

Exhibit I — Security Camera Incidents & Sheriff

Misconduct

EXHIBIT I

SECURITY CAMERA INCIDENTS & SHERIFF MISCONDUCT (2020–2024)

This exhibit documents **repeated instances of misconduct by sheriff deputies**, including derogatory comments, improper conduct inside Petitioner’s home, forced entry, and the complete deletion of all Ring and Wyze camera recordings.

I-1 — WITT YOST INCIDENT

(Approx. 45–60 Minutes — 2020)

I-1A. Summary of Event

- Sheriffs arrived at Petitioner’s home seeking an individual named **Witt Yost**, a guest temporarily staying at the residence.
- Deputies remained inside Petitioner’s home for **45–60 minutes**.
- Petitioner repeatedly held onto his dog (Roxie) for safety.

I-1B. Derogatory Comments & Harassment

Deputies made several inappropriate statements including:

- “You don’t need to hold your dog like that.”
- “As long as it doesn’t bite me, we don’t care about dogs.”

- Petitioner responded: “I don’t want her shot.”

- Deputies responded with profanity:

“Who’s gonna shoot your dog?”

“Why would you say something so f***** stupid?”

I-1C. “Megan’s Law” Harassment

One deputy, while walking past Petitioner inside his own home, stated:

- **“At least I’m not on Megan’s Law.”**

This is powerful evidence of:

- bias,
- prejudice,
- targeting,
- and hostility related to PSP’s unlawful registry classification.

I-1D. Treatment of Petitioner’s Guest

- Deputies took Petitioner’s guest **Seth Izzat** outside.

- On return, deputies said:

“Don’t you ever lie to us again.”

- Petitioner states it was evident that deputies were **fabricating accusations** to intimidate his guest.
-

I-2 — FRANKIE SABOTKA INCIDENT

(Illegal Entry into Locked Bedroom & Deletion of All Footage)

I-2A. Warrant Refusal

Deputies claimed they had an arrest warrant for another guest, **Frankie Sabotka**.

When Petitioner asked to see the warrant, deputies responded:

- **“We’ll show you afterwards.”**

They **never showed the warrant**, and no copy was left behind.

I-2B. Demanding Petitioner’s Keys

- Deputies asked Petitioner for the **entire key ring**.
- Petitioner tried to hand them the correct key.
- Deputies demanded:

“Give me the whole ring.”
- Petitioner refused to surrender all keys, offering only the one needed.

I-2C. Forced Entry into Locked Bedroom

- Deputy remaining upstairs forcibly **broke off the padlock** from Petitioner’s tenant/guest’s bedroom door.
- Entry was made **without judicial authorization**, probable cause, or consent.

I-2D. Handling of Petitioner’s Phone

- Another deputy returned downstairs holding Petitioner’s phone (which he had not handed to them).
- The reason for this remains unexplained.

I-2E. Outside “Interview” Without Witnesses

- Deputies took Petitioner **outside** to question him.
- All other guests remained **inside**, without Petitioner present.
- During this time, a man with the deputies — who appeared to be **using a cellphone constantly** — was present outside with Petitioner.

I-2F. Deletion of All Camera Footage (Ring & Wyze)

After deputies left:

- Petitioner discovered **all 10 cameras**, across **two entirely separate platforms** (Ring and Wyze), had **all footage deleted**.
- This included:
 - o All local video files
 - o All cloud-stored clips
 - o All historical camera activity
 - o Doorbell footage
 - o Internal camera footage

This is **extraordinary** and supports allegations that:

- deputies may have deleted evidence,

- tampered with devices or accounts,
- or brought an individual capable of wiping cloud-based data.

This deletion is highly relevant to:

- civil rights violations,
 - misconduct,
 - obstruction concerns,
 - due process,
 - and ongoing harm.
-

I-3 — RELATION TO LATER ARRESTS

These incidents demonstrate:

- a **pattern of hostility**
- repeated **pretextual presence** in Petitioner's home
- escalating **aggression and misconduct**
- targeted harassment, including reference to "Megan's Law"
- **potential manipulation** of evidence and devices

- **improper search and seizure**
- systematic disregard for Petitioner's rights

This pattern built directly into the treatment Petitioner received during Arrests #1–#4 — including:

- derogatory sexual labels (“child molester”)
 - excessive force (taser)
 - home left unsecured
 - lost/stolen property
 - extended detentions
 - and physical and emotional harm
-

I-4 — Summary Conclusion (Exhibit I)

Exhibit I documents major sheriff

misconduct, illegal entries, unauthorized

searches, harassment, and deletion of all

recorded security footage — all linked to the false PSP registration imposed on Petitioner.

This exhibit strongly supports:

- due process claims,
- excessive force claims,
- equal protection concerns,
- agency misconduct,
- and a pattern of targeted actions rooted in an unlawful registry status.

End of Exhibit I