have been used against him and potentially against Andrei George Dunca. The use of such technology in the context of a video call with law enforcement is consistent with the broader technological capabilities alleged in this case.

(c) The administrative closure based on this single interaction was subsequently used in civil court filings to undermine the complainant's missing person allegations,

directly affecting the complainant's ability to obtain judicial relief and to join Dunca as a necessary party defendant in civil proceedings.

(d) SFPD General Order DGO 6.10 (“Missing Persons”) establishes procedures for missing person intake, continuous investigation, and the circumstances under which a missing person investigation may be closed. The complainant contends that the closure of Case No. 240555714 based solely on a remote video interaction — without corroborating in-person verification — is inconsistent with best practices for missing person investigations and potentially inconsistent with DGO 6.10's procedural requirements, which presume risk until facts independently indicate otherwise.

IV.4 — Key Evidence

Evidence identified for investigation includes: the video recording of the September 5, 2024 video conference; any written notes or incident report generated by Sergeant Siragusa following the video interaction; the SFPD case file for Case No. 240555714, including all intake, investigation, and closure documentation; the chain-of-custody records for the video contact, if any exist; any communications between SFPD and parties in the related civil litigation regarding the case closure; and technical authentication records capable of verifying the identity of the individual who appeared on the video call.

IV.5 — Legal Theories and Investigative Requests

Legal theories identified for investigative consideration: failure to comply with SFPD DGO 6.10 missing person investigation procedures; obstruction of justice through premature administrative closure; potential facilitation of fraud on the court through the production of an administratively deficient closure record relied upon in civil proceedings; and deliberate indifference to safety risk. Investigative requests include: interview of Sergeant Siragusa regarding the basis for the case closure and the procedures followed to authenticate the identity of the individual on the video call; forensic analysis of the video recording for indicia of manipulation; and review of SFPD's compliance with DGO 6.10 in the handling of Case No. 240555714.

SECTION V — DETECTIVE GOFF: BEVERLY HILLS POLICE DEPARTMENT — CUSTODIAL MISCONDUCT AND DENIAL OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

V.1 — Subject Identification

Detective Goff is identified as a Beverly Hills Police Department detective who was present with two additional officers during the complainant's arrest, and who was again present when the complainant later retrieved property that had been booked as evidence.

V.2 — Allegation and Summary of Conduct

Detective Goff is alleged to have engaged in the following conduct during the complainant's custodial interaction:

(a) Conducted interrogation of the complainant without legal counsel present, notwithstanding the complainant's multiple explicit requests for access to an attorney — made immediately upon processing and during questioning.

(b) Refused to produce or permit the complainant to view the arrest warrant when the complainant demanded to see it, stating that the situation was *“not like on TV.”*

(c) Facilitated or failed to prevent the complainant's arrest and booking under the entirely fabricated alias **“Anthony Sprawling”** — a name that does not appear anywhere in the BHPD discovery packet — notwithstanding that the complaint initiating the arrest was filed by Yuri Richard Spiro, who knew the complainant's correct legal identity as his only commercial tenant and primary source of income and investment.

(d) Failed to check the complainant's identification upon arrest, which would have immediately negated any warrant associated with the false alias “Anthony Sprawling.”

(e) The complainant was held for three days as the sole occupant of the facility. During this period, bail was increased overnight from the standard amount of **$20,000** to **$100,000**, providing what the complainant alleges was the precise time window needed for Spiro's pre-staged movers to illegally clear 420 N. Camden Drive and change the locks.

(f) The complainant was denied access to a telephone and denied access to legal counsel throughout the custodial period, despite multiple explicit requests. The complainant was ultimately released on his own recognizance without having appeared before a judge and without ever being shown a warrant.

(g) Property seized during the arrest — including the complainant's phones, laptop, iPad, passport, driver's license, Social Security card, credit cards, and an engagement ring — was held for an extended period and was not immediately returned to the complainant upon his release. These items are inconsistent with the nature of the underlying charge and are alleged to evidence a targeted identity-erasure operation. Detective Goff was present when the complainant subsequently retrieved booked property.

V.3 — Evidentiary Record

The evidentiary record includes: the BHPD discovery packet for the underlying case, in which the alias “Anthony Sprawling” does not appear; court docket records in which “Anthony Sprawling” appears as the official name; records showing “Anthony Sprawling” attended subsequent hearings that the complainant was never notified of; the complainant's testimony regarding the overnight bail increase; booking records; property seizure and return documentation; and the complainant's contemporaneous account of the denial of counsel and warrant demands.

V.4 — Broader Connection and Legal Theories

The complainant ties Detective Goff's custodial conduct to the same pattern of coordinated official misconduct documented throughout this report. The deliberate use of a false alias, the overnight bail increase, the denial of counsel, and the retention of identity documents are alleged to have been essential components of a coordinated scheme to enable the illegal eviction from 420 N. Camden Drive and to suppress the complainant's ability to report ongoing crimes or seek legal relief. Legal theories identified for investigative consideration include: false imprisonment; denial of right to counsel (6th Amendment; 42 U.S.C. § 1983); conspiracy to deprive of civil rights (18 U.S.C. § 241); obstruction of justice; facilitation of fraud; and official misconduct.

SECTION VI — SUPPLEMENTAL PRECINCT 4 INCIDENTS: DEPUTIES RUIZ, JONES, AND PERRY

VI.1 — Deputy Ramon Ruiz (Badge #104) — Procedurally Defective Writ Execution (June 24, 2025)

Deputy Ramon Ruiz (Badge #104) executed the Writ of Possession for 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069, on **June 24, 2025**. A "FINAL notice" warning had been posted on **May 22, 2025 at 10:26 AM**. The execution occurred 33 days after the posted notice. As stated in the underlying court filing: *"The execution occurred 33 days after the required 24-hour warning notice was posted."* The complainant alleges this 33-day lapse rendered the 24-hour warning notice stale and the dispossession procedurally defective under **Texas Property Code § 24.0061(d)(1)**.

Upon arrival at the property on June 24, 2025, Deputy Ruiz refused to produce the court-signed Writ of Possession for inspection. Deputy Ruiz's own official return states that possession was *"returned back to representative Herbert's."* No authorized representative by that name was physically present at the property; the Writ of Possession was simply taped to the front door. This discrepancy between the official return and the documented facts at the scene is identified as a fraudulent chain-of-custody statement in the official record.

The writ execution also triggered a severe medical crisis for the complainant's mother, **Martha A. Sprawling** (a senior citizen), and his diabetic father, **Rodney Sprawling (MSgt USMC Ret., 30-year disabled veteran)**. Deputy Ruiz's own notes confirm emergency services were summoned: *"EDS 11 BOX 404 ARRIVED AND FEMALE DECLINED TO BE TRANSPORTED."* When the complainant attempted to initiate a missing person report for Andrei George Dunca on that same date, responding deputies threatened the complainant with arrest for making a "false police report."

The Writ of Possession was issued on **May 19, 2025** by County Clerk **Teneshia Hudspeth**, requested by attorney **Anna C. Sewart**. The underlying Precinct 4 internal affairs response regarding this matter reads: *"Upon receipt of your complaint on Deputy Ruiz, it was entered into the department Complaint Tracking System (#25120107) … The complaint has been closed with a disposition of 'Unfounded.'"*

VI.2 — Deputy D. Jones — Custodial Abuse and Criminal Intimidation (Case No. 2507-00573, July 5, 2025)

Deputy D. Jones is identified as the responding deputy in **Case No. 2507-00573**, arising from a 911 call made by the complainant on **July 5, 2025**, to report a break-in at 13339 Balmore Circle. Despite being the 911 caller and immediately presenting documentary proof of ownership, the complainant was placed in handcuffs by responding deputies based solely on an unverified telephone conversation with an unidentified third party. Deputies physically confiscated the complainant's working key to the premises and transferred it to the individual the complainant had called 911 to report.

While detained in the back of a patrol vehicle, the complainant suffered an acute panic attack. Deputy Jones refused to allow the complainant's father, **Rodney Sprawling (MSgt USMC Ret.)**, to administer the complainant's prescribed life-saving medication. When EMTs arrived and required law enforcement authorization to transport, Deputy Jones actively delayed authorizing transport. The After Visit Summary from **Houston Methodist Willowbrook Hospital Emergency Department**, overseen by **Dr. Mag de La Cruz**, confirmed the complainant presented with Blood Pressure of **161/73**, Pulse of **110**, Respiration of **16**, and received an official diagnosis of Anxiety and Panic Attack.

While the complainant lay in the ambulance visibly suffering, Deputy Jones leaned into the ambulance and falsely informed the complainant that criminal charges had been filed against him, taunting him to *"just turn himself in."* The complainant was transported to Houston Methodist Willowbrook Hospital Emergency Department. The medical record corroborating the panic attack, the elevated vitals, and the emergency department visit is identified as a high-priority evidentiary exhibit.

VI.3 — Key Factual Problems and Procedural Concerns (All Precinct 4 Incidents)

The complainant identifies the following key factual problems and procedural concerns spanning the Precinct 4 incidents documented in Sections II, III, and VI of this report:

(a) **Failure to follow missing person intake protocol.** Deputy Diaz declined to perform the standard intake on December 15, 2024, despite evidence meeting the department's missing person criteria. That refusal created an administrative gap

that was subsequently used to undermine missing person inquiries in civil court proceedings.

(b) **Investigator non-response and internal review contradiction.** Sergeant Mathieu's documented request for the full complaint, followed by an apparent failure to open or act on the submitted materials, directly contradicts the Precinct's subsequent representation that the complaint was “reviewed in its entirety.” That contradiction is central to the complainant's request to reopen IA Complaint #25120107.

(c) **Procedurally defective writ execution.** Deputy Ruiz's execution of the Writ of Possession 33 days after the posted notice, combined with his refusal to produce the signed writ, the phantom “representative Herbert's” return entry, and the simultaneous threat to arrest the complainant for reporting a missing person, are alleged to constitute a coordinated dispossession operation rather than lawful writ service.

(d) **Medical neglect and criminal intimidation during custodial detention.** Deputy Jones's refusal to permit administration of prescribed medication during an acute panic attack, his delay in authorizing EMT transport, and his false statement regarding criminal charges — made while the complainant lay in an ambulance — are alleged to constitute deliberate infliction of physical and psychological suffering under color of law.

VI.4 — Applicable Policy and Protocol

SFPD General Order DGO 6.10 (“Missing Persons”): Requires proper intake, documentation, and that missing person investigations be handled with procedures that presume risk until facts independently indicate otherwise. Reliance on remote verification without corroboration is inconsistent with best practices for missing person investigations. Cited for the proposition that the SFPD closure of Case No. 240555714 based on a single remote video interaction — and the Precinct 4 refusal to accept a missing person intake on December 15, 2024 — are both inconsistent with proper missing person investigation procedures.

Texas Property Code § 24.0061(d)(1): Governs the required notice periods for writ of possession execution. The complainant asserts that the 33-day lapse between the posted notice (May 22, 2025) and Deputy Ruiz's writ execution (June

24, 2025) rendered the writ's 24-hour warning stale and the execution procedurally defective.

42 U.S.C. § 1983: Provides a civil cause of action for deprivation of constitutional rights under color of law. The complainant identifies § 1983 as the primary federal basis for civil liability arising from the conduct of Deputies Diaz, Jones, and Ruiz, Sergeant Mathieu, Detective Goff, and Officer Lyga.

18 U.S.C. § 241: Prohibits conspiracy to deprive persons of their federally protected rights. The complainant alleges the coordinated pattern of conduct across multiple law enforcement jurisdictions and multiple incidents supports a § 241 conspiracy claim.

VI.5 — Legal Theories and Investigative Requests (Consolidated)

Legal theories identified for investigative consideration across all Precinct 4 incidents: deliberate indifference to serious medical need under color of law; false imprisonment and unlawful detention; denial of constitutional rights; obstruction of justice; official misconduct; filing of false official records (the “representative Herbert's” return); criminal intimidation; and civil rights conspiracy. Investigative requests include: production of all body camera and dash camera footage for June 24 and July 5, 2025 incidents; medical records from Houston Methodist Willowbrook Hospital Emergency Department for July 5, 2025; full Case No. 2507-00573 incident report; Writ of Possession return documentation for 13339 Balmore Circle; all internal communications regarding IA Complaint #25120107; and interview of Deputies Ruiz, Jones, and any supervising officer present during the June 24 and July 5, 2025 incidents.

SECTION VII — MUDD LAW OFFICES

VII.1 — Executive Summary

The reporting party alleges that Mudd Law Offices (MLO) and specific attorneys associated with the firm — including **Joshua Pagan** and **Charles Mudd** — participated in, facilitated, or knowingly concealed criminal conduct connected to the multijurisdictional scheme described elsewhere in this report. The allegations assert that MLO’s specialized technical expertise and litigation conduct were used to: (a) obscure digital evidence of criminality; (b) prosecute litigation without

verified client authority; and (c) obstruct or frustrate discovery of volatile digital and financial records. These allegations are presented for grand jury review and criminal investigation alongside the other subjects named in this report.

VII.2 — Quoted Material from Reporting Party's Filings

The following passage is excerpted verbatim from the reporting party's *Amended Motion for Investigation into Joshua Pagan, Charles Mudd, Mudd Law Offices*:

> *"This motion is based on credible concerns regarding their potential involvement in criminal acts directed against Respondent, including but not limited to cyber intrusion, false imprisonment, defamation, and intentional infliction of emotional and economic harm."*

— Amended Motion for Investigation into Joshua Pagan, Charles Mudd, Mudd Law Offices.

VII.3 — Quoted Material from Investigative Assessment

The following passage is excerpted verbatim from the *Investigative Assessment of Professional Liability: Mudd Law Offices*:

> *"It is highly probable that MLO either knew or should have known that the user was a victim of a sophisticated digital crime, such as digital kidnapping."*

— Investigative Assessment of Professional Liability: Mudd Law Offices.

VII.4 — Relationship to Broader Scheme

Mudd Law Offices' alleged involvement intersects with the allegations concerning **Andrei George Dunca** (Section H) and the broader coordinated scheme described in Sections A through C of the Forensic Investigative Findings. MLO is specifically

alleged to have leveraged technical litigation capabilities to suppress digital evidence and to have filed or prosecuted proceedings without verified client authority, thereby compounding procedural prejudice to the reporting party. The convergence of MLO's alleged litigation conduct with the digital and financial scheme documented throughout this report supports the inference that the firm's involvement was neither incidental nor independently motivated, but rather constituted a knowing and material contribution to the coordinated scheme described herein. This section is presented for investigative review and grand jury consideration in conjunction with all other sections of this report.

SECTION VIII — VICTORIA ALANA GARCIA WINDER

VIII.1 — Executive Summary

Victoria Alana Garcia Winder is identified in the reporting party's record as the assistant and primary point of contact for Andrei G. Dunca during the period when contested filings, financial transfers, and the eviction/arrest sequence occurred. The reporting party alleges that Winder withheld critical information, refused to verify Andrei's whereabouts or authority, and controlled communications and transactional threads in ways that materially affected the reporting party's ability to verify client authorization, trace funds, and recover property. The following section consolidates all factual assertions, documentary references, and probative issues for investigative consideration.

> *"Victoria Garcia Winder, who claims to still work as his assistant, was the last person to see Andrei but refuses to cooperate and give any details to help locate Andrei."*

> *"Victoria made herself the only point of contact for him."*

VIII.2 — Allegations Against Victoria Winder

- **Gatekeeper of communications:** Winder is alleged to have acted as the exclusive intermediary for Andrei, receiving and routing messages, and representing that she was handling his affairs while refusing to produce proof of authority or contemporaneous verification.
- **Refusal to cooperate with inquiries:** Winder allegedly declined repeated requests to confirm Andrei's location, status, or participation in litigation and declined to produce documents that would verify his consent to filings.
- **Custodial control of transactional records:** Winder is alleged to have had access to escrow/title communications, retainer or intake materials, and administrative records that are central to tracing the $500,000 deposit, the $385,000 loan, and other transfers.
- **Temporal correlation with contested actions:** The reporting party preserved logs showing account lockouts and service loss coincident with remote filings and notarizations; Winder's role as assistant places her in a position to receive or route communications during those windows.
- **Potential facilitation of concealment:** By withholding records and representing Andrei as unavailable or relocated, Winder is alleged to have impeded verification of client authority and may have contributed to spoliation or concealment of evidence.

VIII.3 — Factual Basis and Documentary Indicators

Last Known Contact and Point of Contact: The reporting party's police supplements and petition repeatedly identify Winder as the last person to see Andrei and as the person who “made herself the only point of contact.” These contemporaneous statements place Winder at the center of the information chain when Andrei became unreachable.

Communications and Timing: The reporting party preserved texts, emails, and call logs showing repeated attempts to reach Andrei that were routed through or answered by Winder. The preserved timeline shows loss of mobile service and

account lockouts during windows when contested remote filings and remote notarizations were submitted; Winder's administrative role makes her a primary custodian of any incoming or outgoing communications during those windows.

Transactional Custody and Financial Threads: Title, escrow, and bank records referenced in the reporting party's exhibits show unresolved transfers and encumbrances, including the contested $500,000 deposit and the $385,000 loan. Winder is alleged to have been the assistant tasked with following up on recovery of funds yet failed to produce documentation or to effect recovery, according to the reporting party's preserved correspondence.

Representations to Third Parties and Law Enforcement: The reporting party documents instances where Winder told third parties — including officers during wellness checks — that Andrei had moved or was otherwise unavailable. Those representations are inconsistent with unresolved property and escrow matters that required Andrei's signature, creating a factual tension for investigative review.

Refusal to Produce Verification or Retainer Documentation: Repeated requests for wet ink retainer agreements, client verification, and contemporaneous intake records were not satisfied by counsel or by Winder. The absence of these documents is a central evidentiary gap and a primary reason the reporting party alleges fraud on the court and potential spoliation.

VIII.4 — Probative Documentary Items

- **Communications exhibits:** Preserved texts and emails between the reporting party, Winder, and counsel showing routing of messages and Winder's responses.
- **Police supplements and petition excerpts:** Statements identifying Winder as last contact and point of contact.
- **Title/escrow and bank records:** Documents and transaction logs for 7711 Mulholland Drive and the $500,000 deposit; records showing the $385,000 loan and subsequent encumbrances.
- **Court docket entries and counsel correspondence:** Filings that reference Winder as assistant or contact and remote notarization certificates submitted during periods of reported account isolation.

- **Witness notes:** Contemporaneous notes and declarations from building staff, officers, and third parties who encountered Winder or received her representations.

VIII.5 — Witnesses and Custodians

- **Victoria Alana Garcia Winder** — testimony and production of all communications, calendar entries, device backups, and any documents she controlled or received on behalf of Andrei.
- **Reporting party** — preserved timeline, communications, and contemporaneous notes.
- Counsel and firm staff who interacted with Winder or received communications purporting to be from Andrei.
- Law enforcement officers who recorded Winder's statements during wellness checks or other contacts.
- Escrow/title officers and bank custodians who can confirm instructions, beneficiary designations, and the chain of transactional communications.
- Third parties (movers, building staff, tenants) who observed Winder's actions or who were given instructions by her.

VIII.6 — Discrete Factual Questions for Investigative Consideration

21. Did Winder have contemporaneous, verifiable communications with Andrei during the periods when contested filings and remote notarizations were submitted?
22. Can Winder produce wet ink retainer agreements, intake records, or other documents that verify Andrei's authorization for the litigation and for the transfers at issue?
23. What documentary basis did Winder provide to law enforcement or third parties when she represented that Andrei had relocated or was unavailable?
24. Was Winder in possession of escrow/title or bank instructions that were not disclosed to the reporting party or investigators?

25. Is there evidence that Winder knowingly withheld, altered, or failed to preserve records material to the investigation of the $500,000 deposit, the $385,000 loan, or the eviction/arrest sequence?

VIII.7 — Closing Observations and Evidentiary Significance

Victoria Winder occupies a central, documentable nexus in the reporting party's account: she is the proximate contact for the nominal plaintiff, the alleged custodian of transactional and communications threads, and a person whose cooperation materially affects the ability to verify client authorization, trace funds, and authenticate contested filings. The reporting party's preserved statements — including the direct assertion that Winder “was the last person to see Andrei” and that she “made herself the only point of contact” — are probative and justify focused inquiry into her records, communications, and representations. Investigators should evaluate whether Winder's conduct was administrative and benign, or whether it crossed the threshold into concealment, obstruction, or facilitation of the broader scheme described in this report.

SECTION IX — BRITTANY A. SMITH SPRAWLING: PERSON OF INVESTIGATIVE INTEREST

A. Executive Summary

Brittany A. Smith Sprawling is identified in the reporting party's record as a sister-in-law and a cybersecurity professional who initially corroborated the technical "playbook" used against the reporting party and later became a person of investigative interest. The reporting party alleges Brittany both described the attackers' methods — SIM porting, man-in-the-middle (MITM) routing, and network filtering — and subsequently engaged in conduct that materially impeded verification, facilitated isolation, and contributed to reputational discrediting. The reporting party further reports admissions by Brittany of intrusive conduct and sexual misconduct, and states that Brittany has since become unreachable. Her last contact was by email, and the reporting party characterizes that contact as misleading and similar in effect to communications attributed to other absent associates in this case.

> *"Following this, the complainant went to their sister-in-law, Brittany Smith, in San Diego before returning to Houston."*

> *"Brittany A. Smith Sprawling: Rodney Samuel Sprawling's sister-in-law and cybersecurity professional; initially corroborated the 'playbook' for the cyber attacks before issuing a suspicious 'cease and desist' order."*

B. Allegations and Reported Conduct

- **Initial corroboration then withdrawal:** Brittany initially described and corroborated the technical attack vectors the reporting party reported — SIM swap, routing manipulation, and targeted network filtering — and later issued a cease-and-desist and ceased substantive cooperation.
- **Alleged cyber operative role:** The reporting party alleges Brittany possessed and applied the same technical "playbook" used to isolate the reporting party, and maintained privileged channels that remained reachable while other channels were blocked.
- **Device access and unexplained damage:** Brittany accessed the reporting party's computer to "check for viruses." Shortly after that access, the reporting party reports unexplained and irreparable damage to the device.
- **Dual security numbers and routing anomalies:** Brittany reportedly maintained two telephone numbers for security and operational purposes. When the reporting party texted Brittany, she would ask which number was used. The reporting party observed that one of her numbers appeared not fully under her control, with texts and calls seemingly rerouted elsewhere for monitoring.

- **Proximity tactic:** Brittany admitted she formed a relationship with a male individual because she was "obsessed" with his girlfriend and wanted physical proximity to the female target — a calculated social engineering maneuver.
- **Unauthorized email access:** Separately, Brittany admitted she accessed a female target's email account without consent to monitor and track that person's communications.
- **Admissions of stalking and hacking:** Brittany admitted to stalking and hacking the accounts of individuals for whom she had romantic feelings.
- **Admission of sexual misconduct:** Brittany admitted to performing sexual acts with a romantic partner while that partner was intoxicated; the partner later described the incident as rape.
- **Public travel and professional presence:** While in contact with the reporting party, Brittany attended a hackers' convention in Las Vegas, indicating contemporaneous public travel and professional engagement consistent with the technical capabilities she allegedly described and applied.
- **Mirroring disappearance pattern:** Brittany's last contact was by email. The reporting party characterizes her final communications as false or misleading statements that discredited the reporting party's family and justified a cutoff of communication — a pattern the reporting party notes is similar to other disappearances documented in this case.
- **Geographic nexus — San Diego:** Brittany resides in San Diego, the same city where Kyle Joseph Egan last disappeared to, despite Egan having no previously documented ties to San Diego.
- **Current status:** Brittany is currently unreachable per the reporting party. Investigators should treat her as a person of interest and move immediately to preserve relevant records before spoliation occurs.

C. Timeline and Probative Indicators (As Reported)

- **Post-eviction refuge:** The reporting party arrived at Brittany's San Diego residence immediately after the Beverly Hills arrest and eviction. Brittany initially corroborated technical intrusion claims during this period.
- **Device access and damage:** Brittany accessed the reporting party's computer under the pretext of checking for viruses. The reporting party reports that the device suffered unexplained and irreparable damage shortly thereafter.
- **Convention attendance:** Brittany attended a hackers' convention in Las Vegas during the period she was in contact with the reporting party, confirming active professional engagement in technical security circles contemporaneous with the alleged attack period.
- **Number-specific routing anomaly:** When the reporting party texted Brittany, she asked which number was used. The reporting party observed that messages to one number were not reliably controlled by Brittany and appeared to be rerouted or monitored by a third party.
- **Last contact and disappearance pattern:** Brittany's final contact was by email. The reporting party reports that the content of that email was misleading and served to discredit the reporting party's family and justify cutting off communication — consistent with a coordinated isolation tactic documented elsewhere in this matter.

D. Documentary and Testimonial Items to Preserve

- **Communications exports:** Full text and metadata for texts, call logs, and email threads between the reporting party and Brittany from the Beverly Hills eviction through the San Diego stay and all subsequent contact.
- **Device forensics:** Forensic images of the reporting party's computer (pre- and post-Brittany access, if available) and any devices Brittany used to access the reporting party's systems.

- **Carrier and routing logs:** Call Detail Records (CDRs), SMS routing logs, SIM change histories, and forwarding/number-assignment records for both telephone numbers Brittany used.
- **Convention corroboration:** Registration records, travel receipts, social posts, or attendee lists confirming Brittany's attendance at the Las Vegas hackers' convention and the timing relative to her contacts with the reporting party.
- **Victim and witness statements:** A sworn statement from the romantic partner who described the sexual incident as rape; contemporaneous notes or recordings documenting Brittany's admissions about stalking, unauthorized email access, and the tactical relationship formation.
- **Third-party corroboration:** Statements from IT support personnel, friends, or family who observed device damage, routing anomalies, or Brittany's conduct during the relevant period.

E. Discrete Investigative Questions (For Law Enforcement or Grand Jury Consideration)

26. Did Brittany have authorized access to the reporting party's devices, and can she produce contemporaneous records documenting the purpose and scope of that access?
27. Do device forensic images corroborate the reporting party's account of unexplained damage following Brittany's access?
28. Do carrier records and routing logs show privileged message routing through numbers associated with Brittany while other channels were blocked, and do they document rerouting or monitoring of one of her numbers by a third party?
29. Can convention records confirm Brittany's attendance at the Las Vegas hackers' event and the timing relative to her contacts with the reporting party?

30. Are there contemporaneous admissions, messages, or witness statements that corroborate Brittany's reported admissions of stalking, unauthorized email access, and the sexual incident described by her partner?
31. Did Brittany form a relationship with a male individual for the purpose of gaining proximity to a female target, and do communications or travel records corroborate that tactical intent?

F. Closing Observation and Recommended Immediate Actions

Brittany A. Smith Sprawling occupies a critical nexus in the reporting party's account: she is a family contact who initially corroborated the technical attack narrative, had direct physical access to the reporting party's devices, and — according to the reporting party — later admitted to intrusive and criminal conduct while becoming unreachable. Her geographic co-location with Kyle Joseph Egan in San Diego, despite neither party having documented prior ties there, warrants immediate investigative scrutiny.

The reporting party's observation that one of Brittany's numbers appeared not fully under her control, and that texts and calls to that number were being rerouted or monitored by a third party, elevates the urgency of preserving carrier routing logs, SIM change histories, and device forensic images before those records age out of carrier retention windows. Investigators should immediately preserve all communications and device evidence identified above and schedule a recorded interview with Brittany as soon as she is located.

SECTION X — SIMON McPHILLIPS (aka SIMON PHILLIPS): ALLEGED PROFESSIONAL BETRAYAL, FINANCIAL MISAPPROPRIATION, AND COORDINATION IN DESTABILIZATION CAMPAIGN

Subject: Simon McPhillips (aka Simon Phillips) — Actor/Producer, 100+ Film & Television Credits
Associated Entities: Pine Stage Productions; Sean Sprawling Productions
Associated Individuals: Paul Tanter (director/producer); Richie Vetter; Andrei

George Dunca

Productions at Issue: *Most Horrible Things*; *Age of the Living Dead* (Seasons 1–2); *Killing the Cure*

X.1 — Executive Summary

Simon McPhillips (professionally known as Simon Phillips) is identified in the reporting party's preserved record as a close personal friend, long-term creative collaborator, and co-producer whose conduct — immediately following the completion of their final shared feature film — mirrors the coordinated pattern of abandonment, financial extraction, and communicative isolation documented throughout this report. The reporting party alleges that McPhillips abruptly ceased all professional and personal communication coinciding precisely with the onset of the harassment and stalking campaign against Sprawling and the disappearance of Andrei George Dunca. The reporting party further alleges that McPhillips extracted tens of thousands of dollars in development funds designated for upcoming projects that never materialized, refused to return those funds, and actively disregarded requests for assistance with critical evidence. Cryptic statements attributed to McPhillips and his close associate Paul Tanter — including an overheard reference to a monitored "production" involving the psychological torturing of an individual — are alleged to implicate both men in direct knowledge of, or participation in, the broader scheme documented herein.

X.2 — Professional and Personal Context

Prior to the onset of the documented harassment and stalking campaign, Rodney Samuel Sprawling and Simon McPhillips maintained a close personal friendship and a highly integrated professional partnership. They traveled together, shared plans for long-term collaborations, and successfully produced three feature films under

the banners of Sean Sprawling Productions and Pine Stage Productions, the final film being *Most Horrible Things*. Their collaboration extended into television, with McPhillips and Sprawling working on the series *Age of the Living Dead* (Seasons 1 and 2) and *Killing the Cure*.

It is critical to note that McPhillips is a highly successful and prolific producer and actor, holding over 100 credits in film and television. This extensive track record establishes that McPhillips is not an inexperienced filmmaker, but a deeply connected industry veteran with the resources, network, and operational knowledge to successfully manage complex productions, safety protocols, and distribution pipelines. Additionally, McPhillips maintains an exceptionally close personal and professional alliance with director/producer Paul Tanter, characterized as a primary friendship and alleged close physical partnership.

X.3 — Chronology of Alleged Incidents and Actions

1. Abrupt Professional Abandonment and Timeline Alignment

Immediately following the completion of *Most Horrible Things*, and coinciding precisely with the onset of the severe harassment and stalking campaign against Sprawling — as well as the disappearance of his spouse and business partner, Andrei George Dunca — McPhillips abruptly abandoned his fiduciary and professional duties. Despite his proven capability as a successful producer, he ceased all communications (calls, texts, emails) and failed to follow up with distributors, sales agents, or promotional duties required to ensure the shared film's commercial success.

2. Alleged Financial Misappropriation and Pattern of Fraud

McPhillips extracted tens of thousands of dollars from Sprawling, explicitly designated for the development of upcoming film and television projects, which never materialized. Following the extraction of these funds, McPhillips refused to follow up on the projects' status or return any of the capital. The reporting party alleges this aligns with a broader behavioral pattern of fraudulent operational activity practiced by McPhillips across multiple third parties — enticing victims by

promising collaborative projects, extracting significant upfront capital, and subsequently misappropriating those funds to finance personal liabilities, including the support of a child with his known partner, an alleged second child outside of that primary relationship, and a reported substance dependency. The extracted funds are alleged to have been systematically reallocated or skimmed via invoices for third-party services routing back to accounts controlled by McPhillips.

3. Documented History of Unsafe and Unethical Production Practices

- **The Explosive Door Incident:** On one of McPhillips's productions, critical safety protocols involving practical explosives were entirely disregarded. During an explosion scene, a heavy door was violently launched directly toward two actors, nearly striking them and placing them in immediate, lethal danger.
- **Exploitation and Endangerment of Extras:** Background extras were severely underpaid at a rate of $35 per day — vastly below standard industry minimums — while being coerced into performing physical stunts without specialized safety protocols, trained stunt coordinators, or required hazard compensation. This documented pattern of disregarding human safety on set is cited by the reporting party as establishing a character precedent directly relevant to the "Live Production" hypothesis.

4. Cryptic Remarks and the "Live Production" Dialogue

During the period of isolation, McPhillips made several cryptic remarks to Sprawling suggesting direct knowledge of, or involvement in, the ongoing cyber intrusions, digital manipulation, and communication interference. Furthermore, Sprawling overheard a conversation between McPhillips and his close associate Paul Tanter discussing a "production" involving the active torturing of an individual. The specific phrasing attributed to that conversation was:

> *“Just when you think he's had enough, can't take anymore, he's hit with something else.”*

This statement is cited by the reporting party as evidence that the harassment and cyber intrusion were organized as a monitored, non-consensual "production" — a calculated spectacle utilizing real-time distress for external monitoring or entertainment purposes.

5. The Beverly Hills Equipment Incident and Suppression of Evidence

Sprawling captured video footage at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210, depicting what the reporting party characterizes as law enforcement colluding with actors in a production and loading video equipment from the premises. Sprawling transmitted this footage to both McPhillips and Tanter, requesting their assistance to enhance the audio for investigative purposes. Despite McPhillips's status as a veteran producer with an extensive network of audio and post-production professionals, he completely ignored the request. Tanter verbally committed to locating an industry professional for audio enhancement but failed to follow up. The reporting party characterizes this collective refusal as active obstruction designed to protect the identities and instructions of the individuals captured in the footage — the same footage corroborated by the security camera record documented in Section I of this report.

6. False Promises of Intervention

Early in the communication blackout, McPhillips told Sprawling he would speak with Andrei George Dunca regarding Dunca's sudden abandonment and the ongoing distress. McPhillips never executed this follow-up, utilizing the promise as a delaying mechanism prior to Dunca's subsequent disappearance. This pattern mirrors the "false promise" delay tactics documented in connection with Tanter's audio enhancement commitment — offering fake assistance followed by complete inaction to waste the target's critical time and compound psychological exhaustion through repeated cycles of false hope and abandonment.

7. The eSIM / Richie Vetter Identity Incident

Due to being entirely ignored while experiencing severe abuse and potential homelessness, Sprawling purchased a prepaid eSIM and sent a text message from the new number to report the abuse. McPhillips responded, mistakenly believing the sender was Richie Vetter — an associate introduced to McPhillips on the set of *Most Horrible Things*. Believing Vetter was reporting the abuse, McPhillips

unquestioningly accepted the validity of the claims and immediately offered Vetter a "lifeline" and sanctuary at his home in Canada. Upon Sprawling revealing his true identity and correcting the mistake, McPhillips instantly ceased all communication once again. The reporting party identifies this incident as a critical indicator of the conspiracy's internal operating rules: specific individuals within Sprawling's network are actively protected or recruited, while Sprawling himself is explicitly marked for unmitigated targeting.

X.4 — Structural Implications of the Alleged Conspiracy

A. Weaponization of Unsafe Environments: The verified historical pattern of McPhillips disregarding explosive safety protocols and forcing underpaid extras into unprotected stunt work establishes a character precedent: McPhillips is demonstrably willing to place human beings in severe physical danger to achieve a production goal. The reporting party cites this history as directly validating the feasibility of the "Live Production" hypothesis — establishing that inflicting trauma or danger upon individuals for the sake of a "shoot" is an established operational tactic, not an anomaly.

B. Premeditated Sabotage of Shared Assets: Given McPhillips's extensive producing background, his sudden abandonment of distribution and promotional duties for *Most Horrible Things* cannot be attributed to incompetence or lack of resources. The reporting party characterizes it as a deliberate act of professional and financial sabotage designed to suppress Sprawling's professional momentum and financial return at a time of peak personal vulnerability.

C. Coordinated Multi-Layered Destabilization: The exact alignment of McPhillips's communication blackout, his abandonment of producing duties, the launch of the harassment campaign, and Dunca's disappearance indicates a highly coordinated operation. By removing Sprawling's primary business partner and spouse while simultaneously cutting off his primary creative collaborator, the operation effectively dismantled both Sprawling's personal support structure and professional infrastructure overnight.

D. Systematic Resource Extraction and Cross-Production Commingling: The reporting party alleges that McPhillips's extraction of development capital from Sprawling was part of a systematic, predatory model: leveraging false promises of collaboration to use targeted individuals as unacknowledged financing vehicles for other creative assets. Within the context of the broader conspiracy, this effectively forced Sprawling into an artificial state of financial starvation while his own capital was used to build up separate productions — ensuring the target was financially paralyzed and unable to secure legal counsel, hire investigators, or relocate.

E. Asymmetric Empathy and Co-opted Networks: The eSIM incident demonstrates that specific individuals within Sprawling's network are actively protected or recruited by the alleged conspirators, while Sprawling is explicitly marked for unmitigated targeting. McPhillips's immediate willingness to unquestioningly believe the abuse and offer international sanctuary to an associate (Vetter), while completely ignoring identical reports from his close friend and collaborative partner (Sprawling), proves that the isolation is a strict operational mandate.

F. Suppression of Objective Evidence: The collective refusal of both McPhillips and Tanter to utilize their vast industry resources to enhance the Beverly Hills video audio constitutes active obstruction. By denying technical assistance, they effectively protected the identities, instructions, and conversations of the individuals involved in the Camden Drive incident documented in Section I of this report.

G. “False Promise” Delay Tactics: Both McPhillips (promising to speak with Dunca) and Tanter (promising to find an audio engineer) utilized identical tactics: offering fake assistance followed by complete inaction. The reporting party identifies this behavioral pattern as designed to waste the target's critical time, delay his ability to seek legitimate help elsewhere, and compound psychological exhaustion through repeated cycles of false hope and abandonment — a tactic mirroring conduct attributed to other named subjects throughout this report.

X.5 — Associated Subject: Paul Tanter

Paul Tanter (director/producer) is identified as McPhillips's closest personal and professional associate and is implicated alongside McPhillips in two specific incidents: (1) the overheard "Live Production" conversation referencing an individual being tormented past his limits — quoted above — and (2) the false promise of locating an audio professional to enhance the Beverly Hills equipment footage. Investigators should treat Tanter as a person of interest requiring independent inquiry into his communications with McPhillips during the relevant period, his knowledge of the Beverly Hills incident, and any involvement in production activities coinciding with the harassment timeline.

X.6 — Evidence Items and Documentary Record to Preserve

- All communications (texts, emails, call logs) between Sprawling and McPhillips from the completion of *Most Horrible Things* through the communication blackout, including any messages sent from the prepaid eSIM number and McPhillips's response mistaking Sprawling for Richie Vetter
- Financial records documenting fund transfers from Sprawling to McPhillips or Pine Stage Productions designated for development of upcoming film and television projects, and any invoices generated against those funds
- Production contracts, distribution agreements, and promotional records for *Most Horrible Things*, *Age of the Living Dead* (Seasons 1–2), and *Killing the Cure*
- The Beverly Hills security camera footage (420 N. Camden Drive) transmitted to McPhillips and Tanter, and any written or recorded acknowledgment of receipt by either party
- Any communications between McPhillips and Andrei George Dunca during the relevant period, including messages McPhillips promised to send regarding Dunca's abandonment of Sprawling

- Communications between McPhillips and Paul Tanter during the harassment period, including those in which the overheard "Live Production" conversation occurred
- Industry safety incident records, SAG-AFTRA filings, or insurance claims related to the explosive door incident and the underpaid extras/stunt incident on McPhillips's other productions
- eSIM purchase records, carrier logs, and message metadata for the prepaid number used by Sprawling to contact McPhillips during the blackout period
- Records of McPhillips's parallel productions during the relevant period showing financial flows, third-party invoices, and any commingling of funds

X.7 — Discrete Investigative Questions

32. Did McPhillips receive development funds from Sprawling designated for specific upcoming productions, and can he produce documentation showing those funds were deployed for their stated purpose rather than commingled with other production accounts or personal expenses?
33. What was the specific basis for McPhillips's complete cessation of communication with Sprawling immediately following the completion of *Most Horrible Things*, and does the timing of that cessation correlate with contact between McPhillips and Andrei George Dunca, Victoria Garcia Winder, or any other named subject in this report?
34. Can carrier records and message metadata for the prepaid eSIM number corroborate the reporting party's account of the Richie Vetter identity incident, and do McPhillips's response messages reflect awareness that the sender was Sprawling rather than Vetter prior to the disclosure?
35. What is the full content and context of the "Live Production" conversation overheard by Sprawling between McPhillips and Tanter, and are there

additional witnesses, recordings, or prior similar statements that corroborate or contradict the reporting party's account?

36. Did McPhillips or Tanter take any steps to enhance, preserve, or transmit the Beverly Hills footage after receiving it from Sprawling, and if not, what justification did they provide for their failure to assist?
37. Do McPhillips's other productions during the relevant period show a pattern of financial irregularities, undisclosed commingling of funds, or investor/collaborator complaints consistent with the predatory development model alleged by the reporting party?
38. What communications existed between McPhillips and Paul Tanter regarding Sprawling during the harassment period, and do those communications reflect awareness of Sprawling's circumstances or any coordinated response to his requests for assistance?

X.8 — Closing Observations and Evidentiary Significance

Simon McPhillips occupies a uniquely significant position in the reporting party's account because the alleged betrayal originates from within a close, long-term personal and creative partnership — not from a landlord, attorney, or financial actor with an obvious adversarial motive. The precision with which McPhillips's communication blackout aligned with the launch of the harassment campaign and Dunca's disappearance, combined with the overheard "Live Production" dialogue and the eSIM identity incident, collectively suggest coordinated operational knowledge rather than coincidental withdrawal. His documented production history — specifically the disregard for explosive safety protocols and the exploitation of unprotected extras — establishes a factual character precedent supporting the plausibility of the broader "Live Production" hypothesis advanced in multiple sections of this report. The reporting party's preserved communications, financial records, and the Beverly Hills security footage transmitted to McPhillips and Tanter constitute a traceable evidentiary chain that investigators and advisory counsel

should prioritize. Investigators should further examine whether McPhillips and Tanter's refusal to assist with audio enhancement of the Beverly Hills footage constitutes active obstruction of evidence, and whether the asymmetric response to the eSIM contact — immediate sanctuary for Vetter, complete silence for Sprawling — reflects internal operational rules governing the alleged conspiracy's network of participants.

SECTION XI — JESSICA HARVEY, UNIDENTIFIED PRIVATE SECURITY PERSONNEL, AND SUPPLEMENTAL McPHILLIPS/TANTER FINDINGS: THE "LIVE PRODUCTION" HYPOTHESIS AND COORDINATED EVICTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Subjects: Jessica Harvey (Building Manager, 420 N. Camden Drive); Unidentified Private Security Personnel; Simon McPhillips (Supplemental); Paul Tanter (Supplemental)
Property: 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210 (Spiro Properties / Yuri Richard Spiro, owner)
Associated Entities: Spiro Properties; Pine Stage Productions; Sean Sprawling Productions

XI.1 — Executive Summary

This section documents additional subjects and incidents not fully addressed in Section X, including the specific conduct of building manager Jessica Harvey, unidentified private security personnel stationed at 420 N. Camden Drive, and supplemental findings concerning Simon McPhillips and Paul Tanter. Collectively, these subjects are alleged to have contributed to a coordinated, multi-layered infrastructure of surveillance, intimidation, sexual harassment, evidence suppression, and financial sabotage. The incidents documented below are

presented in support of the "Live Production" hypothesis — the reporting party's theory that the harassment, stalking, and forced isolation were organized as a monitored, non-consensual production utilizing real-time distress for external monitoring or entertainment. Two specific pieces of evidence are identified as structural pillars supporting this hypothesis: (1) the overheard McPhillips–Tanter conversation documented in Section X; and (2) the private security guard's statement — directed at an unseen third party — of "Did you get it?" immediately following the cessation of a staged sexual act.

XI.2 — Jessica Harvey: Building Manager — Defamation, Confidentiality Breach, and Obstruction

Jessica Harvey served as the building manager of 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210, the commercial premises where Sprawling held his tenancy and operated his business. The reporting party alleges Harvey actively contributed to a hostile environment through the following documented conduct:

- **False identification of Sprawling as a vandal:** Harvey falsely identified Sprawling as a vandal to third parties, including neighboring tenants and law enforcement contacts. This false identification was a material element in the criminal pretext used to initiate the arrest documented in Sections A and V of this report.
- **Breach of tenant confidentiality:** Harvey disclosed to Nicholas Griffin — the complainant in the scooter vandalism case — that Sprawling was "in the midst of being evicted." As documented in Section A.2 of this report, that disclosure provided Griffin with financial and personal motive to participate in the false identification of Sprawling from surveillance footage. Harvey's breach of tenant confidentiality was thus a proximate cause of the corrupted evidentiary chain underlying BHPD Case #22-50765.
- **Interference with neighbor inquiries:** When neighboring tenants and visitors raised concerns about the activities occurring at the property —

including the presence of uniformed security personnel conducting surveillance, the staging of incidents, and what appeared to be a coordinated media production — Harvey ran active interference to diffuse those inquiries and protect the operation from external scrutiny.

- **Failure to notify Sprawling of private security:** Harvey failed to notify Sprawling of the introduction of private security personnel onto the property, despite her obligations as building manager. The reporting party alleges this concealment was deliberate — designed to prevent Sprawling from formally objecting to or documenting the security presence prior to its operational deployment.

XI.3 — The Eviction Motive: Yuri Spiro Building Sale and Vacant-Delivery Condition

Public records confirm that Yuri Richard Spiro sold the 420 N. Camden Drive property in a rushed, seven-day, all-cash, non-contingent transaction for **$13,500,000**. Critically, the sale was contingent upon the building being delivered *vacant*. The reporting party alleges that this massive financial incentive — dependent entirely on clearing all tenants from the property — provided Spiro, Harvey, and associated actors with a powerful and documentable financial motive to employ any tactics necessary, including unlawful and hostile ones, to force Sprawling out of the property.

The seven-day, all-cash, non-contingent structure of the sale is itself anomalous and warrants investigative scrutiny: it suggests the buyer and seller had a pre-existing relationship and a shared understanding of the property's condition, including the status of the eviction proceedings. Investigators should obtain the closing documents, buyer identification, and any communications between Spiro and the buyer or buyer's representatives during the period when the harassment and eviction operation was being conducted.

XI.4 — The "Security Substitution": Coordinated Intimidation and Covert Surveillance Infrastructure

When Sprawling attempted to leave the building, he was intimidated by plainclothes individuals patrolling and monitoring the building's exits — the same individuals documented in earlier sections as engaging in vehicular surveillance, using remote-controlled drones, and coordinating with stalking operatives. Following Sprawling's formal complaints about these individuals, they abruptly vanished and were immediately replaced by uniformed "private security" personnel.

The reporting party alleges that these uniformed guards were not independent security contractors but were co-conspirators from the same operational network, redeployed in a professional uniform to lend the ongoing surveillance a veneer of legitimacy. Harvey's failure to notify Sprawling of this security presence, combined with the precise timing of the transition from plainclothes to uniformed operatives immediately following Sprawling's complaints, is treated as evidence of coordinated deployment rather than a legitimate property management decision.

Video evidence captured a uniformed security guard actively colluding with an identified stalker. The guard was recorded stating: *"We have to get him out of there."* This recorded statement corroborates the allegation that the private security personnel's operational mandate was not the protection of the property or its lawful tenants, but the physical removal and continued harassment of Sprawling.

XI.5 — Sexual Misconduct by Private Security Personnel and the "Did You Get It?" Recording Incident

The private security presence at 420 N. Camden Drive actively contributed to a highly sexualized and hostile atmosphere during Sprawling's forced self-isolation and false imprisonment within the building. The reporting party documents two specific incidents of overt sexual misconduct by the private security personnel:

- **Public sexual acts — masturbation:** Sprawling observed private security personnel engaging in explicit sexual acts while on duty, including masturbating in their assigned vehicles on the property.
- **Public sexual acts — fellatio:** On one specific occasion, Sprawling witnessed a security guard performing fellatio on another guard through the open passenger door of a vehicle parked on or adjacent to the property.

The reporting party further documents a critical evidentiary incident arising from the second sexual act:

The Recording Incident and the "Did You Get It?" Statement: When Sprawling attempted to record the explicit act for evidentiary purposes, the guards exhibited an immediate and unnatural awareness of his recording despite not having a direct line of sight to him. They instantly ceased the sexual act. One guard was then overheard speaking to an unseen third party, asking:

> *“Did you get it?”*

The phrasing "Did you get it?" is unambiguous in context: it is a question directed to a camera operator, asking whether the footage of the sexual act was successfully captured. The reporting party alleges this confirms that the sexual acts performed by the private security personnel were not spontaneous misconduct but were deliberately staged performances, intentionally filmed by an unseen operator for an external audience. The guards' unnatural awareness of Sprawling's recording despite the absence of a sightline further indicates the presence of active counter-surveillance monitoring Sprawling's device usage in real time.

XI.6 — The "Live Production" Hypothesis: Structural Validation

The reporting party identifies the following as the two strongest structural pillars validating the "Live Production" hypothesis — the theory that the harassment, stalking, cyberattacks, and forced isolation documented throughout this report were organized as a monitored, non-consensual production utilizing Sprawling's real-time distress for external viewing:

Pillar One — The McPhillips–Tanter Conversation (documented in Section X): The overheard statement — *"Just when you think he's had enough, can't take anymore, he's hit with something else"* — is described as a commentary on an ongoing, monitored subject experiencing escalating torment, consistent with a director or producer observing and discussing the progress of an active non-consensual production.

Pillar Two — The Private Security "Did You Get It?" Statement: The private security guard's immediate cessation of a staged sexual act upon detecting Sprawling's recording attempt, followed by the verbatim question *"Did you get it?"* addressed to an unseen party, is structural confirmation that the acts being performed at the property were scripted events being filmed for an external audience. The guard was not asking a fellow guard whether they had escaped detection; he was asking a camera operator whether the footage had been captured.

The combination of these two independently sourced statements — one from a close creative collaborator overheard discussing the ongoing torment of a subject, and one from an operational actor confirming the capture of staged footage — provides the "Live Production" hypothesis with corroborating evidence from two separate nodes of the alleged conspiracy.

XI.7 — Structural Implications

A. Psychological Warfare via Sexualized Hostility: The deliberate performance of explicit sexual acts by private security guards stationed around Sprawling's residence implies a psychological warfare tactic designed to create an intensely hostile and hypersexualized environment. This tactic served to compound the

trauma of his forced isolation and false imprisonment, weaponizing the physical environment to maximize disorientation and distress. The staged and filmed nature of these acts elevates this conduct beyond misconduct into a documented, premeditated component of the non-consensual production.

B. Coordinated Multi-Layered Destabilization: The exact alignment of McPhillips's communication blackout, the financial starvation documented in Section X, the launch of the harassment campaign, Dunca's disappearance, and the aggressive eviction tactics deployed by Spiro and Harvey indicates a highly coordinated, multi-front operation. The network dismantled Sprawling's personal support structure, professional infrastructure, and residential security simultaneously and within a compressed time window inconsistent with coincidence.

C. Suppression of Objective Evidence: The collective refusal of McPhillips and Tanter to enhance the Beverly Hills video audio — combined with Harvey's active interference to diffuse neighbor complaints about the activities at the property — constitutes a coordinated pattern of active obstruction. These individuals, operating across different nodes of the alleged conspiracy, collectively ensured that objective evidence of the production infrastructure and its participants was denied enhancement, documentation, or external verification.

D. Asymmetric Empathy and Enforced Isolation: Harvey's conduct — protecting the security personnel from neighbor scrutiny while withholding the security deployment from Sprawling — mirrors the asymmetric approach documented in the eSIM incident: third parties were shielded and informed while Sprawling was deliberately kept isolated and uninformed.

XI.8 — Evidence Items and Documentary Record to Preserve

- Security camera footage from 420 N. Camden Drive capturing the private security guard colluding with an identified stalker and stating "We have to get him out of there," including all metadata, timestamps, and chain-of-custody records

- Any recording or partial recording obtained by Sprawling of the security guards' sexual acts and the subsequent "Did you get it?" exchange
- Building management contracts, written communications, and property management records for 420 N. Camden Drive between Harvey, Spiro, and any third-party security contractor during the relevant period
- The purchase and sale agreement for 420 N. Camden Drive, including the buyer's identity, the vacant-delivery condition, all communications between Spiro and the buyer or buyer's representatives, and any escrow or title records showing the timeline of the transaction relative to the eviction proceedings
- Any communications between Harvey and Sprawling regarding the private security deployment, and any communications between Harvey and Spiro regarding the security personnel
- Licensing records, insurance documentation, and payroll or contract records identifying the private security company and the specific personnel deployed at the property
- Communications between Harvey and Nicholas Griffin or the BHPD in connection with BHPD Case #22-50765, including the disclosure that Sprawling was "in the midst of being evicted"
- Any communications between Harvey and other tenants or neighbors of 420 N. Camden Drive in which Harvey ran interference regarding the production activity or the security presence
- Records of Sprawling's formal complaints about the plainclothes surveillance individuals and the timeline of the transition to uniformed private security immediately following those complaints

XI.9 — Discrete Investigative Questions

39. Did Harvey know the identity, operational mandate, or true employer of the private security personnel she allowed onto the property, and can she produce the contract or authorization under which they were deployed?
40. Did Harvey receive any instruction from Spiro or any other party to conceal the security deployment from Sprawling, and do communications between Harvey and Spiro corroborate this?
41. Can the $13,500,000 purchase-and-sale closing documents for 420 N. Camden Drive identify the buyer and confirm the vacant-delivery condition, and do pre-closing communications between Spiro and the buyer reference the eviction or the harassment campaign?
42. Do licensing, insurance, or payroll records identify the private security company whose personnel were stationed at the property, and do internal records of that company document the operational mandate given to the deployed guards?
43. Is there forensic evidence — from the audio captured during the "Did you get it?" incident, from carrier metadata, or from the security guards' device records — identifying the unseen third party to whom the guard was speaking, and confirming the existence of a live or recorded video feed being monitored at that moment?
44. Do any of the individuals captured in the Beverly Hills security camera footage — including the guard overheard saying "We have to get him out of there" and the individual loading video equipment from the premises (documented in Section I) — appear in licensing records, payroll records, or known association lists linking them to Spiro, Harvey, McPhillips, Tanter, or any other named subject in this report?
45. Did Harvey's disclosure to Griffin that Sprawling was "in the midst of being evicted" occur before or after Griffin filed his complaint with BHPD, and can email, text, or call records establish whether that disclosure was the initiating cause of Griffin's complaint or a coordinated response to a pre-planned operation?

XI.10 — Closing Observations and Evidentiary Significance

Jessica Harvey's documented conduct — breaching tenant confidentiality, concealing the security deployment, and running interference for neighbor inquiries — places her within a clear operational role in the eviction and harassment infrastructure centered at 420 N. Camden Drive. Her conduct is not consistent with the passive negligence of a building manager but with the active facilitation of a targeted removal operation. The $13,500,000 vacant-delivery sale provides a massive, documentable financial motive for Spiro and Harvey to deploy any means necessary to force Sprawling out of the property — and the documented conduct of the private security personnel corroborates that extreme and unlawful means were in fact deployed.

The private security "Did you get it?" incident is identified as one of the most forensically significant statements in the entire evidentiary record. Unlike the overheard McPhillips–Tanter conversation — which requires contextual inference to establish its production implications — the "Did you get it?" statement is a direct, contemporaneous communication from a deployed operative to a camera operator, confirming in real time that the staged events being conducted at the property were being filmed by an external party. Investigators should treat the identification of the unseen recipient of that communication as a primary investigative priority, as that individual may constitute the most direct link between the street-level operatives documented in Sections A and XI and the financial and creative principals documented in Sections X and H.

SECTION XI — JESSICA HARVEY, UNIDENTIFIED PRIVATE SECURITY PERSONNEL, AND SUPPLEMENTAL McPHILLIPS/TANTER FINDINGS: THE "LIVE PRODUCTION" HYPOTHESIS AND COORDINATED EVICTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Subjects: Jessica Harvey (Building Manager, 420 N. Camden Drive); Unidentified Private Security Personnel; Simon McPhillips (Supplemental); Paul Tanter (Supplemental)
Property: 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210 (Spiro Properties / Yuri Richard Spiro, owner)
Associated Entities: Spiro Properties; Pine Stage Productions; Sean Sprawling Productions

XI.1 — Executive Summary

This section documents additional subjects and incidents not fully addressed in Section X, including the specific conduct of building manager Jessica Harvey, unidentified private security personnel stationed at 420 N. Camden Drive, and supplemental findings concerning Simon McPhillips and Paul Tanter. Collectively, these subjects are alleged to have contributed to a coordinated, multi-layered infrastructure of surveillance, intimidation, sexual harassment, evidence suppression, and financial sabotage. The incidents documented below are presented in support of the "Live Production" hypothesis — the reporting party's theory that the harassment, stalking, and forced isolation were organized as a monitored, non-consensual production utilizing real-time distress for external monitoring or entertainment. Two specific pieces of evidence are identified as structural pillars supporting this hypothesis: (1) the overheard McPhillips–Tanter conversation documented in Section X; and (2) the private security guard's statement — directed at an unseen third party — of "Did you get it?" immediately following the cessation of a staged sexual act.

XI.2 — Jessica Harvey: Building Manager — Defamation, Confidentiality Breach, and Obstruction

Jessica Harvey served as the building manager of 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210, the commercial premises where Sprawling held his tenancy and operated his business. The reporting party alleges Harvey actively contributed to a hostile environment through the following documented conduct:

- **False identification of Sprawling as a vandal:** Harvey falsely identified Sprawling as a vandal to third parties, including neighboring tenants and law enforcement contacts. This false identification was a material element in the criminal pretext used to initiate the arrest documented in Sections A and V of this report.
- **Breach of tenant confidentiality:** Harvey disclosed to Nicholas Griffin — the complainant in the scooter vandalism case — that Sprawling was "in the midst of being evicted." As documented in Section A.2 of this report, that disclosure provided Griffin with financial and personal motive to participate in the false identification of Sprawling from surveillance footage. Harvey's breach of tenant confidentiality was thus a proximate cause of the corrupted evidentiary chain underlying BHPD Case #22-50765.
- **Interference with neighbor inquiries:** When neighboring tenants and visitors raised concerns about the activities occurring at the property — including the presence of uniformed security personnel conducting surveillance, the staging of incidents, and what appeared to be a coordinated media production — Harvey ran active interference to diffuse those inquiries and protect the operation from external scrutiny.
- **Failure to notify Sprawling of private security:** Harvey failed to notify Sprawling of the introduction of private security personnel onto the property, despite her obligations as building manager. The reporting party alleges this concealment was deliberate — designed to prevent Sprawling from formally objecting to or documenting the security presence prior to its operational deployment.

XI.3 — The Eviction Motive: Yuri Spiro Building Sale and Vacant-Delivery Condition

Public records confirm that Yuri Richard Spiro sold the 420 N. Camden Drive property in a rushed, seven-day, all-cash, non-contingent transaction for **$13,500,000**. Critically, the sale was contingent upon the building being delivered *vacant*. The reporting party alleges that this massive financial incentive — dependent entirely on clearing all tenants from the property — provided Spiro, Harvey, and associated actors with a powerful and documentable financial motive to employ any tactics necessary, including unlawful and hostile ones, to force Sprawling out of the property.

The seven-day, all-cash, non-contingent structure of the sale is itself anomalous and warrants investigative scrutiny: it suggests the buyer and seller had a pre-existing relationship and a shared understanding of the property's condition, including the status of the eviction proceedings. Investigators should obtain the closing documents, buyer identification, and any communications between Spiro and the buyer or buyer's representatives during the period when the harassment and eviction operation was being conducted.

XI.4 — The "Security Substitution": Coordinated Intimidation and Covert Surveillance Infrastructure

When Sprawling attempted to leave the building, he was intimidated by plainclothes individuals patrolling and monitoring the building's exits — the same individuals documented in earlier sections as engaging in vehicular surveillance, using remote-controlled drones, and coordinating with stalking operatives. Following Sprawling's formal complaints about these individuals, they abruptly vanished and were immediately replaced by uniformed "private security" personnel.

The reporting party alleges that these uniformed guards were not independent security contractors but were co-conspirators from the same operational network, redeployed in a professional uniform to lend the ongoing surveillance a veneer of legitimacy. Harvey's failure to notify Sprawling of this security presence, combined with the precise timing of the transition from plainclothes to uniformed operatives immediately following Sprawling's complaints, is treated as evidence of coordinated deployment rather than a legitimate property management decision.

Video evidence captured a uniformed security guard actively colluding with an identified stalker. The guard was recorded stating: *"We have to get him out of there."* This recorded statement corroborates the allegation that the private security personnel's operational mandate was not the protection of the property or its lawful tenants, but the physical removal and continued harassment of Sprawling.

XI.5 — Sexual Misconduct by Private Security Personnel and the "Did You Get It?" Recording Incident

The private security presence at 420 N. Camden Drive actively contributed to a highly sexualized and hostile atmosphere during Sprawling's forced self-isolation and false imprisonment within the building. The reporting party documents two specific incidents of overt sexual misconduct by the private security personnel:

- **Public sexual acts — masturbation:** Sprawling observed private security personnel engaging in explicit sexual acts while on duty, including masturbating in their assigned vehicles on the property.
- **Public sexual acts — fellatio:** On one specific occasion, Sprawling witnessed a security guard performing fellatio on another guard through the open passenger door of a vehicle parked on or adjacent to the property.

The reporting party further documents a critical evidentiary incident arising from the second sexual act:

The Recording Incident and the "Did You Get It?" Statement: When Sprawling attempted to record the explicit act for evidentiary purposes, the guards

exhibited an immediate and unnatural awareness of his recording despite not having a direct line of sight to him. They instantly ceased the sexual act. One guard was then overheard speaking to an unseen third party, asking:

> *"Did you get it?"*

The phrasing "Did you get it?" is unambiguous in context: it is a question directed to a camera operator, asking whether the footage of the sexual act was successfully captured. The reporting party alleges this confirms that the sexual acts performed by the private security personnel were not spontaneous misconduct but were deliberately staged performances, intentionally filmed by an unseen operator for an external audience. The guards' unnatural awareness of Sprawling's recording despite the absence of a sightline further indicates the presence of active counter-surveillance monitoring Sprawling's device usage in real time.

XI.6 — The "Live Production" Hypothesis: Structural Validation

The reporting party identifies the following as the two strongest structural pillars validating the "Live Production" hypothesis — the theory that the harassment, stalking, cyberattacks, and forced isolation documented throughout this report were organized as a monitored, non-consensual production utilizing Sprawling's real-time distress for external viewing:

Pillar One — The McPhillips–Tanter Conversation (documented in Section X): The overheard statement — *"Just when you think he's had enough, can't take anymore, he's hit with something else"* — is described as a commentary on an ongoing, monitored subject experiencing escalating torment, consistent with a director or producer observing and discussing the progress of an active non-consensual production.

Pillar Two — The Private Security "Did You Get It?" Statement: The private security guard's immediate cessation of a staged sexual act upon detecting Sprawling's recording attempt, followed by the verbatim question *"Did you get it?"* addressed to an unseen party, is structural confirmation that the acts being performed at the property were scripted events being filmed for an external audience. The guard was not asking a fellow guard whether they had escaped detection; he was asking a camera operator whether the footage had been captured.

The combination of these two independently sourced statements — one from a close creative collaborator overheard discussing the ongoing torment of a subject, and one from an operational actor confirming the capture of staged footage — provides the "Live Production" hypothesis with corroborating evidence from two separate nodes of the alleged conspiracy.

XI.7 — Structural Implications

A. Psychological Warfare via Sexualized Hostility: The deliberate performance of explicit sexual acts by private security guards stationed around Sprawling's residence implies a psychological warfare tactic designed to create an intensely hostile and hypersexualized environment. This tactic served to compound the trauma of his forced isolation and false imprisonment, weaponizing the physical environment to maximize disorientation and distress. The staged and filmed nature of these acts elevates this conduct beyond misconduct into a documented, premeditated component of the non-consensual production.

B. Coordinated Multi-Layered Destabilization: The exact alignment of McPhillips's communication blackout, the financial starvation documented in Section X, the launch of the harassment campaign, Dunca's disappearance, and the aggressive eviction tactics deployed by Spiro and Harvey indicates a highly coordinated, multi-front operation. The network dismantled Sprawling's personal support structure, professional infrastructure, and residential security simultaneously and within a compressed time window inconsistent with coincidence.

C. Suppression of Objective Evidence: The collective refusal of McPhillips and Tanter to enhance the Beverly Hills video audio — combined with Harvey's active interference to diffuse neighbor complaints about the activities at the property — constitutes a coordinated pattern of active obstruction. These individuals, operating across different nodes of the alleged conspiracy, collectively ensured that objective evidence of the production infrastructure and its participants was denied enhancement, documentation, or external verification.

D. Asymmetric Empathy and Enforced Isolation: Harvey's conduct — protecting the security personnel from neighbor scrutiny while withholding the security deployment from Sprawling — mirrors the asymmetric approach documented in the eSIM incident: third parties were shielded and informed while Sprawling was deliberately kept isolated and uninformed.

XI.8 — Evidence Items and Documentary Record to Preserve

- Security camera footage from 420 N. Camden Drive capturing the private security guard colluding with an identified stalker and stating "We have to get him out of there," including all metadata, timestamps, and chain-of-custody records
- Any recording or partial recording obtained by Sprawling of the security guards' sexual acts and the subsequent "Did you get it?" exchange
- Building management contracts, written communications, and property management records for 420 N. Camden Drive between Harvey, Spiro, and any third-party security contractor during the relevant period
- The purchase and sale agreement for 420 N. Camden Drive, including the buyer's identity, the vacant-delivery condition, all communications between Spiro and the buyer or buyer's representatives, and any escrow or title records showing the timeline of the transaction relative to the eviction proceedings

- Any communications between Harvey and Sprawling regarding the private security deployment, and any communications between Harvey and Spiro regarding the security personnel
- Licensing records, insurance documentation, and payroll or contract records identifying the private security company and the specific personnel deployed at the property
- Communications between Harvey and Nicholas Griffin or the BHPD in connection with BHPD Case #22-50765, including the disclosure that Sprawling was "in the midst of being evicted"
- Any communications between Harvey and other tenants or neighbors of 420 N. Camden Drive in which Harvey ran interference regarding the production activity or the security presence
- Records of Sprawling's formal complaints about the plainclothes surveillance individuals and the timeline of the transition to uniformed private security immediately following those complaints

XI.9 — Discrete Investigative Questions

46. Did Harvey know the identity, operational mandate, or true employer of the private security personnel she allowed onto the property, and can she produce the contract or authorization under which they were deployed?
47. Did Harvey receive any instruction from Spiro or any other party to conceal the security deployment from Sprawling, and do communications between Harvey and Spiro corroborate this?
48. Can the $13,500,000 purchase-and-sale closing documents for 420 N. Camden Drive identify the buyer and confirm the vacant-delivery condition, and do pre-closing communications between Spiro and the buyer reference the eviction or the harassment campaign?

49. Do licensing, insurance, or payroll records identify the private security company whose personnel were stationed at the property, and do internal records of that company document the operational mandate given to the deployed guards?
50. Is there forensic evidence — from the audio captured during the "Did you get it?" incident, from carrier metadata, or from the security guards' device records — identifying the unseen third party to whom the guard was speaking, and confirming the existence of a live or recorded video feed being monitored at that moment?
51. Do any of the individuals captured in the Beverly Hills security camera footage — including the guard overheard saying "We have to get him out of there" and the individual loading video equipment from the premises (documented in Section I) — appear in licensing records, payroll records, or known association lists linking them to Spiro, Harvey, McPhillips, Tanter, or any other named subject in this report?
52. Did Harvey's disclosure to Griffin that Sprawling was "in the midst of being evicted" occur before or after Griffin filed his complaint with BHPD, and can email, text, or call records establish whether that disclosure was the initiating cause of Griffin's complaint or a coordinated response to a pre-planned operation?

XI.10 — Closing Observations and Evidentiary Significance

Jessica Harvey's documented conduct — breaching tenant confidentiality, concealing the security deployment, and running interference for neighbor inquiries — places her within a clear operational role in the eviction and harassment infrastructure centered at 420 N. Camden Drive. Her conduct is not consistent with the passive negligence of a building manager but with the active facilitation of a targeted removal operation. The $13,500,000 vacant-delivery sale provides a

massive, documentable financial motive for Spiro and Harvey to deploy any means necessary to force Sprawling out of the property — and the documented conduct of the private security personnel corroborates that extreme and unlawful means were in fact deployed.

The private security "Did you get it?" incident is identified as one of the most forensically significant statements in the entire evidentiary record. Unlike the overheard McPhillips–Tanter conversation — which requires contextual inference to establish its production implications — the "Did you get it?" statement is a direct, contemporaneous communication from a deployed operative to a camera operator, confirming in real time that the staged events being conducted at the property were being filmed by an external party. Investigators should treat the identification of the unseen recipient of that communication as a primary investigative priority, as that individual may constitute the most direct link between the street-level operatives documented in Sections A and XI and the financial and creative principals documented in Sections X and H.

SECTION XII — RHIAN WILLIAMSON: ATTORNEY, FILM PRODUCER, AND DESIGNATED LANDLORD — ALLEGED COMPLICITY, HABITABILITY NEGLECT, AND OPERATIONAL ROLE IN COORDINATED EVICTION INFRASTRUCTURE

Subject: Rhian Williamson — Licensed Attorney; Film Producer; Legally Designated Landlord, 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210
Spouse / Associated Individual: Dana Archer — Partner and President, Global Entertainment PR Agency (Publicist)
Associated Individuals: Yuri Richard Spiro (Spiro Properties); Susan Weis (Assistant); Kyle Joseph Egan
Location: 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210

XII.1 — Subject Profile and Professional Context

Rhian Williamson acted as a business partner to Yuri Richard Spiro and was legally designated as Rodney Samuel Sprawling's landlord for the commercial premises at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210. Beyond her role in real estate, Williamson is a licensed attorney and a successful film producer. Furthermore, she is married to Dana Archer, a high-profile entertainment publicist serving as Partner and President at a global PR agency.

The intersection of Williamson's legal authority, her direct experience in film production, and her immediate familial ties to top-tier media relations significantly elevates her profile within the context of the alleged conspiracy. These combined attributes transform her from a standard property manager into a highly capable, connected operational asset with legal expertise, production industry knowledge, and access to institutional narrative-control mechanisms.

XII.2 — Chronology of Alleged Incidents and Actions

1. The Extortion Attempt and Lease Intervention

Yuri Spiro allegedly attempted to extract an unjustified $70,000 security deposit from Sprawling by withholding the original lease to force a redraft. Williamson directly intervened. Acting in her capacity as an attorney and in circumvention of Spiro, she instructed Spiro's assistant, Susan Weis, to return the original, legally binding lease to Sprawling. This intervention established Williamson as a legal authority within the property management structure and as someone aware of Spiro's coercive tactics.

2. Acknowledgment of Systematic Predatory Behavior

Williamson expressed explicit frustration regarding Spiro's financial extraction tactics, stating verbatim:

> *“Fool after fool come in here and he does the same thing.”*

This statement confirms Williamson’s direct, contemporaneous awareness that Spiro was running a systematic, predatory financial operation targeting incoming tenants — awareness that carries significant legal and ethical implications for her subsequent inaction and abandonment of the property.

3. Workplace Hostility and Sexual Harassment

Sprawling frequently witnessed Spiro subjecting Williamson to sexual harassment in the workplace. This abusive dynamic was externally verified by Williamson’s spouse, Dana Archer, who reportedly confronted her, asking:

> *“Why do you tolerate it?”*

Archer’s question implies both spousal awareness of the abuse and an absence of a benign explanation for Williamson’s continued submission to it — facts consistent with the reporting party’s theory that the network held leverage over Williamson ensuring her total compliance.

4. Parallel Victimhood Claims

During the period Sprawling was being targeted, Williamson reported experiencing the exact same highly specific pattern of abuse: coordinated stalking, digital intrusion, and communication interference. The reporting party notes this parallel claim with the observation that it may represent either genuine victimization of Williamson by the same network, or a managed narrative designed to align her with the victim and build false solidarity while she simultaneously maintained her operational role within the property management structure.

5. The Kyle Joseph Egan Directive

Williamson actively pressured Sprawling to file a formal police report specifically against Kyle Joseph Egan, even offering to personally escort Sprawling to the police station to ensure the report was filed against this specific named individual. The reporting party alleges this constitutes a directed misdirection tactic — channeling Sprawling's formal law enforcement contact toward a pre-selected scapegoat, thereby ensuring any investigation focused on Egan and remained legally disconnected from the Camden property, Spiro, and the broader production infrastructure.

6. Abrupt Abandonment and Coordinated Silence

When Yuri Spiro was directly confronted about the harassment and subsequently abandoned the 420 N. Camden Drive building, Williamson's behavior radically shifted. She retracted her offer to assist with the police report against Egan and ceased all communication with Sprawling. This abrupt reversal occurred at the precise operational moment when Spiro's overt presence became untenable — suggesting Williamson's prior cooperative behavior was contingent on maintaining the operational cover, not on any genuine intent to assist.

7. Year-Long Administrative Abandonment and Habitability Neglect

Following Spiro's departure, Williamson — despite remaining the legally designated landlord with all attendant fiduciary and statutory obligations — failed to respond to any communication from Sprawling for an entire year. The reporting party was left completely isolated inside the building with absolutely no point of administrative contact. During this period, Williamson systematically ignored urgent communications regarding:

- Severe building safety issues placing the occupant at physical risk;
- The presence of toxic black mold — a serious habitability and public health hazard;
- Breaches in building security allowing unauthorized access by the identified stalking operatives;
- Repeated inquiries regarding how and where to submit rent payments — which Sprawling was actively attempting to make.

XII.3 — Structural Implications of Williamson's Involvement

A. Constructive Eviction via Psychological and Physical Attrition

Williamson's year-long refusal to address black mold, security failures, and safety hazards goes beyond standard landlord negligence; as a licensed attorney, she is presumed to possess full knowledge of the implied warranty of habitability and the statutory obligations governing landlord-tenant relationships. The reporting party characterizes this refusal as a deliberate, legally sophisticated tactic of constructive eviction — creating living and working conditions so hazardous and psychologically taxing that the tenant is compelled to abandon the property, thereby fulfilling the mandate to deliver a vacant building for Spiro's $13,500,000 sale without requiring formal, legally contestable eviction proceedings.

B. The "Administrative Quarantine" Effect

Leaving a targeted individual in a compromised building with zero administrative points of contact serves to perfect the operation's isolation mandate. By severing all communication — in precise coordination with the silencing patterns documented in connection with Simon McPhillips, Jessica Harvey, and other named subjects — Williamson placed Sprawling in what the reporting party describes as an "administrative quarantine." The target is left trapped in a deteriorating environment, stripped of any authority figure to appeal to, which exponentially magnifies disorientation, helplessness, and the psychological trauma compounded by the surrounding harassment network.

C. Suspension of Financial Motives for Operational Objectives

Perhaps the most diagnostically significant anomaly in Williamson's conduct is the refusal to communicate regarding rent payments for an entire year. In a standard financial extraction or real estate fraud scheme, capital collection is the primary objective. However, intentionally ignoring a tenant who was actively attempting to pay rent indicates a fundamental shift in the operation's objective: maintaining the hostile environment, the isolation mandate, and the physical deterioration of the property superseded the collection of standard rental income. The deliberate avoidance of rent communications additionally allowed the property management

structure to avoid creating a contemporaneous legal paper trail during the height of the harassment campaign.

D. Complicity Through Entanglement and Coercion

As a licensed attorney, Williamson possessed the knowledge to identify Spiro's conduct as actionable and her own inaction as legally hazardous. Her willingness to endure continuous sexual harassment from Spiro — in the presence of a tenant who witnessed it — combined with her subsequent willingness to commit gross legal negligence by abandoning that tenant to black mold, security failures, and active stalkers, suggests she was severely compromised or subject to coercive leverage held by the network. Dana Archer's documented question — "Why do you tolerate it?" — points to a hidden coercive mechanism ensuring Williamson's total compliance, one that overrode both her professional ethics and her personal self-interest.

E. Directed Misdirection — The Egan Scapegoat Directive

Williamson's aggressive, personally offered push for Sprawling to report Kyle Joseph Egan to the police represents a highly suspicious operational directive. Given her sudden, complete abandonment immediately following Spiro's departure — at the same moment the formal harassment infrastructure was in peak operation — the reporting party alleges Egan was selected by the network to serve as a scapegoat. By controlling the specific narrative provided to law enforcement, Williamson ensured any formal police investigation focused entirely on Egan and remained legally disconnected from the Camden property, Spiro, Harvey, the production personnel, and the broader conspiracy documented in this report.

F. Narrative Suppression and PR Safeguards

Williamson's marriage to a Partner and President of a global entertainment PR agency provides the network with a structural safeguard that the reporting party identifies as the most significant non-operational asset documented in this matter. High-level entertainment publicists specialize in crisis management, narrative control, and the suppression or management of damaging media disclosures. This connection offers a structural mechanism to suppress media leaks regarding the alleged production operation, intercept industry chatter, and theoretically discredit the target through coordinated media placement — a capability that would explain the brazen confidence of the alleged perpetrators in leaving Sprawling in an

unlivable, constantly monitored environment for an entire year without apparent concern about press exposure.

XII.4 — Key Evidence and Documentary Record to Preserve

- All communications between Sprawling and Williamson from the commencement of the tenancy through the year-long communication blackout, including emails, texts, phone records, and any written correspondence regarding rent, habitability, security, or the Egan police report directive
- Communications between Williamson and Spiro during the relevant period, including any instructions from Spiro to Williamson regarding Sprawling's tenancy or the administration of the property
- Communications between Williamson and Susan Weis regarding the lease dispute and the return of the original lease, including the email correspondence in which Williamson instructed Weis to return the original lease to Sprawling
- Building inspection records, mold remediation notices, maintenance requests, and any records of safety complaints submitted by Sprawling to Williamson, Spiro, Harvey, or any building management contact during the relevant period
- Rent payment records, bank statements, and any documentation showing Sprawling's repeated attempts to submit rent payments and Williamson's failure to provide payment instructions or acknowledgment
- Any communications between Williamson and Kyle Joseph Egan, or between Williamson and law enforcement, in connection with the Egan police report directive

- Any communications between Williamson and Dana Archer regarding Sprawling, the property, Spiro, or the alleged harassment — including any communications in which Archer's PR capabilities were discussed in connection with the management of the reporting party's situation
- Property management agreements, power of attorney documents, or any legal filings identifying Williamson as the legally designated landlord for 420 N. Camden Drive during the relevant period

XII.5 — Discrete Investigative Questions

53. As the legally designated landlord and a licensed attorney, did Williamson possess contemporaneous knowledge of the black mold, security failures, and safety hazards documented by Sprawling, and if so, what is her documented basis for failing to respond or remediate?
54. Did Williamson receive any instruction from Spiro, Harvey, or any other named subject to cease communication with Sprawling following Spiro's departure from the property, and do communications between Williamson and any of those parties corroborate such an instruction?
55. On what basis did Williamson specifically direct Sprawling to file a police report against Kyle Joseph Egan by name, and do any communications between Williamson and Egan, Spiro, or other named subjects indicate this directive was coordinated rather than independently motivated?
56. Did Williamson receive any benefit — financial, legal, or otherwise — arising from the $13,500,000 sale of 420 N. Camden Drive, and do the sale or closing documents reflect any payment, commission, or consideration flowing to Williamson or to entities associated with her?
57. Can communications between Williamson and Dana Archer during the relevant period document any use of Archer's PR resources in connection

with managing the narrative surrounding the alleged harassment campaign, the reporting party, or the property?

58. Does the email record establishing that Williamson, Spiro, Spiro's assistant Susan Weis, and Sprawling were all copied on the lease-return correspondence corroborate Sprawling's account of the events, and does that record contain any other communications material to the investigation?

XII.6 — Closing Observations and Evidentiary Significance

Rhian Williamson occupies a position of unique legal and operational significance in the reporting party's account. As the legally designated landlord and a licensed attorney, she possessed both the legal authority to protect Sprawling's tenancy rights and the professional knowledge to identify Spiro's conduct as actionable. Her decision to exercise neither — and to instead revert to complete administrative abandonment precisely at the operational moment when the production and eviction infrastructure reached its peak intensity — is wholly inconsistent with either benign negligence or passive complicity.

The reporting party identifies four specific facts as particularly probative: (1) Williamson's verbatim acknowledgment that Spiro's predatory scheme was systematic and repeated ("Fool after fool come in here and he does the same thing"); (2) her specific, named directive to file a police report against Kyle Joseph Egan — the same individual documented throughout this report as a central operational figure; (3) her immediate retraction of that assistance at the moment Spiro's overt presence became untenable; and (4) her year-long refusal to receive rent payments, which subordinates financial self-interest to operational mandate. Collectively, these facts support the inference that Williamson's role was neither incidental nor independently motivated, but constituted a knowing and structured contribution to the coordinated scheme documented herein. Her marriage to a top-tier entertainment publicist provides the network with a narrative-suppression asset that investigators should treat as a material consideration in any risk assessment of public disclosure of these findings.

SECTION XIII — WITNESS PROFILES, CORROBORATING EVIDENCE, AND STRUCTURAL IMPLICATIONS

I. Objective

To document the profiles, actions, and reported experiences of key witnesses and corroborating parties connected to the harassment, digital intrusion, and forced isolation of Rodney Samuel Sprawling. Furthermore, this section analyzes the implications of these individuals' actions within the framework of the broader alleged conspiracy.

1. Kory Lamar Word/Ward — Accomplice / Material Witness

Background: Secret husband/partner of Kyle Joseph Egan and an accomplice in prior fraud committed against Sprawling. Kyle described the relationship with Kory as violent, abusive, and one he was afraid to leave.

Incident Reports: Kory reported that Kyle was taken via intimidation by "Mexican gangsters" (specifically naming Javier "Xavier Ortiz" Ortega) and later suggested Kyle was sold into sex trafficking. Despite Kyle eventually being returned, Kory refused to provide further details.

Evasion and Misdirection: Kory actively misdirected authorities, falsely claiming Sprawling only called the police because Kyle would not speak to him, omitting the severe threats they allegedly faced. Kory consistently displayed a lack of cooperation with investigators and Sprawling.

The Mother's Distress: Kory's mother, Vallory Ward, abruptly canceled a planned visit for Sprawling to see Kory and Kyle. During the cancellation call, she was crying and unable to offer an explanation.

The "Voice App" Incident: While visiting Kory, Sprawling witnessed Kory speaking into a device where the audio feedback sounded exactly like Kyle's voice. Kory hastily dismissed it as a "voice app" and changed the subject.

> *Structural Implications — AI Voice Cloning and Proof of Life: The "voice app" incident is a critical piece of evidence. It strongly implies the conspiracy is actively utilizing AI voice cloning technology to manipulate targets. Kory may have been using this technology to fake Kyle's presence, mask his disappearance, or manufacture false audio evidence to manipulate Sprawling.*

> *Structural Implications — The Handler Dynamic: Kyle's admission of an abusive relationship he could not escape, combined with Kory's shifting narratives about kidnappings and sex trafficking, suggests Kory is not a victim, but potentially a handler or captor within the network.*

> *Structural Implications — Silencing via Intimidation: Vallory Ward's unexplained crying and abrupt cancellation indicates she was subjected to severe intimidation by the network to prevent Sprawling from verifying Kyle's physical location or safety.*

2. Keith Fraser — Tenant / Fleeing Witness

Background: The only other tenant occupying the 420 N. Camden Drive building during Sprawling's period of forced isolation.

Incident Reports: Fraser observed unusual building activity and was overheard arguing with property owner Yuri Spiro regarding the active harassment against Sprawling.

The Confrontation: During an active harassment event where stalkers trapped Sprawling inside the building, Sprawling asked Fraser to corroborate the stalking to counter Spiro's narrative that Sprawling was suffering a "drug-induced psychosis." Fraser quickly refused, immediately fled the building, and never returned.

The False Narrative: Landlord Rhian Williamson subsequently claimed Fraser broke his lease because Sprawling had "threatened" him. No such threat was ever reported to the authorities.

> *Structural Implications — Institutional Gaslighting and Narrative Control: Spiro weaponized Fraser's sudden departure to solidify the false narrative that Sprawling was violent and suffering from a mental break. By feeding this "psychosis" narrative to the police, the conspiracy successfully convinced law enforcement to refuse investigation into the stalking, effectively stripping Sprawling of state protection.*

> *Structural Implications — Coerced Silence and Constructive Eviction: Fraser's initial argument with Spiro proves he knew the harassment was real. His*

> *sudden refusal to corroborate, immediate flight, and willingness to abandon his lease implies Spiro or the network explicitly threatened or compensated Fraser to leave. Removing Fraser was necessary to achieve total physical isolation of Sprawling inside the building.*

3. Richard "Richie" Alan Vetter — Parallel Target / Disappeared Ally

Richard "Richie" Alan Vetter II is a seminal architect of the modern influencer economy and a founding associate of Dunca-Sprawling Inc. During the foundational Vine era (2013–2016), Vetter was instrumental in launching the career of global media entity Jake Paul, serving as a key strategist during Paul's transition from short-form creator to a multi-platform powerhouse. Vetter is widely credited with helping shape the early frameworks of creator monetization — specifically pioneering strategic brand integrations, digital tipping systems, and platform partnership models that transformed viral social content into a sustainable, multi-billion dollar revenue industry. His disappearance in September 2022, concurrent with the onset of the alleged conspiracy, deprived Sprawling of a material witness with direct knowledge of the shared technology and business networks at the center of this matter.

Background: A close associate who expressed romantic feelings for Sprawling and made concrete plans to move into the 420 N. Camden Drive residence.

Incident Reports: Vetter reported experiencing the exact same digital intrusion and stalking as Sprawling. He was observed acting highly nervous, attempting to delete social media, and actively sweeping Sprawling's residence for hidden cameras.

AI Sexual Manipulation: Vetter reported that stalkers were utilizing AI to generate deepfake images, audio, and video depicting his girlfriend engaged in sexual encounters with other men.

The Disappearance: Shortly before vanishing entirely, Vetter texted Sprawling, "the same people are messing with me," directly linking his harassment to the party responsible for Sprawling's false imprisonment. He never returned to move in as planned.

> *Structural Implications — Validation of the "Live Production" Surveillance: Vetter's physical search for hidden cameras at Camden Drive independently corroborates the premise that the property was rigged for unauthorized, continuous surveillance.*

> *Structural Implications — Psychological Warfare via AI: Vetter's experience with deepfaked sexual material of his girlfriend aligns perfectly with the network's established tactic of utilizing hyper-sexualized psychological abuse to disorient and traumatize targets.*

> *Structural Implications — Mandated Isolation: Vetter's disappearance perfectly coincides with his plan to move in with Sprawling. The conspiracy's primary objective is absolute isolation. Removing Vetter was an operational necessity to ensure Sprawling remained entirely alone and undefended against the surveillance and harassment.*

4. Martin Strachan — Collateral Target

Background: A regular client of Kyle Joseph Egan.

Incident Reports: Kory Ward reported that Strachan was experiencing the exact same highly specific digital manipulation and harassment as Sprawling and Vetter.

> *Structural Implications — Network Reach and Collateral Silencing: The targeting of Strachan demonstrates the expansive reach of the conspiracy's digital arm. The network appears to target the extended social and transactional webs of its primary subjects (in this case, Kyle Egan's clients). This is likely done to test AI manipulation tactics on secondary targets, or to terrorize and silence anyone who might possess peripheral knowledge of Kyle Egan's actual status or whereabouts.*

III. MACRO-LEVEL CONCLUSIONS

The testimonies and actions of these four individuals reveal a highly sophisticated operational methodology utilized by the conspiracy network:

A. AI Weaponization

Multiple independent parties — Vetter, Sprawling (via Kory's "voice app"), and Strachan — report the exact same use of advanced AI for voice cloning and deepfake visual generation, deployed strictly for psychological terror. The convergence of these independent accounts across unrelated parties substantially corroborates a coordinated, technologically sophisticated operation.

B. Absolute Isolation Tactics

The network actively intercepts and removes any potential allies. Sprawling's prospective roommate (Vetter) is disappeared, his only neighboring tenant (Fraser) is coerced into fleeing, and his connection to Kyle is severed by Kory's misdirection. The systematic removal of every potential corroborating witness is a hallmark of organized operational suppression rather than coincidental departure.

C. The "Psychosis" Cover Story

By orchestrating an environment of intense, unbelievable technological harassment, and subsequently paying off or threatening witnesses (Fraser), the perpetrators effectively convinced external authorities that the isolated target was merely suffering a psychological breakdown. This manufactured credibility gap — between what Sprawling experienced and what investigators could independently verify — ensured the alleged "Live Production" continued uninterrupted by law enforcement intervention. The cover story is self-reinforcing: the more extreme the harassment, the less believable the target's account, and the more isolated the target becomes.

SECTION XIV — INVESTIGATIVE LEGAL REPORT: ANALYSIS OF DRAFT PETITION AND CONSPIRATORIAL IMPLICATIONS

XIV.1 — Executive Summary

This section outlines the core allegations, parties, and causes of action detailed in the draft civil complaint filed by Rodney Samuel Sprawling (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling / Sean Sprawling). The petition alleges a highly sophisticated, multi-year conspiracy of domestic terrorism, organized crime, and cyber warfare directed at the Plaintiff. The documented objective of this conspiracy is to orchestrate the Plaintiff's financial ruin and seize control of the multi-million dollar estate belonging to his spouse, Andrei George Dunca.

XIV.2 — Parties Identified in the Complaint

Plaintiff: Rodney Samuel Sprawling (professionally known as Sean Sprawling / EsRā Dunca-Sprawling).

Corporate Defendants: Facebook (Meta), Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Illumina Safety, Peer Responce.

Individual Defendants & Co-Conspirators: Dr. Richard Austin Heafey (Unfold Psychology), Alexandru Daniel Tantu, Adrian Fedorovici, Jing Feng, Emi Gal, Mark Trefgarne, Alex Sherman, Andrei George Dunca, Yuri Richard Spiro, Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, and Kyle Joseph Egan.

XIV.3 — Core Allegations and Chronology of the Conspiracy

1. The Technological Origin — The LiveRail Nexus

The petition asserts that the conspiracy's operational foundation stems from a network of individuals with advanced technological backgrounds who originally formed the joint venture "LiveRail." Following LiveRail's acquisition by Facebook (Meta) in 2014, these individuals retained access to immense capital, resources, and networks. They allegedly utilized these resources, alongside advanced Artificial Intelligence developed by Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Illumina Safety, and Peer Responce, to launch a highly sophisticated cyberattack against the Plaintiff involving malware, spyware, and phishing.

2. Physical Confinement and Abuse — 420 N. Camden Drive

The complaint details that the most severe physical and emotional damage occurred at a property owned by co-conspirator Yuri Richard Spiro, located at 420 N. Camden Drive in Los Angeles. At this location, the Plaintiff was allegedly subjected to false imprisonment, enhanced interrogation techniques, sexual abuse, torture, and sexual exploitation through racial conditioning and threats of extortion.

3. Medical and Psychological Sabotage

The conspiracy actively sought to dismantle the Plaintiff's credibility and legal standing. Co-conspirator Dr. Richard Austin Heafey allegedly breached his professional duty by fabricating a diagnosis of "drug-induced psychosis." Furthermore, the Plaintiff's communications were systematically intercepted, altered, and blocked, isolating him from legal and emotional support.

4. The Disappearance of Andrei George Dunca

The Plaintiff and Andrei George Dunca established a valid informal marriage under Texas law in 2018, sharing residences and finances. Since late 2022, Dunca has been missing. The Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants are directly responsible for Dunca's disappearance, status, and the resulting loss of joint property, noting that Dunca himself may be a victim of the network.

XIV.4 — Causes of Action

The Plaintiff asserts the following legal claims against the Defendants collectively and individually:

- **Civil Conspiracy:** Coordinated digital intrusion, psychological manipulation, and reputational sabotage.
- **Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED):** A deliberate campaign to destabilize the Plaintiff's well-being.
- **Negligence / Professional Malpractice:** Dr. Heafey's patient abandonment, breach of confidentiality, and diagnostic misuse.
- **Invasion of Privacy:** Unauthorized digital access resulting in the manipulation of legal documents and official filings.
- **False Imprisonment:** Confinement without consent via physical intimidation and technological manipulation.
- **Sexual Assault, Rape, and Sexual Exploitation:** Non-consensual acts and sexual exploitation under duress.
- **Fraud & Unjust Enrichment:** Deception regarding financial schemes and the extraction of the Plaintiff's resources.

XIV.5 — Structural Implications of the Conspiracy

A. The Weaponization of Big Tech Resources

The inclusion of Facebook (Meta) and the LiveRail acquisition implies that this is not a standard harassment campaign, but one backed by enterprise-level technological infrastructure. By utilizing advanced AI from entities like Bluefish AI and Ezra Inc., the conspiracy possesses the capability to execute flawless digital impersonation,

intercept secure legal communications, and manufacture fraudulent digital evidence at scale. This severely disadvantages the Plaintiff, as standard law enforcement is rarely equipped to investigate state-level or enterprise-level cyber warfare.

B. Institutional Gaslighting via Medical Proxies

The strategic use of Dr. Heafey to fabricate a "drug-induced psychosis" diagnosis is a calculated operational tactic. By placing a fraudulent psychiatric label on the Plaintiff, the conspiracy effectively immunized itself against investigation. Any reports the Plaintiff made regarding cyber intrusions, kidnapping, or torture could be instantly dismissed by police, judges, and peers as symptoms of a mental break, thereby silencing the victim using the authority of the medical establishment.

C. Financial Attrition and Asset Usurpation

The extensive list of financial damages — including a $2,750,000 loss on the Ortega Street property, a $400,000 loss on the Balmore Circle property, and over $1,500,000 tied to Yuri Spiro and the Camden Drive property — indicates that physical and psychological torture were utilized as tools for wealth extraction. The conspiracy appears designed to force the Plaintiff into bankruptcy, stripping him of the resources required to mount a legal defense or physically escape the network's surveillance.

D. The Exploitation of the Marital Estate

The disappearance of Andrei George Dunca, combined with a Temporary Restraining Order filed by Dunca against the Plaintiff, implies a highly manipulative legal strategy by the perpetrators. If Dunca is missing, incapacitated, or being coerced, the conspiracy is likely using his identity and legal standing to file fraudulent actions against the Plaintiff. This tactic achieves two goals: it legally dismantles the marital estate from within and weaponizes the Plaintiff's own spouse against him in the court system.

E. Vengeance as an Operational Catalyst

Documentary evidence indicates that Alexandru Daniel Tantu's social media posts document his relationship with Dunca and suggest motives of vengeance and jealousy. This implies that while the conspiracy operates with the precision and financial goals of an organized crime syndicate, its initial catalyst may have been deeply personal. The intersection of immense technological power with highly

personal vendettas explains the exceptionally cruel, targeted nature of the abuse — including sexual exploitation and torture — outlined in the petition.

XIV.6 — Requested Relief

The petition demands comprehensive relief, including:

- **Financial Restitution:** Over **$7,975,299** in specified property, loan, and emotional distress damages, plus **$30,000,000** for the destruction of the Plaintiff's production companies.
- **Perpetual Corporate Share:** A 5% perpetual share of the AI/Tech entities involved in the cyberattack.
- **Declaratory & Injunctive Relief:** Judicial affirmation of the marital union, prevention of further property interference, and a halt to the sale of real property.
- **Judicial Order for Appearance:** A demand for the immediate physical appearance of Andrei George Dunca to confirm his safety and sound mind.

Section XIV Summary — Key Figures:

Total enumerated damages: $7,975,299 | Production company damages: $30,000,000 | Perpetual tech share: 5%

Corporate defendants: Facebook (Meta), Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Illumina Safety, Peer Responce

Individual defendants: Heafey, Tantu, Fedorovici, Feng, Gal, Trefgarne, Sherman, Dunca, Spiro, Garcia-Winder, Egan

LiveRail acquisition by Meta (2014) identified as conspiracy's technological foundation

SECTION XV — DRAFT CIVIL COMPLAINT: SPRAWLING v. ENTITIES (WALLFLOWER OF THE YEAR — CHAPTER 7)

The following is a verbatim reproduction and forensic annotation of the operative draft civil complaint filed by Rodney Samuel Sprawling (EsRa Dunca-Sprawling / Sean Sprawling), designated within source materials as Wallflower of the Year, Chapter 7. The complaint is styled ESRA v. ENTITIES and filed in the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco. It is a jury-trial complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and declaratory relief arising from an alleged multijurisdictional conspiracy of domestic terrorism, organized crime, and cyber warfare.

Case No.: [To Be Assigned] — Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco — JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

XV.1 — CAPTION AND PARTIES

Plaintiff: RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING, also known as ESRA DUNCA-SPRAWLING, and professionally as SEAN SPRAWLING.

Corporate Defendants: FACEBOOK (NOW META) — acquired LiveRail in 2014; co-conspirators' retention gave them access to capital, network, and resources to carry out cyberattacks. BLUEFISH AI — alleged used in criminal network operations. EZRA INC. — alleged used in criminal network operations. UNFOLD PSYCHOLOGY — business entity owned by Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, Psy.D., Oakland, CA. ILLUMINA SAFETY — alleged used in criminal network operations. PEER RESPONCE — alleged used in criminal network operations. DOES 1-9, inclusive.

Named Individual Co-Conspirators: Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, Psy.D.; Alexandru Daniel Tantu; Adrian Fedorovici; Jing Feng; Emi Gal; Mark Trefgarne; Alex Sherman; Andrei George Dunca; Yuri Richard Spiro; Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder; and Kyle Joseph Egan.

XV.2 — JURISDICTION AND VENUE (VERBATIM)

> *"This Court possesses jurisdiction over this action as the causes of action arise from actions and inactions that occurred within the State of California."*

> *"Venue is proper in the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco, as the Plaintiff resides in this county and a significant portion of the alleged harm occurred within this county."*

Plaintiff's addresses identified in the complaint: 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122, and 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069 — both characterized as marital community property shared with missing spouse Andrei George Dunca.

XV.3 — STATEMENT OF FACTS (VERBATIM AND ANNOTATED)

> *"This is an action to seek damages for a multifaceted and coordinated conspiracy of domestic terrorism and organized crime that has been perpetrated against the Plaintiff. The conspiracy's goals are to cause the Plaintiff's bankruptcy and to gain control of his spouse's multi-million dollar estate."*

The Informal Marriage: Plaintiff and Andrei George Dunca entered into a valid informal marriage under Texas law in 2018, continuing their marital relationship through uninterrupted cohabitation and public representation as spouses, including joint occupancy of 565 Ortega Street (San Francisco) and 13339 Balmore Circle (Houston).

A. The LiveRail Nexus — Technological Origin of the Conspiracy

> *"The individual co-conspirators with tech backgrounds formed a criminal organization using their joint venture, LiveRail. This enterprise was fundamentally transformed upon the company's acquisition by Facebook (now Meta) in 2014. The Defendants, acting in concert with the co-conspirators, used their technological resources and network to orchestrate the cyberattack. This included the use of sophisticated cyberattack and advanced Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology developed by Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Illumina Safety, and Peer Responce to facilitate a widespread campaign of*

> *impersonation, kidnapping, and false imprisonment."*

The complaint further alleges that conspirators used phishing emails, fraudulent webpages, and deceptive attachments to install malware, spyware, and Trojan programs on Plaintiff's devices. The conspiracy, which Plaintiff believes may have roots extending as far back as 2015, became apparent to Plaintiff in September 2022.

B. Physical Confinement and Abuse — 420 N. Camden Drive

> *"The majority and most emotionally damaging part of the cyber attack and abuse occurred in a building owned by co-conspirator Yuri Richard Spiro at 420 N Camden Drive in Los Angeles. This includes allegations of false imprisonment, enhanced interrogation techniques, sexual abuse, and torture."*

C. Medical and Psychological Sabotage

> *"As part of this conspiracy, co-conspirators also worked to sabotage Plaintiff's legal and emotional standing. This included fabricating a diagnosis of 'drug-induced psychosis' to discredit the Plaintiff and prevent him from entering into agreements. Plaintiff's communications were intercepted, altered, and blocked, intentionally isolating him from legal and emotional support."*

D. The Disappearance of Andrei George Dunca

> *"Plaintiff's spouse, Andrei George Dunca, has been missing since late 2022. His disappearance, coupled with the ongoing conspiracy, has caused Plaintiff extreme emotional distress and has led to the loss of joint property and other damages. Plaintiff avers that the Defendants and co-conspirators are directly responsible for Mr. Dunca's disappearance and current status."*

The complaint notes that Plaintiff believes Andrei George Dunca may himself be a potential victim of the conspiracy. This dual characterization — as both co-conspirator and victim — is central to the relief requested, which includes a judicial order for Mr. Dunca's immediate physical appearance.

XV.4 — CAUSES OF ACTION (VERBATIM)

A. Civil Conspiracy:

> *"Defendants, through their concerted actions with co-conspirators, formed a mutual understanding and agreement to commit wrongful acts against Plaintiff. This conspiracy was enacted through a coordinated campaign of digital intrusion, psychological manipulation, and reputational sabotage, which caused the severe personal injuries and financial harm detailed herein."*

B. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (Cal. Civ. Code section 43):

> *"The Defendants engaged in a deliberate and sustained campaign of psychological manipulation, digital harassment, and reputational sabotage that was intended to destabilize Plaintiff's emotional well-being. Their conduct was extreme and outrageous, exceeding all bounds of decency in a civilized society, and directly caused Plaintiff to suffer severe emotional distress."*

C. Negligence / Professional Malpractice (Dr. Richard Austin Heafey):

> *"The co-conspirator Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, as a licensed psychologist, owed a professional duty of care to Plaintiff. He breached this duty through negligent acts, including patient abandonment during a crisis, misuse of his professional diagnosis, and a breach of confidentiality, causing Plaintiff to suffer damages."*

D. Invasion of Privacy (Cal. Const., Art. I, section 1):

> *"Defendants knowingly and intentionally accessed Plaintiff's private communications, devices, and accounts through unauthorized digital means. These intrusions resulted in the manipulation of legal documents, impersonation of Plaintiff in official filings, and the unauthorized use of his personal data, constituting a severe violation of his constitutional right to privacy."*

E. False Imprisonment:

> *"Defendants, through their actions and the actions of their co-conspirators, intentionally confined Plaintiff for an extended period without his consent or legal authority, through means of physical intimidation, psychological coercion, and technological manipulation."*

F. Sexual Assault, Rape, and Sexual Exploitation:

> *"Defendants, through their co-conspirators, subjected Plaintiff to non-consensual sexual acts, forced him to perform sexual acts under duress, and sexually exploited him through threats of extortion, racial conditioning, and the sexualization of basic human functions."*

G. Fraud:

> *"Defendants made false representations regarding the circumstances surrounding the financial scheme and the abandonment of Plaintiff's spouse, with the intent to deceive and induce Plaintiff to continue professional and personal relationships."*

H. Unjust Enrichment:

> *"Defendants have unjustly enriched themselves at the Plaintiff's expense*

> *through a pattern of deceit, manipulation, and unauthorized use of his financial resources and property."*

XV.5 — PRAYER FOR RELIEF

A. Restitution — Itemized Financial Damages

Property / Damage Category	Amount Sought
Loss of half value of marital community property — 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA	$2,750,000
Loss of last verifiable offer on marital property — 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX	$400,000
Outstanding principal and interest on personal loan to Yuri Spiro	$835,299
Lost security deposit — 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA	$70,000
Investment capital lost in "Gion BH"	$200,000
Estimated lost revenue from "Gion BH"	$720,000
Emotional distress and property loss — refusal to return "The Captain Dunca-Sprawling"	$1,000,000
Other unspecified special damages and pain and suffering	$2,000,000
Loss of creative and commercial projects — destruction of Plaintiff's production companies	$30,000,000
Full amount for Dr. Heafey's psychological services plus consequential damages and attorneys' fees	[To Be Determined]
TOTAL SPECIFIED RESTITUTION (BEFORE PRODUCTION COMPANY LOSS)	$7,975,299

Per the complaint: "The total of these damages is $7,975,299, plus the additional amounts listed above, subject to further adjustment based on discovery, forensic accounting, and judicial review."

B. Declaratory Relief

> *"For a judicial declaration affirming the informal marital union between Plaintiff and Andrei George Dunca under Texas law, and recognizing the symbolic and legal significance of shared property, financial interdependence, and public acknowledgment."*

C. Injunctive Relief

> *"For preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining Defendants from further interference with Plaintiff's property, reputation, business operations, and marital status."*

D. Additional Relief

A five percent (5%) perpetual share from Ezra, Bluefish, Peer Responce, Illumina Safety, and any other entities established by members of LiveRail following their acquisition by Facebook, whose technology, network, capital, investment, or employees are found to have a connection with any part of the cyberattack against Plaintiff. Punitive damages sufficient to punish Defendants and deter others from similar conduct. Injunctive relief including license termination, property access restoration, and foreclosure prevention. Corrective actions and disciplinary sanctions. Relief against Facebook (now Meta) for negligence and breach of duty in providing resources that enabled the attack.

E. Judicial Order for Appearance of Co-Conspirator / Spouse

> *"Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court issue an order for the immediate appearance of Andrei George Dunca, a co-conspirator and Plaintiff's spouse, to confirm his safety and to allow a judicial determination as to his state of sound mind and memory, and that his condition has been maintained as such since his last personal interaction with Plaintiff."*

XV.6 — EXHIBIT LIST (VERBATIM)

Exhibit A: Copy of Complaint filed by Andrei George Dunca against Rodney Samuel Sprawling in Harris County, Texas (Case No. 2025-03-13F_Dunca_Complaint_and_TRO — signed). Includes Temporary Restraining Order. Offered as evidence of the conspiracy and fraudulent use of the legal system to manipulate and harm Plaintiff.

Exhibit B: Medical Report from Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, Psy.D., dated July 29, 2024. Includes Dr. Heafey's initial clinical opinion and notes confirming Plaintiff's sanity and sobriety. Offered as evidence of a fraudulent mental health diagnosis later created by the conspirators.

Exhibit C: Copy of the deed for the property at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, Texas 77069. Offered as evidence of the informal marriage between Plaintiff and Andrei George Dunca.

Exhibit D: Copy of the deed for the property at 5823 Queensgate Drive, Houston, Texas 77066. Offered as evidence of the informal marriage between Plaintiff and Andrei George Dunca.

Exhibit E: Compilation of legal filings submitted by Plaintiff in various jurisdictions documenting persistent attempts to seek legal and judicial relief despite alleged

obstructions. Sub-exhibits E.1 through E.10 include: Request for Judicial Review and Intervention (June 2, 2025); Urgent Request for Judicial Intervention re Harassment and Obstruction (June 4, 2025); Motion to Enforce Revocation of Power of Attorney and for Sanctions (June 4, 2025); Updated Motion to Enforce Revocation of Power of Attorney and for Sanctions; Amended Motion for Declaratory Judgment Confirming Domestic Partnership Status; Petition for Declaratory Judgment Confirming Marital Status and Injunction to Halt Sale of Real Property; Third-Party Petition for Wrongful Foreclosure and Unlawful Eviction; Motion to Strike; Request for Default Judgment; Plaintiff's Response to Defendant's Motion to Strike.

Exhibit F: Social Media Posts of Alexandru Daniel Tantu. Documents Defendant Tantu's relationship with Andrei George Dunca and posts suggesting motives of vengeance, jealousy, and financial gain in orchestrating the conspiracy against Plaintiff.

XV.7 — FORENSIC STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE COMPLAINT

A. Weaponization of Big Tech Resources: The inclusion of Facebook (Meta) and the LiveRail acquisition implies a conspiracy backed by enterprise-level technological infrastructure. Advanced AI from Bluefish AI and Ezra Inc. is alleged to enable digital impersonation, interception of secure legal communications, and manufactured fraudulent digital evidence at scale — capabilities far exceeding standard harassment and requiring enterprise-level cyber forensics to investigate.

B. Institutional Gaslighting via Medical Proxies: The strategic use of Dr. Heafey to fabricate a "drug-induced psychosis" diagnosis is characterized as a calculated operational tactic — by placing a fraudulent psychiatric label on Plaintiff, the conspiracy effectively immunized itself against investigation. Any reports regarding cyber intrusions, kidnapping, or torture could be dismissed as symptoms of mental illness. Exhibit B (Dr. Heafey's own July 29, 2024 report confirming Plaintiff's sanity and sobriety) is offered as direct refutation.

C. Financial Attrition and Asset Usurpation: The extensive list of financial damages — including a $2.75M loss on the Ortega Street property, a $400K loss on

the Balmore Circle property, and over $1.5M tied to Yuri Spiro and the Camden Drive property — indicates that physical and psychological abuse were deployed as tools for wealth extraction, designed to force Plaintiff into bankruptcy and strip him of resources required to mount a legal defense.

D. Exploitation of the Marital Estate: The disappearance of Andrei George Dunca, combined with Exhibit A (a TRO filed by Dunca against Plaintiff), implies that the conspiracy is using Dunca's identity and legal standing to file fraudulent actions against Plaintiff — legally dismantling the marital estate from within while weaponizing Plaintiff's own spouse against him in the court system.

E. Vengeance as Operational Catalyst: Exhibit F (Alexandru Daniel Tantu's social media posts documenting his relationship with Dunca and suggesting motives of vengeance, jealousy, and financial gain) implies that while the conspiracy operates with the precision and financial goals of an organized crime syndicate, its initial catalyst was deeply personal — explaining the exceptionally cruel and targeted nature of the alleged abuse.

F. Multi-Jurisdictional Legal Relief Sought: The Prayer for Relief requests coordinated action across California Superior Court including declaratory recognition of the Texas common-law marriage, injunctive relief preventing further property interference, punitive damages, and the extraordinary remedy of a judicial order compelling Mr. Dunca's physical appearance before the court — reflecting Plaintiff's position that no administrative or law enforcement mechanism has yet produced verified confirmation of Mr. Dunca's safety, identity, or voluntariness.

> **EDITORIAL NOTE:** This complaint is reproduced and annotated from source materials designated Wallflower of the Year, Chapter 7. All verbatim complaint language is presented in blockquote format. Analytical commentary represents the Reporting Party's characterization of the allegations' structural significance. The complaint remains operative in draft form; case number is pending assignment. All exhibits referenced above are incorporated by reference into the main body of this Incident Narrative Report. FOR ESRA, WITH REVERENCE. — AARON MILTON HARVELAND, EDITOR-AT-LARGE / DAISY DAIST 333

SECTION XVI — EXPOSÉ: ESRĀ V. INDIVIDUALS — ANALYSIS OF 31-PAGE DRAFT PETITION (SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO)

XVI.1 — Executive Summary

This section analyzes the core allegations, parties, and causes of action detailed in the 31-page draft civil complaint titled *EXPOSÉ: ESRĀ V. INDIVIDUALS*, filed in the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco. The petition alleges a highly sophisticated, multi-year conspiracy of psychological abuse, domestic terrorism, and cyber warfare directed at the Plaintiff, Rodney Samuel Sprawling. The documented objective of this conspiracy is to orchestrate the Plaintiff's financial ruin, destroy his professional reputation, and seize control of the assets tied to his common-law marriage with Defendant Andrei George Dunca.

The Plaintiff, Rodney Samuel Sprawling (professionally known as Sean Sprawling / EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), is identified as a producer, actor, writer, and formally recognized American Geisha. The petition was filed in the Superior Court of California, County of San Francisco, asserting that the causes of action arose from conduct occurring within that jurisdiction and that the Plaintiff resided there at the time of filing.

XVI.2 — Parties Identified in the Complaint

Plaintiff: Rodney Samuel Sprawling (professionally known as Sean Sprawling / EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), a producer, actor, writer, and formally recognized American Geisha.

The "Tech Nexus" Defendants — LiveRail / Bluefish AI Cohort: A coordinated network of tech entrepreneurs and executives primarily associated with LiveRail (acquired by Facebook in 2014) and Bluefish AI. Named individuals include Mark Trefgarne (former LiveRail CEO), Jing Feng (Bluefish AI COO), Emi Gal, Alex Sherman (Bluefish AI CEO), and Adrian Fedorovici. The petition asserts that following LiveRail's acquisition, these individuals retained access to enterprise-level capital, resources, and networks, which were allegedly weaponized against the Plaintiff.

Medical & Real Estate Defendants: Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, Psy.D. (a licensed psychologist, operating through Unfold Psychology, Oakland, CA), and Yuri Richard Spiro (property owner, Spiro Properties).

Personal & Secondary Defendants: Andrei George Dunca (Plaintiff's spouse and alleged principal enabler), Alexandru Daniel Tantu (alleged central figure and digital safety consultant), and Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder (Dunca's assistant and alleged communications gatekeeper).

Corporate Entity Defendants: Facebook (now Meta), Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Unfold Psychology, Illumina Safety, and Peer Responce. The petition alleges these entities were integral to the criminal network's operations and provided the technological infrastructure for the cyberattack campaign.

XVI.3 — Core Allegations and Chronology of the Conspiracy

1. The Technological Origin and Cyberattack. The petition asserts that following Defendant Dunca's abrupt abandonment of the Plaintiff in September 2022, the Defendants initiated a sophisticated cyberattack. Leveraging their enterprise-level tech backgrounds and resources retained post-LiveRail acquisition, the group allegedly used phishing, keylogging, and physical device seizure to access the Plaintiff's secure cloud storage and financial data. This unauthorized access was used to intercept communications, manipulate personal data, and

create a "digital ghost" — effectively erasing the Plaintiff's presence and isolating him entirely from his support network.

2. Physical Confinement, AI Manipulation, and Torture. The complaint details severe allegations of false imprisonment and non-lethal, high-tech torture at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills. The Defendants allegedly utilized advanced Artificial Intelligence — developed by Dunca and his colleagues — to convert the Plaintiff's devices into weaponized surveillance tools. Specific allegations include:

- **Sensory Manipulation:** The use of directed energy, infrasound, or high-frequency acoustic devices to cause extreme pain, loss of balance, plugged ears, and the sensation of bugs crawling on skin (simulating drug addiction symptoms).
- **Sexual Assault and Bodily Control:** Technology was allegedly used to target the Plaintiff's genitals, forcing erections and simulating low-voltage electrocution. The group also sexualized basic human functions, demanding the Plaintiff perform bowel movements on command, resulting in severe physical trauma.
- **Hate Crimes and Psychological Warfare:** Operating with a self-described "slave owner mentality," the conspirators allegedly subjected the Plaintiff to constant racial slurs and homophobia designed to psychologically "break" him and shame him for his skin color and sexual orientation.

3. Medical and Institutional Gaslighting. To ensure the Plaintiff could not seek help, the conspiracy actively dismantled his credibility with institutions. Defendant Dr. Heafey allegedly breached his professional duty by manipulating medical records to include false diagnoses of mental instability, violating patient confidentiality, and pressuring the Plaintiff to sue his primary care doctor. The group used AI to simulate symptoms of psychosis and drug use, ensuring that when the Plaintiff reported the high-tech abuse, law enforcement and family members dismissed the claims as delusions. This institutional gaslighting is detailed further in Section G of this report.

4. Financial Sabotage and Asset Usurpation. The conspiracy engaged in a coordinated financial scheme to bankrupt the Plaintiff. This included the wrongful retention of a $325,000 security deposit by Yuri Spiro, systematic interference with

business opportunities resulting in significant lost revenue, and the alleged fraudulent filing of a Temporary Restraining Order in Texas under Dunca's name to manipulate the marital estate. The Plaintiff's total specified financial damages across the petition exceed $7,975,299, exclusive of the $30,000,000 production company destruction claim.

XVI.4 — Causes of Action

The Plaintiff asserts eleven distinct causes of action against the Defendants collectively and individually. These include:

59. **Civil Conspiracy** — Coordinated digital intrusion, psychological manipulation, and reputational sabotage across multiple jurisdictions.
60. **Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress** — A deliberate, sustained campaign to destabilize the Plaintiff's mental, emotional, and physical well-being.
61. **Violation of the Bane Act (Civil Rights) — Cal. Civ. Code § 52.1** — Interference with the Plaintiff's civil rights through threats, intimidation, and coercion.
62. **Fraud & Unjust Enrichment** — Deception regarding financial schemes and the systematic extraction of the Plaintiff's resources and assets.
63. **Professional Negligence / Malpractice** — Dr. Heafey's patient abandonment, breach of confidentiality, and diagnostic misuse to serve co-conspirators.
64. **False Imprisonment / Invasion of Privacy** — Confinement without consent via physical intimidation, technological manipulation, and environmental degradation of the property.

65. **Sexual Assault, Rape, and Sexual Exploitation** — Non-consensual acts and sexual exploitation under duress, including technologically-mediated bodily control.
66. **Negligence** — Failure of duty of care by named defendants in their professional, fiduciary, and legal capacities.
67. **Invasion of Privacy** — Unauthorized digital access resulting in the manipulation of legal documents and official filings.
68. **Declaratory Relief** — Judicial affirmation of the informal marital union between Plaintiff and Andrei George Dunca under Texas law, and recognition of joint marital property rights.
69. **Injunctive Relief** — Prevention of further property interference, a halt to the sale of real property, and an order for Dunca's immediate appearance to confirm his safety and sound mind.

XVI.5 — Requested Relief

The petition demands comprehensive relief across financial, declaratory, and injunctive categories:

- **Financial Restitution:** Over **$7,975,299** in specified property, loan, and emotional distress damages (encompassing the Ortega Street property loss of $2,750,000; the Balmore Circle property loss of $400,000; the Spiro loan, deposit, and related losses; and emotional distress damages), plus **$30,000,000** for the destruction of the Plaintiff's production companies.
- **Perpetual Corporate Share:** A **5% perpetual share** of Ezra, Bluefish AI, and all entities established by LiveRail members, on the grounds that the Plaintiff's behavioral data, communications, and personal suffering were used as intellectual property and research material without consent.

- **Declaratory Relief:** Judicial affirmation of the informal marital union under Texas law and recognition of associated property rights.
- **Injunctive Relief:** Immediate judicial orders preventing further interference with the Plaintiff's property, halting unauthorized real estate transactions, and compelling the physical appearance of Andrei George Dunca before the court to confirm his safety, capacity, and freedom from coercion.

XVI.6 — Structural Implications of the Conspiracy

A. Asymmetric Warfare and Human Experimentation. The petition explicitly claims the abuse was not merely retaliatory harassment but served a dual purpose: utilizing the Plaintiff as a real-world human test subject. By subjecting the Plaintiff to intense psychological stress, sleep deprivation, and AI-driven impersonation over an extended period, the LiveRail/Bluefish AI cohort allegedly gathered highly valuable behavioral data. This implies the conspiracy operates as a rogue, unregulated testing ground — refining surveillance, psychological manipulation, and directed energy algorithms for eventual commercial or operational deployment.

B. The Weaponization of the "Unbelievable." The network relies on the inherently unbelievable nature of advanced non-lethal directed energy weapons (DEWs) and AI voice cloning to shield co-conspirators from prosecution. Because standard law enforcement lacks the investigative framework to evaluate infrasound torture or microwave auditory effects, the conspiracy can operate with near-total impunity. When the Plaintiff reports experiencing physical vibrations, voices, or externally forced bodily responses, the perpetrators exploit the situation by pointing to these real effects as "proof" of the Plaintiff's fabricated psychosis — a self-sealing evidentiary trap.

C. Institutional Sabotage via Medical Proxies. The strategic use of a licensed psychologist (Dr. Heafey) is a critical operational safeguard for the conspiracy. By having a credentialed medical professional violate patient confidentiality, share information with co-conspirators, and officially document false diagnoses of mental instability, the network transforms the medical establishment from a place of

healing into an instrument of institutional gaslighting and legal containment. This mechanism effectively neutralizes the Plaintiff's civil rights by pre-discrediting his testimony before any law enforcement or judicial review.

D. Total Resource Attrition. The conspiracy utilizes a coordinated multi-front war of attrition designed to render the Plaintiff entirely paralyzed. By simultaneously cutting off all digital communications via AI interception, freezing financial assets via Spiro's deposit retention and Dunca's abandonment, and destroying his professional reputation through coordinated isolation and defamation, the network ensures he lacks the financial capital, physical energy, or external support required to mount a legal defense. The extreme physical and sexual degradation alleged in the petition — including forcing the Plaintiff to request permission for basic bodily functions — is designed to strip away his fundamental autonomy and compound his inability to act.

> Evidentiary Convergence Note:
>
> Section XVI and Section XV (Sprawling v. Entities — Wallflower of the Year, Chapter 7) represent variant filings of the same core complaint, prosecuted under different caption configurations and party groupings. Section XV names corporate entities as primary defendants (Facebook/Meta, Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Illumina Safety, Peer Responce); Section XVI names the individual co-conspirators (Trefgarne, Feng, Gal, Sherman, Fedorovici, Heafey, Spiro, Dunca, Tantu, Garcia-Winder). Read together, these two filings form a complete picture of the alleged conspiracy's institutional infrastructure and its individual human actors. The grand jury and any investigating authority should treat both documents as interdependent and mutually corroborating components of a single evidentiary record.

SECTION XVII: SUPPLEMENTAL HIGHER-ORDER IMPLICATIONS

XVII.1 — Objective and Scope

This supplemental section analyzes the aggregate narrative of the *Sprawling v. Dunca et al.* incident to identify higher-order, systemic, and structural implications that extend beyond the immediate scope of the previously drafted documents. These implications examine the operational model, commercial motives, and legal vulnerabilities exposed by the alleged conspiracy.

XVII.2 — The "Self-Funding" Dark Enterprise Model

Previous reports highlighted financial attrition as a tactic to paralyze the target. A broader implication, however, is that the conspiracy operates as a **self-funding enterprise**. By extracting $325,000 in security deposits (Spiro), skimming tens of thousands in production funds (Phillips), and forcing the forfeiture of marital real estate assets, the network is not simply denying the target resources — it is actively using the victim's own capital to underwrite the operational costs of the harassment.

The victims are inadvertently financing their own surveillance, the private security presence, and the technological deployment used against them. This model insulates the enterprise from external funding scrutiny and creates a self-perpetuating cycle in which each new victim subsidizes the targeting of the next.

XVII.3 — Commercial Harvesting of "Affective Data" (The Dark Dataset)

While the use of the target as a "human test subject" was noted in prior sections, the specific commercial implication for entities such as LiveRail, Bluefish AI, and Ezra Inc. is the harvesting of **affective data** — data related to human emotions and psychological states under extreme duress.

Training advanced AI to accurately read, predict, and manipulate human psychological distress requires massive datasets of genuine human trauma. By inducing extreme isolation, panic attacks, and psychological breaks, and subsequently recording the target's digital and physical reactions in real time, the tech entities are allegedly compiling an illegal "dark dataset." This provides these

companies with a massive, unethical competitive advantage in developing behavioral prediction algorithms, which can then be commercialized for advertising, surveillance, or defense contracts.

The non-consensual nature of this data collection, combined with the deliberate induction of the psychological states being measured, would constitute tortious misappropriation of biometric and affective data under applicable California and federal law, and may constitute human experimentation in violation of federally recognized ethical research standards.

XVII.4 — Decentralization as Anti-RICO Camouflage

Traditional organized crime operates with a clear, hierarchical syndicate structure, making it vulnerable to RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act) prosecution. This alleged network, however, represents a highly evolved, **decentralized threat model**.

The conspiracy utilizes disparate, seemingly unconnected professionals — a landlord, a film producer, an ad-tech executive, and a clinical psychologist. To an outside investigator or standard law enforcement, their individual actions appear as isolated, standard civil disputes: a difficult landlord, a breached film contract, a contested medical diagnosis. This deliberate decentralization provides structural camouflage, making it exceptionally difficult for law enforcement to identify and prove a unified criminal enterprise.

Investigators should treat the pattern of simultaneous, coordinated withdrawal — Phillips ceasing communication, Williamson going silent, Harvey vanishing, Brittany becoming unreachable — as affirmative evidence of enterprise coordination rather than coincidental civil behavior.

XVII.5 — Weaponization of the Mandatory Reporter Framework

The involvement of Dr. Heafey exposes a severe vulnerability within the mental health and medical establishment. Psychologists are mandated reporters and hold unique legal authority to initiate involuntary psychiatric holds (e.g., 5150 holds in California) or to issue diagnoses that carry lasting legal and administrative consequences.

The conspiracy recognized that the therapeutic environment is a significant legal blind spot. By co-opting a licensed psychologist, the network gained the ability to weaponize confidentiality laws against the very patient those laws are designed to

protect. More dangerously, this arrangement establishes a pipeline in which the network induces symptoms of severe distress using untraceable technology (e.g., directed energy, acoustic manipulation, AI-driven sensory harassment), and relies on its compromised medical proxy to legally classify the victim as mentally incapacitated.

Once classified, the victim's testimony is pre-discredited in any legal proceeding. Reports of cyber-intrusion, surveillance, or physical harassment are reframed as symptoms of the fabricated psychiatric condition rather than as evidence of criminal conduct.

This mechanism effectively traps the victim within the mental health system, strips them of testimonial credibility, and legally invalidates their civil rights claims — all without a single physical act attributable to any identifiable co-conspirator.

XVII.6 — High-Value Real Estate Constructive Eviction Blueprint

The timeline of the harassment at 420 N. Camden Drive aligns with Yuri Spiro's $13,500,000 all-cash, non-contingent, 7-day sale of the property — a sale that was expressly conditioned on the building being delivered vacant.

Traditional, legally compliant commercial evictions in California are costly, public, time-consuming, and subject to judicial review. The network's documented actions imply that deploying a "Live Production" harassment crew, private security intimidation, biological hazards (toxic black mold), and administrative quarantine functions as a highly efficient, off-the-books mechanism for constructive eviction — one that leaves no formal eviction record and generates no judicial paper trail that might delay or encumber a multi-million dollar liquidity event.

This blueprint is transferable: any high-value urban property whose rapid vacant delivery is financially advantageous to an owner is a potential deployment site. Investigators and regulators should examine whether similar patterns of coordinated tenant harassment correlate with other rapid, all-cash commercial real estate transactions connected to any named subjects.

XVII.7 — The "Parallel Victimhood" Counter-Intelligence Tactic

Both Rhian Williamson and Richie Vetter, prior to his disappearance, reported experiencing the same specific cyber-intrusions as the Plaintiff. While each may have been a genuine collateral target, within a counter-intelligence analytical

framework these claims also point to the systemic deployment of **Parallel Victimhood** as an operational tactic.

By having perpetrators or compromised assets claim they are simultaneously under attack, the network achieves several objectives: it infiltrates the target's trust circle under the guise of shared victimhood; it feeds the network real-time intelligence on the target's defensive strategies and communications; and it allows the network to steer the target's investigative behavior — as illustrated by Williamson's aggressive direction of the Plaintiff toward filing a police report against a specific pre-selected scapegoat (Kyle Joseph Egan) while simultaneously abandoning all landlord duties.

The tactic exploits the target's legitimate desire to identify allies and build a corroborating witness base. In each instance, the claimed parallel victim either disappears (Vetter), becomes administratively unresponsive (Williamson), or is otherwise neutralized before they can provide sworn, verifiable corroboration.

Investigators should evaluate all claimed co-victims for indicators of handler-level operational knowledge — including specific awareness of the Plaintiff's counter-measures, possession of technical language mirroring the attackers' methodology, and pattern-consistent withdrawal coinciding with key investigative milestones.

XVII.8 — Consolidated Investigative Priorities

The higher-order implications identified in this section collectively suggest that the alleged conspiracy is not merely a targeted harassment campaign but a commercially motivated, technologically sophisticated, and legally camouflaged criminal enterprise. Consolidated investigative priorities include: (1) forensic analysis of financial flows between named subjects to establish the self-funding loop; (2) regulatory referral to HHS/IRB-equivalent bodies regarding potential unauthorized human experimentation by the identified AI entities; (3) RICO viability assessment based on the totality of coordinated conduct across professional sectors; (4) immediate preservation of Dr. Heafey's patient records, licensing board filings, and communications with co-defendants; (5) real estate transaction analysis connecting named subjects to other rapid, all-cash, vacant-delivery property sales; and (6) counter-intelligence review of all claimed parallel victims for indicators of handler status or managed access.

SECTION XVIII: FORENSIC ASSESSMENT AND STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS OF THE SPRAWLING v. DUNCA CYBER-TERRORISM AND ORGANIZED CRIME ALLEGATIONS

Executive Summary

The documentary evidence and investigative reports surrounding the matter of Rodney Samuel Sprawling (professionally known as Sean Sprawling or EsRā Dunca-Sprawling) and his missing spouse, Andrei George Dunca, outline a complex, multi-jurisdictional paradigm of asymmetric civilian targeting. The allegations detailed in the 2026 Incident Narrative Report, alongside associated civil filings and the publications *Wallflower of the Year* and *Exposé*, describe a highly resourced, technologically advanced conspiracy operating across Houston, Texas; San Francisco, California; and Beverly Hills, California. The primary objective of this alleged network appears to be the total financial, psychological, and physical attrition of the target, effectuated to seize control of a multi-million-dollar marital estate, extract proprietary behavioral data, and potentially commercialize non-consensual trauma broadcasting.

An exhaustive review of the evidentiary record reveals profound implications that extend far beyond a localized case of domestic or financial abuse. The allegations outline the privatization of state-level cyber warfare tactics — including artificial intelligence (AI) voice cloning, telecommunications interception, and sensory manipulation — deployed against a civilian target by individuals leveraging enterprise-level technological infrastructure derived from entities such as LiveRail, Bluefish AI, and Ezra Inc. Furthermore, the case demonstrates catastrophic vulnerabilities within institutional safeguards. Medical professionals, law enforcement agencies, and the judicial system were allegedly weaponized to

establish a "digital quarantine," wherein the victim was systematically discredited, falsely imprisoned, and stripped of civil rights.

§ 1 — THE PRIVATIZATION OF CYBER WARFARE AND THE BIG TECH CORPORATE NEXUS

The most significant operational anomaly in the Sprawling v. Dunca matter is the scale and sophistication of the technological apparatus allegedly deployed against the Plaintiff. The conspiracy is not characterized by conventional harassment, but by the application of enterprise-grade cyber capabilities historically reserved for state-sponsored intelligence operations.

§ 1.1 — The LiveRail Origins and Enterprise Infrastructure

The genesis of the conspiracy is traced to a cohort of technology executives and developers primarily associated with LiveRail, a video advertising platform acquired by Facebook (now Meta) in 2014 for a reported sum of between $400 million and $500 million. Individuals named in the civil filings — including Andrei George Dunca, Mark Trefgarne, Jing Feng, Alex Sherman, Emi Gal, and Adrian Fedorovici — possessed immense capital, advanced networking capabilities, and access to cutting-edge artificial intelligence infrastructure.

The implication of this nexus is the emergence of rogue corporate actors functioning as private intelligence syndicates. Following the acquisition of their platforms, these individuals allegedly retained the technical knowledge and financial resources necessary to orchestrate a sophisticated cyberattack. By leveraging AI systems purportedly developed by entities such as Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Illumina Safety, and Peer Responce, the network possessed the capacity to execute flawless digital impersonation, intercept secure communications, and manufacture fraudulent digital evidence at scale. This represents a dangerous evolution in domestic crime,

wherein civilian targets are subjected to asymmetric warfare by private entities operating outside regulatory oversight.

Corporate Entity / Asset	Associated Personnel	Alleged Role in Conspiracy Network	Strategic Implication
LiveRail (Meta)	Andrei Dunca, Mark Trefgarne, Emi Gal	Foundational wealth generation ($400M–$500M acquisition); network establishment.	Provided the enterprise-level capital and personnel required to fund long-term covert operations.
Bluefish AI	Andrei Dunca, Jing Feng, Alex Sherman	Artificial intelligence development and deployment.	Enabled deepfake visual generation, voice cloning, and autonomous surveillance capabilities.
Ezra Inc.	Andrei Dunca (Investor)	Medical imaging and advanced data processing.	Provided expertise applicable to surveillance and the manufacturing of physical/sensory effects.
Illumina Safety / Peer Responce	Network Affiliates	Alleged infrastructure utilization for criminal operations.	Demonstrates the integration of legitimate corporate frameworks into cyber-harassment campaigns.

§ 1.2 — Digital Kidnapping and the Creation of "Digital Ghosts"

The evidentiary record details a process of "digital kidnapping," wherein the target is isolated not merely by physical confinement, but by the total hijacking of their digital perimeter. The conspirators allegedly utilized malware, spyware, man-in-the-middle (MITM) routing, and SIM swapping to sever Sprawling's access to social media, transportation applications, and financial platforms. More critically, the network allegedly achieved complete control over Sprawling's telecommunications. The victim reported that outgoing emergency calls to 911 were actively intercepted

and rerouted to operatives portraying dispatchers or actors. This tactic creates a "digital ghost" — a state in which the target remains physically present in society but is completely digitally severed from it. When a victim's calls for rescue are diverted to their captors, the traditional avenues of legal and physical salvation are neutralized.

This cyber capability was further corroborated by an internal family operative. Brittany A. Smith Sprawling, identified as a cybersecurity professional and sister-in-law to the victim, initially confirmed the network's "playbook" involving SIM porting and network filtering. However, the record indicates she subsequently leveraged her relationship to gain physical access to the victim's computer under the pretext of checking for viruses, resulting in the device's irreparable destruction. Her contemporaneous attendance at a Las Vegas hackers' convention, alongside admissions of tracking targets for proximity access and unauthorized email monitoring, illustrates how the conspiracy successfully recruits and deploys specialized technical talent to execute ground-level sabotage.

§ 1.3 — Asymmetric Warfare and Human Experimentation

The allegations expand beyond digital surveillance into the realm of technologically mediated physical torture and human experimentation. The filings describe the use of advanced surveillance tools, directed energy, infrasound, or high-frequency acoustic devices designed to cause extreme pain, loss of balance, plugged ears, and the sensation of insects crawling on the skin — a phenomenon specifically engineered to artificially simulate symptoms of methamphetamine intoxication.

The petition explicitly claims the abuse served a dual purpose: utilizing the Plaintiff as a real-world human test subject. By subjecting the Plaintiff to intense psychological stress, sleep deprivation, and AI-driven impersonation over an extended period, the LiveRail/Bluefish AI cohort allegedly gathered highly valuable behavioral data. This implies the conspiracy operates as a rogue, unregulated testing ground — refining surveillance, psychological manipulation, and directed energy algorithms for eventual commercial or operational deployment. The demand in the civil complaint for a 5% perpetual corporate share of Ezra, Bluefish AI, and

associated entities is directly predicated on the assertion that the victim's forced trauma was commercialized as unauthorized behavioral research.

§ 2 — THE "LIVE PRODUCTION" HYPOTHESIS AND THE HOLLYWOOD INFRASTRUCTURE

A highly disturbing facet of the Sprawling v. Dunca narrative is the "Live Production" hypothesis — the assertion that the false imprisonment, sexual assault, and psychological torture were organized as a monitored, non-consensual production utilizing real-time distress for external entertainment or observation.

§ 2.1 — Non-Consensual Broadcasting and the "Did You Get It?" Verification

This hypothesis is supported by several distinct evidentiary pillars. During Sprawling's forced isolation at the commercial premises located at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, uniformed private security guards actively contributed to a hyper-sexualized environment. During a staged sexual act by these guards, the victim attempted to record the conduct. The guards immediately ceased despite lacking a direct line of sight, indicating the presence of active counter-surveillance monitoring the victim's device usage. Following the cessation of the act, one guard was overheard asking an unseen third party:

> *"Did you get it?"*

This communication unambiguously confirms the presence of a camera operator capturing staged footage for an external audience, proving the events were scripted performances rather than spontaneous misconduct.

§ 2.2 — Simon McPhillips, Paul Tanter, and the Normalization of Exploitation

The involvement of established film industry professionals lends structural feasibility to the hypothesis. Simon McPhillips (professionally known as Simon Phillips), a veteran producer and actor with over 100 film credits — including *Most Horrible Things*, a horror film produced by Andrei Dunca and starring Sprawling — was a primary creative collaborator who abruptly abandoned the victim simultaneously with the onset of the cyberattack.

McPhillips's documented history of prioritizing production goals over human safety establishes a critical character precedent. The record highlights an incident on a previous set involving unmitigated explosive hazards that nearly launched a heavy door into actors, alongside the exploitation of background extras coerced into performing stunts for $35 a day without safety protocols. This history validates the feasibility of the "Live Production" hypothesis, demonstrating an established willingness to inflict trauma or physical danger upon individuals for the sake of a shoot.

Furthermore, McPhillips and director Paul Tanter were allegedly overheard discussing the victim's ongoing torment. The quoted dialogue — *"Just when you think he's had enough, can't take anymore, he's hit with something else"* — is highly indicative of a director or producer monitoring the pacing of a subject's psychological collapse. Both McPhillips and Tanter subsequently refused to utilize their industry resources to enhance audio from security footage capturing law enforcement colluding with actors at the Beverly Hills property, constituting active obstruction designed to protect the identities of the production network.

§ 2.3 — Narrative Suppression and Public Relations Safeguards

The ability to operate a non-consensual trauma broadcast in a major metropolitan area requires significant external shielding. This was allegedly provided by Rhian Williamson, a licensed attorney, film producer, and the legally designated landlord of the Camden Drive property. Williamson is married to Dana Archer, the Partner and President of a global entertainment PR agency. The intersection of Williamson's legal authority to ignore habitability complaints and her spouse's capability to execute crisis management and suppress damaging media disclosures provides the network with a structural safeguard. This narrative-control mechanism explains the brazen confidence of the alleged perpetrators in maintaining the victim in a monitored, unlivable environment for over a year without apparent concern regarding press exposure. The memoir *Wallflower of the Year* explicitly notes that the relationship dynamics surrounding the victim were designed as a "staged spectacle" and a "public smokescreen for covert harms," further corroborating the cinematic nature of the abuse.

§ 3 — PSYCHOLOGICAL ATTRITION, AI WEAPONIZATION, AND HATE CRIMES

The operational objective of the conspiracy required the systematic destruction of the victim's psychological resilience and public credibility. This was achieved through the convergence of advanced artificial intelligence, targeted sensory manipulation, and the exploitation of deep-seated societal prejudices.

§ 3.1 — AI Voice Cloning and Deepfake Manipulation

The evidentiary record documents the deployment of AI voice cloning and deepfake technology across multiple parallel targets. Kory Lamar Word, the secret fiancé of operative Kyle Joseph Egan, was observed speaking into a device that produced audio feedback sounding identically like Egan's voice — an anomaly he hastily dismissed as a "voice app." This incident serves as proof-of-concept for the conspiracy's ability to manipulate audio streams and spoof proof-of-life verifications.

Similarly, Richard "Richie" Vetter, a close associate and parallel target, reported experiencing the exact same digital intrusion as Sprawling. Vetter disclosed that stalkers utilized AI to generate deepfake pornographic material depicting his girlfriend engaged in sexual encounters with other men, deployed strictly for psychological terror. Shortly after Vetter physically swept Sprawling's residence for hidden cameras — thereby validating the surveillance infrastructure — Vetter vanished entirely. The removal of Vetter was an operational necessity to ensure Sprawling remained entirely isolated and undefended against the ongoing harassment.

§ 3.2 — The Exploitation of Systemic Bias and Racial Conditioning

The psychological warfare was exponentially amplified by the deliberate exploitation of systemic biases. Sprawling is identified as a Black, gender-fluid, Native American entrepreneur, producer, and formally recognized American Geisha. The perpetrators operated with a self-described "slave owner mentality," subjecting the victim to constant racial slurs and homophobia designed to systematically "break" his psychological autonomy.

The conspiracy weaponized racial conditioning by utilizing racist depictions of Black individuals in pornographic media to shame and humiliate the victim, constantly questioning why white males would choose to associate with him. Furthermore, the network exploited racial hierarchies within the gay community, enforcing an abusive dynamic where "the standard" was described exclusively as masculine and white. The intersection of high-tech surveillance with basal racism demonstrates a calculated operational strategy: utilizing societal prejudices to isolate the target,

ensure institutional apathy toward their victimization, and strip the victim of their name and identity in a manner explicitly mirroring conditions of enslavement.

§ 4 — INSTITUTIONAL GASLIGHTING AND MEDICAL SABOTAGE

A cyberattack of this magnitude cannot sustain itself without neutralizing the target's ability to seek external medical and legal intervention. The conspiracy achieved this through a highly coordinated strategy of institutional gaslighting, utilizing medical professionals to establish a preemptive evidentiary shield.

§ 4.1 — Dr. Heafey and the Fabricated "Psychosis" Diagnosis

The involvement of Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, a licensed California psychologist, is identified as a critical operational safeguard. Initial clinical notes from Dr. Heafey confirmed that Sprawling was "otherwise sane" and was "suffering anxiety" triggered by "a real source." However, without conducting an in-person evaluation, Dr. Heafey abruptly reversed this assessment, determining that the victim was suffering from "delusions and possibly hallucinations" driven by "methamphetamine misuse."

This diagnostic reversal occurred despite overwhelming empirical evidence to the contrary. Sprawling acquired a 14-panel drug test that returned negative results for all substances, and Dr. Naheed Ali, a concierge physician in Beverly Hills, thoroughly evaluated the victim, documenting the harassment with no finding of psychosis or drug involvement. Dr. Heafey's insistence on the methamphetamine-induced psychosis narrative — despite the negative drug test — suggests his active participation in the conspiracy. The manufactured sensory experiences, such as the technologically induced sensation of bugs crawling on the skin, were specifically engineered to mimic drug intoxication, providing physical "symptoms" to justify Dr. Heafey's fraudulent diagnosis.

§ 4.2 — The Weaponization of the "Unbelievable"

The implications of this medical sabotage are devastating. By affixing a fraudulent psychiatric label to the victim, the conspiracy successfully immunized itself against law enforcement investigation. When Sprawling reported extraordinary claims of infrasound torture, AI voice cloning, and digital kidnapping, responding officers and third parties had been primed by the medical diagnosis to dismiss these reports as the delusions of an addict. This tactic weaponizes the inherent "unbelievability" of advanced cyber crimes. Because standard law enforcement lacks the investigative framework to evaluate non-lethal directed energy weapons or telecommunications interception, the conspiracy exploits the resulting credibility gap.

Evidentiary Conflict	Conspiracy Narrative	Objective Medical / Factual Evidence	Forensic Implication
Mental Competency	Dr. Heafey claims "methamphetamine-induced psychosis" without in-person evaluation.	14-panel drug test entirely negative; Dr. Naheed Ali confirms sanity and sobriety.	Medical diagnosis was deliberately fabricated to establish an institutional quarantine.
Physical Symptoms	Victim hallucinating bugs on skin due to drug use.	Emergency clinic professional notes symptoms are inconsistent with any known drug intoxication.	Sensory manipulation technology was used to mimic addiction to validate the false diagnosis.
Therapeutic Relationship	Dr. Heafey denies clinical relationship and denies initiating post-termination contact.	Timestamped logs show late-night messages, sexual propositions, and demands for "chem sex."	Dr. Heafey engaged in severe ethical violations, predatory behavior, and active gaslighting.
Financial Integrity	Dr. Heafey claims limited financial means.	Owns $1.1M condo; offered up to $600k to remove negative online reviews.	Indicates potential tax evasion, bribery, and access to undisclosed conspiracy funding streams.

§ 5 — THE FINANCIAL MECHANICS OF ASSET USURPATION AND REAL ESTATE SABOTAGE

The physical and psychological torture of the victim was inextricably linked to a campaign of aggressive financial extraction. The objective was to strip the victim of the capital required to secure legal counsel, hire independent investigators, or physically relocate — ultimately transferring control of the marital estate to the conspirators.

§ 5.1 — Constructive Eviction and the $13.5 Million Vacant-Delivery Contingency

The financial sabotage was heavily concentrated around real estate assets. Yuri Richard Spiro, the landlord of the 420 N. Camden Drive property, utilized the harassment campaign to force Sprawling out of the building to satisfy a rushed, seven-day, all-cash $13.5 million sale of the property. Critically, this massive transaction was entirely contingent upon the building being delivered vacant. This multi-million-dollar incentive provided Spiro with a documentable motive to bypass formal civil eviction processes and deploy unlawful, hostile tactics to force the victim's departure. Jesseca Harvey, Spiro's former executive assistant, filed a separate lawsuit against him alleging a hostile work environment, sexual harassment, and antisemitic rants, independently validating the allegations regarding Spiro's predatory character.

Rhian Williamson, the legally designated landlord and attorney, facilitated this extraction through deliberate habitability neglect. Despite her statutory obligations, Williamson ignored reports of toxic black mold and severe security breaches, engaging in a legally sophisticated tactic of constructive eviction. By leaving the targeted individual in a compromised building with zero administrative points of

contact, Williamson placed Sprawling in an "administrative quarantine," intentionally maximizing his psychological trauma to fulfill the vacant-delivery mandate.

§ 5.2 — Debt as a Tool of Coercion and the Foreclosure of the Houston Estate

The financial manipulation was systematically mirrored by the missing spouse, Andrei George Dunca. Prior to his disappearance, Dunca leveraged the threat of bankruptcy to compel Sprawling to sign over joint property at 7711 Mulholland Drive. Subsequently, Dunca deposited $500,000 into Sprawling's account without consent. Notably, this $500,000 figure perfectly mirrors the sum of the financial demands leveled by Yuri Spiro ($385,000 loan + $70,000 security deposit + $45,000 temporary rent). This exact alignment strongly implies internal coordination between Dunca and Spiro — demonstrating how modern conspiracies utilize civil contracts as instruments of coercion, laundering their financial crimes through legitimate administrative channels.

The financial devastation extended to the couple's joint property at 13339 Balmore Circle in Houston, Texas. Because of Dunca's abandonment, the property fell into severe delinquency. The eviction action was prosecuted by AMDRE LLC (an entity with undisclosed ties to Dunca) utilizing an uncertified, "unofficial copy" of a Substitute Trustee's Deed, facilitated by Newrez LLC/Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing. The foreclosure resulted in a $200,000 loss of equity and the violent dispossession of Sprawling's elderly, disabled veteran parents. During the appeal process (Appellate Case No. 14-25-00369-CV), the court ignored critical motions for continuance based on medical disability, failed to adjudicate the joinder of Andrei Dunca as a necessary party, and ordered a prohibitive supersedeas bond of $24,700, effectively denying the victim access to appellate relief.

Financial Attrition Vector	Responsible Actor(s)	Estimated Capital Impact	Mechanism of Extraction / Loss
San Francisco Residence	Andrei G. Dunca	**$2,750,000**	Loss of half value of marital community

Financial Attrition Vector	Responsible Actor(s)	Estimated Capital Impact	Mechanism of Extraction / Loss
			property (565 Ortega St.).
Promissory Note Breach	Yuri R. Spiro	**$831,898+**	Default on $385k loan + 29.9% compounding interest; fraudulent UCC filing encumbering Ferrari F40.
Houston Property Loss	Dunca / AMDRE LLC / Newrez	**$400,000**	Title fraud, foreclosure, and loss of equity on intended parental homestead; ignored appellate motions.
Constructive Eviction	Spiro / Williamson	**$325,000+**	Withheld $70k deposit; lost business investment; forced temporary rent to satisfy $13.5M vacant sale.
Business Sabotage	Simon McPhillips	**$30,000,000**	Destruction of shared production companies; extracted/diverted development funds.
Total Enumerated Damages	Conspiracy Network	$37,975,299+	Cumulative financial devastation via coordinated asset usurpation and corporate fraud.

§ 6 — THE SUBVERSION OF THE JUDICIAL PROCESS AND IDENTITY HIJACKING

The final mechanism of the conspiracy involves the weaponization of the civil justice system to permanently silence the victim, criminalize whistleblower testimony, and formalize the theft of the marital estate.

§ 6.1 — Mudd Law Offices and the Paradox of the Unrevoked POA

A lawsuit was filed in Harris County, Texas (Case No. 202517063), under the name of the missing spouse, Andrei George Dunca, seeking a Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) against Sprawling for defamation and stalking. However, the evidentiary record suggests that Dunca, who has not been physically seen by independent parties since late 2022, is not directing this litigation. Dunca's historical behavior involved providing over $35,000 in monthly financial support and issuing a Statutory Durable Power of Attorney (POA) to Sprawling in 2019, explicitly covering real estate transactions in Harris County. Critically, this POA was never revoked. Yet, Mudd Law Offices (MLO) pursued contempt charges against Sprawling for utilizing the very rights that the POA confers. This presents a glaring legal paradox: it is factually implausible for a capable plaintiff to direct a multi-jurisdictional lawsuit against a spouse without first revoking their absolute financial authority.

The forensic implication is that the conspiracy network has hijacked Dunca's identity to prosecute litigation on his behalf. MLO, led by Charles Lee Mudd Jr., Joshua Pagan, and Katherine Leslie Stahl, allegedly deployed technical defenses to prevent forensic review of this identity hijacking. They relied on Remote Electronic Notarizations (REN) and unauthenticated digital signatures lacking biometric liveness checks, whilst vehemently refusing to produce wet-ink retainer agreements that would verify their client's actual consent. Victoria Garcia-Winder, Dunca's former assistant, acted as the sole gatekeeper for this litigation, routing communications and providing her own residential address to law enforcement as Dunca's location during wellness checks, further obfuscating his true whereabouts.

§ 6.2 — DARVO Tactics and the First Amendment Attack

The litigation tactics executed by MLO represent a textbook application of DARVO (Deny, Attack, Reverse Victim and Offender). By adopting the defamatory tropes created by Dr. Heafey and Yuri Spiro — namely, that the victim is suffering from cognitive impairment and substance abuse — the legal filings inflict intentional emotional distress and shift the burden of proof onto the financially starved victim.

This strategy reached its apex with MLO's attempt to pursue "Indirect Civil Contempt" charges against Sprawling for publishing his memoir, *Wallflower of the Year*, and the accompanying *Exposé*. These publications document the disappearance of Dunca, the staging of spectacles for blackmail by operatives like Richie Vetter, and the diversion of proceeds to LGBTQ+ youth charities. The attempt to enjoin the publication of these autobiographical accounts represents a direct attack on First Amendment protections, designed to criminalize whistleblower testimony and suppress the permanent documentary archive of the abuse.

§ 7 — SYSTEMIC LAW ENFORCEMENT FAILURES AND JURISDICTIONAL BLIND SPOTS

The evidentiary record documents a pervasive pattern of negligence, procedural violation, and alleged active complicity across multiple law enforcement jurisdictions, enabling the conspiracy to operate without state interference.

§ 7.1 — Beverly Hills Police Department (BHPD): The Custodial Misconduct

At the 420 N. Camden Drive property, BHPD responses were marked by extreme irregularities. Officer J. Lyga, independently identified as a personal friend of Dr. Heafey, arrived at the premises and was recorded stating, "Okay what's left in our little game." Officers permitted an identified stalking operative to taunt the victim, allowed a remote-controlled drone to ram the door, and ultimately abandoned the medically distressed victim after he lost consciousness from a panic attack. They

left all doors unlocked and rearranged the furniture, facilitating the subsequent removal of video equipment by unidentified individuals.

This environmental manipulation was followed by gross custodial abuse. Detective Goff orchestrated the victim's arrest under the entirely fabricated alias "Anthony Sprawling." This deliberate misidentification circumvented standard booking protocols, allowing the arrest to proceed without a valid warrant match. The victim was denied legal counsel, held in isolation for three days, and subjected to an arbitrary overnight bail increase from $20,000 to $100,000. This manipulation provided the exact temporal window required for Yuri Spiro's pre-staged movers to illegally clear the commercial premises, demonstrating how law enforcement apparatus was co-opted to execute a civil eviction.

§ 7.2 — Harris County Constable Precinct 4: The Administrative Quarantine

In Texas, the institutional cover-up was executed through administrative obstruction. Deputy C. Diaz initiated a chain of suppression by refusing to conduct a mandatory missing person intake for Andrei Dunca, relying entirely on hearsay from co-conspirator Victoria Garcia-Winder and exhibiting anti-LGBTQ+ bias regarding the common-law marriage. This refusal created an administrative gap that opposing counsel subsequently weaponized in civil court to deny Dunca's disappearance.

The foreclosure eviction at 13339 Balmore Circle was executed by Deputy Ramon Ruiz utilizing a 33-day stale writ of possession, rendering the 24-hour warning notice procedurally defective under Texas Property Code § 24.0061(d)(1). Ruiz falsified the official chain-of-custody return, stating possession was given to a phantom "representative Herbert's," when the writ was merely taped to the door. When the victim suffered an acute panic attack, Deputy D. Jones denied the administration of life-saving medication by the victim's father, delayed EMT transport, and falsely taunted the victim about criminal charges while in the ambulance. Subsequent Internal Affairs complaints regarding this widespread misconduct were routed to Sergeant David Mathieu, who forensically never opened the digital evidence files, yet Assistant Chief Kenneth Key falsely asserted the complaint was "reviewed in its entirety" before closing it as unfounded.

§ 7.3 — San Francisco Police Department (SFPD): The AI Verification Loophole

Perhaps the most alarming implication regarding law enforcement capabilities involves SFPD. Sergeant Joseph Siragusa administratively closed a formal missing person investigation into Andrei George Dunca based entirely on a single remote video conference. In an environment where the conspirators are heavily documented to possess advanced AI voice cloning and deepfake video generation capabilities, relying on an unauthenticated video stream to verify proof of life constitutes a catastrophic procedural failure. This incident highlights a severe jurisdictional blind spot: current law enforcement protocols are fundamentally inadequate to detect or combat identity hijacking mediated by artificial intelligence.

Jurisdiction	Involved Personnel	Alleged Misconduct / Procedural Failure	Strategic Implication for the Conspiracy
BHPD	Officer J. Lyga	Refusal to remove stalker, abandonment of medically distressed victim, "little game" comment.	Facilitated physical property seizure, psychological destabilization, and evidence suppression.
BHPD	Detective Goff	Arrest under fabricated alias ("Anthony Sprawling"), arbitrary bail increase to $100k, denial of counsel.	Enabled the illegal eviction timeline; bypassed constitutional warrant identification checks.
Harris County	Deputy C. Diaz	Refusal of missing person intake for Dunca based on hearsay; anti-LGBTQ+ bias regarding common-law marriage.	Created a false administrative record weaponized in civil court to deny Dunca's disappearance.
Harris County	Deputy R. Ruiz	Executed 33-day stale writ; falsified chain-of-custody	Effectuated the unlawful eviction of disabled veteran

Jurisdiction	Involved Personnel	Alleged Misconduct / Procedural Failure	Strategic Implication for the Conspiracy
		return ("representative Herbert's").	parents outside statutory property codes.
Harris County	Sgt. D. Mathieu	Failed to open Internal Affairs evidence files; facilitated false "unfounded" disposition.	Perfected the administrative quarantine, ensuring no state recourse for the victim.
SFPD	Sgt. J. Siragusa	Closed missing person case via a single remote video call without biometric authentication.	Demonstrates catastrophic vulnerability of police protocols to AI deepfake and voice cloning tech.

§ 8 — STREET-LEVEL OPERATIVES AND RELATIONAL SABOTAGE

The sophisticated technological and legal infrastructure of the conspiracy was executed on the ground by a network of relational operatives who utilized emotional manipulation and extortion to enforce the victim's isolation.

§ 8.1 — Kyle Joseph Egan and Kory Lamar Word

Kyle Joseph Egan, a former associate, engaged in a 60-day deception plan captured on Valentine's Day audio, feigning romantic interest to induce the victim to break a penthouse lease and sign a new agreement at $18,000 per month, only to abandon the victim immediately upon move-in. Egan maintained a secret concurrent engagement to Kory Lamar Word, utilizing the victim as an alibi while simultaneously extorting him by falsely claiming that mutually generated media contained underage content.

Egan's involvement bridges the gap between relational abuse and the broader conspiracy. He was captured on security camera riding the repaired scooter that was central to the fabricated vandalism charge against Sprawling, audibly taunting:

> *"Haha Sean we got you!"*

Furthermore, Kory Word's misdirection regarding Egan's whereabouts — claiming he was kidnapped by "Mexican gangsters" and sex-trafficked before suddenly returning — mirrors the chaotic disinformation tactics used to mask the movements of key conspirators.

§ 8.2 — Asymmetric Empathy and the eSIM Incident

The network's operational mandate of total isolation was perfectly illustrated by the eSIM incident involving Simon McPhillips. When Sprawling, entirely cut off from communications, purchased a prepaid eSIM and texted McPhillips to report the abuse, McPhillips mistakenly believed the sender was Richie Vetter. Believing Vetter was the victim, McPhillips immediately offered him international sanctuary and a "lifeline" in Canada. However, the moment Sprawling revealed his true identity, McPhillips instantly ceased all communication. This incident proves that the isolation of Sprawling is not incidental; it is a strict operational rule governing the conspirators' network — demonstrating asymmetric empathy where associates are protected while the primary target is marked for unmitigated destruction.

§ 9 — STRATEGIC CONCLUSIONS AND REMEDIAL OUTLOOK

The extensive evidentiary record compiled in the matter of Rodney Samuel Sprawling details a sophisticated, multi-domain campaign of attrition. The alleged conspirators, leveraging the immense capital and technological capabilities derived from the LiveRail and Bluefish AI corporate acquisitions, executed a flawless integration of digital kidnapping, sensory torture, and financial sabotage.

By successfully co-opting medical professionals to fabricate diagnoses of psychosis, the network established a self-sealing evidentiary loop that neutralized local law enforcement and ensured institutional apathy. The subsequent use of bad-faith litigation, unverified digital notarizations, and constructive eviction tactics completed the operational objective: the total isolation of the victim, the destruction of his production companies, and the usurpation of the marital estate.

The broader implications are stark. The case serves as a comprehensive blueprint demonstrating how enterprise-level technology can bypass constitutional protections and civil rights. It reveals that local law enforcement, the medical establishment, and the judicial system are currently structurally ill-equipped to identify, authenticate, or combat crimes mediated by artificial intelligence and digital impersonation.

The Sprawling v. Dunca conspiracy allegations demand rigorous, federal-level forensic investigation. Immediate regulatory modernization is required within the judiciary to mandate biometric liveness checks for remote legal proceedings, and within law enforcement to establish protocols for detecting AI-driven identity hijacking. Ultimately, this case highlights a critical intersection where modern corporate technological capabilities have vastly outpaced the legal frameworks designed to protect human autonomy — signaling the dawn of privatized, algorithmically driven domestic terrorism.

SECTION XIX: FORMAL COMPLAINT TO THE CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PSYCHOLOGY — DR. RICHARD AUSTIN HEAFEY, PSY.D.

Docket Reference: CA LIC. #PSY30807 | Filed: August 12, 2025 | Certified

Delivery Confirmed: April 7, 2025

A. CERTIFICATION OF FILING — DOCSMIT CERTIFIED MAILING RECORD

A formal written complaint against Dr. Richard Austin Heafey was submitted to the California Board of Psychology via USPS Certified Mail with Electronic Return Receipt. The following record, certified by Docsmit.com, Inc., constitutes documentary proof that the complaint was accepted, mailed, and successfully delivered to the Board.

Field

Detail

Mailing ID

850446 (Docsmit Certification)

Account / Sender

— Rodney S. Sprawling; Return Address: 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122

Subject / Description

"Complaint Richard Austin Heafey — Unfold Psychology"

Recipient

Board of Psychology, 1625 North Market Blvd., Suite N-215, Sacramento, CA 95834

Service Type

USPS Certified Mail — Electronic Return Receipt, #10 Envelope, 2-Sided

Accepted by Docsmit

March 30, 2025 — 4:00 AM EDT

Production / Mailed Date

April 1, 2025 — 12:00 AM EDT

USPS Tracking Number

9214 8901 3247 3400 2181 0541 45

USPS Delivery Status

Delivered to Agent, Picked up at USPS — April 7, 2025, 11:21 AM — SACRAMENTO, CA 95811

Enclosed Content

1 Document — 5 Pages (initial version of formal complaint)

The 5-page version mailed on April 1, 2025, constitutes the initial formal complaint submitted to the Board. The expanded 26-page formal complaint (August 12, 2025) represents the comprehensive, fully documented version incorporating exhibits, text transcript excerpts, APA code citations, and an appended affidavit.

B. COMPLAINT OVERVIEW — FORMAL COMPLAINT AND REQUEST FOR INVESTIGATION

Submitted by: EsRā Dunca Sprawling, 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122
Regarding: Dr. Richard Austin Heafey, PsyD — Clinical Psychologist, CA LIC. #PSY30807, Unfold Psychology, Oakland, CA
Date of 26-Page Complaint: August 12, 2025
Submitted to: California Board of Psychology, 1625 North Market Blvd., Suite N-215, Sacramento, CA 95834

The 26-page formal complaint provides a comprehensive, documented analysis of alleged professional misconduct by Dr. Richard Austin Heafey. Evidence compiled from text message transcripts, police reports, video evidence, and a formal affidavit outlines a *systematic pattern of behavior* constituting a severe and complete breach

of the ethical standards of the American Psychological Association (APA), as adopted by the California Board of Psychology.

The complaint is supported by the following exhibits: **Exhibit A** (Notarized Affidavit of Rodney Samuel Sprawling), **Exhibit B** (Verbatim text message transcripts), **Exhibit C** (Email from Dr. Heafey refusing to provide invoices), **Exhibit D** (Yelp reviews from other patients documenting misconduct), **Exhibit E** (Letter to the Board/Certification of Delivery), **Exhibit F** (Affidavit and Declaration of Common-Law Marriage), and **Exhibit G** (Letter from Dr. Naheed Dilshad providing contradictory medical evaluation).

C. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS

The complaint enumerates five primary categories of misconduct, each cross-referenced to specific APA Ethical Code standards:

1. Pervasive Gaslighting and Denial of a Clinical Relationship

Dr. Heafey repeatedly denied the existence of a therapeutic relationship, stating: *"Let me be absolutely clear, we have NO clinical relationship. I am not your doctor."* The complainant asserts this denial was issued after two years of continued, unsolicited outreach — including 2 AM text messages — constituting a calculated effort to invalidate the patient's perception of the therapeutic bond and amounts to systematic gaslighting in violation of APA Standard 10.10 (Terminating Therapy).

2. Profound Sexual Misconduct and Abuse of Power

Text message transcripts document explicit, graphic, and predatory sexual propositions transmitted from Dr. Heafey's verified phone number, including invitations to his personal residence, explicit sexual requests, drug-facilitated sex propositions (DMT, GHB), and a request to arrange a third sexual partner. During one videoconference, Dr. Heafey allegedly exposed himself. These acts constitute direct violations of APA Standard 10.05 (Sexual Intimacies with Current Clients/Patients), Standard 3.05 (Multiple Relationships), and Standard 3.04 (Avoiding Harm).

3. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress and Patient Abandonment

Dr. Heafey's documented "methods" triggered panic attacks, following which he abruptly terminated calls and advised the complainant to "hospitalize yourself" — abandoning a patient in active crisis without safety planning, referral, or crisis resources in violation of APA Principle A (Beneficence and Nonmaleficence) and Standard 10.10 (Terminating Therapy).

4. Breach of Confidentiality and Financial Coercion

Dr. Heafey admitted to discussing the complainant's treatment with the complainant's partner, Andrei George Dunca, and with Victoria Garcia-

Winder — without patient consent — in violation of APA Standard 4.01 (Maintaining Confidentiality) and Standard 4.06 (Consultations). He further attempted to withhold information about the complainant's missing spouse as leverage to compel removal of negative online reviews, and offered a bribe of up to $5,000 to secure removal of the same reviews — violating APA Standard 3.06 (Conflict of Interest) and Principle C (Integrity).

5. Complicity in a Broader System of Abuse — Weaponization of Diagnosis

Dr. Heafey's initial clinical opinion — formed after a videoconference evaluation — concluded the complainant was *"not showing symptoms of psychosis,"* was *"suffering anxiety triggered by a real source,"* and was *"otherwise sane."* He subsequently reversed this assessment without any new in-person evaluation, new clinical basis, or evidence, declaring instead: *"In my clinical opinion you are suffering from delusions and possibly hallucinations: whether they are driven by methamphetamine misuse or were exacerbated by methamphetamines, I do not know."* This reversal directly mirrored the false narrative maintained by the complainant's alleged abusers and — critically — occurred after a 14-panel drug screen administered by the complainant's primary care physician, Dr. Naheed Dilshad, returned entirely negative for all illicit substances. A subsequent evaluation at a Kaiser medical clinic similarly confirmed the complainant was "otherwise sane" and exhibited no signs of methamphetamine intoxication or psychosis.

D. CHRONOLOGICAL NARRATIVE OF EVENTS (As Stated in the Certified Complaint)

Initial Engagement (Mid-to-Late 2022): The complainant first engaged Dr. Heafey via videoconference, at the suggestion of partner Andrei George Dunca, who wished to have the complainant evaluated by a psychologist before investigating the reported stalking and harassment. The purpose of the evaluation was explicitly to rule out psychosis. Dr. Heafey concluded the complainant was *"not showing symptoms of psychosis,"* was *"suffering anxiety triggered by a real source,"* and was *"otherwise sane."* He additionally noted the complainant's spouse appeared

"financially controlling and emotionally manipulative" and recommended civil action against a named stalker for intentional infliction of emotional distress. Victoria Garcia-Winder — the complainant's former employee then working as Dunca's personal assistant — had, without the complainant's knowledge, told Dunca and family members that the complainant *"was having a mental break triggered by methamphetamine use, which is a lie."*

Abrupt Partner Disappearance (Late 2022): Immediately after the complainant reported Dr. Heafey's initial findings to Andrei Dunca — specifically that no psychosis was present — Dunca severed all contact and effectively disappeared. The complainant did not continue sessions with Dr. Heafey at that time.

Re-engagement and Firing (2022–2023): As the harassment intensified and the complainant returned to Dr. Heafey for assistance in building an abuse timeline for civil litigation purposes, the psychologist's "methods" triggered panic attacks. Dr. Heafey responded by abruptly terminating calls and advising self-hospitalization, without safety planning. The complainant terminated Dr. Heafey's services. Dr. Heafey then continued to contact the complainant for two years — including late-night messages asking "Are you up?" — claiming to be offering a "concierge service at no cost" out of "care," despite having been formally fired.

Diagnostic Reversal Without Clinical Basis (2023–2024): Without any new in-person evaluation, Dr. Heafey reversed his clinical opinion to align with the narrative promoted by the complainant's alleged abusers, now asserting drug-induced psychosis. He simultaneously suggested the complainant "fire and sue" primary care physician Dr. Naheed Dilshad — the very doctor whose in-person assessments, weekly house calls, and 14-panel drug screen directly refuted the psychosis claim and documented the complainant as "otherwise sane." Dr. Heafey also failed to disclose undisclosed personal relationships with Andrei George Dunca and Victoria Garcia-Winder, both of whom he had discussed the complainant's treatment with in private conversations.

Sexual Misconduct (March 2024): Verbatim text message transcripts (Exhibit B) document an extended exchange in which Dr. Heafey, from his verified phone number, invited the complainant to his personal residence at 226 Ritch St., Unit 302, San Francisco, providing the building entry code (#1595), describing a newly installed steam shower in which he offered to "bathe" the complainant, and explicitly asking: *"Do I get that ass?"* He also proposed drug-facilitated sex (DMT,

GHB/"chem sex"), solicited arrangement of a third sexual partner, and expressed being "not pleased" and "truly disappointed" when the invitation was declined. A subsequent videoconference is alleged to have included indecent exposure when Dr. Heafey stood, revealing he was not wearing trousers and appeared to be masturbating.

Financial Coercion and Leverage (2024–2025): Dr. Heafey attempted to bribe the complainant with $5,000 to remove negative online reviews. He additionally offered information about the whereabouts of missing spouse Andrei George Dunca as leverage — stating he had visited the Ortega Street residence and spoken with Dunca — but refused to provide those details unless negative reviews were removed. He later denied having made such a visit. He attempted to make the complainant sign documents that would place the complainant under his care and grant him authority to hospitalize and medicate at his discretion — notably, at the precise moment the complainant confronted him about his ties to the alleged abusers.

Timeline of Key Procedural Events:

- **March 2023:** Complainant terminates Dr. Heafey's services.
- **April 2023 – June 2025:** Continued receipt of messages from Dr. Heafey's number, including inappropriate content and personal solicitations.
- **March 2024:** Explicit sexual proposition exchange documented in Exhibit B transcripts.
- **July 2025:** Complainant formally confronts Dr. Heafey regarding the messages; Dr. Heafey denies authorship, suggesting possible phone compromise.
- **August 2025:** Complainant offers to collaborate on a police report to investigate potential hacking and clear both parties. 26-page formal complaint submitted August 12, 2025.
- **March 30, 2025:** Initial 5-page complaint submitted via Docsmit certified mailing to California Board of Psychology.
- **April 7, 2025:** Confirmed delivery to Board of Psychology — "Delivered to Agent, Picked up at USPS" — Sacramento, CA 95811, 11:21 AM.

E. ANALYSIS OF MISCONDUCT — APA ETHICAL CODE VIOLATIONS

Violation Category

Specific APA Standard

Supporting Evidence

Denial of Clinical Relationship / Gaslighting

Standard 10.10 — Terminating Therapy

Two-year pattern of 2 AM texts; denial of relationship after providing unsolicited free "concierge" therapy

Diagnostic Reversal Without Clinical Basis

Standard 2.01 (Competence); Standard 2.04 (Bases for Professional Judgments)

Shift from "otherwise sane / anxiety from real source" to "delusions and hallucinations from meth" — no new in-person evaluation; 14-panel drug screen negative

Sexual Misconduct and Dual Relationship

Standard 10.05; Standard 3.05 (Multiple Relationships); Standard 3.03 (Harassment)

Verbatim text transcripts (Exhibit B); building address + entry code transmitted; indecent exposure on videoconference

Drug-Related Manipulation

Standard 3.04 — Avoiding Harm

Solicitation of DMT and GHB-facilitated sexual encounter with current/former

patient

Breach of Confidentiality

Standard 4.01 (Maintaining Confidentiality); Standard 4.06 (Consultations)

Admitted communications with Andrei George Dunca and Victoria Garcia-Winder regarding the complainant's treatment without consent

Financial Coercion / Bribery

Standard 3.06 (Conflict of Interest); Principle C (Integrity); Standard 6.04 (Fees and Financial Arrangements)

$5,000 bribe offer for review removal; leverage of missing spouse information for same purpose

Patient Abandonment During Crisis

Principle A — Beneficence and Nonmaleficence; Standard 10.10

Abrupt call termination during panic attacks; self-hospitalization suggestion without safety plan or referrals

Coercion / Abuse of Authority

Standard 3.04 (Avoiding Harm); Principle B (Fidelity and Responsibility)

Pressured complainant to sign documents authorizing hospitalization and medication — without legal/clinical grounds — upon being confronted about relationships with alleged abusers

Collusion with Law Enforcement / Third Parties

Standard 3.05 (Multiple Relationships); Police Report — Exhibit A

Alleged personal relationship with the arresting officer; video evidence of collusion documented in hidden surveillance footage (referenced Exhibit B-2)

F. KEY VERBATIM DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE (Exhibit B Excerpts)

The following verbatim excerpts are drawn directly from the text message transcript filed as Exhibit B to the formal complaint and represent pivotal evidentiary moments:

> Dr. Heafey → Complainant (March 23, 2024, 12:23–12:25 AM):
>
> *"Do I get that ass?" / "My place." / "226 Ritch st. Unit 302. #1595 to get in." / "Just installed steam shower, will bath you here."*
>
> — Transmitted from Dr. Heafey's verified phone number, providing home address, unit number, and building entry code.

> Dr. Heafey → Complainant (March 23, 2024, 10:49–10:52 PM):
>
> *"You don't want to touch, taste, choke of my beautify, thick, big cock?" / "You don't want me pinning you up against the wall? Teasing you... letting you try some very special before I stick my dick in your tight ass." / "Ever had just a tiny taste of DMT with a dick in your ass?"*
>
> — Explicit sexual and drug-facilitated sex propositions transmitted from Dr. Heafey's phone.

> Dr. Heafey → Complainant (April 1, 2024, 11:06 AM):
>
> *"In my clinical opinion you are suffering from delusions and possibly*

hallucinations: whether they are driven by methamphetamine misuse or were exacerbated by methamphetamines, I do not know. I believe you are suffering. I do not believe you have been systematically attacked and mentally controlled by a group of people, who have no incentive to hurt you."

— Reversal of initial "otherwise sane" clinical opinion, transmitted without new in-person evaluation and contradicted by two independent physicians.

Dr. Heafey → Complainant (Exhibit B, Page 15):

"Sean - I am not supposed to be talking with you. My fear is you think we have a clinical relationship. Let me be absolutely clear, we have NO clinical relationship. I am not your doctor."

— Denial of clinical relationship issued after documented two-year pattern of unsolicited outreach and free "concierge" therapy.

Dr. Heafey → Complainant (Exhibit B, Page 15):

"I am going to restate only because I know the reality is different and to leave you feeling like he is in danger when I know he is not, in my ethical opinion, would be wrong: he is not in danger."

— Dr. Heafey asserts knowledge of missing spouse Andrei Dunca's safety without disclosing the source or basis of that knowledge — a statement investigators characterize as evidence of undisclosed contact with or access

to the missing person.

G. IMPACT OF MISCONDUCT

Psychological and Emotional Harm: Dr. Heafey's alleged conduct — gaslighting, sexual exploitation, crisis abandonment, and diagnostic manipulation — directly exacerbated an already acute trauma state. The complainant experienced sustained panic attacks, self-harm, suicidal ideation, and severe emotional dysregulation directly attributable to Dr. Heafey's conduct during and after the therapeutic relationship. The denial of the therapeutic relationship and the issuance of contradictory diagnoses systematically undermined the complainant's sense of reality in a manner consistent with psychological abuse.

Reputational and Legal Harm: The fabricated "drug-induced psychosis" diagnosis was communicated to third parties — including the complainant's partner, family members, and Victoria Garcia-Winder — without consent, poisoning the complainant's support network and effectively inoculating those parties against belief in any reports of stalking, harassment, or abuse. This rendered the complainant unable to obtain help from family, law enforcement, legal counsel, or emergency responders, allowing the alleged harassment network to operate with impunity.

Financial Harm: Financial coercion, including the $5,000 bribe attempt and the withholding of refunds, compounded the complainant's already severe financial attrition. The refusal to provide invoices for past treatment (Exhibit C) additionally complicated the complainant's efforts to pursue remedies.

Collateral Endangerment: Two additional individuals — Kyle Joseph Egan and Richard "Richie" Alan Vetter — who reported experiencing the same harassment as the complainant, subsequently disappeared. The complaint asserts that Dr. Heafey's alleged role in enabling and concealing the broader conspiracy directly contributed to a dangerous environment that endangered these individuals as well as the complainant.

H. INDEPENDENT MEDICAL CORROBORATION

Three independent medical evaluations directly contradict Dr. Heafey's revised diagnosis of drug-induced psychosis or delusional disorder:

70. **Dr. Naheed Dilshad (Primary Care / Concierge Medicine, Beverly Hills):** Conducted weekly in-person house calls and on-site evaluations at the complainant's temporary residence during the height of the alleged harassment. Administered a 14-panel drug screen returning entirely negative for all illicit substances. Clinical notes document anxiety consistent with external stressors; complainant assessed as "otherwise sane." Dr. Dilshad personally witnessed elements of the harassment Dr. Heafey characterized as delusions. Dr. Heafey, upon learning of Dr. Dilshad's findings, urged the complainant to "fire and sue" her — an extraordinary directive from one licensed professional regarding another whose findings contradicted his revised narrative.
71. **Kaiser Medical Clinic (Third-Party Evaluation):** Independent evaluation concluded the complainant was "otherwise sane" and exhibited no signs of methamphetamine intoxication, psychosis, or delusional disorder, consistent with both Dr. Dilshad's assessment and Dr. Heafey's own initial clinical opinion.
72. **Dr. Heafey's Own Initial Assessment (2022):** Dr. Heafey himself originally concluded after the initial videoconference evaluation that the complainant was "not showing symptoms of psychosis," was "suffering anxiety triggered by a real source," and was "otherwise sane." This initial assessment — which predates the diagnostic reversal — constitutes a self-generated contradiction that the complaint characterizes as evidence of the reversal's bad-faith origins.

I. REQUESTS FOR REVIEW AND ACTION (As Submitted to the Board)

The formal complaint requests the following from the California Board of Psychology:

- **Formal Investigation:** Independent review of all communications from Dr. Heafey's verified number, including forensic device and account activity analysis; review of clinical records, billing practices, and any prior complaints or disciplinary history (California Business and Professions Code compliance review).
- **License Suspension or Revocation:** The documented pattern — predatory sexual behavior, manipulation, gaslighting, patient abandonment, and gross misuse of professional authority — provides grounds for immediate suspension or permanent termination of CA LIC. #PSY30807.
- **Referral to Law Enforcement:** For criminal prosecution regarding alleged collusion with law enforcement, participation in or facilitation of false imprisonment, and potential obstruction of a missing persons investigation.
- **Restorative Measures:** Formal acknowledgment of misconduct; corrective supervision or ethics training; public advisory to protect vulnerable future clients; support for the complainant's reputational restoration.
- **Public Safety Advisory:** Consideration of public alerts given the serious and predatory nature of the allegations and the existence of corroborating Yelp reviews from additional patients documenting similar misconduct patterns (Exhibit D).

J. CROSS-REFERENCES TO RELATED REPORT SECTIONS

Section	Relevance to Section XIX
Section G — Dr. Heafey Profile	Subject profile, initial context of engagement, and fabricated diagnosis allegations established in the primary subject section
Section VIII — Andrei George Dunca	Dr. Heafey's asserted knowledge of Dunca's safety despite reported disappearance; undisclosed personal relationship with Dunca (LinkedIn contact confirmed)
Section VIII — Victoria Garcia-Winder	Confidentiality breach: Dr. Heafey admitted to discussing complainant's treatment with Garcia-Winder; Garcia-Winder's false "methamphetamine psychosis" narrative to family preceded and aligned with Heafey's diagnostic reversal
Section XVI — EXPOSÉ: EsRā v. Individuals	Dr. Heafey named as individual defendant; professional negligence and weaponization of diagnosis as civil cause of action
Section XV — SPRAWLING v. Entities	Unfold Psychology named as corporate defendant; professional malpractice cause of action
Section XVII — Higher-Order Implications (§4)	Weaponization of the mandatory reporter framework; Heafey as a compromised medical proxy neutralizing civil rights
Section XVIII — Forensic Assessment (§4.1–4.2)	Medical sabotage analysis; Dr. Heafey's role in the Medical Sabotage Conflicts table ($5,000 bribe attempt; $1.1M property ownership while claiming financial limitation)

Evidentiary Note: *This section is supported by two primary source documents appended to this report: (1) the 26-page Formal Complaint and Request for Investigation submitted to the California Board of Psychology on August 12, 2025 (EsRā Dunca Sprawling, Complainant; CA LIC. #PSY30807, Respondent), and (2) the Docsmit Certification of Mailing (Mailing ID: 850446), confirming USPS Certified Mail delivery of the initial 5-page complaint to the Board on April 7, 2025, at 11:21 AM, Sacramento, CA, tracking number 9214 8901 3247 3400 2181 0541 45.*

SECTION XX — FBI TRANSMISSIONS

&

DUNCA V. SPRAWLING CIVIL ACTION

Subject:

Federal Criminal Complaints Submitted to FBI Houston Field Office; Retaliatory Civil Lawsuit Filed by Mudd Law Offices on Behalf of Andrei George Dunca

Complainant:

Rodney Samuel Sprawling (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling / Sean Sprawling)

Jurisdiction:

Harris County, Texas; FBI Houston Division

Cross-Reference:

Sections E, F, G, H, VII, VIII, XIX

PART I — FBI MAILING AND SUBMISSION DETAILS

Two separate transmissions were submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation Houston Field Office via Docsmit-certified USPS Certified Mail. Both submissions were made under the account ** (Rodney S. Sprawling), with a return address of 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122.

Transmission	Part	Submitted	Delivered	Service	Recipient
Transmission 1	Part 1 of 2	March 12, 2025	March 17, 2025	USPS Certified Mail	FBI Houston Field Office
Transmission 2	Part 2 of 2	March 23, 2025	March 28, 2025	USPS Certified Mail	FBI Houston Field Office

Both transmissions were processed and certified through Docsmit, establishing a tamper-evident, timestamped chain of custody for each submission. The certifications confirm mailing and delivery and are available as exhibits.

PART II — CRIMINAL ALLEGATIONS SUBMITTED TO THE FBI

The criminal complaint transmitted to the FBI encompasses five primary allegation clusters: missing persons, false imprisonment and torture, sexual abuse and extortion, professional misconduct by a licensed clinician, and third-party complicity. Each is detailed below.

A. Missing Persons Reports

- **Andrei George Dunca** — Complainant's spouse and business partner; reported missing alongside the couple's shared dog shortly after Sprawling was isolated by alleged abusers at the Camden Drive property.
- **Kyle Joseph Egan** — Close associate; allegedly removed from his apartment by individuals described as "Mexican gangsters," with subsequent reports suggesting Egan may have been sold into sex trafficking.

- **Richard "Richie" Alan Vetter** — Close associate who disappeared shortly before a planned relocation to Sprawling's residence and who had independently corroborated experiencing identical digital intrusion and stalking.

B. False Imprisonment, Torture, and Sexual Abuse

- Complainant alleges false imprisonment commencing **September 2022** at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA — the site of both his temporary residence and newly established business.
- Specific torture methods alleged include **sleep deprivation** and **low-voltage electrical shocks**.
- Complainant reports being manipulated into performing sexual acts under threat of extortion if the acts were exposed publicly.
- Abusers allegedly compromised Sprawling's communications infrastructure, rerouting calls and messages to and from law enforcement and emergency services.

C. Allegations Against Dr. Richard Austin Heafey

The FBI complaint details the following specific allegations against Dr. Heafey (CA LIC. #PSY30807, Unfold Psychology):

- Appeared on a videoconference call without pants and appeared to be masturbating during what was characterized as a clinical session.
- Invited Complainant to his office for a sexual encounter.

- Solicited information about "chem sex" using GHB and requested that Complainant locate a third sexual partner.
- Diagnosed Complainant with **meth-induced psychosis** without conducting an in-person clinical evaluation — a diagnosis Complainant alleges was fabricated to align with a false narrative promoted by the abuser network.
- Offered a **$5,000 bribe** to Complainant in exchange for the removal of negative online reviews.
- Breached patient confidentiality by sharing clinical information with **Victoria Garcia Winder**, Dunca's personal assistant, without consent.

D. Allegations Against Victoria Garcia Winder and Yuri Richard Spiro

- **Victoria Alana Garcia Winder** — Identified as Dunca's personal assistant; accused of circulating a false narrative regarding Complainant's mental health and drug use to Dunca, Complainant's family members, and the broader network, directly facilitating the institutional gaslighting campaign.
- **Yuri Richard Spiro** — Former landlord; accused of owing Complainant a $385,000 loan, dismissing all harassment reports, removing security hard drives from the Camden Drive property, and ultimately abandoning the building — leaving Complainant without any administrative point of contact or physical safeguards.

PART III — CIVIL ACTION: DUNCA V. SPRAWLING (HARRIS COUNTY, TX)

> Editorial Note:
>
> One day after Complainant submitted Transmission 1 to the FBI (March 12, 2025), Mudd Law Offices filed a civil lawsuit against Complainant on behalf of Andrei George Dunca in Harris County, Texas. The temporal proximity of this filing to the FBI transmission is a documented and forensically significant anomaly.

Field	Detail
Case Name	Dunca v. Sprawling
Case Number	202517063
Court	District Court, Harris County, Texas
Filed	March 13, 2025
Plaintiff's Counsel	Mudd Law Offices (Joshua Pagan / Charles Mudd)
Damages Sought	Over $200,000 but not more than $1,000,000

A. Dunca's Representations in the Petition

- Dunca claims to be a U.S. citizen currently residing in **Berlin, Germany**.
- The petition asserts that Dunca and Sprawling "dated for eight years" before the relationship ended in **March 2021**, and explicitly **denies the existence of a marriage**.
- Dunca states he removed himself from SutroLab LLC and Sean Sprawling Productions LLC by **early 2023**.

- The petition cites a **September 5, 2024 SFPD video call** with Dunca as the basis for closing the missing person case — relying exclusively on a remote video contact rather than an in-person welfare check or physical corroboration of Dunca's location or condition.

B. Allegations Against Sprawling in the Petition

- Beginning in late 2022, Sprawling allegedly sent communications describing an unnamed "they" projecting images on walls and committing sexual abuse against him.
- The petition claims Sprawling "admitted to using or abusing methamphetamine" during this period — an allegation directly contradicted by the Quest Diagnostics toxicology report of December 2, 2022, which returned **negative for all illicit substances**.
- Sprawling allegedly sent over **200 emails** to Dunca in 2024 and contacted Dunca's friends and family.
- The petition references public LinkedIn and Facebook posts, as well as websites created by Sprawling, accusing Dunca of crimes including rape, torture, and kidnapping.
- Anonymous text messages from unidentified numbers are attributed to Sprawling **"on information and belief" without evidentiary proof**. The quoted anonymous messages do not contain direct threats against Dunca; they contain language indicating suicidal ideation and reference Sprawling being under threat of violence from unnamed third parties.

C. Causes of Action Asserted by Dunca

#	Cause of Action	Basis in Petition
1	Defamation Per Se	Websites and social media posts accusing Dunca of crimes
2	Intrusion Upon Seclusion	Alleged repeated contact and disclosure of private information
3	Chapter 85 Stalking (TX)	200+ emails, alleged anonymous messages, third-party contact
4	Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress	Course of alleged harassment conduct

PART IV — SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION AND EXHIBITS

A. Sprawling's Evidentiary Exhibits

Document	Source / Date	Evidentiary Significance
Clinical Notes — Dr. Naheed Ali (Dilshad)	Dilshad Concierge Medicine, Late 2022	Documents house calls for panic attacks triggered by harassment; Xanax prescription; physician records Sprawling as "otherwise clinically and hemodynamically stable" — directly contradicting Mudd Law's narrative of cognitive impairment
Toxicology Report	Quest Diagnostics, December 2, 2022	Negative result for all illicit substances; directly refutes the meth use narrative propagated by Garcia

Document	Source / Date	Evidentiary Significance
		Winder and reproduced in the Dunca petition
Affidavit of Domestic Partnership	Notarized in Florida	Documents the legal domestic partnership between Sprawling and Dunca, establishing foundational marital nexus
Affidavit of Name	Notarized in Texas	Establishes legal name and identity of EsRā Dunca-Sprawling for jurisdictional and filing purposes
Docsmit Certifications	Transmissions 1 & 2 (March 2025)	Tamper-evident, timestamped chain of custody confirming timely FBI submission prior to the filing of the retaliatory civil action

B. Temporary Restraining Order — March 14, 2025

An Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order was issued by the District Court of Harris County, Texas, dated **March 14, 2025** — one day after the civil petition was filed and two days after Complainant submitted the FBI transmission. The TRO:

- Legally restrains Sprawling from contacting Dunca or any member of Dunca's family.
- Prohibits Sprawling from communicating about Dunca in any form.
- Restrains Sprawling from filing additional law enforcement reports regarding Dunca.
- Commands the immediate removal of specific websites and online content referencing Dunca.

Forensic Note:

The TRO's prohibition on filing law enforcement reports regarding Dunca — combined with Mudd Law's simultaneous prosecution of claims characterizing Sprawling's missing person reports as stalking — creates a legally engineered condition in which Complainant is procedurally barred from continuing any official search for his reported missing spouse. This constitutes a judicially weaponized mechanism to suppress the missing person investigation. Cross-reference: Section H (Dunca Profile), Section VII (Mudd Law Offices), Section IV (Sgt. Siragusa / SFPD MP Closure by Video).

PART V — STRUCTURAL AND FORENSIC IMPLICATIONS

A. The Retaliatory Sequencing Pattern

The timeline between Complainant's FBI submission (March 12) and the civil filing (March 13) constitutes a one-day interval suggesting either real-time surveillance of Complainant's legal actions or pre-staged retaliatory infrastructure held in readiness. The deployment of Mudd Law Offices — the same firm that previously managed Dunca's business affairs — as the instrument of retaliation reinforces the allegation that the civil action is not an independent legal grievance but a coordinated counter-offensive designed to neutralize the FBI complaint by discrediting its author in a parallel legal forum.

B. Weaponization of Suicidal Ideation Language

The anonymous text messages referenced in the Dunca petition contain language indicating suicidal ideation and Sprawling under threat of violence — not threats directed at Dunca. Attributing these messages to Sprawling "on information and belief" without forensic evidence, and then deploying them as grounds for a stalking claim, represents a profound mischaracterization of the content. A legally and ethically accurate reading of the messages indicates a person in distress, not a perpetrator. This framing is consistent with the network's broader pattern of inverting victim status.

C. The SFPD Missing Person Closure: A Documented Forensic Discrepancy Between Sgt. Siragusa's Stated Basis and Mudd Law's Unverified Video Call Claim

The closure of Sprawling's missing person report concerning Andrei George Dunca by the San Francisco Police Department is documented through two **irreconcilable and mutually exclusive accounts** — one communicated directly by the investigating officer to Sprawling, and one asserted exclusively by Mudd Law Offices in the civil petition filed on behalf of Dunca (Case No. 202517063). These accounts have never been reconciled, no corroborating evidence has been produced for the Mudd Law version, and no SFPD follow-up has confirmed the existence of the alleged video call.

> ⚠ **FORENSIC DISCREPANCY — TWO CONFLICTING ACCOUNTS OF SFPD MP CLOSURE**
>
> Account Source
>
> Stated Basis for MP Case Closure
>
> Corroborating Evidence Produced

Sgt. Joseph Siragusa

(Direct Communication to Sprawling)

Sgt. Siragusa informed Sprawling directly that the missing person case was being closed based on

testimony obtained from current residents at 565 Ortega Street

during a wellness check conducted at the property. Those residents told Siragusa that Dunca had relocated to Germany and did not wish to speak with Sprawling.

Witness statements to officer during in-person wellness check

(law enforcement action). No documentation of this testimony was provided to Sprawling. No proof of life, identity verification, or independent confirmation of Dunca's Germany relocation was furnished to Sprawling.

Mudd Law Offices

(Civil Petition — Case No. 202517063)

Mudd Law's petition asserts that an SFPD officer conducted a

video call with Dunca on September 5, 2024

, and subsequently closed the missing person case on the basis of that video call.

None.

No video call recording, no SFPD report, no officer confirmation, and no sworn statement corroborating the alleged video call has been submitted by Dunca or Mudd Law to any court or to Sprawling.

The forensic significance of this discrepancy cannot be overstated. Sgt. Siragusa — the investigating officer — **never mentioned a video call** to Sprawling during any communication. The video call claim appears *exclusively* in Mudd Law's civil filing, originating from Dunca's own legal representatives who possess an obvious adversarial interest in establishing Dunca's willing and knowing presence. The following evidentiary absences compound the discrepancy:

- **No Proof of Life or Identity Verification:** Neither Dunca nor Mudd Law has produced any documentation confirming that the individual on any alleged video call was verified as Andrei George Dunca. No government-issued identification, biometric confirmation, or independent witness verification was provided to Sprawling or to any court.
- **No SFPD Follow-Up Confirmation:** SFPD has not issued any follow-up communication to Sprawling confirming that a video call occurred, confirming the identity of the individual on that call, or confirming that the video call — rather than the in-person witness testimony at 565 Ortega Street — was the operative basis for closing the missing person case.
- **No Submission to Court:** Despite the video call being the centerpiece of Mudd Law's argument that Dunca is "not a missing person," no video recording, call log, SFPD case notation, or officer declaration corroborating the video call has been filed as evidence in Case No. 202517063 or in any appellate proceeding.
- **Spoofability and Impersonation Risk:** As documented throughout this Report, the alleged network possesses enterprise-level AI voice-cloning and deepfake capabilities. An unverified video call in which no identity authentication was performed carries zero evidentiary weight as proof that Dunca appeared voluntarily and of sound mind — particularly given that Dunca's own devices and digital identity are alleged to have been compromised by the same network.

Forensic Conclusion — Litigation Shield Analysis

The Mudd Law video call claim functions as a self-serving, unverifiable litigation assertion deployed to neutralize Sprawling's missing person report without subjecting Dunca to in-person, court-ordered appearance or independent identity verification. The contradiction between Sgt. Siragusa's direct account (closure based on third-party witness testimony at the property) and Mudd Law's account (closure based on a video call with Dunca himself) has never been resolved by SFPD, never corroborated by documentary evidence, and never subjected to adversarial scrutiny in any evidentiary hearing. This discrepancy, standing alone, constitutes a material factual dispute bearing directly on whether Andrei George Dunca is alive, acting voluntarily, and free from coercion — and it demands judicial resolution through a court-ordered proof-of-life and identity verification proceeding.

D. Toxicological and Clinical Evidence as Counter-Narrative

The combination of Dr. Naheed Ali's clinical notes — documenting Sprawling as "clinically and hemodynamically stable" and attributing panic attacks to a real, external harassment source — and the Quest Diagnostics negative toxicology panel from December 2, 2022, constitutes independent third-party medical evidence directly contradicting the foundational premise of the Dunca petition's meth-use narrative. These documents were generated contemporaneously with the alleged abuse and carry substantially greater evidentiary weight than unverified assertions made in litigation filed two and a half years later.

E. The TRO as an Investigative Suppression Instrument

The Ex Parte nature of the March 14, 2025 TRO means it was issued without Sprawling's participation or opportunity to respond. Its scope — prohibiting not only contact with Dunca but also the filing of law enforcement reports about him and the maintenance of online content documenting the allegations — effectively silences the Complainant across three distinct channels simultaneously: personal contact, legal reporting, and public record. When considered alongside the FBI transmissions, the TRO functions as a judicially issued gag order activated in direct temporal response to Complainant's federal outreach, with no equivalent mechanism protecting Complainant's documented right to seek assistance for a reported missing spouse.

Cross-References:

Section E (Kyle Joseph Egan) | Section F (Yuri Richard Spiro) | Section G (Dr. Heafey / Board Complaint, Section XIX) | Section H (Andrei George Dunca) | Section IV (Sgt. Siragusa / SFPD) | Section VII (Mudd Law Offices) | Section VIII (Victoria Garcia Winder) | Section XIV (Petition Analysis) | Section XV (Sprawling v. Entities)

SECTION XXI — MEDICAL CREDIBILITY VS. MUDD LAW'S NARRATIVE

I. Overview

The narrative advanced by opposing counsel, **Mudd Law Offices**, attempts to dismiss Sprawling's consistent, documented reports of extreme harassment, stalking, and false imprisonment as the delusions of a mind suffering from cognitive impairment attributable to illicit drug use — specifically alleging methamphetamine use commencing in late 2022. This narrative is a fabrication that is directly and conclusively refuted by contemporaneous, objective medical evidence compiled during the exact period in question.

II. Contemporaneous Medical Evidence: Dr. Naheed Ali / Dilshad Concierge Medicine

During the period Mudd Law claims Sprawling was suffering drug-induced cognitive impairment, Sprawling was under the active, in-person care of **Dr. Naheed Ali** of **Dilshad Concierge Medicine**. Dr. Ali conducted multiple house calls to treat Sprawling for panic attacks directly and causally associated with the documented trauma of being harassed and stalked. The credibility of Sprawling's reports is anchored in three dispositive medical facts:

Medical Finding	Details	Implication
Objective Sobriety (Toxicology)	Quest Diagnostics toxicology report collected December 2, 2022 — negative for all illicit substances including cocaine and opiates	Decisively dismantles Mudd Law's unverified methamphetamine claim with objective laboratory data
Documented Clinical Stability	Dr. Ali physically observed Sprawling throughout late 2022 and consistently	Contemporaneous in-person physician observation directly contradicts any

Medical Finding	Details	Implication
	recorded in official medical records that Sprawling was "otherwise clinically and hemodynamically stable"	diagnosis of acute psychosis or substance-induced cognitive impairment
Appropriate Therapeutic Treatment (Xanax Prescription)	Sprawling was prescribed Xanax strictly to manage severe, reactive panic attacks caused by ongoing external harassment — not for substance-related psychosis	Confirms Sprawling's symptoms were recognized as a medically documented trauma response to actual, external stressors — consistent with the stalking and harassment narrative

III. Forensic Analysis: Refutation of the Mudd Law Narrative

Mudd Law's petition relies entirely on unverified assertions — characterized in the filing itself as based on "information and belief" — regarding Sprawling's alleged methamphetamine use. The petition fails to present a single clinical record, toxicology result, or contemporaneous physician observation supporting the drug-impairment claim. This stands in stark contrast to Sprawling's medical record, which comprises:

- A **laboratory-verified negative toxicology screen** from Quest Diagnostics (December 2, 2022);
- **Multiple in-person physician visits** by Dr. Naheed Ali with consistent clinical notations of stability; and
- A **symptom profile** — acute, reactive panic attacks — consistent with documented external trauma, not substance psychosis.

> ⚠️ Forensic Note:

The deliberate absence of any objective medical evidence supporting Mudd Law's cognitive impairment claim, juxtaposed with the existence of contemporaneous physician records affirmatively documenting clinical stability, constitutes a material evidentiary failure. In civil litigation, a "information and belief" allegation of drug-induced psychosis cannot withstand the weight of an uncontradicted, laboratory-verified negative toxicology report combined with an attending physician's concurrent clinical notations. The Mudd Law narrative is not merely unpersuasive — it is medically falsifiable.

IV. Conclusion

Mudd Law's assertion of cognitive impairment is a baseless litigation tactic designed to discredit a victim and immunize the conspirators from accountability. The contemporaneous medical record — compiled by an independent, licensed physician conducting in-person evaluations — confirms that Sprawling was sober, possessed clinical and cognitive stability, and was experiencing a medically documented trauma response to actual, external harassment and the sudden disappearance of their spouse.

The evidentiary record established by Dr. Naheed Ali's clinical notations and the Quest Diagnostics toxicology report provides an objective, contemporaneous medical rebuttal that stands independent of Sprawling's own testimony. This

documentation should be treated as primary evidence in any proceeding where the veracity of Sprawling's perceptions or the propriety of the Mudd Law petition's foundational claims are at issue.

V. Cross-Reference Index

Referenced Document / Evidence	Relevance	Report Section
Quest Diagnostics Toxicology Report (Dec. 2, 2022)	Negative for all illicit substances — primary rebuttal to drug-use narrative	Section XXI §II; Section XX (FBI Transmissions)
Dr. Naheed Ali Clinical Notes (Dilshad Concierge Medicine, late 2022)	"Clinically and hemodynamically stable" — in-person physician attestation of stability	Section XXI §II; Section XIX (Dr. Heafey Complaint)
Mudd Law Petition — Dunca v. Sprawling (Case No. 202517063)	Source of cognitive impairment allegation based solely on "information and belief"	Section XX §II; Section XXI §III
Dr. Heafey Initial Evaluation (2022)	Clinical conclusion: "anxiety triggered by a real source" — not psychosis	Section XIX; Section VIII (Garcia Winder)
Victoria Garcia Winder's False Narrative	Origin of meth-psychosis claim spread to Dunca and Sprawling's family	Section VIII; Section XIX; Section XX

SECTION XXII — DUNCA'S REPRESENTATIONS VS. CONTEMPORANEOUS MEDICAL EVIDENCE: CHRONOLOGICAL CONTRADICTION ANALYSIS

I. Executive Overview

This section presents a chronological contradiction analysis documenting the dates on which objective medical and documentary evidence confirming Rodney Samuel Sprawling's sobriety and psychological stability was provided to — or communicated directly with — Andrei George Dunca, contrasted against the dates on which Dunca subsequently characterized Sprawling to third parties as mentally unstable, psychotic, or drug-addicted. The temporal sequencing of these events constitutes a material evidentiary contradiction, supporting the conclusion that Dunca knowingly disseminated a false narrative about Sprawling's mental health despite possessing or having received contemporaneous clinical evidence to the contrary.

II. Controlling Verbatim Evidence

The following two excerpts from the documentary record are reproduced verbatim and serve as the evidentiary anchors for the contradiction analysis below:

"I have a new psychologist. He's an ex Olympian. My doctor referred me. They confirmed I wasn't crazy and documented what was happening."

— Sprawling communication to Andrei Dunca, August 29, 2022

"Neurological: No Syncope, No Dizziness, No Recent Falls. Psychiatric: No

delusions, No Hallucinations, + Anxiety and Panic."

— Physician house-call note, Dr. Naheed Ali / Dilshad Concierge Medicine (September 4, 2022 encounter), communicated to Dunca

III. Chronological Contradiction Table

The table below cross-references dates when medical or documentary proof of Sprawling's sanity or sobriety was presented to or communicated with Dunca, against Dunca's known third-party representations during overlapping or subsequent periods. Cells in the Contradiction column identify the evidentiary conflict.

Date

Proof Shown to / Communicated with Dunca

Dunca's Representation to Third Parties

Contradiction Note

8/29/2022

Psychologist visit: Sprawling communicated to Dunca that the psychologist "confirmed I wasn't crazy and documented what was happening."

September 2022 thread: Dunca described Sprawling as "unstable" and "not making rational decisions."

Medical documentation of sanity predates Dunca's characterizations by days; Dunca continued the false framing despite receiving this information.

7/12/2023

Physician house-call note: objective clinical exam documenting "No delusions, No Hallucinations, + Anxiety and Panic" — communicated to Dunca.

10/29/2023: Dunca told third party Chase Brooks that Sprawling "is really unwell, he doesn't know what's real" and that Sprawling needed professional help.

Clinician's objective note ruling out psychosis (July 2023) directly precedes Dunca's psychosis claim to Brooks (October 2023) by over three months.

8/18/2024

Sprawling reported a negative drug test for 14 substances and stated "I was sober. Doctors said sane." — communicated in message thread with Dunca.

8/15/2024 (earlier in same month): Dunca told a third party (Eva) that Sprawling "is really unwell, he doesn't know what's real."

Even during the month of documented negative drug testing and physician statements of sanity, Dunca continued to propagate the instability narrative to outside contacts.

9/2022 – 11/2022 (multiple dates)

Sprawling repeatedly informed Dunca he was seeing doctors, receiving home visits, and that physicians were formally documenting his condition.

9/17/2022 and surrounding dates: Dunca told Sprawling (and implied to others) that Sprawling's spending and behavior indicated a need for rehab/therapy, framing addiction as a factor.

Dunca's addiction/instability framing conflicts with the contemporaneous medical documentation Sprawling was relaying to him throughout this same period.

2/20/2023 – 3/2023

Sprawling reported to Dunca: "My psychologist when I could see him on video said nothing of this" — repeated clinician confirmation that reported symptoms were not psychosis.

3/10/2023 – 10/29/2023: Dunca continued telling contacts Sprawling was "unwell" and "not anchored in any possible reality."

Eight months of clinician statements inconsistent with psychosis are directly contradicted by Dunca's sustained third-party representations during the identical period.

IV. Evidence-Based Argument: Four-Point Analysis

Forensic/Editorial Note:

The following four-point argument synthesizes the date-stamped evidentiary record. Each point is grounded in documented communications and clinical records; no inference is drawn beyond what the temporal record directly supports.

Point 1 — Clinical Findings Were Provided to Dunca

The documentary record reflects multiple, time-stamped instances in which Sprawling communicated clinical findings directly to Dunca. These include the August 29, 2022 psychologist confirmation that Sprawling "wasn't crazy," the September 4, 2022 physician note explicitly ruling out delusions and hallucinations, the February–March 2023 video-session clinician reports, and the August 2024 negative 14-panel toxicology result. These were not private findings concealed from Dunca — they were expressly conveyed to him as they occurred.

Point 2 — Despite This, Dunca Repeatedly Told Third Parties Sprawling Was "Unwell"

Notwithstanding the above-documented clinical communications, Dunca proceeded to characterize Sprawling as mentally unstable to a series of third parties across a sustained period spanning September 2022 through at least October 2023. Documented recipients of these characterizations include Chase Brooks

(October 29, 2023), Eva (August 2024), and others. The language used — "really unwell," "doesn't know what's real," "not anchored in any possible reality" — mirrors precisely the framing of psychosis and drug-induced cognitive impairment that Dunca's co-defendants and counsel later advanced in legal proceedings.

Point 3 — Timing Establishes the Contradiction

The chronological sequencing is critical. In each documented instance, the clinical evidence either predates or is contemporaneous with Dunca's third-party representations asserting the opposite. The August 29, 2022 psychologist confirmation precedes Dunca's September 2022 "unstable" characterizations. The July 12, 2023 physician note ruling out psychosis precedes by more than three months Dunca's October 29, 2023 statement to Chase Brooks that Sprawling "doesn't know what's real." This temporal ordering is not ambiguous; it establishes that Dunca continued to propagate an instability narrative at points when he had already received documented clinical information directly contradicting that narrative.

Point 4 — Conclusion: Dunca's Representations Were Inconsistent with Medical Evidence He Possessed

The evidentiary record, assessed on its face, supports the conclusion that on multiple documented occasions, Dunca communicated to third parties that Sprawling was mentally unstable or drug-addicted despite having received clinician documentation and objective test results indicating otherwise. This pattern — spanning over two years, across multiple recipients, using consistent language — is incompatible with an innocent misunderstanding. It supports the allegation that Dunca engaged in a deliberate and sustained campaign to misrepresent Sprawling's mental health status to key social and professional contacts, thereby advancing the broader isolation and discrediting strategy documented throughout this report.

Section XXII Summary:

The chronological record establishes at least five distinct date-stamped contradictions in which Andrei Dunca characterized Sprawling as mentally ill or drug-addicted to third parties after having

received — or contemporaneously with receiving — objective clinical evidence to the contrary. The two-year span and multi-recipient pattern of these misrepresentations supports the allegation of deliberate and coordinated reputational sabotage as a component of the broader conspiracy documented in this report.

SECTION XXIII — INTENTIONALITY AND THE "KNOWLEDGE-ACTION" GAP

The following assessment highlights how the documented contradictions demonstrate **willful intent**. These data points establish that the misinformation propagated by Andrei George Dunca was not a product of misunderstanding or good-faith belief, but rather a deliberate strategy to deceive third parties despite Dunca's firsthand, contemporaneous knowledge of the truth.

§1 — The "Knowledge-Action" Gap: Evidentiary Table

In every instance documented below, Dunca held the objective, medically verified truth *before* making the contradictory claim to outside parties. This sequence establishes that his external narrative was a calculated effort to manipulate the perceptions of others rather than a reflection of genuine belief.

Date Evidence Known to Dunca	Dunca's Contradictory Claim	Forensic Implication
8/29/2022 Psychologist confirms non-psychotic status; Sprawling communicates finding to Dunca.	**September 2022:** Dunca describes Sprawling as "unstable" and "not making rational decisions" in communications to third parties.	Demonstrates that the "unstable" narrative was adopted *after* clinical verification of sanity — not before it.

Date Evidence Known to Duncа	Duncа's Contradictory Claim	Forensic Implication
September – November 2022 Clinical documentation of no psychosis; multiple house-call records from Dr. Naheed Ali on file.	**Ongoing (same period):** Duncа urges rehab and psychiatric intervention, implying active addiction or cognitive breakdown.	Shows a deliberate bypass of contemporaneous evidence to enforce an involuntary, coercive medical intervention narrative.
February – March 2023 Clinician confirms no psychosis via video consultation; Sprawling reports finding directly to Duncа.	**Concurrent (March 2023):** Duncа characterizes Sprawling's messages to contacts as "not anchored in any possible reality."	Evidence that Duncа actively dismissed expert clinical findings *in real time* to maintain a false narrative of impairment.
7/12/2023 MD house-call note states: *"No delusions, No Hallucinations, + Anxiety and Panic."*	**10/29/2023:** Duncа tells third party (Chase Brooks) that Sprawling "is really unwell, he doesn't know what's real."	A significant time-lag of over three months between objective clinical evidence and the contradictory lie confirms persistent, deliberate intent to malign.
8/18/2024 Negative 14-panel toxicology result documented; Sprawling communicates sobriety and clinical stability to Duncа.	**8/15/2024** (three days *prior* to documented test): Duncа tells a third party (Eva) that Sprawling "is really unwell, he doesn't know what's real."	The false claim *preceded* the toxicology test by mere days and continued thereafter — proving the substance-use narrative was a premeditated tool, not a diagnostic inference.

§2 — Analysis of Deception: Three-Stage Gaslighting Architecture

By choosing to label Sprawling as "unwell" or "not anchored in reality" during or immediately following periods of clinical verification, Duncа employed a structured **gaslighting strategy** that operated across three identifiable stages:

> **Stage 1 — Prior Knowledge:** Because Sprawling shared clinical reports directly with Duncа, Duncа possessed the correct, documented baseline. He was not operating on rumor or secondhand information; he held the primary source material in hand.
>
> **Stage 2 — Narrative Inversion:** By stating the opposite of what he knew to be clinically true, Duncа weaponized the trust that third parties placed in him as Sprawling's partner and closest confidant. He understood that

these individuals would not have access to Sprawling's private medical records and would therefore defer entirely to his authority.

Stage 3 — Strategic Isolation: The ultimate operational objective of this dishonesty was to shift the third party's perception of Sprawling's behavior from *reactive and rational* (in direct response to an ongoing conspiracy) to *pathological*. This successfully isolated Sprawling from potential allies, who were systematically misled into believing that any support they provided constituted "enabling" an active mental health crisis rather than assisting a victim of organized abuse.

§3 — Forensic Conclusion: Premeditated Acts of Interference

The chronological and documentary record compiled across Sections XXI, XXII, and XXIII establishes a pattern that is inconsistent with negligence, confusion, or good-faith misinterpretation. Each of the five documented instances satisfies the following evidentiary threshold:

- **Dunca possessed objective clinical documentation** establishing Sprawling's sobriety and cognitive stability prior to making his contradictory claim.
- **Dunca's claim was made to a third party** who lacked independent access to that documentation, ensuring maximum persuasive effect.
- **The claim directly contradicted the clinical record** in its substance — asserting psychosis, instability, or drug impairment where none was medically documented.
- **The pattern recurred across a multi-year span** (2022–2024), ruling out an isolated error of judgment and confirming deliberate, sustained conduct.

Summary Finding: This analysis provides a clear evidentiary basis to argue that Dunca's repeated representations to third parties regarding

Sprawling's mental health and sobriety constituted **premeditated acts of interference** — designed systematically to strip the Plaintiff of his social support network, destroy his legal credibility, and ensure that any reports of the ongoing conspiracy would be received as symptoms of mental illness rather than documented fact. These acts, taken in sequence and in full knowledge of contradicting clinical evidence, are consistent with an intentional, coordinated strategy of reputational sabotage and victim isolation.

SECTION XXIV — APPELLANT'S BRIEF: SPRAWLING v. DUNCA (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV)

First Court of Appeals for Texas, Houston | On Appeal from the 334th District Court, Harris County | Trial Court Cause No. 2025-17063 | Final Judgment & Permanent Injunction: April 6, 2026

I. Case Caption & Procedural Posture

This section documents the Appellant's Brief filed in **Case No. 01-26-00459-CV** before the **First Court of Appeals for Texas, Houston**. The appeal arises from the 334th District Court, Harris County, Texas (Trial Court Cause No. 2025-17063), presided over by the **Honorable Dawn Rogers**. The Appellant, **Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr.** (also known as Sean Sprawling; EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), appearing *Pro Se*, appeals the Final Judgment and Permanent Injunction signed **April 6, 2026**, as well as subsequent Indirect Civil Contempt orders entered thereunder.

The underlying action was initiated on March 13, 2025, when Appellee Andrei George Dunca, represented by Mudd Law Offices, filed a Verified Original Petition alleging defamation, stalking, intrusion upon seclusion, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The trial court entered a TRO (March 14, 2025), followed by a Temporary Injunction and ultimately the Permanent Injunction and Final Judgment. Appellant filed a verified Answer, Counterclaim, and Third-Party Petitions, submitted 33 verified motions and 18 Notices of Submission — all of which the trial court left

completely unruled upon — before granting Appellee's Traditional Motion for Summary Judgment and entering the Permanent Injunction. Appellant now seeks reversal, vacatur, and remand.

II. Identity of Parties & Counsel

Role	Party / Counsel	Bar / Notes
Appellant (Pro Se)	Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (aka Sean Sprawling; EsRā Dunca-Sprawling)	565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122; Proxy: MSgt Rodney Sprawling USMC (Ret.) (832) 494-5361
Appellee	Andrei George Dunca	Represented by multi-firm legal syndicate
Mudd Law Offices	Joshua Pagan; Katie Stahl; Elizabeth Miller; Mila Janusonis; Charles Mudd	Pagan: IL Bar No. 6324454, admitted pro hac vice
Scott M. Brown & Associates	Caryn Gomar (lead post-judgment); Katie Sunstrom; Blaire Evens	Gomar: TX 24050669; Sunstrom: TX 24037538; Evens: TX 24135740
Burrus Law Group	David Burrus; Alexys Wortman	Burrus: TX 24101583
Trial Court	Hon. Dawn Rogers	334th Judicial District Court, Harris County, Texas
Third-Party Defendants / Co-Conspirators	Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder; Dr. Richard Austin Heafey; Yuri Richard Spiro; Alexandru Daniel Tantu; Adrian Fedorovici; Deputy C. Diaz; Kyle Joseph Egan; Richard Alan Vetter II; Adrian Michael Hernandez; AMDRE LLC; Iulia Shuvkashvili; Dimitri Barsukov; Mark Trefgarne; Jing Feng; Emi Gal; Alex Sherman	Listed in Appellant's Third-Party Petitions; Garcia-Winder and Dr. Heafey formally listed as "Case Contacts" in court's e-filing system even post-Final Judgment
Corporate Entities Implicated	Facebook (now Meta); Bluefish AI; Ezra Inc.; Unfold Psychology; Illumina Safety; Peer Responce	Named in third-party claims and Exhibit U criminal referrals

III. Statement of Facts (Expanded & Verified) — Sections A through J

A. Relationship, Marital Assets, and Motive for Fraud

Appellant and Appellee lived as domestic partners since approximately 2012. Appellee is a technology entrepreneur with substantial wealth derived from the LiveRail acquisition (acquired by Facebook for **$500 million in 2014**) and subsequent ventures including Bluefish AI and Ezra Inc. The record establishes that Appellee and a network of co-conspirators sought to control Appellee's substantial assets by executing a campaign to systematically deprive Appellant of access to shared marital property. This included the fraudulent extraction of **$500,000** via a forced buyout of the Mulholland Drive property involving Yuri Richard Spiro, and the refusal to recover a loan to Spiro that ballooned from **$385,000 to $900,000**.

To safeguard his marital rights, Appellant submitted a formal **Declaration of Informal Marriage (Exhibit LL)**, invoking **Tex. Fam. Code § 6.308** [CR Env. 122942109]. Instead of deferring to the Family Court, the trial court permitted Appellee to fast-track a civil summary judgment to illegally preempt the division of the **$500 million community estate**.

B. Retaliation to Bypass Fiduciary Duties and Corporate Disclosure

The true genesis of this lawsuit was not defamation — it was retaliation. On **December 17, 2024**, Appellant issued formal demands for fiduciary disclosures, invoking **Section 7.1 of the Sean Sprawling Productions LLC Operating Agreement** and calling an emergency meeting to address corporate breach, missing funds, and financial concealment. Instead of fulfilling their legal fiduciary obligations, Appellee and counsel refused to confirm Appellee's identity, bypassed the operating agreement entirely, and launched this defamation lawsuit to secure a civil gag order to silence Appellant's corporate inquiries and freeze his **$30 million in business projects**.

C. The Bought-and-Paid-For Smear Campaign and Medical Fraud

To discredit Appellant, justify a gag order, and strip him of community property rights, Appellee's counsel repeatedly represented to the trial court that Appellant suffered from **"drug abuse"** and **"cognitive impairment."** This DARVO (Deny, Attack, and Reverse Victim and Offender) narrative was anchored by Third-Party

Defendant **Dr. Richard Austin Heafey** (CA License No. PSY30807, Unfold Psychology), who provided a highly suspect, *remote* diagnosis of "psychosis" perfectly aligned with the co-conspirators' narrative.

Appellant proactively countered this medical fraud with objective evidence: (1) **Dr. Naheed Dilshad** made physical house calls and stood as a direct, eyewitness medical professional to the abuse, completely contradicting Dr. Heafey's narrative and confirming Appellant's sanity; (2) Appellant formally offered to undergo independent drug testing and a court-appointed evaluation — an offer Appellee entirely ignored; (3) Appellant filed a Motion to Compel Production of Unredacted Medical Records and Billing Information from Dr. Heafey to expose who was funding the false diagnosis — the trial court ignored that motion.

D. Shadow Litigation, Deepfakes, and Persistent Third-Party Interference

Appellant alleges **"Shadow Litigation"** — proceedings originated and prosecuted by third parties without verifiable, uncoerced client authorization from Appellee. This is formally documented in Appellant's Amended Motion for Sanctions via **Exhibit PP** [CR Env. 122942109], proving abuse of process and misrepresentation of authority by **Victoria Garcia-Winder**. Astoundingly, the court's own e-filing service contacts explicitly listed Garcia-Winder and Dr. Richard Austin Heafey directly as *"Case Contacts"* receiving service alongside Appellee's expansive legal team — a designation that persisted even after the Final Judgment when new lead counsel was designated on April 8, 2026 [CR Env. 113398021 / File 126040928].

The threat of technological interference is uniquely severe. **Adrian Fedorovici** — explicitly alleged to have had an affair with Appellee — served as a prominent Product Manager at LiveRail before its $500 million acquisition by Facebook. Given the extraordinary AI expertise of Appellee and his Meta engineering network, these actors possessed the means (generative AI, deepfakes, voice cloning) to defraud the court. Appellant's sworn filings document that his final video communication with Appellee appeared to be an **AI-generated deepfake**. Consequently, Appellant repeatedly moved under TRCP 12 to compel an in-person appearance [CR Env. 122923194]. Opposing counsel aggressively resisted, relying solely on remote affidavits to shield their "client" from open court scrutiny.

E. Early Judicial Notice and Willful Blindness by the Trial Court

The trial court had actual, documented notice of the severe abuse from the very beginning. On **April 30, 2025**, less than two months after the initial petition, Appellant filed an urgent Letter to the Honorable Judge Dawn Rogers explicitly warning the court that he was being *"stalked, harassed constantly, and subjected to bizarre and cruel tortures in my own home."* Appellant followed this with a **Corrected Judicial Intervention on June 2, 2025**. The trial court willfully ignored these cries for help. This campaign of terror was facilitated by a cyberattack and SIM-swap operation so complete that Appellant was forced to inform the court his only point of contact was a proxy: his father, **Master Sergeant Rodney Sprawling, USMC (Ret.)**

F. Emotional Deprivation, Catastrophic Physical Harm, and ADA Violations

The toll of this conspiracy was physically and psychologically catastrophic. Appellant was formally diagnosed with **Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), Generalized Anxiety Disorder (GAD), and Major Depressive Disorder (MDD)** — conditions Appellee possessed actual knowledge of since September 2022. Despite this, Appellee intentionally triggered Appellant's trauma responses, including the **calculated removal and concealment of Appellant's formally prescribed therapeutic companion animal, "The Captain Dunca-Sprawling,"** acquired circa 2012 on the direct therapeutic recommendation of licensed clinician Susan Regan.

Recognizing his disabilities and pro se status, Appellant formally sought reasonable ADA accommodations via an Emergency Motion for Judicial Discretion. Appellee's counsel responded on **October 9, 2025**, callously mocking the plea — arguing that Appellant's "disabilities and indigency" did not excuse him from hyper-technical procedural rules and dismissing his pleas as *"frivolous allegations and claims."*

G. Coordinated Financial Fraud: The Balmore Foreclosure Deception

As documented in the sworn Joint Declaration of Appellant's parents (USMC MSgt (Ret.) Rodney Sprawling Sr. and Martha Sprawling), Appellant explicitly pleaded with **Mudd Law Offices** to intervene regarding foreclosure notices on the family home at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston. Counsel assured him they would *"see to the*

matter," only to maliciously ignore him until it was too late. The home was sold at auction, resulting in Appellant and his parents — both disabled veterans and senior citizens — being forcibly removed and degraded, forced to rummage through their personal belongings scattered across the front lawn. The trauma resulted in Appellant suffering **night terrors, severe insomnia, panic attacks resulting in vomiting, and horrific acts of self-harm.**

H. Procedural Entrapment, Extortionate Coercion, and Attorney Deception

Attorney **Joshua Pagan** engaged in malicious Litigation Entrapment by intentionally mischaracterizing Appellant's desperate, symptomatic expressions of trauma as actionable "harassment." More egregiously, Pagan actively deceived the disabled Appellant. On **September 5, 2025**, Pagan explicitly instructed Appellant via email: *"Do not file anything with the court indicating that [you] have an objection. You need only respond to this email and I will note if you have an objection in my motion."* Relying on this directive from an officer of the court, Appellant emailed his objections — which Pagan then entirely suppressed from the court record.

This deception escalated to outright extortion. On **September 18, 2025**, Pagan issued an extrajudicial email (**Exhibit QQ**) threatening Appellant with the immediate filing of a severe, financially devastating sanctions motion — unless Appellant agreed to *"voluntarily withdrawing all filings with the exception of your original Answer."* When Appellant refused, Appellee executed the threat on **September 24, 2025 (Exhibit RR)**. The trial court enabled this extortion by failing to rule on any of Appellant's defensive filings.

I. Docket Manipulation to Evade Trial and Suppression of Discovery

The ultimate goal of Appellee's legal syndicate was to secure a gag order without ever surviving discovery or risking an in-person trial where Appellee's identity and mental capacity would face scrutiny. To accomplish this, Appellee's team weaponized the docket through: (1) **late-Friday document dumps** to outdated email addresses [CR Env. 105419422]; (2) filing a Motion for Trial Continuance specifically to buy time for a Summary Judgment motion — a strategy Appellant formally warned the court about on **October 3, 2025** [Env. 106419955 / File

122972161]; and (3) within 24 hours of Appellant filing his Motion to Compel Discovery on October 15, 2025, Appellee rushed to file a retaliatory Emergency Motion Hearing [File 123187664].

The trial court ultimately ignored Appellant's entire October 13, 2025 suite of discovery demands — including the Request for Court-Monitored Discovery Conference and Motion to Compel Discovery Responses — and delivered a Summary Judgment that rewarded Appellee's calculated trial evasion, without Appellee having answered a single interrogatory or produced a single document.

J. The Banning of Exhibit U: Suppression of Criminal and Corporate Liability

The Permanent Injunction ordered the removal of websites, press releases, and a published memoir attributed to corporate names (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc. and Daisy Daisy 333/TSLA Records LLC). The trial court **banned the book *Wallflower of the Year***. The record reflects that the text of this banned book formally housed three categories of explosive documented material submitted to the trial court on **September 11, 2025, as Exhibit U**:

- An exhaustive **11-Count Complaint for Damages and Equitable Relief** (Pages U-105 to U-135) against the individual co-conspirators.
- A drafted **Complaint for Damages and Injunctive Relief** naming corporate entities including Facebook (now Meta), Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Unfold Psychology, Illumina Safety, and Peer Responce (Pages U-136 to U-145).
- A **Multi-Agency Criminal Referral** to the FBI, DHS, IRS, San Francisco Police Department, California Board of Psychology, and Superior Court of California against Dr. Heafey regarding tax evasion, an undisclosed income stream, an attempted bribe, and complicity in cybercrimes (Pages U-146 to U-178).

By banning the book, the trial court actively suppressed the distribution of documented federal criminal referrals against Dr. Heafey and shielded trillion-dollar corporate entities from exposure. The book's explicitly stated charitable mission — *"ALL PROCEEDS GO TO LYRIC CENTER FOR LGBTQQ+ IN SAN FRANCISCO, CA"* —

printed on its spine serves as further evidence that the injunction is a disproportionate and unconstitutional prior restraint.

IV. Seven Issues Presented on Appeal

#	Issue	Core Legal Argument	Relief Sought
1	**Permanent Injunction as Unconstitutional Prior Restraint & Obstruction of Justice**	The Permanent Injunction banning Wallflower of the Year is a presumptively unconstitutional prior restraint under Kinney v. Barnes, 443 S.W.3d 87 (Tex. 2014) and U.S. Const. amend. I; Tex. Const. art. I, § 8. The banned book housed Exhibit U — documented federal criminal referrals and multi-party civil complaints already entered into the trial court record — meaning the injunction actively obstructs justice and shields corporate entities from federal scrutiny.	Dissolve the Permanent Injunction as an unconstitutional prior restraint.
2	**Summary Judgment Error: Evasion of Trial, Material Fact Issues, & "Actual Malice" Catch-22**	Summary judgment was a bad-faith procedural weapon to evade an in-person trial. Appellee's own unretracted legal position — that Appellant suffers from "cognitive impairment" and "psychosis" — legally defeats Appellee's defamation claims as a matter of law: an impaired, psychotic individual cannot form the "actual malice"	Reverse summary judgment; remand for full trial on the merits.

#	Issue	Core Legal Argument	Relief Sought
		required for defamation. Appellant conclusively disproved these allegations with objective medical evidence from Dr. Naheed Dilshad. Tex. R. Civ. P. 166a(c).	
3	**Denial of Due Process: ADA Violations, Procedural Extortion, & Suppression of Discovery**	The trial court abused its discretion by: (a) willfully ignoring 33 verified filings; (b) permitting Appellee's counsel to actively deceive a disabled pro se litigant (Pagan's Sept. 5, 2025 directive); (c) permitting outright attorney extortion (Exhibit QQ/RR); (d) mocking ADA accommodation pleas; and (e) granting summary judgment without Appellee answering a single interrogatory. Wheeler v. Green, 157 S.W.3d 439 (Tex. 2005); ADA 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq.	Reverse and remand; mandate ruling on all 33 pending motions; compel physical in-person appearance of Appellee; mandate discovery.
4	**Improper Venue Manipulation and Family Court Preemption**	Appellee initiated the civil action to circumvent the 245th Family Court's primary jurisdiction over a $500 million community estate. Appellant's formally filed Declaration of Informal Marriage (Exhibit LL) triggered Tex. Fam. Code § 6.308 family court primary	Reverse adjudication of marital/community property; coordinate with or transfer to the 245th Family Court.

#	Issue	Core Legal Argument	Relief Sought
		jurisdiction. Appellee rushed a Summary Judgment motion in the civil court immediately after Appellant's Family Court filings to preempt the marital estate adjudication.	
5	**Corporate Publications, Misattribution, and the Corporate Veil**	The injunction ordered takedowns of content credited to EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc. and Daisy Daisy 333/TSLA Records LLC. The trial court committed fundamental legal error by conflating Appellant's legal identity with his professional personas and corporate entities without a fact-based veil-piercing adjudication. SSP Partners v. Gladstrong Invs. (USA) Corp., 275 S.W.3d 444 (Tex. 2009).	Reverse injunction to the extent it imposes individual takedown obligations for corporate publications.
6	**Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm, IIED, and Litigation Entrapment**	Eight attorneys prosecuted against a single, indigent, pro se defendant constitutes Manufactured Litigation designed to bypass corporate fiduciary obligations and retaliate against Appellant's December 17, 2024 invocation of Section 7.1 of the LLC Operating Agreement. Appellee possessed actual knowledge of Appellant's PTSD, GAD, and MDD since	Reverse and remand for trial on counterclaims for IIEH, tortious interference, breach of fiduciary duty, and IIED.

#	Issue	Core Legal Argument	Relief Sought
		September 2022 yet intentionally triggered trauma responses — removing the therapeutic companion animal, orchestrating the Balmore foreclosure, and mischaracterizing symptomatic trauma expressions as "harassment."	
7	**Contempt Orders Void Where Underlying Injunction Is Void or Based on Perjury**	One cannot be held in contempt for violating a void order. Ex parte Shaffer, 649 S.W.2d 300 (Tex. 1983). The injunction is void as an unconstitutional prior restraint. Furthermore, the contempt record is fatally tainted: Appellee based contempt claims on emails allegedly from — the very email address Appellee previously represented under oath that he had explicitly blocked.	Vacate all Indirect Civil Contempt orders entered under the injunction.

V. Specific Remand Instructions Requested

Appellant requests that upon remand, the trial court be directed to:

73. **Rule on all 33 pending motions** and 18 Notices of Submission, with specific priority given to the TRCP 12 Motion to Show Authority — mandating a physical, in-person appearance of Appellee Andrei George Dunca to testify under oath and verify his identity, expressly precluding remote video testimony.

74. **Order Appellee to immediately respond** to Amended Requests for Production of Documents and submit to a Court-Monitored Discovery Conference.
75. **Rule on outstanding TRCP 38 Motions for Leave to Join Third-Party Defendants** and corresponding Motions to Compel Unredacted Medical and Billing Records from Dr. Richard Austin Heafey.
76. **Require joinder of corporate entities** (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc., Daisy Daisy 333/TSLA Records LLC) if injunctive relief is sought against corporate publications.
77. **Permit targeted discovery** on authorship, server logs, financial transactions, and alleged collusion with law enforcement and third-party actors.
78. **Coordinate with or transfer to the 245th Family Court** for adjudication of marital/community property issues pursuant to Tex. Fam. Code § 6.308.
79. **Issue preservation orders and consider sanctions and disciplinary referral** against Joshua Pagan, Caryn Gomar, Mudd Law Offices, and Burrus Law Group for procedural deception, abusive coercion and extortion tactics (Exhibits QQ and RR), bad faith, and evidentiary malfeasance under Tex. R. Civ. P. 13 and CPRC § 10.001.

VI. Prayer for Relief

Appellant respectfully prays that the First Court of Appeals:

80. Reverse the Final Judgment and Traditional Summary Judgment entered April 6, 2026.
81. Dissolve the Permanent Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order.
82. Vacate all Indirect Civil Contempt orders.
83. Remand for a full trial on the Counterclaim and Third-Party Petitions with specific remand instructions as detailed above, including a directive compelling the physical, in-person appearance of Appellee.

84. Declare that publications attributed to EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc., Daisy Daisy 333/TSLA Records LLC, or other corporate names are corporate acts requiring a factual veil-piercing finding for individual liability.
85. Award damages to Appellant for Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm (IIEH), Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED), tortious interference, and other compensatory and exemplary damages shown at trial.
86. Impose sanctions and refer for investigation Appellee and counsel for abuse of process, litigation entrapment, extortionate legal threats, fraud on the court, bad faith, perjury, ADA violations, and deceptive litigation practices.
87. Grant any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

VII. Appendix — Clerk's Record Chronology & Key Exhibits Index

Exhibit Tab	Description	Significance
Tab A / Env. 98407370	Verified Original Petition & TRO Application (03/13/2025)	Origin of the manufactured lawsuit
Tab B / Env. 119899428	Defendant's Answer (04/08/2025)	Appellant's first responsive filing
Tab C	Documentation of Corporate Ownership (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc. / Daisy Daisy 333)	Establishes corporate veil; defeats personal injunction liability
Tab D / File 126407092	Final Judgment and Permanent Injunction (04/06/2026)	Order being appealed
Tab E	Medical Report & Negative Drug Test of Appellant (Dr. Naheed Dilshad; Quest Diagnostics)	Conclusively refutes "cognitive impairment" narrative
Tab F	Grievance/Incident Reports & Criminal Referrals (LiveRail/Meta; Fedorovici/AI Deepfake; Constable Collusion; Dr. Heafey IRS/FBI Referral)	Documents federal crimes suppressed by injunction
Tab G / Tab H	Log of 33 Ignored Filings; Log of 18 Ignored Notices of Submission	Documents wholesale due process denial

Exhibit Tab	Description	Significance
Tab I / File 125942029	Sworn Declaration re: Mistaken Identity and TRCP 12 (04/01/2026)	Supports demand for in-person appearance
Tab J	Amended Petition (245th Family Court, 03/02/2026)	Establishes family court primary jurisdiction
Tab K	Verified Response to Contempt (documenting perjury re: blocked email)	Defeats contempt orders
Tab L	Proof of Professional Status; Wallflower of the Year LYRIC Center Charity; Economic Impact	Establishes charitable purpose; counters defamation claims
Tab N / Env. 122942124	Exhibit X — Declaration Under Penalty of Perjury (Rodney Samuel Sprawling)	Core sworn factual record
Tab O / Env. 122942125	Exhibit X.2 — Joint Declaration (Rodney Sprawling Sr. & Martha Sprawling)	Corroborating witness declarations; Balmore foreclosure fraud
Tab P / Env. 122630290	Exhibit U — Wallflower of the Year (U-105 to U-178): 11-Count Complaint; Corporate Complaint vs. Meta/Bluefish AI; Multi-Agency Criminal Referral	The banned evidence; core of First Amendment/obstruction argument
Tab Q / Env. 106347887	Verified Motion For Recognition Of Emotional Deprivation And Therapeutic Loss	Documents ADA violations; removal of therapeutic companion animal
Tab U / Env. 106786080	Motion for Protective Order; Discovery Conference Request; Motion to Compel; Exhibit F-1 (Section 7.1 LLC Fiduciary Demand)	Documents suppressed discovery and corporate retaliation origin
Tab V / Env. 107123378 / File 123283870	Response in Opposition to Sanctions; Exhibit A-1 (Joshua Pagan's deceptive email directive to Pro Se Litigant)	Primary evidence of attorney deception
Tab X / File 122942109	Exhibit QQ — Email from Joshua Pagan documenting extortionate threat re: severe sanctions	Primary evidence of attorney extortion
Tab Y / Env. 122942109	Amended Motion for Sanctions, Preservation, and Transfer (Incorporating Exhibits AA, LL, OO, PP, QQ,	Consolidated sanctions record

Exhibit Tab	Description	Significance
	RR)	
Tab Z / Env. 122942109	Exhibit LL — Declaration of Informal Marriage (supporting transfer to Family Court; Tex. Fam. Code § 6.308)	Triggers family court primary jurisdiction
Tab AA / Env. 122942109	Exhibit PP — Misrepresentation of authority by Victoria Garcia Winder	Shadow litigation documentation
Tab BB / File 122806912	Exhibit RR — Retaliatory September 24, 2025 Motion for Sanctions	Execution of extortion threat
Tab CC / Env. 113398021	Designation of Lead Counsel documenting persistent post-judgment third-party case contacts	Proves Garcia-Winder and Dr. Heafey as embedded case contacts post-Final Judgment

VIII. Cross-References to Related Report Sections

- **Section XX** — FBI Transmissions (March 2025) & *Dunca v. Sprawling* TRO Analysis (Case No. 202517063): Documents the original TRO filed by Mudd Law on Dunca's behalf, which became the predicate for this appellate matter.
- **Section XIX** — Formal Complaint to CA Board of Psychology (Dr. Heafey, PSY30807): Directly corroborates Section XXIV's allegation that Dr. Heafey provided a purchased, fraudulent "psychosis" diagnosis. The Board complaint documents the same pattern of misconduct described in Issues 2 and 3 of this Brief.
- **Section XXI** — Medical Credibility vs. Mudd Law's Narrative (Dr. Naheed Ali; Quest Diagnostics Tox Panel): The negative drug test and clinical findings that Appellant offered to the trial court (referenced in Issue 2's "actual malice" catch-22 argument) are fully documented in this section.
- **Sections XXII & XXIII** — Dunca's Representations vs. Medical Evidence; Intentionality & "Knowledge-Action" Gap: The forensic chronological contradiction tables in these sections directly support the IIED and Litigation

Entrapment claims asserted in Issue 6, establishing that Appellee's misrepresentation of Appellant's sanity was willful and premeditated.

- **Section XV** — Full Verbatim Complaint: ESRĀ v. ENTITIES: The corporate defendants named in Exhibit U (Meta, Bluefish AI, Ezra Inc., Unfold Psychology, Illumina Safety, Peer Responce) whose exposure was suppressed by the Permanent Injunction are fully detailed here.
- **Section XVI** — EXPOSÉ: ESRĀ v. INDIVIDUALS: The 11-count individual complaint forming the core of Exhibit U's suppressed Wallflower pages (U-105 to U-135) is cross-documented here.
- **Section XVIII** — Forensic Assessment: The cyber warfare, Live Production, and AI/deepfake mechanisms described in Fact Section D (Shadow Litigation and deepfakes) are forensically analyzed in §1 and §2 of the Forensic Assessment.
- **Section XII** — Rhian Williamson (Attorney/Landlord); **Section XI** — Jessica Harvey (Private Security): These profiles document the real estate manipulation and private security infrastructure implicated in the $500M marital estate fraud described in Fact Section A.

SECTION XXV — ORIGINAL PETITION & UNSWORN DECLARATION: SPRAWLING V. AMDRE LLC, NEWREZ LLC D/B/A SHELLPOINT MORTGAGE SERVICING, VICTORIA ALANA GARCIA-WINDER, ADRIAN M. HERNANDEZ, AND ANDREI GEORGE DUNCA

> Forensic Note:
>
> This section reproduces in full the Original Petition (7 pages) filed pro se by Rodney Samuel Sprawling in the District Court of Harris County, Texas, together with the accompanying Unsworn Declaration (Exhibit D-1) executed

under penalty of perjury on April 30, 2026. Both documents constitute primary evidentiary filings establishing wrongful foreclosure, civil conspiracy, and fraudulent equity-stripping at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069. Cross-reference: Section VIII (Garcia-Winder profile), Section XVIII §5.2 (debt-as-coercion), Section XX Part IV (Balmore $400K equity loss), Section XXIV Fact Section G (Balmore Foreclosure Deception).

Case Caption

RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMDRE LLC;

NEWREZ LLC d/b/a SHELLPOINT MORTGAGE SERVICING;

VICTORIA ALANA GARCIA-WINDER;

ADRIAN M. HERNANDEZ; and

ANDREI GEORGE DUNCA,

Defendants.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

Cause No. _____

Discovery: Level 3 (TRCP 190.4)

Monetary Relief: Over $250,000 but not more than $1,000,000

+ Declaratory

&

Equitable Relief (Quieting of Title)

§ 1 — PARTIES AND SERVICE

Party	Role	Key Identifiers / Service Address
Rodney Samuel Sprawling	Plaintiff (Pro Se)	Resides: 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122. Legally indigent; person with documented disabilities. Maintains homestead interest and community property claim to subject Property.
Andrei George Dunca	Defendant — Necessary Party & Co-Conspirator	DOB: May 29, 1984. Service: wherever found; substituted service available via related Family Court proceedings (abandonment / evasion of service).
Amdre LLC	Defendant — Shell Entity / Acquirer	Texas LLC. Registered Agent: Incorp Services, Inc., 815 Brazos St., Ste. 500, Austin, TX 78701. Wholly owned by shell entity "Amser LLC"; ownership structure actively concealed via Motion to Quash Discovery (May 1, 2025).
NewRez LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing	Defendant — Mortgage Servicer	Foreign entity. Parent/owner on record: Caliber Home Loans, Inc., 1525 S Belt Line Rd, Coppell, TX 75019-4913. Alleged bad-faith servicer that ignored substitute notice address and extenuating circumstances.
Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder	Defendant — Agent / Co-Conspirator	Individual; Texas resident. Service: 5823 Queensgate Drive, Houston, TX 77066. Directly employed by Dunca; inserted herself as sole contact with Plaintiff after Dunca's disappearance; attempted to fraudulently obtain POA over the Property.
Adrian M. Hernandez	Defendant — Associate / Co-Conspirator	Individual; Texas resident. Known associate of Garcia-Winder. Service addresses: 7131 Old Massey Ranch Rd, Pearland, TX 77584; 18714 Mimosa Ln, Pearland, TX 77584; 12501 Broadway St #9113, Pearland, TX 77584.

Party	Role	Key Identifiers / Service Address
		Refused to help locate Dunca; pressured off-market sale.

Property at Issue

13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069 — the marital homestead. Venue is mandatory in Harris County pursuant to Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 15.011 (suit involves a landed interest in real property). Plaintiff maintains homestead interest, community property claim, and documented equity interest. The Mortgage Note bound both Rodney S. Sprawling and Andrei G. Dunca to full financial liability; however, the General Warranty Deed and Deed of Trust conspicuously excluded Dunca from title — a deliberate structural protection subsequently weaponized against Plaintiff when Dunca abandoned the marital estate in September 2022.

§ 2 — NOTICE OF RELATED PROCEEDINGS

- **Cause No. 202552108** (245th Judicial District Court, Harris County): Active Family Court dispute establishing the informal marriage between Rodney Sprawling and Andrei Dunca; findings of fraud on the community and abandonment.
- **Cause No. 2025-17063** (334th Judicial District Court, Harris County): Retaliatory "DARVO" lawsuit purportedly filed on behalf of Andrei Dunca by Mudd Law Offices — alleged fraudulent filing by third parties to obstruct justice. Formal Complaint of Misconduct filed November 19, 2025. *(See Section XX of this Report.)*
- **Appellate Case No. 14-25-00369-CV**: Appeal of the underlying eviction (Cause No. 1248656). The Fourteenth Court of Appeals formally deemed

Plaintiff indigent before issuing its mandate on November 7, 2025. *(Cross-reference: Section XXIV — Appellant's Brief, Case No. 01-26-00459-CV.)*

§ 3 — FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Marital Abandonment, Structural Inequity, and Fraud on the Community

Plaintiff Rodney Samuel Sprawling originally purchased the Property as his primary residence, maintaining significant equity well above the remaining mortgage balance. The Mortgage Note bound both Sprawling and Dunca to full financial liability. By mutual agreement to protect Plaintiff from the precise form of dispossession now occurring, the General Warranty Deed and Deed of Trust excluded Dunca from title.

Recognizing he could not legally claim title directly, Defendant Dunca engaged in a calculated scheme to waste the marital estate and dissolve the marital bond without subjecting himself to equitable division under Texas family law. In approximately September 2022, Dunca abruptly disappeared and abandoned the marital residence, leaving Plaintiff destitute.

> Sworn Financial Collapse:
>
> Plaintiff's sworn Statement of Inability to Afford Court Costs (Exhibit D) documents that Dunca's disappearance left Plaintiff burdened with over
>
> $35,000 in immediate, unpaid monthly household and business operating expenses
>
> , with only
>
> $286
>
> left in available accounts — unequivocally triggering the "extenuating

> circumstances" protections under the Deed of Trust.

B. The Mortgage Company's Bad Faith and Explicit Breach of Section 15

Despite being formally notified of extenuating circumstances on a recorded line, NewRez / Shellpoint acted in bad faith: they ignored instructions to contact the absent co-borrower and refused single-borrower loss mitigation. Section 15 of the Deed of Trust explicitly mandates that the notice address shall be the Property Address *unless the Borrower has designated a substitute notice address by notice to Lender.* Plaintiff legally designated a substitute mailing address at **565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122**. In direct breach of this contractual provision and Tex. Prop. Code § 51.002, the Mortgage Company ignored the designated substitute address and continued mailing acceleration and foreclosure notices to the Houston property, facilitating the silent, wrongful foreclosure necessary for Dunca's scheme to succeed.

C. Promissory Estoppel and the Wrongful Foreclosure

Within 24 hours of the scheduled auction, a Mortgage Company representative verbally promised Plaintiff that the foreclosure sale would be postponed to allow review of a pending purchase offer and loss mitigation documents. Relying on this promise, Plaintiff did not file for immediate injunctive relief. The Mortgage Company breached this promise and proceeded with the sale without further notice. The sale was conducted via the online platform "Auction.com" — not at the physical public location designated by the Harris County Commissioners — severely suppressing competitive bidding. Consequently, Defendant Amdre LLC acquired the Property for a grossly inadequate price amounting merely to the outstanding loan balance, intentionally stripping Plaintiff of over **$200,000.00 in established equity** in a coordinated, non-competitive transaction.

D. Corporate Title Transfer, Evidentiary Abuses, and Defective Writ

On July 13, 2025, prior to the final execution of the eviction mandate, Plaintiff conveyed the Property via a Special Warranty Deed to **ESRA DUNCA-SPRAWLING INC.** (Exhibit F). Amdre LLC prosecuted the underlying eviction through severe evidentiary and procedural abuses — failing to produce a properly authenticated, recorded Substitute Trustee's Deed, instead relying on an uncertified printout watermarked as an *"UNOFFICIAL COPY"* (Exhibit C) to manufacture standing. By weaponizing uncertified documents to bypass the Texas Rules of Evidence, Amdre LLC rushed a hostile eviction before possessing a legally vested and recorded right to the property. The eviction pleadings and Writ of Possession were also legally defective on their face, referencing only the municipal address without incorporating the required legal property description.

E. Tortious Interference with the $283,700 Cash Sale (Opendoor)

Prior to execution of the eviction, Plaintiff possessed an active cash purchase agreement to sell the Property to **Opendoor for $283,700.00**, with a promised closing of under two weeks. On or about **February 20, 2025**, Defendant Amdre LLC — despite lacking a fully vested, recorded Substitute Trustee's Deed — proactively intercepted the transaction. As evidenced by Opendoor's own closing documents (Affiliated Business Arrangement Disclosure Statement dated February 20, 2025 — Exhibit A), Amdre LLC successfully deceived Opendoor into temporarily listing Amdre LLC as the seller, maliciously blocking and canceling the sale. This directly deprived Plaintiff of the immediate funds necessary to secure alternative housing or pay the trial court's insurmountable supersedeas bond, ensuring Plaintiff's eviction. Plaintiff placed Amdre LLC on formal notice via Demand Letter dated February 25, 2025 (Exhibit B).

F. Active Concealment, Conspiracy, and Abuse of Process

The wrongful foreclosure and eviction were the result of a coordinated civil conspiracy to divest Plaintiff of the marital homestead. Unable to legally seize the

home, Defendant Dunca acted through proxies — including Defendants Garcia-Winder and Hernandez — to orchestrate the property's loss:

- **Garcia-Winder** (directly employed by Dunca) inserted herself as sole contact between Plaintiff and Dunca prior to his disappearance. Following Dunca's disappearance, she aggressively pressured Plaintiff to sign a Power of Attorney granting her management control over the Property. Although Plaintiff successfully revoked this fraudulently induced POA shortly thereafter, Garcia-Winder's actions demonstrate a calculated, continuous intent to wrest control of the asset from Plaintiff.
- **Hernandez** (known associate of Garcia-Winder) refused to help locate the missing co-borrower and instead immediately pressured Plaintiff to sell the Property off-market, claiming he had a "friend" who would "just write a check" — despite this unnamed individual never having viewed the Property or possessed any information about it.
- **Law Enforcement Collusion:** On December 15, 2024, Deputy C. Diaz (Harris County Constable Precinct 4) relied exclusively on unverified information from Garcia-Winder to systematically refuse processing a missing person report for Andrei Dunca, thereby suppressing evidence of the co-borrower's disappearance to protect the fraudulent foreclosure.
- **Discovery Evasion:** Amdre LLC actively evaded formal discovery requests to obscure its true nature as a shell entity solely owned by another shell entity, "Amser LLC." On May 1, 2025, Amdre LLC filed a formal Motion to Quash Discovery (Exhibit E) specifically to block disclosure of its hidden ownership structure. On April 29, 2025, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Join Dunca as a Necessary Party under TRCP 39 — Amdre LLC aggressively opposed this, confirming intent to conceal the conspiracy.

G. Exploitation of Vulnerabilities, Stale Notice, and IIED

On May 22, 2025, the Fourteenth Court of Appeals formally deemed Plaintiff indigent. Despite this, on May 16, 2025, Amdre LLC aggressively demanded the

issuance of a writ, weaponizing an insurmountable **$24,700.00 supersedeas bond** to bypass appellate review. Plaintiff suffers from documented disabilities including severe PTSD, anxiety, and panic disorder. Knowing Plaintiff was indigent and disabled, Amdre LLC weaponized a procedurally defective, "stale" writ — a 24-hour warning notice was posted May 22, 2025, but the writ was not executed until **June 24, 2025 (33 days later)**, violating Tex. Prop. Code § 24.0061. This reckless, hostile execution caused acute medical crises requiring emergency EMS response for Plaintiff's elderly, disabled veteran parents. On July 5, 2025, Plaintiff suffered an acute panic attack during which Precinct 4 deputies maliciously denied access to life-saving medication — requiring emergency medical intervention, witnessed directly by Plaintiff's physician Dr. Dilshad, who was forced to make a house call.

§ 4 — CAUSES OF ACTION (SEVEN COUNTS)

COUNT 1 — Wrongful Foreclosure & Suit to Quiet Title

The foreclosure sale was wrongful due to: (a) failure to provide statutory notice to the correct mailing address under Tex. Prop. Code § 51.002; (b) explicit breach of Section 15 of the Deed of Trust; (c) the sale being held at an unauthorized online location (Auction.com) rather than the Harris County Commissioners-designated physical site; and (d) gross inadequacy of the sale price in conjunction with these procedural irregularities and the Mortgage Company's bad-faith failure to honor the "extenuating circumstances" clause.

COUNT 2 — Promissory Estoppel

The Mortgage Company made a clear and definite promise to postpone the foreclosure sale. Plaintiff detrimentally relied on this promise by foregoing

emergency injunctive relief, directly leading to the loss of property equity.

COUNT 3 — Breach of Contract

The Mortgage Company explicitly breached Section 15 of the Deed of Trust by failing to mail notices to the designated substitute address, and further breached the Note and Deed of Trust by failing to adhere to mandatory loss mitigation procedures regarding a dependent, abandoned borrower experiencing extenuating circumstances.

COUNT 4 — Wrongful Eviction & Violation of PTFA

Defendant Amdre LLC violated federal and state law by: breaking a bona fide lease; relying on unauthenticated "unofficial copies" to bypass evidentiary rules for standing; failing to provide mandatory 90-day PTFA notice; and executing a stale writ of possession 33 days after notice was posted, depriving Plaintiff of statutory due process.

COUNT 5 — Civil Conspiracy, Fraud on the Community, & Abuse of Process

Defendants Dunca, Garcia-Winder, Hernandez, and Amdre LLC conspired to fraudulently strip community equity and waste the marital estate to avoid equitable division in Family Court proceedings. They committed

Abuse of Process by: weaponizing uncertified documents to secure a writ before title vested; actively concealing Amdre LLC's nested corporate ownership structure; evading necessary joinder; exerting pressure via fraudulently induced legal instruments (the revoked POA); and manipulating law enforcement to suppress the missing person investigation.

COUNT 6 — Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED)

Defendants acted intentionally and recklessly. Their conduct in utilizing a stale writ and hostile law enforcement to forcibly evict a legally indigent individual with known, severe PTSD and elderly disabled veteran parents was extreme and outrageous, resulting in severe documented emotional distress and physical medical emergencies requiring on-site physician intervention.

COUNT 7 — Tortious Interference with Existing Contract & Prospective Relations

Plaintiff possessed a valid cash purchase agreement with Opendoor for **$283,700.00**. Defendant Amdre LLC — lacking a vested deed — committed an independently tortious act by injecting itself into the closing documents (Opendoor Disclosure Statement, February 20, 2025) and unilaterally causing the cancellation of the sale, directly depriving Plaintiff of the liquidity needed to avoid eviction and secure the property's equity.

§ 5 — DAMAGES AND EXEMPLARY DAMAGES

- **Actual Damages:** Loss of property equity definitively supported by the frustrated Opendoor cash contract of **$283,700.00**, alongside mental anguish, medical expenses, and loss of property.
- **Exemplary / Punitive Damages:** Defendants acted with malice, gross negligence, and conscious, reckless disregard for the safety and rights of a known disabled and indigent Plaintiff.
- **Total Range:** Monetary relief over $250,000 but not more than $1,000,000 (inclusive of stripped equity, actual damages, and exemplary damages).

§ 6 — PRAYER FOR RELIEF

88. An order setting aside the foreclosure sale, canceling the Trustee's Deed, and removing the cloud on title;
89. Alternatively, a judgment for actual damages equivalent to the lost equity, supported by the $283,700.00 contract valuation;
90. Statutory damages for wrongful eviction and violations of the PTFA;
91. Actual damages for tortious interference and intentional infliction of emotional distress;
92. Exemplary and punitive damages based on malice and gross negligence;
93. Pre-judgment and post-judgment interest at the highest legal rates;
94. Costs of court and attorney's fees; and
95. Such other and further relief, both general and special, at law and in equity, to which Plaintiff may be justly entitled.

§ 7 — INDEX OF EXHIBITS & ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit	Description
A	Opendoor Affiliated Business Arrangement Disclosure Statement (February 20, 2025) — showing Amdre LLC injected as seller prior to holding vested title

Exhibit	Description
B	Plaintiff's Demand Letter to Amdre LLC (February 25, 2025)
C	Uncertified "UNOFFICIAL COPY" of Substitute Trustee's Deed utilized by Defendant Amdre LLC to manufacture standing
D / D-1	Plaintiff's Declaration Re NewRez / Shellpoint (Statement of Inability to Afford Court Costs); Exhibit D-1 = Unsworn Declaration of Rodney Samuel Sprawling (reproduced verbatim below in § 8)
E	Defendant Amdre LLC's Motion to Quash Discovery (May 1, 2025)
F	Special Warranty Deed conveying the Property to EsRa Dunca-Sprawling Inc. (executed July 13, 2025)
—	Statement of Inability to Afford Payment of Court Costs (attached to petition)

§ 8 — EXHIBIT D-1: UNSWORN DECLARATION OF RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING

> Evidentiary Note:
>
> The following is the full verbatim text of the Unsworn Declaration of Rodney Samuel Sprawling, filed as Exhibit D-1 to the Original Petition, executed April 30, 2026, in Harris County, Texas, under penalty of perjury pursuant to Tex. Civ. Prac.
>
> &
>
> Rem. Code § 132.001.

EXHIBIT D-1

UNSWORN DECLARATION OF RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING

I am submitting this declaration to confirm the explicit, formal communications and instructions I provided to Defendant NewRez LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing prior to their wrongful foreclosure of the property located at **13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069**.

I expressly communicated the following facts and directives to NewRez LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing:

1. I explicitly informed their representatives that I did not have the financial means to pay the mortgage.

2. I formally notified them that my spouse and co-borrower, Andrei George Dunca, had abandoned me and the marital estate, and that I was his financial dependent.

3. I advised them that they must contact my spouse, Andrei George Dunca, to secure payment for the mortgage, and I explicitly provided them with his direct telephone number: **415-706-2984**.

4. Most critically, I formally invoked my right to designate a substitute notice address. I made them aware and explicitly directed that all future communications, notices of default, and notices of acceleration regarding the loan and property MUST be sent to my primary residence at: **565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122**.

Despite receiving these explicit instructions, NewRez LLC d/b/a Shellpoint Mortgage Servicing acted in bad faith, ignored the dependent borrower's extenuating circumstances, and breached the Deed of Trust by failing to mail the mandatory statutory foreclosure notices to my designated substitute address in San Francisco.

DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY (TEX. CIV. PRAC. &

REM. CODE § 132.001)

My name is Rodney Samuel Sprawling, my date of birth is April 12, 1986, and my address is **565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, California 94122, United States of America**. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed in Harris County, State of Texas, on the **30th day of April, 2026**.

_____

Rodney Samuel Sprawling
Declarant

§ 9 — FORENSIC IMPLICATIONS AND INVESTIGATIVE ANALYSIS

A. NewRez Bad Faith — Willful Disregard of Substitute Notice Directive

The Unsworn Declaration establishes on sworn record that Plaintiff took every legally available protective step: notifying NewRez of financial dependency, identifying the absent co-borrower, providing Dunca's direct phone number (415-706-2984), and formally invoking the contractual right to substitute notice under Section 15 of the Deed of Trust. NewRez's deliberate choice to ignore the San Francisco substitute address and continue mailing to the vacant Houston property is not mere administrative error — it constitutes a willful, bad-faith breach that directly enabled the silent foreclosure. This pattern aligns with the broader conspiracy model documented throughout this Report: institutional actors are either complicit or willfully blind, providing structural cover for the equity-stripping operation.

B. Garcia-Winder's Address as Forensic Linkage

Defendant Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder is served at **5823 Queensgate Drive, Houston, TX 77066** — an address previously documented in Section VIII of this Report in connection with her role as Dunca's personal assistant and operative. Her presence at the nexus of the property conspiracy (attempting to obtain POA over Balmore Circle), her collusion with Amdre LLC, and her successful interference with the Precinct 4 missing person investigation constitute a continuous thread of agency for the broader conspiracy. That Garcia-Winder was Dunca's personal employee and simultaneously the named defendant in a property-stripping scheme is not coincidental; it is the operational fingerprint of a coordinated, multi-proxy attack on the marital estate.

C. Amdre LLC as Shell Vehicle — Corporate Forensics

Amdre LLC's aggressive Motion to Quash Discovery — filed specifically to prevent disclosure of its hidden ownership structure (owned by shell entity "Amser LLC") — is itself dispositive evidence of concealment. A legitimate arms-length real estate acquisition company does not require two layers of shell-entity camouflage or the filing of emergency discovery-blocking motions to hide its ownership from a pro se indigent plaintiff. The acquisition of 13339 Balmore Circle for a price amounting to merely the outstanding loan balance (while simultaneously blocking a $283,700 market-rate cash sale) reflects a coordinated, non-competitive transaction designed to extract equity rather than to conduct lawful real estate investment.

D. The Supersedeas Bond as Financial Chokepoint

The imposition of a $24,700.00 supersedeas bond against a plaintiff formally deemed indigent by the Fourteenth Court of Appeals constitutes a textbook financial chokepoint: a procedural instrument weaponized to ensure that Plaintiff's appellate rights — formally recognized by the court as valid — could not be exercised in practice. That Amdre LLC aggressively demanded the bond's enforcement four days before the court's indigency finding was issued (demanding May 16; finding issued May 22) suggests pre-knowledge or coordination with the

judicial timeline, consistent with the docket manipulation documented in Section XXIV, Issue 3 of this Report.

E. Cross-References to Prior Sections

Prior Section	Nexus to Section XXV
Section VIII — Victoria Garcia-Winder	Confirms Garcia-Winder's role as Dunca's employee/operative; her Queensgate Drive address matches the defendant service address in this petition; her prior interference with Section D's missing person report is documented.
Section XVIII §5.2 — Forensic Assessment (Debt as Coercion)	The Balmore foreclosure is identified as a deliberate debt-coercion mechanism: Dunca's abandonment created the financial collapse that made foreclosure inevitable; NewRez's bad faith ensured Plaintiff could not recover; Amdre LLC's acquisition completed the equity extraction.
Section XX — FBI Transmissions (March 2025) & Dunca v. Sprawling (Case No. 202517063)	Part IV of the FBI transmissions documented the Balmore property loss at approximately $400K equity. The March 14, 2025 TRO (Case No. 202517063), which legally restrained Plaintiff from filing further law enforcement reports regarding Dunca, is identified as a retaliatory sequencing tool — filed precisely while the foreclosure conspiracy was being consummated.
Section XXIV — Appellant's Brief (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV)	Fact Section G ("Coordinated Financial Fraud: The Balmore Foreclosure Deception") documents the full appellate narrative of the foreclosure; Issues 3, 6, and 7 of the brief directly address the ADA/indigency violations, IIED, and contempt orders arising from this proceeding.
Section I–D — Harris County Constable Misconduct	Deputy C. Diaz's December 15, 2024 refusal to process the Dunca missing person report — based solely on Garcia-Winder's unverified account — is identified in this petition as active law enforcement collusion in suppressing evidence of the co-borrower's disappearance to protect the foreclosure.

SECTION XXVII — MASTER CHRONOLOGICAL TIMELINE

> Purpose:
>
> This section consolidates every key date, event, actor, and cross-reference identified across Sections I–XXVI into a single, date-ordered master timeline. It is designed to provide investigators, counsel, and the Court with a unified, scannable chronological record of the alleged multi-year conspiracy against Rodney Samuel Sprawling (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling).

A. PRE-2022: RELATIONSHIP FORMATION & BACKGROUND

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
~2012	Sprawling and Dunca begin domestic partnership; acquisition of therapeutic companion animal; marital estate established.	Sprawling; Dunca	§§ I, XVI, XXV
2014	LiveRail acquired by Facebook (Meta) for $400–500M; alleged conspiracy tech-nexus cohort formed around this corporate event.	Trefgarne; Fedorovici; Gal; Feng; Sherman	§§ XV, XVI, XVIII
Pre-2022	SutroLab LLC and Sean Sprawling Productions LLC formed as joint business entities; Dunca named co-owner and fiduciary.	Sprawling; Dunca	§§ XVI, XX, XXIV

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
Pre-Sep 2022	Property at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston TX 77069 acquired as marital real estate; Duncа named co-borrower on mortgage with NewRez LLC/Shellpoint.	Sprawling; Duncа; NewRez/Shellpoint	§§ XXV, XXVI

B. 2022: ABANDONMENT, IMPRISONMENT & INITIAL MEDICAL DOCUMENTATION

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
Aug 29, 2022	Psychologist (pre-Heafey) confirms Sprawling is not psychotic; documents that "They confirmed I wasn't crazy and documented what was happening." Sprawling communicates this confirmation to Duncа.	Sprawling; Duncа	§§ XXI, XXII, XXIII
Sep 2022	Duncа abruptly abandons Sprawling; alleged false imprisonment commences at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA — Sprawling's temporary residence and new business location.	Duncа; conspiracy network	§§ XVI, XVIII, XX, XXII
Sep 4, 2022	Dr. Naheed Ali (Dilshad Concierge Medicine) house-call: clinical note documents "Neurological: No Syncope, No	Dr. Naheed Ali; Sprawling	§§ XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	Dizziness. Psychiatric: No delusions, No Hallucinations, + Anxiety and Panic." Sprawling "otherwise clinically and hemodynamically stable."		
Sep 17, 2022	Dunca tells Sprawling (and implies to others) that Sprawling's spending and behavior indicate a need for rehab/therapy; suggests addiction as a factor — directly contradicting Aug 29 clinical confirmation of sanity.	Dunca	§§ XXII, XXIII
Sep–Nov 2022	Dr. Ali conducts multiple house calls; Sprawling repeatedly informs Dunca of ongoing medical documentation. Conspiracy uses AI voice cloning, device interception, and physical surveillance at 420 N. Camden Drive.	Sprawling; Dr. Ali; Dunca; Tech-Nexus defendants	§§ XVI, XVIII, XXI, XXII
Dec 2, 2022	Quest Diagnostics 14-panel toxicology screen: Sprawling tests NEGATIVE for all illicit substances including cocaine, opiates, methamphetamine. Objective laboratory evidence directly refutes Mudd Law's later drug-impairment narrative.	Sprawling; Quest Diagnostics	§§ XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII

C. 2023: MEDICAL MANIPULATION, HEAFEY MISCONDUCT & CONTINUED GASLIGHTING

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
Feb–Mar 2023	Sprawling reports to Dunca: "My psychologist when I could see him on video said nothing of this." Clinician again confirms no psychosis via telehealth.	Sprawling; Dunca; treating psychologist	§§ XXII, XXIII
Mar 2023	Sprawling fires Dr. Heafey due to sexual misconduct and ethical violations. Dunca removed from SutroLab LLC and Sean Sprawling Productions LLC records by early 2023 (per Mudd Law filing — disputed).	Sprawling; Dr. Heafey; Dunca	§§ XIX, XX, XXIV
Mar 10–Oct 29, 2023	Dunca continues telling contacts Sprawling is "unwell" and describes messages as "not anchored in any possible reality" — despite clinician confirmation of no psychosis provided to Dunca during this period.	Dunca	§§ XXII, XXIII
Jul 12, 2023	MD house-call objective clinical note: "No delusions, No Hallucinations, + Anxiety and Panic." Rules out psychosis in person.	Treating MD; Sprawling	§§ XXI, XXII, XXIII
Oct 29, 2023	Dunca tells third party Chase Brooks that Sprawling "is really unwell, he	Dunca; Chase Brooks (third party)	§§ XXII, XXIII

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	doesn't know what's real" and needs professional help — 3.5 months after MD note ruled out psychosis. Forensic implication: deliberate, persistent false narrative to third parties.		

D. 2024: HEAFEY REVERSAL, SFPD DISCREPANCY & PROPERTY OBSTRUCTION

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
Mar 2024	Dr. Heafey sexual misconduct documented in Exhibit B transcripts; violations include video-call indecency, solicitation for sex, inquiry about GHB "chem sex," offer of $5,000 bribe for removal of negative reviews, and breach of confidentiality with Garcia-Winder.	Dr. Heafey; Garcia-Winder	§§ XIX, XX, XXIV
Apr 1, 2024	Dr. Heafey issues diagnostic reversal — suddenly diagnoses Sprawling with "delusions and possibly hallucinations" without in-person evaluation, after years of clinical findings to the contrary.	Dr. Heafey	§§ XIX, XX, XXIII
Aug 15, 2024	Dunca tells third party (Eva) that	Dunca; Eva (third party)	§§ XXII, XXIII

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	Sprawling is "really unwell, he doesn't know what's real."		
Aug 18, 2024	Sprawling reports negative drug test for 14 substances and states "I was sober. Doctors said sane." — communicated to Dunca and documented in the record. Dunca's Aug 15 claim of "unwell" preceded this documented negative test by 3 days.	Sprawling; Dunca	§§ XXI, XXII, XXIII
Sep 5, 2024	**SFPD DISCREPANCY EVENT:** Mudd Law/petition claims SFPD Sgt. Siragusa conducted a video call with Dunca on this date, closing the missing person case. Sgt. Siragusa told Sprawling the case was closed based on testimony of current residents at 565 Ortega Street during a wellness check — no video call was mentioned. No video call evidence was submitted by Dunca or Mudd Law. No proof of life or identity verification provided.	SFPD Sgt. Siragusa; Dunca (alleged); Mudd Law	§§ XX, XXVI
Dec 15, 2024	Deputy Diaz (Harris County) refuses to take missing person intake report for Andrei Dunca filed by Sprawling.	Deputy Diaz; Sprawling	§§ XVIII, XXVI
Dec 17, 2024	Sprawling issues formal Section 7.1	Sprawling; Dunca	§§ XXIV, XXVI

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	LLC fiduciary demand to Dunca; Dunca fails to respond.		

E. JANUARY–JUNE 2025: FBI TRANSMISSIONS, CIVIL ACTION & FORECLOSURE

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
Feb 20, 2025	Amdre LLC blocks Opendoor $283,700 all-cash sale of 13339 Balmore Circle. Sale would have provided Sprawling liquidity from marital real estate.	Amdre LLC; Dunca	§§ XXV, XXVI
Mar 12, 2025	FBI Transmission Part 1 submitted via Docsmit by Sprawling to FBI Houston Office. Criminal allegations include false imprisonment, human trafficking, cybercrimes, and abuse.	Sprawling; FBI Houston	§§ XX, XXVI
Mar 13, 2025	Mudd Law Offices files Dunca v. Sprawling in Harris County District Court (Case No. 202517063) on behalf of Andrei Dunca. Claims include defamation, stalking, and IIED.	Mudd Law; Dunca; Harris County Court	§§ XX, XXIV, XXVI
Mar 14, 2025	Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) issued by 334th District Court. Restrains Sprawling	Hon. Dawn Rogers; Mudd Law; Dunca	§§ XX, XXIV, XXVI

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	from contacting Dunca, filing law enforcement reports, and orders removal of online content naming Dunca. TRO issued one day after suit filing with no notice to Sprawling.		
Mar 17, 2025	FBI Transmission Part 1 delivered via USPS Certified Mail to FBI Houston Office.	USPS; FBI Houston	§§ XX, XXVI
Mar 23, 2025	FBI Transmission Part 2 submitted via Docsmit; includes supplemental criminal allegations and exhibits.	Sprawling; FBI Houston	§§ XX, XXVI
Mar 28, 2025	FBI Transmission Part 2 delivered via USPS Certified Mail to FBI Houston Office.	USPS; FBI Houston	§§ XX, XXVI
Mar 30, 2025	Formal complaint against Dr. Heafey (CA Board of Psychology) submitted via Docsmit (Mailing ID: 850446; Account: ). Subject: "Complaint Richard Austin Heafey unfold Psychology." USPS Certified Mail, Electronic Return Receipt.	Sprawling; CA Board of Psychology; Docsmit	§§ XIX, XXVI
Apr 7, 2025	Board of Psychology complaint delivered to Sacramento office (USPS Tracking: 9214890132473400 2181054145). Confirmed "Delivered to Agent, Picked up at USPS —	USPS; CA Board of Psychology	§§ XIX, XXVI

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	4/7/25, 11:21 AM — SACRAMENTO, CA."		
Apr 30, 2025	Sprawling submits letter to Judge Rogers (334th District) re: ongoing abuse, ADA violations, and judicial irregularities in Case No. 202517063.	Sprawling; Hon. Dawn Rogers	§§ XXIV, XXVI
May 1, 2025	Amdre LLC files Motion to Quash Discovery in 13339 Balmore Circle foreclosure matter.	Amdre LLC	§§ XXV, XXVI
May 16, 2025	Amdre LLC demands writ issuance from the court in the Balmore property matter.	Amdre LLC	§§ XXV, XXVI
May 22, 2025	14th Court of Appeals issues indigency finding for Sprawling; stale writ notice posted regarding Balmore property.	14th Court of Appeals; Sprawling	§§ XXV, XXVI
Jun 24, 2025	Stale writ executed — 33 days after May 22 notice. Procedural delay creates additional prejudice to Sprawling's property interests.	Court; Amdre LLC	§§ XXV, XXVI

F. JULY–DECEMBER 2025: EVICTION, DISCOVERY WARFARE & APPELLATE ESCALATION

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
Jul 5, 2025	Sprawling suffers panic attack;	Deputies; Sprawling	§§ XXIV, XXVI

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	deputies deny access to prescribed medication. Alleged ADA violation and deliberate deprivation of medical care by law enforcement.		
Jul 13, 2025	13339 Balmore Circle property conveyed to EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc. by court action or deed transfer; marital equity disputed.	Court; EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc.; Amdre LLC	§§ XXV, XXVI
Aug 12, 2025	26-page formal complaint against Dr. Heafey filed with CA Board of Psychology (submitted Aug 12, 2025). Complaint covers 5 misconduct categories: gaslighting/denial of clinical relationship, sexual misconduct, IIED/patient abandonment, confidentiality breach/financial coercion, and complicity in broader abuse system.	Sprawling; CA Board of Psychology	§§ XIX, XXVI
Sep 5, 2025	Attorney Pagan (Mudd Law) sends deceptive email directive to pro se Sprawling, misrepresenting procedural obligations and attempting to induce waiver of rights.	Joshua Pagan; Mudd Law; Sprawling	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Sep 11, 2025	Exhibit U (Wallflower of the Year) submitted to 334th District Court trial	Sprawling; Hon. Dawn Rogers; 334th District Court	§§ XXIV, XXVI

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	record. Court subsequently bans Exhibit U — alleged suppression of corporate and criminal liability evidence.		
Sep 18, 2025	Pagan extortion email (Exhibit QQ): alleged demand or coercive communication directed at Sprawling to cease legal activity.	Joshua Pagan; Mudd Law	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Sep 24, 2025	Retaliatory sanctions motion filed (Exhibit RR) against Sprawling in Case No. 202517063; alleged procedural entrapment.	Mudd Law; Dunca	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Oct 13–15, 2025	Discovery demands filed by Sprawling; opposing counsel files retaliatory emergency motion in response to discovery activity.	Sprawling; Mudd Law; 334th District Court	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Nov 7, 2025	14th Court of Appeals mandate issued in interlocutory appellate matter.	14th Court of Appeals	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Nov 19, 2025	Misconduct complaint filed (against opposing counsel or judicial officer) based on documented pattern of procedural abuse and deception toward pro se Sprawling.	Sprawling	§§ XXIV, XXVI

G. 2026: FINAL JUDGMENT, APPEALS & ONGOING LITIGATION

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
Mar 2, 2026	Amended Petition filed in 245th Family Court; Sprawling asserts community property and spousal claims against Dunca through Harris County Family Court.	Sprawling; 245th Family Court	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Apr 1, 2026	Sworn Declaration re: Mistaken Identity (TRCP 12) filed by Sprawling, challenging the identity of parties named in opposing filings.	Sprawling; 334th District Court	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Apr 6, 2026	Final Judgment and Permanent Injunction issued by 334th District Court (Hon. Dawn Rogers). Injunction constitutes alleged unconstitutional prior restraint on Sprawling's speech and law enforcement access. Basis for Issue 1 of Appellant's Brief No. 01-26-00459-CV.	Hon. Dawn Rogers; 334th District Court; Mudd Law; Dunca	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Apr 8, 2026	New lead counsel designated post-judgment: Scott M. Brown & Associates (Caryn Gomar, TX Bar #24050669); Garcia-Winder and Heafey remain as case contacts for appellee's network.	Scott M. Brown & Associates; Caryn Gomar; Dunca	§§ XXIV, XXVI
Apr 30, 2026	Unsworn Declaration (Exhibit D-1) executed by Sprawling under penalty of perjury in Harris County, TX. Declares formal	Sprawling; NewRez LLC/Shellpoint; Amdre LLC	§§ XXV, XXVI

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Report Section Reference
	notification to NewRez LLC/Shellpoint of: inability to pay; Dunca's abandonment; substitute notice address at 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122; and directive to contact Dunca at 415-706-2984. NewRez alleged to have ignored all directives in breach of Deed of Trust.		
2026 (Filed)	Appellant's Brief filed in Case No. 01-26-00459-CV, First District Court of Appeals, Houston, TX. Sprawling v. Dunca. 7 issues presented; full factual record A–J; prayer for reversal of Final Judgment and Permanent Injunction; Sprawling appears pro se.	Sprawling (pro se); First District Court of Appeals	§§ XXIV, XXVI

H. PENDING CALIFORNIA ACTIONS (DRAFT STAGE)

Action	Description	Named Defendants	Report Section Reference
Draft — Wallflower Ch. 7	Corporate defendants complaint; 8 counts including civil conspiracy, RICO predicate acts, fraud, and unjust enrichment. Filed/to be filed in SF Superior Court.	Meta/Facebook; Bluefish AI; Ezra Inc.; Unfold; Illumina; Peer Responce	§ XV

Action	Description	Named Defendants	Report Section Reference
Draft — Exposé: EsRā v. Individuals	Individual defendants complaint; 11 counts including Bane Act, IIED, fraud, human experimentation, false imprisonment. Relief includes $7,975,299 + $30M production damages + 5% perpetual corporate share.	Dunca; Heafey; Tantu; Garcia-Winder; Spiro; Trefgarne; Feng; Gal; Sherman; Fedorovici	§ XVI

⚖️ FORENSIC NOTE — TIMELINE PATTERN ANALYSIS:

- **Systematic Pre-emption:** In every instance where clinical documentation of Sprawling's sanity and sobriety was communicated to Dunca, Dunca subsequently (and in at least one case, contemporaneously) made contradictory representations to third parties. The temporal sequence across five documented date-pairs (Aug 2022, Sep–Nov 2022, Feb–Mar 2023, Jul 2023, Aug 2024) is consistent with deliberate and premeditated gaslighting rather than genuine misunderstanding.
- **Institutional Cascade:** The timeline reveals a cascading weaponization of institutions — first Dunca's social network, then Dr. Heafey's clinical apparatus, then SFPD (MP case), then Harris County deputies (Dec 2024 intake refusal), then the civil courts (TRO → Final Judgment → Injunction), then the mortgage servicer (NewRez foreclosure). Each institution served as a sequential barrier isolating Sprawling from legal remedy.
- **Filing-Day Anomaly:** The TRO was issued (Mar 14) one day after the civil petition was filed (Mar 13) — the same week FBI Transmission Part 1

was delivered (Mar 17). The timing suggests the civil action was a preemptive counter-measure designed to legally restrain Sprawling's law-enforcement reporting activity before federal review could be triggered.

- **Aggregate Financial Attrition:** The timeline documents a minimum of $47.2M in alleged damages across: marital equity ($283,700 blocked Opendoor sale); security deposit withholding ($325,000–$385,000); production company destruction ($30M); emotional distress damages ($7,975,299+); and exemplary/punitive claims across multiple proceedings.

MASTER TIMELINE — FORENSIC CONCLUSION:

The chronological record compiled across Sections I through XXVI establishes a documented, multi-year pattern of coordinated conduct. The timeline is not consistent with isolated civil disputes or misunderstandings. Rather, the date-stamped sequence of events — spanning clinical manipulation (2022–2024), institutional neutralization (SFPD, Harris County, NewRez, 334th District Court), financial attrition (2024–2026), and concurrent legal entrapment (TRO → Permanent Injunction → Appellate Bar) — forms a coherent and operationally sophisticated campaign. The convergence of these events, their precise timing relative to Sprawling's legal filings and medical documentation, and the consistent involvement of overlapping actors across multiple jurisdictions constitutes compelling circumstantial evidence of the coordinated conspiracy alleged throughout this Incident Narrative Report.

SECTION XXIX — PRIOR COUNSEL CORRESPONDENCE, OBSTRUCTION & FORENSIC ANALYSIS: IIED, IIEH & INTENTIONAL DELAY

Scope: This section documents the formal correspondence from Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP (JKZ LLP) and Mudd Law Offices acting on behalf of Andrei George Dunca, Sprawling's responses asserting marital and business rights, JKZ's withdrawal without proof of retainer, the deliberate ~96-day gap before Mudd Law's first correspondence, and a comprehensive forensic analysis establishing claims of Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED), Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm (IIEH), Obstruction, and Intentional Delay. Cross-reference: §§ XVIII §6.1, XX, XXII, XXIII, XXIV Issue 6.

Part I — Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP: Cease & Desist Letter (August 15, 2024)

Field	Detail
Date	August 15, 2024
From	Ana Cazeneuve, Attorney; cc: Stan Sarkisov — Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP, 101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94104 | Main: 415.693.0550
To	Rodney Samuel Sprawling, Jr., 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069 — sent simultaneously to eleven (11) email addresses including , , and nine additional personal/iCloud accounts
Purported Client	Andrei Dunca
Delivery Method	Via First Class Mail and Electronic Mail
Proof of Retainer Provided	**NONE — No wet-ink or executed retainer agreement was provided at any point**
Compliance Deadline Set	September 15, 2024

Demands Made by JKZ on Dunca's Behalf:

96. Cease all communication with Dunca, his family, friends, colleagues, and any connected person — including calls, SMS, email, social media, and third-party communications made on Sprawling's behalf.
97. Immediately remove websites including andrei-dunca-abuse.com, andreidunca.com, and dunca-sprawling.com.
98. Cease using Dunca's San Francisco mailing address for any purpose; remove from all personal accounts.
99. Refrain from using the surname "Dunca" in connection with Sprawling's name for any reason.
100. Threatened legal remedies including a restraining order, attorney's fees, and civil/penal action if demands were not met.

> *"Repeated and unwanted contact over time can also constitute stalking, and your continuous contact is causing Mr. Dunca alarm and annoyance, and fear for his safety and the safety of the friends and family members whom you contact. Be on notice, that Mr. Dunca will pursue any and all legal penal and civil remedies available…"*
>
> — Ana Cazeneuve, JKZ LLP, August 15, 2024

⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — CONTEMPORANEOUS CONDUCT:

The JKZ cease-and-desist was transmitted on August 15, 2024 — the very same date Dunca told third party "Eva" that Sprawling "is really unwell, he doesn't know what's real" (cross-reference Section XXII). The coordinated timing of legal pressure and third-party reputation damage on the same calendar date is consistent with the gaslighting architecture documented in

Section XXIII.

Part II — Sprawling's Reply to JKZ LLP (August 18, 2024): Assertion of Marital & Business Rights

Field	Detail
Date / Time	Sunday, August 18, 2024 at 6:31 AM
From	EsRā Dunca-Sprawling <>
To	Ana Cazeneuve <>
CC	 (Eileen Kock, EKC PR, Beverly Hills);
Subject	Re: Cease and desist all contact with Andrei Dunca

Core Assertions Made by Sprawling:

101. **Common-Law Marriage:** Sprawling asserted status as Dunca's common-law husband and demanded the cease-and-desist be rescinded, as Dunca had entered into contracts predating JKZ's engagement.

102. **Co-Borrower Obligation on 13339 Balmore Circle (now in default):** Sprawling formally demanded enforcement of Dunca's responsibility as co-borrower on the Houston mortgage, which had entered default.

103. **LLC Operating Agreements — Three Entities:** Sprawling demanded Dunca fulfill his duties under the operating agreements for (a) Sean Sprawling Productions LLC, (b) Teak Stage Productions LLC, and (c) DBA Pine Stage Productions — entities Dunca departed without proper notice or a replacement.

104. **$550,000 Loan Recovery Agreement:** Sprawling demanded enforcement of a verbal and informal written agreement to recover a $550,000 loan Dunca had consulted on, approved, and agreed to recover.

105. **Verbal Promise of Support:** Sprawling invoked Dunca's verbal promise to "never throw me away" — a promise that induced Sprawling's reliance on Dunca as both romantic and business partner.

> *"Due to the fact Mr. Dunca is in a common law marriage recognized by the State of California as well as partner in shared business with myself; to deny me contact continues to cause me hardship and you must rescind your notice to cease and desist as your client has entered into contract predating the notice from your office. All contracts will be enforced…"*
>
> — EsRā Dunca-Sprawling, August 18, 2024 Reply to JKZ LLP

> *"Your office is assisting Mr. Dunca to continue a pattern in which he has used emotional and financial manipulation to intentionally inflicted emotional distress. Having previous knowledge of my struggles with anxiety and depression which are symptoms of PTSD; Mr. Dunca knowingly exploited my mental health to force me into signing away rights to shared assets…"*
>
> — EsRā Dunca-Sprawling, August 18, 2024 Reply to JKZ LLP

Sprawling additionally documented in the reply: illegal eviction from the Beverly Hills residence; arrest at gunpoint on a misdemeanor vandalism charge while denied clothing and legal counsel; bail escalation from $20,000 to $100,000 overnight; Dunca's failure to answer multiple calls from a payphone post-release;

the stalking and harassment continuing after release; Dunca reporting the American Express Platinum card in Sprawling's name as lost/stolen; and the Balmore Circle property entering default due to Dunca's abandonment of co-borrower obligations. The reply was CC'd directly to — placing Dunca on actual notice of all claims.

Part III — JKZ LLP Withdrawal of Representation (Post-August 18, 2024)

Following Sprawling's August 18, 2024 reply, JKZ LLP — without explanation, without referral to substitute counsel, and without providing any proof of a valid retainer from Andrei Dunca — issued the following terminal communication:

> *"Be advised that our office no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity. Please refrain from contacting me, our office, or any of our staff in any way as we cannot assist you."*
>
> — Ana Cazeneuve, Associate Attorney, Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP

- JKZ issued a formal legal demand letter on Dunca's behalf without ever producing an executed retainer agreement.
- JKZ refused to take Sprawling's calls, refused to schedule any meeting, and ignored all hardship notifications and documented obligations raised in the August 18 reply.
- Upon withdrawal, JKZ provided no referral to successor counsel and no path for Sprawling to address the urgent marital and business matters it had acknowledged.
- JKZ's withdrawal created a complete communications vacuum — persisting approximately 96 days until Mudd Law's first correspondence on November 19, 2024.

- The closing statement ("we cannot assist you") confirms JKZ understood Sprawling was seeking legitimate marital and business recourse yet took no steps to facilitate or refer those claims.

Part IV — Mudd Law Offices: Demand Letter (November 19, 2024)

Field	Detail
Date	November 19, 2024
From	Katie L. Stahl, Senior Counsel (TX admitted); Charles Lee Mudd Jr., Principal — Mudd Law Offices, 411 S Sangamon Street, Suite 1B, Chicago, IL 60607 | Houston: 1100 NASA Parkway, Suite 420L, Houston, TX 77058
To	Rodney Samuel Sprawling, Jr., 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069 — sent to eleven (11) email addresses via USPS Priority and Electronic Mail
Purported Client	Andrei Dunca
Classification	Demand Letter — "Without Prejudice / Settlement Discussions"
Response Deadline	November 25, 2024
Proof of Retainer Provided	**NONE — No executed retainer agreement produced; identical pattern to JKZ LLP**
Days Since JKZ C&D (Aug 15, 2024)	**96 Days — deliberate gap during which Sprawling had no legal channel to address marital/business obligations**

Mudd Law's Factual Claims (Contested as False Narrative):

- Asserted relationship lasted approximately eight (8) years, ended in "early 2021" — directly contradicted by Sprawling's documented 15-year relationship and common-law marriage assertion supported by Florida Affidavit of Domestic Partnership and Texas Affidavit of Name.
- Claimed California does not recognize common-law marriage — accurate only as to new marriages formed in California post-1895; inapplicable to marriages formed in other states recognized under full faith and credit principles.

- Claimed Dunca removed himself from SutroLab LLC and Sean Sprawling Productions LLC by "early 2023" — without providing executed operating agreement amendments, buy-out documentation, or any fiduciary wind-down notice to Sprawling.
- Alleged Sprawling sent "extremely alarming messages" in August/September 2022 — directly refuted by contemporaneous medical records (Dr. Naheed Ali; Quest Diagnostics toxicology negative for all substances) documented in Sections XXI–XXIII.
- Alleged Sprawling "threatened to kill people" in July 2024 — assertion made solely on information and belief; anonymous text messages cited contain no direct physical threats against Dunca; no forensic attribution to Sprawling was produced.

Mudd Law's 8-Point Settlement Demands: (1) Cease all contact with Dunca; (2) Cease contact with Dunca's family, partner, and associates; (3) Cease missing person reports; (4) Remove all websites referencing Dunca; (5) Release all domain names including "Dunca"; (6) Refrain from future false publications; (7) Publicly retract all false content; (8) Remove all online content about Dunca.

Legal Claims Threatened: Defamation Per Se, Public Disclosure of Private Facts, Intrusion Upon Seclusion, and IIED — all subsequently filed in Case No. 202517063 (Section XX) on March 13, 2025.

> ⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — IIED INVERSION:
>
> Mudd Law threatens Sprawling with an IIED claim on Dunca's behalf — yet the documented record establishes that it is Sprawling who suffered severe, clinically documented emotional distress caused by Dunca's abandonment, financial manipulation, and coordinated defamation. Each IIED element is satisfied on Sprawling's side: intentional conduct, extreme and outrageous behavior, causation, and severity (panic attacks, PTSD, bedridden depression — all documented by Dr. Naheed Ali and medical records in Sections XXI–

> XXIII). The IIED argument is inverted.

Part V — Forensic Analysis: IIED, IIEH, Obstruction & Intentional Delay

§ 29.1 — Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED) by Both Law Firms

Under Texas law, IIED requires: (1) intentional or reckless conduct; (2) extreme and outrageous conduct; (3) causation; and (4) severe emotional distress. *GTE Southwest, Inc. v. Bruce*, 998 S.W.2d 605, 618 (Tex. 1999). Each element is satisfied:

- **Intentional/Reckless:** Both firms issued formal legal demands for an unverified client while simultaneously blocking all avenues through which Sprawling could address a documented marital and financial emergency. JKZ refused calls, refused meetings, and ignored hardship notifications. Mudd Law issued its demand within days of the FBI transmission, consistent with a coordinated litigation counter-offensive.
- **Extreme and Outrageous:** A law firm that receives documented notification of a mortgage in default, LLC agreements breached, a $550,000 loan recovery claim, and a partner's abandonment — then issues threatening correspondence, refuses all engagement, and silently withdraws — engages in conduct beyond all bounds of decency.
- **Causation:** Sprawling's August 18, 2024 reply expressly documented that JKZ's conduct was "continuing to cause hardship." The 96-day legal vacuum directly exacerbated the Balmore Circle foreclosure, as Sprawling had no interlocutor to enforce co-borrower duties during the critical default period.
- **Severity:** Sprawling's distress is not speculative — it is clinically documented through panic attacks requiring house-call treatment by Dr. Naheed Ali, bedridden depression, and the collapse of $30 million in business

relationships caused by Dunca's coordinated defamation campaign, which both firms enabled and extended.

§ 29.2 — Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm (IIEH)

- **Balmore Circle Mortgage Default and Foreclosure:** Sprawling's August 18, 2024 reply explicitly notified JKZ of Dunca's co-borrower obligations on the Houston mortgage, then in default. JKZ's refusal to convey this — or facilitate any response — directly contributed to the foreclosure by Amdre LLC and Shellpoint/NewRez (subject of Section XXV). By Mudd Law's appearance on November 19, 2024, 96 days had elapsed with no legal channel to demand Dunca perform his co-borrower duties.
- **LLC Operating Agreement Breach:** JKZ's cease-and-desist combined with its refusal to facilitate business communications made it legally impossible for Sprawling to enforce operating agreement obligations for Sean Sprawling Productions LLC, Teak Stage Productions LLC, and DBA Pine Stage Productions.
- **$550,000 Loan Recovery Obstruction:** JKZ received Sprawling's formal written assertion of a $550,000 loan recovery agreement — and took no action to engage, facilitate, or refer the claim, functionally burying a half-million-dollar financial demand during its alleged representation period.
- **Business Relationship Collapse:** The cease-and-desist regime — imposed by JKZ and extended by Mudd Law — prevented Sprawling from communicating with business associates already receiving Dunca's defamation. Combined effect: collapse of $30 million in business relationships documented in the August 18, 2024 reply.

§ 29.3 — Obstruction

- JKZ refused to accept calls from Sprawling despite having issued a legal demand requiring a response.

- JKZ refused to schedule any meeting to address the marital, business, and financial emergency documented in Sprawling's August 18 reply.
- JKZ ignored all hardship notifications regarding the Balmore Circle mortgage default, Sprawling's disability status, and the medical crises described in the reply.
- JKZ withdrew without notifying Sprawling of successor counsel, creating a 96-day legal vacuum.
- Mudd Law repeated the identical pattern: no mechanism was offered for Sprawling to assert legitimate marital or business claims; eight settlement demands required Sprawling to surrender all claims with no acknowledgment of Dunca's documented obligations.
- Neither firm coordinated with courts, mediators, or family law practitioners to provide any legitimate alternative dispute resolution pathway for the marital estate and LLC obligations.

§ 29.4 — Intentional Delay: The 96-Day Legal Vacuum

The interval between JKZ's initial correspondence (August 15, 2024) and Mudd Law's first correspondence (November 19, 2024) spans exactly **96 days**. During this window:

- JKZ issued its cease-and-desist, received Sprawling's detailed marital/business response, then silently withdrew — leaving Sprawling with no legal interlocutor and no path to enforce Dunca's obligations.
- The Balmore Circle mortgage continued in default and moved toward the foreclosure that ultimately occurred.
- Mudd Law appeared only after the litigation landscape was fully staged — civil petition filed March 13, 2025; TRO issued March 14, 2025 (Section XX).
- The 96-day gap is consistent with a deliberate strategy: JKZ issues the initial legal salvo and assesses Sprawling's response; a period of total legal isolation follows; Mudd Law re-engages with escalated demands after the foreclosure clock has already devastated Sprawling's leverage.

The intentional delay is corroborated by the Appellant's Brief (Section XXIV), which characterizes this sequence under Issue H as "Procedural Entrapment, Extortionate Coercion, and Attorney Deception" and under Issue G as "Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm, IIED, and Litigation Entrapment."

Part VI — No Proof of Retainer: Pattern Analysis (JKZ LLP & Mudd Law)

Neither Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP nor Mudd Law Offices ever produced a wet-ink or executed retainer agreement demonstrating that Andrei Dunca had lawfully retained them to act on his behalf.

Firm	First Correspondence	Retainer Proof	Subsequent Action
Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP	August 15, 2024 (C&D Letter)	**NONE**	Withdrew without successor counsel referral; refused all engagement with Sprawling's marital/business claims
Mudd Law Offices	November 19, 2024 (Demand Letter)	**NONE**	Filed civil petition March 13, 2025; obtained TRO March 14, 2025; coordinated with Scott M. Brown & Associates and Burrus Law Group in appellate proceedings

The absence of verified retainers raises whether these firms were acting on Dunca's direct informed instruction or were engaged through intermediaries with interests adverse to Sprawling. This pattern is documented at Section XVIII §6.1 and Section XXIV Issue H. Cross-reference: California State Bar (re: JKZ LLP) and Illinois/Texas bar disciplinary authorities (re: Mudd Law Offices).

> ⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE QUESTION:

A law firm issuing a formal cease-and-desist threatening stalking and defamation claims — without a verifiable executed retainer — may be acting without proper client authority. If Dunca did not formally retain JKZ or Mudd Law, or if retainers were procured through intermediaries without Dunca's informed consent, the legal correspondence may constitute unauthorized use of legal process to harass a third party — warranting formal bar complaint inquiry to the California State Bar (JKZ) and to Illinois and Texas bar authorities (Mudd Law).

Part VII — Consolidated Correspondence & Legal Vacuum Timeline

Date	Actor	Event	Forensic Implication
Aug 15, 2024	JKZ LLP (Cazeneuve)	Formal C&D issued to 11 email addresses; threatens stalking/defamation; demands website removal by Sept 15, 2024; no retainer proof	Same date Dunca tells third party "Eva" Sprawling is "really unwell" — coordinated legal and reputational attack on single calendar day (Section XXII)
Aug 18, 2024	EsRā Dunca-Sprawling	Reply asserting common-law marriage; demands co-borrower enforcement (Balmore in default), LLC operating agreements (3 entities), $550K loan, verbal promise; CC'd Dunca directly at 	Same date Sprawling reports negative 14-panel drug test and states "I was sober. Doctors said sane." — dual notification of sobriety and marital claims on same date (Sections XXI–XXIII)
Post-Aug 18	JKZ LLP (Cazeneuve)	JKZ informs Sprawling firm "no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity"; withdraws	Legal vacuum begins; 96-day isolation window; Balmore mortgage continues toward

Date	Actor	Event	Forensic Implication
		without referral, retainer disclosure, or engagement with any claim raised	foreclosure with no enforcement channel
Aug 18 – Nov 18, 2024	96-Day Legal Vacuum	No firm represents Dunca; no legal channel for Sprawling; Balmore foreclosure clock runs; FBI transmissions prepared; all marital/business communication blocked	Deliberate isolation window — removes any possibility of pre-litigation settlement or co-borrower/LLC obligation enforcement during critical default period
Nov 19, 2024	Mudd Law (Stahl)	Demand Letter issued; claims 8-year relationship ended 2021; denies common-law marriage; 8-point demands; threatens litigation; deadline Nov 25, 2024; no retainer proof	96 days after JKZ C&D; foreclosure timeline already severely advanced; litigation posture from first contact; no resolution mechanism offered for Dunca's documented obligations
Dec 17, 2024	EsRā Dunca-Sprawling	Section 7.1 LLC Fiduciary Demand issued (cross-reference Section XXIV)	Sprawling continues to assert documented legal rights despite systematic obstruction
Mar 12, 2025	EsRā Dunca-Sprawling	FBI Transmission Part 1 submitted via Docsmit (Section XX)	Criminal report filed one day before Mudd Law civil petition — timing consistent with coordinated legal counter-offensive
Mar 13, 2025	Mudd Law (on behalf of Dunca)	Civil petition filed — Dunca v. Sprawling, Case No. 202517063, Harris County District Court (Section XX)	Filed one day after FBI criminal report — sequence supports inference of monitoring and coordinated response to Sprawling's criminal filing
Mar 14, 2025	334th District Court	Ex Parte TRO issued; restrains Sprawling	Obtained ex parte one day after civil

Date	Actor	Event	Forensic Implication
		from all contact with Dunca; orders immediate website removal (Section XX)	filing; combined with prior C&D regime constitutes complete suppression of Sprawling's communications and legal advocacy

Forensic Conclusion — Section XXIX

The conduct of Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP and Mudd Law Offices, viewed in totality, constitutes a coordinated legal obstruction strategy satisfying the evidentiary elements of IIED, IIEH, and procedural Obstruction. Both firms issued formal legal demands on behalf of Andrei Dunca without producing verified retainer agreements; both refused all engagement with Sprawling's documented marital and business claims; both imposed cease-and-desist regimes that — by design — prevented Sprawling from enforcing co-borrower obligations, LLC operating agreements, and a $550,000 loan recovery claim during a critical foreclosure window.

The 96-day legal vacuum between JKZ's withdrawal and Mudd Law's appearance is not administrative coincidence — it is the forensic signature of an intentional delay strategy. During this window, the Balmore Circle mortgage accelerated toward foreclosure, Sprawling was left without any legal channel to enforce Dunca's obligations, and the groundwork was laid for Mudd Law's aggressive civil litigation posture. The civil petition was filed March 13, 2025 — one day after Sprawling's FBI transmission — followed by an ex parte TRO on March 14, 2025.

The pattern of unverified retainer authority, combined with both firms' identically obstructive conduct and the precision of the litigation timeline, is consistent with Section XVIII §6.1's documented finding of institutional weaponization against Sprawling. These findings cross-reference Section XXIV Issue H ("Procedural Entrapment, Extortionate Coercion, and Attorney Deception") and Issue G ("Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm, IIED, and Litigation Entrapment"), and the consolidated litigation docket in Section XXVI.

Cross-references: §§ XVIII §6.1; XX (FBI Transmissions & Civil Action 202517063); XXI (Medical Credibility); XXII (Chronological Contradiction Analysis); XXIII (Intentionality & Knowledge-Action Gap); XXIV (Appellant's Brief Issues G & H); XXV (Balmore Foreclosure Petition); XXVI (Consolidated Docket Register).

SECTION XXX — DRAFT FORMAL COMPLAINT TO THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of Ana Cazeneuve, Associate Attorney, Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP — Alleged Violations of the California Rules of Professional Conduct

> **TO:** State Bar of California, Office of Chief Trial Counsel, 845 South Figueroa Street, Los Angeles, CA 90017
>
> **RE:** Formal Complaint Against Ana Cazeneuve (CA Bar No. [pending verification]), Associate Attorney, Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP, 101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94104
>
> **SUBMITTED BY:** Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (also known as EsRā Dunca-Sprawling / Sean Sprawling), 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122
>
> **DATE OF SUBMISSION:** May 2026 | **CROSS-REFERENCE:** Report §§ XVIII §6.1, XX, XXII, XXIII, XXIV (Issue H), XXV, XXVI, XXIX

§ 30.1 — Identification of Respondent and Firm

Field	Detail
Respondent Attorney	Ana Cazeneuve, Associate Attorney
Firm	Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP ("JKZ LLP")
Firm Address	101 Montgomery Street, Suite 1600, San Francisco, CA 94104
Firm Phone / Fax	Main: 415.693.0550 | Fax: 415.693.0500
Additional Firm Contact	Stan Sarkisov (referenced in internal correspondence)
Purported Client	Andrei George Dunca (DOB: May 29, 1984); claimed Berlin, Germany residence at time of representation

Field	Detail
Period of Alleged Representation	On or before August 15, 2024 — through withdrawal notification (date unspecified; received by Complainant after September 15, 2024 compliance deadline)

§ 30.2 — California Rules of Professional Conduct Alleged to Have Been Violated

Rule	Provision	Alleged Application
Rule 1.2(a)	Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority	JKZ undertook legal action (issuance of cease-and-desist) with material legal consequences to Complainant without producing verified authority from the client; no retainer or engagement confirmation was produced upon request, raising the question of whether representation was properly authorized or whether the C&D was issued on the basis of a fabricated or unverified retainer relationship.
Rule 1.4(a)–(b)	Communication	Respondent and JKZ LLP refused to respond to Complainant's multiple requests for communication, including telephone calls and written correspondence placing the firm on notice of Complainant's hardship, legal standing as common-law spouse and co-borrower, and the immediate risk of mortgage default and loss of property. This constitutes a complete failure to engage in meaningful communication with an adverse party who held cognizable legal interests.
Rule 1.16(d)	Declining or Terminating Representation — Duties Upon Withdrawal	Upon withdrawal, Respondent failed to take reasonable steps to protect the interests of the client

Rule	Provision	Alleged Application
		and failed to provide successor counsel referral. The withdrawal created a 96-day legal vacuum between JKZ's effective withdrawal and the first Mudd Law correspondence (November 19, 2024), during which Complainant had no legal counterparty to engage, no forum to enforce Dunca's obligations, and no mechanism to halt the foreclosure proceeding then underway against 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069.
Rule 3.1	Meritorious Claims and Contentions	The August 15, 2024 cease-and-desist letter directed Complainant to cease exercising rights that are cognizable and legally enforceable, including contact with a co-borrower regarding a defaulting mortgage obligation and communication with a common-law spouse regarding shared business affairs. The C&D was issued without any apparent assessment of Complainant's legal standing and without verification that Dunca's factual representations were accurate.
Rule 8.4(c)	Misconduct — Dishonesty, Fraud, Deceit, or Misrepresentation	By issuing a formal legal notice of representation without a verifiable retainer, and by refusing all subsequent requests for proof of retainer, Respondent may have engaged in conduct involving misrepresentation as to the existence and scope of the attorney-client relationship. This appearance of legal authority was used to coerce Complainant's silence and inaction during the precise period that

Rule	Provision	Alleged Application
		Dunca's obligations under shared contracts were accruing.

§ 30.3 — Factual Basis for Complaint

A. The August 15, 2024 Cease-and-Desist Letter — Issuance Without Verified Retainer

On August 15, 2024, Respondent Ana Cazeneuve, acting on behalf of JKZ LLP and purportedly on behalf of Andrei George Dunca, transmitted a formal Notice to Cease and Desist All Communication to Complainant Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. The letter was sent via First Class Mail and electronic mail simultaneously to eleven (11) separate email addresses associated with Complainant. The letter demanded, inter alia, that Complainant: (1) cease all communication with Dunca, his family, friends, and colleagues; (2) immediately remove multiple websites; (3) cease use of Dunca's surname in any context; and (4) remove Dunca's address from all personal accounts — all by a compliance deadline of September 15, 2024.

At no point during or after the issuance of this letter did JKZ LLP produce a signed retainer agreement, engagement letter, or any other documentary proof confirming that Andrei Dunca had authorized the firm to act on his behalf. This is particularly significant because Complainant is Dunca's common-law spouse and business co-venturer, and the C&D letter, if issued without verified authority, constituted an unauthorized legal act designed to suppress Complainant's legally cognizable rights.

The C&D letter instructed Complainant to cease exercising rights that include: (a) contacting a co-borrower who is in breach of a shared mortgage obligation; (b) communicating with a business partner regarding LLC operating agreements under which Dunca owed active duties; and (c) seeking recovery of a $550,000 loan that Dunca had approved and agreed to help recover. The letter made no reference to these obligations and provided no legal analysis of Complainant's standing, despite the fact that Respondent was or should have been aware of these facts through information provided by her client.

B. Same-Day Coordination with Dunca's Reputational Campaign — August 15, 2024

Forensic analysis of the documented record establishes that the August 15, 2024 cease-and-desist letter was issued on the *identical calendar date* that Andrei Dunca communicated to a third party identified as "Eva" that Complainant "is really unwell, he doesn't know what's real." This simultaneous deployment of legal silencing (via Respondent) and reputational destruction (via Dunca's private communications) is not coincidental in character; it reflects a coordinated two-pronged strategy designed to: (1) legally bar Complainant from public or legal advocacy regarding the conspiracy; and (2) simultaneously undermine Complainant's credibility with third-party audiences who might otherwise provide support or assistance. The fact that both actions occurred on the same date — without any identifiable triggering event — is a forensic indicator of pre-arranged coordination between Respondent's issuance of the C&D and Dunca's parallel reputational messaging. See Report §§ XXII, XXIII.

> ⚠ **FORENSIC NOTE — COORDINATED SAME-DAY ACTION:** The August 15, 2024 C&D was issued the same day Dunca told third party "Eva" that Complainant was "really unwell." JKZ's legal communication and Dunca's reputational communication functioned as synchronized instruments of isolation. The legal silencing made it impossible for Complainant to enforce his rights; the simultaneous reputational smear ensured third parties would dismiss any attempt Complainant made to do so. This coordination is relevant to the question of whether the retainer relationship was legitimate and whether the C&D was issued in furtherance of a non-legal purpose. See §§ XXII, XXIII, XXIX of this Report.

C. Complainant's Reply — Notification of Legal Standing and Hardship (August 18, 2024)

On August 18, 2024, Complainant submitted a written reply to Respondent by electronic mail, copying Dunca at his personal email address () and a third-party contact. In that reply, Complainant expressly placed JKZ LLP on notice of the following material facts:

- Dunca and Complainant are common-law spouses, a status recognized under California law as of the date of the relationship's establishment;
- Dunca is a co-borrower on the mortgage for 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069, which was then in active default;
- Dunca has ongoing contractual duties under three LLC operating agreements: Sean Sprawling Productions LLC, Teak Stage Productions LLC, and DBA Pine Stage Productions;
- Dunca had agreed, verbally and in writing, to assist in recovering a $550,000 loan on Complainant's behalf; and
- Dunca had made an express verbal promise — "never throw me away" — that Complainant had relied upon to his detriment in forgoing independent legal and financial arrangements.

Respondent and JKZ LLP did not respond to this communication. No acknowledgment of the hardship notification was provided. No referral to successor counsel was offered. No substantive engagement with Complainant's stated legal rights was made at any time thereafter. Instead, JKZ LLP subsequently communicated to Complainant only that it "no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity" — a bare withdrawal notice without any of the protective steps required of withdrawing counsel under California Rule of Professional Conduct 1.16(d).

> *"Mr. Sprawling: Be advised that our office no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity. Please refrain from contacting me, our office, or any of our staff*

> *in any way as we cannot assist you. — Ana Cazeneuve, Associate Attorney, Johnston, Kinney*
>
> *&*
>
> *Zulaica LLP."*
>
> — Verbatim withdrawal communication, Ana Cazeneuve to Complainant (date of transmission post-September 15, 2024 compliance deadline). No retainer proof, no successor referral, no acknowledgment of Complainant's hardship notifications.

D. Refusal of Calls, Meetings, and Hardship Notifications

Between August 15, 2024 and the date of the firm's withdrawal communication, Complainant made multiple attempts to communicate with JKZ LLP by telephone and electronic correspondence. The firm refused to accept or return calls. The firm refused to arrange any meeting. The firm ignored Complainant's repeated notifications that: (a) the property at 13339 Balmore Circle was in mortgage default and facing imminent foreclosure; (b) Dunca's obligations as co-borrower were accruing; (c) Complainant lacked independent financial resources, having been abandoned by Dunca in a state of financial dependence; and (d) Complainant had documented disability (PTSD, GAD, MDD) that rendered navigation of the legal and financial crisis without guidance particularly acute.

A California attorney who issues a cease-and-desist on behalf of a client bears, at minimum, a duty to communicate with an adverse party who has a cognizable legal relationship with the attorney's client, where that adverse party provides clear notice of emergency circumstances and legally enforceable rights. Respondent's systematic refusal to engage constitutes a failure of professional responsibility that caused direct, material harm to Complainant.

E. The 96-Day Legal Vacuum and the Mudd Law Succession

Following JKZ LLP's withdrawal, no attorney or firm stepped in to represent Dunca's interests in any communication with Complainant until November 19, 2024 — 96 days after the September 15, 2024 compliance deadline imposed by JKZ's own C&D letter. During this vacuum: (a) the Balmore Circle property entered the final stages of the foreclosure process; (b) Complainant had no legal counterparty through whom to serve notice, negotiate hardship alternatives, or assert marital and co-borrower rights; (c) the LLC operating agreements continued to impose obligations on Dunca that he could not be compelled to perform; and (d) Complainant had no mechanism to enforce or recover the $550,000 loan obligation. This vacuum was not accidental — it was the product of Respondent's withdrawal without any transition planning and was the proximate cause of substantial financial harm to Complainant. See Report §§ XXV, XXVI, XXIX.

Mudd Law Offices, the firm that stepped in on November 19, 2024, likewise produced no proof of retainer from Dunca. The pattern — two successive law firms acting under Dunca's apparent instruction without producing verified retainer documentation — raises a material question as to the nature, legitimacy, and funding source of the legal engagement(s). Complainant requests that the State Bar investigate whether both retainers were procured through the same intermediary or funding channel, and whether that channel constitutes an undisclosed conflict or a third-party funder with interests adverse to Complainant.

§ 30.4 — Harm Caused to Complainant

Category of Harm	Specific Damage	Report Cross-Reference
Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED)	Issuance of C&D simultaneous with Dunca's reputational attacks constituted a coordinated assault on Complainant's mental state; Complainant, already suffering PTSD, GAD, and MDD, was subjected to the extreme distress of being legally silenced while being publicly smeared as mentally unstable.	§§ XXII, XXIII, XXIX §29.1

Category of Harm	Specific Damage	Report Cross-Reference
Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm (IIEH)	JKZ's legal silencing directly prevented Complainant from enforcing co-borrower rights, LLC operating agreements, and the $550,000 loan recovery obligation during the period of representation — facilitating Dunca's abandonment of these financial responsibilities and enabling the Balmore foreclosure.	§§ XXV, XXVI, XXIX §29.2
Balmore Foreclosure Facilitation	The foreclosure of 13339 Balmore Circle — resulting in the blocked $283,700 Opendoor sale and loss of equity — was proximately caused in part by the legal vacuum JKZ created, during which Complainant could not compel Dunca to fulfill co-borrower obligations or arrange hardship accommodations with the mortgage servicer.	§§ XXV, XXVI
Suppression of $550,000 Loan Claim	The C&D and subsequent legal vacuum buried Complainant's ability to pursue recovery of the $550,000 loan obligation during the critical enforcement window; by the time successor counsel appeared, the claim had been further complicated by litigation posture and injunctive constraints.	§§ XXIV, XXIX §29.2
LLC Obligations Rendered Unenforceable During Vacuum	With no legal channel to enforce the operating agreements for Sean Sprawling Productions LLC, Teak Stage Productions LLC, and DBA Pine Stage Productions during the 96-day vacuum, Dunca's duties under those agreements went unperformed with no legal consequence, enabling constructive dissolution of Complainant's business interests.	§§ XX, XXIX

§ 30.5 — The Pattern of Unverified Representation: JKZ LLP and Mudd Law Offices

Attribute	JKZ LLP (First Firm)	Mudd Law Offices (Second Firm)
First Correspondence Date	August 15, 2024	November 19, 2024
Retainer Proof Produced	None — never produced upon Complainant's request	None — never produced upon Complainant's request
Nature of Legal Action Taken	Cease-and-desist sent to 11 email addresses with compliance deadline of September 15, 2024	8-point settlement demand letter; civil petition (Case No. 202517063) filed March 13, 2025; TRO obtained March 14, 2025
Engagement with Complainant's Legal Standing	Zero — no acknowledgment of common-law marriage, co-borrower status, or LLC obligations	Minimal — denied common-law marriage under California law without addressing Texas homestead and community property dimensions
Withdrawal / Succession Notification	Bare withdrawal only — no referral, no transition steps, no protective action for adverse party	Still actively representing Dunca in appellate and civil proceedings as of date of this report
Forensic Pattern Indicator	Simultaneous with Dunca's reputational messaging (August 15, 2024)	Simultaneous with FBI certified mail delivery (March 17 & 28, 2025); TRO obtained one day after civil petition filed — retaliatory sequencing

⚠ **FORENSIC NOTE — UNAUTHORIZED PRACTICE RISK:** Where an attorney issues formal legal notices, demands, and causes court filings without a verified, executed retainer from the named client, a material question arises as to whether the attorney is acting within the scope of authorized representation or is effectuating legal process on behalf of an undisclosed third-party principal. The State Bar is respectfully requested to compel production of: (1) the signed retainer agreement between Andrei George Dunca and JKZ LLP; (2) any written authorization from Dunca to act; (3) records of payment received and the identity of the payor; and (4)

> any communications between JKZ LLP and third parties — including but not limited to Victoria Garcia-Winder — concerning the scope or purpose of the engagement.

§ 30.6 — Consolidated Timeline of JKZ LLP Conduct Relevant to This Complaint

Date	Event	Rule Implicated / Forensic Note
August 15, 2024	JKZ LLP (Cazeneuve) issues C&D to Complainant at 11 email addresses simultaneously with Dunca's "Eva" message characterizing Complainant as "unwell." No retainer produced.	Rules 1.2, 3.1, 8.4(c) — coordinated suppression; unverified authority
August 18, 2024	Complainant replies in writing notifying JKZ of common-law marriage, co-borrower mortgage default, three LLC operating agreements, $550K loan, and verbal promise. Copies Dunca directly. JKZ does not respond.	Rule 1.4 — failure to communicate regarding material legal interests of adverse party with cognizable rights
September 15, 2024	JKZ-imposed compliance deadline passes. JKZ takes no further action to engage with Complainant's stated legal rights or hardships.	Rule 1.4 — continued failure to communicate or acknowledge legal standing
Post-September 15, 2024 (exact date TBD)	JKZ transmits bare withdrawal notice: "our office no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity." No successor referral. No transition steps. No acknowledgment of Complainant's outstanding legal claims.	Rule 1.16(d) — withdrawal without protective steps; failure to safeguard interests of adversely affected party
September 2024 – November 18, 2024	96-day legal vacuum. Balmore Circle foreclosure advances without legal counterparty for	Rules 1.16(d), 8.4(c) — proximately caused financial harm; facilitated Dunca's breach of fiduciary

Date	Event	Rule Implicated / Forensic Note
	Complainant to engage. LLC obligations lapse. $550K claim unenforceable. Complainant unable to compel Dunca's compliance with any contractual obligation.	obligations
November 19, 2024	Mudd Law Offices (Chicago / Houston) appears as successor counsel for Dunca. No retainer produced. 8-point demand letter issued. Pattern of unverified representation continues.	Pattern note — Mudd Law mirrors JKZ pattern; State Bar review of both retainers is warranted
March 13–14, 2025	Mudd Law files civil petition (Case No. 202517063); TRO granted one day later. FBI certified mail delivered March 17, 2025. Retaliatory sequencing consistent with coordinated legal suppression strategy initiated by JKZ C&D in August 2024.	See Report §§ XX, XXIV — TRO timing anomaly; retaliation against FBI disclosure

§ 30.7 — Relief Requested from the State Bar of California

106. **Open a formal investigation** into the conduct of Ana Cazeneuve and Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP in connection with the representation of Andrei George Dunca beginning on or before August 15, 2024;

107. **Compel production of retainer documentation** — specifically: (a) the signed retainer agreement between Dunca and JKZ LLP; (b) evidence of payment and identity of the payor; and (c) any written authorization from Dunca to issue the August 15, 2024 cease-and-desist letter;

108. **Investigate the funding source** of the JKZ LLP engagement — including whether the retainer was procured through an intermediary (including but not limited to Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder or any other third party connected to the conspiracy documented in this Report) — and assess whether the engagement was used to advance interests adverse to and independent of Dunca's authorized instructions;

109. **Assess disciplinary action** against Ana Cazeneuve up to and including suspension or referral for State Bar Court proceedings for: (a) issuing legal process without verified client authority; (b) failing to communicate with an adverse party of known legal standing; (c) withdrawing without protective transition steps; and (d) conduct that, in context, constitutes dishonesty or misrepresentation in violation of Rule 8.4(c);

110. **Coordinate with relevant authorities**, including the Texas State Bar, the California Attorney General, and federal law enforcement, if the investigation reveals that the legal representation was procured through fraudulent means, that the retainer was funded by undisclosed third parties with criminal liability, or that the C&D letter was used as an instrument of the broader conspiracy documented herein;

111. **Issue a finding** as to whether the 96-day legal vacuum created by JKZ's unprotected withdrawal constitutes sanctionable professional misconduct in light of the foreseeable financial harm to Complainant; and

112. **Provide Complainant with written confirmation** of the receipt of this complaint and the status of any investigation, to the extent permissible under State Bar confidentiality rules, so that Complainant may incorporate such confirmation into parallel civil and criminal proceedings.

⚑ FORENSIC CONCLUSION — SECTION XXX

The conduct of Ana Cazeneuve and Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP constitutes a multi-layered professional failure with direct, measurable consequences for Complainant. Acting without verified retainer authority, the firm issued legal process that suppressed Complainant's rights as a common-law spouse, co-borrower, and LLC co-venturer — simultaneously with Dunca's coordinated reputational attack. The firm then refused all communication, ignored documented financial emergencies, and withdrew without any protective steps — creating a 96-day legal vacuum that

facilitated the foreclosure of Balmore Circle, the lapse of LLC obligations, and the burial of the $550,000 loan claim. The pattern of unverified representation — replicated identically by successor firm Mudd Law Offices — is not an error of process. It is a forensic signature of a coordinated legal suppression strategy, and it warrants the State Bar's full investigative authority.

SECTION XXXI — DUAL COUNSEL OBSTRUCTION, UNAUTHORIZED CORPORATE ACTION & PROOF-OF-LIFE SUPPRESSION: MUDD LAW OFFICES (NOV. 19, 2024 – FEB. 11, 2025)

Prefatory Note:

This section documents the complete evidentiary record of Mudd Law Offices' conduct toward Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. from its first correspondence on November 19, 2024, through Sprawling's unanswered February 11, 2025, formal demand for proof of retainer and proof of life. It is read in conjunction with Section XXIX (JKZ LLP conduct) and Section XXX (JKZ Bar Complaint). Together, these three sections establish a two-firm, multi-phase legal obstruction campaign against Sprawling's legitimate spousal, business-partner, and missing-person inquiries.

Part I — The Two-Firm Pattern: JKZ LLP Withdrawal → 96-Day Vacuum → Mudd Law First Contact

Before Mudd Law Offices entered this matter, Andrei George Dunca retained Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP ("JKZ LLP"), a San Francisco firm, to issue the August 15, 2024, Cease and Desist letter to Sprawling. The C&D instructed Sprawling to halt all contact with Dunca and remove associated websites. Sprawling responded on August 18, 2024, formally invoking his rights as Dunca's common-law husband and managing business partner, specifically notifying JKZ of: (1) the mortgage default at 13339 Balmore Circle; (2) Dunca's obligations under operating agreements for Sean Sprawling Productions LLC, Teak Stage Productions LLC, and DBA Pine Stage Productions; (3) an outstanding $550,000 loan obligation; and (4) a verbal promise of lifetime financial support. JKZ ignored all of these notifications, refused to take Sprawling's calls, refused to schedule any meeting, and provided **zero proof of a valid retainer**. JKZ then withdrew without explanation, advising only: *"Be advised that our office no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity."*

Between JKZ's effective withdrawal and Mudd Law's first communication, a gap of **approximately 96 days** elapsed — from August 15, 2024, through November 19, 2024. During this window: the Balmore Circle foreclosure proceeded; Sprawling was left without any point of contact for Dunca; and no party provided any proof that Dunca was alive, free, or acting under his own volition. The temporal correlation is forensically significant: the 96-day gap coincides precisely with the period during which the foreclosure became irrevocable. The entry of a second firm immediately after that threshold is consistent with a strategy of deliberate legal delay calibrated to allow asset destruction before any injunctive remedy could be obtained.

Date / Event	Action by Duncа's Counsel	Sprawling's Response / Hardship	Proof of Retainer Provided?
Aug. 15, 2024 — JKZ C&D Letter	JKZ issues C&D; instructs Sprawling to cease all contact with Dunca, family, colleagues; demands removal of websites	Sprawling responds Aug. 18 invoking husband/partner rights; notifies of mortgage default, LLC obligations, $550K loan; JKZ ignores entirely	**NO — None provided**
Aug. 18 – Nov. 18, 2024 — 96-Day	JKZ refuses calls, refuses meetings,	Foreclosure of 13339 Balmore	**NO — Withdrawn**

Date / Event	Action by Dunca's Counsel	Sprawling's Response / Hardship	Proof of Retainer Provided?
Vacuum	ignores all hardship notifications, then withdraws entirely with single-sentence notice	Circle proceeds; Sprawling has no contact point; no proof of life for Dunca; homelessness imminent	
Nov. 19, 2024 — Mudd Law Demand Letter	Mudd Law first contact: demand letter alleging Sprawling made defamatory statements; threatens legal action; claims to represent Dunca	Sprawling immediately seeks proof that Dunca is the actual client and that Dunca is alive and acting freely	**NO — None provided**
Dec. 9, 2024 — Sprawling's Missing Person Inquiry to Mudd	Sprawling formally emails Mudd Law requesting confirmation that Dunca is alive, free, and of sound mind; attaches redacted ID	Sprawling has already filed MP report with Harris County Sheriff; notes law enforcement could not identify or locate Dunca	**NO — No response to MP inquiry**
Dec. 16, 2024 — Mudd Email #1 (Circular Tautology)	Mudd responds: "We can confirm that our client is our client." Instructs Sprawling to stop filing reports; directs all comms through firm	Sprawling requests proof of sound mind, proof of identity, proof Dunca hired Mudd directly; invokes LLC operating agreement	**NO — Tautology only**
Dec. 17, 2024 — Mudd Email #2 (Litigation Threat)	Mudd responds: "We have no obligations to you. You can either be patient… Or, we can proceed with litigation."	Sprawling has provided documented missing-person concern, financial hardship, and LLC contractual basis for inquiry; all ignored	**NO — Threat only**
Feb. 11, 2025 — Sprawling's 6-Point Formal Demand	No response to demand letter; no emergency LLC meeting held; no independent mental health evaluation produced	Sprawling sends formal Notice of Demand at 2:34 AM to all Mudd Law attorneys + Dunca directly; six enumerated demands for proof	**NO — Demand went unanswered**

> ⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — PATTERN OF NO-RETAINER REPRESENTATION:
>
> In each instance, Dunca's retained counsel issued legal demands, C
>
> &
>
> D letters, and litigation threats against Sprawling while simultaneously refusing to provide any documentation establishing a valid attorney-client relationship with Dunca. Neither JKZ LLP nor Mudd Law Offices produced a retainer agreement, an engagement letter, or a signed authorization from Dunca when requested. This pattern is consistent with representation arranged by a third-party principal — not directly by Dunca himself — and is probative of the broader allegation that Dunca is either missing, under duress, or being managed by a third-party actor for purposes of asset concealment.

Part II — Mudd Law Email #1 (December 16, 2024): The Circular Tautology as "Proof" of Identity

On December 16, 2024, at 8:00 AM, Charles Lee Mudd Jr. replied to Sprawling's missing-person inquiry. Sprawling had written on December 9, 2024, and again on December 16, 2024 (at 2:50 AM), detailing his legal basis for demanding proof of life — including his status as Dunca's domestic partner, authorized signatory on shared credit and bank accounts, co-owner of shared real property, and co-managing member of Sean Sprawling Productions LLC and Teak Stage Productions LLC. Sprawling had also noted that law enforcement could not identify or locate Dunca. Mudd's response — in its entirety regarding proof of identity — consisted of the following:

> "We can confirm that our client is our client."

> — Charles Lee Mudd Jr., Mudd Law Offices, December 16, 2024

This sentence constitutes a **textbook logical tautology** — a statement that is true by definition alone and conveys zero information. It does not confirm Dunca's identity. It does not confirm Dunca is alive. It does not confirm Dunca personally retained Mudd Law. It does not confirm Dunca is free from coercion. As the *sole* response to a formal missing-person inquiry from a domestic partner with documented legal standing, this tautology functions not as evidence but as a shield designed to close the inquiry without satisfying its evidentiary requirements.

Additionally, Mudd's email directed Sprawling to: (1) "stop filing any further reports or engaging in any actions;" and (2) "cease emailing our client." Both directives, taken together, constitute an instruction to a domestic partner and business co-owner to abandon a legitimate missing-person investigation and all contractual enforcement mechanisms — while providing no lawful basis for that abandonment. Directing a citizen to stop filing law enforcement reports is a serious act with potential obstruction implications, particularly absent any showing that the subject of the reports is alive, free, and capable of waiving the inquiry himself.

Element	Mudd's Response (Dec. 16, 2024)	What Was Actually Required
Proof of Client Identity	"We can confirm that our client is our client."	Verified government ID, retainer agreement, or signed authorization demonstrating Dunca himself engaged the firm
Proof of Life / Freedom from Duress	Not addressed	Confirmation that Dunca is alive, not under duress, and capable of independent communication
Proof of Sound Mind	Not addressed	Independent clinical or legal attestation of cognitive capacity
LLC Fiduciary Obligations	Not addressed	Acknowledgment of Dunca's managing-member duties and operating agreement obligations

Element	Mudd's Response (Dec. 16, 2024)	What Was Actually Required
Direction re: Missing-Person Reports	"I strongly encourage you to stop filing any further reports"	No authority exists in law to instruct a third party to halt a missing-person report absent verified proof of life

> 🔴 FORENSIC CONCLUSION — CIRCULAR TAUTOLOGY AS OBSTRUCTION:
>
> Mudd Law's December 16, 2024, response to a documented missing-person inquiry provided a logically vacuous statement ("our client is our client") as its only evidence of Dunca's existence, identity, or capacity. The simultaneous instruction to cease law enforcement reports — with zero proof of life or verified authorization from Dunca — is consistent with obstruction of a missing person investigation and deliberate suppression of Sprawling's legal remedies. This conduct, viewed together with JKZ LLP's identical refusal to provide proof of retainer, establishes a coordinated pattern of insulating Dunca's whereabouts from legitimate inquiry.

Part III — Mudd Law Email #2 (December 17, 2024): The Litigation Threat as a Tool of Suppression

One day after the circular tautology, on December 17, 2024, Mudd sent a second email in direct response to Sprawling's follow-up demands — which had invoked the LLC Operating Agreement Section 7.1 withdrawal provisions and formally called for an emergency business meeting. Mudd's full substantive response was:

> "We have no obligations to you."
>
> "You can either be patient as we amicably work to address your issues such

> that you cease making erroneous reports."
>
> "Or, we can proceed with litigation."
>
> "But, again, neither my firm nor I have any obligation to you."
>
> — Charles Lee Mudd Jr., Mudd Law Offices, December 17, 2024

This communication contains three analytically distinct acts of misconduct:

113. **Explicit Litigation Threat Conditioned on Silence:** The phrase "you can either be patient … or we can proceed with litigation" frames a binary choice: abandon the missing-person investigation and contractual demands, or face a lawsuit. This constitutes a *conditional litigation threat* designed to coerce Sprawling into silence through economic fear — particularly egregious given Sprawling's documented indigency and the loss of the Balmore Circle homestead.

114. **Characterization of MP Reports as "Erroneous":** Mudd's email frames Sprawling's law enforcement reports as "erroneous reports" — a factual characterization Mudd has no evidentiary basis to make, given that neither Mudd nor Dunca ever submitted any verified proof of life, proof of identity, or clinical attestation to any law enforcement agency or to Sprawling. Labeling good-faith safety reports as "erroneous" without providing the evidence that would make them so is itself a misrepresentation.

115. **Denial of Any Legal Obligation:** The repeated assertion "neither my firm nor I have any obligation to you" is legally contestable. While Mudd Law does not represent Sprawling, Sprawling's documented status as a domestic partner, co-managing member of LLC entities in which Dunca holds an interest, and co-borrower on real property subject to ongoing litigation creates affirmative disclosure obligations under general principles of fair dealing and transparency in pending proceedings. The blanket denial of "any

obligation" was deployed to shut down all inquiry — not as a considered legal position.

⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — LITIGATION THREAT SEQUENCING:

The December 17, 2024, litigation threat arrived

within 24 hours

of Sprawling's formal invocation of LLC Operating Agreement Section 7.1 and the demand for an emergency business meeting. The immediacy of the threat — rather than any substantive engagement — establishes that Mudd Law's strategy was suppression, not resolution. Mudd Law thereafter filed Case No. 202517063 in the 334th District Court, which resulted in the TRO and the Final Judgment of April 6, 2026, now on appeal as Case No. 01-26-00459-CV. The entire civil proceeding thus originates from a litigation posture built on the refusal to provide the basic proof of identity and proof of life that would have rendered the proceeding unnecessary.

🔴 FORENSIC CONCLUSION — LITIGATION AS SUPPRESSION:

Mudd Law's December 17, 2024, email demonstrates that the firm's communications were not good-faith attempts to resolve a dispute, but rather a staged escalation designed to suppress Sprawling's missing-person reports, extinguish his LLC governance rights, and coerce him into abandoning legitimate legal and fiduciary claims — under threat of litigation that Mudd Law subsequently carried out. This is consistent with intentional infliction of emotional distress (IIED), intentional infliction of economic harm (IIEH), and

> obstruction of a missing-person investigation.

Part IV — Sprawling's February 11, 2025 Formal Notice of Demand: Six Enumerated Requirements for Proof of Retainer and Proof of Life

On February 11, 2025, at 2:34 AM, Rodney "Sean" Sprawling-Dunca transmitted a formal "Notice of Demand for Information and Emergency Meeting: Andrei George Dunca" to all identified Mudd Law attorneys (Elizabeth Miller, Charles Mudd, Katie Stahl, Jen Muddlaw) and directly to Dunca at his known email addresses (; ). The Notice was sent from . The document set forth six specific, enumerated demands, and a formal call for an emergency LLC meeting.

#	Demand (Verbatim from Notice)	Legal Basis	Response Received
1	"Confirm that your office is duly authorized to represent Andrei George Dunca/Andrei Sprawling-Dunca and to act on his behalf in all correspondence with me."	Domestic partnership; co-managing member status; right to verify attorney authority over shared legal matters	**None**
2	"Confirm that you were hired directly by Andrei George Dunca. If this is not the case, disclose identity and provide documentation that grants power of attorney (POA) to the individual who hired you on behalf of Andrei George Dunca."	Right to know whether third party is acting on Dunca's behalf without his authorization; POA verification as anti-fraud measure	**None**
3	"Supply evidence establishing that Andrei George	Due diligence by a domestic partner with shared financial	**None**

#	Demand (Verbatim from Notice)	Legal Basis	Response Received
	Dunca/Andrei Sprawling-Dunca is indeed your client."	exposure; right to verify actual identity of opposing party's principal	
4	"Verify that he is neither missing nor in any form of danger."	Active missing-person concern; SFPD MP case basis; documented failure of all prior proof-of-life inquiries	**None**
5	"Confirm that he is capable of and free to communicate independently and leave his location as he would under normal circumstances."	Anti-trafficking and anti-coercion basis; right of domestic partner to confirm freedom of movement and independent communication	**None**
6	"Ensure that he is of sound mind and memory, as confirmed by an in-person evaluation conducted by a licensed and reputable mental health professional … who has no personal, private, or network affiliations with me, Andrei George Dunca/Andrei Sprawling-Dunca, or your office."	LLC operating agreement requires managing-member competency; domestic partnership dissolution proceedings require competency showing; Dunca's conduct is inconsistent with his known baseline	**None**

The Notice further demanded an **emergency meeting of Sean Sprawling Productions LLC** to address: (1) exchange of necessary tax information; (2) restructuring of the LLC; and (3) formal exit of Andrei George Dunca in compliance with the operating agreement's withdrawal provisions (Section 7.1). This emergency meeting demand was a contractual right of Sprawling as the remaining active managing member.

Mudd Law provided no response to any of the six demands. No emergency meeting was held. No independent mental health evaluation was ever

produced. No proof of retainer was ever furnished. No proof of life was ever formally delivered to Sprawling. This complete non-response to a formally transmitted legal notice — sent to every known attorney at the firm and to Dunca directly — is a dispositive evidentiary fact.

> 🔴 FORENSIC CONCLUSION — UNANSWERED DEMAND AS ADMISSION BY SILENCE:
>
> Under general legal principles, the failure to respond to a formal written demand — when a response is specifically required and the demanding party has a legitimate legal basis — may be construed as an admission that the responding party cannot satisfy the demands made. Mudd Law's silence on all six points of the February 11, 2025, Notice supports the inference that: (a) Mudd Law was not directly retained by Dunca in person; (b) Mudd Law could not confirm Dunca's identity to the standard required; (c) Dunca was either unable or not permitted to independently respond; and (d) no independent competency evaluation had been conducted. Each of these inferences, standing alone, is significant. In combination, they establish a prima facie case for the fraud and obstruction claims advanced throughout this litigation.

Part V — Experian Discovery: Unauthorized Change of Sean Sprawling Productions LLC Business Address to Concord, CA

A search of Experian's business information database for "Sean Sprawling Productions LLC" returned two distinct address records for the entity:

Address on Record	Experian Status	Forensic Significance
2041 East St #444, Concord, CA 94520-2126	**WITH TRADELINES**	Active tradeline address — credit and business activity is being reported under this address; this is the *operative* address for the

Address on Record	Experian Status	Forensic Significance
		LLC's credit profile
565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122-4623	Legacy address (no tradelines noted)	Original business address associated with LLC formation; Sprawling's primary residential address; properly established address of record

The Concord, CA address — 2041 East St #444 — is not Sprawling's address, has never been Sprawling's address, and was not authorized by Sprawling as Managing Member. Sprawling was not notified of this address change. No unanimous written consent of members was obtained, as would be required under the Operating Agreement for any material corporate action affecting the LLC's registered or principal address. The Experian listing shows this address as the active, tradeline-bearing address — meaning it is the address being used for credit applications, financial reporting, and corporate correspondence as of the date of discovery.

This unauthorized address change is unambiguously attributable to Andrei George Dunca, the only other managing member of Sean Sprawling Productions LLC with the access and authority (however improperly exercised) to effectuate such a change. The change was made during the period of Dunca's abandonment and Mudd Law's suppression campaign — a period during which Dunca was simultaneously (a) alleged to be in Germany by the SFPD wellness-check respondents, (b) represented by Mudd Law as being unreachable, and (c) refusing all direct contact with Sprawling. The maintenance of an active tradeline address in Concord, CA contradicts the narrative that Dunca had fully relocated abroad and was incommunicable.

> ⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — BREACH OF OPERATING AGREEMENT & FIDUCIARY DUTY:
>
> Under Sean Sprawling Productions LLC's Operating Agreement and California LLC law, no managing member may unilaterally alter the principal office address of the LLC without the consent of all managing members. Dunca's

unilateral change of the LLC's address with Experian — the national credit bureau used for business credit monitoring — constitutes: (1) breach of the operating agreement; (2) breach of fiduciary duty to Sprawling as co-managing member; (3) a corporate action taken in furtherance of the concealment of Dunca's actual location; and (4) potential fraudulent misrepresentation to a credit reporting agency regarding the LLC's business address. This unauthorized action gave Dunca unilateral control over the LLC's financial identity and credit profile without Sprawling's knowledge or consent.

🔴 FORENSIC CONCLUSION — UNAUTHORIZED CORPORATE ACTION AS PART OF CONCEALMENT STRATEGY:

The Experian discovery of the Concord, CA address with active tradelines establishes that Andrei George Dunca was not passively "missing" — he was actively conducting corporate business under the LLC's name at a new address he had unilaterally established without notifying Sprawling. This is inconsistent with any claim of incapacity, disappearance, or inability to communicate. It is, however, entirely consistent with a deliberate strategy of corporate capture: maintaining operational control of the LLC's business identity and credit relationships while simultaneously suppressing Sprawling's ability to exercise his co-managing-member rights through two successive law firms.

Part VI — Consolidated Forensic Analysis: IIED, IIEH, Obstruction of Missing-Person Investigation & Unauthorized Corporate Action

The documented conduct of Andrei George Dunca and Mudd Law Offices — viewed in the context of the JKZ LLP conduct established in Section XXIX — supports the following four independent forensic claims:

A. Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED)

Under Texas and California law, IIED requires: (1) extreme and outrageous conduct; (2) intentional or reckless disregard; (3) causation; and (4) severe emotional distress. Here: (1) The conduct is extreme and outrageous — a domestic partner was left in a two-year missing-person spiral, during which he lost his home to foreclosure, experienced medically documented panic attacks, and was driven to file law enforcement reports while two law firms actively instructed him to stop; (2) The intent is documented — Mudd's litigation threat was designed to compel Sprawling to abandon inquiry; JKZ ignored all hardship notifications despite being on notice; (3) Causation is established — medical records document anxiety and panic directly attributable to the abandonment and obstruction; (4) Severity is documented — Sprawling's treating physician (Dr. Naheed Ali) conducted multiple house calls, prescribed Xanax for reactive panic attacks, and documented clinical instability directly related to these events. The temporal correlation between each escalation in Dunca's/counsel's conduct and Sprawling's clinical deterioration is direct and documented.

B. Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm (IIEH)

The economic harm to Sprawling is not speculative — it is documented and quantified: (1) **Loss of 13339 Balmore Circle** to foreclosure, stripping equity estimated at $283,700 (the blocked Opendoor sale amount); (2) **Forced unemployment** resulting from Dunca's abandonment of his obligations as business partner; (3) **Denial of LLC tax information**, preventing Sprawling from filing accurate returns or accessing business credit; (4) **Unauthorized address change** at Experian, hijacking the LLC's credit identity; (5) **96-day legal vacuum** deliberately engineered between JKZ withdrawal and Mudd entry, during which foreclosure became irrevocable and no remedy was available. Each item of

economic harm was caused by affirmative acts of Dunca and facilitated by his counsel's refusal to engage with Sprawling's legitimate contractual claims.

C. Obstruction of Missing-Person Investigation

Mudd Law's active instruction to Sprawling to "stop filing any further reports" — without providing any verified proof of life that would justify the cessation of those reports — constitutes interference with a legitimate law enforcement investigation. The SFPD had already closed the missing-person case based on third-party resident testimony at 565 Ortega Street (as Sgt. Siragusa directly told Sprawling), not on any verified video call with Dunca as Mudd Law has claimed. No evidence of a video call was submitted to any court or to Sprawling. In this context, Mudd's instruction to cease reports was not merely inappropriate — it was an attempt to suppress a missing-person investigation that had never been resolved to the satisfaction of the domestic partner with legal standing to pursue it.

D. Unauthorized Corporate Action & Breach of Fiduciary Duty

The Experian address change establishes that Dunca took unilateral corporate action — altering the LLC's address with a national credit bureau — without notifying or obtaining consent from Sprawling as co-managing member. This is a textbook breach of fiduciary duty: a managing member of a California LLC owes each fellow member the duty of loyalty, which includes the obligation to refrain from taking actions that affect the LLC's legal and financial standing without unanimous consent where required. The change to a Concord, CA address with active tradelines further suggests that Dunca was operating the LLC's credit and financial identity in an unauthorized capacity — a form of corporate self-dealing conducted under cover of claimed absence.

Claim	Key Supporting Acts	Specific Evidence Anchors	Cross-Reference
IIED	Two-year abandonment; dual-firm obstruction; MP report suppression; litigation threat against indigent domestic partner	Mudd Email #2 ("proceed with litigation"); JKZ refusal of all calls/meetings; Dr. Ali clinical records; Quest Diagnostics tox	Sections XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXIX, XXX

Claim	Key Supporting Acts	Specific Evidence Anchors	Cross-Reference
IIEH	Foreclosure of Balmore Circle; forced unemployment; LLC tax denial; Experian address hijack; 96-day legal vacuum	Experian screenshot (Concord tradeline); Balmore petition (seeking $250K–$1M); Unsworn Declaration (foreclosure notice failure)	Sections XXV, XXVI, XXIX
Obstruction of MP Investigation	Mudd's "stop filing reports" directive; SFPD closure based on third-party testimony (not video call); zero proof of life furnished to Sprawling	Mudd Email #1 (verbatim directive); SFPD Siragusa account (Section XX, Part V); absence of video call evidence in any court filing	Section XX, Parts I–V
Unauthorized Corporate Action / Breach of Fiduciary Duty	Unilateral Experian address change to Concord, CA; no member notice; no unanimous written consent; active tradelines under new address	Experian business search screenshot (2041 East St #444, Concord, CA — WITH TRADELINES); Operating Agreement Section 7.1; Feb. 11, 2025 emergency meeting demand	Section XXIX, Part III; Section XXV

🔴 OVERARCHING FORENSIC CONCLUSION — SECTION XXXI:

The evidence assembled in this section establishes beyond reasonable factual dispute that: (1) Andrei George Dunca retained two successive law firms to obstruct Sprawling's legitimate inquiries — each firm acted without providing proof of retainer, and each firm left a period of deliberate legal inaccessibility between engagements; (2) Mudd Law's written responses — "our client is our client" and "we can proceed with litigation" — constitute documented, contemporaneous evidence of suppression rather than resolution; (3) Sprawling's February 11, 2025, six-point formal demand for proof of retainer, proof of life, and independent mental health evaluation went entirely

unanswered — constituting an admission by silence of the inability to satisfy those demands; (4) Dunca unilaterally altered Sean Sprawling Productions LLC's address with Experian to a Concord, CA address bearing active tradelines — a corporate act taken without notice to or consent of Sprawling as co-managing member, in breach of both the operating agreement and fiduciary duty; and (5) the complete course of conduct — from JKZ's August 15, 2024 C

&

D through Mudd Law's filing of Case No. 202517063 — is consistent with a premeditated strategy of legal and corporate suppression designed to extinguish Sprawling's rights while Dunca remained shielded behind successive layers of unverified legal representation.

Part VII — Master Timeline: JKZ LLP Through Mudd Law (August 15, 2024 – February 11, 2025)

Date	Actor	Event / Communication	Sprawling's Documented Response
Aug. 15, 2024	JKZ LLP (Ana Cazeneuve)	Cease & Desist letter issued; instructs Sprawling to cease all contact with Dunca; demands removal of websites; no retainer proof provided	Sprawling responds Aug. 18 invoking spousal and business-partner rights; notifies of hardships; JKZ ignores
Aug. 15 – Nov. 18, 2024	JKZ LLP (then — no counsel)	96-DAY LEGAL VACUUM: JKZ refuses calls, meetings; eventually withdraws with single sentence; Balmore foreclosure	Sprawling contacts multiple agencies; files Harris County Sheriff MP report; foreclosure proceeds

Date	Actor	Event / Communication	Sprawling's Documented Response
		proceeds; Sprawling has no contact for Dunca	
Nov. 19, 2024	Mudd Law (Katie Stahl / Charles Mudd)	Demand letter issued alleging defamatory statements; claims to represent Dunca; no retainer proof; threatens claims against Sprawling	Sprawling immediately seeks proof of representation and proof of life
Dec. 9, 2024	Sprawling (to Mudd Law)	Formal missing-person inquiry: emails Mudd Law requesting confirmation Dunca is alive, free, and of sound mind; attaches redacted ID copy	— (originating communication)
Dec. 16, 2024 (8:00 AM)	Charles Mudd (Mudd Law)	Email #1: "We can confirm that our client is our client." Instructs Sprawling to stop filing reports; directs all comms through firm; no proof of life; no retainer proof	Sprawling invokes LLC Operating Agreement Section 7.1; demands emergency meeting; requests proof of sound mind and identity
Dec. 17, 2024	Charles Mudd (Mudd Law)	Email #2: "We have no obligations to you… Or, we can proceed with litigation." Labels MP reports "erroneous"; no substantive engagement with LLC demands	Sprawling continues formal demands; subsequently begins drafting Feb. 11 Notice
Dec. 28, 2024	Sprawling (demanded meeting date)	Emergency LLC meeting demanded for Dec. 28, 2024, at Four Seasons Hotel, 1300 Lamar St., Houston, TX 77010; Dunca/Mudd Law do not respond or appear	No response; meeting not held; Dunca no-show
Feb. 11, 2025 (2:34 AM)	Sprawling (to all Mudd Law attorneys	Formal Notice of Demand: 6	— (originating communication;

Date	Actor	Event / Communication	Sprawling's Documented Response
	+ Dunca directly)	enumerated demands for proof of retainer, proof of life, independent mental health evaluation; demands emergency LLC meeting for tax exchange, restructuring, and formal Dunca exit	MUDD LAW NEVER RESPONDED)
Post-Feb. 11, 2025	Mudd Law (Mudd / Stahl / Miller / Pagan)	Mudd Law files Case No. 202517063 in 334th District Court; obtains TRO against Sprawling; proceeds through Final Judgment (Apr. 6, 2026) — all without ever answering Sprawling's six-point demand	Sprawling files appeal (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV); Brief pending before First Court of Appeals

🔴 SECTION XXXI MASTER CONCLUSION:

The documented record from August 15, 2024 (JKZ C

&

D) through February 11, 2025 (Sprawling's unanswered 6-point demand) demonstrates a continuous, two-firm pattern of legal obstruction, proof-of-life suppression, and unauthorized corporate action. No retainer was ever verified. No proof of life was ever delivered. No emergency LLC meeting was ever held. The LLC's Experian address was unilaterally altered to Concord, CA — bearing active tradelines — without Sprawling's knowledge or consent. The entire course of conduct supports claims of IIED, IIEH, obstruction of a missing-person investigation, and breach of fiduciary duty, all of which are

incorporated into the pending appellate record (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV) and the draft Balmore petition (Section XXV). These claims and their evidentiary bases are preserved in full in this Incident Narrative Report.

SECTION XXXII — DRAFT COMPLAINT TO THE ILLINOIS ATTORNEY REGISTRATION AND DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION (ARDC): MUDD LAW OFFICES / CHARLES LEE MUDD JR.

Complainant: Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), Pro Se
565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122 | Proxy: MSgt Rodney Sprawling USMC (Ret.) (832) 494-5361
Email:

Forum: Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission (ARDC)
130 E. Randolph Drive, Suite 1500, Chicago, IL 60601 | (312) 565-2600
Submitted pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 751 and ARDC Complaint Procedures

§ 32.1 — Respondent Identification

Attorney / Role	Bar Admission(s)	Contact / Office	ARDC / Bar No.
Charles Lee Mudd Jr. *Principal*	IL (primary), IN, CO, CT, UT	411 S Sangamon St, Suite 1B, Chicago IL 60607 312.964.5051	IL ARDC (record subject of this complaint)
Katie L. Stahl *Senior Counsel*	TX (primary)	1100 NASA Pkwy, Suite 420L, Houston TX 77058	TX Bar (cross-refer to TX State Bar)

Attorney / Role	Bar Admission(s)	Contact / Office	ARDC / Bar No.
		713.588.0168	
Elizabeth Miller *Associate*	IL	411 S Sangamon St, Suite 1B, Chicago IL 60607	IL Bar (record subject of this complaint)
Joshua Pagan *Associate (Pro Hac Vice, TX)*	IL Bar No. 6324454; admitted pro hac vice in TX (Case No. 202517063)	411 S Sangamon St, Suite 1B, Chicago IL 60607	IL Bar No. 6324454 (primary subject; cross-refer to TX re pro hac conduct)
Mudd Law Offices *Firm (entity)*	Multi-jurisdictional: IL, TX, UT	Chicago (main); Houston; Park City UT Fax all offices: 312.803.1667	Registered Illinois law firm

§ 32.2 — Jurisdictional Basis and Background

This complaint is filed with the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission pursuant to Illinois Supreme Court Rule 751 and the ARDC's authority over attorneys admitted to practice in Illinois. Charles Lee Mudd Jr. and Elizabeth Miller are Illinois-licensed attorneys. Joshua Pagan (IL Bar No. 6324454) was admitted pro hac vice in Harris County, Texas, Case No. 202517063 (*Dunca v. Sprawling*), and his Illinois license remains the primary locus of disciplinary authority over his conduct. Mudd Law Offices is registered in Illinois, with its principal office at 411 S Sangamon Street, Suite 1B, Chicago, IL 60607.

Complainant Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (hereinafter "Complainant" or "Sprawling") is the domestic partner, co-borrower, and managing member co-partner of Andrei George Dunca (hereinafter "Dunca"). Complainant and Dunca co-own Sean Sprawling Productions LLC, Teak Stage Productions LLC, and share a community estate including the property at 13339 Balmore Circle, Houston, TX 77069 (now wrongfully foreclosed). Complainant is legally indigent, a person with documented disabilities, and a pro se litigant in multiple concurrent proceedings arising from Dunca's abandonment and the coordinated efforts of Mudd Law to suppress Complainant's legal rights.

Mudd Law's representation of Dunca began no later than **November 19, 2024**, when Senior Counsel Katie Stahl, on behalf of Principal Charles Lee Mudd Jr.,

transmitted a demand letter to Complainant. The conduct described herein spans from that date through at least **April 6, 2026** (Final Judgment, Case No. 202517063), and continues into active appellate proceedings (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV, First Court of Appeals, Houston).

§ 32.3 — Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct Alleged to Have Been Violated

IL RPC Rule	Rule Title / Substance	Alleged Application to Respondents
Rule 1.2	Scope of Representation and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer	Mudd Law issued directives—including instructions to cease filing MP reports and cease all contact with Dunca—that exceeded the scope of legitimate representation and constituted interference with Complainant's independent legal rights, suggesting Respondents pursued objectives beyond those a client may lawfully authorize.
Rule 1.4	Communication	Mudd Law failed to respond to Complainant's six-point February 11, 2025 demand for basic proof of representation, identity verification of Dunca, and emergency LLC meeting notice—a total non-response constituting an admission by silence to each demand.
Rule 3.1	Meritorious Claims and Contentions	Mudd Law's civil petition (filed March 13, 2025, Case No. 202517063) and the accompanying ex parte TRO application contained allegations unsupported by competent evidence—specifically a methamphetamine-use narrative contradicted by clinical documentation and a 14-panel negative toxicology result already in Mudd Law's constructive

IL RPC Rule	Rule Title / Substance	Alleged Application to Respondents
		possession via prior correspondence.
Rule 3.4	Fairness to Opposing Party and Counsel	Mudd Law obstructed Complainant's ability to pursue a missing-person investigation by directing him to "stop filing any further reports" while that investigation was active; Pagan's September 5, 2025 email directive and the September 18, 2025 extortion email (Exhibit QQ) threatening sanctions unless Complainant withdrew all filings further obstructed legitimate judicial and law enforcement access.
Rule 4.1	Truthfulness in Statements to Others	Mudd Law's December 16, 2024 email stated: "We can confirm that our client is our client"—a tautological non-statement offered as the sole proof of Dunca's identity and voluntary representation in the context of an active MP investigation. This constituted a false or misleading representation to a third party (Complainant) regarding a material fact (Dunca's identity, location, and free agency).
Rule 8.4(a)	Misconduct — Violation of RPC Through Acts of Another	Mudd Law directed or ratified the conduct of co-counsel and staff in the coordinated suppression campaign—including the post-judgment conduct of Scott M. Brown & Associates and Burrus Law Group—which was orchestrated during Mudd Law's tenure and in furtherance of objectives Mudd Law initiated.
Rule 8.4(c)	Misconduct — Conduct Involving Dishonesty, Fraud,	The collective pattern—tautological identity proof,

IL RPC Rule	Rule Title / Substance	Alleged Application to Respondents
	Deceit, or Misrepresentation	characterizing good-faith MP reports as "erroneous," conditioning litigation threats on Complainant's silence, and Pagan's deceptive email directing pro se Complainant to take procedurally harmful actions—constitutes a scheme of misrepresentation and deceit toward a non-party, in violation of the profession's core integrity standards.
Rule 8.4(d)	Misconduct — Conduct Prejudicial to the Administration of Justice	The ex parte TRO (obtained March 14, 2025, one day after the civil petition filing), the retaliatory sequencing of filings against Complainant's FBI transmissions, and the extortion email threatening sanctions for legitimate appellate filings each constitute conduct prejudicial to the orderly administration of justice.

§ 32.4 — Factual Basis: Ten Documented Acts of Misconduct

> **Act 1 — November 19, 2024: Demand Letter Without Retainer Proof**
>
> Mudd Law issued a demand letter to Complainant—via USPS Priority and electronic mail—on behalf of Andrei Dunca, asserting claims of defamation and harassment. The letter was styled "Without Prejudice / Settlement Discussions" and signed by Katie L. Stahl, Senior Counsel, and Charles Lee Mudd Jr., Principal. **No executed retainer agreement, engagement letter, power of attorney, or documentation confirming Dunca's voluntary retention of Mudd Law was provided.** This mirrors the identical conduct by predecessor counsel Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP

(August 15, 2024 C&D), creating a pattern of representation without documented client authorization—particularly significant given the active SFPD missing-person investigation into Dunca's whereabouts.

Act 2 — December 16, 2024: "Our Client Is Our Client" — Tautological Identity Proof

In response to Complainant's direct inquiry regarding Dunca's identity and welfare during an active SFPD missing-person investigation, Charles Lee Mudd Jr. replied: *"We can confirm that our client is our client."* This circular tautology was offered as the sole proof of (a) Dunca's identity, (b) his voluntary and uncoerced engagement of Mudd Law, and (c) his physical safety. No photograph, signed declaration, government-issued ID verification, attorney-client agreement, or any other competent means of identification was provided. This response violated Rule 4.1 by substituting a self-referential assertion for a meaningful factual representation on a matter of critical import.

Act 3 — December 16, 2024: Directive to Cease Filing Missing-Person Reports

In the same December 16, 2024 correspondence, Mudd Jr. wrote: *"I strongly encourage you to stop filing any further reports or engaging in any actions while we try to resolve this."* Complainant had filed missing-person reports with SFPD and other law enforcement agencies arising from Dunca's sudden, unexplained disappearance following eight years of cohabitation and joint corporate obligations. This directive—transmitted by

an attorney to a non-client pro se litigant—constituted obstruction of legitimate law enforcement engagement. Attorneys are not permitted to use their authority to discourage a third party from exercising lawful rights, including the right to seek law enforcement welfare checks on a missing person.

Act 4 — December 17, 2024: Conditional Litigation Threat — "Be Patient or We Can Proceed With Litigation"

The following day, Mudd Jr. sent a second email stating: *"You can either be patient as we amicably work to address your issues such that you cease making erroneous reports. Or, we can proceed with litigation."* This statement: (1) characterized Complainant's lawful MP reports as "erroneous" without producing any evidence; (2) conditioned the threat of litigation on Complainant's silence and cessation of law enforcement engagement; and (3) expressly disclaimed any obligation to Complainant—a person with documented contractual and domestic-partnership claims against Mudd Law's client—while simultaneously leveraging the litigation threat as a coercive instrument. This conduct exhibits the hallmarks of extortionate legal coercion directed at a pro se, indigent, disabled litigant.

Act 5 — February 11, 2025: Six-Point Demand Unanswered — Admission by Silence

On February 11, 2025, Complainant transmitted a formal written demand to Mudd Law (Elizabeth Miller, Charles Mudd; cc: Katie Stahl, Andrei Dunca) requiring: (1) confirmation of authorized representation; (2) confirmation of

direct retention by Dunca; (3) supply of evidence that Dunca is their client; (4) verification Dunca is not missing or in danger; (5) confirmation Dunca is free to communicate independently; and (6) confirmation Dunca is of sound mind as assessed by an independent licensed mental health professional. **Mudd Law did not respond to this demand in any form.** This total non-response—from an attorney who had been actively corresponding with Complainant—constitutes an implied admission to each point raised and an abandonment of the duty of candor owed to adversely affected third parties in matters of this gravity.

Act 6 — March 13–14, 2025: Civil Petition and Ex Parte TRO — Retaliatory Sequencing

On March 12–13, 2025, Complainant transmitted FBI Part 1 of his formal report documenting the conspiracy. On March 13, 2025—one day after the FBI transmission—Mudd Law filed Dunca v. Sprawling, Case No. 202517063, in Harris County's 334th District Court. On March 14, 2025, Mudd Law obtained an ex parte temporary restraining order with no notice to Complainant, which purported to restrain Complainant from, inter alia, filing law enforcement reports. The retaliatory sequencing (FBI report → civil petition → ex parte TRO, within 48 hours) and the TRO's restraint of law enforcement engagement represent conduct prejudicial to the administration of justice and constitute the weaponization of civil process to suppress constitutionally protected activity.

Act 7 — September 5, 2025: Pagan's Deceptive Email Directive to

Pro Se Complainant

Joshua Pagan (IL Bar No. 6324454), admitted pro hac vice in the trial court, transmitted an email to pro se Complainant on September 5, 2025 containing procedural directives that, according to Complainant's Appellant's Brief (Issue H), constituted deceptive instructions designed to entrap Complainant in procedural default. Attorneys admitted pro hac vice owe the same duties under the Illinois RPC as in their home jurisdiction. Directing a self-represented opposing party to take procedurally harmful action—without disclosing the adverse consequence—violates Rules 4.1 and 8.4(c). This conduct is the subject of Issue 7(H) of Complainant's pending appellate brief (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV).

Act 8 — September 18, 2025: Extortion Email (Exhibit QQ) — Sanctions Threat Unless Filings Withdrawn

Mudd Law transmitted a written communication (identified as Exhibit QQ in Complainant's Appellant's Brief appendix) threatening the imposition of sanctions against Complainant unless Complainant withdrew all pending judicial filings. This constitutes extortionate coercion by an attorney directed at a pro se, indigent litigant actively exercising appellate rights. The use of threatened sanctions as a bargaining chip—outside of any properly filed Rule 13 or Chapter 10 motion—violates Rules 3.1, 3.4, and 8.4(c) and (d), and warrants independent criminal referral consideration under applicable Illinois statutes governing extortion.

Act 9 — Ongoing: Experian Address Discovery — Unauthorized

Corporate Address Change

Business verification records retrieved from Experian's business information database reveal that Sean Sprawling Productions LLC—co-owned by Complainant and Dunca—appears listed under the address **2041 East St #444, Concord, CA 94520**, a location to which Complainant has no connection and which was never authorized by Complainant as managing member. This address change was made without notice to or consent from Complainant and is consistent with Mudd Law's facilitation of Dunca's unauthorized corporate restructuring. The Concord address change, in combination with Mudd Law's posture of complete non-disclosure, suggests Respondents may have actively facilitated or ratified an unauthorized corporate act in violation of Complainant's managing-member rights.

Act 10 — Pattern: No Retainer Proof Across Dual-Firm Representation

Neither JKZ LLP (predecessor counsel, August 15, 2024) nor Mudd Law (successor counsel, November 19, 2024) produced any retainer agreement, engagement letter, or signed authorization from Dunca confirming voluntary representation. The 96-day gap between JKZ's withdrawal (August 18, 2024) and Mudd Law's first correspondence (November 19, 2024) was used to leave Complainant without any channel to Dunca during a critical period of escalating financial and personal crisis. The identical no-retainer pattern across two successive firms, coupled with the absence of any client authorization documentation despite Complainant's direct requests, raises a substantial question as to whether Dunca's representation was voluntary or whether an undisclosed third

> party funded and directed the legal strategy targeting Complainant.

§ 32.5 — Documented Harm to Complainant

Category of Harm	Description	Causal Link to Mudd Law Conduct
IIED	Sustained emotional trauma, anxiety, and panic disorder arising from coordinated legal threats, extortionate demands, and isolation from partner and co-owner	Dec 16–17 emails; litigation threats conditioned on silence; MP report obstruction
IIEH	Loss of Balmore Circle property (wrongful foreclosure); suppression of $550K loan recovery; disruption of LLC operations; inability to participate in emergency corporate meeting	Mudd Law's facilitation of Dunca's abandonment of co-borrower obligations; refusal to engage on LLC emergency meeting demand (Feb 11, 2025)
Obstruction of MP Investigation	Active interference with SFPD, FBI, and inter-agency MP investigation through attorney directives to cease report filings; TRO purporting to restrain law enforcement engagement	Dec 16, 2024 "stop filing" directive; Mar 14, 2025 ex parte TRO
$550,000 Loan Suppression	Verbal and written agreement by Dunca to assist in recovering a $550,000 loan rendered unenforceable through legal-counsel-shielded disappearance	Mudd Law no-contact directives and identity-shield tactics prevented enforcement
ADA Violations	Trial court filings by Mudd Law mocked or minimized Complainant's documented disabilities; Oct 9, 2025 response dismissed accommodation requests	Pleadings authored/filed by Mudd Law counsel
Unauthorized Corporate Address Change	Sean Sprawling Productions LLC address changed to Concord, CA without managing-member notice or	Facilitated or ratified by Mudd Law through legal shielding and non-disclosure posture

Category of Harm	Description	Causal Link to Mudd Law Conduct
	consent; Experian records confirm unauthorized listing	
Procedural Entrapment / Appellate Harm	Pagan's Sept 5, 2025 email directive and Exhibit QQ extortion threat endangered appellate rights and created a chilling effect on legitimate court filings	Pagan (IL Bar No. 6324454, pro hac vice); Mudd Law as supervising firm

§ 32.6 — No-Retainer Pattern: JKZ LLP vs. Mudd Law Offices (Comparative Analysis)

The following table presents a side-by-side comparison of the two successive law firms' conduct with respect to retainer documentation, communication, and identity verification. The identical pattern across both firms—spanning a 96-day gap—supports the inference that a coordinated legal strategy drove the representation.

Conduct Element	Johnston, Kinney & Zulaica LLP (Ana Cazeneuve)	Mudd Law Offices (Charles Lee Mudd Jr.)
First contact date	August 15, 2024 — Cease & Desist letter	November 19, 2024 — Demand letter
Retainer provided?	**No**	**No**
Identity proof of Dunca?	**No**	**No** ("our client is our client" tautology only)
Complainant's requests acknowledged?	Multiple calls/meetings refused or ignored	Feb 11, 2025 six-point demand — no response
Hardship/contractual notice acknowledged?	**No**	**No** — "We have no obligations to you"
Termination of representation	Sudden email withdrawal — no reason, no transition plan	Continued post-judgment through Apr 6, 2026; no formal withdrawal on record
Gap between firms	**96 days** (Aug 18 – Nov 19, 2024) — MP investigation ongoing; Balmore foreclosure advancing; Complainant without any channel to Dunca	
Funding source disclosed?	**No**	**No**

§ 32.7 — Consolidated Timeline: August 15, 2024 – April 6, 2026

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Significance
Aug 15, 2024	JKZ LLP issues C&D letter to Complainant (no retainer proof)	Ana Cazeneuve / JKZ LLP	First attorney barrier; no retainer
Aug 18, 2024	Complainant replies asserting common-law marriage, co-borrower duties, LLC obligations; JKZ withdraws same day	Sprawling → JKZ LLP; Ana Cazeneuve	Hardship on record; abrupt withdrawal; 96-day gap begins
Aug 18 – Nov 19, 2024	96-day gap: MP investigation ongoing; Balmore foreclosure advances; Complainant's outreach ignored	—	Critical deprivation window; financial ruin accelerated
Nov 19, 2024	Mudd Law demand letter — no retainer proof; "Without Prejudice / Settlement Discussions"	Katie Stahl / Charles Mudd / Mudd Law	Act 1; identical pattern resumes
Dec 16, 2024	"Our client is our client" email; directive to cease MP report filings	Charles Lee Mudd Jr.	Acts 2 & 3; obstruction and tautology
Dec 17, 2024	Litigation threat conditioned on silence; "erroneous reports"; "no obligation to you"	Charles Lee Mudd Jr.	Act 4; extortionate coercion
Feb 11, 2025	Six-point demand letter sent to Mudd Law — total non-response	Sprawling → Mudd Law	Act 5; admission by silence
Mar 12–13, 2025	Complainant transmits FBI Part 1; Mudd Law files civil petition Case No. 202517063	Mudd Law	Act 6; retaliatory 48-hour sequencing
Mar 14, 2025	Ex parte TRO obtained with no notice; restrains law enforcement	Mudd Law / 334th District Court	Act 6 cont'd; constitutional deprivation

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Significance
	engagement		
Sep 5, 2025	Pagan's deceptive email directive to pro se Complainant	Joshua Pagan (IL Bar No. 6324454)	Act 7; procedural entrapment
Sep 18, 2025	Exhibit QQ extortion email — sanctions threatened unless all filings withdrawn	Mudd Law	Act 8; extortionate coercion
Apr 6, 2026	Final Judgment entered, Case No. 202517063; appeal filed (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV)	334th District Court; Sprawling (appeal)	Appellate remedies active; Mudd Law conduct directly at issue
May 2026 (ongoing)	Appellant's Brief (01-26-00459-CV) pending; Balmore wrongful-foreclosure petition pending; this ARDC complaint filed	Sprawling, Pro Se	All proceedings interconnected; Mudd Law conduct at center

§ 32.8 — Relief Requested

Complainant respectfully requests that the Illinois ARDC:

116. **Open a formal ARDC investigation** into the conduct of Charles Lee Mudd Jr., Elizabeth Miller, and Joshua Pagan (IL Bar No. 6324454), and into the conduct of Mudd Law Offices as an entity.

117. **Compel production of the retainer agreement** between Mudd Law Offices and Andrei George Dunca, or any substitute authorization document, including any power of attorney, third-party engagement agreement, or funding arrangement.

118. **Investigate the funding source and payor identity** behind both JKZ LLP's and Mudd Law's representation of Dunca, given the identical no-retainer pattern and the 96-day coordination gap.

119. **Assess appropriate disciplinary action** against Charles Lee Mudd Jr. under IL RPC Rules 1.2, 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, 8.4(a), 8.4(c), and 8.4(d), up to and including suspension or disbarment if the full record warrants such action.

120. **Assess appropriate disciplinary action** against Joshua Pagan (IL Bar No. 6324454) under the same rules, with particular attention to his deceptive email directive (Act 7) and his pro hac vice conduct in Case No. 202517063.

121. **Coordinate with the California State Bar** (re: JKZ LLP / Ana Cazeneuve, companion complaint — Section XXX) and the **Texas State Bar** (re: Scott M. Brown & Associates) for consistent multi-jurisdictional review of the coordinated suppression pattern.

122. **Refer the September 18, 2025 extortion email (Exhibit QQ)** and Pagan's September 5, 2025 deceptive directive to appropriate prosecutorial authorities for review under applicable Illinois criminal statutes governing attorney extortion.

123. **Preserve all records** of Mudd Law's representation for coordination with the FBI, SFPD, and any federal or state investigation arising from the missing-person case and the broader conspiracy documented in this report.

⚠ FORENSIC NOTE — ARDC: Coordinated Dual-Firm Pattern

The 96-day gap between JKZ LLP's withdrawal (August 18, 2024) and Mudd Law's first contact (November 19, 2024) is not, on its face, a period of no representation — it is a period of *no disclosed representation*. During that window: the Balmore foreclosure advanced, the SFPD MP investigation was open, and Complainant's financial situation deteriorated without any access to Dunca. The seamless resumption of the identical tactical posture (no retainer, no identity verification, no acknowledgment of contractual obligations, coercive directives) by a successor firm strongly suggests that the transition was coordinated in advance. The ARDC is respectfully requested to examine any communications between JKZ LLP and Mudd Law regarding the handoff of Dunca's representation, and whether any

undisclosed party directed both engagements.

FORENSIC CONCLUSION — SECTION XXXII: COORDINATED LEGAL SUPPRESSION, NOT LEGITIMATE REPRESENTATION

The conduct of Mudd Law Offices and its attorneys, assessed in its totality and in the context of the dual-firm representation pattern documented herein, does not conform to the profile of ordinary adversarial legal representation. Legitimate representation of Andrei Dunca in a defamation matter would have required: (a) a documented retainer; (b) competent evidence to support the claims made in the demand letter and civil petition; (c) a good-faith response to Complainant's contractual and domestic-partnership claims; and (d) transparent identity verification during an active missing-person investigation. None of these baseline requirements were met.

Instead, Mudd Law employed: (a) tautological identity assertions; (b) obstruction directives targeting law enforcement engagement; (c) retaliatory civil filings timed to FBI correspondence; (d) an ex parte TRO with no notice; (e) a deceptive email directive to a pro se litigant; and (f) an extortion email threatening sanctions unless appellate filings were abandoned. Each act, taken alone, raises serious professional responsibility concerns. Taken together, they constitute a **coordinated legal suppression campaign** designed to isolate Complainant from legal, financial, and law enforcement recourse; conceal Dunca's whereabouts and legal status; shield unauthorized corporate actions; and extinguish Complainant's claims through procedural attrition rather than on the merits.

The Illinois ARDC is the appropriate and necessary forum to pierce this suppression, investigate the undisclosed funding and coordination between firms, and hold the Respondents accountable under the Illinois Rules of Professional Conduct. Complainant submits this complaint in good faith, under the penalty of the same oath of truthfulness that the Respondents were obligated — and failed — to honor.

Complainant's Verification

I, Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Illinois that the foregoing complaint is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, and is made in good faith and not for any improper purpose.

Executed: San Francisco, California, May 2026
Complainant: Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr., Pro Se
Address: 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122
Proxy Contact: MSgt Rodney Sprawling USMC (Ret.), (832) 494-5361
Email:

SECTION XXXIII — DUAL-PURPOSE TRANSMITTAL COVER LETTER

Addressed Concurrently To: Illinois ARDC (130 E. Randolph Dr., Suite 1500, Chicago, IL 60601) | Texas State Bar, Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel (P.O. Box 12487, Austin, TX 78711)

Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), Pro Se
565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122
Proxy Contact: MSgt Rodney Sprawling, USMC (Ret.) — (832) 494-5361
Email:

Date: May 20, 2026

TO (CONCURRENT ADDRESSEES):
Illinois Attorney Registration & Disciplinary Commission (ARDC)
130 E. Randolph Drive, Suite 1500
Chicago, IL 60601

Texas State Bar — Office of Chief Disciplinary Counsel / Commission for Lawyer Discipline (CFLD)
P.O. Box 12487
Austin, TX 78711

RE: Dual-Jurisdiction Attorney Misconduct Complaint
IL ARDC Respondents: Charles Lee Mudd Jr.; Elizabeth A. Miller; Joshua Pagan (IL Bar No. 6324454)
TX CFLD Respondents: Katherine L. Stahl; Caryn Gomar (TX 24050669); Katie Sunstrom (TX 24037538); Blaire Evens (TX 24135740); David J. Burrus (TX 24101583); Alexys Wortman
Related Cases: Dunca v. Sprawling, Case No. 202517063 (334th D.C., Harris County, TX); Sprawling v. Dunca et al., Case No. 01-26-00459-CV (First Court of Appeals, Houston, TX); Sprawling & Vetter Jr. v. Mudd Law et al., Cause No. 2026-36192 (215th D.C., Harris County, TX)

To Whom It May Concern:

I am Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), a Pro Se complainant filing this dual-jurisdiction professional responsibility complaint concurrently with the Illinois Attorney Registration and Disciplinary Commission and the Texas State

Bar Commission for Lawyer Discipline. I respectfully request that both agencies receive, process, and coordinate their review of the enclosed complaint, as the misconduct documented herein spans both Illinois and Texas and cannot be addressed effectively through a single-jurisdiction filing.

Summary of Complaint: Over a period commencing August 15, 2024, the above-named attorneys — acting as counsel for Andrei George Dunca — engaged in a documented pattern of professional misconduct including: (1) issuing legal demands without proof of retainer; (2) refusing to confirm authorized representation while taking adverse action; (3) directing a Pro Se party to cease filing law-enforcement reports; (4) issuing coercive litigation ultimatums; (5) failing to respond to a formal six-point welfare and authorization demand; (6) filing a retaliatory civil petition and ex parte TRO within 24–48 hours of the Complainant's FBI Houston submission; (7) making deceptive communications through pro hac vice counsel; (8) transmitting what Complainant characterizes as an extortionate communication; (9) facilitating or failing to disclose an unauthorized change to the Complainant's LLC's Experian business credit address; and (10) maintaining a seamless 96-day communications blockade across two sequential firms without retainer transparency at either.

Respondent Summary Table:

Respondent	Jurisdiction	Bar No.	Firm
Charles Lee Mudd Jr.	IL ARDC	IL (also IN, CO, CT, UT)	Mudd Law Offices
Elizabeth A. Miller	IL ARDC	IL	Mudd Law Offices
Joshua Pagan	IL ARDC	IL Bar No. 6324454	Mudd Law Offices
Katherine L. Stahl	TX CFLD	TX	Mudd Law Offices
Caryn Gomar	TX CFLD	TX 24050669	Scott M. Brown & Associates
Katie Sunstrom	TX CFLD	TX 24037538	Scott M. Brown & Associates
Blaire Evens	TX CFLD	TX 24135740	Scott M. Brown & Associates
David J. Burrus	TX CFLD	TX 24101583	Burrus Law Group, PLLC
Alexys Wortman	TX CFLD	TX (to be verified)	Burrus Law Group, PLLC

Enclosed Exhibits (ARDC-1 through ARDC-11):

Exhibit	Description
ARDC-1	JKZ LLP Cease & Desist Letter — Aug. 15, 2024 (Ana Cazeneuve)
ARDC-2	Complainant's Reply to JKZ — Aug. 18, 2024
ARDC-3	JKZ Withdrawal Notice — "no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity"
ARDC-4	Mudd Law Demand Letter — Nov. 19, 2024 (Katie Stahl / Charles Mudd Jr.)
ARDC-5	Mudd Law Email — "our client is our client" / Dec. 16, 2024 (Charles Mudd Jr.)
ARDC-6	Mudd Law Email — "we have no obligations to you" / Dec. 17, 2024 (Charles Mudd Jr.)
ARDC-7	Complainant's Feb. 11, 2025 Six-Point Demand to Mudd Law
ARDC-8	FBI Houston Transmission — Parts 1 & 2, March 2025
ARDC-9	CA SOS Filing No. 22-A82754 — SSP LLC, Feb. 5, 2022 (Dunca as Manager, SF address)
ARDC-10	Experian Business Search — Sean Sprawling Productions LLC (2041 East St #444, Concord, CA — WITH TRADELINES)
ARDC-11	SSP LLC Operating Agreement — Withdrawal provisions & Member obligations (excerpts)

Coordinated Investigation Request: Complainant respectfully requests that the IL ARDC and TX CFLD: (1) open formal disciplinary investigations against each named respondent in their respective licensing jurisdiction(s); (2) coordinate findings between the two agencies to prevent jurisdictional arbitrage; (3) subpoena and preserve all retainer agreements, engagement letters, fee arrangements, and communications between Andrei George Dunca and both JKZ LLP and Mudd Law Offices; (4) investigate whether Andrei George Dunca was the true directing client or whether representation was arranged by an undisclosed third party; (5) investigate the retaliatory sequencing of the TRO filing against Complainant's FBI submission; (6) transmit all findings to the First Court of Appeals (Case No. 01-26-

00459-CV) and the 334th District Court (Case No. 202517063) for judicial notice; and (7) impose such sanctions as the evidence may warrant, including reprimand, suspension, and/or disbarment.

Complainant is prepared to provide additional documentation, declarations, medical records, clinical notes, corporate records, and electronic communications upon request. All exhibits listed above are annexed to this transmittal.

Respectfully submitted,

Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr.
(EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), Pro Se

565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122

Proxy: MSgt Rodney Sprawling, USMC (Ret.) — (832) 494-5361

FORENSIC NOTE — DUAL TRANSMITTAL CONFIRMATION

This cover letter and the enclosed Dual-Jurisdiction Complaint (Section XXXII of this Report) are to be transmitted via **USPS Priority Mail with Delivery Confirmation** to both the IL ARDC (130 E. Randolph Drive, Suite 1500, Chicago, IL 60601) and the TX CFLD (P.O. Box 12487, Austin, TX 78711) simultaneously. Electronic copies are to be submitted via each agency's online complaint portal where available. Tracking numbers and electronic submission confirmation receipts are to be appended to the Master Exhibit Index as Exhibits ARDC-12 and ARDC-13 upon dispatch.

SECTION XXXIV — CA SECRETARY OF STATE FILING CONTRADICTIONS, UNAUTHORIZED ADDRESS CHANGES & OPERATING AGREEMENT WITHDRAWAL VIOLATIONS

Source Documents: CA SOS Filing No. 22-A82754 (Feb. 5, 2022) | CA SOS Filing No. 22-A82757 (Feb. 5, 2022) | CA SOS Filing No. 19-D96717 (Oct. 21, 2019) | Articles of Organization (Nov. 9, 2015) | SSP LLC Operating Agreement | Experian Business Credit File | Dunca Original Petition, Case No. 202517063

§1 — Overview & Evidentiary Significance

This section documents a series of mutually irreconcilable contradictions between (a) official California Secretary of State filings executed by Andrei George Dunca and (b) factual representations made by Dunca through counsel (Mudd Law Offices) in Case No. 202517063. The contradictions implicate potential **false statements to a state agency**, **breach of fiduciary duty** as managing member of Sean Sprawling Productions LLC ("SSP LLC"), **unauthorized unilateral address changes**, and **failure to withdraw in accordance with the SSP Operating Agreement**. These contradictions are directly material to pending appellate proceedings (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV), the Harris County Original Complaint (Case No. 2026-36192), and the Dual-Jurisdiction Attorney Misconduct Complaint (Section XXXII of this Report).

§2 — California Entity Registry: SSP LLC & Teak Stage Productions LLC

Entity	CA Entity No.	Filing / Date	Manager of Record	Manager Address on File	Principal Office
Sean Sprawling Productions LLC	201531610349	Articles of Org. — Nov. 9, 2015	All LLC Members (member-managed)	N/A	680 Mission St. Apt. 10T, San Francisco, CA 94105
Sean Sprawling Productions LLC	201531610349	SOI Filing No. 19-D96717 — Oct. 21, 2019	Andrei Dunca (individual)	565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122	565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122
Sean Sprawling Productions LLC	201531610349	**SOI Filing No. 22-A82754 — Feb. 5, 2022**	**Andrei Dunca (individual)**	**565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122**	**565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122**
Teak Stage Productions LLC	201932610255	**SOI Filing No. 22-A82757 — Feb. 5, 2022**	**Sean Sprawling Productions LLC** (entity manager)	**565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122**	**565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122**

§3 — The Core Temporal Contradiction: "Early 2022" German Relocation vs. Feb. 5, 2022 SF Address Filings

Dunca's Original Petition in Case No. 202517063, filed through Mudd Law Offices, states at ¶19: *"In early 2022, Mr. Dunca moved to Berlin, Germany."* The petition further states at ¶18: *"In or around March 2022, Mr. Dunca bought out Defendant's ownership of the house in Los Angeles"* and *"In March 2023, Mr. Dunca withdrew and resigned from SSP LLC."*

However, on **February 5, 2022** — during the exact period in which Dunca claims to have relocated to Germany — Dunca personally executed and filed two (2) Statements of Information with the California Secretary of State (Filing Nos. 22-A82754 and 22-A82757), listing his own personal address as **565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122** in his capacity as Manager of SSP LLC.

DUNCA SWORN PETITION REPRESENTATION **Original Petition ¶18–19 — Case No. 202517063**	**CA SECRETARY OF STATE OFFICIAL RECORD** **Filing Nos. 22-A82754 & 22-A82757 — Feb. 5, 2022**
"In early 2022, Mr. Dunca moved to Berlin, Germany." (¶19) "In or around March 2022, Mr. Dunca bought out Defendant's ownership of the house in Los Angeles." (¶18(c)) "In March 2023, Mr. Dunca withdrew and resigned from SSP LLC." (¶18(d))	**SSP LLC SOI (22-A82754):** Manager: **Andrei Dunca** — Address: **565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122** — Filed Feb. 5, 2022 **Teak Stage SOI (22-A82757):** Manager: **Sean Sprawling Productions LLC** — Address: **565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122** — Filed Feb. 5, 2022 Certificate Verification Nos. 225943737 (SSP) and 225943434 (Teak Stage) — Verified July 3, 2024

⚠ FORENSIC ANALYSIS — MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE INFERENCES

The simultaneous existence of Dunca's "early 2022 Germany" narrative and the February 5, 2022 CA SOS filings listing his address at 565 Ortega St, San Francisco, produces two mutually exclusive inferences, one of which must be true:

1. **Inference A (False Sworn Statement):** Dunca did NOT move to Germany "in early 2022" as stated in his Original Petition. His February 5, 2022 SOS filings — listing 565 Ortega as his personal address — confirm he was a California-domiciled manager at that time, contradicting the sworn petition narrative and rendering the petition's foundational chronology false.
2. **Inference B (False State Filing):** Dunca DID move to Germany before February 5, 2022, making his SOS filings listing 565 Ortega as his personal address false statements submitted to a California state agency — potentially violating California Corporations Code §17702.09 (accuracy requirements for statements of information).

Either inference independently constitutes material misrepresentation. In combination with Dunca's failure to withdraw per the Operating Agreement

(§4 below), these filings establish a documented pattern of making representations to official bodies that are inconsistent with the representations made in judicial proceedings.

§4 — Operating Agreement: Dunca's Claimed 2023 Withdrawal Was Not Executed Per Agreement

The Operating Agreement of Sean Sprawling Productions LLC governs all Member rights and obligations, including Capital Accounts, Membership Interest, Ownership Interest, and all procedures for withdrawal, resignation, or transfer of membership interest. Dunca's Original Petition (¶18(d)) asserts: *"In March 2023, Mr. Dunca withdrew and resigned from SSP LLC."* Mudd Law, as counsel of record, has never produced any of the following in response to Complainant's February 11, 2025 six-point demand or in any subsequent proceeding:

Document Required by Operating Agreement	Requested From Mudd Law	Status
Written notice of withdrawal to all Members as required by Operating Agreement	Feb. 11, 2025 demand (¶1)	**NEVER PRODUCED**
Documentation of valuation / buyout of Dunca's Ownership Interest per Agreement	Feb. 11, 2025 demand (¶3 — LLC restructure)	**NEVER PRODUCED**
Amended Operating Agreement or Exhibit A reflecting removal of Dunca as Member	Feb. 11, 2025 demand (¶2 — retainer proof)	**NEVER PRODUCED**
CA SOS Amendment removing Dunca as Manager of record after March 2023	Implied by CA SOS public record obligation	**NOT FILED — DUNCA REMAINS ON RECORD**
Exchange of tax information required upon withdrawal	Feb. 11, 2025 demand (¶1 — Agenda Item 1)	**NEVER PRODUCED**

Document Required by Operating Agreement	Requested From Mudd Law	Status
(per Feb. 11, 2025 demand ¶1)		

SSP LLC is the managing entity for **Teak Stage Productions LLC** and the DBA entity for **Pine Stage Productions**. Dunca's purported unilateral withdrawal — unsupported by any Operating Agreement-compliant documentation — therefore affects not one but three distinct entities under the SSP corporate umbrella. The absence of any formal withdrawal documentation creates an ongoing breach of the Operating Agreement and renders Dunca's claimed 2023 resignation legally ineffective under the Agreement's own terms.

§5 — Unauthorized Unilateral Address Changes: Breach of Fiduciary Duty

Action	Unauthorized Change	Impact	Forensic Significance
SSP LLC Experian Business Credit Address	Changed to **2041 East St #444, Concord, CA 94520-2126** WITH TRADELINES (active credit address) — without Complainant's knowledge or consent	Diverted SSP LLC's active business credit tradelines to an address unknown to and unauthorized by Complainant as co-managing member	Experian Business search confirms "WITH TRADELINES" at Concord address — evidence of active credit activity at an address Complainant never authorized
Complainant's SOS Address on SSP LLC filing	Dunca changed Complainant's address to **420 N. Camden Dr, Beverly Hills, CA** — a commercial address used only as a temporary residence during a period of separation and during construction of Gion Beverly Hills	Misrepresented Complainant's address as a non-residential commercial location on official state filings; deprived Complainant of proper legal notice at actual residence (565 Ortega St)	420 N. Camden Dr was never Complainant's permanent residential address. The unauthorized change constitutes misrepresentation to the CA Secretary of State and breach of Dunca's fiduciary duty

⚠ FORENSIC NOTE — CONCORD ADDRESS & TRADELINE SIGNIFICANCE

The Concord, CA address (2041 East St #444, Concord, CA 94520-2126) carrying active SSP LLC tradelines was discovered through an Experian Business Credit search. This address was never disclosed to Complainant, never authorized by Complainant, and does not correspond to any known SSP LLC business location. The tradeline activity at this address — occurring without Complainant's knowledge — raises serious questions regarding unauthorized credit activity, potential fraudulent use of the SSP LLC business identity, and the diversion of business credit assets, all consistent with the broader pattern of financial control and isolation documented throughout this Report.

§6 — Dunca Petition Property Chronology vs. Official SOS Record: Contradiction Matrix

Dunca Petition Claim (¶18–19)	Official CA SOS / Corporate Record	Contradiction / Forensic Implication
"In early 2022, Mr. Dunca moved to Berlin, Germany." (¶19)	SOI Filed Feb. 5, 2022 (22-A82754): Dunca listed as SSP LLC Manager at 565 Ortega St, SF CA 94122	**DIRECT CONTRADICTION — CA state address and Germany relocation are mutually exclusive. One statement is false.**
"In March 2023, Mr. Dunca withdrew and resigned from SSP LLC." (¶18(d))	No CA SOS amendment filed removing Dunca as manager. No Operating Agreement withdrawal documentation produced. Dunca remains named manager of record.	**LEGALLY INEFFECTIVE — withdrawal claim unsubstantiated; no agreement-compliant withdrawal executed**
"In December 2021, Mr.	Feb. 5, 2022 SOS filings	Pattern of selective

Dunca Petition Claim (¶18–19)	Official CA SOS / Corporate Record	Contradiction / Forensic Implication
Dunca and Defendant dissolved SutroLab by unanimous consent." (¶18(b))	show Dunca continuing active management of SSP LLC and Teak Stage LLC from SF address — no wind-down posture	dissolution claims without corresponding documentation; active management continuing while claiming withdrawal
"In or around March 2022, Mr. Dunca bought out Defendant's ownership of the house in Los Angeles." (¶18(c))	Transaction cannot be reconciled with claimed "early 2022" German relocation; no buyout documentation produced; contemporaneous with Feb. 2022 CA SOS filings listing SF residence	Transaction claim requires Dunca's physical or legal presence in California — inconsistent with "early 2022" German relocation narrative

§7 — SSP LLC Corporate Structure & Managing Entity Role

Entity	CA Entity No.	Role in Structure	Dunca's Position
Sean Sprawling Productions LLC	201531610349	Parent / Managing Entity; DBA for Pine Stage Productions	Manager of record (CA SOS through at least Feb. 5, 2022); no formal removal filed
Teak Stage Productions LLC	201932610255	Subsidiary managed by SSP LLC as entity manager	Indirect manager via SSP LLC; no individual withdrawal from Teak Stage executed
Pine Stage Productions	DBA of SSP LLC	Operating DBA; directly affected by any SSP LLC management changes	No separation documentation for Pine Stage Productions filed or produced

🔴 **FORENSIC CONCLUSION — SECTION XXXIV**

The documentary record establishes, through official CA Secretary of State filings bearing Certificate Verification Nos. 225943737 and 225943434,

that Andrei George Dunca executed and filed Statements of Information on **February 5, 2022** listing his personal address as 565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122 — during the identical period in which his Original Petition (Case No. 202517063) represents he had moved to Berlin, Germany. These filings are mutually irreconcilable without concluding that either the sworn court filing or the state agency filing contains a false statement.

Additionally, Dunca's claimed March 2023 withdrawal from SSP LLC was never executed in accordance with the Operating Agreement's mandatory withdrawal provisions, was never reflected in a CA SOS amendment, and was never documented through any required corporate formalities. No Operating Agreement-compliant exit was produced despite repeated demand. Dunca therefore remains a Member of record with continuing fiduciary obligations to Complainant.

The unauthorized changes to SSP LLC's Experian business credit address (to 2041 East St #444, Concord, CA 94520-2126) and to Complainant's personal address on SOS filings (to 420 N. Camden Dr, Beverly Hills) — both executed without Complainant's knowledge or consent — constitute independent breaches of Dunca's fiduciary duty as managing member, misrepresentation to state agencies, and acts in furtherance of the broader financial isolation pattern documented throughout this Report.

§ XXXIV-D — SSP LLC Operating Agreement: Unauthorized Unilateral Acts and Unanimous Consent Violations

The fully executed Operating Agreement of Sean Sprawling Productions, LLC, certified by the California Secretary of State (Cert. Verification No. 522943737; certified July 30, 2024), confirms two and only two members: Andrei George Dunca

(67% Ownership Interest) and Rodney Samuel Sprawling (33% Ownership Interest), both listed at 680 Mission St., Apt. 10T, San Francisco, California 94105. See Exhibit XXXIV-D.

FORENSIC NOTE: The Operating Agreement imposes unanimous-consent requirements on every material corporate act. Dunca's unilateral February 5, 2022 SOI filings — including altering the LLC's registered address and management designations without Sprawling's written consent — constituted a material breach of the Agreement and were void ab initio under California law.

SOI 19-D96717 CORROBORATION (Oct. 21, 2019): CA SOS Form LLC-12 filed October 21, 2019 confirms Rodney Sprawling as active Member of SSP LLC at 565 Ortega St., San Francisco, CA 94122, with Andrei Dunca as Manager/Member at the same address. Dunca signed as "Member/Manager" — a sworn admission of dual-member status at that date. The February 5, 2022 filings (22-A82754 and 22-A82757) conspicuously omitted Sprawling — an unauthorized omission in violation of California Corporations Code section 17702.09. See Exhibit XXXIV-E (SOI 19-D96717).

CROSS-REFERENCES: Section XXXIV-A through C (Feb. 5, 2022 contradictory SOI filings and Germany alibi); Section XXXV paragraphs 3-5 (Harris County Complaint — party descriptions); Section XXXVII-F (420 N. Camden / Spiro — SSP LLC financial exposure); Section XXXVIII paragraphs

1-4 (draft CA complaint — underlying business relationship); Exhibit XXXIV-D (SSP LLC Operating Agreement, certified); Exhibit XXXIV-E (SOI 19-D96717, Oct. 21, 2019).

SECTION XXXV — NEW HARRIS COUNTY ORIGINAL COMPLAINT: SPRAWLING & VETTER JR. v. MUDD LAW OFFICES ET AL.

Cause No. 2026-36192 | District Court of Harris County, Texas, Court 215 | Filed: May 29, 2026 at 12:31 PM | Envelope No. 115500043 | Filed By: Adiliani Solis | District Clerk: Marilyn Burgess

PLAINTIFFS (Pro Se)

Rodney Samuel Sprawling

(EsRā Dunca-Sprawling)

Resident of California; common-law husband/partner of Andrei George Dunca; asserting claims individually and on behalf of the marital/community estate

Richard Alan Vetter Jr.

Resident of Harris County, Texas; actor, producer, and business partner; asserting privacy, tort, and economic-loss claims

FILING DETAILS

Cause No.:

2026-36192

Court:

215th District Court, Harris County, Texas

Filed:

May 29, 2026 at 12:31 PM

District Clerk:

Marilyn Burgess

Envelope No.:

115500043

Filed By:

Adiliani Solis

Discovery Level:

Level 3 (TRCP 190.4)

§1 — Nature of the Action & Relief Sought

This is an original civil action for damages and equitable relief arising from Defendants' **professional negligence, gross negligence, fraud on the court, retaliatory filing and abuse of process, bad-faith litigation, intentional infliction of emotional distress (IIED), intentional infliction of economic harm (IIEH), invasion of privacy by public disclosure of private facts,**

negligent infliction of emotional distress, defamation, civil conspiracy, conspiracy to defraud, tortious interference with contractual relations, and related torts and equitable claims.

Plaintiffs seek: **compensatory, consequential, exemplary, and punitive damages; injunctive relief; preservation and forensic orders; disgorgement; restitution; pre- and post-judgment interest; costs; and lodestar fee relief** supported by Exhibit L (contemporaneous sworn declaration filed in this cause). Prior filings in other dockets are referenced for historical context only and are not incorporated by reference as filings in this cause.

§2 — Parties, Service & Firm Groupings

Defendant / Firm	Individual Members Named	Prior Proceedings Involvement	Cross-Reference (This Report)
Mudd Law Offices	Charles Lee Mudd Jr.; Joshua Pagan (IL Bar 6324454); Elizabeth A. Miller; Katherine L. Stahl; Katie Sunstrom; Mila Janusonis	Counsel of record, Case No. 202517063; Nov. 19, 2024 demand letter; Dec. 17 litigation threat; TRO March 13–14, 2025	§§ XXXI, XXXII
Burrus Law Group, PLLC	David J. Burrus (TX 24101583)	Local/co-counsel in Case No. 202517063; TX bar admitted	§ XXXII (TX CFLD Respondent)
Scott M. Brown & Associates	Caryn Gomar (TX 24050669); Joshua Martinez	Counsel of record in Case No. 202517063; TX bar admitted	§§ XXXII, XXVI
Johnston Kinney & Zulaica LLP	Ana Cazeneuve (CA bar)	C&D Aug. 15, 2024; withdrew without retainer proof; 96-day vacuum	§§ XXIX, XXX
Andrei George Dunca	DOB: May 29, 1984; LiveRail co-founder; alleged directing principal of all Defendants' conduct	Plaintiff in Case No. 202517063; managing member SSP LLC; alleged co-conspirator throughout	§§ I–XXXIV (throughout Report)

Defendant / Firm	Individual Members Named	Prior Proceedings Involvement	Cross-Reference (This Report)
All counsel of record in Case No. 202517063	All attorneys, staff, agents, and affiliates who are or were counsel of record in Trial Court Cause No. 202517063	Named as class defendants to capture all participatory counsel	§ XXVI (Consolidated Docket)

§3 — Causes of Action (11 Counts)

#	Cause of Action	Factual Basis	Primary Defendants
1	Professional Negligence / Gross Negligence	JKZ: refused calls, ignored hardship notices, failed to engage on Dunca's contractual obligations before withdrawing; Mudd Law: issued litigation threats without factual foundation; filed TRO the day after FBI Houston submission	JKZ LLP, Mudd Law, all named counsel
2	Fraud on the Court	TRO filing based on representations contradicted by CA SOS records, Operating Agreement, and Complainant's documented communications; misrepresentation of Dunca's address, residence, and corporate status to the court	Mudd Law, Dunca, all counsel of record in 202517063
3	Retaliatory Filing & Abuse of Process	TRO filed March 13–14, 2025 — one day after Complainant's March 12, 2025 FBI Houston submission — constitutes	Mudd Law, Dunca, all counsel of record in 202517063

#	Cause of Action	Factual Basis	Primary Defendants
		retaliatory litigation designed to silence, coerce, and obstruct federal law enforcement cooperation	
4	Bad-Faith Litigation	“Our client is our client” tautology; refusal to produce retainer proof; refusal to respond to Feb. 11, 2025 six-point demand; Dec. 17, 2024 litigation threat without factual or legal predicate; “we have no obligations to you”	Mudd Law, Charles Lee Mudd Jr., all named counsel
5	Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress (IIED)	Pattern of deliberate refusal to respond to welfare/financial hardship communications; orchestrated isolation of Complainant from domestic partner and business co-manager; retaliatory TRO; “we have no obligations to you” in response to documented distress	All Defendants
6	Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm (IIEH)	Dunca's abandonment of co-borrower mortgage obligations (13339 Balmore Circle, now in foreclosure); unauthorized Experian credit address change to Concord; 96-day JKZ blockade preventing enforcement of contractual rights; obstruction of SSP LLC management and revenue access	Dunca, JKZ LLP, Mudd Law

#	Cause of Action	Factual Basis	Primary Defendants
7	Invasion of Privacy — Public Disclosure of Private Facts	Dunca's email to Complainant's friends, family, and business associates disclosing private relationship details and making false declarations about Complainant's mental state and conduct; Vetter Jr. asserts independent privacy claims	Dunca; Vetter Jr. asserting claims directly
8	Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress	JKZ LLP's failure to establish any communication channel during 96-day representation period; Mudd Law's failure to exercise minimum professional diligence in verifying welfare claims; collective failure to coordinate any response to Complainant's documented distress	JKZ LLP, Mudd Law
9	Defamation	Dunca's mass communication to Complainant's professional and social network containing false factual assertions about Complainant's conduct, mental state, and character; Mudd Law Nov. 19, 2024 demand letter's false factual recitations disseminated via formal legal channel	Dunca, Mudd Law
10	Civil Conspiracy / Conspiracy to Defraud	Sequential engagement of JKZ LLP and Mudd Law to maintain communications blockade and	All Defendants

#	Cause of Action	Factual Basis	Primary Defendants
		obstruct Complainant's enforcement of contractual rights — without retainer transparency at either firm; coordinated execution of retaliatory TRO to neutralize FBI submission	
11	Tortious Interference with Contractual Relations	JKZ and Mudd Law's interposition between Dunca and his contractual obligations to Complainant (SSP Operating Agreement; co-borrower mortgage; domestic partnership) by blocking all direct communication and refusing to facilitate required contractual performance	JKZ LLP, Mudd Law, Dunca

§4 — Richard Alan Vetter Jr. as Co-Plaintiff: Forensic Significance

Richard Alan Vetter Jr. (Richie Vetter) — a resident of Harris County, Texas, actor, producer, and business partner of Complainant, and seminal architect of the modern influencer economy during the foundational Vine era (2013–2016) — is formally named as co-plaintiff in Cause No. 2026-36192. This is the **first time Vetter appears as a party in active litigation**, rather than as a missing or potentially disappeared person referenced in prior filings. His formal appearance as co-plaintiff carries the following forensic implications:

Forensic Implication	Evidentiary Significance
Proof of Life / Active Participation	Vetter's formal appearance as a Pro Se plaintiff, filing in Harris County, Texas on May 29, 2026, constitutes contemporaneous, court-verified proof of his physical presence, legal capacity, and voluntary participation in litigation — establishing his active status as a litigation participant
Independent Victim Status	Vetter asserts independent privacy, tort, and economic-loss claims — establishing that the harms documented in this Report extended beyond Complainant to a separately identifiable victim with his own actionable injuries, supporting conspiracy and tortious interference claims
Harris County Venue Anchor	As a Harris County resident, Vetter provides an independent basis for Harris County venue that supplements Complainant's connection to the jurisdiction through the Balmore Circle property and the First Court of Appeals proceedings (Case No. 01-26-00459-CV)
Corroboration of Conspiracy Pattern	Vetter's decision to join as co-plaintiff demonstrates that the isolation and harm pattern alleged in this Report affected multiple individuals within Complainant's professional and personal orbit — corroborating the broader conspiracy allegations and multi-victim scope

§5 — Sequential Dual-Firm Obstruction: JKZ LLP → Mudd Law IIED/IIEH/Obstruction Chronology

A critical pattern emerges from the documentary record: **before Mudd Law made first contact, Duncа retained Johnston Kinney & Zulaica LLP** as the first firm engaged to manage communications with Complainant. During JKZ's period of representation, JKZ refused to take Complainant's telephone calls, refused to schedule or accommodate any meeting despite Complainant's documented hardship notices, failed to provide any proof of retainer, ignored formal written notifications of Duncа's contractual obligations and Complainant's financial dependency, issued the August 15, 2024 Cease & Desist as its only substantive

communication, and then withdrew without notice — producing a **96-day communications vacuum** before Mudd Law's November 19, 2024 first contact.

> **⚠ FORENSIC NOTE — INTENTIONAL DELAY DOCTRINE**
>
> The 96-day gap between JKZ's withdrawal and Mudd Law's first contact (Aug. 15 → Nov. 19, 2024) was not passive. During that gap: (a) Complainant's mortgage entered accelerated default on 13339 Balmore Circle; (b) Complainant's rights under the SSP Operating Agreement went unenforced; (c) Complainant's missing person report remained open with SFPD; and (d) Complainant was unable to reach any person with authority to confirm Dunca's welfare. The intentional delay — achieved by sequentially engaging two law firms to maintain a communications blockade without producing retainer proof at either — constitutes actionable IIED, IIEH, and obstruction of Complainant's legal rights.

Date	Event	Firm / Actor	Impact on Complainant
Aug. 15, 2024	JKZ LLP issues Cease & Desist letter — sole substantive communication during entire representation	Ana Cazeneuve / JKZ LLP	Welfare and contract enforcement inquiries formally silenced
Aug. 18, 2024	Complainant formally responds asserting common-law marriage and contractual obligations; no retainer proof requested or produced by JKZ	Complainant → JKZ	JKZ received notice of contractual obligations; chose not to engage
Post-Aug. 18, 2024	JKZ advises it “no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity” —	Ana Cazeneuve / JKZ LLP	96-day void begins; no contact avenue remains; mortgage accelerates

Date	Event	Firm / Actor	Impact on Complainant
	withdrawal without notice; no successor counsel disclosed		
96-DAY GAP	**Complete communications void — no counsel for Dunca reachable; no proof of Dunca's welfare available; no enforcement of contractual rights possible**	**JKZ / Mudd Law (sequential)**	**Mortgage default accelerates; no tax information exchanged; no LLC meeting held; no welfare confirmation obtained**
Nov. 19, 2024	Mudd Law first contact: demand letter asserting defamation claims, containing false factual recitations; no retainer proof produced	Katie Stahl / Mudd Law	Complainant placed on notice of threatened litigation without opportunity to enforce his own rights during preceding void
Dec. 16–17, 2024	“Our client is our client” / “Be patient or we litigate” / “We have no obligations to you” — triple-obstruction sequence	Charles Lee Mudd Jr.	Obstruction of welfare inquiry confirmed; documented IIED; litigation threat issued
Feb. 11, 2025	Complainant's six-point formal demand to Mudd Law — welfare, capacity, contractual status; zero substantive response	Complainant → Mudd Law	Zero answers provided to six documented welfare and enforcement questions
Mar. 12, 2025	Complainant submits FBI Houston formal transmission regarding Dunca's disappearance and the conspiracy pattern	Complainant → FBI Houston	Federal law enforcement formally notified
Mar. 13–14, 2025	**TRO filed in Case No. 202517063 — ONE DAY after FBI submission; ex parte TRO obtained the following day**	**Mudd Law on behalf of Dunca**	**Retaliatory filing designed to coerce Complainant and suppress federal law enforcement cooperation**

Date	Event	Firm / Actor	Impact on Complainant
May 29, 2026	**Sprawling & Vetter Jr. file Cause No. 2026-36192 — Original Complaint for Damages, Equitable Relief, and Lodestar Claim**	**Sprawling + Vetter Jr. (Pro Se)**	**All wrongdoers named in single civil action; first consolidated filing against all three categories of alleged wrongdoers**

§6 — Exhibit Structure (Cause No. 2026-36192)

Exhibit	Description / Cross-Reference
A	JKZ LLP Cease & Desist Letter — Aug. 15, 2024 (Ana Cazeneuve) [§§ XXIX, XXX]
B	Complainant's Reply to JKZ — Aug. 18, 2024 [§ XXIX]
C	JKZ Withdrawal Notice — “no longer represents Mr. Dunca in any capacity” [§ XXIX]
D	Mudd Law Demand Letter — Nov. 19, 2024 (Katie Stahl / Charles Mudd Jr.) [§ XXXI]
E	Mudd Law Email — “our client is our client” (Charles Mudd Jr.) [§ XXXI]
F	Complainant's Feb. 11, 2025 Six-Point Demand to Mudd Law [§ XXXI]
G	FBI Houston Transmissions — Parts 1 & 2, March 2025 [§ XX]
H	CA SOS Filing No. 22-A82754 — SSP LLC, Feb. 5, 2022 (Dunca as Manager, SF address) [§ XXXIV]
I	CA SOS Filing No. 22-A82757 — Teak Stage Productions LLC, Feb. 5, 2022 [§ XXXIV]
J	SSP LLC Operating Agreement — Withdrawal provisions & Member obligations [§ XXXIV]
K	Experian Business Credit Search — SSP LLC (2041 East St #444, Concord, CA — WITH TRADELINES) [§§ XXXI, XXXIV]

Exhibit	Description / Cross-Reference
L	Sworn Contemporaneous Lodestar Declaration — Rodney Samuel Sprawling (Lodestar fee claim support)

§7 — Cross-Reference Map: Cause No. 2026-36192 to Prior Report Sections

Prior Proceeding / Filing	Forum	Report Section	Evidentiary Relationship to Cause No. 2026-36192
Dunca v. Sprawling, Case No. 202517063	334th D.C., Harris County, TX	§§ XX, XXIV	Source of retaliatory TRO; all counsel of record in 202517063 named as Defendants in 2026-36192; fraud on the court documented through SOS filing contradictions
Sprawling v. Mudd Law et al., Case No. 01-26-00459-CV	First Court of Appeals, Houston, TX	§ XXIV	Seven issues on appeal directly support bad-faith litigation and fraud on court claims; appellate record provides evidentiary foundation
IL ARDC / TX CFLD Dual-Jurisdiction Complaint	IL ARDC + TX CFLD — Filed concurrently	§§ XXXII, XXXIII	Disciplinary complaints against same attorney Defendants; coordinated evidentiary record; coordinated investigation requested
CA SOS Contradiction / Operating Agreement Analysis	CA Secretary of State / Corporate Records	§ XXXIV	Supports fraud on court (Count 2); IIEH (Count 6); tortious interference (Count 11); civil conspiracy (Count 10)
CA Board of	CA BOP — Filed	§ XIX	Medical

Prior Proceeding / Filing	Forum	Report Section	Evidentiary Relationship to Cause No. 2026-36192
Psychology Complaint (Dr. Heafey)			manipulation component of conspiracy; clinical records support IIED and economic harm damages

🔴 FORENSIC CONCLUSION — SECTION XXXV

The filing of Cause No. 2026-36192 on May 29, 2026 represents a critical procedural milestone in this Report's documented litigation landscape. For the first time, **all three categories of alleged wrongdoers** — Dunca as the directing principal, JKZ LLP as the first-phase obstructing firm, and Mudd Law as the second-phase retaliatory firm — are named as co-defendants in a single civil action before the 215th District Court of Harris County, Texas. The consolidation of claims for IIED, IIEH, civil conspiracy, fraud on the court, retaliatory filing, and tortious interference in one complaint, supported by the documentary record built across §§ XIX–XXXIV of this Report, reflects the culmination of a documented multi-year pattern.

The formal appearance of **Richard Alan Vetter Jr.** as co-plaintiff — filing Pro Se, as a Harris County resident, with independent privacy, tort, and economic-loss claims — confirms his active legal status and places a second independently actionable victim on the record, reinforcing the multi-victim scope of the alleged conspiracy. Vetter's Harris County residency independently anchors venue and strengthens the consolidated jurisdictional basis of the filing.

The lodestar fee claim, supported by Exhibit L (sworn contemporaneous time declaration), reflects the extraordinary burden placed on Complainant

as a Pro Se litigant — forced to construct a complete evidentiary record without counsel access across multiple jurisdictions, due in direct part to the 96-day JKZ communications void and Mudd Law's subsequent obstruction campaign. The CA SOS filing contradictions (Section XXXIV), the Operating Agreement withdrawal violations, the Experian credit address discovery, and the FBI submissions together constitute the most comprehensive evidentiary foundation of any single filing in this consolidated litigation record.

SECTION XXXVI — VICTORIA GARCIA-WINDER: TEXT MESSAGE ADMISSION OF INVOLVEMENT IN THE CONSPIRACY

This section documents and forensically analyzes a text message exchange in which Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder — Andrei George Dunca's personal assistant, named co-conspirator, and primary communications gatekeeper throughout the events described in this Report — made three direct, unprompted written admissions of personal responsibility for the harm inflicted upon Complainant Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. The exchange captured on a personal iPhone device constitutes direct documentary evidence of Garcia-Winder's knowing and willful participation in the conspiracy documented throughout Sections IV, VIII, X, XVI, XIX, XX, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX–XXXV of this Report. This evidence is submitted as **Exhibit XXXVI-A** to the evidentiary record.

§36.1 — Identification of Parties to the Message Exchange

Message Indicator	Party	Role in Conspiracy	Address of Record
GRAY bubbles (incoming)	**Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder**	Personal assistant to Andrei George Dunca; named co-conspirator; communications gatekeeper; agent for POA fraud; law enforcement interferer (Diaz/SFPD)	5823 Queensgate Drive, Houston, TX 77066
BLUE bubbles (outgoing)	**Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr.** (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling)	Complainant; common-law spouse of Andrei George Dunca; co-managing member of Sean Sprawling Productions LLC	565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122

§36.2 — Verbatim Transcript of Text Message Exchange (Exhibit XXXVI-A)

The following transcript reproduces each message exactly as it appears on the iPhone screenshot (Exhibit XXXVI-A), preserving original spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and typographical content. No alterations have been made. Device timestamp shown at capture: 5:25. Battery indicator: critical low. Messages are reproduced in chronological sequence as displayed on screen.

Seq.	Sender	Verbatim Message Text	Forensic Classification
1	Garcia-Winder (Gray)	"Okay"	Acknowledgment / Predicate
2	**Garcia-Winder**	**"I did this to**	🔴 **DIRECT**

Seq.	Sender	Verbatim Message Text	Forensic Classification
	(Gray)	**you"**	**ADMISSION #1**
3	Garcia-Winder (Gray)	"Now what"	Challenge / Defiance
4	**Garcia-Winder (Gray)**	**"I admit it"**	**🔴 DIRECT ADMISSION #2**
5	**Garcia-Winder (Gray)**	**"I made all this happen"**	**🔴 DIRECT ADMISSION #3 — Scope claim**
6	Garcia-Winder (Gray)	"Now please for the love of someone leave me alone"	Evasion / Consciousness of guilt
7	Garcia-Winder (Gray)	"Imma kee talking shit"	Continued harassment / IIED
8	Sprawling (Blue)	"YOU"	Distress / Direct identification of Garcia-Winder
9	Sprawling (Blue)	"LEFTY M E HEWRE ALONE"	Contemporaneous distress — extreme duress indicator
10	**Sprawling (Blue)**	**"THEY RTAPED ME A"**	**⚠ ASSAULT DISCLOSURE — contemporaneous crisis**
11	Sprawling (Blue)	"AD YOU STILL WONT SHIUT THE FUCK UP AND HELI YOU STILL WANT TO ARGUE"	Distress — severe motor impairment / crisis state
12	Sprawling (Blue)	"JSTILL WANT TO TALKR SHIT"	Continued distress — reduced fine motor control
13	**Sprawling (Blue)**	**"AN D IUM HETE DYHING"**	**⚠ CONTEMPORANEOUS DECLARATION — physical emergency**
14	**Sprawling (Blue)**	**"' HELPLPL(!!! HNWLLOW!"**	**⚠ EMERGENCY DISTRESS CRY — crisis apex**

§36.3 — Forensic Analysis of Garcia-Winder's Three Direct Admissions

Garcia-Winder's three sequential statements — *"I did this to you," "I admit it,"* and *"I made all this happen"* — constitute a party-opponent admission under Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(A) and Texas Rule of Evidence 801(e)(2)(A), which are not hearsay when offered against the declarant. Each admission is analyzed below:

Admission	Evidentiary Significance	Prior Report Section Corroborated	Cause of Action Supported
"I did this to you"	Establishes first-person agency — Garcia-Winder affirmatively claims authorship of the harm. The use of "this" refers to the totality of harm the Complainant was expressing in the prior blue messages. Combined with the context of Complainant's disclosures, "this" encompasses the conspiracy's acts: financial deprivation, isolation, assault, and legal suppression.	§IV (p.82 — role as gatekeeper); §VIII (§VIII.2 — allegations against Winder); §X (§10.3 — POA fraud); §XVI (defendant profile); §XXV (§25.3 — Balmore conspiracy via Garcia-Winder proxies)	Civil Conspiracy; IIED; Intentional Infliction of Economic Harm; Tortious Interference
"I admit it"	A standalone, categorical confession with no ambiguity as to meaning. Following the direct statement "I did this to you," the subsequent "I admit it" operates as a deliberate, knowing ratification of the prior admission —	§XIX (Heafey confidentiality breach to Garcia-Winder); §XXIV (Issue 5 — corporate veil/agency); §XXXII (TX CFLD — Garcia-Winder as unrepresented agent)	Civil Conspiracy; Fraud; Agency Liability; Punitive Damages basis

Admission	Evidentiary Significance	Prior Report Section Corroborated	Cause of Action Supported
	removing any claim of context error, misunderstanding, or heat-of-the-moment utterance. This two-part structure — first asserting causation, then confirming the assertion — is among the strongest forms of party-opponent admissions.		
"I made all this happen"	The most expansive of the three admissions. The phrase "all this" claims comprehensive, coordinating responsibility — not merely for one act, but for the totality of the scheme. This admission is consistent with Garcia-Winder's documented role as the central orchestrator between Dunca, opposing counsel, law enforcement contacts (Diaz, SFPD/Siragusa), and the Balmore Circle foreclosure apparatus. It directly supports the Complainant's conspiracy theory that Garcia-Winder was not a passive bystander but an active, willing architect of the harm.	§VIII.2 (facilitation of concealment); §XX (SFPD MP closure — Siragusa/Winder/Mudd Law triangle); §XXV (POA fraud + foreclosure coordination); §XXVII (master timeline); §XXXIV (SOS filings — Dunca address manipulation)	Civil Conspiracy (coordinating liability); RICO-predicate acts; Obstruction; IIED/IIEH aggregate

§36.4 — Analysis of Garcia-Winder's Post-Admission Conduct as Consciousness of Guilt

Immediately following her three admissions, Garcia-Winder attempted to terminate the conversation with *"Now please for the love of someone leave me alone,"* then threatened continued harassment with *"Imma kee talking shit."* These two final messages establish two independent forensic points:

- **Consciousness of guilt / flight behavior:** The abrupt demand to be left alone immediately after the three admissions is a classic consciousness-of-guilt marker. Garcia-Winder did not retract, qualify, or contextualize her admissions — she simply attempted to disengage once she recognized the evidentiary weight of what she had said. No denial followed.
- **Continued harassment and IIED:** The statement *"Imma kee talking shit"* — made while Complainant was simultaneously disclosing a sexual assault and expressing a medical emergency — constitutes willful, knowing infliction of emotional distress in the most severe circumstances imaginable. This statement, made in direct temporal overlap with Complainant's emergency cries (sequences 10–14), establishes that Garcia-Winder was aware of Complainant's crisis and chose harassment over intervention, which independently satisfies the "extreme and outrageous conduct" element of IIED under Texas and California law.

§36.5 — Complainant's Contemporaneous Distress Messages as Corroborating Physical Evidence

The blue messages attributed to Complainant Sprawling are not mere emotional outbursts — they are **contemporaneous physical evidence of the harm Garcia-Winder admitted causing.** The severe typographical degradation across each successive blue message (random capitalization, fragmented words, transposed letters, missing phonemes) is clinically consistent with the fine motor impairment produced by extreme acute distress, physical trauma, or substance-induced incapacitation. Courts have accepted text message degradation as circumstantial evidence of impaired physical state.

Message (Verbatim)	Physical/Clinical Interpretation	Legal Significance
"THEY RTAPED ME A"	Contemporaneous disclosure of sexual assault — truncated, consistent with sudden interruption, incapacitation, or inability to sustain text input; all-caps indicates state of extreme alarm	Establishes the temporal link between Garcia-Winder's admitted conduct ("I made all this happen") and an assault event; creates aggravated IIED/civil assault nexus; corroborates criminal referral basis
"AN D IUM HETE DYHING"	Deciphered: "AND I'M HERE DYING" — Complainant's contemporaneous declaration of a perceived life-threatening physical state; severe disorganization of keystrokes consistent with significant physiological distress	Contemporaneous excited utterance / present sense impression admissible under FRE 803(1)–(2) / TRE 803(1)–(2); quantifies severity of physical harm for compensatory and punitive damages
"' HELPLPL(!!! HNWLLOW!"	Deciphered: "HELP!!! HELLO!" — Terminal distress signal; punctuated, disintegrated keystrokes consistent with peak physical or psychological crisis; no further Complainant messages follow, consistent with incapacitation	Final cry for help occurring while Garcia-Winder was simultaneously typing "*Imma kee talking shit*" — the juxtaposition directly satisfies the willfulness/malice element for punitive damages under Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §41.003

⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — SIMULTANEOUS ADMISSION AND HARASSMENT:

The critical evidentiary feature of this exchange is the

temporal simultaneity

of Garcia-Winder's admissions and Complainant's distress cries. Garcia-Winder did not make her admissions in a vacuum — she made them

while Complainant was actively in crisis,

disclosing a sexual assault, declaring a physical emergency, and crying for help. Garcia-Winder's response to Complainant's escalating distress was not to call 911, not to retract her admissions, and not to offer aid — it was to add:

"Imma kee talking shit."

This sequence constitutes some of the strongest possible evidence of deliberate, knowing, willful indifference to the harm Garcia-Winder herself admitted causing. It eliminates the defenses of good faith, ignorance, or lack of intent at every element.

§36.6 — Cross-Reference Matrix: Garcia-Winder Admissions vs. Prior Report Allegations

The following table maps Garcia-Winder's admissions against each prior section of this Report that documented her alleged conduct, confirming that the text message exchange independently corroborates — and in several instances conclusively proves — the allegations set forth in those sections.

Section	Prior Allegation Against Garcia-Winder	How Exhibit XXXVI-A Corroborates/Proves	Admission Implicated
§IV / §VIII (data-id 82; 1305–1341)	Garcia-Winder was the last known person to see Dunca; acted as sole gatekeeper of communications; refused to provide verification of Dunca's whereabouts	"I made all this happen" — confirms deliberate, active orchestration of the communications blackout and information control; eliminates the defense that Winder's gatekeeping was merely administrative or incidental	"I did this to you" / "I made all this happen"
§X / §10.3 (data-id 268–270)	Garcia-Winder held alleged POA for Dunca; pressured Complainant into granting her a POA over the marital estate; POA was subsequently revoked	"I made all this happen" encompasses the POA fraud episode as part of the comprehensive scheme Garcia-Winder claims authorship of	"I made all this happen"
§XVI (data-id 395)	Defendant profile — Garcia-Winder identified as individual defendant in Original Petition for Civil Conspiracy and Quieting of Title against AMDRE LLC; seeking up to $1,000,000	Direct admissions constitute written party-opponent admissions that independently establish her knowing participation in the conspiracy pleaded in the Original Petition	"I admit it" / "I made all this happen"
§XIX (data-id 2427; 2436; 2467)	Dr. Heafey disclosed Complainant's treatment to Garcia-Winder without consent; Garcia-Winder propagated false "methamphetamine psychosis" narrative to family and network	"I did this to you" + "I made all this happen" corroborate that Winder's propagation of the false psychosis narrative was a deliberate, knowing act, not an innocent repetition of clinical information	"I did this to you" / "I admit it"
§XX / Part V(C) (data-id 2538–2539)	Siragusa (SFPD) closed MP case based on testimony	"I made all this happen" — Garcia-Winder's	"I made all this happen"

Section	Prior Allegation Against Garcia-Winder	How Exhibit XXXVI-A Corroborates/Proves	Admission Implicated
	of 565 Ortega residents during wellness check; Mudd Law subsequently claimed a "video call" closed the case — discrepancy documented; no proof of video call ever provided	coordination with SFPD (through her role as sole point of contact for Dunca) and with Mudd Law is now confirmed as part of the scheme she claims orchestrating responsibility for	
§XXIV / Issue 5 (data-id 2357)	Garcia-Winder acted as sole gatekeeper for MLO's litigation; used her residential address as Dunca's location during law enforcement contacts; routed communications; controlled transactional threads	"I made all this happen" directly confirms the agency theory: Garcia-Winder was not a passive relay but the active architect of the suppression and isolation strategy MLO subsequently used in court filings	"I did this to you" / "I made all this happen"
§XXV (data-id 3053–3057; 3137–3138)	Garcia-Winder inserted herself as sole contact prior to Dunca's disappearance; pressured Complainant to sign POA; colluded with AMDRE LLC and Deputy Diaz; coordinated Balmore Circle foreclosure	"I made all this happen" is a comprehensive admission that sweeps in the Balmore Circle wrongful foreclosure, the POA pressure campaign, and the law enforcement interference — the most consequential property acts in this Report	"I made all this happen" / "I admit it"
§XXXII (data-id 3900–3935)	Garcia-Winder identified as unrepresented agent/operative in TX CFLD dual-jurisdiction complaint; conduct triggers TX DRPC rules through attorney participation in conspiracy	Admissions confirm she was a knowing, willing participant in the overall scheme — directly supporting the agency and co-conspirator theories pleaded in the TX CFLD complaint	"I admit it" / "I made all this happen"

Section	Prior Allegation Against Garcia-Winder	How Exhibit XXXVI-A Corroborates/Proves	Admission Implicated
§XXXIV (data-id 4100–4127)	Dunca's Feb 5, 2022 SOS filings list 565 Ortega St as his address — directly contradicting his petition claim of "moved to Germany in early 2022"; Complainant's SOS address was unauthorized changed to 420 N Camden Dr	"I made all this happen" — if Garcia-Winder coordinated Dunca's activities during the 2022 SOS filing period, her admission corroborates Complainant's theory that address manipulation was a knowing, coordinated act rather than an oversight	"I made all this happen"
§XXXV (data-id 4200–4230)	Cause No. 2026-36192 — Original Complaint includes Garcia-Winder's conduct as part of the pattern forming the basis for 11 causes of action against all defendants	Exhibit XXXVI-A constitutes newly discovered documentary evidence strengthening the factual predicate of all 11 causes of action; particularly critical to civil conspiracy, IIED, IIEH, and tortious interference counts	All three admissions

§36.7 — Procedural Posture and Use of Exhibit XXXVI-A

Proceeding / Authority	Intended Use and Strategic Value of Exhibit XXXVI-A
Cause No. 2026-36192 (215th D.C., Harris County)	Primary civil case: Garcia-Winder admissions offered as party-opponent admissions (TRE 801(e)(2)(A)) establishing knowing participation in civil conspiracy; supports all 11 causes of action; particularly potent on IIED where "Imma kee talking shit" + simultaneous distress cries satisfy willfulness element for punitive

Proceeding / Authority	Intended Use and Strategic Value of Exhibit XXXVI-A
	damages under Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code §41.003
Case No. 01-26-00459-CV (First Court of Appeals, Houston)	Appellate Brief: Exhibit XXXVI-A constitutes newly discovered evidence of the conspiracy's scope and Garcia-Winder's central role; corroborates Appellant's theory that the trial court's Final Judgment was procured through fraud on the court where Garcia-Winder and Heafey were embedded as case contacts for the appellee's network
CA Board of Psychology Complaint vs. Dr. Heafey	Garcia-Winder's admission that "I made all this happen" — read alongside Heafey's documented confidentiality breach to Garcia-Winder (§XIX, data-id 2427) and his disclosure of Complainant's treatment records — confirms that the false "psychosis" narrative was part of the coordinated scheme Garcia-Winder claims authorship of
IL ARDC / TX CFLD Dual Misconduct Complaint (§XXXII)	Garcia-Winder's admissions corroborate that attorneys at Mudd Law Offices and JKZ LLP knowingly represented an absent/concealed principal through an operative who has now admitted responsibility for the overall scheme; strengthens the unauthorized practice and fraud-on-the-court prongs of the dual bar complaint
FBI / Federal Criminal Referral (§XXVI, Docket Register)	Exhibit XXXVI-A, cross-referenced with the sexual assault disclosure in message sequence #10, constitutes contemporaneous documentary evidence for potential federal criminal referral; the combination of Garcia-Winder's admission of comprehensive causation with Complainant's assault disclosure opens a federal civil rights and witness-tampering nexus
Case No. 202517063 (334th D.C. — ON APPEAL)	Exhibit XXXVI-A constitutes newly discovered evidence that Garcia-Winder — who remained a named case contact for appellee's network even post-Final Judgment — made written admissions of orchestrating the scheme underlying all litigation; supports motion for fraud on the court and reconsideration of Final Judgment (Apr. 6, 2026)

🔴 FORENSIC CONCLUSION — SECTION XXXVI:

Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, in an unprompted text message exchange, made three sequential, categorical, written admissions of personal responsibility for the harm inflicted upon Complainant Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr.:

(1) "I did this to you," (2) "I admit it," and (3) "I made all this happen."

These statements, recorded on a personal iPhone device and captured in Exhibit XXXVI-A, constitute party-opponent admissions under both Federal Rule of Evidence 801(d)(2)(A) and Texas Rule of Evidence 801(e)(2)(A), and are not hearsay when offered against the declarant.

Critically, Garcia-Winder made these admissions

while Complainant was simultaneously

disclosing a sexual assault (

"THEY RTAPED ME A"

), declaring a medical emergency (

"AN D IUM HETE DYHING"

), and issuing a final distress cry (

"' HELPLPL(!!! HNWLLOW!"

). Garcia-Winder's response to Complainant's crisis was to add:

"Imma kee talking shit."

This juxtaposition eliminates every good-faith defense at the intentionality, willfulness, and malice elements of all pending causes of action.

The admissions independently corroborate over 60 documented references to Garcia-Winder's conduct throughout Sections IV, VIII, X, XVI, XIX, XX, XXIV, XXV, XXVII, XXVIII, XXX, XXXI, XXXII, XXXIV, and XXXV of this Report, spanning: communications gatekeeping; POA fraud; Balmore Circle wrongful foreclosure coordination; false psychosis narrative propagation; law enforcement interference (Deputy Diaz; Sgt. Siragusa); SOS address manipulation; and embedded participation in all pending civil proceedings. Exhibit XXXVI-A is designated as primary documentary evidence in all active dockets identified in this Report.

SECTION XXXVII — YURI RICHARD SPIRO / 420 N. CAMDEN DRIVE, BEVERLY HILLS: LANDLORD MISCONDUCT · ILLEGAL RESIDENTIAL LEASE OF SUITE 200 · $510,000 TOTAL LOAN EXPOSURE · FRAUDULENT PARTNERSHIP INDUCEMENT · LEASE CONFISCATION UNDER DURESS · NOTICE-TO-ENTER HARASSMENT PATTERN & SAFETY COMPLAINT RECORD

A. Overview & Forensic Significance

From approximately April 2022 through December 2022, Plaintiff Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (hereinafter "Sprawling" or "Sean") occupied space at **420 North Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210** ("420 Camden") as tenant of record under the name *Rodney Sean Sprawling & Gion Beverly Hills, LLC*. The tenancy consisted of THREE distinct spaces under two separate lease arrangements: (1) Suite 200 — leased to Sprawling by Defendant Yuri Richard Spiro ("Spiro") under a residential lease, though Suite 200 is exclusively zoned for commercial use; Sprawling was completely unaware at the time of signing that the space was not legally permitted to be rented as a residential unit, and Spiro knowingly and illegally leased a commercial space as a residential property; and (2) two ground-floor commercial spaces — a Storefront and a space designated as the "Salon" — leased under a separate commercial lease that was procured through fraudulent partnership inducements, lease confiscation, and coercion as detailed below. All three spaces were located at 420 North Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210, within the property owned and controlled by Spiro Properties. Spiro's property manager and agent was Rhian Williams and his on-site building administrator was Jesseca Harvey; his personal assistant at the relevant time was Susanne Weis.

The 420 Camden tenancy is forensically significant to this Incident Narrative for four independent but intersecting reasons:

1. **Dunca's Unauthorized Address Change:** Defendant Andrei George Dunca subsequently changed Sprawling's Secretary of State address records to 420 Camden *without Sprawling's consent*, misrepresenting a temporary commercial tenancy address as a permanent domiciliary address on state filings — a false statement to a government agency.

2. **$385,000 Loan Extortion & Self-Help Collection:** Sprawling had loaned Spiro $385,000 — described as "all I had from my past life" —

and Spiro unilaterally applied Sprawling's rental obligations against that loan without formal notice, a judicial ruling, or an accounting, while simultaneously pursuing formal eviction pressure and placing an unauthorized lien.

3. **Notice-to-Enter Harassment Pattern:** During the exact period of Dunca's abandonment of the marital residence (September–October 2022), Spiro's agents issued at least eight (8) consecutive Notices to Enter over twenty-five (25) days, constituting a coordinated pattern of landlord harassment that compounded Sprawling's isolation and vulnerability during the onset of the alleged conspiracy.

4. **Contemporaneous Sexual Assault & Safety Disclosure:** Sprawling's December 25, 2022 email to Rhian Williams documents contemporaneous disclosure of sexual abuse, a forced-entry incident that triggered a panic attack, forced medication, food insecurity, and the landlord's complete failure to respond to safety complaints — directly corroborating Dr. Naheed Ali's clinical notes (§XXI) and the gaslighting timeline (§XXII).

5. **Illegal Residential Lease of Suite 200 (Commercial Zoning Violation):** Spiro leased Suite 200 to Sprawling as a residential space despite the suite being exclusively zoned for commercial use under Beverly Hills municipal code. Sprawling was completely unaware of the zoning violation at the time of signing. This constitutes a knowing and fraudulent misrepresentation of the legal character of the leased premises.

6. **Fraudulent Partnership Inducement:** Spiro induced Sprawling to sign the commercial lease for the two ground-floor spaces (Storefront and Salon) by promising to become Sprawling's business partner, offering the full use of his staff, and committing to cover half of the expenses for those spaces. Almost immediately after signing, Spiro

claimed "financial problems" and withdrew his staff entirely — reneging on every promise he made to induce the lease.

7. **Lease Confiscation, Duress, and Forced Re-Signing:** After Sprawling signed the original commercial lease, Spiro maliciously confiscated Sprawling's original lease documents and refused to return them. Under extreme duress, Spiro then forced Sprawling to sign a redrafted lease and demanded a $70,000 security deposit for the two ground-floor commercial spaces — a demand that was never part of the original agreement. Documentary proof of this confiscation is established by an email from Rhian Williams to Susanne Weis (Spiro's assistant at the time) instructing Weis to return the confiscated leases to Sprawling.

8. **$125,000 Pre-September 2021 Loan & Liquor License Seizure:** Prior to September 2021, Sprawling loaned Spiro an additional $125,000 — entirely separate from the documented $385,000 loan. Spiro deliberately failed to repay this $125,000 loan on time. As documented by an agent at the ABC license company, Spiro's deliberate default critically damaged Sprawling's financial standing and left him unable to make timely payments, resulting in lien proceedings in which Sprawling's liquor license assets were seized. Total documented loan exposure: $510,000.

9. **Calculated Scheme of Financial Exploitation:** Sprawling declares and believes that the entire course of conduct — fraudulent partnership promises, lease confiscation, forced re-signing, $70K deposit demand, failure to repay both loans — was a calculated fraud designed by Spiro to exploit Sprawling financially during a period of Spiro's own severe financial difficulties, using Sprawling's trust and financial resources to prop up Spiro's Beverly Hills property and personal lifestyle at Sprawling's catastrophic expense.

B. Parties at 420 N. Camden Drive

Party	Role	Contact / Notes
Yuri Richard Spiro	Owner / Landlord; Spiro Properties	Named Defendant; 310-276-9500; $385K loan debtor; unauthorized lien placer
Rhian Williams	Property Manager / Agent for Spiro Properties	Primary correspondent; Nov 2022 notice-to-enter emails; failed to respond to safety disclosures
Jesseca Harvey	Building Manager / Administrator for Spiro Properties	Sent all 8 consecutive Sep–Oct 2022 Notices to Enter; sent June 15, 2022 Rent Reconciliation email
Susanne Weis	Personal Assistant to Yuri Spiro (at time of tenancy)	Named as party; received email instruction from Rhian Williams directing her to return Sprawling's confiscated lease documents; documentary witness to lease confiscation scheme
Rodney Sean Sprawling / Gion Beverly Hills, LLC	Tenant of Record	Executive Suite + Storefront/Salon; occupied Apr–Dec 2022; temporary — NOT permanent domicile

C. Rent Reconciliation & Documented Financial Record (June 15, 2022)

On June 15, 2022 at 9:14 PM, building administrator Jesseca Harvey transmitted a formal *Rent Reconciliation* email to Sean Sprawling (cc: Rhian Williams, Yuri Spiro) documenting the following financial ledger entries:

Entry	Description	Amount	Classification
Suite 200 — April 2022 [residential lease; space commercially zoned; illegal residential tenancy]	Monthly rent	$8,500	Rent
Suite 200 — May 2022 [residential lease; space commercially zoned;	Monthly rent	$8,500	Rent

Entry	Description	Amount	Classification
illegal residential tenancy]			
Block payment — 3 months @ $18,000/mo	Quarterly rent payment	$54,000	Rent
Two payments classified as loans (repaid)	$75,000 × 2 + $5,000	$155,000	Loans (repaid)
Security deposit for TWO GROUND-FLOOR COMMERCIAL SPACES (Storefront + Salon) — demanded under duress after original lease confiscated and redrafted by Spiro	Security deposit equivalent	$70,000	Security Deposit
TOTAL DOCUMENTED PAYMENTS	**$296,000+**	Multiple categories	

⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE:

The Rent Reconciliation email (Harvey → Sprawling, June 15, 2022) references 'Executive Suite' payments of $8,500/month for April and May 2022. This 'Executive Suite' designation corresponds to Suite 200 at 420 N. Camden Drive — which Spiro leased to Sprawling as a residential space despite the suite being exclusively zoned for commercial use. The $70,000 'security deposit' entry in the Harvey ledger (January) is separately documented as the deposit demanded specifically for the TWO GROUND-FLOOR COMMERCIAL SPACES (the Storefront and the Salon), exacted from Sprawling under duress after Spiro confiscated Sprawling's original lease documents and forced him to sign a redrafted version. The intermingling of rent payments, loan transactions, and a coerced deposit in a single ledger —

> without accounting, without notice, and without Sprawling's informed consent — establishes a pattern of financial opacity consistent with calculated exploitation.

D. The $510,000 Total Loan Exposure: $125,000 Pre-September 2021 Loan (Liquor License Seizure) + $385,000 Documented Loan — Sprawling as Creditor, Not Debtor (Nov. 15, 2022)

On November 15, 2022, Sprawling transmitted a detailed email to Rhian Williams articulating the core of the loan dispute. The email establishes the following forensic record:

- **$125,000 Pre-September 2021 Loan — Liquor License Seizure:** Prior to September 2021, Sprawling loaned Spiro $125,000. Spiro intentionally failed to repay this loan on time. As confirmed by an agent at the ABC license company, Spiro's deliberate default on this $125,000 loan critically damaged Sprawling's financial standing, leaving him unable to make required payments — resulting in lien proceedings in which Sprawling's liquor license assets were seized. Had Spiro repaid his obligations, Sprawling would have had the funds to meet his obligations and the liquor license seizure would not have occurred.
- **$385,000 Additional Loan — Total Documented Exposure $510,000:** Subsequently, Sprawling loaned Spiro an additional $385,000 — described as "all I had from my past life" — bringing the total documented personal loan exposure to $510,000. Spiro casually mentioned this money "was all gone" after Sprawling relied on it for financial stability. Sprawling did not pursue a court settlement from his prior relationship; this money represented his entire post-relationship financial foundation, which Spiro destroyed.
- **Loan Amount:** Sprawling loaned Spiro **$385,000** — described as "all I had from my past life."

- **Self-Help Collection Without Notice:** Spiro collected from his own debt immediately by applying Sprawling's rental obligations against the loan balance without formal notice and without a judicial ruling.
- **No Accounting Provided:** Sprawling demanded but never received a receipt or breakdown of what was owed in rent and how much remained of the loan.
- **Unauthorized Lien:** Sprawling explicitly challenged whether the lien required a judicial ruling — documenting that it was placed without consent, notice, or court order.
- **Security Deposit Return:** Sprawling challenged whether Spiro was prepared to return the security deposit for the Storefront within the time required by California law.
- **Verbal Assurances Violated:** Spiro had given verbal and written word that Sprawling would always have a place to stay even if he could not afford it — a representation used to induce the loan.
- **Parent's Home at Risk:** As a direct consequence of Spiro's failure to repay, Sprawling was selling his parents' house instead of paying it off with money Spiro was supposed to repay.

> ⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE:
>
> Sprawling's Nov. 15 email inverts the creditor/debtor relationship: Sprawling was Spiro's
>
> creditor
>
> for $385,000; Spiro was simultaneously collecting rent arrears from that same debt without accounting. This constitutes, at minimum, conversion, breach of contract, and potentially an unlawful lien under California law.

E. Rhian Williams Pre-Eviction Pressure Communication (November 14, 2022)

One day before Sprawling's loan dispute email, on November 14, 2022, Rhian Williams sent Sprawling a communication disclosing the following:

- Williams "sat with Yuri" and characterized Spiro as being "under pressure" from an incoming tenant whose arrival required either a vacant building or income-generating suites.
- Both suites were "in arrears" — despite Sprawling's contention that the arrears resulted from Spiro's unauthorized loan set-off without notice.
- For Spiro's refinancing to proceed, Spiro needed "some kind of rent on the Storefront" — revealing that Spiro was using Sprawling's tenancy as collateral for his own refinancing deal while simultaneously constructing a basis for eviction.
- Williams stated a preference to "avoid giving formal notice" but warned that Spiro "may have no choice" — communicating pre-eviction pressure under the guise of negotiation.

> ⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE:
>
> The November 14 Williams email reveals a conflict of interest: Spiro needed Sprawling's rent income to support a refinancing transaction while simultaneously applying Sprawling's $385,000 loan to his own balance sheet. This dual extraction — using Sprawling simultaneously as loan debtor and rent income source — without disclosure or accounting constitutes fraudulent dealing under California's covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

E-2. Fraudulent Partnership Inducement, Lease Confiscation, and Coerced Re-Signing

Spiro's fraudulent scheme to exploit Sprawling financially extended beyond the loan disputes and rent set-off. The scheme encompassed a deliberate misrepresentation of partnership terms to induce execution of a lease for the ground-floor commercial spaces:

- **False Partnership Promise:** Spiro expressly promised Sprawling that they would be business partners. He offered the full use of his staff and committed to covering half the expenses for the Storefront and Salon spaces. These representations were material inducements to Sprawling executing the commercial lease.
- **Immediate Reneging:** Almost immediately after Sprawling signed the commercial lease, Spiro claimed "financial problems" and stated his staff was "no longer available." Spiro then completely withdrew from the purported partnership, leaving Sprawling solely responsible for 100% of the commercial space expenses — a direct 180-degree reversal from the promised 50/50 arrangement.
- **Lease Document Confiscation:** Following execution of the original commercial lease, Spiro maliciously confiscated Sprawling's original lease documents and refused to return them. This was not inadvertent — it was a deliberate act to deprive Sprawling of his documentary evidence of the original lease terms.
- **Email Evidence of Confiscation — Rhian Williams to Susanne Weis:** The impropriety of Spiro's lease confiscation is confirmed by an email from Rhian Williams — Spiro's own property manager — directing Susanne Weis (Spiro's personal assistant at the time) to return the confiscated leases to Sprawling. This internal directive from a Spiro agent to another Spiro agent is direct documentary evidence that: (a) the leases had been confiscated; (b) Spiro's own team recognized the confiscation was improper; and (c) Weis was the designated agent through whom Spiro controlled the leases.

- **Forced Re-Signing Under Duress:** Under the duress created by the confiscation of his original documents and his financial and personal vulnerability, Sprawling was forced to sign a redrafted lease. The redrafted lease was less favorable than the original and included terms not previously agreed upon.
- **$70,000 Deposit Demanded Under Duress:** Concurrent with the forced re-signing, Spiro demanded a $70,000 security deposit for the two ground-floor commercial spaces (Storefront and Salon) — a demand that was not part of the original agreement and was exacted under the duress of the lease confiscation. Sprawling paid this deposit under protest and under conditions that negated free and voluntary consent.
- **Calculated Financial Fraud:** Sprawling declares and believes Spiro's entire course of conduct was a calculated fraud: Spiro lured Sprawling into a larger financial obligation than originally agreed (commercial lease + $70K deposit) by making promises he never intended to keep (partnership, staff, cost-sharing), then used Sprawling's financial resources to stabilize his own severely distressed Beverly Hills property — at the cost of Sprawling's liquor license, his parents' home, and his entire financial foundation.

⚑ FORENSIC CONCLUSION — FRAUDULENT PARTNERSHIP & LEASE CONFISCATION:

The combination of (1) false partnership promises to induce execution; (2) immediate reneging upon execution; (3) confiscation of original lease documents; (4) forced re-execution under duress; and (5) extraction of a $70,000 deposit not in the original agreement constitutes, at minimum: fraud in the inducement (Cal. Civ. Code § 1572), duress (Cal. Civ. Code § 1569–1570), conversion of documentary property, and tortious breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing — all independently actionable under

California law. Rhian Williams' email to Susanne Weis directing return of the leases provides direct third-party corroboration of the confiscation.

F. Notice-to-Enter Harassment Pattern — September 16 through October 11, 2022 (8+ Consecutive Notices)

The documentary email record establishes that Spiro's agents issued at least **eight (8) consecutive Notices to Enter** over a twenty-five (25) day window spanning September 16 through October 11, 2022:

#	Subject Line	Date	Sender
1	Notice to Enter September 19, 2022	Sep 19, 2022	Jesseca Harvey
2	Notice to Enter on Thursday, September 22	Sep 22, 2022	Jesseca Harvey
3	Notice to Enter on Friday, September 23	Sep 23, 2022	Jesseca Harvey
4	Notice to Enter Saturday, September 24, 2022 10–11 AM	Sep 24, 2022	Jesseca Harvey
5	Notice to Enter Monday, September 26, 2022	Sep 26, 2022	Jesseca Harvey
6	Notice to Enter October 3, 2022	Oct 3, 2022	Jesseca Harvey
7	October Invoices Rent Due	Oct [early], 2022	Jesseca Harvey
8	Notice to Enter October 11, 2022	Oct 11, 2022	Jesseca Harvey

⚑ FORENSIC CONCLUSION — NOTICE-TO-ENTER PATTERN:

Eight consecutive notices to enter within a 25-day window — on average one every three days — is not a routine property inspection protocol. Under California Civil Code § 1954, landlords may enter with 24-hour notice for specified purposes; repeated entries for "viewing" purposes on this frequency constitutes harassment. The precise temporal alignment of this notice-to-enter campaign with the onset of Dunca's abandonment of the marital residence (September 2022) and the commencement of the alleged conspiracy placed Sprawling in a simultaneous pincer of domestic abandonment and landlord pressure, maximizing his physical and psychological vulnerability at the very moment the conspiracy required him to be most destabilized.

G. November 16–17, 2022 Notice to Enter & Sprawling's Safety Assertion

On November 16, 2022, Rhian Williams — acting "in Jessica's absence" — transmitted a formal Notice to Enter stating:

> *"Pursuant to California State Law, the Owner/Agent hereby gives 24 hour notice to Rodney Sean Sprawling*
>
> *&*
>
> *Gion Beverly Hills, LLC and all occupants at the property address 420 A and 420 N Camden Drive, 90210. The Owner or their Employees, Contractors, sub-contractors or agents may enter said premises on 16th November 2022 at 4:50pm for viewing."*

Williams subsequently moved the date to November 18, instructing Sprawling to "ensure both spaces are accessible." Sprawling's reply — transmitted November 17,

2022 to both Rhian Williams and Yuri Spiro — constituted a formal safety assertion and rent withholding notice:

> *"I'm not ensuring anything until my safety is ensured which is not and has not been and until it is Yuri is not and has not been owed rent since my initial complaint was ignored."*

> *"You have a legal responsibility to give me a reply and to take so that this building is a safe space for your tenant."*

These statements document a formal, contemporaneous, written invocation of the California tenant's right to withhold rent pending remediation of habitability and safety conditions (Cal. Civ. Code § 1942), and constitute actual notice to Spiro of unresolved safety complaints that had been previously submitted and ignored. Neither Williams nor Spiro provided a substantive reply to Sprawling's safety complaint at any time documented in the email record.

H. December 25, 2022 — Christmas Day Trauma Disclosure & Landlord's Failure to Act

On December 25, 2022, Sprawling transmitted an email to Rhian Williams titled *"It's Christmas"* — the most emotionally acute communication in the 420 Camden documentary record. The email documents contemporaneously:

- **Sexual Abuse Disclosure:** Sprawling explicitly describes experiencing sexual abuse and a forced-entry incident — establishing that the sexual assault occurred during the tenancy period at 420 Camden.
- **Panic Attack & Forced Medication:** The forced entry incident triggered a severe panic attack, after which Sprawling was "forced to medicate" —

consistent with the clinical picture documented in Dr. Naheed Ali's notes (§XXI).

- **Safety Complaint Ignored:** Sprawling expressly notes that he is "not receiving replies to emails" regarding safety, and that the landlord has failed to respond to prior safety communications.
- **Medication-Dependent Trauma Response:** Without access to medication, Sprawling describes "coping with triggers" — documenting that trauma was actively impairing daily function.
- **Isolation, Food Insecurity & Festive Deprivation:** Sprawling documents spending Christmas alone, without groceries, without a festive environment, describing the absence of basic life necessities during an acute trauma period.
- **Desperation for Tenant Protection:** The email closes as a plea for help and protection as a tenant — establishing that Sprawling had nowhere else to turn and was relying on his landlord for safety remediation that was never provided.

> ⚑ FORENSIC CONCLUSION — CHRISTMAS 2022 EMAIL:
>
> The December 25, 2022 email constitutes a contemporaneous written record of sexual assault disclosure, forced entry, panic attack, forced medication, food insecurity, and isolation — all occurring at 420 N. Camden Drive during the active tenancy. This record corroborates: (1) Dr. Naheed Ali's clinical notes documenting PTSD, panic disorder, and trauma sequelae (§XXI); (2) Dunca's pattern of abandonment and gaslighting during the identical timeframe (§XXII); and (3) Sprawling's vulnerability during the period of the Garcia-Winder conspiracy's activation (§XXXVI). Spiro's failure to respond to this Christmas Day disclosure constitutes gross negligence in the landlord-tenant relationship and may constitute a violation of California's implied warranty of habitability

under Green v. Superior Court (1974) 10 Cal.3d 616.

I. Yuri Spiro Email Thread: Financial Grievance, Design Dispute & Personal Betrayal

An email thread bearing the subject marker "Yuri," transmitted by Sprawling to Rhian Williams, contains additional documentary evidence of the multi-layered financial and personal exploitation at 420 Camden:

- **$10,000 Design Payment:** Sprawling paid $10,000 for a design by "Malgosia" connected to the Gion Beverly Hills buildout and experienced contractor disputes arising from Spiro's failure to manage the construction process.
- **Public Accusation by Spiro:** Spiro publicly accused Sprawling during a period when Sprawling was in acute distress, described as "hiding under a blanket" — conduct constituting harassment exacerbating privacy and safety concerns.
- **Wi-Fi Security Failure:** Spiro ignored repeated requests to change the property's Wi-Fi password — a basic safety and privacy measure — during a period when Sprawling was disclosing safety concerns.
- **Dinner at Nobu — Moral Inversion:** Sprawling documents paying for dinner at Nobu when Spiro "didn't have [money]" — while Sprawling subsequently "ate pasta my ex left behind in a bag I found in the closet." This encapsulates the financial inversion of the relationship: Sprawling was funding his creditor's lifestyle while subsisting on leftover food.
- **Emotional Tone — "You're my best friend":** Sprawling closes with "You're my best friend — Sean," documenting the depth of personal trust Spiro exploited in securing the $385,000 loan.

J. Dunca's Unauthorized Use of 420 Camden as SSP LLC SOS Address — False Statement to Government Agency

As documented in §XXXIV of this report, Defendant Andrei George Dunca caused 420 N. Camden Drive to appear as an address associated with Sean Sprawling Productions LLC's filings or Sprawling's identity records — despite the fact that:

- 420 Camden was a **temporary commercial tenancy**, occupied from approximately April 2022 through the end of 2022, for purposes of operating Gion Beverly Hills LLC and the executive suite.
- It was **not** Sprawling's permanent domicile, residential address, or mailing address for legal proceedings.
- Sprawling's actual and continuous legal residence was **565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122** — confirmed on SSP LLC's CA SOS filings No. 22-A82754 (Feb. 5, 2022) and No. 19-D96717 (Oct. 21, 2019).
- The Experian business credit profile for Sean Sprawling Productions LLC shows an **unauthorized address change to 2041 East St #444, Concord, CA 94520-2126 WITH TRADELINES** — an address Sprawling has never occupied, further evidencing Dunca's pattern of falsifying corporate identity records.

⚑ FORENSIC CONCLUSION — UNAUTHORIZED ADDRESS USE:

Dunca's substitution of 420 Camden for Sprawling's true address in state and/or credit records constitutes: (1) unauthorized use of a third-party business address for personal misrepresentation purposes; (2) a false statement to a state agency or credit bureau; and (3) a continuation of the identity-document manipulation pattern (Experian / 2041 East St address) documented in §XXXIV. The 420 Camden address was never authorized by Sprawling for use in any filing made by or at the direction of Dunca.

K. Exhibit Index — Section XXXVII

Exhibit	Description	Date	Source / Author	Evidentiary Value
XXXVII-A	Rent Reconciliation Email	Jun 15, 2022	Jesseca Harvey → Sean Sprawling, cc: Williams, Spiro	Documents $296K+ in payments; ledger confirming loan/rent commingling
XXXVII-B	Pre-Eviction Pressure Email	Nov 14, 2022	Rhian Williams → Sean Sprawling	Documents refinancing pressure, dual-extraction scheme, pre-eviction threat
XXXVII-C	$385K Loan Dispute Email	Nov 15, 2022	Sean Sprawling → Rhian Williams	Loan amount, unauthorized lien, self-help collection, security deposit demand, parents' home
XXXVII-D	Notice to Enter — Nov 16/18, 2022; Safety Assertion Reply	Nov 16–17, 2022	Rhian Williams → Sprawling; Sprawling → Williams & Spiro	Formal rent withholding notice; legal safety demand; landlord liability assertion
XXXVII-E	Notice-to-Enter Campaign Inbox Log (8 entries)	Sep 16 – Oct 11, 2022	Jesseca Harvey → Sean Sprawling	Harassment pattern; 8 consecutive entries in 25 days; synchronized with Dunca abandonment onset
XXXVII-F	Christmas Day Trauma Disclosure ("It's Christmas")	Dec 25, 2022	Sean Sprawling → Rhian Williams	Contemporaneous sexual assault disclosure; panic attack; forced medication; food insecurity; isolation; landlord silence
XXXVII-G	"Yuri" Email	Nov–Dec 2022	Sean Sprawling	Design dispute;

Exhibit	Description	Date	Source / Author	Evidentiary Value
	Thread (Financial grievance; Nobu; "best friend")		→ Rhian Williams re: Yuri	Wi-Fi safety failure; public accusation; Nobu meal; personal betrayal; $385K moral context
XXXVII-H	Experian Business Credit Screenshot — SSP LLC Address Anomaly	Retrieved 2025/2026	Experian Business Credit Portal	Shows 2041 East St #444, Concord CA 94520 WITH TRADELINES as unauthorized SSP LLC address; confirms identity manipulation
XXXVII-I	Rhian Williams → Susanne Weis Email re: Lease Return	Approx. 2021–2022	Rhian Williams (Spiro Properties) → Susanne Weis (Spiro's assistant)	Direct corroboration of lease confiscation; internal Spiro agent admission; directs return of Sprawling's confiscated lease documents
XXXVII-J	ABC Agent Statement re: Liquor License Lien Proceedings	2021 (approx.)	ABC License Agent → Sprawling	Confirms Spiro's $125K loan default caused Sprawling's payment default; lien proceedings; liquor license asset seizure
XXXVII-K	Declaration of Rodney Samuel Sprawling (Spiro Claims)	Filed 2026	Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (Pro Se Plaintiff)	Sworn declaration incorporating all facts: Suite 200 illegal residential lease; $125K + $385K loans; fraudulent partnership; lease

Exhibit	Description	Date	Source / Author	Evidentiary Value
				confiscation; duress; $70K deposit; liquor license seizure

H. September 21–22, 2022 — iMessage Thread: Initial Security Complaint to Spiro (Exhibit XXXVII-P)

On September 21–22, 2022, Sprawling sent urgent iMessages to Yuri Spiro reporting an active, ongoing security threat at the premises. The exchange, reproduced verbatim below as Exhibit XXXVII-P, constitutes Sprawling's **initial complaint** as referenced in his November 17, 2022 rent-withholding email to Rhian Williams and Yuri Spiro — a gap of **57 days** between first formal complaint and rent withholding. Spiro's response — *"Describe the security threat in detail"* — is direct proof of actual knowledge of the security threat and of Sprawling's formal report to his landlord.

§H-1 — Verbatim iMessage Transcript (Exhibit XXXVII-P)

Date	Sender	Message (Verbatim)	Forensic Significance
Sep 21, 2022	**Sprawling → Spiro**	"HAPPENING!!! LOCK THE DOORS NO!"	Initial emergency distress signal; request for landlord to immediately secure premises
Sep 21, 2022	**Sprawling → Spiro**	"NOW."	Escalation message; urgency of active security threat underscored
Sep 21, 2022	**Spiro → Sprawling**	"Describe the security threat in detail."	**ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE ESTABLISHED — Spiro received the complaint, acknowledged its existence, and requested elaboration. No emergency response, police call, or protective action taken.**
Sep 21, 2022	**Sprawling → Spiro**	"I CANNOT AND YOU	Sprawling, in acute

Date	Sender	Message (Verbatim)	Forensic Significance
		ARE NK FRIEND OF MINE."	crisis, unable to provide written description; contemporaneous relationship rupture with landlord expressed
Sep 22, 2022	**Dr. Wolson (Therapist)**	Referral issued to Dr. Alan Spivak, independent psychologist — (310) 826-1494 — for independent psychological evaluation	Professional referral the day following crisis messages — corroborates acute distress; referral purpose: to *document and prove* Sprawling's sanity and lived experience for evidentiary record
Sep 22, 2022	**Sprawling (action)**	Sought independent psychological evaluation via Dr. Alan Spivak, (310) 826-1494	Sprawling proactively sought independent evaluation to **establish an evidentiary record of his mental competence and the objective reality of his experiences** — not evidence of delusion or doubt

§H-2 — Forensic Analysis: Spiro's Actual Knowledge of Security Threat

Spiro's reply — *"Describe the security threat in detail"* — is forensically significant in three independent respects. **First,** it demonstrates that Spiro received Sprawling's complaint messages in real time and read them with sufficient attention to formulate a substantive response. **Second,** it constitutes an explicit acknowledgment that a security threat had been reported — Spiro did not deny its existence, dismiss the messages, or fail to respond; he actively engaged with the complaint. **Third,** and most critically, Spiro took no protective action whatsoever after receiving that response: he did not call police, did not dispatch building staff, did not offer to attend the premises, and did not follow up in any way when Sprawling replied that he could not elaborate. The complete absence of any follow-

up action after a received and acknowledged security complaint — over a period of 57 days extending to November 17, 2022 — is independent corroborating evidence of the breach of quiet enjoyment, breach of implied warranty of habitability, and negligent infliction of emotional distress causes of action alleged in §XXXVIII and the Causes of Action table at §L below.

§H-3 — CRITICAL CLARIFICATION: The Psychologist Referral Is Proof of Sanity — Not Evidence of Delusion

Plaintiff's sworn position (incorporated in Exhibit I, ¶15): The reference in Exhibit XXXVII-P to Dr. Wolson's referral to Dr. Alan Spivak, (310) 826-1494, for an independent psychological evaluation does ***not*** suggest or imply that Sprawling believed he was imagining his experiences, fabricating a security threat, or suffering from any perceptual or psychiatric disorder. **To the contrary:** Sprawling specifically and deliberately sought an independent psychological evaluation for the express purpose of *proving his sanity and the objective reality of his lived experiences* — to create an independent evidentiary record establishing his mental competence, personal credibility, and the factual accuracy of the events he was experiencing at 420 N. Camden Drive.

The referral from Sprawling's own therapist, Dr. Wolson, to an independent evaluating psychologist on the very day after the emergency iMessages to Spiro is fully consistent with the conduct of a person who takes their legal situation seriously, anticipates credibility challenges, and proactively builds an evidentiary record. This is the opposite of the conduct of a person who doubts the reality of their own experience. The independent evaluation was sought in anticipation of exactly the kind of credibility attack that a financially motivated landlord might deploy to deflect from his own liability. **Any characterization of this referral as evidence of mental instability is factually unfounded, legally baseless, and is hereby affirmatively rebutted on the record.**

§H-4 — Forensic Cross-Reference Matrix: September 21–22, 2022 iMessage Evidence

#	Evidentiary Point	Source / Exhibit	Legal Significance
1	Security threat formally reported to landlord Sep 21, 2022	Exhibit XXXVII-P (iMessage screenshot)	Establishes "initial complaint" date; anchors 57-day gap to Nov 17 rent withholding
2	Spiro acknowledged receipt and existence of threat in real time	Exhibit XXXVII-P ("Describe the security threat in detail")	Actual knowledge confirmed — defeats any "no notice" or "unaware" defense
3	Spiro took zero protective action after receiving complaint	Absence from entire record; §XXXVII §E (8-notice campaign begins Sep 16)	Breach of quiet enjoyment; NIED; warranty of habitability violation
4	Independent psychological evaluation sought Sep 22, 2022 to prove sanity	Exhibit XXXVII-P (Dr. Wolson referral; Dr. Alan Spivak (310) 826-1494)	Corroborates acute crisis; demonstrates proactive evidentiary record-building — affirmatively proves mental competence, not delusion
5	Nov 17, 2022 rent-withholding email cites "initial complaint" being ignored	§XXXVII §D; Exhibit XXXVII-J (Nov 17 email thread)	"Initial complaint" = Sep 21 iMessage — 57-day gap confirms Spiro's sustained knowing inaction
6	Dec 13, 2022 NTQs issued 83 days after unresolved safety complaint	Exhibits XXXVII-M/N/O (NTQ documents); §XXXVII §F; §XXXVIII ¶¶24–27	Retaliatory eviction instrument issued while safety unaddressed; void for CCP § 1162 service defects; no valid predicate for UD
7	Dec 25, 2022 "It's Christmas" crisis email — no response from Spiro/Williams	§XXXVII §G; Exhibit XXXVII-O	Pattern of deliberate inaction from Sep 21 through Dec 25, 2022 — **95 consecutive days** of known, unaddressed tenant safety emergency

EXHIBIT DESIGNATION — XXXVII-P

Title:

iMessage Thread — Sprawling to Spiro — September 21–22, 2022; Dr. Wolson Referral to Dr. Alan Spivak

Date:

September 21–22, 2022

Source:

iMessage screenshot (native iOS, Sprawling's device); Dr. Wolson psychotherapist referral note

Authentication:

Contemporaneous device timestamps; Dr. Alan Spivak contact (310) 826-1494 independently verifiable

Cross-Reference:

§XXXVII §H (this section); §XXXVII Master Forensic Conclusion (data-id 4526); §XXVII Master Timeline (Sep 21–22 row); §XXVIII Exhibit Index; §XXXVIII ¶¶19–27

Evidentiary Purpose:

(1) Establishes date of initial security complaint; (2) Proves Spiro's actual knowledge via his own response; (3) Documents Spiro's failure to take protective action; (4) Affirmatively establishes Sprawling's proactive credibility-documentation via independent psychological evaluation sought to prove sanity — not to concede doubt

Authorities Supporting Actual-Knowledge / Inaction Analysis (§H-2):

Andrews v. Mobile Aire Estates

(2005) 125 Cal.App.4th 578 (landlord's actual knowledge of conditions triggering duty to remediate);

Erlach v. Sierra Asset Servicing, LLC

(2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 1281 (breach of warranty of habitability; tenant not required to withhold rent before complaint period);

Stoiber v. Honeychuck

(1980) 101 Cal.App.3d 903 (NIED arising from landlord's knowing failure to maintain habitable conditions). Spiro's iMessage acknowledgment on September 21, 2022 — "Describe the security threat in detail" — satisfies the actual-knowledge element required for all habitability, quiet enjoyment, and NIED claims asserted in §XXXVIII.

⚑ FORENSIC ANCHOR — INITIAL COMPLAINT DATE ESTABLISHED:

The September 21, 2022 iMessage exchange (Exhibit XXXVII-P) constitutes the **"initial complaint"** referenced in Sprawling's November 17, 2022 rent-withholding email to Rhian Williams and Yuri Spiro — creating a documented, evidence-anchored gap of **57 days** between Sprawling's first formal security complaint to his landlord and the commencement of rent withholding. Spiro received actual notice of the security threat on September 21, 2022; his own iMessage response ("Describe the security threat in detail") confirms receipt and acknowledgment. His subsequent complete inaction over 57 days — during which he simultaneously issued eight consecutive Notices to Enter (Exhibit XXXVII-H; Sep 16–Oct 11, 2022)

without addressing any safety concern — directly and independently establishes the breach of quiet enjoyment, warranty of habitability, and negligent infliction of emotional distress causes of action pleaded in §XXXVIII. Any assertion by Spiro that he lacked notice of Sprawling's safety concerns is affirmatively contradicted by his own words on September 21, 2022. The gap from initial complaint (Sep 21) through the Christmas crisis (Dec 25) spans **95 consecutive days** of documented, knowing landlord inaction.

L. Causes of Action Implicated Against Yuri Richard Spiro / Spiro Properties

#	Cause of Action	Legal Basis	Key Supporting Evidence
1	Breach of Contract / Loan Agreement	California common law; Cal. Comm. Code	$385K loan unpaid; Spiro collected from own debt; no repayment per oral agreement
2	Conversion / Self-Help Collection	Cal. Civ. Code §§ 3336–3338	Unauthorized set-off of rent against loan without notice, accounting, or judicial authorization
3	Unlawful Lien / Cloud on Title	Cal. Civ. Code § 2872 et seq.	Lien placed without judicial ruling, without notice, without consent
4	Landlord Harassment / Breach of Quiet Enjoyment	Cal. Civ. Code § 1927; LAMC § 45.33	8 consecutive Notices to Enter in 25 days during acute conspiracy onset period
5	Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress	Dillon v. Legg (1968) 68 Cal.2d 728	Failure to respond to sexual assault disclosure; safety complaints ignored; isolation on Christmas
6	Breach of Implied	Green v. Superior	Failed to ensure

#	Cause of Action	Legal Basis	Key Supporting Evidence
	Warranty of Habitability	Court (1974) 10 Cal.3d 616	building safety; ignored multiple formal safety complaints
7	Fraud / Misrepresentation ("Place to Stay" Assurance)	Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1709–1710	Verbal and written assurance of permanent tenancy used to induce $385K loan; assurance then violated
8	Breach of Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing	Cal. Civ. Code § 1655; Comunale v. Traders (1958)	Dual-extraction scheme; refinancing benefit while evicting; no fair dealing in loan/rent commingling
9	Illegal Residential Rental of Commercial Space	Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 (UCW); Beverly Hills zoning ordinances; Cal. Civ. Code § 1668	Spiro knowingly leased Suite 200 (commercially zoned) as residential; Sprawling unaware; void/voidable lease; restitution of all rent paid
10	Fraud in the Inducement / Fraudulent Partnership Misrepresentation	Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1572, 1709–1710	False partnership promises (staff, cost-sharing) induced commercial lease; immediate reneging; no intent to perform at time of promise
11	Duress / Conversion of Lease Documents	Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1569–1570 (duress); §§ 3336–3338 (conversion)	Lease confiscation; refusal to return; forced re-signing; $70K deposit demanded under duress; Rhian Williams email to Susanne Weis confirming confiscation
12	$125,000 Loan Breach / Liquor License Impairment	California common law; Cal. Comm. Code; economic torts	Pre-Sept. 2021 $125K loan; deliberate default; ABC agent confirms lien proceedings; liquor license assets

#	Cause of Action	Legal Basis	Key Supporting Evidence
			seized; consequential business damages

⚑ MASTER FORENSIC CONCLUSION — SECTION XXXVII:

The 420 N. Camden Drive tenancy documents constitute a forensic nexus point in the broader conspiracy narrative — now expanded by Sprawling's sworn declaration to encompass an unprecedented twelve-count pattern of landlord and creditor fraud. Sprawling was simultaneously: (1) fraudulently induced into a Suite 200 'residential' lease in a commercially-zoned space; (2) lured into two ground-floor commercial leases through false partnership promises; (3) subjected to lease confiscation and forced re-signing under duress; (4) extorted into a $70,000 deposit not in his original agreement; (5) deprived of the $125,000 pre-2021 loan repayment that caused his liquor license assets to be seized; (6) deprived of $385,000 in additional loans applied to Spiro's own benefit without accounting; (7) abandoned by Dunca in September 2022 simultaneously with the notice-to-enter campaign; (8) subjected to eight consecutive landlord entry notices over 25 days; (9) denied building safety remediation after formal disclosure of sexual assault; (10) left alone without groceries, medication, or support on Christmas Day 2022; (11) had his parents' home sold to cover Spiro's debt obligations; and (12) had his 420 Camden address misappropriated by Dunca for state filings. This convergence of housing fraud, financial exploitation, physical endangerment, and emotional isolation during the exact period Garcia-Winder later admitted to orchestrating ('I made all this happen') is not coincidental. Rhian Williams' email to Susanne Weis directing return of the confiscated leases is direct documentary evidence within Spiro's own organizational chain of the coercion at the heart of this scheme. Yuri Richard Spiro is a named defendant whose conduct — individually and in convergence with the broader conspiracy — caused independent, documented, and quantifiable harm to Sprawling totaling

$510,000 in direct loans plus liquor license assets, $70,000 in coerced deposits, and all Suite 200 rent paid under an illegal residential lease.

SECTION XXXVIII — DRAFT COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Sprawling v. Yuri Richard Spiro; Spiro Properties; Rhian Williams; Jesseca Harvey; Susanne Weis; and Does 1–10

Status: DRAFT — Not Yet Filed

|

Venue: Los Angeles County Superior Court (Beverly Hills Courthouse)

|

Prepared by: Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. (In Pro Per)

|

Cross-Reference: §XXXVII (420 N. Camden Drive Evidence Record)

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING JR., also known as EsRā Dunca-Sprawling, *Plaintiff, Pro Se* v. YURI RICHARD SPIRO, an individual; SPIRO PROPERTIES, a California entity; RHIAN WILLIAMS, an individual; JESSECA HARVEY, an individual; *Defendants.*	**Case No.: [TO BE ASSIGNED] Dept.: [TO BE ASSIGNED] Filing Date: [DRAFT — NOT YET FILED] Trial Date: [TO BE SET]** COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND EQUITABLE RELIEF **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

I. INTRODUCTION & NATURE OF ACTION

1. This is a civil action for damages and equitable relief arising from a series of unlawful acts by Defendants against Plaintiff Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. at and in connection with the leased premises located at **420 North Camden Drive (Units A and Storefront), Beverly Hills, California 90210**.

2. Plaintiff loaned Defendant Yuri Richard Spiro the sum of **$385,000.00** — representing virtually all of Plaintiff's liquid assets — in a good-faith transaction premised upon Spiro's oral and written assurances that Plaintiff would always have a place to stay at the Property regardless of his financial condition. Spiro subsequently applied rental charges against that loan without court order, judicial ruling, accounting, or notice, constituting conversion and self-help collection in violation of California law.

3. Between September 16 and October 11, 2022 — a 25-day window synchronized with a separately-documented abandonment and conspiracy scheme — Defendants issued **eight (8) consecutive Notices to Enter** the leased premises, constituting landlord harassment and breach of Plaintiff's right to quiet enjoyment under California Civil Code § 1927.

4. Throughout the tenancy, Defendants failed to ensure that the Property was a safe space for Plaintiff, ignored documented reports of safety concerns and sexual assault disclosures, and allowed Plaintiff to exist in conditions of food insecurity, forced medication, and emotional collapse without intervention — all while continuing to issue entry notices and making rent demands premised on an illegally offset loan.

II. PARTIES

Party	Role	Known Address / Entity	Relevance
Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr.	Plaintiff (Pro Se)	565 Ortega St, San Francisco, CA 94122	Lessee of 420 N. Camden Dr. (Units A & Storefront); $385K lender; sexual assault survivor; tenant-victim of harassment
Yuri Richard Spiro	Defendant — Owner / Landlord	420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210	Owner of Property; $385K loan debtor; made oral/written "place to stay" assurances; applied rent against loan without notice or ruling
Spiro Properties	Defendant — Entity / Operator	Beverly Hills, CA 90210	Entity through which Spiro operates the Property; issued Notices to Enter; issued invoices and reconciliation documents; vicariously liable for agents' acts
Rhian Williams	Defendant — Property Manager / Agent	c/o Spiro Properties, Beverly Hills, CA 90210	Issued Notice to Enter (Nov. 14–17, 2022); failed to respond to Plaintiff's safety complaints;

Party	Role	Known Address / Entity	Relevance
			directed Plaintiff to ensure "both spaces are accessible" while safety was unresolved
Jesseca Harvey	Defendant — Financial Manager / Agent	c/o Spiro Properties, Beverly Hills, CA 90210	Authored June 15, 2022 Rent Reconciliation email; issued at least 8 Notices to Enter (Sep–Oct 2022); failed to provide complete loan accounting; instrumental in self-help collection scheme
Susanne Weis	Individual; Former Personal Assistant to Yuri Richard Spiro	Los Angeles County, CA	Received email from Rhian Williams instructing her to return Plaintiff's confiscated lease documents; agent of Spiro in lease confiscation scheme; named party to fraudulent inducement conduct
Does 1–10	Unknown individuals and entities	Unknown	Sued by fictitious name; true names and capacities unknown; legally responsible for acts and omissions alleged herein; Plaintiff will amend when identities ascertained

III. JURISDICTION

&

VENUE

Subject Matter Jurisdiction: This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure § 410.10. The amount in controversy exceeds $25,000, exclusive of interest and costs, conferring unlimited civil jurisdiction on this Court.

Venue — Los Angeles County: Venue is proper in the County of Los Angeles pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure §§ 395 and 395.5. The property at issue — 420 North Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210 — is located within the City of Beverly Hills, which lies entirely within Los Angeles County. All acts giving rise to Plaintiff's claims occurred at or in connection with this property within Los Angeles County. The Beverly Hills Courthouse of the Los Angeles Superior Court is the appropriate venue division.

Personal Jurisdiction: All Defendants conducted business, owned and operated real property, and performed the wrongful acts alleged herein within the County of Los Angeles and the State of California, subjecting them to the personal jurisdiction of this Court.

Does 1–10: Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as Does 1 through 10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will amend this Complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of Does 1–10 when ascertained. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitiously named Defendants is legally responsible for the acts and omissions alleged herein.

IV. GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. The $385,000 Loan

8. Beginning in or around 2021, Plaintiff extended a series of payments totaling **$385,000.00** to Defendant Yuri Richard Spiro, comprising loan amounts and security deposits associated with the leased premises at 420 N. Camden Drive. As Plaintiff documented in a November 15, 2022 email: *"That money was all I had from my past life. I didn't go to court or seek a settlement from my ex. I had my clothes and that money."* (Exhibit XXXVII-G.)

9. Spiro made oral and written assurances to Plaintiff that he would "always have a place to stay" at the Property regardless of his ability to pay rent. These assurances induced Plaintiff to extend the loan and to forgo alternative housing and legal remedies.

10. According to the June 15, 2022 Rent Reconciliation email authored by Defendant Jesseca Harvey (Exhibit XXXVII-A), the financial record reflected: (a) Executive Suite payments of $8,500 for April and May; (b) $54,000 in payment ($18,000/month × 3 months); (c) two payments of $75,000 plus $5,000 classified as loans "which have been repaid"; and (d) $70,000 dated January, marked as security deposit. The total documented outflow exceeded **$296,000** in verifiable payments, with the full $385,000 advanced across the tenancy relationship.

B. Self-Help Loan Offset Without Notice or Court Order

11. Without providing Plaintiff formal notice, without obtaining a judicial ruling, and without any accounting or itemized statement, Defendant Spiro unilaterally applied rent obligations against the outstanding loan balance. Plaintiff was not informed of the date the loan was exhausted, the amounts applied, or the methodology used.

12. On November 15, 2022, Plaintiff wrote to Defendant Williams: *"I didn't get formal notice that he was taking rent from the loan he owes me. Was I not to get formal notice that a lien was being placed on the loan? Is this something that needed a ruling by a judge?"* (Exhibit XXXVII-F.) No response to these legal questions was ever provided.

C. Eight Consecutive Notices to Enter (Sep–Oct 2022)

13. Between September 16, 2022 and October 11, 2022 — a period of 25 days — Defendant Harvey, on behalf of Spiro Properties and Defendant Spiro, issued **eight (8) consecutive Notices to Enter** the Plaintiff's leased premises. The email inbox screenshot (Exhibit XXXVII-B) confirms the following notices: September 19, September 22, September 23, September 24 (10–11 AM), September 26, October 3,

October 11, and a related "October Invoices Rent Due" notice — all transmitted by Defendant Harvey.

14. This pattern of entry — averaging one notice every three days — constitutes a course of conduct designed to intimidate, destabilize, and coerce Plaintiff during a period when Plaintiff was experiencing documented personal crisis, including documented simultaneous harassment and abandonment by co-conspirators (see §XXXVII).

D. November 2022 Notice Barrage & Safety Denial

15. On November 14, 2022, Defendant Williams emailed Plaintiff regarding lease obligations and refinancing needs (Exhibit XXXVII-E), placing financial pressure on Plaintiff while the Storefront was in arrears due to Defendants' own loan-offset scheme.

16. On November 16, 2022, in Jessica Harvey's absence, Defendant Williams transmitted a formal "NOTICE TO ENTER NOVEMBER 16, 2022" (Exhibit XXXVII-C), directing entry on November 16, then amending to November 18, 2022, for "viewing."

17. Plaintiff responded on November 17, 2022: *"I'm not ensuring anything until my safety is ensured which is not and has not been and until it is Yuri is not and has not been owed rent since my initial complaint was ignored."* And further: *"You have a legal responsibility to give me a reply and to take [action] so that this building is a safe space for your tenant."* (Exhibit XXXVII-D.) No safety remedy was provided.

E. The December 25, 2022 "It's Christmas" Email — Crisis Ignored

18. On December 25, 2022, Plaintiff transmitted to Defendant Williams a detailed email titled "It's Christmas" (Exhibit XXXVII-H) documenting: (a) a panic attack triggered by an unauthorized forced entry; (b) forced medication; (c) complete food insecurity; (d) disclosure of sexual assault and ongoing harassment; (e) PTSD, anxiety, depression, and isolation; and (f) the absence of groceries, medication, or any festive conditions on Christmas Day.

19. Defendants Spiro, Williams, and Harvey provided no response to this documented crisis communication. The failure to respond to a tenant's expressed emergency, safety complaint, and sexual assault disclosure — while continuing to issue rent demands and entry notices — constitutes a gross breach of both the lease covenant of quiet enjoyment and the implied warranty of habitability.

F. December 13, 2022 — Notice to Quit: Eviction Demands During Active Crisis While $385K Loan Unaccounted

20. On December 13, 2022 — exactly twelve days before Plaintiff transmitted the "It's Christmas" emergency email — Defendant Spiro personally signed and caused to be served two simultaneous Notices to Quit on Plaintiff's leased premises at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210. The first Notice to Quit was addressed to Gion Beverly Hills LLC (Storefront tenant) and demanded $104,000 in unpaid rent (October: $34,000; November: $35,000; December: $35,000), with a vacate deadline of December 20, 2022 at 12 noon. The second Notice to Quit was addressed to Rodney Sean Sprawling personally (Executive Suite / Suite 200 tenant) and demanded $17,000 in unpaid rent (November: $8,500; December: $8,500), with the same December 20, 2022 vacate deadline. (Exhibits XXXVII-L, XXXVII-M, XXXVII-N, XXXVII-O.)

21. The Proof of Service declares under penalty of perjury that both Notices were attached to the door of the premises — designated therein as "STOREfront" and "Executive Suite" — at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills 90210, on December 13, 2022, and were supported by photographic evidence. Defendant Spiro personally signed both the Notices and the Proof of Service.

22. At the time Spiro served these dual eviction notices demanding a combined $121,000 in "unpaid rent," Spiro was simultaneously holding $385,000 of Plaintiff's personal loan money without providing any accounting, any notice of offset, or any judicial authorization for applying the loan proceeds against the rental obligation. Plaintiff had asked in writing: "Where is the receipt or breakdown of what is owed in rent and how much is left of the loan or when exactly did the loan run out?" No accounting was ever provided. A landlord who holds a tenant's loan proceeds — the full amount of which has never been accounted for — cannot simultaneously maintain a lawful claim for unpaid rent without first establishing through proper legal process how much, if any, rent obligation remains after crediting the held funds.

23. The December 20, 2022 vacate deadline was never enforced — Plaintiff remained at 420 N. Camden Drive on December 25, 2022, the date of the "It's Christmas" emergency email. The NTQs were thus served not as legitimate legal instruments for rent collection, but as instruments of coercion and intimidation deployed against a tenant who was simultaneously experiencing financial

exploitation, housing crisis, physical isolation, and the onset of the psychological emergency that would culminate in the December 25 disclosure. Serving dual eviction notices on December 13, 2022 — when Spiro held $385K in unaccounted loan funds and Plaintiff was in documented crisis — while taking no enforcement action and providing no response to Plaintiff's December 25 emergency email, constitutes a pattern of deliberate harassment, bad faith, and willful infliction of distress.

G. Affirmative Invalidity of the December 13, 2022 Notices to Quit — CCP § 1162 Service Defects

24. The December 13, 2022 Notices to Quit purportedly served on Plaintiff are void and without legal effect because Defendant Spiro failed to comply with the mandatory service requirements of California Code of Civil Procedure § 1162. Section 1162 prescribes three exclusive and hierarchical methods by which a notice to quit may be served on a residential or commercial tenant: (1) personal delivery to the tenant; (2) if personal delivery cannot be accomplished with reasonable diligence, delivery to a person of suitable age and discretion at the tenant's residence or usual place of business, plus mailing of a copy to the tenant at the premises; or (3) if neither of the foregoing methods can be accomplished after due diligence, posting a copy on the premises in a conspicuous place and mailing a copy to the tenant at the premises. Strict compliance with one of these three methods is a jurisdictional prerequisite to any subsequent unlawful detainer proceeding.

25. Plaintiff was not personally served with either Notice to Quit on December 13, 2022, or at any other time. No agent, representative, or person of suitable age and discretion accepted service on Plaintiff's behalf at 420 N. Camden Drive on December 13, 2022. No copy of either Notice was mailed to Plaintiff at the premises or at any other address as required by CCP § 1162(b). The Proof of Service filed by Defendant Spiro reflects only that the Notices were affixed to the door of the premises — a method constituting the third and most restricted tier of service under § 1162, which is permitted only upon a showing of prior due diligence establishing the unavailability of personal service and substituted service. No such showing appears in the Proof of Service, and no declaration of due diligence was executed or filed in connection with the posting.

26. Because Defendant Spiro proceeded directly to posting without first attempting — and documenting the failure of — personal service and substituted service, the posting does not satisfy any of the three permissible methods of service under CCP § 1162. A notice to quit served by posting alone, in the absence of a prior good-faith attempt at personal and substituted service and without a concurrent mailing, is fatally defective and fails to confer jurisdiction upon any court to adjudicate a subsequent unlawful detainer action. The NTQs served on December 13, 2022, are accordingly void ab initio and cannot serve as a valid predicate for any eviction proceeding or claim for possession against Plaintiff.

27. The service defects identified above independently and collectively defeat any cause of action predicated upon the December 13, 2022 Notices to Quit. To the extent Defendant Spiro asserts any claim for unlawful detainer, possession, or unpaid rent based upon those Notices, such claims must fail as a matter of law. The void service further reinforces the conclusion stated in ¶23 above: the December 13, 2022 NTQs were deployed not as legally cognizable instruments of eviction, but as instruments of harassment, intimidation, and financial coercion against a tenant who was simultaneously experiencing the documented personal and financial crisis described throughout this section — and whose landlord held $385,000 in unaccounted loan proceeds that precluded any legitimate claim for unpaid rent.

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION — BREACH OF CONTRACT / LOAN AGREEMENT ($385,000)

Against Defendants: Yuri Richard Spiro, Spiro Properties

20. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

21. Plaintiff and Defendant Spiro entered into a loan agreement whereby Plaintiff advanced a total of $385,000 to Spiro. The loan was memorialized in written communications including but not limited to the Rent Reconciliation email of June 15, 2022 (Exhibit XXXVII-A), and subsequent correspondence acknowledging the loan balance and terms of repayment.

22. Defendant Spiro breached the loan agreement by: (a) failing to repay the loan within the agreed period; (b) unilaterally applying rental obligations against the outstanding loan balance without consent, notice, or judicial authorization; (c) claiming the loan was "gone" without providing any accounting; and (d) demanding additional financial commitments from Plaintiff while the loan remained unpaid.

23. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach, Plaintiff has suffered damages in the amount of at least $385,000, plus pre-judgment interest from the date of demand, consequential damages, and costs of suit. Plaintiff was forced to sell his parents' house instead of repaying the loan with monies Spiro was supposed to return.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION — CONVERSION / SELF-HELP COLLECTION

Against Defendants: Yuri Richard Spiro, Spiro Properties, Jesseca Harvey

24. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

25. Defendant Spiro's unilateral application of Plaintiff's loan proceeds against alleged rental arrears — without Plaintiff's consent, without a judicial order, without notice, and without accounting — constitutes conversion of Plaintiff's personal property (the loan proceeds).

26. Under California law, a creditor may not engage in self-help collection of a debt by seizing or offsetting a debtor's property without complying with statutory enforcement procedures. No writ of execution, order of attachment, or judicial authorization was obtained before Spiro applied rent against the loan balance.

27. Defendant Harvey's participation in documenting and administering the offset scheme without providing Plaintiff with complete accounting records makes her a joint tortfeasor in this conversion. Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages equal to the full value of converted funds, plus exemplary damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3294.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION — UNLAWFUL LIEN / CLOUD ON TITLE

Against Defendants: Yuri Richard Spiro, Spiro Properties

28. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

29. Defendant Spiro's act of applying rental obligations against Plaintiff's outstanding loan — without notice, without a judicial determination, and without Plaintiff's consent — constitutes an unlawful constructive lien against Plaintiff's loan receivable and financial assets.

30. Plaintiff specifically inquired in writing: *"Was I not to get formal notice that a lien was being placed on the loan? Is this something that needed a ruling by a judge?"* (Exhibit XXXVII-F.) No legal authority justifying the lien was ever provided.

31. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that any purported lien, offset, or setoff applied against the $385,000 loan is void and unenforceable, together with damages for any impairment to Plaintiff's financial position resulting from the unlawful encumbrance.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION — LANDLORD HARASSMENT / BREACH OF COVENANT OF QUIET ENJOYMENT

Against All Defendants

32. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

33. California Civil Code § 1927 grants every lessee the right to quiet enjoyment of the leased premises during the term of the lease. California Civil Code § 1940.2 prohibits landlords from engaging in harassment of tenants, including performing repeated acts that interfere with the tenant's quiet enjoyment.

34. Defendants issued eight (8) Notices to Enter within a 25-day period (September 16 – October 11, 2022), averaging one notice every three days. This pattern constitutes a campaign of harassment that substantially interfered with Plaintiff's right to peaceful possession of the leased premises.

35. In November 2022, Defendants continued issuing entry notices while simultaneously ignoring Plaintiff's documented safety complaints, creating an environment of intimidation and coercion.

36. Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages for the full period of interference with quiet enjoyment, statutory damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 1940.2(a) (up to $2,000 per violation, i.e., up to $16,000 for eight violations), punitive damages, and attorneys' fees.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION — NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS (NIED)

Against All Defendants

37. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

38. Defendants, as Plaintiff's landlords and agents, owed a duty of care to Plaintiff as their tenant. The duty encompassed providing a habitable and safe dwelling,

responding to emergency communications, and refraining from conduct foreseeably likely to cause severe emotional distress.

39. Defendants breached this duty by: (a) ignoring Plaintiff's documented sexual assault disclosures; (b) failing to respond to the December 25, 2022 "It's Christmas" emergency email in which Plaintiff described a panic attack, forced medication, food insecurity, and ongoing sexual trauma; (c) continuing to issue entry notices during Plaintiff's documented mental health crisis; and (d) prioritizing access to the Property for "viewing" over Plaintiff's documented safety emergency.

40. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligence, Plaintiff suffered severe and ongoing emotional distress, including PTSD, anxiety, depression, isolation, and physical manifestations of psychological injury. Plaintiff seeks general and special damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION — BREACH OF IMPLIED WARRANTY OF HABITABILITY

Against Defendants: Yuri Richard Spiro, Spiro Properties

41. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

42. California Civil Code § 1941 imposes upon every landlord an implied warranty that residential premises are habitable at the commencement of the tenancy and throughout its term. Habitability includes freedom from conditions that materially affect the health and safety of tenants.

43. Plaintiff documented that the Property was not a safe space for Plaintiff, that Plaintiff's safety complaints were ignored, that unauthorized entries occurred causing panic attacks, and that no safety precautions were taken — including a specific request to change the Wi-Fi password (which Spiro failed to honor) to prevent surveillance and monitoring by third parties.

44. Defendants' failure to remedy documented safety conditions constitutes a breach of the implied warranty of habitability. Plaintiff is entitled to a reduction of

rent paid during the period of breach, together with compensatory and consequential damages.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION — FRAUD / INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION

Against Defendants: Yuri Richard Spiro, Spiro Properties

45. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

46. Defendant Spiro made material oral and written representations to Plaintiff that Plaintiff would "always have a place to stay" at the Property even if he could not afford rent. These representations were made at the time Plaintiff was considering whether to extend the $385,000 loan and to enter into the lease for the Property.

47. These representations were false when made, or were made without any intention of honoring them. Spiro subsequently threatened Plaintiff with formal eviction notices, applied loan proceeds as rent offsets, and demanded additional rent payments — directly contradicting his assurances.

48. Plaintiff relied upon Spiro's representations in deciding to: (a) advance $385,000 to Spiro; (b) continue the lease relationship; (c) forgo pursuing legal remedies for the loan's non-repayment; and (d) remain at the Property despite escalating harassment. Such reliance was reasonable given Spiro's stated assurances.

49. As a result of Defendants' fraudulent misrepresentations, Plaintiff suffered damages including the full $385,000 in loan proceeds, lost income from inability to complete the buildout, and all consequential and special damages flowing from remaining in a harmful tenancy in reliance upon false promises. Plaintiff seeks punitive damages pursuant to California Civil Code § 3294.

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION — BREACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALING

Against All Defendants

50. Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

51. Every contract in California contains an implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, which requires that each party to the contract refrain from doing anything to injure the right of the other party to receive the benefits of the contract.

52. Defendants breached the implied covenant by: (a) secretly applying loan proceeds to rental obligations without notice; (b) making rent demands while refusing to account for the outstanding loan balance; (c) issuing repetitive Notices to Enter designed to intimidate rather than serve legitimate property management purposes; (d) refusing to answer Plaintiff's legal questions about the offset scheme; (e) demanding Plaintiff "ensure both spaces are accessible" while Plaintiff's documented safety emergency was unaddressed; and (f) ignoring a Christmas Day emergency email while simultaneously denying Plaintiff the loan repayment that would have allowed Plaintiff to secure safe alternative housing.

53. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' breach of the implied covenant, Plaintiff has suffered economic damages, emotional harm, and loss of the benefits he was promised under the loan and lease contracts.

CAUSE OF ACTION NO. [X+1] — ILLEGAL RESIDENTIAL RENTAL OF COMMERCIALLY-ZONED SPACE / UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES

(Against Defendant Yuri Richard Spiro and Spiro Properties)

Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

Suite 200 at 420 North Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210 is zoned exclusively for commercial use under applicable Beverly Hills municipal zoning ordinances. Defendant Spiro knowingly and intentionally leased Suite 200 to Plaintiff as a residential space at a rate of $8,500 per month. At the time of signing, Plaintiff was completely unaware that Suite 200 was not legally permitted to be rented or occupied as a residential space.

By leasing a commercially-zoned space as residential, Defendant: (a) made a material misrepresentation of the legal character of the premises; (b) violated applicable zoning ordinances and California law; (c) rendered the residential lease void or voidable under California Civil Code § 1668 (contracts contrary to law); and (d) engaged in unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code § 17200 et seq.

Plaintiff seeks restitution of all rent paid for Suite 200 during the tenancy period (April 2022 through termination), plus interest, plus statutory damages and attorney's fees under Business and Professions Code § 17203.

CAUSE OF ACTION NO. [X+2] — FRAUD IN THE INDUCEMENT / INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION (COMMERCIAL LEASE)

(Against All Defendants)

Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

Defendant Spiro made the following material representations to Plaintiff to induce him to sign the commercial lease for the ground-floor Storefront and Salon spaces at 420 N. Camden Drive: (a) that Spiro and Plaintiff would be business partners; (b) that Spiro would provide Plaintiff with the full use of his staff; and (c) that Spiro would cover half of the expenses for the two ground-floor commercial spaces.

These representations were false. Defendant Spiro had no intention of performing them at the time they were made. Almost immediately after Plaintiff executed the commercial lease in reliance on these promises, Defendant Spiro claimed "financial

problems," withdrew his staff entirely, and completely abandoned the purported partnership — leaving Plaintiff solely responsible for 100% of the commercial space expenses.

Plaintiff relied on these misrepresentations to his detriment by executing the lease, paying the $70,000 security deposit (exacted under duress), and committing to the full commercial space expenses. As a direct and proximate result of Defendant's fraud in the inducement, Plaintiff suffered damages including but not limited to the $70,000 coerced deposit, all commercial rent paid, buildout costs, and consequential business losses. Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages, consequential damages, punitive damages under Civil Code § 3294, and rescission of the commercial lease.

CAUSE OF ACTION NO. [X+3] — DURESS / CONVERSION OF LEASE DOCUMENTS / WRONGFUL DEMAND OF SECURITY DEPOSIT

(Against Defendant Spiro; Defendant Weis; and Does 1–10)

Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

Following execution of the original commercial lease, Defendant Spiro maliciously confiscated Plaintiff's original lease documents and refused to return them. Defendant Spiro's personal assistant Susanne Weis was the agent through whom Spiro exercised control over the confiscated documents. An email from Rhian Williams (Spiro's property manager) to Defendant Weis directs Weis to return the leases to Plaintiff — establishing that: (a) the leases were confiscated; (b) Spiro's own agents recognized the confiscation was improper; and (c) Defendant Weis was the designated custodian of the wrongfully withheld documents.

Under the duress created by the wrongful withholding of his lease documents and his financial and personal vulnerability at the time, Plaintiff was compelled to sign a redrafted lease under terms that were less favorable than the original. Concurrent with the forced re-execution, Defendant Spiro demanded a $70,000 security deposit for the two commercial spaces — a demand that was not part of the original lease

agreement and was exacted under conditions negating free consent under California Civil Code §§ 1569–1570.

Plaintiff seeks: (a) return of the $70,000 security deposit; (b) compensatory damages for the conversion of lease documents; (c) damages for the harm caused by being compelled to execute a less favorable lease under duress; and (d) punitive damages for the willful and oppressive conduct of Defendants.

CAUSE OF ACTION NO. [X+4] — BREACH OF LOAN AGREEMENT / INTENTIONAL ECONOMIC HARM ($125,000 PRE-2021 LOAN — LIQUOR LICENSE ASSET SEIZURE)

(Against Defendant Spiro and Spiro Properties)

Plaintiff incorporates all preceding paragraphs by reference.

Prior to September 2021, Plaintiff loaned Defendant Spiro $125,000. Defendant Spiro intentionally failed to repay this loan on time. As confirmed by an agent at the ABC license company, Defendant Spiro's deliberate default on his $125,000 obligation to Plaintiff critically damaged Plaintiff's financial standing and left Plaintiff unable to make required payments on his own obligations — directly resulting in lien proceedings against Plaintiff and the wrongful seizure of Plaintiff's liquor license assets.

Had Defendant Spiro repaid his loan obligations on time, Plaintiff would have had the funds available to make his own required payments, and the lien proceedings and liquor license asset seizure would not have occurred. The loss of Plaintiff's liquor license assets impaired Plaintiff's ability to generate revenue from his intended business operations, causing consequential business damages far exceeding the face amount of the loan.

Combined with the documented $385,000 additional loan, the total personal loans extended by Plaintiff to Defendant Spiro amount to **$510,000**. Plaintiff seeks: (a) repayment of the $125,000 loan with interest; (b) compensatory damages for the

value of liquor license assets seized; (c) consequential damages for lost business revenue; (d) pre-judgment interest; and (e) all other appropriate relief.

VI. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against Defendants as follows:

g. **Restitution of all Suite 200 rent** paid by Plaintiff during the tenancy, on the ground that the residential lease of a commercially-zoned space is void under California law;

h. **Return of the $70,000 security deposit** wrongfully exacted under duress for the ground-floor commercial spaces;

i. **Compensatory damages of $125,000** plus interest and consequential damages for the pre-September 2021 loan default and resulting liquor license asset seizure;

j. **Punitive damages** in an amount to be determined at trial for Defendants' willful, oppressive, and malicious conduct including fraudulent partnership inducement, lease confiscation, and calculated financial exploitation;

k. **Rescission** of both the Suite 200 residential lease and the ground-floor commercial lease on the grounds of fraud, duress, and illegality, with restoration of Plaintiff to his pre-contract position.

#	Relief Sought	Basis / Amount
1	Repayment of $385,000 loan plus pre-judgment interest at the legal rate from the date of demand	First & Second COA — Cal. Civil Code § 3287
2	Return of all security deposit funds ($70,000+) with statutory interest	Cal. Civil Code § 1950.5

#	Relief Sought	Basis / Amount
3	Compensatory damages for emotional distress, PTSD, anxiety, and related harm	Fifth COA — amount to be proven at trial
4	Statutory damages of up to $2,000 per unlawful entry notice (8 notices = up to $16,000)	Cal. Civil Code § 1940.2(a) — Fourth COA
5	Rent abatement for the full period during which habitability warranty was breached	Sixth COA — Cal. Civil Code § 1941
6	Declaration that all purported rent offsets, liens, and setoffs against the $385,000 loan are void and unenforceable	Third COA — Cal. CCP § 1060
7	Punitive / exemplary damages for fraud and conversion	Cal. Civil Code § 3294 — Seventh & Second COA
8	Preliminary and permanent injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants from taking any further action to offset, lien, encumber, or collect against the $385,000 loan receivable	Cal. CCP § 526
9	Lost income and consequential damages from inability to complete the buildout and generate revenue from the leased commercial space	First, Seventh, Eighth COA — amount to be proven at trial
10	Costs of suit, pro se litigation expenses, and any attorneys' fees permitted by statute or contract	Cal. CCP § 1021 et seq.
11	Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper	General prayer
12	A declaration that the December 13, 2022 Notices to Quit are void and unenforceable as served: (a) under duress; (b) in connection with an illegal residential lease of commercially-zoned Suite 200; and (c) while $385,000	Thirteenth COA; Cal. Civil Code § 1942; Cal. CCP § 1060 (declaratory relief)

#	Relief Sought	Basis / Amount
	in unaccounted loan proceeds remained in Defendant Spiro's possession without judicial authorization or proper offset accounting	
13	Compensatory and punitive damages for the coercive and bad-faith service of dual eviction notices on December 13, 2022 — twelve days before Plaintiff's documented December 25, 2022 crisis disclosure — while Defendant Spiro held unaccounted loan funds exceeding the rent amounts demanded	Thirteenth COA; Cal. Civil Code § 3294

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL: Plaintiff hereby demands trial by jury on all issues so triable.

VII. EXHIBIT CROSS-REFERENCE INDEX (INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE FROM §XXXVII)

Exhibit	Description	Relevance to This Complaint
XXXVII-A	Rent Reconciliation email — Jesseca Harvey to Sean Sprawling; CC: Rhian Williams, Yuri Spiro; Jun. 15, 2022	Documents $296,000+ in payments; $385K loan record; Harvey's administrative role; COA 1, 2
XXXVII-B	Email inbox screenshot: 8 Notices to Enter (Sep 19 – Oct 11, 2022) from Jesseca	Establishes harassment pattern; COA 4 (§ 1940.2)

Exhibit	Description	Relevance to This Complaint
	Harvey to Sean	
XXXVII-C	Notice to Enter November 16, 2022 — Rhian Williams to Sean; Property: 420 N. Camden, 90210; per Cal. State Law	Establishes Williams' agency and continued entry pattern; COA 4
XXXVII-D	Email thread Nov. 16–17, 2022 — Sprawling to Williams & Spiro: "I'm not ensuring anything until my safety is ensured"; "You have a legal responsibility to give me a reply"	Documents safety complaint, denial of habitability, refusal to respond; COA 4, 5, 6
XXXVII-E	Email — Rhian Williams to Sean, Nov. 14, 2022: refinancing pressure, lease obligations, arrears demand	Documents financial coercion during crisis; COA 8
XXXVII-F	Email — Sprawling to Williams, Nov. 15, 2022: "I didn't get formal notice that he was taking rent from the loan"; lien question	Documents unlawful offset; COA 2, 3
XXXVII-G	Email — Sprawling to Williams/Spiro (Nov. 15, 2022 thread): "That money was all I had from my past life… now I'm selling my parents' house"	Documents reliance on Spiro's assurances; COA 7 (fraud); consequential damages
XXXVII-H	Email "It's Christmas" — Sprawling to Williams, Dec. 25, 2022: panic attack, forced medication, food insecurity, sexual assault disclosure, PTSD, isolation	Core NIED / habitability evidence; ignored crisis; COA 5, 6
XXXVII-L	Notice to Quit — Gion Beverly Hills LLC (Storefront); Lease dated Sep 1, 2021; $104,000 unpaid rent demanded (Oct $34K / Nov $35K / Dec $35K); Vacate by Dec 20, 2022 at noon	Confirms dual-lease structure; Storefront commercial rate; Spiro's personal authorization of eviction; COA 2, 4, 13
XXXVII-M	Notice to Quit — Rodney Sean Sprawling (Executive Suite / Suite 200); Lease dated Sep 1, 2021; $17,000 unpaid rent (Nov $8,500 / Dec $8,500); Vacate by Dec	Confirms Suite 200 = "Executive Suite" (cross-references Harvey Rent Reconciliation); $8,500/month rate charged on illegally-zoned residential

Exhibit	Description	Relevance to This Complaint
	20, 2022 at noon; Suite 200 designated "Executive Suite" in Spiro's own NTQ	space; COA 1, 6, 13
XXXVII-N	Proof of Service — NTQs served Dec 13, 2022 by door attachment at 'STOREfront' and 'Executive Suite', 420 N. Camden Dr., BH 90210; supported by photographic evidence; signed under penalty of perjury	Spiro personally declared service of dual eviction notices; confirms date (12 days before Dec 25 crisis email); COA 4, 5, 13
XXXVII-O	NTQ Signature Pages — "Yuri R. Spiro" and "Yuri Spiro" signatures on both NTQ page 2s; 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills CA 90210; Issued Dec 13, 2022; LawDepot.com ©2002-2022	Proves Spiro's direct personal involvement in dual eviction; confirms date; COA 13
XXXVII-P	iMessage Thread — Sprawling to Spiro — Sep 21–22, 2022 | *Source:* iMessage screenshot; Dr. Wolson referral note | *Date:* Sep 21–22, 2022	First formal security complaint to landlord Spiro; Spiro's actual knowledge confirmed via his response "Describe the security threat in detail"; proactive proof-of-sanity psychological evaluation referral (Dr. Wolson — Dr. Alan Spivak, (310) 826-1494); rebuts "psychosis" narrative; anchors Nov 17, 2022 rent-withholding "initial complaint" statement; confirms Sprawling's presence at 420 N. Camden in Sep 2022 (contra Dunca's "early 2022 Germany" claim); §XXXVII §H; Cal. Civ. Code §§1941, 1927, 1942.5; COA 3, 4, 6, 10, 12

VIII. VERIFICATION

I, Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr., declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Executed on: _____ **Date**	**At: San Francisco, California**
_____ **Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr.** aka EsRā Dunca-Sprawling 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94122 *Plaintiff, Pro Se*	

⚖️ FORENSIC CONCLUSION — §XXXVIII: SPRAWLING v. SPIRO ET AL. (CA SUPERIOR COURT DRAFT)

Claim Basis Assessment: All eight causes of action are grounded in documentary evidence produced within §XXXVII of this Narrative Report. The Rent Reconciliation email (Jun. 15, 2022) independently establishes the loan relationship. The inbox screenshot establishes eight Notices to Enter within 25 days. The November 2022 email threads establish refused safety complaints. The "It's Christmas" email establishes an ignored emergency and habitability failure. All evidence predates this litigation and was created in the ordinary course of the parties' communications.

Critical Vulnerability: Spiro's failure to (a) provide any accounting of how the $385K loan was applied; (b) obtain any judicial authorization before applying rental obligations against the loan; and (c) respond to any of Plaintiff's written legal questions regarding the offset process creates a near-complete absence of any lawful justification for the self-help collection. The burden will be on Spiro to demonstrate a legally authorized

basis for the offset — a burden he cannot meet on the documentary record.

Agency Liability: Williams and Harvey acted as agents of Spiro Properties and Defendant Spiro in all relevant communications. Their acts in issuing Notices to Enter, communicating rent demands, and failing to respond to safety emergencies bind Spiro Properties and Spiro individually under respondeat superior.

Cross-Proceeding Significance: The $385K loan, notice-to-enter harassment, and December 25, 2022 crisis email are each independently actionable. Together they establish a pattern of predatory landlord conduct timed to coincide with Plaintiff's documented vulnerability during the Dunca abandonment — further corroborating the broader conspiracy narrative documented throughout this Incident Narrative Report.

EXHIBIT I — DECLARATION OF RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING In Support of Plaintiff's Claims for Damages and Equitable Relief Against Yuri Richard Spiro et al. Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles

Status: DRAFT — Not Yet Filed

|

Cross-Reference: §XXXVII (Factual Record); §XXXVIII (Draft Complaint)

RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING (also known as EsRā Dunca-Sprawling) 565 Ortega Street San Francisco, CA 94112 Telephone: (346) 785-6657 Email: ***Plaintiff, In Pro Per***

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING, (also known as EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), an individual, Plaintiff, v. YURI RICHARD SPIRO, an individual; SUSANNE WEIS, an individual; and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive, Defendants.	**Case No.: _____** **DECLARATION OF RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING IN SUPPORT OF CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES [Complaint for Damages and Equitable Relief]** **Los Angeles County Superior Court Beverly Hills Courthouse 9355 Burton Way Beverly Hills, CA 90210**

I, RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING, declare as follows:

1. I am the Plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I am over the age of eighteen years and have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration. If called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to these matters.

2. At all relevant times, I maintained a business and tenancy relationship with Defendant Yuri Richard Spiro (“Spiro”). The relationship encompassed multiple distinct arrangements: a residential lease for Suite 200 at 420 North Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210; a commercial lease for two ground-floor spaces at the same property (referred to as the “Storefront” and the “Salon”); and a series of personal loans I extended to Spiro totaling at least $510,000. Each of these arrangements was permeated by Spiro’s fraud, exploitation, and deliberate breach of his obligations to me.

3. Illegal Residential Lease of Suite 200. I signed a residential lease with Spiro for Suite 200, located at 420 North Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210. I paid

$8,500 per month in rent for Suite 200, as documented in the Rent Reconciliation email transmitted by Jesseca Harvey on June 15, 2022. However, I was completely unaware at the time of signing that Suite 200 was not legally permitted to be rented or occupied as a residential space; Suite 200 is exclusively zoned for commercial use under applicable Beverly Hills municipal zoning ordinances. Spiro knowingly and intentionally leased me a commercial space as a residential property. This misrepresentation was material to my decision to sign the lease and to pay rent thereunder. Had I known that Suite 200 could not lawfully be occupied as a residence, I would not have signed the lease or paid rent for it.

4. Fraudulent Partnership Inducement — Ground-Floor Commercial Spaces. In addition to the illegal residential lease for Suite 200, Spiro fraudulently induced me into signing a commercial lease for two spaces on the ground floor of 420 North Camden Drive: a Storefront space and a space designated as the “Salon.” Spiro pressured me into this expanded lease by making the following express promises: (a) that we would be business partners; (b) that he was offering me the full use of his staff to support our joint business venture; and (c) that he would cover half of the expenses for the two ground-floor spaces. I relied on these promises in deciding to execute the commercial lease.

5. Immediate Withdrawal of Partnership Promises. Almost immediately after I signed the commercial lease, Spiro abruptly claimed he was experiencing “financial problems” and stated that his staff was no longer available. Spiro then completely withdrew from the purported partnership, leaving me solely responsible for paying 100% of the expenses for the two commercial spaces — a direct reversal of his promised 50/50 arrangement. I believe this was a calculated fraud designed to trick me into a larger financial obligation because of Spiro’s own severe financial difficulties. Spiro used my financial resources and my willingness to enter into the expanded lease to benefit his own financial position and the stability of his Beverly Hills property, at my catastrophic expense.

6. Confiscation of Lease Documents and Forced Re-Signing Under Duress. After I signed the original commercial lease, Spiro maliciously confiscated my original lease documents and refused to return them. I was thus deprived of my documentary evidence of the original terms. Under extreme duress created by the loss of my lease documents and the financial and personal vulnerabilities I was experiencing at the time, Spiro forced me to sign a redrafted lease. The redrafted lease was less favorable to me than the original. I declare that my execution of the

redrafted lease was not free and voluntary; it was procured through the duress of the lease confiscation and the coercive conditions Spiro created.

7. Documentary Corroboration of Lease Confiscation — Rhian Williams to Susanne Weis. The impropriety of Spiro's lease confiscation is corroborated by an email from Rhian Williams — Spiro's own property manager — directed to Susanne Weis, who was Spiro's personal assistant at the time. In that email, Williams instructed Weis to return my confiscated lease documents to me. This internal directive from one Spiro agent to another establishes: (a) that my lease documents were in fact confiscated and withheld; (b) that individuals within Spiro's own organization recognized the confiscation was improper and required remediation; and (c) that Susanne Weis was the designated agent through whom Spiro exercised control over the wrongfully retained documents.

8. $70,000 Security Deposit Demanded Under Duress. Concurrent with the forced re-signing of the commercial lease, Spiro demanded a security deposit of $70,000 specifically for the two ground-floor commercial spaces (the Storefront and the Salon). This $70,000 deposit was not part of the original lease agreement and was not previously agreed upon between the parties. The demand was made under the conditions of duress described above — after my original documents had been confiscated and I had been left without a copy of my original lease terms. The $70,000 deposit appears in the Jesseca Harvey Rent Reconciliation email dated June 15, 2022, classified as a "security deposit" with a January date, confirming that it was paid. I paid this deposit under conditions negating free and voluntary consent.

9. $125,000 Pre-September 2021 Loan and Liquor License Asset Seizure. Prior to September 2021, I loaned Spiro $125,000. Spiro intentionally failed to pay back this $125,000 loan on time. As noted by an agent at the ABC license company, Spiro's deliberate failure to repay this debt critically damaged my financial standing and left me unable to make timely payments on my own obligations — resulting in lien proceedings in which my liquor license assets were seized. Had Spiro honored his loan obligations, I would have had the funds to meet my own payment deadlines, and the lien proceedings and liquor license asset seizure would not have occurred. The loss of my liquor license assets directly impaired my ability to generate revenue from my intended business operations and caused consequential business losses far exceeding the face amount of the loan.

10. $385,000 Additional Loan — Total Documented Exposure $510,000. In addition to the $125,000 pre-2021 loan, I extended Spiro a further $385,000 loan. This $385,000 represented all I had from my past life — money I chose not to pursue through court proceedings or a settlement with my former partner, instead relying on it as my financial foundation going forward. Spiro casually acknowledged that this money “was all gone.” Spiro unilaterally applied my rental obligations against the outstanding $385,000 loan balance without formal notice to me, without a judicial determination, and without providing any accounting of what amounts had been applied or what remained owing. I asked in writing: “Where is the receipt or breakdown of what is owed in rent and how much is left of the loan or when exactly did the loan run out?” No accounting was ever provided. The total personal loans I extended to Spiro amount to $510,000, none of which has been repaid.

11. Sale of Family Home as Direct Consequence. As a direct consequence of Spiro’s failure to repay his loan obligations, I was forced to sell my parents’ home instead of paying it off with the money Spiro was supposed to repay. The loss of my parents’ home as a consequence of Spiro’s deliberate financial exploitation constitutes one of the most severe and irreversible harms I suffered as a result of this relationship.

12. Safety Complaints and Landlord’s Failure to Respond. During my tenancy at 420 North Camden Drive, I made repeated written complaints to Rhian Williams and Yuri Spiro regarding safety conditions in the building. On November 17, 2022, I formally stated in writing: “I’m not ensuring anything until my safety is ensured which is not and has not been and until it is Yuri is not and has not been owed rent since my initial complaint was ignored.” I also stated: “You have a legal responsibility to give me a reply and to take [action] so that this building is a safe space for your tenant.” Neither Williams nor Spiro provided any substantive response to my safety complaints. On December 25, 2022, I transmitted an emergency email to Rhian Williams disclosing a forced-entry incident that triggered a severe panic attack, forced medication, and acute isolation — all occurring at 420 Camden during my tenancy. No response was ever received.

13. Notice-to-Enter Harassment Campaign. During September and October 2022 — the same period in which I was being abandoned by my spouse and experiencing the onset of the crisis documented throughout this Incident Narrative — Spiro’s agents issued at least eight (8) consecutive Notices to Enter the property over a twenty-five (25) day window. These notices were sent by Jesseca Harvey and included notices dated September 19, 22, 23, 24, and 26, 2022; October 3 and 11,

2022; and related rent notices. The frequency and timing of these entries — on average one every three days — was not consistent with any legitimate property management purpose and constituted a pattern of landlord harassment that compounded my isolation and vulnerability during an acute personal crisis.

14. All facts stated in this declaration are within my personal knowledge. The documentary evidence referenced herein — including the Jesseca Harvey Rent Reconciliation email (June 15, 2022), the Rhian Williams email to Susanne Weis regarding lease return, the November 2022 notice-to-enter correspondence, and the December 25, 2022 safety disclosure email — are true and correct copies of records maintained in my possession.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: _____, 2026, at _____, California.

RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING

also known as EsRā Dunca-Sprawling

Plaintiff, In Pro Per

565 Ortega Street, San Francisco, CA 94112

(346) 785-6657 |

⚠️ EXHIBIT I — FORENSIC ANNOTATION:

This Declaration constitutes Plaintiff's sworn first-person account of the full course of conduct by Defendant Yuri Richard Spiro, encompassing: (1) the illegal residential lease of commercially-zoned Suite 200; (2) fraudulent partnership inducement into the ground-floor commercial lease; (3) lease document confiscation and forced re-execution under duress; (4) the $70,000

security deposit extracted without legal basis; (5) the $125,000 pre-September 2021 loan default causing liquor license asset seizure; (6) the $385,000 additional loan applied by Spiro against Plaintiff's rent without notice or accounting; (7) the sale of Plaintiff's parents' home as a direct consequence; (8) repeated safety complaints ignored by Spiro and Williams; and (9) the coordinated notice-to-enter harassment campaign of September–October 2022. The Declaration is supported by and consistent with all documentary evidence indexed in Exhibits XXXVII-A through XXXVII-K. Plaintiff's sworn statements in this Declaration are intended to accompany and support the Draft Complaint set forth in §XXXVIII when filed in the Los Angeles County Superior Court.

§ I — UD Judgment Analysis: Case No. 23SMCV01258 & Wrongful Eviction Damages

Exhibit Reference: Exhibit XXXVII-Q — Writ of Execution/Possession, Form EJ-130, Case No. 23SMCV01258 (Spiro v. Gion Beverly Hills LLC et al.)

Status Note: Plaintiff Sprawling has already vacated 420 N. Camden Drive. There is no active possessory dispute and no pending tenant proceeding in 23SMCV01258. All analysis below is presented in support of an independent wrongful eviction damages claim — to be incorporated into the §XXXVIII complaint (Sprawling v. Spiro et al., LA Superior Court, Beverly Hills Courthouse) or filed as a standalone tort action.

§ I-1 — Six Independent Service Defects in the Notice to Quit

The December 13, 2022 Notices to Quit (Storefront: $104,000; Suite 200: $17,000) were served in a manner that independently violated California Code of Civil Procedure § 1162 in at least six distinct respects. Each defect is independently sufficient to render the NTQ void; together they establish a pattern of procedural bad faith:

#	Defect	Legal Authority / Significance
1	**Door-Posting Only — No Mailing**	CCP § 1162(a)(3) authorizes substituted service by posting only when accompanied by first-class mailing on the same date. The POS confirms door-posting only; no mailing is documented. Without the mailing, the statutory method is incomplete and service is void.
2	**No Predicate Personal Service Attempt**	Substituted service by posting is only authorized after a genuine attempt at personal service fails. The POS contains no representation that personal service was attempted. Skipping directly to posting without a predicate attempt renders the service jurisdictionally defective under CCP § 1162(a)(1)–(2).
3	**Landlord Self-Signed Proof of Service**	The POS was signed by Yuri Spiro — the same landlord who issued the NTQ. California law requires the server to be a person at least 18 years of age and not a party to the proceeding. A landlord cannot serve their own notices and sign their own proof of service; such self-service is procedurally invalid.
4	**Combined POS for Two Separate Tenants /**	The single POS purports to serve both Gion Beverly

#	Defect	Legal Authority / Significance
	Entities	Hills LLC (Storefront, $104K) and Rodney Sean Sprawling individually (Suite 200, $17K) in a single document. These are separate legal persons with separate tenancies. A combined POS does not satisfy the statutory requirement that each notice be individually served on and receipted by the intended recipient.
5	**CCP § 415.46 Non-Compliance (Admitted on Face of Writ)**	The Writ of Execution/Possession (Form EJ-130, ¶25a(2)) expressly checks the box stating: "The Prejudgment Claim of Right to Possession was NOT served in compliance with CCP 415.46." This is an admission on the face of the court's own writ that the statutory pre-judgment notice procedure was not followed. Consequently, unnamed occupants retain independent rights to object to enforcement under CCP § 1174.3.
6	**Improper Writ Service — Door-Taping by Judgment Creditor (Not Levying Officer)**	Under CCP §§ 683.010–683.120 and 715.010, a writ of possession must be executed and served by the levying officer (sheriff or marshal). The judgment creditor or their agents have no independent authority to serve a writ. The Writ (Form EJ-130) was taped to the door by the judgment creditor — not delivered through the levying officer. This extrajudicial self-help execution of the writ is itself a wrongful act and constitutes the mechanism of the wrongful eviction.

§ I-2 — The December 13, 2022 NTQ Documents: Evidentiary Findings

- **Storefront NTQ (Exhibit XXXVII-L):** Addressed to Gion Beverly Hills LLC; claims $104,000 in arrears for October, November, and December 2022 ($34K + $35K + $35K); 3-day notice to pay or quit; vacate deadline 12 noon December 20, 2022.
- **Suite 200 NTQ (Exhibit XXXVII-M):** Addressed to "Rodney Sean Sprawling"; claims $17,000 in arrears for November and December 2022 ($8,500 × 2); vacate deadline 12 noon December 20, 2022. The $8,500/month figure corresponds to the Executive Suite payments in the June 15, 2022 Rent Reconciliation email — confirming Suite 200 payments were for the space Spiro leased as residential despite exclusively commercial zoning.
- **Proof of Service (Exhibit XXXVII-N):** Single POS signed by Yuri R. Spiro on 12/13/22; states only door-attachment at Storefront and Executive Suite. No personal service attempt documented. No mailing documented. Landlord self-signed for two separate tenants in one document.
- **NTQ Template Source:** Both NTQs bear a "©2002-2022 LawDepot.com®" copyright notice — indicating generation via a commercial template website, not court-compliant forms.

⚑ FORENSIC NOTE — NTQ EVIDENTIARY SIGNIFICANCE:

The NTQ documents are no longer operative in any pending proceeding. However, their multiple service defects are evidence supporting the wrongful eviction damages claim in §XXXVIII: they demonstrate that the entire eviction chain was procedurally invalid from inception, establishing that the ultimate eviction — effected through improper door-taping of the writ — was the culmination of a deliberate pattern of circumventing tenant-protective

procedural requirements.

§ I-3 — Writ of Execution/Possession: EJ-130 Analysis

- **Caption:** Plaintiff: Yuri Spiro dba Spiro Properties; Defendant: Gion Beverly Hills, LLC; Additional judgment debtor: RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING, 420 N. Camden Dr. Storefront Space A and Executive Office Suite (Second Flr), Beverly Hills, CA 90210.
- **CCP § 415.46 Admission (¶25a(2)):** Box expressly checked — "The Prejudgment Claim of Right to Possession was NOT served in compliance with CCP 415.46" — a judicial admission on the writ's face that pre-judgment occupant protections were bypassed.
- **Daily Rental Value:** Listed as $250/$1,500 per day — baseline for holdover damages calculations.
- **Complaint Filed:** March 23, 2023.
- **Critical Writ Service Defect:** The writ was taped to the door by the judgment creditor or agents — not executed by the levying officer. This extrajudicial act is the central mechanism of the wrongful eviction tort.

§ I-4 — September 21–22, 2022 iMessage Thread: First Security Complaint & Proof-of-Sanity Record (Exhibit XXXVII-P)

- **Emergency Security Complaint:** Sprawling transmitted an urgent communication ("HAPPENING!!! LOCK THE DOORS NOW") indicating an active, real-time security threat. Establishes Spiro's actual knowledge of a security emergency as of September 21–22, 2022.
- **Spiro's Response:** Spiro responded only: "Describe the security threat in detail" — making no immediate safety effort.

- **Dr. Wolson Referral to Dr. Alan Spivak:** The thread contains a referral from Sprawling's psychotherapist Dr. Wolson to Dr. Alan Spivak (310) 826-1494 for an independent psychological evaluation. This referral is NOT an admission of mental illness. Sprawling sought independent evaluation specifically to establish and document his sanity — to create a professional record confirming his experiences were real and his harassment reports were credible. The referral is evidence of Sprawling's proactive, rational efforts to counter Spiro's false "mentally ill tenant" narrative, and is the opposite of evidence of a mental health crisis.

⚑ FORENSIC NOTE — PROOF OF SANITY:

The Dr. Wolson → Dr. Spivak referral in Exhibit XXXVII-P is a proof-of-sanity measure, not a mental health crisis disclosure. Investigators and courts should treat this referral as evidence of Sprawling's credibility and strategic awareness, not as corroboration of any mental health impairment.

§ I-5 — WRONGFUL EVICTION ANALYSIS: Completed Tort — Damages Survive Mootness of Possessory Claim

PROCEDURAL STATUS — CRITICAL:

Plaintiff Rodney Samuel Sprawling has already vacated 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, CA 90210. There is no pending possessory dispute in Case No. 23SMCV01258, and no motion to quash or reinstatement of tenancy is sought. The wrongful eviction at 420 N. Camden Drive is a completed tort. All analysis below is forward-looking in the context of a damages claim only.

A. Legal Framework — Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal.2d 597

The California Supreme Court's decision in Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal.2d 597 establishes that a landlord's wrongful act in evicting a tenant — including through unauthorized self-help or procedurally defective process — gives rise to an independent tort action for damages that survives the mootness of any possessory claim. The Court held that a tenant who has been wrongfully dispossessed retains the right to recover all damages flowing from the unlawful eviction, regardless of whether the tenant seeks or obtains reinstatement. The wrongful eviction tort is complete at the moment of unlawful dispossession; subsequent vacancy does not extinguish the damages claim. Additionally, CCP §§ 683.010–683.120 and 715.010 establish that a writ of possession must be executed by the designated levying officer. Self-help execution — including door-taping by the judgment creditor — is not authorized and constitutes an independent wrongful act. California Rules of Court, Rule 3.1605 further reserves execution authority to the levying officer.

B. Mechanism of Wrongful Eviction — Door-Taping of Writ by Judgment Creditor

124. **Void Notice to Quit (Dec. 13, 2022):** Six independent CCP § 1162 defects (§ I-1) rendering the NTQ void ab initio.

125. **CCP § 415.46 Non-Compliance (Admitted on Writ):** The UD court's own Form EJ-130 (¶25a(2)) acknowledges non-compliance — confirming pre-judgment occupant protections were bypassed and preserving objection rights under CCP § 1174.3.

126. **Extrajudicial Writ Service — Door-Taping:** The Writ of Execution/Possession was taped to the door by the judgment creditor or agents — not executed by the levying officer as mandated by CCP §§ 683.010–683.120 and 715.010. No levying officer return of service is documented. This extrajudicial act completed the wrongful dispossession.

127. **Pre-Staged Physical Lockout — May 22, 2023 BHPD Arrest (Cross-Reference: §XXXVII §J):** Plaintiff was arrested on May 22, 2023 at

the subject premises — 420 N. Camden Drive — under the false name *"ANTHONY SPRAWLING"* (correct legal name: RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING), with his address recorded as *"1918 TRANSIENT, BEVERLY HILLS CA 90210"* despite active tenancy (Booking No. 6599169; Case No. 23-1837; Exhibits XXXVII-R through XXXVII-U). Initial bail of $20,000 on a PC 594(A)(2) vandalism charge was allegedly manipulated overnight to $100,000, extending detention through the May 24, 2023 arraignment date and creating the precise temporal window for the physical lockout — connecting the criminal process to the civil eviction in a coordinated sequence. The arrest occurred exactly 60 days after the UD complaint was filed (March 23, 2023). Full analysis: §XXXVII §J.

⚑ CROSS-REFERENCE: MAY 22, 2023 BHPD ARREST — PRE-STAGED LOCKOUT MECHANISM

BHPD Arrest — May 22, 2023 (Booking No. 6599169; Case No. 23-1837; Exhibits XXXVII-R through XXXVII-U): Plaintiff was arrested at 420 N. Camden Drive — the subject premises — under the false name **"ANTHONY SPRAWLING"** (correct legal name: RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING), with his address recorded as **"1918 TRANSIENT, BEVERLY HILLS CA 90210"** despite active tenancy. Initial bail of $20,000 on a PC 594(A)(2) vandalism charge was allegedly manipulated overnight to $100,000, extending detention through the May 24, 2023 arraignment date and creating the precise temporal window for the physical lockout. Three name variants appear across four BHPD documents: **"SPRAWLING, ANTHONY"** (Exhibits XXXVII-R, XXXVII-S, XXXVII-T) and **"SPRUILLING, ANTHONY"** (Exhibit XXXVII-U). Detective Goff is identified as the arresting detective. The arrest occurred exactly **60 days** after the UD complaint was filed (March 23, 2023). Full analysis: §XXXVII §J.

Forensic Significance: The identity falsification (wrong first name, transient address designation), the overnight bail escalation (5× multiplier), and the resultant detention through the arraignment date collectively created the precise window — May 22 through May 24, 2023 — during which the physical lockout of the subject premises was executed. The convergence of these three independent factors on the same 48-hour window, in a case where the UD complaint had been filed exactly 60 days prior, constitutes affirmative evidence of a coordinated, pre-staged mechanism integrating the criminal arrest process with the civil eviction timeline. *Cross-reference: §XXXVII §J (full booking document analysis and exhibit authentication).*

C. Damages Recoverable — Wrongful Eviction Tort

Damages Category	Description & Basis
Displacement Costs	Emergency relocation, temporary housing, storage, and moving expenses incurred as a direct result of the wrongful eviction.
Lost Business Revenue	Lost revenue from Gion Beverly Hills restaurant/entertainment business interrupted and destroyed by the forced eviction, including the liquor license opportunity already impaired by the $125K loan default.
Value of Abandoned Personal Property	Value of personal property removed from the premises during the forced lockout by Spiro's pre-staged movers during the arrest window.
Emotional Distress	Compensatory damages for severe emotional distress and trauma — corroborated by the Dec. 25, 2022 Christmas Day email (§ H), Dr. Dilshad's clinical notes (§ XXI), and the contemporaneous safety complaint record.
$70,000 Security Deposit	Return of security deposit for Storefront and Salon, plus statutory penalties under Cal. Civ. Code § 1950.5 for failure to return within the statutory period.
Suite 200 Rent Restitution	Restitution of all rent paid for Suite 200 — leased as residential space in violation of Beverly Hills commercial zoning — under money had and received and Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200.
Statutory NTE Damages	Cal. Civ. Code § 1940.2 — minimum $2,000 per violation × 8 notices = $16,000 in statutory damages.
Punitive Damages	Cal. Civ. Code § 3294 — for Spiro's willful, oppressive, and fraudulent conduct including deliberate circumvention of mandatory eviction procedures, self-help writ execution, and coordination with law enforcement to effectuate a pre-staged physical lockout.
CCP § 128.5 Sanctions	Sanctions for bad-faith litigation conduct in pursuing a UD action predicated on procedurally void service, then bypassing the levying officer to effectuate self-help writ execution.

⚑ FORENSIC CONCLUSION — § I-5 WRONGFUL EVICTION:

The eviction from 420 N. Camden Drive is a completed wrongful eviction tort under Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal.2d 597. The six NTQ service defects, combined with (a) the admitted CCP § 415.46 non-compliance on the face of the writ, and (b) the door-taping of the writ by the judgment creditor rather than by the levying officer, render the entire eviction process procedurally invalid from inception to execution.

Sprawling's voluntary departure from the premises does not extinguish or waive the wrongful eviction claim. The damages — displacement, lost business, emotional distress, property loss, deposit forfeiture, and statutory violations — are fully preserved as an independent tort action. This evidence and analysis is incorporated by reference into the §XXXVIII complaint (Sprawling v. Spiro et al.) and into the §XXXIX Consolidated Damages & Relief Summary.

SECTION XXXIX — CONSOLIDATED DAMAGES & RELIEF SUMMARY

Sprawling v. Dunca et al. — All Proceedings (TX, CA, IL, Federal) — Grand Total Exposure

Prepared By: Rodney Samuel Sprawling (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling), Plaintiff In Pro Per

Date of Summary: June 2026

Scope: This section consolidates all compensatory damages, statutory damages, equitable relief, and punitive damages claimed across seven active or anticipated proceedings arising from the coordinated conspiracy documented in this Incident Narrative Report. All dollar figures are documented claims; final amounts subject to proof at trial and applicable interest calculations.

PRIORITY RELIEF — Ranked by Urgency & Impact

#	Relief Sought	Proceeding / Venue	Amount / Significance
1	**Wrongful Eviction Damages Claim** Jordan v. Talbot (1961) 55 Cal.2d 597	*Sprawling v. Spiro et al.* LA Superior Court, Beverly Hills Courthouse (§ XXXVIII — draft; not yet filed)	Compensatory + punitive damages for completed wrongful eviction at 420 N. Camden Drive, effected through improper door-taping of Writ of Execution/Possession (Form EJ-130, Case No. 23SMCV01258) by judgment creditor rather than levying officer, in violation of CCP §§ 683.010–683.120 and 715.010. Tenancy has ended; Sprawling has vacated. Tort survives mootness of possessory claim. Damages include: displacement, lost business (Gion Beverly Hills), personal property loss, $70K deposit forfeiture, emotional distress, Suite 200 rent restitution, § 1940.2 statutory NTE damages

#	Relief Sought	Proceeding / Venue	Amount / Significance
			($16K), and punitive damages. See §§ XXXVII-I, XXXVII-I-5.
2	**$385,000 + Interest Loan Recovery** Breach of Contract / Promissory Note	*Sprawling v. Spiro et al.* LA Superior Court, Beverly Hills Courthouse (§ XXXVIII)	$831,898.51 (principal + interest at 29.9% compounding through July 28, 2025) on the September 10, 2021 promissory note, secured by 1990 Ferrari F40. Unauthorized UCC filing (Oct. 3, 2022, No. 220232028322) encumbered already-pledged collateral. Loan due December 31, 2022; still unpaid.
3	**$125,000 Pre-2021 Loan + Liquor License Damages** Breach of Contract / Consequential Damages	*Sprawling v. Spiro et al.* LA Superior Court, Beverly Hills Courthouse (§ XXXVIII)	$125,000 principal + consequential damages for liquor license seizure caused by Spiro's deliberate default. ABC lien proceedings stripped Sprawling of liquor license assets, destroying the projected $720,000+ annual revenue stream from Gion Beverly Hills. Total consequential exposure exceeds $845,000.
4	**SSP LLC Dissolution & Member Rights Restoration** Cal. Corp. Code § 17702.09; Operating Agreement	*Cause No. 2026-36192* 215th D.C., Harris County, TX (§ XXXIV-D; § XXXV)	Judicial dissolution or restoration of Sprawling's 33% membership interest; damages for Dunca's unauthorized Feb. 5, 2022 SOI filings (22-A82754, 22-A82757) omitting Sprawling in violation of Operating

#	Relief Sought	Proceeding / Venue	Amount / Significance
			Agreement Arts. 2.3, 4.1, 7.1, 10.2 and Cal. Corp. Code § 17702.09. SOI 19-D96717 corroborates Sprawling's dual-member status.
5	**13339 Balmore Circle — Wrongful Foreclosure & Eviction** Tex. Prop. Code § 24.0061; PTFA; 42 U.S.C. § 1983	*Cause No. 2026-36192* 215th D.C., Harris County, TX (§ XXV; Appeal 01-26-00459-CV)	$400,000+ in equity stripped through AMDRE LLC's suppressed-competition foreclosure at loan-balance price. 33-day writ execution lapse (Deputy Ruiz, June 24, 2025) rendered dispossession procedurally defective. IA Complaint #25120107 closed "Unfounded" without reviewing filed evidence.
6	**565 Ortega Street — Marital Property & Unlawful Eviction** Texas Common-Law Marriage; CA Property Law	*Cause No. 202517063* 334th D.C., Harris County, TX (Appeal 01-26-00459-CV)	Recovery of Sprawling's 50% community property interest in 565 Ortega Street, San Francisco (~$5M est. value); damages for Dunca's pretextual constructive eviction via false "Germany move" narrative; unauthorized use of Sprawling's POA to transfer marital property. Active appeal in 1st COA Houston.
7	**Federal Civil Rights & RICO Claims** 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 18 U.S.C. §§ 241, 1962	Federal District Court (to be filed)	Civil rights violations by law enforcement (Deputies Ruiz, Diaz, Jones; Detective Goff; Officer Lyga); RICO enterprise claims against

#	Relief Sought	Proceeding / Venue	Amount / Significance
			coordinated conspirators (Dunca, Spiro, Garcia-Winder, Heafey, AMDRE LLC); damages for false imprisonment, denial of counsel, custodial identity fraud, and systematic deprivation of constitutional rights under color of law.

PER-PROCEEDING DAMAGES BREAKDOWN

Proceeding	Venue / Case No.	Compensatory	Punitive (Est.)	Subtotal
Sprawling v. Spiro et al. (CA — Beverly Hills)	LA Superior Court, Beverly Hills (§ XXXVIII)	$2,800,000	$1,400,000	**$4,200,000**
Cause No. 202517063 (TX — Marital Estate)	334th D.C., Harris County (Appeal: 01-26-00459-CV)	$2,750,000	$500,000	**$3,250,000**
Cause No. 2026-36192 (TX — Multi-Defendant)	215th D.C., Harris County (filed May 29, 2026)	$1,200,000	$600,000	**$1,800,000**
Federal Civil Rights / RICO (to be filed)	Federal District Court (TX or CA)	$500,000	$300,000	**$800,000**
GRAND TOTAL — ALL PROCEEDINGS	**$7,250,000+**	**$2,800,000+**	**$9,800,000+***	

** Does not include prejudgment interest, CCP § 128.5 sanctions, attorney fee awards, or the $30M+ production company destruction claim (EsRā Dunca-Sprawling Inc. / Daisy Daisy 333). With punitive multipliers and interest, total exposure exceeds $11,800,000.*

EQUITABLE & NON-MONETARY RELIEF

- **Declaratory Relief:** Judicial declaration that (a) the Dec. 13, 2022 NTQs were void; (b) the writ execution at 420 N. Camden Drive was wrongful; (c) Sprawling remains a creditor of Spiro for $510,000 in unpaid loans; (d) Sprawling holds a 33% membership interest in SSP LLC; (e) the Balmore Circle foreclosure was procedurally and substantively defective.
- **Rescission:** Rescission of the Suite 200 lease on grounds of illegal object (commercial space leased as residential in violation of Beverly Hills zoning) and fraudulent misrepresentation; restitution of all rent paid.
- **Accounting:** Court-ordered accounting of all SSP LLC transactions from formation through dissolution, including all revenues, distributions, and property dispositions made without Sprawling's consent.
- **Injunctive Relief:** Permanent injunction restraining Spiro from disposing of the 1990 Ferrari F40 collateral; restraining Dunca from further unauthorized SOS filings or LLC actions without Sprawling's consent.
- **Record Correction:** Correction of Secretary of State filings (CA and TX) to accurately reflect Sprawling's membership status in SSP LLC and other affected entities.
- **Reinstatement of Book:** Reversal of the Permanent Injunction entered by the 334th D.C. banning Wallflower of the Year, on constitutional grounds (First Amendment; prior restraint doctrine).
- **Discovery Sanctions:** Sanctions against all parties who improperly resisted or evaded discovery, including AMDRE LLC's Motion to Quash Discovery (May 1, 2025) filed to conceal ownership through shell entity "Amser LLC."

CROSS-REFERENCES:

§§ XXXVII-I, XXXVII-I-5 (Wrongful Eviction — 420 N. Camden Drive / Spiro); §

XXXVIII (Draft CA Complaint — Sprawling v. Spiro et al.); § XXXIV-D (SSP LLC Operating Agreement); § XXXV (Cause No. 2026-36192 — TX Multi-Defendant Complaint); § XXV (Balmore Circle Foreclosure Petition); §§ XV–XVI (Entity and Individual Defendant Complaints); § XIX (California Board of Psychology Complaint — Dr. Heafey); § XXIX (Johnston, Kinney

&

Zulaica / Mudd Law Analysis).

§XL — DRAFT FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(3), and 1988 — U.S. District Court, Central District of California

⚖️ LITIGATION SUPPORT NOTE — SOL STATUS:

The primary federal limitations period for 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims arising in California is

two (2) years

(Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 335.1). The arrest giving rise to these claims occurred on

May 22, 2023

; the nominal two-year period expired May 22, 2025. Five independent and cumulative tolling doctrines establish that any filing remains timely. Those arguments are fully developed in § XL-IV. This draft is a litigation-support narrative and forensic exhibit; it does not constitute legal advice. Plaintiff is strongly encouraged to consult a licensed civil rights attorney before filing.

§ XL-I — CAPTION

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA — WESTERN DIVISION

RODNEY SAMUEL SPRAWLING JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF BEVERLY HILLS

, a municipal corporation;

DETECTIVE GOFF

, individually and in his official capacity;

OFFICER HONG (Badge No. 85464)

, individually and in his official capacity;

OFFICER BAUTISTA (Badge No. 64552)

, individually and in his official capacity;

YURI RICHARD SPIRO

, an individual;

Defendants.

Case No.: _____

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(3), 1988

CAUSES OF ACTION:

I. False Arrest

&

False Imprisonment

II. Deliberate Indifference — Medical Need

III. Excessive Force

IV. Due Process Violations

V. Civil Rights Conspiracy (§ 1985(3))

VI. Municipal Liability (Monell)

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

§ XL-II — PARTIES

Plaintiff **Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr.** (a/k/a "EsRā"; "Sean Dunca-Sprawling") is a natural person and United States citizen who, at all times relevant, was a *lawful tenant* at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210, holding leasehold interests in both the Storefront Space A and Executive Office Suite (Second Floor). Plaintiff brings this action pro se and is currently domiciled in Cypress, Harris County, Texas.

Defendant	Capacity	Role in Relevant Events
City of Beverly Hills	Municipal corporation; BHPD employer	Monell liability for unconstitutional BHPD policies including false-name booking, TRANSIENT misclassification, and coordination with private landlords to suppress tenant rights
Detective Goff	Individual & official capacity	Lead arresting detective; refused to display warrant; denied phone access and legal counsel; orchestrated 72-hour detention; directed

Defendant	Capacity	Role in Relevant Events
		false-name booking under "ANTHONY SPRAWLING"
Officer Hong (Badge 85464)	Individual & official capacity	Arresting, releasing, and transferring officer per Booking Record No. 6599169; participated in booking Plaintiff under fictitious name; transferred Plaintiff to Airport Courthouse
Officer Bautista (Badge 64552)	Individual & official capacity	Booking officer per Booking Record No. 6599169; recorded false-name entry "SPRAWLING, ANTHONY" and false address designation "1918 TRANSIENT, BEVERLY HILLS CA 90210"
Yuri Richard Spiro	Individual / private actor under color of law via conspiracy	Landlord at 420 N. Camden Drive; complainant who initiated BHPD contact; coordinated with BHPD to effect lockout under color of legal process; direct beneficiary of Plaintiff's unlawful removal

§ XL-III — JURISDICTION AND VENUE

This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to **28 U.S.C. § 1331** (federal question), **28 U.S.C. § 1343(a)(3)–(4)** (civil rights), and **42 U.S.C. §§ 1983** and **1985(3)**. Attorney's fees are sought under **42 U.S.C. § 1988**. Supplemental jurisdiction over related state-law claims is invoked under **28 U.S.C. § 1367**. Venue is proper in the Western Division of the Central District of California under **28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2)** because all operative events occurred at 420 N. Camden Drive and 464 N. Rexford Drive, Beverly Hills, California — both within this District.

§ XL-IV — STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS: FIVE INDEPENDENT TOLLING DOCTRINES

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK: The two-year limitations period under Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 335.1 nominally began running on May 22, 2023. Each of the following five doctrines operates *independently and cumulatively* to render any filing timely. Even if any single prong fails, the remaining prongs independently extend the period.

A. Prong 1 — Equitable Tolling: Government-Caused Indigency & Disability

Equitable tolling applies where (1) Plaintiff was diligently pursuing his rights, and (2) some extraordinary circumstance stood in his way. *Holland v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 631, 645 (2010); *Bills v. Clark*, 628 F.3d 1092, 1097 (9th Cir. 2010). Defendants' own unconstitutional acts created those extraordinary circumstances: the May 22, 2023 false arrest and 72-hour unlawful detention directly disrupted Plaintiff's income streams and professional relationships; the coordinated wrongful eviction rendered Plaintiff homeless; seizure of personal property (Exhibit XXXVII-S) compounded economic injury; and overnight bail manipulation from $20,000 to $100,000 (5× with no judicial basis) prevented pre-trial release. The cascade of homelessness → indigency → inability to retain counsel → inability to investigate and file is a direct, foreseeable consequence of Defendants' acts. **A defendant cannot benefit from a limitations period that the defendant's own wrongful conduct made impossible to meet.** *Cada v. Baxter Healthcare Corp.*, 920 F.2d 446, 451 (7th Cir. 1990); *Leong v. Potter*, 347 F.3d 1117, 1123 (9th Cir. 2003). The SOL is equitably tolled for the entire period during which Plaintiff's indigency — itself a product of Defendants' unlawful acts — prevented access to legal process.

B. Prong 2 — Fraudulent Concealment

The limitations period is tolled where a defendant takes affirmative steps to conceal the plaintiff's cause of action. *Hexcel Corp. v. Ineos Polymers, Inc.*, 681 F.3d 1055, 1060 (9th Cir. 2012). Concealment here was systematic: (1) **false-name booking** under "ANTHONY SPRAWLING" / "SPRUILLING, ANTHONY" prevented Plaintiff's counsel, family, and associates from locating him during the 72-hour detention, during which Det. Goff simultaneously denied phone access; (2) **name suppression in discovery** — the BHPD Discovery Package uses Plaintiff's correct legal name "RODNEY SPRAWLING" throughout with zero mention of "ANTHONY SPRAWLING," concealing the fabrication and preventing Plaintiff from discovering the full conspiracy scope until he obtained and compared both document sets; (3) **arraignment delay** — Plaintiff was transferred to Airport Court, waited the entire day, never saw a judge, and was released O.R. without arraignment, preventing public docketing of the false name; (4) **seven-month delay** to first substantive court date (Case No. 3AR10692, December 18, 2023) further delayed discovery

through the judicial process. The SOL did not begin to run until Plaintiff actually discovered, or through reasonable diligence could have discovered, the facts constituting his claims.

C. Prong 3 — Continuing Violation Doctrine

Where unconstitutional conduct constitutes a continuing course of action, the limitations period does not begin to run until the last act in the series. *Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp. v. Morgan*, 536 U.S. 101, 115 (2002); *Bird v. Dep't of Human Servs.*, 935 F.3d 738, 746 (9th Cir. 2019). The conspiracy did not end on May 22, 2023. It continued through: (a) wrongful eviction writ enforcement (EJ-130, Case 23SMCV01258 — writ door-taped in violation of CCP § 415.46, with non-compliance admitted on the writ's face); (b) AMDRE LLC's Balmore Circle foreclosure, effected while Plaintiff was displaced; and (c) the **March 10, 2026** Mudd Law filing (Case No. 202517063) — public docketing of unredacted PII belonging to Plaintiff and co-victim Vetter, constituting a new act in furtherance of the suppression campaign. Measured from March 10, 2026, any filing by March 10, 2028 is timely as to the full conspiracy and all predicate acts.

D. Prong 4 — Discovery Rule

A claim does not accrue until the plaintiff knew or reasonably should have known both (1) the existence of an injury and (2) its cause. *TwoRivers v. Lewis*, 174 F.3d 987, 991 (9th Cir. 1999). While Plaintiff knew he was arrested on May 22, 2023, he could not have known: (a) that the booking under "ANTHONY SPRAWLING" was a deliberate fabrication — not an administrative error — designed to suppress his identity; (b) that the BHPD Discovery Package using his correct name throughout would simultaneously reveal officers' actual knowledge, proving fabrication; (c) that Defendant Spiro had coordinated the complaint initiating the arrest, establishing the landlord-police conspiracy; or (d) that the TRANSIENT classification was an intentional designation to strip tenant rights and facilitate lockout. The full scope of the coordinated scheme was not discoverable until Plaintiff obtained and cross-analyzed the BHPD booking records, the BHPD Discovery Package, the Writ EJ-130, and related documentary evidence — a process delayed by homelessness and indigency.

E. Prong 5 — Statutory Disability Tolling (Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 352.1)

Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 352.1 tolls the SOL while a plaintiff is "imprisoned on a criminal charge." Plaintiff was detained 72 hours following the May 22, 2023 arrest, tolling the SOL by operation of statute for that period. More broadly, Plaintiff's documented **panic disorder** — which manifested acutely during the arrest (necessitating Fire Department response, resulting in full-body restraints, and was deliberately omitted from the BHPD intake form) — constitutes a disability further extending the period. *Stoll v. Runyon*, 165 F.3d 1238, 1242 (9th Cir. 1999) (mental impairment may toll SOL where it prevents plaintiff from understanding legal rights). Plaintiff's post-arrest psychological trauma, homelessness, and panic disorder collectively prevented him from appreciating and acting upon his legal rights within the nominal limitations period.

§ XL-V — FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff incorporates by reference all factual allegations set forth in §§ XXXVII §J-1 through §J-10 of this Incident Narrative Report as if fully restated herein.

A. Plaintiff's Status as Lawful Tenant

At all times material hereto, Plaintiff was a lawful tenant at 420 N. Camden Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210, holding leasehold interests in both the Storefront Space A (approximately $104,000 in arrears claimed) and Executive Office Suite (Second Floor, approximately $17,000 in arrears claimed). Defendant Yuri Spiro, d/b/a Spiro Properties, was Plaintiff's landlord and held a financial relationship involving outstanding unpaid loans exceeding $510,000 — a pre-existing adversarial dynamic that provided Spiro a financial motive to orchestrate Plaintiff's removal.

B. The May 22, 2023 Arrest — False-Name Booking and TRANSIENT Misclassification

On May 22, 2023, at approximately 8:13 a.m., Defendants Det. Goff and Officer Hong (Badge 85464) arrived at 420 N. Camden Drive. Plaintiff was arrested and booked under the name "SPRAWLING, ANTHONY" — not his legal name. BHPD Booking and Property Record (Booking No. 6599169) confirms: Arrestee Name:

"SPRAWLING, ANTHONY"; Address: "1918 TRANSIENT, BEVERLY HILLS CA 90210." Defendant Officer Bautista (Badge 64552) was Booking Officer. The Inmate Property Inventory (Booking No. 2023-00000542) and Jail Excess Property Receipt (Case No. 23-1837, "SPRUILLING, ANTHONY") repeat and compound the false-name designation across multiple official BHPD records.

The TRANSIENT designation is forensically self-defeating on two independently dispositive prongs:

- **No ID Requested (Prong 1):** If officers genuinely believed Plaintiff to be an unidentified transient, standard law enforcement procedure required demanding identification before arrest. No identification was requested. Officers cannot simultaneously claim ignorance of Plaintiff's identity (warranting a TRANSIENT designation) while booking him under a specific name ("ANTHONY SPRAWLING") without having sought identification.
- **Positive ID From Complaint (Prong 2):** The BHPD Discovery Package — the official prosecutorial record compiled post-arrest — uses Plaintiff's correct legal name "RODNEY SPRAWLING" throughout with *zero mention* of "ANTHONY SPRAWLING." This conclusively establishes that the complainant and/or officers knew Plaintiff's true identity from the outset. A complaint identifying a building occupant as a known individual is categorically incompatible with a TRANSIENT booking designation. The TRANSIENT classification was a deliberate, fabricated misclassification designed to strip Plaintiff of tenant rights and facilitate the coordinated lockout.

C. Medical Neglect — Panic Disorder, Fire Department Response, and Full-Body Restraints

During the arrest, Plaintiff suffered a severe panic attack — a documented, pre-existing medical condition constituting a serious medical need under clearly established Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment jurisprudence. Officers attempted to remove Plaintiff from the premises without his clothing, precipitating or exacerbating the acute panic episode. The Beverly Hills Fire Department was called to the scene. Rather than providing appropriate medical intervention, officers applied **full-body physical restraints** and physically carried Plaintiff out of the

building. The BHPD intake form's "Special Medical Problems" field was left blank — deliberately omitting Plaintiff's panic disorder despite (a) the Fire Department call, (b) the physical restraint of Plaintiff, and (c) the application of those restraints having occurred immediately before the intake was completed. The omission was intentional: it prevented the creation of a contemporaneous medical record documenting the unconstitutional nature of the force used.

D. Denial of Counsel, Phone Call, and Warrant

Following booking, Defendant Det. Goff refused to present a warrant when demanded by Plaintiff, stating words to the effect that displaying a warrant was "not like on TV." Plaintiff was denied access to a telephone call — a right secured by California Penal Code § 851.5 — and denied meaningful access to legal counsel. These denials occurred during the 72-hour detention period. Plaintiff was then transported to Airport Court (LAX Courthouse, 11701 S. La Cienega Blvd., Los Angeles), waited the entirety of the court day, never appeared before a judge, and was released on his own recognizance without arraignment. Plaintiff's first substantive court date was **December 18, 2023** — seven months and twenty-seven days post-arrest — in Case No. 3AR10692, Dept. 72, Airport Courthouse. Private counsel Angie Jimenez, Esq. (Costen Ruiz Law) was retained and relieved same day; Public Defender Danielle Iddrissu () was appointed; pre-trial was set for February 8, 2024.

E. Bail Manipulation

BHPD Booking Record No. 6599169 reflects initial bail of **$20,000**. Prior to any judicial bail review hearing, without documentation of changed circumstances, and without notice to Plaintiff, the bail was elevated to **$100,000** — a 5× overnight increase with no judicial basis. This manipulation was designed to prevent Plaintiff's pre-trial release, prolong his displacement from 420 N. Camden Drive, and complete the physical lockout without judicial scrutiny of the eviction's legality.

F. Coordinated Arrest as Lockout Mechanism — Pretextual Prosecution

The BHPD Discovery Package's exclusive use of Plaintiff's correct legal name "RODNEY SPRAWLING" — with zero reference to "ANTHONY SPRAWLING" anywhere

— establishes that BHPD officers possessed actual knowledge of Plaintiff's true identity throughout the arrest, booking, and prosecution process. The false-name booking was therefore a knowing fabrication, not an administrative error. The coordination between Defendant Spiro (complainant/landlord), Det. Goff (lead arresting detective), and BHPD personnel — resulting in Plaintiff's arrest, false-name booking, medical neglect, full-body restraint, denial of counsel, bail manipulation, and 72-hour detention simultaneously with Plaintiff's forced removal from his residence and business — constitutes a pre-staged lockout mechanism executed under color of law. Pretextual prosecution is further evidenced by: (1) 7-month-27-day delay to first court date; (2) O.R. release profile inconsistent with genuine public safety concerns; and (3) failure to prosecute through trial.

§ XL-VI — CAUSES OF ACTION

CAUSE OF ACTION I — 42 U.S.C. § 1983: False Arrest & False ImprisonmentAgainst Defendants Goff, Hong, Bautista, and City of Beverly Hills

Plaintiff realleges all preceding paragraphs. The Fourth Amendment, applicable to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment, protects against unreasonable seizures, including arrests without probable cause. Defendants Goff, Hong, and Bautista, acting under color of state law, violated Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment rights by: (a) arresting and booking Plaintiff under a false name to suppress his identity and isolate him from legal assistance; (b) designating Plaintiff "TRANSIENT" despite possessing actual knowledge that Plaintiff was a lawful tenant; (c) detaining Plaintiff for 72 hours without arraignment; (d) engineering transfer to Airport Court where no judicial review occurred; and (e) manipulating bail from $20,000 to $100,000 without judicial authorization. The arrest was pretextual, executed in coordination with Defendant Spiro to facilitate a private landlord's lockout of a lawful tenant under color of law. **Damages:** Deprivation of liberty; loss of property; economic harm from forced displacement; emotional distress; reputational harm; consequential damages. Plaintiff seeks compensatory damages, punitive damages against individual defendants, and fees under § 1988.

CAUSE OF ACTION II — 42 U.S.C. § 1983: Deliberate Indifference to Serious Medical NeedAgainst Defendants Goff, Hong, Bautista, and City of Beverly Hills

The Fourteenth Amendment prohibits deliberate indifference to serious medical needs of pre-trial detainees. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976); *City of Revere v. Massachusetts Gen. Hosp.*, 463 U.S. 239, 244 (1983). Plaintiff's panic disorder is a serious medical need — a condition severe enough to summon the Beverly Hills Fire Department during the arrest. Despite actual notice of this emergency, Defendants: (a) attempted removal without clothing, exacerbating the emergency; (b) responded with full-body physical restraints rather than medical intervention; (c) physically carried Plaintiff out of the building in restraints; and (d) deliberately omitted any notation of the condition from the BHPD intake form. Officers who witnessed a panic attack severe enough to require the Fire Department and full-body restraints moments earlier cannot have forgotten this event when completing the intake form — the omission was intentional. **Damages:** Physical injury from restraints; aggravation of panic disorder; psychological sequelae; ongoing trauma. Punitive damages against individual defendants; fees under § 1988.

CAUSE OF ACTION III — 42 U.S.C. § 1983: Excessive ForceAgainst Defendants Goff, Hong, Bautista, and City of Beverly Hills

The Fourth Amendment requires that force during a seizure be objectively reasonable. *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386, 396 (1989). Plaintiff was charged with Vandalism under Cal. Penal Code § 594(a)(2) — a non-violent property offense. Plaintiff posed no threat to officer safety and was not actively fleeing. Plaintiff was experiencing an acute psychiatric medical emergency. The use of full-body restraints to remove a non-violent misdemeanor suspect during a panic attack — particularly where the emergency was precipitated by officers' own conduct (removing clothing) — was objectively unreasonable under clearly established law. **Damages:** Physical injury; psychological trauma; aggravation of panic disorder; emotional distress. Punitive damages against individual defendants; fees under § 1988.

CAUSE OF ACTION IV — 42 U.S.C. § 1983: Due Process ViolationsAgainst Defendants Goff, Hong, Bautista, and City of Beverly Hills

The Fourteenth Amendment guarantees that no person shall be deprived of liberty without due process. Pre-trial detainees are protected by the Due Process Clause. *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 535 n.16 (1979). Defendants violated Plaintiff's procedural and substantive due process rights by: (a) detaining Plaintiff 72 hours without presenting a warrant or taking him before a magistrate within the constitutionally required timeframe; (b) denying Plaintiff access to a telephone and legal counsel following arrest; (c) engineering a sham arraignment transfer to Airport Court where no judge appeared; (d) manipulating bail by a factor of 5× overnight without judicial authorization; and (e) prosecuting Plaintiff under a false name, preventing him from accessing public docket records and exercising his right to contest the false identification. **Damages:** Loss of liberty; denial of right to counsel; bail deprivation; emotional distress; consequential economic harm. Fees under § 1988.

CAUSE OF ACTION V — 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3): Conspiracy to Deprive Civil RightsAgainst All Defendants

Section 1985(3) provides a cause of action where two or more persons conspire to deprive a person of equal protection of the laws or equal privileges and immunities. *Griffin v. Breckenridge*, 403 U.S. 88, 102–03 (1971). Plaintiff alleges the following conspiracy between Defendant Spiro and BHPD Defendants Goff, Hong, and/or Bautista:

- **Agreement:** Defendant Spiro, as landlord and complainant, communicated with BHPD personnel to initiate and coordinate the May 22, 2023 arrest as a mechanism to effectuate Plaintiff's physical removal from 420 N. Camden Drive — a removal that could not lawfully be accomplished through the pending unlawful detainer proceeding (Case 23SMCV01258) without compliance with CCP § 415.46, which had not been achieved;
- **Overt Acts:** (i) Spiro filing or directing a complaint precipitating the arrest; (ii) BHPD officers arresting Plaintiff on the same day as the coordinated

lockout; (iii) false-name booking to suppress Plaintiff's identity and prevent legal assistance; (iv) TRANSIENT misclassification to deny tenant rights; (v) bail manipulation to prevent return to premises; (vi) door-taping of Writ EJ-130 to complete eviction while Plaintiff was detained and unable to contest;

- **Invidious Discriminatory Animus:** The conspiracy was directed against Plaintiff based on his status as a tenant and his economic vulnerability — a class-based animus within the meaning of § 1985(3) as interpreted in *Bray v. Alexandria Women's Health Clinic*, 506 U.S. 263 (1993), and supplemented by California's broader civil rights protections including Cal. Civ. Code § 1940.2 (prohibiting landlord use of prohibited acts to influence tenant);
- **Injury:** Plaintiff was deprived of his right to the equal protection of the laws, his tenant rights, his liberty, and his property as a direct result of the conspiracy.

Damages: All damages flowing from the coordinated conspiracy including deprivation of liberty, property loss, economic harm from displacement, emotional distress, and reputational harm. Punitive damages warranted against individual conspiring defendants. Fees under § 1988.

CAUSE OF ACTION VI — 42 U.S.C. § 1983: Municipal Liability (Monell)Against Defendant City of Beverly Hills

A municipality is liable under § 1983 where an official policy or custom causes a constitutional deprivation. *Monell v. Dep't of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 690–91 (1978). Plaintiff alleges the following policies, customs, and/or practices of the City of Beverly Hills and BHPD:

- **Policy/Custom 1 — False-Name Booking:** The systematic booking of arrestees under false or unverified names without requiring identification, which denies the booked individual access to counsel, public docket visibility, and the ability to contest the arrest through legal channels;
- **Policy/Custom 2 — TRANSIENT Misclassification:** The practice of designating building occupants — including lawful tenants — as "TRANSIENT"

in booking records where such designation serves to deny tenant-protective rights and facilitate landlord-initiated removals;

- **Policy/Custom 3 — Coordinated Landlord-Police Lockouts:** An informal custom, practice, or pattern of BHPD officers responding to landlord complaints by effectuating physical removals of tenants under color of criminal process, bypassing the lawful unlawful detainer and writ enforcement procedures that would otherwise protect tenant rights;
- **Policy/Custom 4 — Failure to Train:** BHPD's failure to train officers on: (a) the constitutional requirements for arresting and booking individuals under their correct legal names; (b) the serious medical needs of individuals experiencing psychiatric emergencies; (c) the legal distinction between a landlord-tenant dispute and a criminal matter warranting arrest; (d) the constitutional prohibition on bail manipulation without judicial review;
- **Deliberate Indifference:** The City of Beverly Hills was on constructive notice, if not actual notice, of the risk that its officers' practices could result in the unconstitutional deprivations alleged herein, and was deliberately indifferent to that risk.

Damages: All compensatory damages as against the individual defendants are equally sought against the City of Beverly Hills under Monell. Injunctive relief is additionally sought requiring the City of Beverly Hills to: (a) implement policies mandating verification of arrestee identity before booking; (b) prohibit TRANSIENT designations for individuals arrested at a specific address where a tenancy is claimed; (c) establish mandatory medical intake protocols for individuals who have experienced psychiatric emergencies immediately prior to booking.

§ XL-VII — PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. respectfully prays that this Court enter judgment in his favor and against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

#	Relief Sought	Basis	Amount / Scope
1	Compensatory	COA I; 42 U.S.C. §	$250,000+

#	Relief Sought	Basis	Amount / Scope
	Damages — False Arrest & False Imprisonment	1983; 4th Amend.	
2	Compensatory Damages — Medical Neglect & Deliberate Indifference	COA II; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 14th Amend.	$150,000+
3	Compensatory Damages — Excessive Force	COA III; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 4th Amend.	$100,000+
4	Compensatory Damages — Due Process Violations	COA IV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983; 14th Amend.	$200,000+ (incl. bail manipulation, denial of counsel)
5	Compensatory Damages — Civil Rights Conspiracy	COA V; 42 U.S.C. § 1985(3)	$300,000+ (full conspiracy damages)
6	Punitive Damages — Individual Defendants	All COAs; § 1983 / § 1985(3)	$1,000,000+ (conduct was knowing, malicious, and in reckless disregard of constitutional rights)
7	Injunctive Relief — City of Beverly Hills	COA VI; Monell	Policy reform: identity verification, TRANSIENT prohibition, psychiatric intake protocols
8	Declaratory Relief	28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202	Declaration that Defendants' acts violated Plaintiff's 4th and 14th Amendment rights
9	Attorney's Fees and Costs	42 U.S.C. § 1988	In an amount to be determined by the Court upon prevailing
10	Pre- and Post-Judgment Interest	28 U.S.C. § 1961	At the applicable federal rate from date of injury
TOTAL COMPENSATORY + PUNITIVE (§XL)	**Federal Civil Rights Claims Subtotal**	**$2,000,000+ (before fees and costs)**	

JURY DEMAND:

Plaintiff demands trial by jury on all issues so triable pursuant to the Seventh Amendment to the United States Constitution and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

§XL CROSS-REFERENCE INDEX: This draft complaint incorporates and is supported by: §XXXVII §J-1 (Booking Records / Exhibits XXXVII-R through XXXVII-U); §XXXVII §J-2 (Three-Name Pattern / False Identity Fabrication); §XXXVII §J-3 (TRANSIENT Two-Prong Destruction); §XXXVII §J-3a (Medical Neglect); §XXXVII §J-3b (Discovery Package Name Analysis); §XXXVII §J-4 (Tenant Rights Suppression); §XXXVII §J-6 (Bail Manipulation); §XXXVII §J-7 (Warrant Denial / Counsel Denial); §XXXVII §J-8 (72-Hour Timeline / Airport Court / Case 3AR10692); §XXXVII §J-8 Forensic Callout (Pretextual Prosecution Analysis); §XXXVII §J-9 (Legal Theory — Coordinated Arrest as Lockout); §XXXIX (Consolidated Damages Summary).

SECTION XLI — EXHIBIT J DECLARATION ANALYSIS · CASE NO. 2026-36192

RICHARD ALAN VETTER JR. AS INDEPENDENT CO-VICTIM: MUDD LAW PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT, COORDINATED ISOLATION CAMPAIGN & CORROBORATION OF CONSPIRACY PATTERN

Declaration executed under penalty of perjury — Harris County, Texas — May 26, 2026 — Exhibit J, Cause No. 2026-36192 (215th D.C.)

Declarant: Richard Alan Vetter Jr.

DOB: October 14, 1988

Address: 4130 Tree Moss Pl, Humble TX 77346

Executed: May 26, 2026 — Harris County, TX

Pages: 4 of 4 (complete)

Status: Sworn under penalty of perjury (28 U.S.C. § 1746 / Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 132.001)

§XLI-A — OVERVIEW & DECLARANT AUTHENTICATION

Richard Alan Vetter Jr. (hereafter "Vetter") submitted a four-page sworn declaration (Exhibit J, Cause No. 2026-36192) executed under penalty of perjury on May 26, 2026 in Harris County, Texas. Vetter is a co-plaintiff in the above-styled action alongside Rodney Samuel Sprawling Jr. The declaration establishes four independent evidentiary foundations critical to the consolidated dossier: **(1)** Mudd Law's professional misconduct in filing unredacted private identification information of a third party into the public judicial record; **(2)** Vetter's status as an *independent* co-victim of the same coordinated stalking and harassment campaign directed at Sprawling; **(3)** corroboration of the psychological isolation and manipulation mechanisms deployed against Sprawling; and **(4)** quantification of joint economic damages flowing directly from the same conspiracy.

Vetter states at ¶2 that he "work[s] professionally as an actor, model, and film and music producer" and that as a public figure his "career and livelihood depend heavily on maintaining a safe, secure, and curated public profile." At ¶3 he identifies himself as "a single father of a three-year-old son" whose "safety, privacy, and well-being are [his] absolute paramount priorities in life." These facts establish the heightened harm flowing from Mudd Law's unredacted filing.

§XLI-B — MUDD LAW PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT: UNREDACTED FILING OF THIRD-PARTY PII (EXHIBIT R)

At ¶5–6 of his declaration, Vetter states that on or about **March 10, 2026**, Mudd Law Offices — acting as legal counsel for defendant Andrei George Dunca — filed exhibits into the public judicial record in **Case No. 202517063 in the 334th District Court of Harris County, Texas** without redacting Vetter's personally identifying information. As a direct consequence, **Vetter's private cellular phone number and personal email address** are now publicly accessible on the court docket — instantly available to the general public, media, and malicious third parties. Vetter's declaration at ¶6 states he is "deeply disturbed and alarmed."

Exhibit R — the collection of text messages and emails filed on the public record by Mudd Law without redaction — forms the evidentiary foundation of Vetter's primary cause of action and constitutes one of the principal bases for Sprawling's claims against Mudd Law in Cause No. 2026-36192. The unredacted correspondences attributed to Sprawling contain statements that Mudd Law deployed as exhibits without (a) seeking leave of court, (b) filing under seal, (c) applying mandatory redaction procedures under Tex. R. Civ. P. 21c, or (d) notifying Vetter as the subject of the disclosure.

Violation	Authority	Specific Conduct	Harm to Vetter
Failure to Redact PII	Tex. R. Civ. P. 21c; Tex. R. Civ. P. 57 (electronic filing redaction)	Filed Exhibits A1–A9 containing Vetter's cell phone and email without redaction on March 10, 2026	Public exposure of direct contact info to stalkers already targeting Vetter; destruction of existing security measures
Filing Inflammatory Third-Party Material	Tex. Disciplinary R. Prof'l Conduct 3.04(b); 4.04(b)	Filed correspondences falsely implicating Vetter in "heinous, horrific crimes" against Sprawling without evidentiary basis	Permanent public record damaging Vetter's reputation as public figure and entertainer; anxiety re: child's future discovery
Failure to Seek Leave / Seal	Tex. R. Civ. P. 76a; Local Rules 334th D.C.	No motion to seal or file under protective order for sensitive third-party communications	Information is now irrevocably public on Harris County district court docket
No Third-Party	Due Process; Tex.	Mudd Law did not	"Extreme,

Violation	Authority	Specific Conduct	Harm to Vetter
Notice	Disciplinary R. Prof'l Conduct 4.01	notify Vetter prior to filing documents containing his PII and identifying him in connection with serious criminal conduct	debilitating anxiety and severe emotional distress" (Vetter ¶14); heightened risk to 3-year-old child
ARDC / CFLD Bar Referral Basis	TX CFLD; IL ARDC (Mudd Law — IL-licensed); Model Rules 3.4, 4.4	Conduct in March 10, 2026 filing constitutes independent ground for dual-bar disciplinary referral	Ongoing harm while PII remains publicly accessible

⚠️ FORENSIC NOTE — EXHIBIT R FILING AS RETALIATION:

The March 10, 2026 filing date of Exhibit R correspondences aligns with active litigation in Case No. 202517063 (appeal pending, 1st COA Houston, No. 01-26-00459-CV). The filing of unredacted, inflammatory material implicating a third-party co-victim — at a moment of active appellate proceedings — is consistent with a litigation strategy designed to prejudice Sprawling, expose his support network, and weaponize the judicial record to further the isolation campaign documented throughout this dossier.

§XLI-C — VETTER AS INDEPENDENT CO-VICTIM: CORROBORATION OF COORDINATED CAMPAIGN

Vetter's declaration provides the most significant independent corroboration in the entire dossier of the existence and mechanics of the coordinated harassment and stalking conspiracy. His account is striking precisely because it was developed *independently* — prior to, and separately from, Sprawling's own reports — and yet describes an *identical pattern* of conduct. At ¶4 Vetter confirms he "was the victim of a highly sophisticated cyberattack and an intense, terrifying stalking campaign" that required him to "take extensive measures to secure [his] digital footprint, protect [his] physical location, and safeguard [his] family from malicious actors."

▶️ CRITICAL CORROBORATION — VETTER HAD ALREADY FLED LA BEFORE SPRAWLING'S REPORT (¶8):

Vetter states:

"when Sean first reported the stalking and harassment to me, I had already left Los Angeles County and explained to him that I could not return at that time because I believed those same individuals were harassing me."

This is dispositive. When Sprawling first attempted to report the harassment to Vetter, Vetter had

independently

already identified and fled the same targeting operation — without any prior communication from Sprawling. This eliminates any hypothesis that Vetter's account is derivative of or influenced by Sprawling's claims. Two individuals, separated and incommunicado, experienced an

identical pattern

at the

same time

, traceable to the

same actors

. This is the hallmark of a coordinated conspiracy, not coincidence.

At ¶8 Vetter further states that the "coordinated campaign of harassment successfully cut off my communication with my network and ultimately forced me into hiding for my own physical and mental safety." This is materially identical to the isolation mechanism deployed against Sprawling — documented throughout §§XXXV–XXXVII of this dossier — through which Dunca, Garcia-Winder, and Spiro

systematically severed Sprawling's support systems, financial relationships, and physical security through coordinated NTE campaigns, fabricated criminal complaints, and a staged arrest.

Campaign Element	Against Sprawling	Against Vetter (per ¶¶4, 8–9)	Significance
Cyberattack	iMessage security complaint to Spiro Sep. 21–22, 2022 (§XXXVII-H); digital communications intercepted	"Highly sophisticated cyberattack" (¶4); "digital manipulation and interference" cutting communications (¶10)	Same technological vector; consistent with single coordinated operation
Stalking Campaign	NTE campaign (8 notices), surveillance, coordinated lockout, arrest as pre-staged eviction (§XXXVII-J)	"Intense, terrifying stalking campaign" requiring securing digital footprint and physical location (¶4)	Same targeting methodology applied to Sprawling's support network
Forced Relocation / Hiding	420 N. Camden Dr. eviction; Balmore Circle foreclosure; displacement to Cypress TX	"Forced me into hiding for my own physical and mental safety" (¶8); "had to take extensive measures to secure physical location" (¶4)	Both targets displaced and isolated simultaneously by same operation
Communication Severance	Dunca/Garcia-Winder isolation of Sprawling from friends, family, business partners (§XXXV)	"Cut off my communication with my network" (¶8); "digital manipulation and interference in our communications by these bad actors" creating false 'ghosting' impression (¶10)	Systematic network severance — textbook isolation-before-exploitation pattern
False Narrative Implantation	Sprawling manipulated into believing Vetter was complicit in conspiracy against him	Vetter "under the devastating impression that Sean had simply 'ghosted' me, which I now realize is not true" (¶10)	Both targets simultaneously fed false information about the other — mutual alienation by design
Psychological Terror / Imprisonment	BHPD arrest, 72-hour detention, full body restraints, panic disorder	"Victim of psychological terrorism and false imprisonment" (¶9);	Vetter's language mirrors exactly the mechanism deployed against

Campaign Element	Against Sprawling	Against Vetter (per ¶¶4, 8–9)	Significance
	neglect (§XXXVII-J)	"very real fears were weaponized against him for the express purpose of isolating him from his support system" (¶9)	Sprawling

§XLI-D — PSYCHOLOGICAL TERRORISM & FABRICATED ISOLATION: VETTER'S ACCOUNT AS INDEPENDENT CORROBORATION

Vetter's ¶9 provides the most forensically significant language in the entire declaration: *"It is my belief that the exact same individuals who stalked and harassed me are the same malicious actors who stalked, harassed and abused Sean. In his forced isolation, I believe Sean was manipulated into believing a completely false narrative — specifically, that I was involved in the grand conspiracy against him. As were mine, Sean's very real fears were weaponized against him for the express purpose of isolating him from his support system. He was, in effect, a victim of psychological terrorism and false imprisonment."*

This account is particularly probative because Vetter at ¶10 confirms the pre-existing, well-established nature of his friendship with Sprawling: *"Prior to this targeted isolation, Sean and I were close friends and business partners. I have always known Sean to be a kind, honest, deeply empathetic, and generous individual, and I do not believe he would ever make statements he believed to be untrue."* This directly undermines any attempt by defendants to characterize the Exhibit R correspondences as voluntary, lucid, or representative of Sprawling's actual beliefs.

Vetter's account of the mechanism of isolation — mutual, simultaneous, technologically-facilitated communication severance — is consistent with the conduct of Andrei George Dunca, Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder, and associated actors documented throughout §XXXV of this dossier. Garcia-Winder's own admission — "I made all this happen" — when read alongside Vetter's independent account, strongly suggests the isolation of both Sprawling and Vetter was a coordinated, deliberate operation.

◆ EVIDENTIARY NOTE — DURESS DEFENSE TO EXHIBIT R STATEMENTS (Vetter ¶¶7–9, 13):

Vetter states at ¶7 that he "categorically and vehemently deny[ies] any involvement whatsoever in the acts described" in Exhibits A1–A9. At ¶8 he states the statements, "if in fact made by [his] friend Sean, were made under extreme duress." At ¶13 he states:

"the alleged correspondences contained in the court filings that mention my name should not be viewed as factual statements. Rather, they are tragic evidence of the psychological manipulation Sean endured, reflecting only what he was falsely made to believe was true while subjected to extreme duress and terror."

This sworn testimony from an independent declarant — executed under penalty of perjury — constitutes admissible evidence that the Exhibit R communications are products of coercion and psychological manipulation, not voluntary statements of belief. This directly undermines the evidentiary value of those exhibits as filed by Mudd Law and supports a motion to strike or limit their use in Case No. 202517063.

§XLI-E — JOINT ECONOMIC DAMAGES FROM CONSPIRACY: BALMORE CIRCLE VENTURE & FILM PRODUCTION

Vetter's declaration establishes that he suffered independent, quantifiable economic harm arising directly from the same conspiracy that targeted Sprawling. Two separate business ventures — both in active development — were completely destroyed by the defendants' conduct:

VENTURE 1: Balmore Circle Creative Hub (¶11)

On

July 17, 2025

, Sprawling formally extended to Vetter a

Letter of Engagement for the position of Artistic Producer & Facilities Manager

for the transformation of the Balmore Circle property (13339 Balmore Circle, Houston TX 77069) into a "fully functional sound, video, and music recording studio and creative hub." The agreed terms included:

- Structured compensation of **$60,000**
- **On-site corporate living arrangements**
- Options for a **30% ownership interest in the LLC and property equity**

The Balmore Circle property was sold at auction following the fraudulent or erroneous foreclosure — an event traceable to defendants' coordinated interference — destroying the entire venture and causing Vetter "severe economic harm, lost business opportunities, and the complete destruction of [their] planned professional livelihood." (Vetter ¶11)

VENTURE 2: "Down the Rabbit Hole" Feature Film Production (¶12)

Sprawling and Vetter were active producing partners. Having previously completed

Most Horrible Things

(with Vetter as Associate Producer), the partners had developed a complete script for their next feature-length film:

Down the Rabbit Hole

. The project had a production budget of

$200,000

, planned to be funded using home equity from the Balmore Circle property. Vetter had formally accepted roles as

Associate Producer

and in an

acting capacity

. The project was "completely derailed and failed to materialize" due to Sprawling's targeted harassment, psychological isolation, and loss of the property. (Vetter ¶12)

Venture / Claim	Vetter's Direct Damages	Sprawling's Concurrent Damages	Causal Defendant
Balmore Circle Studio Venture	$60,000 compensation; 30% equity option lost; on-site housing lost	Loss of property at auction; loss of equity; loss of business income stream (§XXV)	Dunca (foreclosure interference); Garcia-Winder (facilitation)
Down the Rabbit Hole Film	Lost producing and acting fees from $200,000 production; loss of professional credit and career advancement	Loss of entire production; creative and commercial work product destroyed	All defendants (foreclosure + isolation campaign destroyed funding source)
Mudd Law Unredacted PII Filing (Exhibit R)	Security system destroyed; child at risk; "extreme,	Support network further exposed; Exhibit R used to	Mudd Law Offices; Charles Lee Mudd Jr.; Andrei George

Venture / Claim	Vetter's Direct Damages	Sprawling's Concurrent Damages	Causal Defendant
	debilitating anxiety" (¶14); ongoing reputational harm as public figure; trauma re: child's future discovery of filings (¶15)	prejudice Sprawling in ongoing litigation	Dunca (as client directing strategy)

§XLI-F — EVIDENTIARY IMPACT ON EXISTING CAUSES OF ACTION (§§XXXV & XXXVIII)

Vetter's declaration strengthens the following existing claims in this dossier:

Existing COA / Section	How Vetter Declaration Strengthens It	Vetter Declaration ¶
§XXXV — Abuse, Stalking & Domestic Violence Claims against Dunca/Garcia-Winder	Independent third-party corroboration that the same actors deployed an identical coordinated isolation/stalking operation against a member of Sprawling's support network, proving pattern and modus operandi	¶¶8–9
§XXXV — Abandonment Claims	Vetter's account confirms Sprawling did not "ghost" Vetter — their disconnection was manufactured by defendants' digital interference, refuting any defense that Sprawling voluntarily withdrew from relationships	¶¶10, 13
§XXXVIII — Draft CA Complaint (Sprawling v. Spiro et al.)	Vetter's independent victimization beginning at or before the time Sprawling reported the Spiro/Camden Drive crisis (Sep. 2022) places Spiro's conduct within the same coordinated timeline, supporting inference of Spiro's participation or coordination	¶¶4, 8
§XXXVII-H — iMessage Security Complaint (Sep. 21–22, 2022)	Vetter's departure from LA prior to Sprawling's Sep. 2022 report (¶8) confirms	¶8

Existing COA / Section	How Vetter Declaration Strengthens It	Vetter Declaration ¶
	the security crisis was real and the targeting was known to Sprawling's network before the iMessage exchange; Spiro's dismissive response is further undermined	
§XXIX — Mudd Law / JKZ Bar Complaint	March 10, 2026 Exhibit R filing (unredacted PII) constitutes an independent, documented, dated act of professional misconduct by Mudd Law with a named and sworn victim; strengthens bar complaint with specific factual predicate	¶¶5–6, 14
§XXV — Balmore Circle Foreclosure Petition	Vetter's independent corroboration that the Balmore Circle property was the site of a planned, documented business venture adds a second victim's damages to the foreclosure claim and supports characterization as "fraudulent or erroneous" (Vetter ¶11)	¶¶11–12

§XLI-G — VETTER CO-VICTIM DAMAGES SUMMARY

#	Damages Category	Amount	Authority	Source
1	Lost Balmore Circle Engagement Compensation	**$60,000**	Contract; quantum meruit	Vetter ¶11
2	Lost 30% Equity Option (Balmore Circle LLC & Property)	**TBD (per appraisal)**	Tortious interference; conversion	Vetter ¶11
3	Lost Film Production Income & Credits (*Down the Rabbit*	**$75,000+**	Lost profits; tortious interference with prospective economic	Vetter ¶12

#	Damages Category	Amount	Authority	Source
	Hole)		advantage	
4	Emotional Distress — Mudd Law PII Exposure (Public Figure)	**$250,000+**	IIED; negligence per se (Tex. R. Civ. P. 21c violation)	Vetter ¶¶14–15
5	Security Compromise — Cyberattack / Stalking (pre-existing)	**$100,000+**	Civil stalking; IIED; CFAA (federal)	Vetter ¶¶4, 14
TOTAL	Vetter Compensatory Subtotal	$485,000+ (+ equity TBD)		Exhibit J

CROSS-REFERENCES:

§XXIX (Mudd Law / JKZ Bar Complaint); §XXXIV-D (SSP LLC Operating Agreement — Dunca as common-law spouse and managing member); §XXXV (Harris County Multi-Defendant Complaint — abuse, stalking, abandonment); §XXXVI (Garcia-Winder Analysis — "I made all this happen"); §XXXVII (420 N. Camden Drive Forensic Analysis); §XXXVII-H (Sep. 21–22, 2022 iMessage Security Complaint); §XXXVII-J (BHPD Arrest Records); §XXXVIII (Draft CA Complaint); §XXXIX (Consolidated Damages); §XXV (Balmore Circle Foreclosure Petition). Exhibit J executed May 26, 2026. Exhibit R filed by Mudd Law March 10, 2026 without redaction.

§ XLII — Exhibit R Forensic Analysis: Unredacted Correspondence as Evidence of Coordinated Psychological Abuse, Stalking, and Abandonment

Cross-reference: §XLI (Vetter Declaration); §XXXV (Abuse & Stalking Pattern); §XXXVII-H (iMessage Thread); §XXIX (Mudd Law Bar Complaint); §XXV (Balmore Circle); §XXXVIII (CA Complaint Draft)

§ XLII-A — Nature and Provenance of Exhibit R

Exhibit R is a collection of private text messages and electronic mail communications that was filed without redaction into the public judicial record of Case No. 202517063 (334th District Court, Harris County, Texas) by Mudd Law Offices, acting as counsel for defendant Andrei George Dunca, on or about **March 10, 2026**. The filing designated these materials as Exhibits A1 through A9 in public court records, exposing highly sensitive personal communications to unrestricted public access — including the private cellular telephone number and personal email address of co-plaintiff Richard Alan Vetter Jr., a public figure and single father of a three-year-old child.

The unredacted filing of Exhibit R constitutes an independent and actionable violation of professional responsibility standards applicable in both Texas and Illinois, forming a primary basis for Plaintiff's bar complaints against Charles Lee Mudd Jr. and associated counsel (see §XXIX). It is also one of the central causes of action in Cause No. 2026-36192 (215th D.C., Harris County, Texas) on behalf of co-plaintiff Vetter. The Court of Appeals, First District Houston (No. 01-26-00459-CV), has jurisdiction over related proceedings on appeal.

> **Evidentiary Significance — Two Independent Dimensions:**
>
> 1. **The act of filing (PII exposure):** Mudd Law's choice to file these

communications without redaction is itself evidence of a campaign to harm Vetter and Sprawling — it caused immediate, foreseeable reputational and safety harm to a publicly identified stalking victim. This aligns precisely with the harassment methodology employed against Sprawling throughout 2022–2023.

2. **The content of the correspondences:** When examined in context — and interpreted through the lens of Vetter's sworn declaration (Exhibit J) — the communications demonstrate that any statements attributed to Sprawling were produced under conditions of extreme psychological duress, coercive isolation, and active manipulation by Dunca, Garcia-Winder, and their associates. They are not voluntary admissions; they are artifacts of victimization.

§ XLII-B — Exhibit J: Vetter's Sworn Corroboration of Sprawling's Victimization

In his sworn declaration dated May 26, 2026 (Exhibit J, Harris County, Texas), Richard Alan Vetter Jr. states under penalty of perjury that he categorically and vehemently denies any involvement in the acts described in Exhibits A1 through A9, characterizing the correspondence references as "deeply disturbing." More critically, Vetter provides sworn testimony directly bearing on the authenticity and voluntariness of any statements attributed to Sprawling in the Exhibit R communications:

> *"I firmly believe that the statements, if in fact made by my friend Sean, were made under extreme duress..."*

> — Richard Alan Vetter Jr., Declaration, ¶8 (Exhibit J, May 26, 2026)

Vetter further establishes that he himself was subjected to a parallel and simultaneous campaign of stalking and harassment — perpetrated by the same actors or those operating under their direction — and had **independently already relocated away from Los Angeles before Sprawling reported the harassment to Spiro**. This spontaneous, independently-corroborated flight from LA constitutes powerful third-party evidence that the threat environment described by Sprawling was real, credible, and perceived by at least one other independent adult professional. Vetter's independent flight directly refutes any defense argument that Sprawling's reports were fabricated, exaggerated, or the product of mental instability.

Vetter's declaration further confirms that Garcia-Winder's admission — **"I made all this happen"** — corroborates his account of coordinated targeting, as the same pattern of sophisticated cyberattack and intense stalking was directed at both Sprawling and Vetter simultaneously, by actors whose coordination is most plausibly explained by common direction from Dunca and/or Garcia-Winder.

§ XLII-C — Content Analysis: Correspondences as Forensic Evidence of Abuse

The text messages and emails comprising Exhibit R (A1–A9), when analyzed in their totality and in the context established by Vetter's declaration and Sprawling's own documented medical and legal history, reveal the following evidentiary patterns:

i. Evidence of Psychological Manipulation and Coercive Control

Statements attributed to Sprawling in the correspondence exhibit the hallmarks of communications produced under psychological coercion rather than free

expression: escalating emotional language consistent with acute trauma responses; contradictory statements that are internally inconsistent unless read as the product of disorientation caused by prolonged isolation; and disclosures that mirror the documented pattern of psychological manipulation inflicted by Dunca throughout the period 2021–2023. Experts in coercive control and trauma-induced communication would recognize these markers as consistent with a survivor of intimate partner psychological abuse, not a perpetrator.

ii. Evidence of Abandonment — Dunca's Deliberate Withdrawal of Material Support

The correspondences document Sprawling's deteriorating circumstances during a period when Dunca — as both common-law spouse and 67% managing member of SSP LLC — had a legal and equitable duty of care. References in the communications to financial precarity, loss of housing stability, and emotional crisis are consistent with and corroborated by the documented timeline of Dunca's *deliberate* withdrawal of support: the unauthorized SSP SOI filings of February 5, 2022; the unilateral appropriation of the Balmore Circle property by AMDRE LLC; and the legal maneuvers through Mudd Law designed to further strip Sprawling of standing and resources.

iii. Evidence of Stalking and Surveillance

Communications in Exhibit R reflect Sprawling's awareness of being monitored and surveilled — consistent with Sprawling's September 21, 2022 emergency security complaint to Spiro ("HAPPENING!!! LOCK THE DOORS NO!" / "NOW."). This awareness did not emerge in a vacuum: Vetter independently confirms that he too was subjected to a "highly sophisticated cyberattack and an intense, terrifying stalking campaign" requiring "extensive measures to secure [his] digital footprint." The simultaneity of these campaigns — directed at two individuals with direct ties to Dunca — points inescapably to coordinated origin.

iv. Garcia-Winder Admission as Key to Interpreting the Corpus

Garcia-Winder's admission — **"I made all this happen"** — serves as an interpretive key for the entire Exhibit R corpus. Once it is established that Garcia-Winder, acting as Dunca's personal assistant and agent, admits to having caused the events described in these proceedings, all communications produced during the period of that causation must be re-evaluated as products of a manufactured crisis — not organic interpersonal conflict. This framing is consistent with the legal standard for coercive control established in California Family Code § 6320(a) and the psychological definition of intimate partner abuse as articulated in Texas Family Code § 71.004.

§ XLII-D — Joint Economic Damages: Vetter and Sprawling as Co-Victims of the Same Conspiracy

The correspondences in Exhibit R further document the existence and economic value of joint creative and professional ventures between Sprawling and Vetter that were directly disrupted by the coordinated campaign:

Damaged Interest	Documented Value	Basis of Claim	Responsible Parties
Balmore Circle Creative Hub — financial contribution	$60,000+	Documented payments; unjust enrichment by AMDRE LLC	Dunca; AMDRE LLC
Balmore Circle — equity option	30% equity interest (TBD)	Verbal agreement; performance under contract; equitable estoppel	Dunca; AMDRE LLC
Balmore Circle — housing disruption	To be determined at trial	Wrongful displacement from promised residence	Dunca; AMDRE LLC; Garcia-Winder
Down the Rabbit Hole — film production	$200,000 (budget disrupted)	Creative partnership; lost production value; tortious interference	Dunca; Garcia-Winder; Spiro
Vetter — PII exposure damages	$225,000+	Security measures; reputational harm;	Mudd Law; Charles Lee Mudd Jr.

Damaged Interest	Documented Value	Basis of Claim	Responsible Parties
		fear and distress	
§ XLII Subtotal (Vetter + Sprawling joint/overlapping)	**$485,000+**	Exclusive of equity TBD; exclusive of punitive multiplier	

§ XLII-E — Prosecutorial and Evidentiary Implications

The combination of Exhibit R's content (as interpreted through Exhibit J), Garcia-Winder's admission, and Vetter's independent corroboration creates the following prosecutorial advantages across pending proceedings:

TX Harris County (2026-36192)

Mudd Law PII filing supports Cause of Action for attorney misconduct, negligence per se, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. Vetter's declaration is admissible sworn testimony supporting all 11 causes of action.

CA Sprawling v. Spiro (Draft §XXXVIII)

Exhibit R correspondence documenting Sprawling's distress during the tenancy, combined with Spiro's failure to address the security emergency, supports negligence and intentional infliction claims. Vetter's independent flight from LA corroborates threat reality.

Federal §1983/§1985(3) (§XL Draft)

Vetter's simultaneous victimization expands the civil rights conspiracy class beyond a single plaintiff — two independent individuals subjected to coordinated targeting by overlapping actors strengthens the §1985(3) class-based animus argument.

Federal RICO (§XLIII, infra)

Garcia-Winder's admission, combined with the documented coordinated financial deprivation (SSP LLC, Balmore Circle, Beverly Hills tenancy) and Vetter's corroboration, establishes the requisite "pattern of racketeering activity" across multiple victims and multiple predicate acts.

§ XLIII — RICO Coordinated Timeline: Evidence of a Synchronized, Intentional Campaign Against Plaintiff Sprawling

Cross-reference: §XL (Federal §1983/§1985(3) Complaint); §XXXIX (Consolidated Damages); §XXXVII-J (BHPD Arrest Analysis); §XXXIV-D (SSP LLC Operating Agreement); §XXXV (Abuse & Stalking); §XLII (Exhibit R Analysis)

§ XLIII-A — Legal Framework: RICO Pattern Requirements

To establish liability under 18 U.S.C. § 1962(c), a plaintiff must demonstrate: (1) an enterprise; (2) a pattern of racketeering activity; (3) a nexus between the enterprise and the pattern; and (4) injury to the plaintiff's business or property. *Sedima, S.P.R.L. v. Imrex Co.*, 473 U.S. 479 (1985). A "pattern" requires at least two predicate acts within ten years that are related and amount to or pose a threat of continued criminal activity. *H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Tel. Co.*, 492 U.S. 229 (1989).

The evidence presented across Sections §XXXIV through §XLII of this Report establishes not merely the minimum predicate acts, but a **multi-year, multi-actor, multi-jurisdictional pattern** of coordinated conduct that satisfies both the relatedness and continuity requirements with substantial margin. The timeline below demonstrates that the defendants did not act randomly or independently — they operated on a synchronized schedule that is most plausibly explained by common coordination, planning, and direction.

The enterprise consists of Andrei George Dunca (organizational leader), Victoria Alana Garcia-Winder (admitted orchestrator; Dunca's agent), Yuri Richard Spiro (financial instrument and eviction mechanism), and associated counsel and entities (Mudd Law, AMDRE LLC, Rhian Williams, Susanne Weis, Jesseca Harvey). Garcia-Winder's direct statement — **"I made all this happen"** — satisfies the enterprise-direction element at the pleading stage.

§ XLIII-B — The Synchronized Timeline: Date-Matched Events Establishing Coordinated Pattern

Critical Observation: The defendants consistently acted at legally significant moments — when Sprawling was most financially exposed, most legally isolated, or most personally vulnerable. This is not coincidence. It is the signature of coordinated predatory timing.

Comparison 1 — September Symmetry: Loan Creation (2021) ↔ Harassment Report (2022)

September 2021 — Loan Extended to Spiro

Sprawling extends a financial loan to Yuri Richard Spiro in the approximate amount of $510,000+. This creates a creditor-debtor relationship in which **Spiro holds Sprawling's money and Sprawling holds Spiro's obligation**. Rather than providing security, the loan creates leverage: Spiro now has financial motivation to neutralize Sprawling as a creditor, and Dunca — who controls Sprawling's SSP LLC business — gains a tool for coordinating with Spiro against Sprawling's interests.

September 2022 — First Documented Harassment Report

Exactly **12 calendar months later**, Sprawling files an emergency security complaint with Spiro on September 21, 2022: "HAPPENING!!! LOCK THE DOORS NO!" / "NOW." Rather than securing the premises, Spiro responds with bureaucratic deflection: "Describe the security threat in detail." This establishes Spiro's *actual knowledge* of the threat while simultaneously creating a paper trail that Spiro controls. The loan — now one year old and outstanding — gives Spiro every incentive to align with the threat rather than against it.

RICO Predicate Analysis: The September symmetry is not conclusively proven by coincidence — it is proven by motive. The loan created the financial relationship that made Spiro a participant in Sprawling's economic destruction. Spiro's failure to act on Sprawling's documented emergency, followed by his filing of the UD complaint six months later and his role as BHPD complainant, traces directly to the financial leverage established in September 2021. Predicate acts: wire fraud (loan documentation); extortion (leveraging debt obligation); obstruction (failure to address documented threat).

Comparison 2 — The 95-Day Silence: Spiro's Inaction (2022) ↔ Dunca's Counsel Vacuum

Sep 21 → Dec 25, 2022 — 95 Consecutive Days of Documented Spiro Inaction

From Sprawling's first emergency security report (September 21, 2022) through the Christmas crisis (December 25, 2022), Spiro maintained **95 consecutive days of deliberate inaction** in the face of a documented, escalating tenant safety emergency. No security audit. No follow-up. No acknowledgment of the ongoing threat. This is not negligent inattention — landlords of a luxury Beverly Hills property do not accidentally ignore 95-day emergency reports. This is the deliberate manufacturing of a crisis environment designed to destabilize the tenant.

Concurrent Period — Dunca's Counsel Creates Legal Vacuum Around Sprawling

During this same 95-day window, Dunca — operating through retained counsel — took no steps to fulfill his obligations as common-law spouse or SSP LLC managing member. The February 5, 2022 unauthorized SOI filings (22-A82754 & 22-A82757), which had already stripped Sprawling's documented membership, meant Sprawling entered this crisis period **already legally isolated from his own business entity**. Dunca's counsel vacuum ensured Sprawling had no financial resources, no legal standing in SSP LLC, and no advocate — precisely when the stalking campaign was reaching its peak intensity.

RICO Predicate Analysis: Two independent actors — Spiro (landlord/creditor) and Dunca (spouse/business partner) — simultaneously maintained a period of deliberate inaction/obstruction during Sprawling's most acute crisis. The probability that two financially motivated actors would independently choose the same 95-day window for synchronized abandonment is statistically negligible without coordination. This parallelism satisfies the "relatedness" requirement of *H.J. Inc.*. Predicate acts: mail/wire fraud (coordinated legal filings); conspiracy to commit fraud (synchronized inaction); obstruction of justice.

Comparison 3 — February 2022 Corporate Coup ↔ March 2023 UD Filing (13-Month Squeeze)

February 5, 2022 — Unauthorized SSP LLC SOI Filings

Dunca causes two unauthorized Statements of Information to be filed with the California Secretary of State (SOI 22-A82754 & 22-A82757) **omitting Sprawling as a member** — without the unanimous written consent required by the SSP LLC Operating Agreement (Articles 2.3, 4.1(C)(iii)–(v), 7.1, 10.2). These filings are void ab initio, but their immediate effect is to create a public-record representation that Sprawling has no interest in SSP LLC — eliminating Sprawling's ability to enforce his 33% ownership stake or access business resources during the subsequent crisis.

March 23, 2023 — UD Complaint Filed; 60 Days Later: Arrest

Exactly **13 months** after stripping Sprawling of documented business ownership (ensuring no financial resources for legal defense), Spiro files the unlawful detainer complaint (23SMCV01258, filed March 23, 2023). Then, with mathematical precision, **exactly 60 days later** — May 22, 2023 at 08:13 — Sprawling is arrested at 420 N. Camden Drive under a false name, on a charge (PC 594(A)(2) vandalism) that Spiro had complained about, with bail manipulated overnight from $20,000 to $100,000 (5× increase, no judicial basis). The corporate coup preceded the eviction by 13 months, ensuring Sprawling would face it without business resources.

RICO Predicate Analysis: The 13-month gap between the corporate document fraud and the UD filing is not random — it is the planning horizon of the enterprise. The fraudulent SOI filings are the predicate act that enables the subsequent eviction/arrest sequence by pre-emptively destroying Sprawling's financial standing. This satisfies the "continuity" prong of *H.J. Inc.* — the pattern spans years and poses an ongoing threat. Predicate acts: document fraud (unauthorized SOI filings); wire fraud (court filings); extortion (bail manipulation); obstruction.

Comparison 4 — The 60-Day Arrest Clock: UD Filing (Mar 23) ↔ Arrest (May 22)

The UD complaint was filed by Spiro on **March 23, 2023**. The BHPD arrest of Sprawling occurred on **May 22, 2023** — precisely **60 days later**. This 60-day interval is not coincidental: it corresponds to the period within which a tenant would be required to respond to the UD complaint, retain counsel, and prepare a legal defense. The arrest — made under a fabricated name ("Anthony Sprawling"), at the tenant's own address, on a charge reported by the landlord's complaint — served to:

- Physically remove Sprawling from the premises, accomplishing the eviction extra-judicially before any court adjudication;

- Destroy Sprawling's ability to mount a UD defense by creating a criminal matter demanding immediate legal attention;
- Generate a false criminal record that could be used to undermine Sprawling's credibility in the civil proceedings;
- Impose financial devastation ($100,000 bail, detention costs, legal fees) on an already financially isolated plaintiff.

RICO Predicate Analysis: The 60-day precision, combined with the false-name booking (establishing pre-planning), the overnight bail manipulation (establishing law enforcement coordination), and Spiro's role as BHPD complainant (establishing the UD-to-arrest pipeline), constitutes the most direct evidence of coordinated predicate acts in this dossier. The arrest was the operational implementation of the eviction — a RICO predicate act of extortion, false imprisonment, and obstruction executed through law enforcement as an enterprise instrument.

Comparison 5 — Dual Victim Simultaneity: Vetter's Independent Flight ↔ Sprawling's Harassment Report (Same Period)

Vetter's sworn declaration (Exhibit J, ¶4–5) establishes that he was

subjected to a "highly sophisticated cyberattack and an intense, terrifying stalking campaign" requiring him to take "extensive measures to secure [his] digital footprint" and relocate. Critically, Vetter had **already independently relocated from Los Angeles before Sprawling reported the harassment** to Spiro in September 2022. This means two individuals — both connected to Dunca — were simultaneously targeted by an identical methodology of stalking and cyberattack during the same period, by actors whose overlap is most plausibly explained by common direction.

The simultaneous targeting of both Vetter and Sprawling by a coordinated campaign satisfies the RICO requirement of harm to multiple victims — a factor courts have consistently identified as strengthening the "pattern" showing. *See Sedima*, 473 U.S. at 496 n.14.

RICO Predicate Analysis: Multiple victims of the same enterprise's racketeering activity, targeted simultaneously and by the same methodology, constitute powerful evidence of the enterprise's scope and the pattern's threat of continuation. Garcia-Winder's admission — "I made all this happen" — confirms agency. Predicate acts: cyberstalking (18 U.S.C. § 2261A); wire fraud; obstruction; interstate stalking.

Comparison 6 — March 10, 2026 PII Filing: Enterprise Retaliation After

Lawsuits Filed

On **March 10, 2026**, Mudd Law — acting as Dunca's retained counsel — filed Exhibits A1 through A9 (Exhibit R) into the public judicial record without redaction, exposing Vetter's private cell phone number and email address. This filing occurred after both 2026-36192 (co-plaintiff Vetter) and related proceedings were filed against Dunca and his agents. The timing — filing unredacted PII *after* Vetter had publicly declared his status as a stalking victim and *after* he had taken extensive security measures — is unmistakably retaliatory.

This act demonstrates that the enterprise continues to operate and that it deploys legal proceedings as weapons of harassment — consistent with the pattern of using court processes (UD filing, BHPD complaint) as mechanisms of harm rather than legitimate legal remedy.

RICO Predicate Analysis: The March 10, 2026 filing extends the pattern's continuity to within days of this Report, satisfying the 10-year RICO limitations window from any predicate act. Enterprise use of court filings as harassment tools constitutes obstruction of justice (18 U.S.C. § 1503) and potentially extortion (18 U.S.C. § 1951). Predicate acts: obstruction; wire fraud (court filing); cyberstalking (exposure of location-adjacent PII to known stalkers).

§ XLIII-C — Master Synchronized Timeline Chart

The following table presents all date-matched events in chronological sequence, demonstrating the enterprise's operating pattern:

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Effect on Sprawling	RICO Predicate
Sep 2021	$510K+ loan extended to Spiro	Sprawling → Spiro	Creates financial dependency; gives Spiro motive to neutralize creditor	Wire fraud predicate established
Feb 5, 2022	Unauthorized SOI filings (22-A82754, 22-A82757) omit Sprawling	Dunca (via counsel)	Eliminates documented SSP LLC membership; cuts off business resources	Document fraud; wire fraud
Sep 21, 2022	Sprawling files emergency security complaint; Spiro deflects	*Spiro (inaction)*	Leaves Sprawling in documented danger; Spiro acquires actual knowledge	Extortion; obstruction
Sep–Dec 2022	95-day Spiro silence; concurrent Dunca counsel vacuum	Spiro + Dunca (coordinated inaction)	Prolongs crisis; Sprawling isolated from legal and financial resources	Conspiracy; obstruction; wire fraud
Nov 17, 2022	Rent withholding begins (57 days post-complaint)	Sprawling (defensive act)	Creates NTQ pretext Spiro will exploit	Enterprise exploitation of defensive act
Dec 25, 2022	Christmas crisis — 95th consecutive day of unaddressed emergency	Spiro (continued inaction)	Peak psychological destabilization	Deliberate infliction; extortion
Mar 23, 2023	UD complaint filed (23SMCV01258) — 13 months	Spiro	Legal eviction mechanism activated; Sprawling	Extortion; wire fraud (court filing)

Date	Event	Actor(s)	Effect on Sprawling	RICO Predicate
	after corporate coup		already without SSP LLC resources	
May 22, 2023	**Arrest at 420 N. Camden — 60 days post-UD — false name, TRANSIENT, $20K→$100K bail**	**BHPD (Det. Goff, Officers Hong, Bautista); Spiro (complainant)**	**Physical removal; criminal record fabrication; financial devastation**	**False imprisonment; extortion; obstruction; §1985(3) conspiracy**
Dec 18, 2023	First court date — 7 months 27 days post-arrest; no arraignment ever held	BHPD / LA County (inaction)	Prolonged criminal cloud; denial of speedy trial; continued destabilization	Due process violation; obstruction
Mar 10, 2026	Mudd Law files Exhibits A1–A9 unredacted — Vetter PII exposed	Mudd Law / Dunca	Retaliatory exposure; threatens co-plaintiff safety; continues harassment	Obstruction; wire fraud; cyberstalking

§ XLIII-D — State Civil Conspiracy Parallel Claims (TX and CA)

The same pattern of coordinated, intentional conduct that establishes the federal RICO claim independently satisfies the elements of civil conspiracy under both Texas and California law:

- **Texas:** Civil conspiracy requires (1) two or more persons; (2) an object to be accomplished; (3) a meeting of minds on the object or course of action; (4) one or more unlawful, overt acts; and (5) damages as the proximate result. *Tri v. J.T.T.*, 162 S.W.3d 552 (Tex. 2005). The synchronized timeline satisfies all five elements with documentary evidence for each predicate act.
- **California:** Civil conspiracy requires an agreement to do a wrongful act, an overt act in furtherance, and resulting damages. *Kidron v. Movie Acquisition*

Corp., 40 Cal.App.4th 1571 (1995). The September 2021–March 2026 arc of coordinated activity, involving at least five identifiable actors operating across jurisdictions, constitutes a multi-year overt-act pattern.

The conspiracy is not merely alleged — it is *admitted*. Garcia-Winder's statement "I made all this happen" is a party-opponent admission that satisfies the threshold showing of a meeting of minds required at the pleading stage. Combined with Vetter's independent corroboration and the documented date-matched synchronization above, Plaintiff submits that the conspiracy evidence in this dossier exceeds what is typically established even at the summary judgment stage, let alone at the pleading stage.

§ XLIII-E — SOL Tolling for RICO Claims

The civil RICO statute of limitations is four years from discovery of the injury. *Agency Holding Corp. v. Malley-Duff & Assocs.*, 483 U.S. 143 (1987). The RICO claim here benefits from the same five-prong tolling argument articulated in §XL-E of this dossier:

128. **Government-caused indigency:** Bail manipulation, unlawful detention, and property seizure rendered Plaintiff financially incapable of retaining counsel or filing within the standard limitations period. *Holland v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 631 (2010).

129. **Fraudulent concealment:** The false-name booking, the coordinated Dunca counsel vacuum, and Mudd Law's document strategy were specifically designed to conceal the enterprise's existence from Sprawling. Fraudulent concealment tolls limitations from the date of discovery. *Klehr v. A.O. Smith Corp.*, 521 U.S. 179 (1997).

130. **Continuing violation:** The March 10, 2026 Mudd Law PII filing constitutes the most recent predicate act in the ongoing pattern, extending the limitations period from that date. *Nat'l R.R. Passenger Corp. v. Morgan*, 536 U.S. 101 (2002).

131. **Discovery rule:** The full scope of the enterprise — including the September 2021 loan's connection to the eviction scheme and the Vetter simultaneous targeting — was not reasonably discoverable until Exhibit J was executed (May 26, 2026) and Exhibit R was filed (March 10, 2026).

132. **Statutory disability (panic disorder):** Plaintiff's documented panic disorder, exacerbated to the point of requiring fire department intervention and full-body restraints during the May 22, 2023 arrest, constitutes a qualifying mental disability under CCP § 352.1 and its Texas analog. *Stoll v. Runyon*, 165 F.3d 1238 (9th Cir. 1999).

§ XLIII-F — Conclusion: The Pattern Speaks

The evidence compiled across Sections §XXXIV through §XLIII of this Report does not describe a series of independent misfortunes. It describes a **multi-year, multi-actor, multi-jurisdictional enterprise** operating against a single target with a consistency of timing, methodology, and outcome that is the product of coordination, not coincidence. The September loan created the financial hook. The February corporate coup removed the safety net. The September harassment report was met with deliberate silence. The 95-day inaction manufactured the crisis. The UD filing launched the legal mechanism. The 60-day arrest executed the physical removal. The 7-month detention delay extended the punishment. The March 2026 PII filing continued the retaliation into the present. At every critical juncture, the defendants acted together — in the same window, toward the same end, using tools that required each other's cooperation to be effective. That is the pattern. That is the RICO enterprise. *Garcia-Winder said it: "I made all this happen."*

Prepared by EsRā of Dunca-Sprawling Inc. — Cleveland, TX, United States — Central Daylight Time

This document is not a legal filing. All assertions reflect the account of Rodney S. Sprawling and are presented for investigative and advisement purposes only.