JUSTICE IS EXPOSURE MEDIA, LLC

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE • OCTOBER 21, 2026

USPS SERVICE REQUEST NO. 92364901

USPS Must Account for High-Profile Certified Court Papers Marked “Delivered, Parcel Locker”

Justice Is Exposure demands the acceptance record, a verified custody timeline, and a written explanation of unresolved delivery and complaint-handling questions.

FLORIDA - Justice Is Exposure Media, LLC is calling on the United States Postal Service to provide a documented account of a Certified Mail shipment sent on **October 5, 2026**, containing court papers intended for the receiving civil process office in Boston. Williams says he repeatedly told postal representatives that this was a **high-profile package** and emphasized the need for documented delivery. The reviewed tracking screenshots show a “Delivered, Parcel Locker” entry at **7:37 p.m. on October 14, 2026**. The correspondence reviewed through October 20 does not contain the requested acceptance record or confirmation from the civil process office that it received the packet.

Founder John Williams says the mailing contained an original summons, complaint and money order intended for the **receiving civil process office in Boston** in connection with a matter he repeatedly identified to USPS as **high-profile**. The immediate public-interest question is concrete: **Who accepted the mailing, when was it accepted, and what record supports that acceptance?**

“A delivery scan does not answer who accepted my court papers,” Williams said. “Produce the acceptance record, explain the parcel-locker entry, and account for the handling of this mailing. I am asking for verifiable answers, a responsible point of contact, and corrective action wherever the records show a failure.”

Williams is concerned that the handling and subsequent lack of substantive answers could reflect intentional interference. That concern is an allegation requiring investigation, not an established finding. The available materials do not establish intent, coordination between organizations, or the package’s present physical location.

Media contact: Dr. Jessica Lynn Campbell
jessica@exposureisjustice.org • JIE@exposureisjustice.org

Postal standards and the limits of the present record

The Domestic Mail Manual describes Certified Mail as providing evidence of mailing and a USPS delivery record that includes a recipient signature. Its recipient rules address signatures and authorized acceptance arrangements. Certified Mail does not, by itself, guarantee expedited transit. The manual is incorporated into postal regulations through 39 C.F.R. § 111.1. [1-3]

USPS also publishes program-specific limits: Certified Mail is not eligible for USPS Electronic Signature Online or gopost, and the premium Post Office Box signature-on-file arrangement does not cover Certified Mail. Those provisions do not establish what kind of locker or acceptance arrangement was involved here. USPS should identify the actual arrangement and explain its compliance. [4-6]

A parcel-locker tracking entry, without the underlying acceptance evidence, is insufficient to determine whether the applicable requirements were satisfied. The absence of that evidence from Williams's correspondence does not prove that USPS has no record. This release seeks the record and an explanation; it does not announce a finding of criminal conduct or a proven regulatory violation.

Justice Is Exposure intends to report the documented handling of the mailing, relevant responses, and any substantiated failures. USPS and the receiving office are invited to provide corrections, records and explanations. Material responses will be fairly reflected in subsequent reporting.

Documented chronology and outstanding questions

October 5: The tracking screenshots show USPS possession in Orlando, Florida, at 2:06 p.m. Williams identifies this mailing as the civil process packet. The screenshots show departure from the post office that evening and a Tampa entry on October 6.

October 13 - initial inquiry and case opening: Williams's contemporaneous email records an initial customer-service call in which the representative's understanding matched his visible tracking: arrival in Tampa, without a subsequent scan establishing departure. USPS acknowledged **Service Request 92364901 at 9:32 a.m.** and said the inquiry had been forwarded to management for research and response.

October 13, 9:46 a.m. - a conflicting Boston-hold account: Williams reports calling the number supplied for Tampa Consumer Affairs. The woman reached there repeatedly stated that the package was **being held in Boston** and referred him to Boston Consumer Affairs. He told her that the preceding representative had identified no scan showing movement beyond Tampa. His email says she nevertheless maintained that the package was being held in Boston.

October 13, 12:02 p.m. - a third account: Williams called the same Tampa number again. According to his email, a male representative's explanation aligned with the first customer-service account: the available information showed Tampa without a subsequent departure scan. That representative did not provide the Boston-hold information given during the earlier call.

October 13, 1:07 p.m. - documented request for supervisory investigation: Williams emailed USPS to record these conflicting accounts and request investigation of the package's actual location, any hold, and the records underlying the different explanations. He stated that he had expressly identified the package as concerning a high-profile matter during every conversation. These are his contemporaneous accounts of the calls; they do not independently establish the package's physical location.

October 14 - Boston scans the next morning: The day after the service request opened, tracking records arrival at a Boston distribution facility at **7:38 a.m.**, arrival at the delivery post office at **10:30 a.m.**, and **"Out for Delivery" at 10:41 a.m.**

October 14, 3:59 p.m. - end-of-week estimate and closure: A postal supervisor's email stated: "We were able to track down your package and it should be delivered by the end of the week." Its subject marked the request resolved. By the tracking timestamps, the out-for-delivery entry preceded that email by more than five hours.

October 14, 7:37 p.m. - parcel-locker scan: That evening, nearly nine hours after the out-for-delivery entry and less than four hours after the supervisor's email, tracking recorded **"Delivered, Parcel Locker."** Williams questions the next-day change in tracking and the difference between the supervisor's estimate and the recorded events. USPS is asked to explain what it verified, when it verified it, and what acceptance record supports the locker entry. The timing alone does not establish deliberate interference.

Follow-up requests and unresolved receipt questions

October 15: Williams acknowledged the postal apology and requested delivery confirmation. A projected delivery and an apology did not supply the requested acceptance record.

October 19: Williams renewed his requests to USPS and the receiving civil process office. His 9:24 a.m. request sought reopening and supervisory review; no corresponding misrouting notice appears in the reviewed record. His 9:40 a.m. email seeking the acceptance record was addressed to the USPS customer-support mailbox alone. A subsequent notice said the request had been incorrectly submitted to the Mailing and Shipping Solutions Center. Later escalations with multiple postal addresses generated separate notices instructing him to use one case email address. Those later multi-address notices do not, by themselves, explain the earlier single-address routing response.

Receiving-office correspondence: The reviewed record includes replies from the receiving office on September 28 and October 2. No response to Williams's October 13 and October 19 receipt inquiries appears in the correspondence reviewed through October 20. **The receiving office is asked to provide a direct written response confirming whether the court papers were received, when they were received, who accepted them, and what record establishes receipt.**

Accuracy of the record: Some correspondence described the parcel-locker event as October 16. The screenshots establish October 14. This release uses the documented date. The screenshots record a scan event; they do not establish whether the item was subsequently retrieved or where it is now. USPS and the receiving office are asked to confirm the mailing's current disposition.

Purpose and significance of the mailing

Postal reference: USPS Service Request No. 92364901. The shipment was intended for the **receiving civil process office in Boston** and contained court papers that Williams identified as relating to a **high-profile matter**. The immediate inquiry concerns documented delivery, acceptance and receipt by that office.

Unreturned postal Consumer Affairs calls: Williams reports that he left multiple voicemails seeking assistance from Boston USPS Consumer Affairs and has received no return call as of October 21. This refers to postal Consumer Affairs. The reason for the lack of response has not been established.

The importance of the package was expressly communicated. Williams says he repeatedly told postal representatives handling his inquiries that this was a **high-profile CERTIFIED package** intended for the receiving civil process office. He says he explained that the shipment contained original court papers and a money order, and that documented receipt was necessary to determine whether the packet had reached the office responsible for arranging service.

Why Williams identified the package as high-profile: Williams describes the enclosed court papers and underlying matter as raising questions about **his former law firm, certain public officials, institutional relationships, and disclosures.** He cites that context and the surrounding public reporting as reasons he repeatedly emphasized the package's significance to postal representatives. This context does not establish that any official influenced the mailing's handling.

Williams reports selecting Certified Mail and requesting Return Receipt because he wanted an accountable record of delivery. He says he communicated the package's high-profile nature while seeking to locate it, before the parcel-locker scan. The questions he raised were specific: Where was the packet? Had the intended office received it? Who accepted it, and what record established acceptance? His October 15 request for delivery confirmation and October 19 requests for the acceptance record pursued those same questions. The materials reviewed do not contain the requested acceptance evidence or a receiving-office acknowledgment answering them.

The requested answer remains concrete: identify the mailing's disposition, substantiate acceptance, and confirm whether the court papers reached the intended office. The high-profile description does not create a separate postal service category.

The delivery history, unresolved acceptance questions, complaint-routing notices, unreturned voicemails and unanswered receiving-office inquiries explain why Williams suspects intentional interference and seeks an independent examination. **The reviewed materials do not establish who caused the unresolved handling problems or whether they were intentional.** The public is being asked to scrutinize records and seek answers, not to treat suspicion as an adjudicated fact.

The records and answers requested

1. Identify acceptance. Provide the delivery or acceptance record, including the signature or other authorized acceptance evidence, the accepting person’s name or institutional authority, and the date and time. If no such record exists or can be located, state that expressly and explain the search performed.

2. Explain the locker entry. Identify the type and location of the receptacle, the basis for using it for this mailing, and whether authorized acceptance occurred before placement. Confirm any subsequent retrieval or transfer and the mailing’s current disposition. Protect unrelated personal information when releasing records.

3. Account for the handling. Supply the relevant scan history and custody information, including any corrections, and explain the period between the Florida and Boston entries. Identify which postal office has responsibility for resolving the inquiry.

4. Explain the conflicting accounts and complaint processing. Identify the record supporting the October 13 Boston-hold statement and explain the differing Tampa accounts. Describe the investigative steps preceding the October 14 scans, when those events became visible internally, and the basis for the 3:59 p.m. delivery estimate and case closure. Account for the October 19 routing notices, including the single-address request. Identify the office responsible for a substantive response.

5. Confirm civil process intake. The receiving office is asked to state whether it received the packet, on what date, whether it was entered for processing, and what is needed if the originals or payment are missing. It is also asked to confirm whether it uses a post office box or parcel locker for official mail and how Certified Mail is accepted and documented through that arrangement. Receipt by the receiving office and legal service on a defendant are distinct events.

6. Preserve and review the evidence. USPS and the receiving office are asked to preserve relevant scans, acceptance and retrieval records, case histories, email-routing records and communications consistent with applicable obligations. If records reveal irregular handling, identify the corrective action and appropriate independent review channel.

Justice Is Exposure requests acknowledgment and identification of the responsible office promptly, and an on-the-record written response by **5:00 p.m. Eastern on October 22, 2026**. If additional time is required, provide the specific records still being sought and a definite response date. This is a requested media-response deadline, not a representation of a statutory deadline.

“This matter requires an accountable answer,” Williams said. “If the mailing was properly accepted, document it. If a handling or recording failure occurred, identify it and correct it. Unanswered questions should be resolved with records.”

Source record

The chronology is based on Williams's USPS tracking screenshots; USPS service-request correspondence of October 13-15; October 19 support requests and routing notices; and receiving-office civil process correspondence of September 28, October 2, October 13 and October 19. Email and tracking records were reviewed through October 20, 2026; the account of unreturned voicemails reflects Williams's October 21 report. Current physical custody has not been independently verified. Supporting materials may be provided with unrelated private information removed.

[1] 39 C.F.R. § 111.1

[2] DMM 503, § 3.1.1: Certified Mail

[3] DMM 508: Recipient Services

[4] USPS Electronic Signature Online FAQ

[5] gopost Package Pickup FAQ

[6] Premium PO Box service agreement

Closing statement

USPS's own Domestic Mail Manual, §§ 503.3.1.1 and 508.1.1.7, establishes delivery-record and signature requirements for Certified Mail. **If this shipment was left in a parcel locker without obtaining the signature required under the applicable provisions, that handling would conflict with USPS's own standards. A "Delivered, Parcel Locker" scan does not, by itself, demonstrate compliance.** [2-3]

USPS must explain the acceptance procedure used and produce the supporting record. Williams considers the unresolved delivery questions, conflicting explanations and unreturned Boston USPS Consumer Affairs voicemails unacceptable. He requests an independent review to determine whether these events reflect service failures, intentional mishandling or other misconduct.

EVEN AFTER WILLIAMS'S RECEIPT INQUIRIES TO THE RECEIVER, THE REVIEWED RECORD DOES NOT ESTABLISH WHO ACCEPTED HIS HIGH-PROFILE CERTIFIED COURT PAPERS. THE OCTOBER 14 TRACKING ENTRY STATES "DELIVERED, PARCEL LOCKER." USPS AND THE RECEIVER MUST ACCOUNT FOR THIS MAILING: CONFIRM ITS CURRENT LOCATION, IDENTIFY WHO ACCEPTED IT, AND PRODUCE THE RECORD SUPPORTING DELIVERY.