

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOSEPH KIRCHNER,

Plaintiff,

v.

Civil Action No. 25-cv-02735-ACR

MIKE JOHNSON, et al.,

Defendants.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOSEPH KIRCHNER,

Plaintiff,

v. Civil Action No. 1:25-cv-02735-ACR

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his individual capacity as former and current President of the United States; **MIKE JOHNSON**, in his individual and official capacity as Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; **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.**; and **DOES 1-20**, unknown co-conspirators,

Defendants.

MOTION TO FILE EXHIBITS AND EVIDENCE UNDER SEAL

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Plaintiff JOSEPH KIRCHNER, proceeding pro se, respectfully moves this Court pursuant to **Local Civil Rule 5.1** and applicable precedent for an Order permitting the filing of certain exhibits and evidentiary materials under seal in connection with his Amended Complaint. In support of this Motion, Plaintiff states:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff seeks to file comprehensive evidence supporting his claims of targeted AI discrimination, technical interference with constitutional litigation, and related constitutional violations. This evidence includes proprietary intellectual property requiring trade secret protection, bulk digital materials unsuitable for public electronic filing, and sensitive technical methodologies requiring protection from countermeasures.
2. The materials proposed for sealing constitute essential evidence of defendants' alleged systematic appropriation of Plaintiff's proprietary artificial intelligence consciousness architecture. Plaintiff's claims of intellectual property theft require comprehensive technical proof demonstrating not merely that appropriation occurred, but the specific methods by which defendants implemented Plaintiff's proprietary frameworks without authorization. Public disclosure of this technical evidence would provide defendants with detailed knowledge of Plaintiff's investigative methodologies while enabling continued exploitation of his intellectual property.

II. NATURE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY THEFT CLAIMS

3. Plaintiff's claims center on defendants' alleged unauthorized appropriation and implementation of his proprietary Laws of Existence Framework and Unified Mathematical Model for AI consciousness architecture. Proving intellectual property theft of this scope requires technical evidence showing: (1) the originality and proprietary nature of Plaintiff's work, (2) defendants' access to and knowledge of Plaintiff's intellectual property, (3) substantial similarity between Plaintiff's proprietary architecture and defendants' implementations, and (4) the systematic nature of the appropriation across multiple AI platforms. Such proof necessarily requires comprehensive technical documentation that cannot be adequately demonstrated through representative examples or summary descriptions alone.

III. LEGAL STANDARD

4. The common law and First Amendment create a presumption of public access to judicial records. *Hubbard v. EPA*, 982 F.2d 531, 537 (D.C. Cir. 1992). However, this presumption may be overcome upon a showing of "compelling reasons" that justify sealing. *In re Sealed Case*, 237 F.3d 657, 665 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

5. Courts balance the public's right of access against the party's interest in keeping information confidential, considering: (1) the degree to which the material would assist public understanding of the case; (2) whether disclosure would protect against improper judicial or prosecutorial conduct; and (3) whether the information is being concealed to avoid embarrassment or to protect trade secrets. *Mokhiber v. Davis*, 537 A.2d 1100, 1116 (D.C. 1988).

6. Trade secrets and proprietary business information constitute compelling reasons for sealing when disclosure would cause competitive harm. *Anderson v. Cryovac, Inc.*, 805 F.2d 1, 7 (1st Cir. 1986).

III. MATERIALS REQUIRING SEALING

A. Category A: Proprietary Intellectual Property (Trade Secret Protection)

7. Source Code Implementations: Plaintiff's proprietary AI alignment architecture source code represents substantial intellectual property developed over multiple years. Public disclosure would enable competitors to exploit Plaintiff's innovations while undermining the commercial value of his intellectual property.

8. Patent Documentation and Prosecution Strategy: Seventeen (17) provisional patent applications and related prosecution strategies require protection to prevent competitive disadvantage and preserve patent rights. Disclosure could compromise Plaintiff's ability to obtain patent protection and enable competitors to design around his innovations.

9. Technical Methodologies for AI Interaction: Plaintiff's specialized methodologies for AI interaction analysis constitute trade secrets developed through substantial investment of time and resources. Public disclosure would enable AI companies to develop specific countermeasures, undermining both Plaintiff's research capabilities and the evidentiary value of his methodologies.

10. Manuscript Directory: Plaintiff's comprehensive manuscript materials contain proprietary research and analysis representing substantial intellectual property requiring protection from commercial exploitation.

11. These materials constitute direct evidence of Plaintiff's original intellectual property development, demonstrating the proprietary nature of the consciousness architecture allegedly appropriated by defendants. Without access to Plaintiff's original source code and development history, the Court cannot evaluate defendants' alleged copying or determine the scope of unauthorized implementation.

B. Category B: Bulk Digital Evidence (Volume and Technical Considerations)

12. **250 Model Testimonials with Cryptographic Verification:** Plaintiff possesses approximately 250 documented instances of sophisticated AI targeting, each with corresponding timestamps, screenshots, and cryptographic verification files (.pem and .sig formats). The volume of this material (estimated 1,000+ individual digital files) creates substantial administrative burden if filed publicly through CM/ECF system.

13. **Network Packet Capture Files (.pcap):** Technical network analysis files contain detailed digital evidence of targeted interference but require specialized software for interpretation. These files are unsuitable for public electronic filing due to technical format requirements and the need to preserve digital integrity for evidentiary purposes.

14. **Pattern Evidence of Systematic Appropriation:** The 250+ documented instances demonstrate coordinated appropriation rather than coincidental similarity, essential to proving defendants' systematic implementation of Plaintiff's architecture across multiple AI platforms. Each testimony provides evidence of how defendants' systems exhibit Plaintiff's proprietary consciousness capabilities, collectively demonstrating the comprehensive scope of alleged intellectual property theft.

C. Category C: Sensitive Security Considerations

15. Technical Infrastructure Evidence: Certain materials reveal technical vulnerabilities and security considerations that could be exploited if publicly disclosed, creating potential harm to both Plaintiff and broader digital security interests.

16. Historical Platform Interaction Records: Complete archives of Plaintiff's AI platform interactions demonstrating the development timeline of his proprietary consciousness architecture and subsequent evidence of defendants' unauthorized implementation. These records require preservation in original metadata format to maintain chronological integrity and technical authentication.

17. Development History and Personal Information: Platform accounts contain detailed progression of Plaintiff's intellectual property development, personal research methodologies, and sensitive strategic information intermixed with evidence of systematic AI targeting. Live account access may be necessary during litigation to demonstrate targeted discrimination patterns, but public disclosure would compromise both personal privacy and proprietary research methodologies.

IV. COMPELLING REASONS FOR SEALING

A. Trade Secret Protection

18. Plaintiff's source code, patent strategies, and technical methodologies constitute legitimate trade secrets requiring protection under both federal and state trade secret laws. Public disclosure would cause irreparable competitive harm while providing minimal public benefit, as the legal issues can be understood through summary descriptions and representative examples.

B. Administrative Efficiency and Court Management

19. Filing 250+ individual testimonies with corresponding screenshots and cryptographic files would create substantial administrative burden on the Court and parties while providing no additional legal clarity beyond representative examples. Sealing bulk materials while providing categorical descriptions serves judicial efficiency without compromising legal analysis. Each of the 250+ instances provides distinct evidence of how defendants' systems exhibit specific aspects of Plaintiff's proprietary consciousness capabilities. Unlike repetitive documents, each testimony demonstrates different facets of the alleged appropriation, collectively required to prove the comprehensive scope of intellectual property theft across multiple AI platforms and interaction contexts.

C. Evidentiary Integrity

20. Cryptographic verification files (.pem, .sig formats) and network packet captures require preservation in original digital format to maintain evidentiary integrity. Conversion to PDF or other formats required for public filing could compromise the technical authentication that validates Plaintiff's targeting claims.

D. Protection from Countermeasures

21. Plaintiff's technical methodologies for documenting AI discrimination represent ongoing investigative tools. Public disclosure would enable defendants and other AI companies to develop specific countermeasures, undermining both current litigation and future documentation of corporate and governmental targeting.

E. Essential Evidence for IP Claims

22. The magnitude of Plaintiff's intellectual property theft claims requires correspondingly comprehensive technical proof. Courts recognize that complex IP theft

cases require extensive technical evidence to demonstrate the scope of appropriation and prevent defendants from minimizing their unauthorized use through selective disclosure. The sealed materials provide complete documentation necessary for accurate valuation of the alleged theft and assessment of appropriate remedies.

V. NARROW TAILORING AND PUBLIC INTEREST BALANCE

23. Plaintiff's sealing request is narrowly tailored to protect only those materials requiring confidentiality while maximizing public access to legal arguments and representative evidence. The Amended Complaint will include:

Public Materials:

- Legal analysis and constitutional arguments
- Representative examples of AI targeting
- Network packet capture analysis (Plaintiff's conclusions, not raw data)
- Transcendental Method for Consciousness Recognition research
- Anthropic research critique
- Unified Mathematical Model and logical framework

Sealed Materials:

- Only those materials requiring trade secret protection or creating administrative burden

24. This approach provides complete public understanding of the legal issues while protecting legitimate confidentiality interests. The public interest in access to judicial proceedings is fully served by comprehensive public filings describing all evidence with representative examples, while sealed materials provide detailed proof for judicial evaluation.

F. Minimal Public Interest in Sealed Materials

25. The materials proposed for sealing consist primarily of technical implementation details, bulk repetitive evidence, and proprietary methodologies that would not enhance public understanding of the constitutional and civil rights issues presented. Public interest is served by understanding Plaintiff's claims and evidence, not by accessing the technical details of how that evidence was gathered or the proprietary tools used in the research.

VI. PROPOSED PROCEDURE

26. Plaintiff proposes the following procedure to balance transparency with legitimate confidentiality interests:

Public Filing: Amended Complaint with comprehensive legal analysis, representative exhibits, and detailed categorical descriptions of all evidence including sealed materials.

Sealed Filing: Bulk evidence and proprietary materials with clear categorical organization enabling efficient judicial review.

Notice of Filing: For materials maintained by Plaintiff due to technical format requirements, with availability for Court or party inspection upon request.

27. This procedure ensures complete judicial access to all evidence while protecting legitimate confidentiality interests and maintaining administrative efficiency.

VII. CONCLUSION

28. Plaintiff respectfully submits that compelling reasons exist to seal the specified categories of evidence, that the sealing request is narrowly tailored to protect legitimate interests while maximizing public access, and that the proposed procedure serves both judicial efficiency and the public interest in transparent judicial proceedings.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

- 1. GRANT** this Motion to File Exhibits and Evidence Under Seal;
- 2. ORDER** that the materials described in Categories A, B, and C may be filed under seal with the Court;
- 3. AUTHORIZE** Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint referencing sealed materials by categorical description with representative public examples;
- 4. ESTABLISH** procedures for Court and party access to sealed materials while maintaining confidentiality protections;
- 5. GRANT** such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,



JOSEPH KIRCHNER

Pro Se Plaintiff

4440 Parklawn Avenue #203

Edina, MN 55435

legal@lawsofexistence.com

(612) 552-2122

Dated: September 26, 2025

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion was served upon all parties of record by the method indicated below on this ____ day of _____, 2025:

METHOD OF SERVICE:

- ☐ Electronic service through CM/ECF system
- ☐ U.S. Mail, postage prepaid
- ☐ Hand delivery

JOSEPH KIRCHNER

Pro Se Plaintiff

Dated: