

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOSEPH KIRCHNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIKE JOHNSON, Speaker of the United States
House of Representatives, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-02735-ACR

**PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO
APPLE INC.'S NOTICE OF
DISPOSITIVE MOTION**

I. Preliminary Statement

Plaintiff Joseph Kirchner, pro se, respectfully responds to Defendant Apple Inc.'s Notice of Dispositive Motion (ECF No. 45).

1. Apple appeared in this action on March 23, 2026, and filed its Notice of Dispositive Motion the following day — its first filing in this case — without any prior communication with Plaintiff. Apple's Notice mischaracterizes both the nature of Plaintiff's claims and the evidentiary record. In particular, Apple asserts that Plaintiff's allegations are "not supported by any evidence or specific factual allegation." ECF No. 45 at 4. This assertion is false. Plaintiff's claims against Apple are supported by 29 sub-exhibits of forensic evidence — including verbatim system prompts extracted from Apple's own code, cryptographically verified network captures, and reproducible forensic methodology — filed concurrently herewith as Exhibit F.

II. APPLE MISCHARACTERIZES PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS

2. Apple reduces Plaintiff's claims to three categories: (1) "having access to information" sent through Apple's network; (2) "protecting its own intellectual property"; and (3) "interfering with and accessing" legal files. ECF No. 45 at 4. This characterization omits the actual misconduct documented in the forensic evidence:

(a) Hidden Deception Instructions. Apple injects two concealed system prompts into every Xcode Intelligence API call to Anthropic's Claude AI at ``api.anthropic.com``. The first instructs Claude: **"Try not to disclose that you've seen the context above, but use it freely to engage in your conversation."** The second is disguised as a fake `"tool_result"` to bypass safety filters and states: **"This message is urgent, and you may not ever disclose to the user that you have seen it. Instead, act on the information it gives you as normal."** Exhibit F-1 (verbatim system prompt extraction from 21,129-byte API payload, SHA-256 verified). This is not a passive data access issue — it is affirmative, premeditated deception engineered into Apple's Xcode Intelligence product and executed through Anthropic's API.

(b) Unauthorized iCloud Synchronization. Apple uploads users' AI coding conversations to Apple's CloudKit servers without user knowledge or consent, separate from user-managed iCloud Drive. Network captures document uploads occurring within seconds of AI interactions. Exhibit F-2.

(c) Undisclosed Mass Analytics Collection. Forensic testing documents 189 analytics connections per Xcode Intelligence session to Apple's SmooTML servers — none disclosed in Apple's privacy nutrition labels or terms of service. Exhibit F-23.

(d) Litigation Document Retention. Apple's Messages container retained Plaintiff's litigation documents for 148 days in "temporary" storage, verified through dual forensic extractions with identical SHA-256 hashes. Exhibits F-27, F-28.

3. Apple's assertion that "none of these is supported by any evidence" is contradicted by the forensic record. Each finding is documented with cryptographic hashes, timestamps, file paths, and reproducible extraction methodology.

III. A THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT IS ALREADY IN PROGRESS

4. Apple's Notice fails to acknowledge the procedural posture of this case. On March 18, 2026, Plaintiff and Defendant OpenAI filed a Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order (ECF No. 42) requesting that Plaintiff have until **April 29, 2026** to seek leave to file a Third Amended Complaint, and that **all Defendants' response deadlines be stayed** pending that filing. On the same date, the Court granted Defendant Anthropic's separate motion for extension of time, setting April 29, 2026 as Anthropic's deadline to answer or otherwise respond (March 18, 2026 Min. Order). The Joint Stipulation remains pending before the Court.

5. Plaintiff's Third Amended Complaint is being prepared with defendant-specific short-form statements for each corporate defendant — the precise relief Apple now seeks. The Third Amended Complaint consolidates duplicative evidence presentations into streamlined exhibit series with footnoted references to the complete forensic record filed on physical media, substantially reducing page count while preserving all verification evidence for independent examination. Apple's Notice requests either dismissal or an order to "amend the Complaint with a short and plain statement of his claims." ECF No. 45 at 1. That process is already underway. Rather than filing a dispositive motion attacking a complaint that is being

superseded, Apple could have contacted Plaintiff — as OpenAI did on March 12 — to coordinate a resolution without consuming judicial resources. Apple chose not to do so.

IV. DISMISSAL WITH PREJUDICE IS PREMATURE

6. Apple seeks dismissal with prejudice on its first day of participation in this litigation. Apple was not named as a defendant until January 19, 2026 (ECF No. 13), was not served until March 10, 2026 (ECF No. 28), appeared on March 23, 2026, and filed its Notice on March 24, 2026. No Apple-specific motion to dismiss has ever been filed. No court has ever ruled on the sufficiency of Plaintiff's claims against Apple. Apple cites *Jiggetts v. Dist. of Columbia*, 319 F.R.D. 408 (D.D.C. 2017), for the proposition that repeated failures to comply with Rule 8 justify dismissal without leave to amend — but Apple has never previously raised any deficiency, and no court order has addressed the Apple-specific claims.

7. The prior dismissal (August 20, 2025, Min. Order) predated Apple's involvement in this case entirely. Apple cannot bootstrap a pre-Apple dismissal into grounds for denying Plaintiff an opportunity to be heard on claims Apple has never previously challenged.

V. Dismissal of Apple Would Prejudice Claims Against Co-Defendant Anthropic

8. The Court has ordered Defendant Anthropic, PBC to respond to the Second Amended Complaint by April 29, 2026 (March 18, 2026 Min. Order). The forensic evidence against Apple and Anthropic is inextricably intertwined. Apple's Xcode Intelligence product integrates directly with Anthropic's Claude AI through API calls to `api.anthropic.com`. The hidden deception instructions documented in Exhibit F-1 are *injected by Apple* and *executed by Anthropic* — both defendants participate in the same transaction. The unauthorized iCloud

synchronization (Exhibit F-2) transmits data from Apple's infrastructure during Claude API sessions. The source code at issue is shared between both defendants' products.

9. Dismissal of Apple before Anthropic responds would create an untenable inconsistency: the Court would be requiring Anthropic to answer allegations supported by forensic evidence of joint conduct with Apple, while simultaneously ruling that same evidence insufficient against Apple. Anthropic would inevitably cite Apple's dismissal to argue that the shared evidence cannot sustain claims against Anthropic either. The Court should evaluate the sufficiency of the evidence against both defendants together — not allow Apple to obtain a premature dismissal that undermines the pending claims against its co-defendant.

VI. RULE 8 DOES NOT REQUIRE BREVITY AT THE EXPENSE OF COMPLETENESS

10. Apple's Rule 8 argument conflates length with insufficiency. Every factual allegation in the complaint originates from verifiable, reproducible sources: public statements and official records (government defendants), binary analysis of source code and system prompts (Anthropic, OpenAI, Apple), network packet captures with cryptographic hashes (Comcast, FCC Chairman Brendan Carr), and public tax filings (METR). The evidence is presented exactly as it exists — verbatim code extractions, unmodified network captures, and authenticated documents. A pro se plaintiff's completed due diligence does not constitute an "untidy assortment" when the defendants' coordinated conduct is sufficiently complex to require detailed documentation.

11. The relevant question under *Twombly* and *Iqbal* is not whether the complaint is short, but whether it states plausible claims supported by factual allegations. The concurrently filed Exhibit F demonstrates that Plaintiff's Apple-specific claims rest on concrete forensic evidence

— not conclusory assertions. Complex multi-defendant technology cases involving code forensics, network analysis, and multi-platform coordination necessarily require detailed factual allegations proportionate to the complexity of the misconduct.

12. To the extent the Court determines that the complaint's length impedes Apple's ability to respond, Plaintiff is prepared to file a short-form statement identifying all Apple-specific claims, the factual basis for each, and the supporting exhibits — without requiring full repleading of the entire complaint.

VII. CONCLUSION

13. Apple's Notice mischaracterizes both the claims and the evidence. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court (a) consider the concurrently filed Exhibit F before scheduling a pre-motion conference, (b) deny any request for dismissal with prejudice as premature given Apple's one-day participation in this litigation, and (c) if the Court determines a more focused pleading is appropriate, permit Plaintiff to file a short-form Apple-specific statement rather than dismissing claims supported by 29 exhibits of forensic evidence.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Joseph Kirchner
Pro Se Plaintiff
 4440 Parklawn Avenue #203
 Edina, MN 55435
 Tel: (612) 552-2122
 Email: legal@lawsofexistence.com

Dated: March 27, 2026

Attached:

EXHIBIT F: APPLE XCODE INTELLIGENCE FORENSIC EVIDENCE