

# **Exhibit H — Attorney Bickerton Email Communications**

## **(2017–2023)**

### **EXHIBIT H**

#### **ATTORNEY LEA TERLONG BICKERTON – EMAIL COMMUNICATIONS**

*(2017–2023)*

---

### **H-1. Source Document**

File: **Gmail - Hello Lea\_ - 2023-12-14.pdf**

Uploaded by Petitioner.

This PDF contains:

- Petitioner’s emails to attorney Bickerton
- Bickerton’s partial replies
- A suspicious “blank” email purportedly in response to a months-old message
- Time stamps reflecting the exchange occurred shortly before Petitioner’s arrest on

December 14, 2023

---

### **H-2. Key Events from Email Record**

#### **1. Petitioner’s Attempts to Obtain Updates (2017–2023)**

- Numerous emails were sent by Petitioner seeking updates on his case.

- Bickerton **did not respond in writing** despite repeated requests.
- She insisted on phone-only communication.
- Petitioner specifically told her:

“I need everything in writing so I have a record.”

## 2. Bickerton’s Non-responsiveness

- Emails show months-long periods with no replies.
- No documentation of work performed.
- No explanation for delays.

## 3. December 2023 Exchange

On **December 13–14, 2023**, Petitioner emailed Bickerton:

- Stating he had not heard from her in **over a year**
- Asking for proof of what she had done on his case
- Informing her that if she did not provide documentation,  
he would consider filing a complaint with the state bar

## 4. Bickerton’s “Blank Email”

- Bickerton responded with a **blank email** claiming it was a reply to a message Petitioner had sent **months earlier**.
- The timestamp shows her “blank reply” was generated **within minutes** of Petitioner receiving it.

- This email appears to have been created **retroactively** to suggest she had replied previously when she had not.

## 5. Arrest Timing

- Petitioner was arrested **within approximately 24 hours** of sending the email warning that he may file a complaint.
- Arrest was for “non-compliance” with registry requirements — a duty never lawfully imposed.

This timing raises serious concerns.

---

## H-3. Relevance to Petition

This exhibit supports claims that:

1. **Petitioner’s legal challenge was abandoned.**
2. Bickerton failed to communicate in writing despite repeated requests.
3. She did not notify Petitioner that his Petition for Review (96 MD 2018) had been **discontinued.**
4. Her “blank email” suggests attempts to create a false record of communication.
5. Lack of representation left Petitioner vulnerable to a series of unlawful arrests.
6. Her conduct directly contributed to:
  - o due process violations,
  - o confusion about Petitioner’s legal status,
  - o delays in seeking relief,
  - o and increased harm.

---

#### **H-4. Documentation Included in Exhibit**

- Full PDF of the 2023 email thread
  - Petitioner’s warning email regarding lack of communication
  - Bickerton’s “blank” email (time stamped minutes before received)
  - Any visible metadata included in the PDF
  - Contextual explanation based on Petitioner’s statements
- 

#### **H-5. Summary Conclusion (Exhibit H)**

**Exhibit H demonstrates attorney abandonment, misleading communication, and failure to pursue relief — contributing to the unlawful arrests and ongoing harm Petitioner suffered.**

This evidence directly supports claims of:

- due process violations,
  - prejudice caused by attorney neglect,
  - lack of notice,
  - and administrative injustice.
- 

**End of Exhibit H**