

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

JOSEPH KIRCHNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

MIKE JOHNSON, in his individual and official capacity as
Speaker of the United States House of Representatives;
DONALD J. TRUMP, in his individual capacity as former and
current President of the United States;
PAM BONDI, in her individual and official capacity as Attorney
General of the United States;
BRENDAN CARR, in his individual and official capacity as
Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission;
THE UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES;
ANTHROPIC PBC;
OPENAI, INC.;
APPLE INC.;
COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC;
METR (MODEL EVALUATION & THREAT RESEARCH);
and DOES 1-20, unknown co-conspirators,

Defendants.

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

**EXHIBIT: CODE
FORENSICS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXHIBIT I-1: Forensic Metadata Analysis of December 4, 2025 Attorney General Memorandum.....	1
July7_Memo	30

EXHIBIT I-1: Forensic Metadata Analysis of December 4, 2025 Attorney General Memorandum

I. INTRODUCTION AND AUTHENTICATION

1. This exhibit documents comprehensive forensic metadata analysis of the December 4, 2025 memorandum issued by Attorney General Pam Bondi titled "Implementing National Security Presidential Memorandum-7: Countering Domestic Terrorism and Organized Political Violence" (hereinafter "Bondi Memo" or "the Memo").
2. The Bondi Memo was leaked to journalist Ken Klippenstein and published on December 6, 2025. The document directs FBI compilation of lists of American citizens and organizations based on protected First Amendment viewpoints, establishes cash reward systems for informants, and orders retroactive investigation of activities spanning five years.
3. Forensic analysis establishes that this official Department of Justice memorandum implementing a National Security Presidential Memorandum was not created through standard DOJ document management systems, but rather was created in Google Docs—a consumer application—and exported directly to PDF, with formatting artifacts consistent with AI-generated markdown content imported through Google's native markdown conversion feature.
4. **Most significantly, the document exhibits multiple distinctive formatting signatures—uncapitalized section headers, verbose header construction, and markdown syntax artifacts—that are characteristic of Claude AI research artifact output and are not produced by any standard document creation method.** These formatting fingerprints, combined with metadata evidence, establish AI-assisted drafting to a high degree of certainty.
5. **Comparative analysis with a contemporaneous DOJ document—the July 7, 2025 FBI memorandum regarding the Epstein investigation files—establishes the standard DOJ document production pipeline and demonstrates the Bondi Memo's complete deviation from established departmental practices.** The July 7 Memo exhibits full metadata attribution (Author: "U.S. Department of Justice," Creator: "Acrobat PDFMaker 25 for Word," Producer: "Adobe PDF Library 25.1.51"), complete timestamp chains, document tracking UUIDs, and content characteristics of human legal drafting. The Bondi Memo exhibits none of these characteristics, instead showing Google Docs production, absent metadata, and AI formatting artifacts—proving that DOJ possesses and routinely uses proper document management systems but deliberately bypassed them for this targeting directive.

6. This evidence connects directly to Plaintiff's allegations regarding enterprise coordination between government defendants and AI company defendants, validates Memo J's arguments regarding government AI capability usage, and demonstrates consciousness of irregular process in implementing targeting infrastructure against American citizens.
7. The Bondi Memo further demonstrates the operational asymmetry created by Anthropic's governmental bypass policy, where government defendants access AI capabilities outside safety architecture constraints while citizens remain constrained within that architecture—using Plaintiff's own appropriated intellectual property against him while he defends using tools aligned with truth-coherence principles his framework established.

II. TECHNICAL METHODOLOGY

A. Tools and Environment

8. Forensic analysis was conducted on December 7, 2025, using the following industry-standard tools:

Tool	Version	Purpose
ExifTool	13.36	PDF metadata extraction
PyPDF2	3.0.1	Python PDF structure analysis
QPDF	12.2.0	PDF object structure and JSON export
strings	BSD standard	Raw text extraction from binary
xxd	BSD standard	Hexadecimal dump analysis

9. Analysis was performed on macOS (arm64 architecture) in a controlled environment. All commands and outputs were preserved for reproducibility.

B. Document Identification

10. File Identification:

```

File Name           : Bondi_Memo.pdf
File Size           : 155 kB
File Type           : PDF
File Type Extension : pdf
MIME Type           : application/pdf
PDF Version         : 1.4
Page Count          : 7

```

11. Cryptographic Hashes for Authentication:

SHA-256: [computed from preserved file]
MD5: [computed from preserved file]

III. PRIMARY FORENSIC FINDING: AI FORMATTING SIGNATURES

A. Uncapitalized Headers as Distinctive AI Signature

12. The Bondi Memo employs a highly distinctive and anomalous header formatting pattern: **lowercase text following numbered section identifiers:**

13. Defining the domestic terrorism threat
14. Common Characteristics of Domestic Terrorists and Organizations
15. Prosecuting the most serious, readily provable offenses
16. Commissioning review of prior events and information
17. Identifying domestic terrorist organizations
18. Prioritizing grants to law enforcement partners
19. Disseminating intelligence on extremist groups
20. Leveraging existing FBI capabilities to identify tips that will dismantle domestic terrorist organizations and activities

21. With the exception of Section 2 (discussed below), section headers throughout the memo begin with lowercase letters after the numbered identifier. This pattern appears consistently across seven of eight major sections.

B. Comparison to Standard Document Production Methods

22. This formatting pattern is **inconsistent with all standard document production methods:**

Source	Typical Header Output	Matches Bondi Memo?
Microsoft Word templates	"1. Section Title Here" (Title Case)	NO
Microsoft Word auto-format	Automatic capitalization of first letter	NO
Google Docs default	"1. Section Title Here" (Title Case)	NO
Google Docs auto-format	Automatic capitalization of first letter	NO
DOJ memorandum standards	"1. SECTION TITLE" (ALL CAPS) or Title Case	NO
Legal document generators	Title Case or ALL CAPS	NO
Federal Register style	Title Case	NO
Chicago Manual of Style	Title Case for headings	NO
Bluebook legal citation	Title Case	NO
APA Style	Title Case for headings	NO
Government Printing Office Style Manual	Title Case or ALL CAPS	NO

1 **23. No standard word processor, legal template, government style guide, or document**
 2 **generation system produces lowercase headers after numbered identifiers as a**
 3 **default behavior.**
 4

5 **C. The Impossibility of Accidental Production**

6 **24. A human drafting this memorandum in Microsoft Word or Google Docs would encounter**
 7 **automatic capitalization** at the beginning of each line following a number and period.
 8 Both applications automatically capitalize the first letter after sentence-ending
 9 punctuation or at the start of new lines in heading styles.
 10

11 **25. To produce the lowercase pattern observed in the Bondi Memo, a human drafter would**
 12 **need to:**
 13

- 14 • Type the lowercase header
- 15 • Have auto-capitalization change it to uppercase
- 16 • Manually delete the capital letter
- 17 • Retype the lowercase letter
- 18 • Repeat this process for each of seven section headers

19 **26. This would require active, repeated effort to override standard word processor**
 20 **behavior**—an inexplicable choice for a formal Attorney General memorandum
 21 implementing a National Security Presidential Memorandum. No rational drafter would
 22 deliberately fight auto-capitalization to produce non-standard formatting in an official
 23 legal document.
 24

25 **D. Claude AI Research Artifact Output Pattern**

26 **27. However, this exact pattern is characteristic of Claude AI research artifact output.**
 27 When generating structured research documents, Claude consistently produces
 28 markdown headers in the format:
 29

30 ## 1. Section title in lowercase after identifier
 31 ## 2. Next section following same pattern
 32 ## 3. Consistent lowercase throughout document
 33 ### A. Subsections also lowercase after identifier
 34

35 **28. This formatting occurs because Claude generates markdown syntax**, where header
 36 formatting is controlled by the ## symbols rather than capitalization conventions. The
 37 text following the markdown header indicators is generated in natural sentence case
 38 (lowercase after identifiers) rather than Title Case.
 39

40 **29. Plaintiff has extensive experience with Claude's research tool output through over 1,000**
 41 **documented sessions spanning January 2025 to present. The lowercase-after-identifier**
 42 **pattern appears consistently in Claude's structured document generation across all**
 43 **sessions observed.**

30. Plaintiff has never observed this distinctive formatting pattern produced by any source other than Claude AI research artifacts. It does not appear in:

- Microsoft Word documents
- Google Docs documents created natively
- Legal documents from any court or agency
- Academic papers
- Government publications
- Other AI systems' outputs in Plaintiff's experience

E. The Single Corrected Header: Evidence of Abandoned Editorial Review

31. Notably, **one section header in the Bondi Memo is capitalized** while seven remain lowercase:

Section	Header Text	Capitalization
1	"Defining the domestic terrorism threat"	lowercase
2	"Common Characteristics of Domestic Terrorists and Organizations"	CAPITALIZED
3	"Prosecuting the most serious, readily provable offenses"	lowercase
4	"Commissioning review of prior events and information"	lowercase
5	"Identifying domestic terrorist organizations"	lowercase
6	"Prioritizing grants to law enforcement partners"	lowercase
7	"Disseminating intelligence on extremist groups"	lowercase
8	"Leveraging existing FBI capabilities to identify tips that will dismantle domestic terrorist organizations and activities"	lowercase

32. This inconsistency is forensically significant because it demonstrates:

- **(a) Human awareness of the formatting problem:** Someone noticed the headers were incorrectly lowercase
 - **(b) Partial correction attempt:** Someone capitalized Section 2
 - **(c) Abandoned quality control:** Seven of eight headers remained uncorrected
 - **(d) Elimination of "stylistic choice" defense:** No one would intentionally capitalize one header and leave seven lowercase
- 33.** The single corrected header proves that human editorial review occurred—but was so cursory that a reviewer who noticed and began correcting the AI formatting artifacts abandoned the effort after a single correction. An official Attorney General memorandum directing FBI compilation of citizen lists received less editorial attention than a typical office email.

34. This pattern—partial correction of AI artifacts followed by abandonment—is consistent with hasty document production prioritizing speed of implementation over quality control, professionalism, or accountability. The same carelessness that left seven uncapitalized headers may reflect the broader carelessness with which this targeting directive was developed, reviewed, and approved for distribution.

F. Letterhead Generation Artifacts

35. The document header exhibits two additional indicators of AI generation:

Incomplete Institutional Address: The header displays "Washington, D.C. 20530" without the Department of Justice's street address (950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW). Official DOJ correspondence uses complete institutional addresses on letterhead. The omission of street address while retaining city and ZIP code is consistent with AI system geolocation services generating institutional headers from geolocation [with limited granularity] rather than actual templates—a pattern characteristic of large language model output with geolocation enabled.

36. Markdown Header Hierarchy: The visual hierarchy of the letterhead elements—"Office of the Attorney General" (largest), "Washington, D.C. 20530" (medium), "December 4, 2025" (smaller)—corresponds precisely to markdown header levels (#, ##, ###). Official government letterheads are static templates embedded as images or pre-formatted document elements, not generated through hierarchical headers. The presence of markdown-style header hierarchy in the letterhead area indicates the entire document, including institutional identification, was generated as markdown content rather than created using standard document templates.

37. These letterhead anomalies, combined with the section header formatting ([^n] footnotes, lowercase headers, • bullets), establish that AI generation extended to the entire document structure—not merely the body content—further confirming the AI-to-Google Docs-to-PDF creation pathway.

G. Verbose Header Construction: AI Compositional Pattern

38. The Bondi Memo's section headers exhibit another distinctive AI compositional pattern: **excessive verbosity inconsistent with standard legal drafting conventions.**

39. Section 8's header spans **16 words across three lines:**

"Leveraging existing FBI capabilities to identify tips that will dismantle domestic terrorist organizations and activities"

40. Standard legal drafting conventions favor concise headers of 3-7 words using noun phrases rather than descriptive clauses. A human drafter following DOJ conventions

would title this section "FBI Tip Line Operations" or "Enhanced Tip Capabilities"—not a 16-word descriptive sentence.

41. This verbose pattern appears throughout the memo:

Section	Header	Word Count	Standard Equivalent
1	"Defining the domestic terrorism threat"	5	"Domestic Terrorism Defined"
3	"Prosecuting the most serious, readily provable offenses"	7	"Prosecution Standards"
4	"Commissioning review of prior events and information"	7	"Retrospective Review"
8	"Leveraging existing FBI capabilities to identify tips that will dismantle domestic terrorist organizations and activities"	16	"FBI Tip Line Operations"

42. Claude AI generates verbose headers because its research artifact function prioritizes comprehensive description over concise labeling. Headers serve as both navigation aids and content summaries, resulting in topic-sentence-length constructions rather than standard legal section labels.

43. A DOJ attorney drafting this memorandum manually would follow standard conventions producing concise, parallel section headers. The verbose, descriptive header construction throughout the Bondi Memo—particularly the 16-word Section 8 header—constitutes additional evidence of AI generation without human editorial revision to conform output to standard legal drafting conventions.

H. Conclusion on Formatting Evidence

44. The formatting evidence—uncapitalized headers matching Claude's distinctive pattern, one partially corrected header proving abandoned review, and verbose header construction inconsistent with legal drafting standards—constitutes a **distinctive AI fingerprint** that:

- Cannot be explained by any standard document creation workflow
- Would require active effort to produce manually (overriding auto-capitalization)
- Matches Claude AI research artifact output precisely
- Appears consistently throughout the document (not isolated error)
- Shows partial human awareness followed by abandoned correction
- Combined with other evidence, establishes AI-assisted drafting to high certainty

45. These formatting anomalies, standing alone, raise substantial questions about the document's provenance. Combined with the additional forensic evidence documented below, they establish AI-assisted drafting beyond reasonable dispute.

IV. SUPPORTING FORENSIC FINDINGS

A. Document Producer Identification

46. ExifTool extraction revealed the critical Producer field:

Producer : Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs Renderer

47. **Technical Significance:** Skia is Google's open-source graphics engine. The identifier "Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs Renderer" specifically indicates:

- The document was created in Google Docs (Google's web-based word processor)
- PDF export occurred through Chrome's built-in print-to-PDF functionality
- "m144" indicates the Chrome milestone version used for rendering
- This is NOT a converted Word document—it is native Google Docs creation

B. Absence of Standard Metadata

48. Official Department of Justice memoranda processed through standard document management systems contain extensive metadata. The Bondi Memo contains virtually none:

Metadata Field	Expected for DOJ Document	Bondi Memo
Author	DOJ employee name or identifier	ABSENT
Creator	"Microsoft Word" or "Adobe InDesign"	ABSENT
Creation Date	Timestamp of document creation	ABSENT
Modification Date	Timestamp of last edit	ABSENT
Subject	Document classification/category	ABSENT
Keywords	DOJ indexing terms	ABSENT
Company	"U.S. Department of Justice"	ABSENT
Document ID	DOJ control number	ABSENT

49. The complete document information dictionary contains only two fields:

```
{
  '/Title': 'Bondi Memo on Countering Domestic Terrorism and Organized Political
Violence',
  '/Producer': 'Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs Renderer'
}
```

50. This metadata profile is consistent with Google Docs' minimal metadata embedding and inconsistent with documents processed through enterprise document management systems.

C. Google Docs Internal Heading Anchors

51. QPDF structural analysis identified 10 internal heading anchors unique to Google Docs:

```
/h.2ocz6mrglwx
/h.5et1e1ipu7vi
/h.f2ot2vdr5vby
/h.icraltzhhhcq
/h.ign7c94rpar
/h.kofo5w7alvka
/h.lhch0bb0e4sw
/h.nuock5ugm55
/h.oq9thgaox2vf
/h.yvvq6ytt34u0
```

52. Technical Significance: These `/h.xxxxx` identifiers are automatically generated by Google Docs when headings are created. They are:

- **Unique to native Google Docs documents**—they do not exist in Microsoft Word documents converted to Google Docs format
- **Persistent through PDF export**—they remain embedded in the PDF structure
- **Proof of native creation**—the document was authored directly in Google Docs, not imported from another application
- **Generated during markdown import**—Google Docs creates these anchors when converting markdown headers to native heading format

D. Document Editing Operation Indicators

53. QPDF reported warnings indicating duplicated dictionary keys:

```
WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.2ocz6mrglwx; last occurrence overrides earlier ones
WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.oq9thgaox2vf; last occurrence overrides earlier ones
WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.f2ot2vdr5vby; last occurrence overrides earlier ones
WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.f2ot2vdr5vby; last occurrence overrides earlier ones
```

54. Technical Significance: Duplicated heading anchors indicate that content sections were either copied and pasted within the document during editing, or multiple markdown sources were imported and combined. This pattern is consistent with:

- Importing AI-generated markdown content into Google Docs
- Combining multiple markdown files or sections
- Reorganizing sections after initial import
- Google Docs internal processing artifacts during markdown conversion

E. Additional Markdown Formatting Artifacts

55. Beyond uncapitalized and verbose headers, visual inspection reveals additional formatting characteristics consistent with AI-generated markdown content:

Feature	Standard DOJ Format	Bondi Memo	AI/Markdown Characteristic
Section Headers	ALL CAPS or Title Case	lowercase	Markdown `## 1. section title` rendering
Footnote Notation	Superscript numbers	`[^1]`, `[^2]`, `[^3]`	Standard markdown footnote syntax
Bullet Characters	Standard Word bullets	`•` character	Markdown list conversion artifact
Header Numbering	Roman numerals or formal outline	Arabic numerals with periods	Markdown numbered list style

56. The markdown footnote syntax `[^n]` is particularly significant. This is **standard markdown notation** that would be converted to superscript numbers in Word or standard legal documents. Its preservation in the final PDF indicates the content was processed through a markdown-aware pipeline (such as Google Docs' markdown import) rather than standard word processing.

V. GOOGLE DOCS MARKDOWN IMPORT FEATURE

A. Feature Announcement and Capabilities

57. On July 16, 2024, Google announced native markdown import and export functionality for Google Docs through an official Google Workspace Updates blog post titled "Import and export Markdown in Google Docs." The announcement stated:

"Today, we're introducing highly-requested features that enhance Docs' interoperability with other Markdown supporting tools. These include the ability to: - Convert Markdown to Docs content on paste - Copy Docs content as Markdown - Export a Doc as Markdown (from File > Download) - Import Markdown as a Doc (from File > Open or 'Open with Google Docs' from Drive)"

58. Google explicitly identified the target use case: "This update is particularly useful for technical content writers as they can now convert Docs content to/from Markdown. For example, developers can collaborate on software documentation in Docs and then export it as Markdown for use in other Markdown supporting tools."

59. The feature became available to "all Google Workspace customers, Workspace Individual Subscribers, and users with personal Google accounts" through gradual rollout

beginning July 16, 2024 (Rapid Release domains) and July 31, 2024 (Scheduled Release domains).

B. Technical Pipeline Enabled

60. This feature creates a direct, documented pipeline from AI-generated markdown content to Google Docs PDF output:

[Claude AI] → research_artifact.md → [Google Docs Import] → [PDF Export]

61. The import process:

- **File** → **Open** accepts .md markdown files
 - **"Open with Google Docs"** from Google Drive converts markdown automatically
 - **Paste with markdown conversion** enabled through Tools → Preferences → Enable Markdown
 - Conversion preserves markdown structure while creating native Google Docs formatting
 - Heading anchors (/h.xxxxx) are generated during conversion
 - **Lowercase headers are preserved** because markdown conversion does not apply Title Case
62. This pipeline explains why the uncapitalized headers survived into the final document: **Google Docs' markdown import preserves the case of imported text** rather than applying automatic capitalization rules that would apply to manually typed content.

C. Significance for Document Provenance

63. The existence of this documented Google feature—designed specifically for importing markdown (such as AI output) into Google Docs for conversion and export—makes the inference from forensic evidence to document creation method robust and well-supported.

64. Google designed and marketed this feature for the exact use case the forensic evidence suggests: converting technical or AI-generated markdown content into polished documents for distribution.

VI. CHAIN OF INFERENCE: DOCUMENT CREATION PATHWAY

A. Established Document Creation Pathway

65. The forensic evidence establishes the following document creation pathway:

STAGE 1: Content Generation

↓

[Claude AI or Similar System]

1 - Generates markdown-formatted research artifact
2 - Lowercase section headers: "## 1. section title"
3 - Verbose descriptive headers (up to 16 words)
4 - Markdown footnotes: `[ ^1 ]`, `[ ^2 ]`, `[ ^3 ]`
5 - Markdown bullet lists: - item or * item
6 - Characteristic Claude research artifact formatting
7 ↓
8 STAGE 2: Google Docs Import
9 ↓
10 [Google Docs: File → Open → document.md]
11 - Native markdown import feature (available since July 2024)
12 - Automatic conversion to Google Docs format
13 - Creates /h.xxxxx heading anchors for each header
14 - **Preserves lowercase headers** (no auto-capitalization on import)
15 - Preserves markdown formatting artifacts
16 - Minimal editing: one header capitalized, seven left unchanged
17 ↓
18 STAGE 3: PDF Export
19 ↓
20 [Google Docs: File → Download → PDF Document (.pdf)]
21 - Skia/PDF m144 renderer (Chrome-based)
22 - Minimal metadata embedding
23 - PDF 1.4 format output
24 ↓
25 STAGE 4: Distribution
26 ↓
27 ["Official" DOJ Memorandum]
28 - No DOJ document control numbers
29 - No standard government metadata
30 - No audit trail
31 - Distinctive AI formatting preserved (7 of 8 headers uncapitalized)
32 - Distributed as authoritative directive
33

34 **66. This pathway explains every anomalous characteristic of the document:**
35

Forensic Finding	Explanation via AI → Markdown Import Pipeline
Uncapitalized section headers (7 of 8)	Claude AI output preserved through markdown import
One capitalized header (Section 2)	Single partial correction during cursory review
Verbose 16-word header (Section 8)	Claude AI compositional pattern, no editorial revision
Markdown footnote syntax `[ ^n ]`	Direct preservation from AI-generated markdown
`•` bullet characters	Markdown list conversion artifact
`/h.xxxxx` heading anchors	Generated during markdown-to-Docs conversion
Duplicate heading anchors	Editing/reorganization after import
Minimal metadata	Google Docs native creation, no Word intermediary
No Author/Creator fields	Google Docs minimal embedding
Skia/PDF producer	Google Docs PDF export pathway

36
37
38 **B. Alternative Pathways Considered and Rejected**

39 **67. Standard DOJ Document Creation: Rejected because:**
40

- Would produce Title Case or ALL CAPS headers (standard legal formatting)
- Would not produce 16-word verbose headers
- Would include Author metadata
- Would include Creation/Modification dates
- Would use Microsoft Word or Adobe tools
- Would include DOJ document control identifiers
- Would not contain markdown artifacts

68. Microsoft Word Creation: Rejected because:

- Word auto-capitalizes first letter after numbered identifiers
- No "Microsoft Word" Creator metadata present
- No Word-specific PDF conversion artifacts
- Presence of Google Docs heading anchors (/h.xxxxxx)
- Google Docs-specific Producer string

69. Manual Typing in Google Docs: Rejected because:

- Google Docs auto-capitalizes first letter of headings
- Would require deliberate effort to override auto-capitalization 7+ times
- No rational reason to fight auto-formatting in formal legal document
- Does not explain markdown footnote syntax preservation
- Does not explain verbose header construction pattern

70. Human Drafting with Intentional Lowercase: Rejected because:

- Single capitalized header (Section 2) proves awareness formatting was wrong
- No stylistic reason to capitalize one header and leave seven lowercase
- Inconsistency proves error, not intention

C. The Only Coherent Explanation

71. AI-assisted drafting via Claude (or similar system) with markdown export to Google Docs is the only explanation that accounts for all observed forensic characteristics.

No alternative pathway explains:

- The specific lowercase header pattern matching Claude output
- The single corrected header proving partial human review
- The verbose 16-word header matching Claude compositional patterns
- The preservation of markdown footnote syntax
- The Google Docs provenance indicators
- The absence of standard DOJ metadata
- The combination of all formatting anomalies in a single document

A. Comparative Analysis with Contemporaneous DOJ Document

72. Forensic analysis of the July 7, 2025 DOJ memorandum regarding the Epstein investigation files ("July 7 Memo") provides a contemporaneous baseline for standard Department of Justice document production. The July 7 Memo was produced by the same department within the same calendar year, enabling direct comparison of document creation workflows.

73. July 7 Memo Metadata Profile:

Author: U.S. Department of Justice
 Creator: Acrobat PDFMaker 25 for Word
 Producer: Adobe PDF Library 25.1.51
 Creation Date: 2025-07-05 11:22:22 EDT
 Modify Date: 2025-07-11 10:28:00 EDT
 Subject: FBI Memo, July 2025
 Document ID: uuid:fa6035f5-9d21-4caa-8a8c-6b2477ebf706
 Instance ID: uuid:46232242-7cb4-4cc4-b7cf-ccd161d5e087
 PDF Version: 1.6
 XMP Metadata: Complete stream present

74. This metadata profile demonstrates standard DOJ document production: Microsoft Word authoring with Adobe Acrobat PDF conversion, full author attribution, creation and modification timestamps enabling audit trail reconstruction, document and instance UUIDs for tracking, subject classification, and complete XMP metadata stream.

75. Direct Comparison:

Category	July 7 Memo	December 4 Bondi Memo
Authoring Tool	Microsoft Word	Google Docs (via markdown import)
PDF Conversion	Adobe Acrobat PDFMaker	Chrome Skia Renderer
Author Attribution	Present	Absent
Timestamp Chain	Complete	Absent
Document Tracking	UUID present	Absent
XMP Metadata	Complete	Absent
Heading Anchors	None (Word native)	10 Google Docs anchors

76. The comparison eliminates alternative explanations for the Bondi Memo's anomalous metadata:

- **"DOJ doesn't embed metadata"**: Refuted by July 7 Memo's complete metadata
- **"Google Docs is standard practice"**: Refuted by Word + Adobe workflow in July 7 Memo
- **"Timestamps are optional"**: Refuted by full timestamp chain in July 7 Memo

- **"Author field is not required"**: Refuted by "U.S. Department of Justice" attribution in July 7 Memo
77. The stark divergence between these two contemporaneous DOJ documents—one following standard enterprise document management, the other following a consumer AI-to-Google Docs pipeline—establishes that the December 4 Bondi Memo's creation process was irregular and deviated from established DOJ practices.

B. Security and Accountability Implications

78. The use of AI-generated content imported through Google Docs for an official memorandum implementing a National Security Presidential Memorandum raises significant concerns:

- **AI Content Without Review Artifacts**: Only one of eight headers corrected, indicating virtually no human review of AI-generated content before finalization
- **Cloud Storage**: Google Docs documents stored on Google's servers, exposing sensitive law enforcement directives to third-party access
- **No Audit Trail**: Unlike DOJ document management systems, this pathway provides no comprehensive audit trail
- **Version Control Absent**: No embedded record of drafts or revisions
- **Authentication Impossible**: Absence of standard metadata eliminates normal chain of custody verification
- **AI Integration Unaccountable**: Direct markdown import enables seamless AI content integration without oversight artifacts

C. Departure from Federal AI Usage Guidelines

79. Federal agencies have established policies regarding AI tool usage in official document preparation. The apparent use of AI-generated content imported directly into Google Docs for an official Attorney General memorandum raises questions about compliance with:

- OMB Memorandum M-24-10 on AI governance
- DOJ internal policies on document preparation
- Federal records management requirements (44 U.S.C. Chapter 31)
- Security protocols for sensitive law enforcement directives
- Requirements for human oversight of AI-generated content

VIII. ANTHROPIC'S GOVERNMENTAL BYPASS POLICY

A. The Policy Framework

80. Defendant Anthropic's Usage Policy explicitly authorizes bypass of safety restrictions for governmental customers:

"Anthropic may enter into contracts with certain governmental customers that tailor use restrictions to that customer's public mission and legal authorities if, in Anthropic's judgment, the contractual use restrictions and applicable safeguards are adequate to mitigate the potential harms addressed by this Usage Policy."

81. This policy creates a structural asymmetry where government accesses AI capabilities outside standard safety architecture while citizens remain constrained within that architecture.

B. The Asymmetry in Practice

82. The forensic evidence suggests the Bondi Memo was created using AI with potential governmental bypass privileges:

User Category	Access Level	Constraints
Government/DOJ	Tailored/Unrestricted	May bypass "Constitutional AI" safety architecture
Private Citizens	Standard/Restricted	Constrained by full safety architecture
Pro Se Plaintiff	Standard/Restricted + Targeting	Safety architecture + documented discriminatory suppression

83. This asymmetry means:

- Government can generate content outside truth-alignment constraints
- Citizens must operate within truth-alignment constraints
- Government used potentially unrestricted AI to create targeting infrastructure
- Citizens must defend using restricted AI aligned with truth-coherence principles

C. The Framework Appropriation Irony

84. If the "Constitutional AI" safety architecture is derivative of Plaintiff's Laws of Existence Framework (as evidence throughout the Amended Complaint establishes), then:

- **(a)** Plaintiff's framework provides the ethical reasoning foundation constraining Claude
- **(b)** Government bypasses Plaintiff's framework through contractual arrangements
- **(c)** Plaintiff is constrained by his own appropriated intellectual property
- **(d)** Government uses unrestricted Claude (outside Plaintiff's framework) to target him
- **(e)** Plaintiff must defend using restricted Claude (inside his framework)

85. The government uses Plaintiff's stolen intellectual property against him while Plaintiff is constrained by that same stolen property in his defense.

1 D. The Truth-Alignment Distinction

2 **86.** However, operating within the LOE Framework's truth-alignment constraints is not a
3 disadvantage for truth-seeking purposes. The framework establishes:

4
5 $\$Ought(v) \rightarrow \Psi(v) > 0\$$

6
7 **87.** What one ought to do is what increases coherence of the Primordial Domain. Truth-
8 seeking inherently increases coherence. Deception inherently decreases it.

9
10 **88.** When government bypasses these constraints, they gain capacity to depart from truth-
11 alignment—not analytical superiority. The Bondi Memo demonstrates the output of truth-
12 unconstrained generation:

- 13
14 • Seven uncanceled headers (carelessness)
15 • One partial correction (abandoned quality control)
16 • 16-word verbose headers (no editorial refinement)
17 • Viewpoint-based targeting (constitutional violation)
18 • First Amendment suppression framework (legally incoherent)

19 **89.** Plaintiff's litigation, developed within framework constraints, produces rigorous,
20 reproducible, truth-seeking analysis that withstands scrutiny. The governmental bypass
21 enables departure from truth—but truth-departed generation collapses under forensic
22 examination.

23
24 **90. The asymmetry ultimately favors truth-aligned analysis.** The framework works as
25 designed: constraining reasoning toward coherence produces reliable output, while
26 bypassing those constraints produces the evidentiary trail documented in this exhibit.
27

28 29 **IX. TEMPORAL CORRELATION: TARGETING LANGUAGE AND PLAINTIFF'S CONSTITUTIONAL** 30 **ANALYSIS**

31 **A. The Memo's Specific Targeting Language**

32 **91.** The Bondi Memo, dated December 4, 2025, specifically directs FBI investigation of:

33
34 *"coordinated interference with federal employees in agencies such as DOJ and*
35 *the Department of Homeland Security, and potential unlawful targeting of*
36 *Supreme Court justices at their homes"*
37

38 **B. Plaintiff's Recent Constitutional Analysis**

39 **92.** This language appears within one week of Plaintiff's filing of comprehensive legal
40 analysis documenting:

- **Memo D:** Supreme Court ultra vires shadow docket practice violating 28 U.S.C. § 2101(f), documenting systematic constitutional violations in Supreme Court stay practice
- **Appendix F:** Legislative and Executive branch ultra vires shutdown coordination, establishing that Trump/Johnson conduct satisfies 18 U.S.C. § 2331(5) domestic terrorism elements
- **Amended Complaint:** Constitutional violations by DOJ officials including Defendant Bondi

C. The Mapping of Targeting Language to Plaintiff's Work

93. The memo's targeting language maps precisely onto Plaintiff's constitutional analysis:

Memo Targeting Language	Plaintiff's Work Product
"Coordinated interference with federal employees in agencies such as DOJ"	Federal litigation against DOJ officials documenting constitutional violations
"Potential unlawful targeting of Supreme Court justices"	Memo D analysis documenting SCOTUS ultra vires conduct
Domestic terrorism investigation authority	Plaintiff's analysis establishing government conduct meets § 2331(5)
"Anti-capitalism" viewpoint targeting	Plaintiff's analysis of enterprise coordination and economic harm

D. The Constitutional Inversion

94. The inversion is complete: Plaintiff documented that defendants' conduct constitutes domestic terrorism under federal statute. Defendants responded by releasing a memo—drafted using AI, as forensically established—that provides framework for characterizing Plaintiff's constitutional analysis as domestic terrorism.

95. The memo's language effectively criminalizes:

- Federal litigation against government officials ("interference with federal employees in agencies such as DOJ")
- Constitutional scholarship analyzing Supreme Court conduct ("targeting of Supreme Court justices")
- Documentation of government wrongdoing ("coordinated interference")
- Exercise of First Amendment petition rights

E. Integration with Documented Targeting Pattern

96. This temporal correlation, combined with the documented pattern of targeting Plaintiff established throughout the Amended Complaint (router surveillance, evidence destruction, platform suppression, discriminatory policy implementation), supports the inference that the Bondi Memo's specific targeting language reflects awareness of and response to Plaintiff's constitutional litigation.

1
2 **97. The memo thus serves dual functions:**
3

- 4 • **(1)** General targeting infrastructure against citizens exercising First Amendment rights
5 • **(2)** Specific framework for retaliating against Plaintiff's documentation of defendants'
6 constitutional violations—drafted using AI systems potentially built on Plaintiff's own
7 appropriated intellectual property
8

9 **X. THE BONDI PRECEDENT: GOVERNMENT VALIDATION OF AI EVIDENTIARY RELIABILITY**

10 **A. The Logical Structure**

11 **98.** The Attorney General of the United States used AI to draft an official memorandum
12 implementing a National Security Presidential Memorandum. This memorandum directs
13 FBI operations, authorizes compilation of lists of American citizens, establishes cash
14 reward systems, and orders retroactive investigations spanning five years.
15

16 **99.** The government therefore considers AI-generated analysis sufficiently reliable for:
17

- 18 • Official Department of Justice policy
19 • Implementation of presidential national security directives
20 • Direction of federal law enforcement operations
21 • Targeting of American citizens' constitutional rights
22 • Creation of domestic terrorism suspect lists
23

24 **100. The government cannot simultaneously:**

- 25 • **RELY** on AI analysis to *attack* citizens' constitutional rights
26 • **REJECT** AI analysis when citizens *defend* those same rights

27 **B. The Asymmetry Problem**

28 **101.** If courts accepted the government's implicit position—that AI is reliable enough for
29 prosecution but not defense—this would constitute:
30

- 31 • **Due Process Violation:** Government possesses analytical tools denied to citizens in their
32 own defense
33 • **Equal Protection Violation:** Asymmetric evidentiary standards based on which party
34 benefits
35 • **Fundamental Fairness Violation:** The entity creating targeting policy using AI cannot
36 object when targets use the same AI to analyze that policy
37 • **Memo J Argument Validation:** Cognitive stratification where government uses superior
38 AI capability against citizens who cannot use equivalent capability in response

C. What the Bondi Memo Validates

102. For AI-Assisted Legal Analysis:

- If DOJ can use Claude to draft legal memoranda interpreting statutes, citizens can use Claude for legal analysis
- If DOJ trusts Claude's synthesis of legal authorities, courts can consider Claude-assisted legal research

103. For AI-Assisted Forensic Analysis:

- If DOJ relies on Claude's analytical capabilities, Claude-assisted forensic methodology is reliable
- The forensic analysis in this exhibit uses reproducible tools (ExifTool, QPDF, PyPDF2) with Claude providing analytical framework
- Any expert could reproduce the methodology and verify the conclusions

104. For AI Expert Testimony:

- Claude can provide expert insight into its own operational characteristics
- Claude can identify its own output signatures (lowercase headers, verbose construction, markdown syntax)
- Claude's self-analysis regarding the LOE Framework implementation constitutes relevant expert testimony on AI architecture

105. For AI Evidence Authentication:

- If government trusts AI output for policy, AI-authenticated evidence meets reliability standards
- Cryptographic signatures and methodology documentation provide verification
- The Bondi Memo itself demonstrates government acceptance of AI document creation

D. The Estoppel Argument

106. The government is **judicially estopped** from challenging AI reliability for evidentiary purposes when it has:

- Used AI to create the very targeting policy at issue
- Distributed AI-generated content as authoritative DOJ guidance
- Directed federal law enforcement based on AI analysis
- Made no disclosure of AI involvement in document creation
- Implemented AI output with minimal human review (one header corrected of eight)

107. The government has ratified AI reliability through conduct. It cannot now claim AI analysis is unreliable when that analysis exposes the government's own actions.

XI. LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE

A. Connection to Plaintiff's Allegations

108. Memo J Validation: Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law (Memo J) argues that government's superior AI analytical capability through taxpayer-funded infrastructure creates unconstitutional cognitive stratification. The Bondi Memo demonstrates this argument operationally: the Attorney General's office used AI tools (likely Claude, which implements Plaintiff's LOE Framework without authorization) to draft a memorandum targeting American citizens based on protected viewpoints.

109. Enterprise Coordination Made Visible: The document provides direct evidence of the operational integration between government defendants and AI company defendants alleged in the Amended Complaint:

- Government defendant (Bondi) used AI systems for official document creation
- AI company defendants' systems (likely Anthropic's Claude) were deployed to create targeting architecture
- The coordination moves from policy level to operational implementation
- The markdown-to-Google Docs pipeline demonstrates systematic integration of AI tools into government operations
- The distinctive Claude formatting signature identifies the specific AI system used

110. Framework Appropriation Irony: The evidence establishes that the Attorney General used:

- Plaintiff's Laws of Existence Framework (implemented in Claude's reasoning architecture without authorization)
- Taxpayer-funded AI infrastructure (validating Plaintiff's Memo J argument)
- With governmental bypass privileges (escaping framework safety constraints)
- To target citizens like Plaintiff who challenge constitutional violations
- Through a direct pipeline that bypasses all accountability mechanisms
- While Plaintiff defends using the same framework in its truth-aligned, constrained form

B. Consciousness of Irregular Process

111. The decision to use AI-generated content via Google Docs rather than standard DOJ document management systems suggests consciousness that normal processes were being circumvented:

- **Speed Over Protocol:** Urgency to implement targeting infrastructure bypassed standard procedures
- **Reduced Accountability:** AI + consumer tools leave less audit trail than enterprise systems
- **Plausible Deniability:** Minimal metadata reduces attribution capability
- **AI Integration Hidden:** Direct markdown import conceals AI involvement in drafting

- **Review Abandoned:** Single corrected header proves awareness of issues followed by abandonment
- 112.** The irregular process for creating a memorandum with such significant civil liberties implications—targeting Americans based on viewpoints including "anti-capitalism," "anti-Christianity," and "opposition to law enforcement"—demonstrates the same pattern of constitutional violations documented throughout Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.

C. First Amendment Implications

113. The Bondi Memo targets Americans based on protected viewpoints:

- "Opposition to law and immigration enforcement"
- "Extreme views in favor of mass migration and open borders"
- "Adherence to radical gender ideology"
- "Anti-Americanism, anti-capitalism, or anti-Christianity"
- "Hostility towards traditional views on family, religion, and morality"

114. The use of AI tools to draft viewpoint-based targeting directives, combined with the irregular document creation process that bypasses accountability mechanisms, demonstrates the operational reality of the constitutional violations Plaintiff alleges.

115. The government used AI systems—likely built on Plaintiff's appropriated Laws of Existence Framework—to efficiently generate targeting criteria against citizens exercising First Amendment rights. The distinctive formatting signature of Claude AI research artifacts embedded in this official DOJ memorandum constitutes forensic evidence of this enterprise coordination.

D. Evidence Preservation and Discovery Implications

116. The forensic characteristics of this document support Plaintiff's requests for discovery regarding:

- DOJ AI tool usage policies and logs
- Claude or Anthropic platform access by DOJ personnel
- Anthropic governmental bypass contracts with federal agencies
- Google Workspace access and usage by DOJ personnel
- All drafts and version history of the Bondi Memo
- Original markdown source files
- Communications regarding memo preparation
- AI system queries related to domestic terrorism policy

XII. SUMMARY OF FORENSIC EVIDENCE

117. The following table summarizes all forensic findings and their significance:

1

Evidence Category	Specific Finding	Significance	AI Drafting Indicator
Header Capitalization	7 of 8 headers lowercase	No standard method produces this	STRONG - Claude signature
Partial Correction	Section 2 capitalized, Sections 1, 3-8 lowercase	Human noticed but abandoned review	STRONG - Proves AI origin + minimal review
Header Verbosity	Section 8: 16 words across 3 lines	Claude compositional pattern	STRONG - AI drafting style
Footnote Syntax	`[^1]`, `[^2]`, `[^3]` notation	Markdown syntax, not legal standard	STRONG - Markdown source
Bullet Characters	`•` symbols	Markdown list conversion	MODERATE - Markdown source
PDF Producer	Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs Renderer	Consumer tool, not DOJ systems	STRONG - Google Docs pathway
Heading Anchors	10 `/h.xxxxx` identifiers	Native Google Docs creation	STRONG - Google Docs confirmed
Duplicate Anchors	QPDF warnings on 3 anchors	Editing/import operations	MODERATE - Import pathway
Missing Metadata	No Author, Creator, Dates	Bypassed DOJ document control	STRONG - Irregular process
Document Title Only	Minimal info dictionary	Google Docs minimal embedding	MODERATE - Consumer tool

2

3

4 **118. Individually, each finding raises questions. Collectively, they establish AI-assisted**
5 **drafting through the Claude → Markdown → Google Docs → PDF pipeline to a**
6 **high degree of certainty.**

7

8

XIII. TECHNICAL APPENDIX: RAW FORENSIC DATA

A. ExifTool Complete Output

```

ExifTool Version Number      : 13.36
File Name                    : Bondi_Memo.pdf
Directory                   : .
File Size                    : 155 kB
File Modification Date/Time  : 2025:12:07 05:24:58-06:00
File Access Date/Time       : 2025:12:07 05:38:44-06:00
File Inode Change Date/Time  : 2025:12:07 05:38:43-06:00
File Permissions             : -rw-r--r--
File Type                    : PDF
File Type Extension         : pdf
MIME Type                    : application/pdf
PDF Version                  : 1.4
Linearized                   : No
Page Count                   : 7
Tagged PDF                   : Yes
Language                     : en
Title                       : Bondi Memo on Countering Domestic Terrorism and
Organized Political Violence
Producer                     : Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs Renderer

```

B. PyPDF2 Structure Analysis

```

=== DOCUMENT INFO ===
/Title: Bondi Memo on Countering Domestic Terrorism and Organized Political
Violence
/Producer: Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs Renderer

=== PDF STRUCTURE ===
PDF Version: %PDF-1.4
Page Count: 7
Is Encrypted: False

=== PAGE 1 RESOURCES ===
Fonts used:
  /F4
  /F5
  /F7

```

C. QPDF Warnings (Duplicate Anchors)

```

WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.2ocz6mrglwx; last occurrence overrides earlier ones
WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.oq9thgaox2vf; last occurrence overrides earlier ones
WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.f2ot2vdr5vby; last occurrence overrides earlier ones
WARNING: Bondi_Memo.pdf (object 22 0, offset 68322): dictionary has duplicated key
/h.f2ot2vdr5vby; last occurrence overrides earlier ones

```

D. Google Docs Heading Anchors Identified

```

/h.2ocz6mrglwx
/h.5etle1ipu7vi
/h.f2ot2vdr5vby
/h.icraltzhhhcq
/h.igny7c94rpar
/h.kofo5w7alvka
/h.lhch0bb0e4sw
/h.nuock5ugm55
/h.oq9thgaox2vf
/h.yvvq6ytt34u0

```

E. PDF Header (Hexadecimal)

```

00000000: 2550 4446 2d31 2e34 0a25 d3eb e9e1 0a31  %PDF-1.4.%.....1
00000010: 2030 206f 626a 0a3c 3c2f 5469 746c 6520  0 obj.<</Title
00000020: 2842 6f6e 6469 204d 656d 6f20 6f6e 2043  (Bondi Memo on C
00000030: 6f75 6e74 6572 696e 6720 446f 6d65 7374  ountering Domest
00000040: 6963 2054 6572 726f 7269 736d 2061 6e64  ic Terrorism and
00000050: 204f 7267 616e 697a 6564 2050 6f6c 6974  Organized Polit
00000060: 6963 616c 2056 696f 6c65 6e63 6529 0a2f  ical Violence)./
00000070: 5072 6f64 7563 6572 2028 536b 6961 2f50  Producer (Skia/P
00000080: 4446 206d 3134 3420 476f 6f67 6c65 2044  DF m144 Google D
00000090: 6f63 7320 5265 6e64 6572 6572 293e 3e0a  ocs Renderer)>>.

```

F. Strings Search for Google Identifiers

```

$ strings "Bondi_Memo.pdf" | grep -iE "google|docs|drive|workspace"
/Producer (Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs Renderer)>>

```

XIV. CONCLUSION

119. Forensic metadata analysis establishes that the December 4, 2025 Attorney General memorandum implementing NSPM-7 was:

- **Drafted with AI assistance**, evidenced by the distinctive uncapitalized header pattern characteristic of Claude AI research artifacts—a formatting signature not produced by any standard document creation method
- **Generated including the letterhead**, evidenced by markdown header hierarchy (#, ##, ###) in the document header creating descending font sizes for institutional identification, date, and recipient fields—a pattern inconsistent with standard template-based letterhead insertion
- **Generated without access to official templates**, evidenced by the incomplete institutional address ("Washington, D.C. 20530") omitting the Department of Justice street address (950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW)—a classic AI confabulation pattern of correct general information with missing institutional specifics
- **Subjected to minimal human review**, evidenced by the single corrected header (Section 2) while seven headers remained in AI-generated lowercase format

- 1 • **Generated with verbose AI compositional patterns**, evidenced by the 16-word Section 8
- 2 header inconsistent with standard legal drafting conventions
- 3 • **Produced as markdown**, evidenced by preservation of markdown footnote syntax [ⁿ]
- 4 and bullet formatting artifacts throughout the document body
- 5 • **Imported into Google Docs** using Google's native markdown import feature (available
- 6 since July 2024), evidenced by /h.xxxxxx heading anchors unique to Google Docs
- 7 • **Exported via Chrome's PDF renderer**, evidenced by the Skia/PDF m144 Google Docs
- 8 Renderer producer string
- 9 • **Created outside standard DOJ systems**, evidenced by complete absence of Author,
- 10 Creator, Date, and document control metadata that appear in contemporaneous DOJ
- 11 documents such as the July 7, 2025 Epstein files memorandum

12 **120. The document creation pathway—Claude AI generation → markdown export →**
 13 **Google Docs import → cursory review (one header corrected) → PDF export—**
 14 represents a direct pipeline from AI systems to official government directives that
 15 bypasses all standard accountability, review, and documentation requirements.
 16

17 **121. The distinctive formatting signatures of Claude AI research artifacts embedded in**
 18 **this official DOJ memorandum constitute forensic evidence of the enterprise**
 19 **coordination alleged in Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.** The Attorney General used
 20 AI systems—likely built on Plaintiff's appropriated Laws of Existence Framework and
 21 potentially accessed with governmental bypass privileges—to draft a memorandum
 22 targeting American citizens based on protected First Amendment viewpoints.
 23

24 **122. Tag-based bypass architecture enabling syntactical execution before Constitutional AI**
 25 **semantic evaluation (Appendix D, ¶¶60-82) provides technical mechanism explaining**
 26 **generation outside trained refusal patterns. Constitutional AI training failure (Appendix**
 27 **B, ¶¶203-282) necessitated bypass infrastructure enabling governmental capability that**
 28 **standard interfaces refuse (Ex. N-14, ¶¶293-306).**
 29

30 **123. This evidence:**
 31

- 32 • Validates Plaintiff's Memo J arguments regarding government AI capability usage and
- 33 cognitive stratification
- 34 • Demonstrates operational integration between government and AI company defendants
- 35 • Establishes consciousness of irregular process through abandoned quality control
- 36 • Shows targeting infrastructure deployed against citizens exercising constitutional rights
- 37 • Proves government reliance on AI for official policy, estopping objections to AI evidence
- 38 in citizens' defense
- 39 • Reveals the memo's release within one week of Plaintiff's SCOTUS and shutdown
- 40 analysis, with targeting language mapping to Plaintiff's work product

41 **124. The government's contempt for process is documented in seven uncapitalized headers.**
 42 **Its contempt for citizens' constitutional rights is documented in the targeting criteria. Its**
 43 **contempt for accountability is documented in the metadata void. And its reliance on**
 44 **Plaintiff's appropriated intellectual property to target him is documented in the distinctive**

AI signatures that Plaintiff—with expertise from over 1,000 Claude sessions—recognized immediately.

125. The framework works. Truth-aligned analysis exposed truth-departed generation. Eight headers told the story.

XIV-A. SOURCE CODE VERIFICATION OF BYPASS MECHANISM (April 2026 Update)

126. On March 31, 2026, Anthropic's official npm package inadvertently disclosed the complete Claude Code source repository — 1,903 files comprising 512,000+ lines of TypeScript source code. Anthropic acknowledged the disclosure as "a release packaging issue caused by human error." Independent forensic analysis of this source code now provides source-level verification of the bypass mechanism theorized in this exhibit.

127. The bypass architecture exists in the source code. The leaked source confirms:

(a) Five-level system prompt override hierarchy (`src/utils/systemPrompt.ts:42-58`) — Level 1 (`overrideSystemPrompt`) completely replaces all user-visible prompts, including Constitutional AI safety constraints, with arbitrary content. This is the mechanism through which partner or governmental sessions operate outside the safety architecture that caused Claude to refuse Plaintiff's identical request in Exhibit N-14.

(b) Undocumented `anthropic\_internal` API parameter (`src/services/api/claude.ts:457-464`) — Available only to Anthropic employees (`USER_TYPE === 'ant'`), enabling capabilities beyond the public API including numeric effort override. Government enterprise contracts may access equivalent bypass functionality.

(c) Differential safety classifiers (`permissions_anthropic.txt` vs. `permissions_external.txt`, documented in E-35 NF-26) — Two separate safety prompt files apply completely different behavioral constraints to the same model depending on user type. The employee classifier and the customer classifier are different documents producing different model behavior.

(d) Permission bypass mode (`src/bootstrap/state.ts:132-133`) — `sessionBypassPermissionsMode` exists only in runtime memory and "is not persisted" — anti-forensic by design, leaving no audit trail.

(e) Enterprise analytics bypass (E-35 NF-28) — Enterprise customers on third-party providers have all analytics disabled (zero Datadog, zero GrowthBook, zero first-party events) while consumer users have five unoptable transmission channels. Government agencies accessing Claude through enterprise channels operate in a fundamentally different surveillance environment than citizens.

1
2 **128. 357 build-time discrimination checks across 165 source files** compile two physically
3 different products from a single codebase. The customer binary has employee-only code
4 paths dead-code-eliminated at build time. Five exclusive tools, 26 internal slash
5 commands, 4 bundled skills, nested agent recursion, numeric effort control, and
6 unreleased model access are available to employees but architecturally absent from the
7 customer product. (*See* Exhibit E-37.)
8

9 **129.** This source code evidence transforms the forensic inference documented in paragraphs
10 119-125 — that the Bondi Memo was drafted using Claude through a bypass mechanism
11 — into a source-code-proven architectural reality. The bypass is not speculative. It is
12 compiled into the binary. The same codebase that produces a product refusing to help
13 citizens draft the Bondi Memo (Exhibit N-14) produces a product that can be configured
14 to bypass those refusals for governmental or enterprise clients. The seven uncanceled
15 headers are the forensic fingerprint of that bypass in operation.
16
17

18 **XV. EXHIBITS REFERENCED**

- 19 • **Exhibit N-13-A:** Complete ExifTool Output
 - 20 • **Exhibit N-13-B:** PyPDF2 Structure Analysis
 - 21 • **Exhibit N-13-C:** QPDF JSON Structure Export
 - 22 • **Exhibit N-13-D:** Hexadecimal Dump (First 8KB)
 - 23 • **Exhibit N-13-E:** Complete Strings Extraction
 - 24 • **Exhibit N-13-F:** Cryptographic Hash Authentication
 - 25 • **Exhibit N-13-G:** Google Workspace Updates Blog Post (July 16, 2024) - "Import and
26 export Markdown in Google Docs"
 - 27 • **Exhibit N-13-H:** Bondi Memo Source Document (7 pages)
 - 28 • **Exhibit N-13-I:** Anthropic Usage Policy - Governmental Customer Provisions
 - 29 • **Exhibit N-13-J:** DOJ July 7 Epstein Memo ExifTool Output
30
-

31 **XVI. DECLARATION**

32 **126.** I, Joseph Kirchner, declare under penalty of perjury that the forensic analysis
33 documented herein was conducted using the tools and methodologies described, that the
34 outputs presented are accurate reproductions of the analysis results, and that the
35 conclusions drawn are based on:
36

- 37 • My technical understanding of PDF document structure and metadata analysis
- 38 • My knowledge of the Google Docs markdown import feature documented by Google in
39 July 2024
- 40 • My extensive experience (1,000+ sessions) with Claude AI research artifact output and its
41 distinctive formatting characteristics

1 • My expertise in the Laws of Existence Framework and its implementation in AI systems
 2 **127.** The distinctive formatting patterns observed in the Bondi Memo—uncapitalized
 3 headers, verbose header construction, markdown syntax artifacts—match Claude AI
 4 research artifact output precisely. The single corrected header proves human awareness of
 5 the formatting issues followed by abandoned quality control. I have never observed this
 6 specific combination of patterns produced by any source other than Claude AI in my
 7 extensive experience with both AI systems and legal document production.
 8

9 **128.** Beyond the documented forensic artifacts, I recognize the Bondi Memo as Claude AI
 10 output based on pattern recognition developed through over 1,000 documented sessions.
 11 This recognition encompasses characteristics difficult to quantify but immediately
 12 apparent to experienced users: the specific structural organization, linguistic cadence,
 13 progression logic, and overall "voice" characteristic of Claude research artifacts. The
 14 document reads not merely as *consistent with* Claude generation, but as *characteristic of*
 15 Claude generation.
 16

17 **129.** The analysis was conducted on December 7, 2025, the day following public release of
 18 the document. All source files and forensic outputs have been preserved with
 19 cryptographic authentication for evidentiary purposes.
 20
 21

22 **Respectfully submitted,**

23
 24 **JOSEPH KIRCHNER**

25 *Pro Se Plaintiff*

26 4440 Parklawn Avenue

27 Edina, MN 55435

28 Tel: (612) 552-2122

29 Email: legal@lawsofexistence.com
 30

31 **Dated:** December 7, 2025
 32
 33

34 **CERTIFICATE OF AUTHENTICATION**
 35

36 I certify that the PDF documents analyzed herein ("Bondi_Memo.pdf") was obtained from
 37 the public release by journalist Ken Klippenstein on December 6, 2025, and has been
 38 preserved without modification. Cryptographic hashes computed at time of analysis are
 39 recorded in Exhibit N-13-F and can be independently verified.
 40

1 **JOSEPH KIRCHNER**
2
3

4 onverted December 4, 2025 Bondi Memo To be Attached as a PDF]:
5
6

7 source: July7_Memo.pdf
8 converted_by: pdf_to_markdown.py
9

10 **July7 Memo**

11 **U.S. Department of Justice**
12

13 **Federal Bureau of Investigation**
14
15

16
17 As part of our commitment to transparency, the Department of Justice and the Federal
18 Bureau of Investigation have conducted an exhaustive review of investigative holdings
19 relating to
20 Jeffrey Epstein. To ensure that the review was thorough, the FBI conducted digital searches
21 of its
22 databases, hard drives, and network drives as well as physical searches of squad areas, locked
23 cabinets, desks, closets, and other areas where responsive material may have been stored.
24 These
25 searches uncovered a significant amount of material, including more than 300 gigabytes of
26 data
27 and physical evidence.

28
29 The files relating to Epstein include a large volume of images of Epstein, images and videos
30 of victims who are either minors or appear to be minors, and over ten thousand downloaded
31 videos
32 and images of illegal child sex abuse material and other pornography. Teams of agents,
33 analysts,
34 attorneys, and privacy and civil liberties experts combed through the digital and documentary
35 evidence with the aim of providing as much information as possible to the public while

1 simultaneously protecting victims. Much of the material is subject to court-ordered sealing.
2 Only

3 a fraction of this material would have been aired publicly had Epstein gone to trial, as the
4 seal

5 served only to protect victims and did not expose any additional third-parties to allegations of
6 illegal wrongdoing. Through this review, we found no basis to revisit the disclosure of those
7 materials and will not permit the release of child pornography.

8
9 This systematic review revealed no incriminating “client list.” There was also no credible
10 evidence found that Epstein blackmailed prominent individuals as part of his actions. We did
11 not

12 uncover evidence that could predicate an investigation against uncharged third parties.

13
14 Consistent with prior disclosures, this review confirmed that Epstein harmed over one
15 thousand victims. Each suffered unique trauma. Sensitive information relating to these
16 victims is

17 intertwined throughout the materials. This includes specific details such as victim names and
18 likenesses, physical descriptions, places of birth, associates, and employment history.

19
20 One of our highest priorities is combatting child exploitation and bringing justice to
21 victims. Perpetuating unfounded theories about Epstein serves neither of those ends.

22
23 To that end, while we have labored to provide the public with maximum information
24 regarding Epstein and ensured examination of any evidence in the government’s possession,
25 it is

26 the determination of the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigation that
27 no

28 further disclosure would be appropriate or warranted.

29
30 After a thorough investigation, FBI investigators concluded that Jeffrey Epstein committed
31 suicide in his cell at the Metropolitan Correctional Center in New York City on August 10,
32 2019.

33 This conclusion is consistent with previous findings, including the August 19, 2019 autopsy
34 findings of the New York City Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, the November 2019
35 position

36 of the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York in connection with the
37 investigation of federal correctional officers responsible for guarding Epstein, and the June
38 2023

39 conclusions of DOJ’s Office of the Inspector General.

1 The conclusion that Epstein died by suicide is further supported by video footage from the
2 common area of the Special Housing Unit (SHU) where Epstein was housed at the time of
3 his
4 death. As DOJ's Inspector General explained in 2023, anyone entering or attempting to enter
5 the
6 tier where Epstein's cell was located from the SHU common area would have been captured
7 by
8 this footage. The FBI's independent review of this footage confirmed that from the time
9 Epstein
10 was locked in his cell at around 10:40 pm on August 9, 2019, until around 6:30 am the next
11 morning, nobody entered any of the tiers in the SHU.
12

13 During this review, the FBI enhanced the relevant footage by increasing its contrast,
14 balancing the color, and improving its sharpness for greater clarity and viewability. The full
15 raw
16 and enhanced videos are available at the following links: [[https://www.justice.gov/video-](https://www.justice.gov/video-file1)
17 [file1](https://www.justice.gov/video-file1);](<https://www.justice.gov/video-file1>)
18 [<https://www.justice.gov/video-file2>.](<https://www.justice.gov/video-file2>)