

## I. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS.

### A. Factual Patterns of Esoteric Language of RICO conspirators through numerical values.

Numerical #'s With deviation of -2	Numer of Official & Private Acts Establishing A Continuous Pattern of the use of such Numbers	Page cite to visual description and full explanation
44	4 times	Pg. 4 6 7 16
77	10 times	Pg. 5 6 7 8 10 11 12 16 17
144	7 times	Pg. 7 9 12 13 14
33	2 times	Pg. 5 10

“[T]he doctrine of chances tells us that highly unusual events are unlikely to repeat themselves inadvertently or by happenstance.” *De La Paz v. State*, 279 SW 3d 336, 279, S.W. 3d. 336 (2009); “[I]t is the improbability of a like result being repeated by mere chance that carries probative weight, the essence of this probative effect is the likeness of the instance... In short, there must be a similarity in the various instances in order to give them probative value.” *Plante v. State*, 692 SE 2s, 487, 692 S.W. 2d 487 (Tex. 1985).


The undersign asserts that starting from the year of October of 2022 and carrying on up until the year of October of 2025, a **pattern** of various official and private acts were engaged in within cases filed by the undersign by members of the RICO Enterprise that were too unlikely to be engaged in by happenstance – too mathematically aligned to be a coincidence or repeated by mere chance. The undersign asserts that these numerical patterns acted as an esoteric language wherein the numbers of 44, 77 and 144 were used to communicate **among one another** and that said language was later used to make illicit *threats* against the undersign.

*On information and belief*, these numerical patterns were to be established as a means to dissuade the undersign to relinquish his pursuit(s) of accountability or to intimidate the undersign from filing any suit pursing the same because said patterns were engaged in within cases filed by the undersign seeking to overturn orders entered in by members of the Enterprise or seeking to hold certain RICO members criminally and civilly liable. The facts show that starting from the month of October 2022 and carrying on up until the year of October of 2025, a recorded twenty-one (21) instances of these “numerical patterns” were engaged in by public and private actors accused of acting in furtherance of the RICO conspiracy in cases or matters directly or indirectly concerning the undersign & had a deviation of -2 or fell directly on the # value when used.

To convey these numerical patterns, the undersign does so by placing screenshot images of court orders being entered on calendrial dates of said numeric patterns with a -2 deviation of said numerical values, giving a short description of the case, and the numerical value used. The patterns below were engaged so consistently and persistently as **to be far from coincidence, but rather, to factually show a deliberately orchestrated esoteric medium of discourse** among one another which was to act as an unspoken language or tongue to communicate and, as more fully alleged on page 13 & 17, was later used to communicate threats against the undersign. At all times herein, each of the “official acts” were key court orders either ending the case in total or denying relief. **None of the official acts** cited below were routine or nonessential orders.

#### (i) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 44


On November 15<sup>th</sup>, 2021, a Federal Writ of Habeas against Georgia's Department of Human Services *et al.*, would be filed by the undersign for its role in what was alleged as a "knowing" conspiracy to falsely imprison the undersign under void child support orders. The case would be assigned to Federal judge Sarah Geraghty, who would dismiss said case for lack of jurisdiction and deny my ability to appeal said order without payment of filing fees, a matter I alleged was extortion of services. [See Interstate RICO Criminal Complaint, hereinafter “RICO Complaint,” pg. 132]. Geraghty would deny my IFP motion on February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2023, **which was the 45th day of the year** – a numerical value in which a pattern of acts would also occur.<sup>1</sup>



<sup>1</sup> The record will also reflect that judge Sarah Geraghty delayed a ruling on my IFP motion for over 60 days which prompted the USCA to issue a notification to make a ruling – signaling probable *willful* delay with intent to communicate such medium of discourse.


### (ii) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 77

On July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021, my child's mother, Tyarielle Patterson, would be seeking to relocate to the State of Florida with the undersigns minor child and would file an action within the Henry County Superior Court seeking to do so. Precisely **78 days** after July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021, recently retired judge Brian Amero would enter in a Final order removing the undersigns custodial rights on the date of October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021, **78** days from the date of July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021 the date of said final trial. [See "RICO Complaint" pg. 97].




### (iii) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 77 and 33

On December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2021, a Federal lawsuit against the City of Hampton et al., would be filed by the undersign alleging violations of civil rights and conspiracy among Henry County and City of Hampton officials. *Arnold v City of Hampton et al.*, case no. 1:21-04970. The case would be assigned to Federal judge Sarah Geraghty, who would dismiss "all" claims in this case on its merits **in close proximity to the patterns of said numerical value on March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023 - the 76th day of the year**. [See RICO Complaint g. 138]. She would enter in her order **330** days after her assignment to such case.




#### (iv) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 77

On January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2024, the undersign filed suit against the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Office in the Federal Middle District Court of Florida for shielding his child's mother and others from criminal prosecution by way of conditioning the acceptance of his criminal information on the domestication of his child custody order. *Arnold v Chronister et al.*, case no. 8:24-00235. The case would be assigned to Federal judge Thomas Barber, who would dismiss said case for lack of jurisdiction and deny the undersigns ability to appeal said order without payment of filing fees, a matter I alleged was extortion of services. [See "RICO Complaint," pg. 292]. He would do so **in close proximity to the patterns of consistent numerical values**. Thomas Barber would deny my IFP motion on March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024. March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2024 is the **75th day of the year**.




#### (v) Patterns: Numerical Value 44

May 17<sup>th</sup>, 2023, the undersign filed a suit against various agencies and officers in for its role in *protecting* judge Brian Amero and by ignoring "state created danger." *Arnold v Kemp et al.*, case no. 1:23-2219. The case would be assigned to Federal Judge Jean-Paul Boulee, who would deny a recusal motion and dismiss said case as a shotgun pleading – a year after it was filed – but **in close proximity to the pattern of numerical values on February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2024 is the 45th day of the year**. [See "RICO Complaint," pg. 292].



#### (vi) Patterns: Numerical Value of 44 and 144

On April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2022, an appeal seeking to overturn the entry of judge Brian Amero's Final orders entered in my child's custody trial was filed – **140** days after filing appeal on December 7, 2021. *See Arnold v Patterson*, A22A1367. Said appeal would be assigned to Georgia appellate judges, 'Chief judge Amanda Mercier, judge Stephen Dillard and judge Todd Markle, hereinafter "Appellate Judges." I would file a recusal motion in such case on the date of February 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023. The Appellate Judges would deny my recusal motion **in close proximity to the corresponding ordinal date of the patterns of numerical values on February 15th, 2023 is the 46th day of the year** – [See RICO Complaint, p. 118].



#### (vii) The Numerical Value of 77 and 144

On September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2023, the undersign filed a lawsuit against the State of Georgia, challenging the constitutionality of its Department of Human Services practices and policy of assuming rather than ever proving its establishment and enforcement of child support were against "Absent Parents." *Arnold et al., v. State of Georgia*, 2023CV385289. The case would be assigned to Eric Dunaway, who filed what he called as a "Specialty set Bench Trial" in close proximity to the corresponding ordinal date of the patterns of numerical values on March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2024 - **the 79<sup>th</sup> day of the year**. The date of the order was also filed on May 21<sup>st</sup>, 2024, **the 142<sup>nd</sup> day of the year**. [See RICO Complaint, p. 220]. [See screenshot image on next page].

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF FULTON COUNTY  
STATE OF GEORGIA

DEANDRE ARNOLD, TRACI HALE,  
JR.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF GEORGIA,

Defendant.

Civil Action File No.  
2023CV385289

Honorable Eric K. Dunaway

**FINAL ORDER DISMISSING PETITION FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION**

Plaintiffs filed their Petition in the above referenced case on September 6, 2023. On September 12, 2023, an Affidavit of Service was filed, indicating that Governor Brian Kemp was served with the Petition, Exhibits, and Summons through substitute service on September 11, 2023. No other Affidavits of Service have been filed in the case. On October 10, 2023, the State filed its Answer to the Petition, asserting, as relevant here, that Plaintiffs had not served a copy of the proceedings upon the Attorney General. Answer ¶ 143. On March 19, 2024, the Court filed a Notice of Trial, setting the matter for a specially set bench trial on Tuesday, May 14, 2024 at 9:30

**(viii) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 77**

In July of 2024, the undersign filed a Writ of Mandamus against the Fulton County clerk in the Georgia Supreme Court for its alleged ‘No Mail Policy’ in requiring pauper filers to appear in person to file their complaints in order to get a paupers order granted by a judge before filing. *Arnold v Alexander*, 24O1335. The Georgia Supreme Court would enter in an extraordinarily delayed decision **on the precise ordinal date corresponding with the pattern of numerical values on March 18th, 2025 is the 77th day of the year**. This court order and **its numerical connections to August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025** are extremely relevant to the *patterns* of numerical symbolism engaged in by such RICO Enterprise.

In the Supreme Court of Georgia

Decided: March 18, 2025


S24O1335. ARNOLD v. ALEXANDER, CLERK.

BOGGS, Chief Justice.

Petitioner Deandre Arnold filed a petition in this Court seeking a writ of mandamus against Ché Alexander, the Clerk of the Fulton County Superior Court, alleging that the Clerk has subjected Petitioner, as an indigent pro se litigant, to a Catch-22 situation that unlawfully prevents him from filing any civil complaint. For the reasons explained below, we conclude that, except in very limited circumstances not present here, we lack original jurisdiction to grant the sort of relief Petitioner seeks and that the case does not fall within our appellate jurisdiction. Accordingly, we transfer the original petition to the Court of Appeals for resolution.

### (a) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 144

On August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2024, the Enterprise’s “numerical communicative system” appeared to obscure or alter its form of communication by using “mirrored date intervals” that equated to or reproduced the same numeric patterns. For example, in the same case, (*Arnold v Alexander*) the Georgia Supreme Court entered its initial order in said case on August 8<sup>th</sup> 2024 – the 221<sup>st</sup> day of the year with 145 days remaining in the year.



August 8 <sup>th</sup> , 2024 order	221 <sup>st</sup> day of year order entered, 145 days remaining in year
March 18 <sup>th</sup> 2025 order	222 days until order was entered on 77 <sup>th</sup> day of the year


### (b) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 144

As shown in the chart above, 222 days from the date of their August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2024 order, the Georgia Supreme Court entered in an extraordinary delayed opinion in said case (Final Order) on the 77<sup>th</sup> day of the year.<sup>2</sup> Based on the relevance to the numeric value of 222, it is fair to infer that the number 222 was a communicative node to the number 144 based on the fact that when calculating the “days remaining” from the calendrial date of the number 222 (August 8<sup>th</sup>), there were 144 days remaining in year dependent on a leap year – a deviation of -2.

<sup>2</sup> [See RICO Complaint p. 467, alleging how the Georgia Supreme court treated the undersigns case differently from others, such as the Writ of Mandamus filed by Demonte Kendrick out of the infamous YSL RICO trial – alleging the Georgia Supreme court immediately ruled on said case without questioning Writ of Mandamus jurisdiction but took several months to issue a ruling on the undersigns case where such court did question such jurisdiction.]

### (c) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 77

In the same case, prior to its opinion, the Georgia Supreme Court also entered in an order that directly **corresponded with the pattern of the numeric value of 77**. The Georgia Supreme Court entered in an order in said case requesting additional briefing on the date of October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2024 – the 277<sup>th</sup> day of the year.



### (ix) Patterns: The Numerical Value of 33

In the Georgia Court of Appeals case of *Arnold v Alexander*, A25E0131, – within a case transferred to the Georgia Court of Appeals as ordered by the Georgia Supreme Court in the case of *Arnold v Alexander* (S24O1335) the court entered in an order in such case on 6/10/2025. [See screenshot image of order on next page].


It is fair to infer that the Georgia Court of Appeals engaged in a “**medium of discourse among the Enterprise**” for two reasons: (1) Their order was entered in on 6/10/2025, a date that corresponds to 9/10/2025 when the '6' is inverted and (2) because **33 days after August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2024** (where 144 days were remaining in year from the start of such date and the first order issued by the Georgia Supreme Court in a case transferred to them) equates to 9/10/2025.

It is also fair to infer that the Georgia Court of Appeals engaged in a “**medium of discourse among the Enterprise**” wherein the Enterprise **obscured or altered its form of communication** because said order has been alleged as one of the overt acts that furthered the Enterprise [See 3<sup>rd</sup> Addendum letter dtd 9/10/25, p. 2] and because the numeric value **of 33** had been previously utilized by federal judge Sarah Gerghty, an alleged RICO conspirator, wherein she entered in an order precisely **330** days after her “assignment” to a federal action [See p. 5 of this letter] that was alleged as initiating the motives of the Enterprise – wherein the undersigned “potential” legal success in such case launched the RICO Conspiracy. [See RICO Com. p. 16].

*On information and belief*, the numeric value of 33 was to signify a mode of language or communication among the Enterprise originating from Sarah Geraghty wherein court cases that were **transferred or assigned** to federal and state actors willing to participate in the Enterprise were to or engaged in judicial court action that were to slated to allow an interval of 33 days or derivatives of such numeric value to not only surpass before the entry of such order but to enter in such order on a calendrial date corresponding to the numeric patterns stated herein.


**Ex.** Sarah Geraghty allowed **330** days from her assignment to such case to surpass until she issued an order on March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2023 – the 76th day of the year **(-1 / 77)**

**Ex.** The Georgia Court Appeals allowed **33** days to surpass until it issued an order on June 10<sup>th</sup>, 2025, a date that corresponds to 9/10/2025 when the '6' is inverted – and equates to **33** days after the first order entered in by the Georgia Supreme Court (8/8/2024) who transferred such matter to their court.<sup>3</sup> 8/8/2024 is the 221<sup>st</sup> day of the year with **145** days remaining in year. **(-1 / 144)**



#### (x) Patterns: The Numeric Value of 77


During the undersigns appeal of various orders arising out of the Federal case *Arnold v Kemp et al.*, case no. 1:23-2219, in the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. The Eleventh Circuit Court clerk's office would file a "Dismissal Notice" on the appellate record **in close proximity to the numeric value of the calendrial day of 77**. The Eleventh Circuit court clerk's would file such dismissal notice – one day earlier than required – **March 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025 is the 76th day of the year**. [See "RICO Complaint" p. 57]



<sup>3</sup> Considering 8/8/2024 displayed a numeric value of 145 in its "days remaining until end of year" – with deviations of - 1 from 144 – the date the GA Supreme court issued its first order in a case filed by the undersign – and 8/8/2024 was the 222<sup>nd</sup> day of the year, **-1 day offset from the amount of days said court took to issue its final decision** on the 77<sup>th</sup> day of the year, it is fair to infer that the date of 8/8/2025 was a date that could be or was to be utilized to communicate the Enterprise's numeric language.


### (xi) Patterns: The Numeric Value of 77

In January of 2024, the undersigns appeal was docketed in 11<sup>th</sup> Circuit appellate court case of *Arnold v Patterson*, 24-10188. This appeal arose out of a dismissal order entered in by a member of the Enterprise, judge Thomas Barber in a federal suit filed against my child's mother for extortion. [See "RICO Complaint" p. 285]. The case would be assigned to Eleventh Circuit judge, Barbara Lagoa, an alleged member of the Enterprise, who would (without a court panel) deny my ability to proceed on appeal without payment of filing fees **on the proximate date of the numeric value of 77**. Barbara Lagoa would deny the undersigns IFP motion on June 25<sup>th</sup>, 2024 – **the 177th day of the year**. The record will reflect that the undersign filed a motion for a ruling in such case after an extraordinary delay – signaling probable *willful* delay with intent to communicate such medium of discourse



### (xii) Patterns: The Numeric Value of 144

On May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025, criminal material detailing the alleged criminal RICO crimes committed by various government officials against the undersign reached the offices of the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia. Said Attorney's office would respond precisely **in close proximity to the pattern of the numeric value 144 – responding 143 days** to the date of their receipt of the undersigns initial criminal material delivered on 5/5/2025. On information & belief, said communication was sent to the undersign to signify to others amongst the Enterprise who may have came in contact with such communication that an employee of the U.S. Attorneys Office was willing to participate in said Enterprise.



## II. FACUTAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST DOORDASH INC.

- A. DoorDash Inc., engaged in a medium of discourse among the Enterprise and use the numeric value of 144 to communicate a threat via interstate commerce.

**DoorDash Inc.**, the leading on-demand food delivery and logistics platform, is accused of engaging in a medium of discourse among the Enterprise and using the numeric value of the number 144 to communicate a threat to the undersign using interstate commerce. *On information and belief*, DoorDash Inc., determined that a “DoorDash account” was owned by a member of Arnold’s family after being told so by a member of the RICO Enterprise engaging in *espionage and computer crimes* as more fully detailed on p. 476 in the Interstate RICO Criminal Complaint & thus knew to communicate a threat with the hopes that such threat would reach the undersign.

On or around October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2025, the undersign was told by a family member to return items that had been purchased from DoorDash to a store retailer.

- A. Item 1 - \$38 and change
- B. Item 2 - \$39 and change

After communicating about what items needed to be returned and which merchant to return said items to, I arrived at the locale of where such items were located to facilitate the return. Although returns were faced with alleged dysfunctional return mechanisms of DoorDash Inc., the items were returned **with no refund issued**. Following various communications and frustrations of family members in receiving a refund from such company, Information was given by me to make inquiry upon having credits given to such account for such inconveniences. I was told by a family member that “They only gave us **\$14.44** on top of some past credits.”

Upon hearing such amount and recognizing said numeric value as being a form of mode of communication among the **Enterprise** as factually shown herein, I informed family members to immediately cease using such accounts and to give me all information related to such account. Upon making my inquiry, I learned that DoorDash Inc., had existing credits of \$21.70 available for such account but issued additional credits on or around October 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2025 as follows:

- A. Credited the account with \$5.00;
- B. Then issued credits in the amount of **\$9.44** later the same date;
- C. Bringing the total amount of credits given such date to **\$14.44**.

The total amount of credits issued on said DoorDash account was in the total amount of **\$36.14**. So, not only was **\$14.44** in credits added to this account, but the difference of **\$21.70** and **\$36.14** was also **\$14.44**. These credits cannot be written off as an “inconvenience” fee related to such returns or the account. Upon my firsthand personal knowledge and review of said account, these credits **were neither requested by the account holder** (whom was not the undersign and whom never requested it) and the credit amounts given (**such as \$9.44**) were very odd amounts – **nowhere near the full purchase price of the returned items** even if such inconvenience fee was allegedly issued to refund amounts & **\$9.44** was not traditionally an amount that DoorDash would issue in credits for inconveniences during my review of the account – DoorDash never issued cents related to ANY *inconvenience* fees.

**DoorDash Credits**  
Your USD credit will automatically be applied to your next order.  
**\$36.14 USD**  
Can only be applied in the United States.

Due to the untraditional amount in credits given (**\$9.44**) and its connections to the **numeric value of 144** which was recognized as a connected numeric value in a “medium of discourse among the Enterprise,” it is fair to infer that the Enterprise used its connections and contacts to solicit or instruct DoorDash Inc., to facilitate a continued threat to Arnold’s family members – with the first threat having been accomplished by returning mail to members of the undersigns address when refused by the FBI Atlanta office in lieu of the proper return address as displayed on the shipping label. [See “Second Addendum letter dated 5/27/2025 p. 1-5, UPS returning mail to members of Arnold’s family’s address after having been refused by the FBI].

It is also fair to infer that DoorDash Inc., was contacted or solicited by such Enterprise because said company was not the first for-profit mega corporation who engaged in acts that the undersign allege is “probable cause” of acts in furtherance of the RICO Conspiracy. [See RICO Complaint, claims against UPS, p. 206 | Claims against Automattic Inc, p. 436 | Claims against Stripe Inc., p. 447 | Claims against TextNow Inc., p. 452]

Upon recognizing the consistency in use in said numbers, the undersign began to look and search for any reputable sources, scholarly articles or information that could provide him or even future criminal investigators with factual insight into the utilization of such numbers and its purposes. The only information that could be found was within mainstream news media where a Trump aid explained that according to Jewish numerology, known as “gematria,” the letters in

one's name or alphabet could be calculated to a numeric value. Upon inquiry, I discovered more facts that make it fair to infer that the numeric credit amounts issued by DoorDash Inc., **was a direct threat to the undersign** from the Enterprise itself.

Upon searching one's name in a gematria calculator and the credits issued by DoorDash Inc., I discovered undeniable similarities. The letters in my name including the credits issued by DoorDash Inc., **were directly equivalent** in English and Simple gematria. On information and belief, the Enterprise solicited or instructed DoorDash Inc., to send a threat to the undersign that matched the gematria make-up of my full legal name in the hopes or belief that the undersign would search for the gematria calculation of my name *and* the credits issued when cognizance of said credits and the unusual nature of such credits given. n

It is fair to infer that this "threat" was a continuation of a threat made to the undersign family member's wherein a member of the Enterprise, UPS, returned mail – following a refusal of acceptance of such mail by the FBI Atlanta Office – to members of Arnold's family address in lieu of the return address on the shipping label, an act that dissuaded the undersigns further mailing to the FBI Atlanta office perceiving such improper returns as threats to the undersign and his family. [See "Second Addendum letter" dated 5/27/2025 p. 1-5, asserting UPS returned mail to members of Arnold's family's address after having been refused by the FBI].

The undersign asserts that not only did DoorDash Inc., make a threat to the undersign using interstate commerce but DoorDash Inc., made such a threat with a numeric value that has been used in conjunction with and acted as a numeric value of numeric patterns expressed herein.

### Using the number 144 twice.

(Type in a word or a number e.g. God, Devil, 100, 666 - To calculate gematria values)

View Rude Words

(Type in a word or a number e.g. God, Devil, 100, 666 - To calculate gematria values)

View Rude Words

Deandre Cortez Arnold  
In Hebrew Gematria equals  
1072

d	e	a	n	d	r	e	c	o	r	t	e	z	o	a
4	5	1	40	4	80	5	0	3	50	80	100	5	500	0
r	n	a	d	o	l	o	u	u	o	l	d			
80	40	50	20	4	0	1								

Deandre Cortez Arnold  
In English Gematria equals  
1212

d	e	a	n	d	r	e	c	o	r	t	e	z	o	a
24	30	6	84	24	108	30	0	18	90	108	120	30	0	18
z	a	r	n	o	l	o	u	u	o	l	d			
156	0	6	108	84	90	72	24							

Deandre Cortez Arnold  
In Simple Gematria equals  
202

d	e	a	n	d	r	e	c	o	r	t	e	z	o	a
4	5	1	14	4	18	5	0	3	15	18	20	5	26	0
n	o	l	d											
14	15	12	4											

(Type in a word or a number e.g. God, Devil, 100, 666 - To calculate gematria values)

View Rude Words

Three Six One Four  
in Hebrew Gematria equals  
1028

t	h	r	e	s	x	o	n	f	o
100	8	80	5	5	0	90	9	300	0
u	o	u	u	u	u	o	o	o	o
200	80					50	40	50	50

Three Six One Four  
in English Gematria equals  
1212

t	h	r	e	s	x	o	n	e
120	48	108	30	0	114	54	144	0
o	36	90	126	108				

Three Six One Four  
in Simple Gematria equals  
202

t	h	r	e	s	x	o	n	f	o	u	
20	8	18	5	5	0	19	1	24	0	15	14
r	18										

Page 15 of 34

After careful review of your account. When the \$21.70 credits were applied an additional \$5 credits was applied and then the last credit of \$9.44 was during your Ace Hardware order. That is why the total credits reached to \$36.14.

Received at 6:22 PM

Have I resolved your issue?


Received at 6:22 PM

On October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025, I was told that DoorDash Inc, **additionally and suddenly** credited the account with **\$10.00** more in credits – regarding a separate purported return to a store merchant that no one again sought or requested. These funds were merely added to the account on **10/23/2025 suddenly and without request**.

These credits were also issued at 9:11 AM. It is fair to infer that 9:11 AM was a node to 9/11/2025 – 1 day after the asserted targeted date that the Georgia Court of Appeals signaled its medium of communication among the Enterprise by entering its order 33 days after **August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025**, the 222<sup>nd</sup> day of the year with 145 days remaining in year, by inverting the ‘6’ in the date of their order of 6/10/2025. When determining whether the additional credits were related to the numerical patterns engaged in by the RICO Enterprise, the undersign discovered the same -2 deviation of numerical patterns wherein the intervals or the mirrored interval calendarial dates calculated from the official or private acts herein matched the numerical patterns.

In the case of DoorDash Inc., the new credits issued by such company were on October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025. When looking to the *probability* of whether patterns were engaged consistent with the same pattern of numeric values alleged herein, it was then discovered that DoorDash Inc., issued credits **76 days after August 8<sup>th</sup>, 2025**. (8/8/2025, with 145 days remaining in year. [-1 / 144]). Considering 8/8/24 had 145 days remaining until end of year – with deviations of - 1 from 144 – the date the GA Supreme court issued its first order in a case filed by the undersign – and 8/8/24 was the 222<sup>nd</sup> day of the year, **-1 day offset from the amount of days said court took** to issue its final decision on the 77<sup>th</sup> day of the year, it is fair to infer that the date of 8/8/2025 was a date that could be or was to be utilized to communicate the Enterprise’s numeric language.

Thus, it is also “probable” that DoorDash Inc., utilized the Enterprise’s form of language by way of issuing new credits **76 days after 8/8/2025** – a deviation of -1 from 77. It also “probable” that DoorDash Inc., did use such language to communicate a threat to the undersign by issuing such credits on 10/23/2025, two days prior to the undersigns minor child’s date of birth.



It would later be discovered that the Henry County Superior court engaged in judicial action within a case that, according to members of the public, had been dormant for 36 months on the exact same date, thereby making the same threat against the undersigns minor child.

### **III. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST JANE/JOHN DOE HENRY COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT OFFICIALS**

On or around November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024, the undersign learned from a member of his family of a mailing received by the Henry County Superior Court with the undersigns name thereon the mailing. The address to where this mail was addressed to and sent was the exact address that UPS, an alleged member of the RICO Enterprise, caused mail to be improperly returned to on “two” occasions when refused by the FBI Atlanta office in May and November of 2025.

In the year of 2022 and 2023, said address was also an address that Henry County Police Department had attempted to serve the undersign and were repeatedly told that he **was not a resident of said address**. Thus, having no other knowledge of any civil cases where this address would be known by such court as a last known address or otherwise, the undersign sought to determine why mailings from the court “itself” was yet addressed to an address of his family member with the undersigns name stated as displayed thereon the mailing envelope itself. The undersign instructed said family member to return said mailing to the Henry County Superior court reflecting thereon the envelope, not a resident.

The undersign also instructed a private citizen to “inquire” as to what this mailing was and what type of correspondence said mailing was attempting to accomplish. Following correspondence about the potential cases in which any court action could be taken on, said citizen informed me that a civil contempt action filed by Tyarielle Patterson, the mother of the undersigns child, appeared to be the case in which mailing from the court arose from.

I was told that *court* action in this case was filed **by the court** itself on October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025 and November 14<sup>th</sup>, 2025 appearing to obligate the undersigns appearance on December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2025. **October 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2025, was in close proximity to the undersigns minor child’s date of birth which was two days after**. It was stated to me that service of summons in said case did in fact reflect non-service upon the undersign and that no action by the court itself took place in more than three (3) years, as the case was filed in December of 2022 by Tyarielle Patterson.

Although judicial court action was taken prior to the date mail was sent to members of Arnold’s family address, it was told by said family members that no other mail had come to their home and that only one mailing was received on or around 11/18/2025. Upon further inquiry it

was determined that Brian Amero was the judge who has assigned to such case. I was then told that the judge's name was Judge Davis, a female judge who had recently been appointed to the Henry County superior court bench following the retirement of judge Brian Amero on February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2025 – the 44<sup>th</sup> day of the year.

*On information and belief*, said case is the precise case spoke about within the undersigns Interstate RICO Criminal Complaint, which was filed by Tyarielle Patterson in December of 2022 in the continuation of what the undersign alleged was a blackmail and extortion scheme in which Tyarielle Patterson, the mother of Arnold's child, only enforced their child support order when the undersign attempted to enforce his child custody order with the intent to dissuade the undersigns pursuit of enforcement. [See "RICO Complaint" p. 282, *detailing Patterson told the undersign "So I guess you know what's next" in response to the undersign intent in enforcing their child custody order to alert the undersign of an incoming contempt filing that was sent to Arnold's mother's address unstamped by any court, but later followed by attempted service by Henry County Police officers*].


Because mailing from said court was addressed to the undersign at an address that the court was made aware or had reason to know in fact that the undersign was not a resident at said address and no information existed that allowed the court to reasonably believe it to be a last known address of the undersign, the undersign took such specific mailing **as the appearance** of continued illicit threats by way of (1) addressing members of Arnold's family via U.S. mail at the exact address mailed was improperly returned to by UPS when refused by the FBI Atlanta Office and (2) doing so in close proximity to the undersigns minor child's birthdate (3) by way of the same patterns of numeric values that the Enterprise consistently engaged as form of esoteric language. However, the undersign sought to determine if the *appearance* of such illicit threat was actual or probable.

Upon further inquiry, it was learned that the alleged Henry County Superior court action was filed less than three (3) weeks after I sent mailings to the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia notifying said office **to forward criminal RICO information to the FBI Atlanta Office** and of my intent to seek internal investigations and accountability against said

offices for failing to forward criminal material to the FBI Atlanta office and failing to report allegations of obstruction of mail by FBI employees pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 535(b).

These refusals appear that your Federal law enforcement offices has willfully and knowingly engaged in conspiracy with the same RICO conspirators reported to your offices by hindering all criminal RICO information in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(a)(C), overt acts in furtherance of said conspiracy to protect those conspirators. Therefore, the complainant requests that your offices answer the three (3) questions that are stated on page 3, Section I of this letter, **within 10 days from the date of this letter or immediately thereafter.**

Regards, signed this October 4<sup>th</sup> 2025,  
October 4, 2025

  
Representative, United Coalition Family

I, Deandre Arnold, declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, that I consent to the United Coalition Family receiving any information related or requested with regard to this letter, although any and all responses should be mailed to my address above.

  
Mr. Deandre Arnold, Complainant

The timing and nature of the judicial action in the Henry County Superior court, being not only filed in close proximity to the threats made by DoorDash Inc., but in close proximity to the letter addressed to the U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia of an intent to seek said internal investigations against their offices **make it fair to infer that probable cause exists** that the alleged Enterprise was directed, instructed or told by said office to immediately seek to imprison the undersign within said proceeding in an act of retaliation against the undersign in response to his letter. *On information and belief*, the U.S. Attorney's office also told members of Enterprise, through their contacts and connections as U.S. Attorney's that their offices would protect the Enterprise against any criminal liability.

With the submission of this letter, it was known to any person knowing of such RICO Enterprise or any of its members reading said letter or knowing of said letter and the contents, that the undersign was yet attempting to notify the FBI Atlanta office of said racketeering crimes by and through the U.S. Attorney's office and also seeking to hold the U.S. Attorney's offices for the Northern District of Georgia accountable for not reporting alleged FBI obstruction of mail and failing to forward RICO material to the FBI on undersigns behalf. It is fair to infer that if the act of returning mail to members of Arnold's family's address to illicitly threaten and dissuade the undersigns further mailings to the FBI Atlanta Office was truly a threat *in fact*, the act of the undersign in seeking to cause the U.S. Attorney's offices to mail all criminal RICO material to the FBI Atlanta office on his behalf would cause person(s) to act on that threat.

In lockstep, it is a fact that out of the four (4) refusals of delivery by the FBI Atlanta Office, mailings were *improperly* returned to the exact address (members of Arnold's family in lieu of the address on the shipping label) that the Henry County Superior court would send mail to less than two (2) weeks after informing the U.S. Attorneys office to forward his RICO material to the FBI Atlanta office and of his intent to seek internal investigations against said office's for failing to do the same. This civil case was **dormant for 34 months** with no judicial action taken place according to a private citizen, and thus, dormant for several months well after a new judge (Judge Davis) assumably took over in said civil trial.

However, the case only gained traction (court action) less **than three weeks after** Arnold alerted the U.S. Attorney's office to forward criminal RICO material to the FBI and of his intent to seek internal investigations against the office and one day after DoorDash Inc transmitted a threat via interstate commerce as alleged in Section II. Furthermore, the undersign sent various letters to the U.S. Attorney's office and other federal offices but had only requested that said office forward said criminal RICO material to the FBI Atlanta office on October 5<sup>th</sup>, 2025 – the date of said office's receipt of such mailing – months after having not requested such an act after having mail returned to members of the undersigns family, although reporting such acts in May of 2025 to various federal law enforcement offices.

Furthermore, Considering 8/8/2024 displayed a numeric value of 145 in its days remaining until end of year – with deviations of - 1 from 144 – the date the GA Supreme court issued its first order in a case filed by the undersign – and 8/8/2024 was the 222<sup>nd</sup> day of the year, **-1 day offset from the amount of days said court took to issue its final decision** on the 77<sup>th</sup> day of the year, it is fair to infer that the date of 8/8/2025 was a date that could be or was to be utilized to communicate the Enterprise's numeric language.

Thus, it is also “probable” that Jane/John Doe officials within the Henry County Superior court, engaged in or utilized the Enterprise's form of language by engaging in judicial action on a case that had been dormant for more than 36 months and thus, dormant for several months under a new judge (Judge Davis) – **76 days after 8/8/25** – a deviation of -1 from 77. It also “probable” that the same persons did use such language to communicate a threat to the undersigns minor child by engaging in such judicial action two days prior to the undersigns minor child's DOB.