Outlook

Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>
Date Fri 11/1/2024 3:11 PM
To contact@jefffenton.com <contact@jefffenton.com>



1 attachment (18 KB)
Joint Stipulation to Redact.docx;

Good afternoon, Mr. Fenton.

I received your voicemail, but unfortunately, I cannot return your call this afternoon because I am taking part in training. I can give you a call next week, but in the meantime, I understand that you are willing to jointly agree to remove Judge Walker's information from the docket. Please take a look at this draft motion and let me know if I can type in your signature on the signature line. Assuming you approve of this draft, I can get this filed on Monday.

Let me know if you have questions.

Thanks, and have a good weekend.

Anica

Anica C. Jones
Chief, Civil Division
Middle District of Tennessee
U.S. Attorney's Office | 719 Church Street, Suite 3300 | Nashville, Tennessee 37203
T: (615) 736-5151 | C: (615) 289-6815 | F: (615) 401-6626
E-Mail: Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov

Please be advised that any emails sent to or from this email address are subject to retention and archiving by the United States Department of Justice.

Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton
Date Fri 11/1/2024 3:30 PM
To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>



Thank you mam.

I'm working at the moment to try to unredact the court record in Michigan, since there are only four words in my FAC which are specific to his address (street number, street name, Nashville), yet they chose to redact 32,741 words instead (my entire complaint) in lieu of just four words.

That is overly broad and unduly burdensome, that I even need to waste my time with this, but unfortunately I must.

I tried to describe that to United States Attorney Cobb, while comparing that to demolishing an entire city to kill a fly.

I'll be happy to help you squash the fly. Please don't squash the entire city or redact my FAC. 😊

I will look over your document this weekend and either have it back to you Monday, or address any outstanding concerns in the matter which we can discuss.

In an act of good faith, I will begin redacting his street address from the documents which I have hosted online regarding my lawsuit.

If I could get EVERYONE to make an appearance in the matter, and quit playing games dodging service, I would redact EVERYONE'S address… again, I have no interests contrary to their privacy. But some of them have chosen to be extremely evasive and have wasted a lot of extra time and money while trying to repeatedly serve them… with other outrageous antics such as mailing service back weeks later, etc… so forcing me to fight to get them served, and to substantiate that the service was GOOD, are my only interests regarding any of their addresses. If you are in a position to help button this up and end this needless waste of time trying to wrestle over service, I would honestly be happy to remove all of their addresses at the same time, while I could do so without requiring much more time than just redacting defendant Walker's.

Anyhow, I don't know what relationship you have with the others, if any, but I just thought I would throw that out there, in the interest of expediting past the bologna and protecting everyone's interests.

I assure you, the core issue of removing his address is of absolutely no concern to me at all. I take no issue with it. All I care about is implementation and not compromising the cohesion and comprehensibility of my lawsuit by the court or the public. (While trying not to create any more work for myself than necessary.)

Have a great weekend, and thanks for reaching out!

Thanks.
Jeff Fenton

Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>
Date Mon 11/4/2024 12:29 PM
To Jeff Fenton

Thanks for your response, Mr. Fenton. I only represent Judge Walker. Please let me know if I can move forward with filing the joint motion to redact Judge Walker's information today.



Outlook

Re: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton
Date Tue 11/5/2024 2:30 PM
To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>



Hello Ms. Jones,

As previously expressed, I have no conflicts with redacting the four words comprising Judge Walker's address throughout any portion of the complaint and lawsuit, but that must be done without redacting or sealing substantial portions of any documents, otherwise I will need to seek leave from the court to resubmit the documents with just his address redacted, so not to compromise the integrity of my entire lawsuit, along with the public's interest in being able to follow the lawsuit without substantive portions missing.

Again, we are just talking about literally four words.

A stipulation limiting the redaction to the four words only (in a couple of different documents), I'd be happy to sign, but as previously stated it is overly broad and an unreasonable burdensome to redact and force me to refile entire documents.

In my mind, that is not only unreasonable, but shows motives to cover-up and hide the facts, evidence, and sworn testimony in my complaint, which are significantly contrary to the honest interests of Justice.

I'm is still needing to waste time in an attempt to correct this with the Michigan court, while it was a wholly unreasonable action on the part of the court in the first place.

Again, we are talking about the need to simply redact four words in two or three different documents.

Courts redact sensitive words and sentences all the time without redacting or sealing entire documents.

People are making this much more difficult for me than it needs to be. (Which causes me to question their motives.)

Please revise your stipulation for precise, extremely limited redactions (4 words), without any language consenting to the court performing substantive redactions of entire documents or sections, and I will be happy to join you in executing the stipulation.

Otherwise, I need to focus on explaining to both the Michigan and Tennessee courts why more substantive redactions are contrary to the honest interests of Justice while pointing out how unnecessary broad and burdensome redacting or sealing entire documents to literally redact four words is.

This seems really simple and common sense to me. If I must seek leave to refile my entire FAC, that will take me a couple of weeks to do once approved by the court.

Thank you.
Jeff Fenton

Get Outlook for iOS



Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>
Date Tue 11/5/2024 3:08 PM
To Jeff Fenton

1 attachment (17 KB)
Joint Stipulation to Redact.docx;

Mr. Fenton, I don't know what "four words" you are talking about. If you have specific edits to the attached stipulation that I sent last week (and I am re-attaching), please send them back to me. Otherwise, I will move forward with filing a motion for the redactions.

Thanks,
Anica



Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>
Date Tue 11/5/2024 3:11 PM
To Jeff Fenton

1 attachment (17 KB)
Joint Stipulation to Redact.docx;

That was the wrong attachment. Here is the correct one.



Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton
Date Wed 11/6/2024 2:07 PM
To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>



1 attachment (3 MB)
20241106_JOINT MOTION TO REDACT PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS.pdf;

Hello Ms. Jones,

Please find that motion/stipulation attached executed.

I tweaked the language a little bit to where I was comfortable with it. I don't believe there are any material changes which will affect your client's privacy interests.

Please let me know if you are good with this or if we need to address anything else at this time.

Thanks.
Jeff Fenton

x.com/@tninjustice
jeff.fenton@live.com
Mobile: (810) 428-6500
Landline: (810) 735-7456

17195 SILVER PKWY, #150
FENTON, MI 48430-3426

3-MIN Video Intro about my Federal Lawsuit: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AaYb-f8ux4o

FENTON v. STORY (1:23-cv-1097) http://rico.jefffenton.com/discovery/
https://casetext.com/case/fenton-v-story
Fraud on the Court by Officers of the Court: Williamson County Chancery Court Docket #48419B

SLAM the GAVEL Podcast Interview from 8/4/2024 about my RICO Lawsuit with Authors Brian Vukadinovich and Maryann Petri: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=plg5eEEnVuU

Brian Vukadinovich is the author of MOTION for JUSTICE (I Rest My Case), and Rogues in Black Robes (Destroying Lives and Committing Crimes with No True Accountability).

Maryann Petri is the author of RAISED BY THESE WOLVES (How Family and Federal Courts are Failing our Children), Dismantling Family Court Corruption (Why Taking the Kids Was Not Enough). Maryann is also the host of SLAM the GAVEL Podcast, focused on all family court topics, trauma, and healing.



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

JEFFREY RYAN FENTON, Plaintiff, v. VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al., Defendants.	)	CASE NO.: 3:24-cv-01282 JUDGE CAMPBELL MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES

EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION REQUESTED

JOINT MOTION TO REDACT PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.03, Plaintiff and Defendant Hon. Charles Walker (Judge Walker) request that portions of filed documents be redacted, and agree as follows:

1. Judge Walker is a federal bankruptcy judge. He has expressed privacy and safety concerns relating to his private address being publicly disclosed in filings in this action.

2. There is good cause to remove judge Walker's address from the filings in this action. Judge Walker's privacy and security interests outweigh the public's interest in this private information, and the details of his address are not relevant to the merits in this action. *See In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., Inc.*, 723 F.2d 470, 474 (6th Cir. 1983); *Malhan v. Grewal*, Civil Action No. 16-8495 (CCC), 2020 WL 6689753, at *2 (D. N.J. Nov. 13, 2020); *Scheffler v. City of New Hope*, Case No. 18-cv-1690 (SRN/LIB) 2018 WL 6012181, at *2 (D. Minn. Nov. 16, 2018) (recognizing that "Judges, in particular, have a critical need to maintain their privacy because of the possible threat posed by dissatisfied litigants. . . ."); *Concerned Pastors for Social Action v. Khouri,* Case No. 16-10277, 2016 WL 8261002, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 25, 2016) (finding that witnesses' home addresses were irrelevant to the merits of the action and ordering redactions).

PROPOSED

3. Redacting more than Judge Walker's address from the filings could have significant consequences, contrary to the interests of justice, which do not benefit the privacy interests mentioned, while potentially compromising the public's interest and ability to follow this lawsuit and understand how different elements and documents interact and relate with each other.

4. It is therefore agreed that the redactions shall be limited to a maximum of one sentence per document, and that entire pages, sections, and documents shall not be redacted or sealed in the record related to this concern.

5. It is further agreed that Judge Walker's name and state of domicile shall not be redacted or concealed in this lawsuit, but that his address number, street name, city, and zip code should be redacted by the Clerk of the Court, pursuant to this motion, for his privacy.

6. It is critical to Plaintiff and hence agreed by the parties herein, that this motion not have a broader impact than specifically intended and as is minimalistically necessary to conceal Judge Walker's residential street address from the public.

7. Accordingly, the Clerk of Court should redact the specific words in this lawsuit which contain or disclose Judge Walker's address number, street name, city, and zip code.

8. These filings include ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293; ECF No. 66, PageID.4874, and ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252, 5254.

9. The parties may not include Judge Walker's unredacted address in any future filings in this action.

Dated: November 6, 2024

/s/ Anica C. Jones

Anica C. Jones
Assistant United States Attorney
719 Church Street, Suite 3300
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
(615) 736-5151
Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov

PROPOSED



Attorney for Defendant Charles Walker

Dated: November 6, 2024

Jeffrey R. Fenton (pro se)
17195 Silver Parkway #150
Fenton, MI 84830
(615) 837-1300
contact@jefffenton.com
Plaintiff

PROPOSED



Outlook

RE: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>
Date Fri 11/8/2024 11:11 AM
To Jeff Fenton

2 attachments (335 KB)
DE 158 - Motion to Redact.pdf; DE 159 - Memo ISO Motion to Redact.pdf;

Good morning, Mr. Fenton, and thank you for your response. I filed the attached motion and memorandum late on Tuesday evening (before receiving your email below on Wednesday), so there is no longer a need to enter a joint stipulation. I appreciate your edits and the time you spent on this. However, I needed to move quickly given the circumstances.



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CASE NO.: 3:24-cv-01282
	)	JUDGE CAMPBELL
VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al.,	)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES
	)	
Defendants.	)	

EMERGENCY MOTION
TO REDACT OR SEAL PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.03, Defendant Honorable Charles Walker (Judge Walker) requests that portions of filed documents be redacted or sealed, stating as follows:

1. Judge Walker is a federal bankruptcy judge. He has expressed privacy and safety concerns relating to his private address being publicly disclosed in filings in this action.

2. There is good cause to remove judge Walker's address from the filings in this action. Judge Walker's privacy and security interests outweigh the public's interest in this private information, and the details of his address are not relevant to the merits in this action. *See In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., Inc*., 723 F.2d 470, 474 (6th Cir. 1983); *Malhan v. Grewal*, Civil Action No. 16-8495 (CCC), 2020 WL 6689753, at *2 (D. N.J. Nov. 13, 2020); *Scheffler v. City of New Hope*, Case No. 18-cv-1690 (SRN/LIB) 2018 WL 6012181, at *2 (D. Minn. Nov. 16, 2018) (recognizing that "Judges, in particular, have a critical need to maintain their privacy because of the possible threat posed by dissatisfied litigants. . . ."); *Concerned Pastors for Social Action v. Khouri,* Case No. 16-10277, 2016 WL 8261002, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 25, 2016) (finding that witnesses' home addresses were irrelevant to the merits of the action and ordering redactions).

3. Accordingly, Defendant asks that the Clerk of Court redact from the ECF in this case any filings that include Judge Walker's private address or, alternatively, seal the specific pages containing the information. These filings include ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293; ECF No. 66, PageID.4874; and ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252, 5254.

4. Defendant further asks the Court to order Plaintiff to refrain from including Judge Walker's unredacted address in any future filings in this action.

5. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.01, Defendant's counsel made attempts to consult with Plaintiff regarding this motion. Defendant's counsel left Plaintiff a voicemail on October 31. Emails were exchanged between Plaintiff and Defendant's counsel on November 1, 4, and 5. Defendant's counsel left Plaintiff another voicemail on November 5. At the time of this filing, Defendant's counsel has not secured Plaintiff's assent to filing this motion jointly.

For the reasons discussed above, Defendant's motion should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS J. JAWORSKI
Acting United States Attorney
Middle District of Tennessee

s/ Anica C. Jones
ANICA C. JONES, B.P.R. #025325
Assistant United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office
719 Church Street, Suite 3300
Nashville, TN 37203
Telephone: (615) 736-5151
anica.jones@usdoj.gov



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION



JEFFREY RYAN FENTON,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CASE NO.: 3:24-cv-01282
	)	JUDGE CAMPBELL
VIRGINIA LEE STORY, et al.,	)	MAGISTRATE JUDGE HOLMES
	)	
Defendants.	)	

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY MOTION TO REDACT OR SEAL PORTIONS OF FILED DOCUMENTS

Pursuant to Local Rule 5.03, Defendant Honorable Charles Walker (Judge Walker) requests that portions of filed documents be redacted or sealed, stating as follows:

1. Judge Walker is a federal bankruptcy judge. He has expressed privacy and safety concerns relating to his private address being publicly disclosed in filings in this action.

2. There is good cause to remove Judge Walker's address from the filings in this action. Judge Walker's privacy and security interests outweigh the public's interest in this private information, and the details of his address are not relevant to the merits in this action. *See In re Knoxville News-Sentinel Co., Inc*., 723 F.2d 470, 474 (6th Cir. 1983); *Malhan v. Grewal*, Civil Action No. 16-8495 (CCC), 2020 WL 6689753, at *2 (D. N.J. Nov. 13, 2020); *Scheffler v. City of New Hope*, Case No. 18-cv-1690 (SRN/LIB) 2018 WL 6012181, at *2 (D. Minn. Nov. 16, 2018) (recognizing that "Judges, in particular, have a critical need to maintain their privacy because of the possible threat posed by dissatisfied litigants. . . ."); *Concerned Pastors for Social Action v. Khouri,* Case No. 16-10277, 2016 WL 8261002, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 25, 2016) (finding that witnesses' home addresses were irrelevant to the merits of the action and ordering redactions).

3. Accordingly, Defendant asks that the Clerk of Court redact from the ECF in this case any filings that include Judge Walker's private address or, alternatively, seal the specific pages containing the information. These filings include ECF No. 16-1, PageID.2293; ECF No. 66, PageID.4874; and ECF No. 95-1, PageID.5252, 5254.

4. Defendant further asks the Court to order Plaintiff to refrain from including Judge Walker's unredacted address in any future filings in this action.

5. Pursuant to Local Rule 7.01, Defendant's counsel made attempts to consult with Plaintiff regarding this motion. Defendant's counsel left Plaintiff a voicemail on October 31. Emails were exchanged between Plaintiff and Defendant's counsel on November 1, 4, and 5. Defendant's counsel left Plaintiff another voicemail on November 5. At the time of this filing, Defendant's counsel has not secured Plaintiff's assent to filing this motion jointly.

For the foregoing reasons, Defendant requests that this motion be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMAS J. JAWORSKI
Acting United States Attorney
Middle District of Tennessee

s/ Anica C. Jones
ANICA C. JONES, B.P.R. #025325
Assistant United States Attorney
United States Attorney's Office
719 Church Street, Suite 3300
Nashville, TN 37203
Telephone: (615) 736-5151
anica.jones@usdoj.gov



Outlook

Re: Fenton v. Story - Joint Motion (attached)

From Jeff Fenton
Date Fri 11/8/2024 9:02 PM
To Jones, Anica (USATNM) <Anica.Jones@usdoj.gov>

You sent me the wrong attachment, and once you sent me the correct document I got it back to you within 24 hours executed.

I regret wasting any time on this, since I must now appeal overly broad and burdensome nonsense, contrary to the interests of Justice, under the guise of redacting four words, which I find it hard to believe have ever been the real concern, considering the actions taken.

You've created weeks more work for me, while making it sound as if I failed or refused to cooperate.

There have been a lot of people involved in covering up the multiple felony crimes committed by the courts and counsel in the preceding matters, while many of them held offices of public trust, swearing to uphold the constitution of the United States of America, while behaving like outlaws.

I will be clarifying the efforts I made to work with you on this matter, along with the real concerns I voiced, and how you chose not to care about the real interests of Justice in this matter, to instead create more work for me while helping to hide the truth from the public.

Please don't contact me directly again, but take all matters before the court for both transparency and accountability.

Get Outlook for iOS

