PLAINTIFF'S FACTUAL STATEMENT

AND EVIDENTIARY RECORD

TEMPORARY MISSISSIPPI PRESENCE, LAW-ENFORCEMENT CONTACT, DISPUTED RESIDENCY, SHERIFF-OFFICE ENCOUNTER, AND ARREST

Public Website Edition

Prepared as a professional presentation of Plaintiff's allegations, claimed evidence, chronology, and disputed factual issues.

PUBLICATION NOTICE

This document presents Plaintiff's allegations and claimed evidence. It does not state that any allegation has been proven, that any person committed a crime or civil wrong, or that any court has made the findings described herein.

DOCUMENT PURPOSE AND SCOPE

IMPORTANT CONTEXT

This website edition is written in neutral legal language. Disputed facts are identified as allegations, contentions, understandings, or perceptions. Statements attributed to recordings should be checked against the complete original audio. The precise legal effect of any supervision requirement, registration duty, warrant, detention, arrest, or signed document must be determined from authenticated records and the law in effect at the relevant time.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. Plaintiff contends that he became temporarily stranded in Mississippi after his recreational vehicle became disabled while he was attempting to return to Colorado. He maintains that he did not travel to Mississippi for the purpose of establishing permanent residence and repeatedly communicated that he was trying to get home.

2. Plaintiff alleges that, after a Mississippi bank denied the emergency loan he sought for his return trip, he remained with approximately $200, a disabled RV, significant medical problems, and limited transportation options. He contacted his Colorado supervision officer and understood that he still had time to return or to communicate further if the emergency continued.

3. Plaintiff alleges that he voluntarily sought guidance from local police, disclosed the location where he intended to keep the RV, and was told that the relevant Mississippi distance requirement was approximately 1,500 feet. He contends that the storage facility he actually rented was approximately 2,800 feet from the relevant school or restricted location.

4. Plaintiff further alleges that local police directed him to contact the county sheriff; that sheriff personnel later instructed him not to leave before a meeting; and that he understood this instruction to mean that he was not free to return to Colorado. Plaintiff contends that he had already identified possible bus or airline transportation and preserved screenshots or communications reflecting those plans.

5. The sheriff-office encounter is central because Plaintiff alleges that he recorded it on audio. He contends that, before completing the paperwork presented to him, he expressly stated that he wanted to leave Mississippi and return home, repeatedly asked what he was signing, and did not understand all of the documents or their consequences.

6. Plaintiff also alleges that a warrant had already been issued before the face-to-face meeting, that the sheriff did not learn about his Mississippi bank account until more than a month after his arrest, that the bank account later appeared within a criminal narrative, and that the storage address used in a complaint differed materially from the location Plaintiff says he actually rented. These chronology and address issues require verification through the original records.

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

7. This statement addresses events occurring after Plaintiff's emergency loan request was denied and focuses on his temporary presence in Mississippi, his communications with Colorado supervision, his voluntary contact with local law enforcement, the sheriff-office meeting, the subsequent arrest, and later disputes concerning the bank account and storage address.

8. Plaintiff contends that the recurring factual issue is the difference between temporary compliance with instructions and an actual intention to establish Mississippi residency. He maintains that his words, travel plans, medical circumstances, communications, and audio recordings should be considered together rather than inferred from isolated paperwork.

9. Plaintiff further contends that chronology is essential. The relevant questions include what each official knew when a decision was made, whether information was learned only later, and whether later-discovered information subsequently appeared in records describing earlier events.

10. Nothing in this statement is intended to establish criminal liability, civil liability, discriminatory intent, conspiracy, unlawful detention, lack of probable cause, or evidence fabrication as an adjudicated fact. Those matters depend upon authenticated evidence, applicable law, and any findings made by a competent court or agency.

II. PLAINTIFF WAS STRANDED AND ATTEMPTING TO RETURN HOME

11. Plaintiff alleges that his RV became disabled in Mississippi while he was traveling and attempting to return to Colorado.

12. He contends that he was approximately 2,000 miles from his Colorado home and family and had already traveled thousands of miles during the preceding trip.

13. Plaintiff states that he had recently received emergency medical treatment in Colorado and was suffering from chronic fatigue, gastrointestinal illness, a painful pancreatic condition, physical pain, anxiety, exhaustion, and medication-related difficulties.

14. Plaintiff further alleges that he had approximately $200 remaining and lacked sufficient funds to repair the RV or easily finance transportation back to Colorado.

15. Before contacting local law enforcement, Plaintiff had sought emergency assistance from family members, friends, attorneys, physicians, a church, a title-loan business, existing banking relationships, and a Mississippi bank.

16. Plaintiff alleges that the Mississippi bank denied the emergency loan he sought, leaving him to consider whether to store the RV and return by bus, airplane, or another means.

III. COMMUNICATIONS WITH COLORADO SUPERVISION

17. Plaintiff was under supervision in Colorado and contends that Colorado remained the supervising jurisdiction during the relevant period.

18. Plaintiff alleges that he contacted his Colorado supervision officer and explained that the RV was disabled, that the bank had denied his loan, and that he was temporarily stranded in Mississippi.

19. According to Plaintiff, the Colorado supervisor reassured him that he had not intentionally done anything wrong and that he still had approximately seven days to return.

20. Plaintiff understood that, if the emergency continued beyond the applicable period, he could notify Colorado so that any necessary interstate procedures could be considered.

21. Plaintiff contends that this communication is relevant because it reinforced his understanding that he had not transferred supervision to Mississippi and was still attempting to return home rather than establish permanent residence there.

IV. PLAINTIFF VOLUNTARILY SOUGHT GUIDANCE FROM LOCAL POLICE

22. Plaintiff alleges that he voluntarily went to a local police department because he believed police could provide guidance concerning his temporary situation and any local rules affecting where the disabled RV could be kept.

23. Plaintiff had not been summoned to the department and maintains that he entered voluntarily for assistance, not because he intended to establish Mississippi residency.

24. During the meeting, Plaintiff explained that his RV was disabled, that he was trying to return to Colorado, that he was under supervision there, and that he had very limited funds.

25. According to Plaintiff, the officer asked questions concerning his identity, length of stay, travel, RV, intended parking location, and other details. Plaintiff answered because he believed cooperation would help him avoid an inadvertent violation.

26. Plaintiff alleges that the officer requested or viewed a photograph of the recreational vehicle and commented that it was a 'nice RV.' Plaintiff contends that the complete context of the encounter, including any notes, recordings, dispatch records, or reports, should be reviewed.

V. STORAGE LOCATION AND DISTANCE DISCUSSION

27. Plaintiff informed the local officer that his Colorado supervision involved geographical restrictions concerning certain locations and asked what distance requirement would apply in Mississippi.

28. According to Plaintiff, the officer stated that the relevant Mississippi distance was approximately 1,500 feet.

29. Plaintiff alleges that he disclosed the storage facility where he intended to keep the disabled RV and that the actual facility was approximately 2,800 feet from the relevant school or restricted location.

30. Based upon the officer's representation, Plaintiff believed that the disclosed location was outside the stated restricted distance and therefore permissible.

31. Plaintiff maintains that he did not conceal the location of the RV and, to the contrary, affirmatively told the officer where he intended to keep it.

32. The actual addresses and distances should be established through the original rental contract, parcel records, maps, geographic measurements, photographs, and any law-enforcement documentation identifying the location.

VI. DIRECTION TO CONTACT THE COUNTY SHERIFF

33. Plaintiff alleges that the local police officer instructed him to contact the county sheriff's office.

34. Plaintiff states that he was confused because Colorado remained his supervising jurisdiction, he had not requested a transfer to Mississippi, and he continued intending to leave the state.

35. Plaintiff contacted his Colorado supervisor again and reported the local officer's instruction.

36. According to Plaintiff, the Colorado supervisor was also uncertain why the sheriff's office needed to become involved and reviewed Mississippi reporting requirements.

37. Plaintiff understood that a reporting duty might arise only if his presence continued long enough or otherwise satisfied applicable legal criteria; however, because local police had instructed him to make contact, Plaintiff says he followed that instruction.

38. Plaintiff contends that his contact with the sheriff should therefore be evaluated as compliance with instructions given while he was stranded, not as conclusive evidence that he voluntarily chose to establish Mississippi residency.

VII. PLAINTIFF'S SURVEILLANCE CONCERNS

39. During the following days, Plaintiff began noticing law-enforcement vehicles near locations where he parked, slept, shopped, and traveled.

40. Plaintiff alleges that sheriff or police vehicles appeared repeatedly near a truck stop where he temporarily slept in the RV, including during nighttime and morning hours over several days.

41. Plaintiff believes that license-plate inquiries were conducted, photographs were taken, and his movements were documented.

42. Plaintiff acknowledges that the mere presence of a law-enforcement vehicle does not itself prove surveillance or improper conduct. He contends, however, that dispatch records, plate-query logs, photographs, reports, body-camera records, vehicle-location records, or officer assignments may objectively confirm or refute his perception.

43. Plaintiff also contends that he perceived heightened scrutiny associated with his out-of-state status, appearance, vehicle, clothing, and perceived socioeconomic status. He does not rely upon that perception alone as proof of discriminatory intent.

VIII. TRANSPORTATION PLANS AND THE ALLEGED INSTRUCTION NOT TO LEAVE

44. Plaintiff continued searching for a means of returning to Colorado and alleges that he identified possible bus and airline transportation.

45. Plaintiff contends that he preserved screenshots, searches, messages, or other communications reflecting those transportation plans.

46. According to Plaintiff, sheriff personnel subsequently instructed him not to leave Mississippi until the sheriff could meet with him several days later.

47. Plaintiff understood this communication as a directive from law enforcement that he was not free to cross state lines and return home before the meeting.

48. Whether the communication legally constituted detention, a mandatory command, an administrative request, or something else is a separate legal question. Plaintiff's factual position is that he personally understood it as an order not to leave.

49. Plaintiff alleges that he canceled, abandoned, or did not complete transportation arrangements as a result. He therefore disputes any inference that his continued physical presence during this period proved that he voluntarily decided to reside in Mississippi.

IX. THE SHERIFF-OFFICE MEETING WAS AUDIO RECORDED

50. Plaintiff subsequently appeared at the sheriff's office as directed.

51. Plaintiff alleges that he recorded the encounter on audio and that the recording captures the discussion from the meeting, including his own statements, the sheriff's statements, his requests for clarification, instructions, and the circumstances surrounding the documents presented for signature.

52. Plaintiff contends that the complete, unedited audio and original metadata are central evidence because they allow later descriptions of the encounter to be compared with the words actually spoken at the time.

53. The recording does not automatically resolve every legal issue. Its significance, according to Plaintiff, is that it may establish the content and sequence of the communications immediately before and during the signing process.

X. PLAINTIFF STATES THAT HE WANTED TO LEAVE AND HAD CHANGED HIS MIND

54. Plaintiff alleges that, before completing the documents presented at the sheriff's office, he expressly stated that he wanted to leave Mississippi and return home.

55. Plaintiff contends that he stated he was not remaining in Mississippi and wanted the matter concluded so that he could return to Colorado.

56. Plaintiff acknowledges that, during the preceding period of illness, exhaustion, fear, financial distress, and confusion, he may have made statements that another person could arguably interpret as contemplating a temporary stay.

57. Plaintiff's position is that any such earlier statement must be considered together with his later and more immediate statement of present intent. He contends that contemplation, confusion, exhaustion, or discussion of alternatives should not automatically be treated as an irrevocable decision concerning residency.

58. Accordingly, Plaintiff maintains that even if an earlier statement was interpreted as an intention to remain, he later communicated that he had changed his mind and intended to leave before the paperwork was completed.

59. Whether Mississippi law had already imposed an independent legal duty regardless of Plaintiff's subjective intent is a separate legal question that must be determined from the law and verified facts.

XI. PLAINTIFF REPEATEDLY QUESTIONED THE DOCUMENTS

60. According to Plaintiff, the sheriff continued presenting documents for signature after he stated that he wanted to leave.

61. Plaintiff alleges that he repeatedly stopped and asked, in substance, 'What am I signing?' and 'Why am I signing this?'

62. Plaintiff contends that he was physically ill, exhausted, recently treated in emergency medical facilities, financially distressed, and emotionally overwhelmed during the encounter.

63. Plaintiff further alleges that he did not understand the purpose or legal effect of all documents presented to him.

64. According to Plaintiff, the possibility of jail or prison was communicated if he refused to comply. The exact words, context, and sequence should be established from the complete audio recording.

65. Plaintiff does not dispute that his signatures may appear on documents created during the meeting. He disputes whether those signatures, standing alone, establish informed and voluntary agreement concerning residency, reporting, or other legal status.

XII. THE WARRANT-TIMING QUESTION

66. Plaintiff alleges that a warrant connected with him had already been issued before the sheriff conducted the face-to-face meeting.

67. Plaintiff contends that, if verified through court records, the timing is important to understanding the purpose and sequence of the meeting, the paperwork, and the arrest.

68. Plaintiff therefore identifies the warrant application, supporting affidavit, judicial order, issuance time, service time, and related docket entries as material evidence.

69. The existence of a preexisting warrant would not, by itself, establish improper conduct. Its factual significance depends upon the warrant's legal basis, what information supported it, when officials obtained that information, and how the subsequent documents related to the arrest.

70. Plaintiff nevertheless contends that the warrant chronology should be compared directly with the sheriff-office audio, the timing of his statement that he wanted to leave, the signing process, and the time of arrest.

XIII. THE ARREST

71. Plaintiff alleges that, after the sheriff-office signing process, he was arrested.

72. Plaintiff maintains that he had voluntarily approached local law enforcement for guidance, contacted the sheriff because he had been instructed to do so, and repeatedly communicated that he wanted to return home.

73. The exact charge, legal theory, probable-cause allegations, warrant status, complaint language, and supporting materials should be established from authenticated court and law-enforcement records.

74. Plaintiff contends that the arrest should be evaluated against the information actually known to officials at the time rather than information discovered only later.

XIV. THE BANK ACCOUNT WAS ALLEGEDLY DISCOVERED AFTER THE ARREST

75. While Plaintiff was incarcerated, mail associated with the Mississippi bank account began arriving through the address connected with the storage facility.

76. According to Plaintiff, sheriff personnel learned about the bank account through this mail more than a month after his arrest.

77. Plaintiff alleges that the sheriff did not know about the bank account when she initially directed him to meet, when he was allegedly told not to leave Mississippi, when he entered the sheriff's office, or when he was arrested.

78. This chronology is significant because information first learned after an arrest could not have formed part of an official's actual contemporaneous knowledge at the earlier time unless other evidence establishes prior knowledge from another source.

79. The date on which sheriff personnel first learned of the account should therefore be established through mail logs, jail records, bank correspondence, investigative notes, subpoenas, reports, or other contemporaneous records.

XV. LATER CRIMINAL-COMPLAINT LANGUAGE

80. Plaintiff alleges that the Mississippi bank account later appeared within a criminal complaint or later version of the criminal narrative as evidence suggesting that he had opened a local account and used a Mississippi address.

81. Plaintiff contends that the original and any amended or rewritten complaints should be compared word-for-word and date-for-date.

82. The central factual question is not merely whether the bank account eventually existed, but when the government first learned about it and whether the account was actually known to the decision-maker when the earlier action occurred.

83. Plaintiff maintains that document metadata, filing dates, version history, investigative reports, warrant materials, and correspondence are relevant to determining whether and when the bank-account allegation was added.

XVI. DISPUTED STORAGE ADDRESS AND DISTANCE

84. Plaintiff alleges that the storage address appearing in the criminal complaint does not match the actual storage facility he rented and disclosed to the local police officer.

85. According to Plaintiff, the actual storage location was approximately 2,800 feet from the relevant school or restricted location, whereas the address used in the complaint was approximately 1,000 feet away.

86. Plaintiff contends that the locations were not merely different unit numbers or minor clerical variations but were materially different locations.

87. Because the distance could affect whether the conduct appeared compliant or noncompliant with an applicable restriction, Plaintiff contends that the address discrepancy is material and should be resolved through the original lease, payment records, parcel records, maps, photographs, GPS evidence, law-enforcement reports, and professionally verified measurements.

88. Plaintiff alleges that he had previously disclosed the actual location to local police and believed it had been cleared based upon the officer's statement concerning the applicable distance.

89. This statement does not determine whether any address discrepancy was intentional, negligent, clerical, or otherwise. It identifies the discrepancy as a factual issue requiring documentary proof.

XVII. THE SAME-BANK CONNECTION

90. Plaintiff further contends that funds collected by or through the sheriff's office or related governmental processes were deposited or processed through the same local banking institution involved in the disputed account-opening transaction.

91. Plaintiff considers this institutional overlap relevant to his investigation and intends to trace the corresponding financial records.

92. The use of the same bank, standing alone, does not establish conspiracy, coordination, fraud, improper motive, or wrongdoing by the bank, sheriff's office, or any individual.

93. Any claimed connection should therefore be evaluated only through authenticated banking, governmental, contractual, and financial records rather than inference from the identity of the institution alone.

XVIII. EVIDENCE IDENTIFIED BY PLAINTIFF

94. Plaintiff identifies the complete sheriff-office audio recording and its original metadata as primary evidence concerning what was said immediately before and during the signing process.

95. Plaintiff further identifies Colorado supervision communications, telephone records, text messages, emails, transportation screenshots, bus and airline searches, and communications with family, attorneys, and physicians as evidence bearing upon his stated intent to return home.

96. Plaintiff identifies police reports, dispatch records, body-camera or dash-camera recordings if any, plate-query logs, photographs, officer notes, sheriff records, and jail records as potential evidence concerning law-enforcement contact and alleged monitoring.

97. Plaintiff identifies the original and amended criminal complaints, warrant application, supporting affidavit, warrant, docket entries, filing dates, and document metadata as evidence bearing upon chronology and the basis for the arrest.

98. Plaintiff identifies the original storage rental agreement, payment records, property records, maps, GPS evidence, photographs, and verified distance measurements as evidence bearing upon the actual storage location and the disputed address.

99. Plaintiff identifies bank records, address records, correspondence, mail records, account-opening materials, and related records as evidence bearing upon when sheriff personnel learned of the bank account and how the Mississippi storage address entered the official record.

XIX. CENTRAL FACTUAL QUESTIONS

100. Did Plaintiff consistently communicate that he was temporarily stranded and attempting to return to Colorado, or did he clearly establish an intent to reside in Mississippi before the sheriff-office meeting?

101. What exactly did Plaintiff's Colorado supervisor tell him concerning the time available to return, possible interstate procedures, and contact with Mississippi authorities?

102. What exactly did the local police officer tell Plaintiff concerning the applicable distance requirement, the storage location, and the instruction to contact the sheriff?

103. Did sheriff personnel instruct Plaintiff not to leave Mississippi before the meeting, and if so, what were the exact words and legal context of that communication?

104. What does the sheriff-office audio establish concerning Plaintiff's statement that he wanted to leave, his questions about the documents, any explanation provided, and any statement concerning incarceration or consequences for refusing to sign?

105. When was any warrant requested and issued, what evidence supported it, and how did its timing relate to the sheriff-office meeting and arrest?

106. When did sheriff personnel first learn that Plaintiff had opened the Mississippi bank account, and did that occur before or after the arrest?

107. Did the criminal complaint or related narrative change after discovery of the bank account, and if so, what wording changed and when?

108. What storage address did Plaintiff actually rent and disclose to police, what address appears in the criminal complaint, and what are the verified distances from each location to the relevant school or restricted location?

109. Do the contemporaneous records support Plaintiff's contention that later paperwork attributed a Mississippi-residency intention to him that he repeatedly rejected or later expressly withdrew?

XX. CONCLUSION

110. Plaintiff's position is that he entered Mississippi as a traveler, became stranded because of a disabled RV, sought emergency assistance to return home, and repeatedly attempted to comply with directions from banking personnel, Colorado supervision, local police, and the sheriff while physically ill and financially distressed.

111. Plaintiff contends that his compliance with instructions should not be treated, without considering the surrounding communications, as conclusive proof that he voluntarily intended to establish Mississippi residency.

112. The sheriff-office audio is particularly significant to Plaintiff because he alleges that it records him stating that he wanted to leave before the paperwork was completed and records his repeated questions concerning what he was being asked to sign.

113. Plaintiff further contends that the chronology of the warrant, arrest, later discovery of the bank account, later criminal-complaint language, and disputed storage address should be reconstructed from original records rather than assumptions or retrospective narratives.

114. Ultimately, Plaintiff maintains that the complete evidentiary record - including recordings, timestamps, travel plans, supervision communications, bank records, storage records, police records, sheriff records, warrant materials, criminal complaints, jail records, and verified geographic measurements - should determine what occurred, what Plaintiff intended, and what officials knew at the time they acted.