PLAINTIFF'S SIMPLIFIED FACTUAL STATEMENT

PART II - WHAT HAPPENED AFTER THE BANK DENIED THE LOAN

Temporary Mississippi Stay • Police Contact • Sheriff Meeting • Arrest • Later Bank-Account Dispute

Purpose of Part II. Part I explains the disputed bank account and storage address. This Part II starts after the bank denied Plaintiff's emergency loan. It focuses only on what allegedly happened next, in simple chronological order.

PUBLIC WEBSITE EDITION

This document states Plaintiff's allegations and identified evidence. It is not a court ruling or finding of wrongdoing.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - PART II IN ONE PAGE

1. Part I ends with the Mississippi bank denying Plaintiff's emergency loan. Plaintiff alleges that he then had a disabled RV, approximately $200 remaining, serious medical problems, and almost 2,000 miles separating him from his Colorado home.

2. Plaintiff contacted his Colorado supervision officer. According to Plaintiff, she reassured him that he had not intentionally violated anything and still had several days to return home or report that the emergency was continuing.

3. Because Plaintiff was worried about local rules while temporarily stranded, he voluntarily asked a local police officer for guidance. Plaintiff alleges that the officer told him the relevant distance requirement was approximately 1,500 feet and that the storage location where Plaintiff intended to keep the RV was approximately 2,800 feet from the relevant school or restricted location.

4. The officer then allegedly told Plaintiff to contact the county sheriff. Plaintiff says he followed that instruction because both the local officer and his Colorado supervisor led him to believe cooperation was the safest course.

5. Plaintiff later found possible bus or airline transportation home. He alleges that sheriff personnel then told him not to leave until a meeting several days later. Plaintiff understood that instruction to mean he was not free to return to Colorado and therefore abandoned his travel plans.

6. When Plaintiff entered the sheriff's office, he alleges that he recorded the meeting on audio. He contends that, before signing the papers presented to him, he clearly stated that he wanted to leave Mississippi and return home.

7. Plaintiff further alleges that he repeatedly asked what he was signing and why he was required to sign. He contends that he was ill, exhausted, confused, and afraid of incarceration if he refused. He was arrested after the signing process.

8. Plaintiff later alleges that sheriff personnel did not learn about his Mississippi bank account until more than a month after the arrest, but that the bank account later appeared in the criminal narrative. He also alleges that the storage address used in the criminal complaint was different from the location he actually rented and disclosed to police.

The simple issue: Part II is about chronology. What did Plaintiff say and intend? What did officials know at the time they acted? And did information learned later become part of the explanation for earlier events?

I. WHERE PART II BEGINS

9. This Part II begins immediately after the bank denied Plaintiff's emergency loan. The bank-account and storage-address dispute itself is addressed in Part I and is not repeated here except where it later becomes relevant.

10. Plaintiff contends that his goal remained the same throughout this period: protect the disabled RV, avoid violating any supervision requirement, and find a way back to Colorado.

II. PLAINTIFF WAS STRANDED, NOT TRYING TO SETTLE IN MISSISSIPPI

11. Plaintiff alleges that he was nearly 2,000 miles from his Colorado home, had approximately $200 remaining, and was physically ill and exhausted after extensive travel and recent emergency medical treatment.

12. Because the RV could not continue the trip, Plaintiff began considering a bus, airplane, or other transportation home while leaving the RV temporarily stored in Mississippi.

13. Plaintiff maintains that these efforts are inconsistent with an intention to permanently relocate to Mississippi.

III. COLORADO TOLD PLAINTIFF HE STILL HAD TIME TO RETURN

14. Plaintiff alleges that he called his Colorado supervision officer and explained that the RV had broken down and that the bank had denied the loan he hoped would finance his return trip.

15. According to Plaintiff, his Colorado supervisor told him that he had not intentionally done anything wrong and still had approximately seven days to return, or to communicate further if the emergency continued.

16. Plaintiff understood from this conversation that Colorado remained his supervising jurisdiction and that he was still being treated as a traveler attempting to get home.

IV. PLAINTIFF VOLUNTARILY ASKED LOCAL POLICE FOR HELP

17. Plaintiff voluntarily went to a local police department because he wanted guidance and did not want to accidentally violate a local rule while temporarily stranded.

18. According to Plaintiff, the officer asked questions about his RV, travel, location, and length of stay. Plaintiff answered because he believed cooperation would help him remain compliant and get home safely.

19. Plaintiff alleges that he specifically asked about the applicable distance restriction and was told approximately 1,500 feet. Plaintiff says he disclosed the actual storage location, which he understood to be approximately 2,800 feet from the relevant school or restricted location.

20. Based on that conversation, Plaintiff believed the storage location was permissible and that local police knew where the RV would be kept.

V. PLAINTIFF WAS TOLD TO CONTACT THE SHERIFF

21. Plaintiff alleges that the local officer then directed him to contact the county sheriff's office, even though Plaintiff remained under Colorado supervision and says he had not decided to move to Mississippi.

22. Plaintiff called his Colorado supervisor again. According to Plaintiff, she was also unsure why the sheriff needed to become involved but advised him that, if local police had instructed him to make contact, he should cooperate.

23. Plaintiff therefore contacted the sheriff because he believed he was following official instructions, not because he had chosen Mississippi as his permanent residence.

VI. PLAINTIFF FOUND A POSSIBLE WAY HOME - THEN SAYS HE WAS TOLD NOT TO LEAVE

24. Plaintiff continued searching for transportation and alleges that he located possible bus or airline options. He states that screenshots and communications exist showing that he was preparing to leave Mississippi.

25. According to Plaintiff, sheriff personnel then instructed him not to leave until a meeting could occur several days later.

26. Plaintiff understood this as a law-enforcement directive that he could not return to Colorado before the meeting. He alleges that he therefore abandoned or canceled the travel plans he had found.

Why this matters: Plaintiff contends that his continued presence in Mississippi after this point should not automatically be treated as proof that he voluntarily decided to live there. He says he remained because he believed law enforcement told him to stay.

VII. THE SHERIFF-OFFICE AUDIO IS THE KEY EVIDENCE

27. Plaintiff alleges that he recorded the sheriff-office meeting on audio. He contends that the complete recording captures what he said, what the sheriff said, the questions he asked, and the circumstances surrounding the papers presented to him.

28. Before the paperwork was completed, Plaintiff alleges that he clearly stated that he wanted to leave Mississippi and return home.

29. Plaintiff acknowledges that, during the preceding days of illness, exhaustion, fear, and uncertainty, he may have made an ambiguous statement that someone interpreted as suggesting he might stay. His position is that he later clearly changed or clarified his intention before completing the paperwork.

Plaintiff's position: Even if someone previously believed that Plaintiff might stay in Mississippi, Plaintiff contends that the sheriff-office audio records his later and clearer position: he wanted to leave and go home. Whether Mississippi law imposed an independent duty regardless of his intent is a separate legal question.

VIII. PLAINTIFF QUESTIONED THE PAPERS BEFORE SIGNING

30. Plaintiff alleges that he repeatedly asked, in substance, "What am I signing?" and "Why am I signing this?" before completing the papers presented by the sheriff.

31. Plaintiff contends that he was physically ill, exhausted, recently treated in emergency rooms, financially distressed, and confused about why the documents were required.

32. He further alleges that the possibility of jail or prison was communicated if he did not comply. Plaintiff therefore disputes any claim that the signatures alone conclusively establish that he freely chose to remain in Mississippi or fully understood the legal consequences of the papers.

IX. THE WARRANT TIMING MUST BE VERIFIED

33. Plaintiff alleges that a judge had already issued a warrant connected to him before the face-to-face sheriff meeting. The exact warrant date, supporting affidavit, legal basis, and time of issuance must be established from authenticated court records.

34. If a warrant had already issued before the meeting, Plaintiff contends that the chronology becomes important in determining the purpose of the meeting and the relationship between the warrant, the paperwork, the signatures, and the arrest.

35. This statement does not conclude that the existence of a prior warrant was improper. It identifies the timing as a factual issue that should be verified.

X. PLAINTIFF WAS ARRESTED

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

37. He maintains that he had voluntarily asked local police for help, contacted the sheriff because he was instructed to do so, and stated that he wanted to return home before the paperwork was completed.

38. The exact charge, probable-cause allegations, warrant status, and legal basis for the arrest should be determined from the original court and law-enforcement records.

XI. THE BANK ACCOUNT ALLEGEDLY APPEARED LATER

39. Plaintiff alleges that sheriff personnel did not know about the Mississippi bank account when he was arrested and learned of it only later, after bank-related mail connected to the storage address became known during his incarceration.

40. According to Plaintiff, this occurred more than a month after the arrest.

41. Plaintiff further alleges that the bank account later appeared in a criminal complaint or later criminal narrative as evidence connecting him to Mississippi.

The chronology question: If the bank account was first discovered after the arrest, it could not have been part of an official's actual knowledge at the earlier time unless another record proves that the information was known from a different source.

XII. PLAINTIFF DISPUTES THE STORAGE ADDRESS USED IN THE CRIMINAL RECORD

42. Plaintiff alleges that the storage address later used in the criminal complaint was not the actual storage location he rented and disclosed to local police.

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

44. Plaintiff contends that this was a material difference because one distance could create the appearance of a violation while the other would not, based on the approximately 1,500-foot rule he says the local officer had given him.

45. The correct address and distance should be established from the original rental contract, payment records, parcel records, maps, photographs, law-enforcement records, and verified geographic measurements.

XIII. THE SAME-BANK ISSUE

46. Plaintiff also contends that certain sheriff-related or governmental funds were handled through the same local bank involved in the disputed account-opening events described in Part I.

47. The use of the same bank, by itself, does not establish a conspiracy, fraud, coordination, or wrongdoing. Plaintiff identifies the overlap only as a matter he believes should be verified through actual financial and governmental records.

XIV. THE FIVE QUESTIONS PART II ASKS

1. Did Plaintiff consistently intend to return to Colorado, and what does the sheriff-office audio show he said immediately before signing?

2. Did sheriff personnel tell Plaintiff not to leave Mississippi, causing him to abandon transportation plans?
3. When was the warrant requested and issued in relation to the sheriff meeting and arrest?
4. When did sheriff personnel first learn about the Mississippi bank account, and did it later become part of the criminal narrative?
5. What storage address did Plaintiff actually rent and disclose, and why does a different address allegedly appear in the criminal complaint?

XV. KEY EVIDENCE

- Complete sheriff-office audio recording and original metadata;
- Colorado supervision communications and phone records;
- Bus, airline, and transportation screenshots showing efforts to return home;
- Police and sheriff reports, dispatch records, photographs, plate-query records, and available recordings;
- Warrant application, affidavit, warrant, docket entries, and exact dates and times;
- Original and later criminal complaints, including any amendments or version history;
- Original storage rental contract, payment records, maps, and verified distance measurements;
- Bank records, mail records, and documents showing when sheriff personnel first learned of the bank account.

CONCLUSION

48. Part II is intentionally narrow. Plaintiff does not ask the reader to re-decide the bank-address dispute described in Part I. Instead, Part II asks what happened after the loan was denied and after Plaintiff sought help from local authorities.

49. Plaintiff's position is that he remained a stranded traveler trying to return to Colorado; that he followed official instructions because he believed compliance was safest; that he later clearly stated he wanted to leave; and that the complete audio and documentary chronology should determine what he intended and what officials actually knew when they acted.

50. Plaintiff further contends that the later bank-account discovery, later criminal narrative, and disputed storage address should be evaluated according to dates and original records, not assumptions made after the fact.

Bottom line: Part I is about how the disputed Mississippi bank address was created. Part II is about what allegedly happened after Plaintiff tried to get home and that Mississippi connection began affecting law-enforcement decisions.

PUBLICATION NOTICE

This document summarizes Plaintiff's allegations and identified evidence for public presentation. It is not a judicial finding, verified news report, or legal determination. Allegations concerning unlawful detention, coercion, lack of probable cause, evidence alteration, fraud, discrimination, conspiracy, or other wrongdoing remain disputed unless established by authenticated evidence or a competent court or agency.