



CARSOL Attorney Janice Bellucci Directly Involved In Sex Offender Complaint Scam.

Convicted Sex Offenders Lied. They Falsely Identified Themselves as “Victims” of a “Scam.”

The SOR websites and their associates have endured an endless barrage of baseless attacks by convicted sex offenders for many years. A particular attack plan coordinated by criminal organizations such as the California Reform Sex Offender Laws (RSOL) and Offendextortion called upon their cretin following to submit “complaints” asserting misconduct on the part of the SOR websites. A template was prepared and provided to this following with instructions to send to law enforcement (address provided). Its creation was a means to manipulate investigators to the concerns identified by the IC3 (Internet Crime Complaint Center) alleging the SOR websites had engaged in misconduct. The sheer number of these complaints all claiming the same or very similar circumstances was intended to create the appearance of wrong doing. Information has been obtained identifying the source that was used by these groups to form an outline to be utilized as the foundation to create these fabricated complaints with a template driven narrative.

Below is the “Scam Alert” that was posted online June 19, 2013 by IC3. It was used by the convicted sex offenders to falsely allege conduct by the SOR websites that was of particular interest to law enforcement at the time and a basis to garner attention in 2013/2014:

SCAM ALERTS - <http://www.ic3.gov/media/2013/130619.aspx>

Jun 19, 2013 04:00 PM

IC3 Warns of Criminals Using Mug Shots to Extort Victims

“The Internet Crime Complaint Center (IC3) has received hundreds of complaints from individuals claiming to have found their mug shots posted on various websites. Some of these individuals have stated they were juveniles at the time of their arrests and their records were sealed—and therefore not available to the public. Others have said that the information posted was either incorrect or blatantly false.”

“When victims requested that the photos be removed from the sites, they were asked to provide copies of their driver’s licenses, court records, and other personal identifying information—putting them at risk for identity theft. They were also told they had to pay a fee...but even then, some pictures were not removed—or if they were taken off one site, they were then posted to a similar site. If victims threatened to report the websites for unlawful practice, the websites’ owners threatened to escalate the damaging information against the victims. If you’ve had a similar experience, please file a complaint at www.ic3.gov.”

ANALYSIS

Our analysis of the above “SCAM ALERT” comes with a breakdown of all the elements the authorities had designated as possible claims that would/could constitute a cyber crime and “mug shot extortion victims.” However, ALL such claims would be a complete fabrication and/or distortion of the facts as such alleged conduct never occurred in relation to or associated with the SOR websites and is proven with a simple review of the irrefutable evidence.

“IC3 HAS RECEIVED HUNDREDS OF COMPLAINTS”

There is no dispute that law enforcement agencies in Phoenix, Arizona received an inordinate large number of “complaints” generated by convicted sex offenders (or their supporters) found in the SOR database. Although the exact number has not been disclosed, it was confirmed that the volume of submitted complaints was “substantial” (emphasis added). The issue that seems to have been discounted in this occurrence is that a complaint’s veracity is not determined by the volume of similar submissions from a like minded group with an attack agenda but rather the evidence to support each claim. It is mind boggling that such an obvious ruse executed by a gang of convicted sex offenders working in concert could lead to professional investigators not realizing they were being so thoroughly duped.

The facts speak for themselves and should not be deterred by the number of dubious pre-planned “complaints” received. The focus should always rely on a simple review of the evidence readily at hand. It is shocking that the SOR websites were even considered to have fit into the category of a “scam” that was “using mug shots to extort victims.” There was no extortion and there certainly were not “victims” profiled in the SOR database. There were only convicted sex offenders looking to circumvent the lawful dissemination of their factual criminal histories found in the SOR database. When criminal organizations such as RSOL and Offendextortion designed and implemented a campaign to garner the participation of their followings by the submission of falsified “complaints” as an attack against their stated nemesis SOR websites, such tactics should have been immediately recognized as vicious rhetoric and dogma and not given any merit. Any and ALL complaints are only as relevant and virtuous as they are truthful. Lies carry no credible validity and cannot withstand scrutiny of the facts. This is the basis for an analysis of the details

as they occurred and demonstrate how circumstances were clearly distorted and misrepresented. Arguably they were submitted as blatant lies which would constitute new criminal conduct perpetrated by the authors who had engaged in a jointly organized and implemented attack agenda to make false claims. The number of complaints is irrelevant when they were created as a group effort committing a fraud to achieve a stated goal that intentionally falsified the facts.

“WERE JUVENILES AT THE TIME OF THEIR ARRESTS AND THEIR RECORDS WERE SEALED – AND THEREFORE NOT AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC.”

The SOR websites have no firsthand knowledge of any profiles fitting into a category of juveniles that had their criminal records “sealed” by court order. There has never been any communication received by the SOR websites even alleging the existence of such a profile and there has been no documentation to support such a claim. However, even if such a profile existed the relevant legal issue would still be one of all profiles within the SOR database were obtained from third party sources, thus protected with immunity by Section 230 of the CDA as a republishing of existing content. There is no distinction for “juvenile” information republished as there is no practical way to identify such content. Also, all data that was obtained from third party sources had at one time been released by an official government agency into the public domain and again would be protected by the U.S. Supreme Court ruling in Cox Broadcasting vs. Cohn (1975). If a SOR database profile includes a juvenile that had the criminal conviction “sealed”, it obviously was public long enough to be in the public domain and republished by the third party source that was utilized in its creation. Again, even beyond the legal considerations that such a profile is properly displayed, there is no knowledge of any profile at issue existing.

“THE INFORMATION POSTED WAS EITHER INCORRECT OR BLATANTLY FALSE.”

There is no knowledge of any profiles in the SOR database that are “either incorrect or blatantly false.” The only issue that occasionally occurred was a profile of an individual that had been “EXONERATED” of the charges – found to be NOT GUILTY as originally determined by the Court. Although not required to remove such a profile by law, the SOR websites would deactivate such a profile free of any charges upon confirmation that any conviction had been reversed and the individual was ‘EXONERATED.’ This did not apply to an individual that had received an “EXPUNGEMENT” of the conviction as that is a totally different legal situation and remedy, one that did not justify or qualify for removal from the SOR database.

The information provided by the SOR database is not edited in any manner. It is disseminated in whatever form and provides the information as that originally obtained from the third party sources. It should also be noted that experience proved hundreds, if not thousands of such claims were made by the convicted sex offenders to the SOR websites and less than 1% (if any) were ever found to have any validity on any level. They would lie – period. First, claiming a change of address or other differences of a minimal significance constitutes “blatantly false” data is not supported by the legal precedent throughout the country and supported in all levels of court proceedings. Second, changes in the specific data such as a current address are not the responsibility of the SOR database to maintain and update. This issue is clearly addressed in the disclaimers found throughout the SOR websites and specifically on each individual profile page.

The information as displayed in the SOR database were obtained from the third party sources and are depicted exactly as the information was received. There is not even the capability to make changes and/or edit this information within the functionality of the SOR database. What is displayed and disseminated online is exactly what was released by the original government agency into the public domain.

“WHEN VICTIMS REQUESTED THAT THE PHOTOS BE REMOVED FROM THE SITES, THEY WERE ASKED TO PROVIDE COPIES OF THEIR DRIVER’S LICENSES, COURT RECORDS, AND OTHER PERSONAL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION – PUTTING THEM AT RISK FOR IDENTITY THEFT.”

First, it is unclear who exactly and what constitutes a person to be classified a “victim” as stated in the IC3 “scam alert.” A clarification of what exactly constitutes a convicted sex offenders now being classified as some kind of “victim” – of what exactly (?) – would be required. Was it their mug shot and data being disseminated on the internet? Such a distinction would also have to include a whole lot of government agencies providing registries as dictated by state statutes – the law – being “victims.” The SOR database consists of factual public records of convicted sex offenders obtained from third party sources. As the case law and Section 230 of the CDA clearly establishes the profiles disseminated via the database are legal, these were not “victims” of anything. They are the convicted perpetrators of heinous crimes. Second, it was an occasional occurrence where additional information was requested. However, this had nothing to do with an attempt of “identity theft.” To make such a claim it would require that an actual case of “identity theft” had occurred. Of course, this never happened with any transaction associated with the SOR websites. There has never been any accusation whether by a private party or any law enforcement agency claiming SOR websites had engaged in “identity theft.” Third, there are legitimate reasons to require this additional information. When the person paid via credit card using the merchant account versus PayPal it was requested that a faxed copy of the Driver’s License be sent. It was requested by the merchant account provider as a proof of authorization as is on occasion a requirement for online transactions by many websites. Also, court records proving that a convicted sex offender had been EXONERATED (expungement was not an accepted removal criteria) of the charges proved by court documentation would be requested occasionally. It is important to note that hundreds of profiled individual falsely claimed their conviction didn’t occur – it was amazing the degree of emphatic denials that were simply ridiculous (lies). A standard response was the request to provide the court documentation that would establish the individual had been EXONERATED of the charges. The reality is that would end 99.9% of all such claims. There were many legitimate reasons to require additional information which did occasionally occur, but only a small percentage (less < 5%) of the time. That said there still was never any claim of “identity theft” associated with information provided to the SOR websites.

“THEY WERE ALSO TOLD THEY HAD TO PAY A FEE...BUT EVEN THEN, SOME PICTURES WERE NOT REMOVED...”

There have repeatedly been accusations against the SOR websites that payment had been made to remove a profile only to remain in the database and continued to be disseminated online. This NEVER occurred. When confronted with this accusation, whether by the individuals profiled,

government agencies or by the media, the response by SOR websites has always been the same – identify one profile that this occurred. The response requesting an example has only been met with silence EVERY time without exception. The misrepresentation that has been utilized to sell this fallacy is the \$79.00 payment for an “expedite” review – not the \$499.00 removal request. There wasn’t a misunderstanding that occurred; it is the intentional distortion/misrepresentation by the convicted sex offenders to falsely discredit the SOR websites. A FREE review of the validity of a profile was offered to any interested party that would be completed in 7-10 days. The SOR websites were under no obligation to offer a FREE review, it was the policy of the websites to display profiles that constituted a CONVICTION of sex offenses and allowed a profiled individual the opportunity to receive a free review upon request. If for some unknown reason the person required the review to be expedited and completed in 24 hours they could CHOOSE to pay the \$79.00 “expedite” review fee. There were clear explanations made available prior to completing the “expedite” request clearly spelling out this option. That the convicted sex offenders would knowingly misrepresent this FREE service as a means to file a fabricated complaint with the authorities is further evidence of the nefarious agenda that was perpetrated by RSOL and Offendextortion. Only a moron could have misunderstood the clear options made available and the terms of service. It has been the ongoing effort of the opposition of convicted sex offenders to falsely depict the reality of such a transaction in order to garner the attention of law enforcement. The main point is that a removal was never paid for without the profile being deactivated from dissemination on the SOR websites – NOT ONE. A review of the FACTS proves what did and did not occur and there will never be evidence produced to refute this assertion. Not ONE example of a profile removal being paid for that was not honored has ever been brought forward to substantiate the many “complaints” filed with authorities.

“THEY WERE ALSO TOLD THEY HAD TO PAY A FEE... IF THEY WERE TAKEN OFF ONE SITE, THEY WERE THEN POSTED TO A SIMILAR SITE.”

When a profile is deactivated from the SOR database it no longer is available to be viewed on ANY of the SOR websites. The database functionality was designed in such a manner that it is impossible for the profile to be deactivated on one site and still appear on another. It really is fundamental MySQL database management. This is one of the fallacies found in the large number of false and fabricated complaints filed with the authorities against the SOR websites. The irrefutable facts support that claims asserting a profile had been removed from one website but would appear on another is simply not possible and the database source code proves it. It is further evidence of the deceit and a concerted effort to misrepresent the facts by these convicted sex offenders in filing their false and fabricated allegations against the SOR websites.

“IF VICTIMS THREATENED TO REPORT THE WEBSITES FOR UNLAWFUL PRACTICE, THE WEBSITES’ OWNERS THREATENED TO ESCALATE THE DAMAGING INFORMATION AGAINST THE VICTIMS.”

The SOR websites would once again challenge the designation of “victims” by the IC3. The convicted sex offenders having their factual criminal history disseminated by the SOR websites are NOT “victims,” and the ones who filed false and fabricated complaints to authorities are the perpetrators of a crime – AGAIN. The SOR websites did NOT threaten “to escalate the damaging information” against anyone. What the SOR websites have posted are factual rebuttals

to repeated attacks based on lies and intentional misrepresentations. Further, the rebuttals were exclusive to a small group of particular antagonistic opposition parties who made it a repeated practice to attack the SOR websites and individuals associated with the websites in a personal and vitriolic manner. There was not some overall program in place to identify the many convicted sex offenders with a SOR database profile and provide additional information when they would attack the SOR websites with false and fabricated “complaints.” The list of identified perpetrators of harassment, attacks and lies can be limited to specific individuals such as: David Ellis – Adam Galvez – Glenn Wyrick – Jeremy Ryan Graves – Gordon Grainger - Melvin Dominique – Janice Bellucci – Robert Anglen. The misconduct of these individuals has been well documented with specific allegations and FACTS as to their malfeasance.

What is important to convey is any content posted to address the attacks received by opposition parties against the SOR websites was not in retaliation but a justified defense for repeated and abusive attacks coming in many forms from the named antagonist. The only way to combat the overwhelming personal assaults being directed toward the SOR websites, and more specifically the individuals associated with the operations, was to present a factual depiction of what was occurring and by whom. The old adage “they started it” applies and it was FORCED upon the SOR websites to respond with the factual disclosure of circumstances as a defense when no other alternative was available. Other options had been attempted, including meeting with law enforcement to report documented death threats and pervasive harassment that also included family members. The surprising and unexpected response was that there was NOTHING the Police could do until there was an actual physical attack upon a person or their family members. The question at that point was a matter of what is someone to do in such a situation. The answer was to publicize the threats and the party making them in an attempt to expose what was happening in a manner that would serve as a deterrent. The theory being the parties involved could not act upon their stated objectives as they had already been identified as likely suspects. It may sound like a crazy rationalization, but it must be taken into account the number and intensity of the threats to really appreciate the need to devise some sort of defense strategy for what was occurring (well documented).

ANALYSIS OF THE 2013 “MUG SHOT” PLAYING FIELD VS. 2016

It is important to articulate the different online environment occurring in June 2013 as opposed to today (2016) in regard to so-called “mug shot” websites. It is important to note that the SOR websites did NOT fit into this emergence of new “mug shot” websites as ALL profiles found in the SOR database only consist of individuals CONVICTED of sex offenses. Back in 2013 there were many of these “mug shot” websites online and new ones were popping up on an almost daily basis and there was no distinction from a profiled individual being merely accused of a crime vs. being convicted of a crime. A law enforcement agency would post yesterday’s arrested online and it was made available as a public record released into the public domain – open to collecting and republishing on a “mug shot” website. The fact is a talented database developer could build a system to “scrape” the new content of recently arrested individuals from official

government websites found throughout the country gathering new content daily. It is understandable that this issue began to get the attention of the law enforcement as there was the possibility of abuse of such sensitive information being so readily available. There is no question that these websites could be started easily and they may or may not operate “legally.” You couple this new online concern with the reality of a large number of “complaints” being generated by the following of RSOL and Offendextortion in a planned and specifically coordinated attack against the SOR websites and it created the appearance of impropriety. It is the culmination of these events that created a perfect storm environment of abuse to falsely implicate the SOR websites for misconduct that had not been committed. This of course was much to the delight of the convicted sex offenders filing false and fabricated complaints as it was their stated goal to devise a strategy to enlist law enforcement to circumvent the SOR websites operations in hopes of eliminating the dissemination of their factual criminal histories to the general public.

In 2016 you no longer see the online proliferation of the “mug shot” websites as they have for the most part gone the way of the dodo bird. The relevance and need to counter the proliferation of new “mug shot” websites appearing weekly has been eliminated – not by the FBI/IC3 – but by Google search result algorithms and credit card processing restrictions. If the same strategy was to be deployed today by the same convicted sex offenders there would be no interest in the false, fabricated and hyperbole of their complaints as it would be immediately and easily recognized for the charade it was and has always been.

REVIEW OF THE “SCAM ALERT” POSTED BY IC3 IN 2013

That the TRUTH is a source of embarrassment and inconvenience to the convicted sex offenders profiled in the SOR database is unfortunate but to be expected. The SOR websites are far more concerned for victims and/or their families. The SOR websites believe the communities **Right To Know** far supersede the desire of convicted sex offenders to hide in anonymity. The double standard and hypocrisy demonstrated by the “scam alert” published in 2013 by the IC3 is preposterous in regard to ANY conduct associated with the SOR websites. The SOR websites did NOT engage in the conduct as detailed in the posting of the IC3. If it is the contention of the IC3 that convicted sex offenders can file frivolous complaint after complaint, post malicious tirades, make direct threats of physical violence, list not only names but addresses, phone numbers and call upon other CONVICTED sex offenders to actively harass and threaten people associated with the SOR websites– which apparently is perfectly reasonable and should be expected – that is NOT acceptable. What is falsely portrayed as “using mug shots to extort victims” if referring to the SOR websites was the LEGAL dissemination of factual criminal histories of CONVICTED sex offenders that had been released into the public domain by official government agencies. The laws (Section 230 of the CDA) and ALL the court rulings up to the U.S. Supreme Court have validated the legal authority to provide this content. Any content claimed to be retaliation by the SOR websites that purportedly “threatened to escalate the damaging information against the victims” is nothing more than a required, justified, and ALWAYS factually accurate (supported with evidence/documentation) RESPONSE/DEFENSE against the vitriol assaults of specific identified irrational zealots determined to harass and

threaten the SOR websites into silence for their own nefarious purpose. Their end goal being to ultimately suppress everyone's **Right To Know** negative information of their misconduct. They operated to achieve their stated agenda with no regard to the FACTS, the TRUTH or the LAW.

CONCLUSION

The opposition by their filing false and fabricated complaints with authorities has operated under the mistaken assumption that the SOR websites cannot respond to their attacks and lies. They believed the SOR websites would be silenced. They believe others who disagree and/or oppose them do NOT have the same rights to express opinions and perspectives that contradict and/or disprove their self-serving rhetoric and blatant lies. They believe their hypocrisy can go forward unchallenged. They are mistaken in such assumptions and exposing their disturbing dogma is supported by the laws and rights guaranteed by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution – Freedom of Speech. By all means the opposition may express whatever opinions, perspective and nonsense they wish to their following of like minded CONVICTED SEX OFFENDERS and supporters. Conversely, the SOR websites and any parties in agreement may exercise their Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Press to protect the general public's **Right To Know**. There is NO concern by the SOR websites for the desire of convicted sex offenders to suppress and hide the knowledge of their heinous crimes and factual criminal history from our communities.

After years of enduring the barrage of false and fabricated “complaints” vindication is finally being realized by the SOR websites. One so called “victim” William Nail was exposed for his SCAM lawsuit in Michigan with TWO Federal Judge’s ruling against his attacks with very harsh and specific language identifying his claims as meritless (February 2016). The so-called “identified victim” of Las Vegas, Nevada will be similarly revealed as a charlatan in Federal court in March 2016. This will be a third Federal Judge to exonerate the SOR websites of these bogus attacks. And finally after three long years of weathering the lies and deceptions in Arizona Federal court, the day of reckoning will be upon attorney Janice Bellucci. She orchestrated a conspiracy to commit fraud by manufacturing a fabricated lawsuit involving false allegations that purportedly occurred in seven states. The claims are blatant lies. Just one of many factual examples is the orchestrated payments by six John Doe plaintiffs for an “expedite review” all occurring during a planned 10-day period. The lawsuit alleged all six of these “expedite review” requests were payment for REMOVALS that were not honored by the SOR websites. Again – ALL timed and carried out as a planned conspiracy of fraud in a 10-day period. It is generally the parties who initiated a lawsuit to be anxious to have “their day in court” as soon as possible. It is telling that in this case it has been the complete opposite. It has been the SOR websites pushing to get the TRUTH of the false and fabricated allegations of the lawsuit into the courtroom before a judge and jury. The so-called “identified victims” have repeatedly sought postponements, delays and outright avoidance of a conclusion before the court. Their evasion tactics have run their course, the day of reckoning is set and they know it. A fourth Federal judge will finally have the opportunity to preside over the disclosure of exactly what was been perpetrated by attorney Janice Bellucci and her co-conspirators. It has been a long a difficult road but it was always believed that in the end the TRUTH would prevail.

For more information, google courtkey.com or [click here](#)

