

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
92677

United States

Sat Nov 11 2025

Elizabeth Dubois, Director
Satori Intelligence Ltd

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
West Sussex,
BN11 1TF,
United Kingdom

**PRE-ACTION NOTICE FOR DEFAMATION, HARASSMENT, AND MISUSE OF
PRIVATE INFORMATION**

**Issued under the Civil Procedure Rules (Pre-Action Protocol for Media and
Communications Claims)**

Dear Ms Dubois,

This letter constitutes a formal pre-action notice regarding a report prepared and/or published by Satori Intelligence Ltd dated on or about 7 November 2025 (the “Report”), commissioned by your client Mr Michael C. R. Reiners, and circulated to third parties.

The Report is not an independent intelligence assessment. It is a coordinated defamation commissioned by your Cambridge contemporary Michael C. R. Reiners to silence reporting of serious misconduct allegations against him.

The Report contains seriously defamatory allegations, unlawful processing and disclosure of my personal data, and reckless amateur psychological commentary presented as fact. It has been used to justify and encourage a campaign of stalking, harassment, and doxxing against me, my family, my associates, and my publication The Restorationist.

This engagement was undertaken exclusively to discredit me personally to enable the censorship of allegations I documented against Mr Reiners, which were reported by third parties.

The Report contains defamatory allegations and appears designed to discredit a critic of Mr Reiners rather than provide objective due diligence.

As a result of your publication of this document:

- My home address in California was published accompanied with menacing death threats (evidence withheld by Orange County Sheriff);
- Members of my family recorded threatening voicemail messages sent to their landline phones;
- At least twenty anonymous X accounts were created with satanic religious imagery threatening harm to myself and my family (evidence documented but omitted for brevity);
- Employees of [REDACTED] were listed and targeted;
- Friends mentioned in this document were abused and harassed online (same);
- Domain names (e.g. [REDACTED].co.uk) were abusively registered to re-publish it and enact extortion.

Your conduct constitutes multiple civil and criminal breaches, including but not limited to:

- Defamation (Libel) – Defamation Act 2013, sections 1–3 (serious harm and publication of false statements).
- Misuse of Private Information – Data Protection Act 2018 and UK GDPR, Articles 5(1)(a)–(f).
- Harassment and Stalking – Protection from Harassment Act 1997, sections 1 and 2A.

Each of these offences is actionable in civil and/or criminal law.

BACKGROUND

- A. I am the founder, editor, and sole owner of The Restorationist and the domain restorationist.org.uk, operated through my California company, AC Dev Services LLC.
- B. On 31 October 2025, The Restorationist published an article under my byline setting out concerns and allegations raised by third parties about Mr Reiners' conduct, together with factual clarification of his lack of ownership or control over The Restorationist and its infrastructure.
- C. Subsequent to this, your firm produced the Report for Mr Reiners. That Report:
 - a. misrepresents my role and ownership of The Restorationist;
 - b. mischaracterises my article and related communications as evidence of a "psychopathic episode" or similar mental instability;
 - c. asserts or implies I am engaged in harassment, defamation, fraud, and manipulative conduct;
 - d. purports to rely on undisclosed "witnesses" and "victims" to suggest a pattern of criminality or abuse;
 - e. reproduces and circulates extensive private, historic, and irrelevant personal data about me and my family.
- D. The Report has been circulated beyond your client, including to hostile third parties who have used it as the basis for a sustained online and offline campaign against me.

These are not speculative risks: they are actual harms triggered and facilitated by the Report, which portrayed me as dangerous, unstable, dishonest, and criminally suspect.

This satisfies the serious harm requirement under section 1 of the Defamation Act 2013.

REFUTATION OF CLAIMS

1. ILLEGITIMACY OF CLAIMS BY CLIENT MICHAEL REINERS

- A. Your client, Michael Reiners, has no legal, moral, or unregistered claim to the Restorationist publication. I am its sole owner. I am the sole legal owner of its domain name (restorationist.org.uk), along with eighteen (18) other corresponding names since May 4 2025.
- B. All financial infrastructure is controlled and operated through my California company, AC Dev Services, LLC.
- C. I am the sole owner of the entire technical infrastructure of the website and its domains;
- D. I am the sole creator of the artwork for and design of the publication;
- E. I am the sole author and copyright holder of legislation published on the Restorationist website which is to be published under my book “Restorationism & The Great Repeal” registered under ISBNs 979-8-9916553-4-7 (print) and 979-8-9916553-5-4 (e-book).

2. FOREKNOWLEDGE OF CRIMINAL INTENT

- A. Mr Reiners has contacted multiple solicitors in England to seek criminal defence representation (see enclosed exhibit 2A).
- B. These emails were sent prior to the publication of this document, indicating he was aware his actions were illegal and his engagement of your services would be considered to be in bad faith.

3. NATURE OF TERMINATION OF MR REINERS

- A. In your report you state, “The purpose of this work is to identify and evidence a sustained pattern of behaviour consistent with harassment, defamation, and reputational manipulation directed towards Mr Michael C. R. Reiners.”
- B. It is an offensive and libelous publication which makes no attempt whatsoever to objectively investigate, and instead constitutes a malicious prosecutor’s case enabling a campaign of doxxing and intimidation.

- C. Mr Reiners' relationship to the Restorationist was permanently terminated on Oct 20 2025, and the reasons were published publicly at the following URL:
<https://restorationist.org.uk/how-long-did-the-restorationist-tolerate-the-drepr-of-michael-reiners/>
- D. Mr Reiners' association with The Restorationist was terminated following receipt of multiple serious misconduct allegations from independent sources, subsequently reported to Hampshire Police. These allegations are detailed in the published article and supported by documentary evidence:
- a. Operating dozens of anonymous accounts harassing people online;
 - b. Bouts of uncontrollable alcoholism lasting up to a week;
 - c. Trading and forcefully sending extreme fetish pornography centred around urine, obesity, and depiction of child anime characters;
 - d. Stalking and intimidating at least two women in person at a conference;
 - e. Boasting of committing serious sexual offences against his partner, identical to a previous criminal arrest for the same behaviour in 2022-2023;
- E. These claims are not defamatory and a fully truthful account. They are entirely factually accurate and supported by evidence.

4. MISREPRESENTED/FALSE ADDRESS HISTORY

- A. I have never lived at 49 WHITEDOWN.
- B. I have never lived at 1 HOLMDALE TERRACE.
- C. I have never lived at 100 WEIR ROAD.
- D. I have never lived at 91 HARVEY LANE.
- E. I have never lived at 33 MELLISS AVENUE.
- F. I have never lived at 340 THE HIGHWAY.

5. MISREPRESENTED/FALSE VEHICLE DATA

- A. I have never owned or driven a vehicle in the United States.
- B. I do not have a US driver's licence

6. MISREPRESENTED SOCIAL MEDIA ACCOUNTS

- A. I did not create, nor do i have any kind of ownership of the X account "azcameron."
- B. I did not create, nor do i have any kind of ownership of the X account "michaelresigns."
- C. I did not create, nor do i have any kind of ownership of the X account "Ezio996856."
- D. I did not create, nor do i have any kind of ownership of the X account "TheCreed38BC."
- E. I do not have any Facebook accounts.

7. MISCHARACTERISATION OF SOCIAL MEDIA CLAIMS

- A. The commentary about Michael Reiners is not defamatory whatsoever. It is truthful and supported by evidence.
- B. As detailed earlier, I am the sole registrant, owner, and operator of the domain restorationist.org.uk. Mr Reiners' claim is false and fraudulent.
- C. Mr Reiners' friend contacted the Restorationist public legal address voluntarily as a journalistic source and claimed "I can offer all [information]." These claims are not defamatory.
- D. Mr Reiners himself admits publicly to among other things, fetishes for urine, obesity, and child anime figures. He has been publicly accused of these offences by campaign group Hope Not Hate. These claims are not defamatory.

8. MISCHARACTERISATION OF 20 YEAR-OLD JOURNALING

- A. The blog posts referenced were permanently deleted 18 years ago.
- B. As a survivor of childhood abuse, like many others, I turned to writing to express the personal feelings I was deeply struggling with.
- C. I turned to therapeutic counselling and suffered depression as a result of this abuse.
- D. [REDACTED] as referenced in these blog posts, is my best friend in the United Kingdom and has been for two decades. Your statements are libelous.
- E. I became a Christian in 2008 and gave my life to Jesus Christ. I was publicly baptised in [REDACTED]

9. MISREPRESENTED/FALSE CLAIMS OF CRIMINAL HISTORY

- A. The source of this information is an abusive ex-girlfriend 2 (initials "[REDACTED]") with a personal grudge after a short relationship ended in 2012. Her statements are libelous.
- B. I did not travel to the United States to "flee prosecution." This statement is baseless and libelous.
- C. To my knowledge, I have never been on any "Interpol list." This statement is libelous.
- D. As your unlawful criminal check suggests, I do not have any unspent convictions in the US, the UK, or any other country.
- E. I did have a minor criminal history in the UK from 20 years ago as a teenager, which are spent and sealed under the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act; and for which I lawfully obtained full forgiveness from the US Department of Homeland Security as part of my immigration to the United States.
- F. Possession of any confidential criminal record in the UK by an unauthorised third party is a criminal offence under the Data Protection Act 2018.

10. MISREPRESENTED/FALSE CLAIMS OF FINANCIAL IMPROPRIETY

- A. Your claims are severely libelous.
- B. The source of this information (“[REDACTED]”) has not once communicated to me any discontent whatsoever in the time I have ever known her. I have not spoken to her for 12 years, and i miss her.
- C. The film project “Michael’s Resignation” was a collaborative work documented in the UK press involving dozens of people on an open basis. Nothing about it was secretive or dishonest.
- D. The project failed catastrophically for multiple different reasons:
 - 1. It was wildly under-budgeted due to inexperience;
 - 2. Its cast and production staff were amateur and unreliable;
 - 3. The company entered into litigation with the payment processor, who would only dispense funds on a monthly basis, disabling even basic concept photography;
 - 4. The project’s problems and ultimate failure were communicated openly and regularly via email and phone calls. There was no attempt made to conceal its failure at any time.
- E. Your claim “a confidential source has alleged that the subject raised approximately £140,000 in private investment” is false. This statement is baseless and libelous.
- F. Your statement “the film project may have been used as a vehicle to obtain investment under false pretenses” is false and severely libelous.
- G. Your own timeline undermines the claim the project was frivolous. It failed in good faith.
- H. I did not receive or transfer any personal financial benefit from this project whatsoever; nor did i conceal any financial data or possess any motive whatsoever for criminal or bad faith endeavour. It simply failed.

11. MISCHARACTERISATION OF ESCAPING ABUSE WEBSITE

- A. You assert pathology without any medical training or context. Your claims are speculative and severely libelous.
- B. The source of “information obtained” (initials “[REDACTED]”) is an ex-girlfriend who severely abused me emotionally and physically during a short relationship. Documented evidence exists of this abuse. It was severe enough that I undertook a year of counseling to recover.
- C. One of the reasons for the ending of that relationship was your source’s father being an [REDACTED], documented in VICE magazine.

12. MISREPRESENTED/FALSE CLAIMS OF SHAM MARRIAGE

- A. I was married in [REDACTED] Ontario in September [REDACTED].
- B. My marriage lasted 8 years, was under no circumstances a “sham,” and I loved my wife deeply. I did not apply for divorce; she did.
- C. Your claims are severely libelous.

13. MISREPRESENTED/FALSE CLAIMS OF IDENTITY SHIFT

- A. I have changed my name once in [REDACTED] as an attempt to distance myself from the childhood abuse I suffered. I have never used a different name in 30 years, nor have i “shifted identities.”
- B. I have never been “known to police for drug related offences, explosives experimentation and other petty crimes.”
- C. I did not “Develop[s] online presence as an AI developer and technologist under [a] new name.”

D. I write under my mother's maiden name (Coppen) as a pen name, as many writers do. I have published at least two books on Amazon. This practice is so common ISBN providers include a special registration field for it. This information is publicly available.

E. These claims are severely libelous.

DENIAL OF CLAIMS

Without waiving the right to rely on further particulars, the Report is defamatory in that it:

- Portrays me as mentally unstable / “psychopathic” – suggesting my work exposing your client is the product of a psychological breakdown rather than good-faith reporting.
- Alleges or implies harassment and orchestrated reputational attacks by me against Mr Reiners.
- Disputes or undermines my lawful ownership of The Restorationist and associated domains, implying dishonest seizure or manipulation.
- Suggests patterns of deception, fraud, or bad-faith conduct, including financial impropriety and identity manipulation.
- Relies on unnamed “witnesses” and “victims” in a manner that implies there is a body of evidence of my wrongdoing or predatory behaviour, without disclosure, context, or substantiation.

The natural and ordinary meaning of these statements (and their innuendo in context) is that I am:

- dishonest and fraudulent;
- engaged in harassment, manipulation, or abuse;
- mentally unstable and unfit to be believed;
- a person against whom there exist multiple undisclosed “victims” or complainants.

These meanings are false, seriously defamatory, and unsupported by evidence.

MISCHARACTERISATION & AMATEUR PSYCHOLOGICAL COMMENTARY

The Report repeatedly engages in speculative “psychological” and “behavioural” commentary about me, presented with the veneer of professional analysis. In particular, it:

- attributes to me supposed personality disorders or “psychopathic” traits;
- pathologises my response to serious allegations against your client;
- recasts evidence-led criticism as delusion, instability, or obsession.

You are not identified as a clinician and there is no indication that these conclusions are grounded in any recognised diagnostic framework or professional qualification. Presenting this pseudo-clinical material as authoritative fact is:

- reckless and unqualified;
- not a protected opinion based on true facts;
- inherently defamatory, as it is intended to discredit my credibility and sanity.

These passages are outside any reasonable scope of “intelligence” reporting and aggravate the seriousness of the libel.

UNSUBSTANTIATED REFERENCES TO “VICTIMS” AND “WITNESSES”

The Report’s references to unidentified “victims,” “witnesses,” or similar sources — framed as corroborating some pattern of abusive or improper conduct on my part — are:

1. gravely serious in implication;
2. entirely unparticularised;
3. deployed to suggest there exists a secret body of evidence against me.

Absent concrete particulars, such references are baseless and defamatory, insinuating criminal or abusive behaviour without affording me any opportunity to know, test, or rebut the allegations.

I put you on notice that I require full particulars of any such references, including dates, contents, and the nature of any allegations relied upon. If you are unable to provide them, the relevant passages must be treated as reckless invention and withdrawn.

UNSUBSTANTIATED “VICTIMS”, HISTORIC ALLEGATIONS & CRIMINAL IMPLICATIONS

The Report’s allusions to “victims”, unnamed witnesses, or historic allegations are particularly egregious.

To be explicit:

- I have never been accused, charged, or convicted of any offence relating to domestic violence, sexual violence, physical violence, financial impropriety, or abuse in any jurisdiction.
- I am myself a survivor of domestic abuse, and I have never raised my hand in violence against a partner or family member.
- Any references in or underlying your Report to events said to have occurred 15+ years ago are, so far as I am aware, based on untrue, hostile, or distorted accounts, never tested in any court and never resulting in any criminal proceedings against me.
- The Report’s framing invites the reader to believe there exists a pattern of serious offending or complaints against me. That suggestion is categorically false.

Accordingly:

- Any wording implying that there are multiple “victims” of my conduct, or that I present any risk of domestic or similar abuse, is defamatory in its gravest form.
- The failure to particularise these allegations, or to distinguish verified facts from hearsay apparently channelled through your client or his associates, is reckless and unreasonable.
- The reliance on historic, untested, third-hand assertions—if sourced from your client or his circle—without independent verification, is a serious departure from the standards of any competent investigative or intelligence practice.

I require you to treat as withdrawn any insinuation that I have a record or pattern of domestic abuse, coercive control, or comparable criminality. No such pattern or history exists.

MISUSE OF PRIVATE INFORMATION & DATA PROTECTION BREACHES

The Report contains, reproduces, or infers:

- historic addresses;
- family references;
- employment and association history;
- sensitive background material;
- data plainly sourced from non-public records or prior confidential contexts.

The collation and circulation of this material exceeds any legitimate interest, is disproportionate to the stated purpose, and has foreseeably enabled harassment and doxxing.

This engages and appears to breach:

- UK GDPR Articles 5(1)(a), (b), (c), and (d) (lawfulness, fairness, purpose limitation, data minimisation, and accuracy);
- Data Protection Act 2018, including potential offences relating to unlawful obtaining and disclosure of personal data.

You and Satori Intelligence Ltd are data controllers (and/or processors) in respect of this activity and are fully responsible for complying with these obligations.

SOURCE OF INFORMATION & LACK OF INDEPENDENCE

I am aware that you, Elizabeth Dubois, Andrzej Czapiewski, and Mr Reiners attended Cambridge University, and previous relationships exist between you. This prior relationship was not disclosed in the Report, which purports to be an independent "intelligence" assessment.

This pre-existing personal connection:

- Negates any claim to objectivity or independence
- Suggests the Report was commissioned in bad faith as retaliation
- Transforms what purports to be due diligence into a coordinated defamation campaign
- Raises serious questions about whether this was genuine investigative work or partisan advocacy designed to order

The failure to disclose this material conflict of interest demonstrates the Report cannot be relied upon as objective analysis.

The structure and content of the Report strongly suggest that:

- it relies heavily, if not predominantly, on information and narrative provided by Mr Reiners himself and his associates;
- it adopts your client's position without impartial testing;
- personal familiarity, professional affinity, or overlapping networks appear to have been allowed to compromise independence and objectivity.

If true, this further undermines any claim that the Report represents balanced due diligence. Instead, it reads as a partisan advocacy document designed to discredit a critic and potential witness.

You are hereby required to identify:

- the categories of sources relied upon;
- the steps taken (if any) to verify allegations about me;
- whether your client, or persons closely associated with him, supplied or "validated" the personal and historical material used.

Any litigation would require full disclosure of:

- The communications between yourself, Andrzej Czapiewski, and Mr Reiners showing coordination of this campaign;

- Your shared Cambridge history and ongoing relationship;
- Payment records and instructions received from Mr Reiners;
- All sources consulted (which I believe were predominantly or exclusively Mr Reiners himself).

Given the apparent bad faith nature of this engagement, we will seek disclosure of all correspondence between Satori Intelligence, Andrzej Czapiewski, and Mr Reiners from first contact to present.

PURPOSE AND INTENDED EFFECT OF THE REPORT

The overall structure, tone, and selective presentation of material in the Report demonstrate that it was not created for genuine due-diligence or risk-assessment purposes. Its function is plainly to apply reputational and psychological pressure on me so that I retract or delete a lawful article published under the First Amendment to the US Constitution concerning allegations against your client.

The timing—immediately following publication of those allegations—and the absence of any balanced assessment make clear that the Report was commissioned and disseminated to silence lawful reporting and to discredit me as a journalist and potential witness in matters that may later be the subject of criminal proceedings.

In consequence, the Report forms part of a wider pattern of intimidation and harassment designed to deter publication of truthful information and to damage my credibility in advance of any investigation into your client. This intention further aggravates the seriousness of the defamation and misuse of private information described above.

LEGAL BASIS

The causes of action I intend to rely upon include (without limitation):

- Defamation (Libel) — Defamation Act 2013 (serious harm; absence of valid defence).
- Misuse of Private Information — wrongful obtaining, retention, and dissemination of private and personal data.

- Data Protection Act 2018 / UK GDPR — unlawful processing and disclosure of personal data.
- Harassment — Protection from Harassment Act 1997, in combination with your Report’s role in enabling a course of conduct which a reasonable person would consider oppressive and unacceptable.

The inclusion of pseudo-psychological analysis, anonymous “victims,” and excessive personal data aggravates the seriousness of these wrongs.

ANTICIPATED FURTHER HARASSMENT AND IMPERSONATION

I have credible reason to believe that your client, Mr Reiners, or persons acting with his knowledge, are preparing additional defamatory material and fabricated statements attributed to fictitious or misrepresented witnesses.

Any such publication would constitute a continuing course of harassment and malicious falsehood, aggravating the damage already caused by the Report. It would also amount to impersonation and fraud in the use of my name, likeness, or personal identifiers.

You are therefore put on notice that any repetition or republication will be treated as deliberate aggravation of the existing defamation and as evidence of malice for the purposes of exemplary damages.

DIVERSIONARY PURPOSE AND INTIMIDATION OF THIRD PARTIES

It is further evident that the Report and subsequent communications form part of a deliberate effort to divert public and institutional attention from serious allegations made by several other individuals against Mr Reiners. I am not the originator of those allegations; my role has been limited to lawful reporting of matters already raised by others and my own experience, shielded by the First Amendment to the US Constitution.

Your client’s conduct—targeting me rather than addressing the underlying complaints—serves to obscure those existing claims and to intimidate or silence the people who first brought them forward. Several of those individuals have described being contacted, pressured, or threatened

following publication of their statements, behaviour which compounds the appearance that the present campaign is a retaliatory and obstructive act, not a good-faith exercise of free expression.

This misuse of process to attack a reporter and to deter witnesses aggravates the seriousness of the harassment and strengthens the inference of malice in both the Report and any related publications.

REQUIRED ACTIONS (WITHIN 7 DAYS)

Given the ongoing nature of the harassment campaign enabled by your Report, immediate action is required. This deadline reflects the urgency of preventing further harm, not any desire to deny you opportunity to respond.

You are hereby required, within seven (7) days of receipt of this letter, to:

1. Withdraw and permanently delete the Report dated on or about 7 November 2025 and any derivative or accompanying materials from all systems under your control.
2. Cease and desist from any further publication, circulation, or reference to the Report or its allegations.
3. Provide a full list of all recipients (individuals and organisations) to whom the Report, or any part of it, has been sent or shown.
4. Confirm the data sources used in compiling the Report, including whether any criminal-record or similar sensitive checks were carried out without lawful basis.
5. Issue a written undertaking:
 - a. not to republish the Report or any similar defamatory statements about me;
 - b. not to engage in further processing or disclosure of my personal data beyond what is strictly required by law.
6. Propose terms for a public correction and apology, to be agreed with me, which:
 - a. acknowledges the Report's inaccuracies and excess;

- b. confirms my lawful ownership of The Restorationist and its domains;
- c. withdraws any suggestion that I am suffering from mental illness or engaged in a baseless smear campaign.

Written confirmation of full compliance should be sent to acamerondev@protonmail.com no later than 15 NOVEMBER 2025.

CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE

If you fail to respond in full within 7 days, I will, without further notice:

- Instruct solicitors to issue proceedings in the High Court of Justice (Media and Communications List) seeking:
 - damages (including aggravated damages);
 - an injunction to restrain further publication;
 - orders for delivery up / deletion;
 - costs on the indemnity basis.
- Lodge a formal complaint with the Information Commissioner's Office concerning unlawful data processing, and other bodies.

Provide relevant material to law-enforcement authorities regarding any potential offences arising from the creation, use, and distribution of the Report in the course of the harassment and doxxing campaign.

LITIGATION INTENTION, RELIEF, AND IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

If you do not comply in full with the demands set out in this letter within seven (7) days, I will instruct specialist solicitors to issue court proceedings in the appropriate jurisdiction(s). Those proceedings will seek:

1. Full compensatory, aggravated and, if appropriate, exemplary damages for libel and misuse of private information;
2. Declaratory relief and interim and final injunctions restraining further publication, republication, or dissemination of the Report and any related material;
3. Orders for delivery up, deletion and eradication of all copies and derivatives held by you, your client, and third parties;
4. Specific disclosure orders (including Norwich Pharmacal / third-party disclosure applications) to compel identification of persons, organisations, and accounts that assisted in the preparation, circulation or republication of defamatory or private material;
5. Preservation orders and asset-freezing relief (where appropriate) and applications for immediate relief to protect evidence (including search and seizure relief where the strict legal tests are met); and
6. Recovery of my full legal costs on an indemnity basis and any ancillary relief necessary to vindicate my rights.

I will pursue these remedies vigorously against all persons and entities involved, wherever they may be located, and will enforce any judgment or order obtained in any relevant jurisdiction. Any subsequent republication or further dissemination of defamatory or private material will be relied upon as aggravation of the claim and as evidence of malice.

DISCLOSURE AND MULTI-PARTY PROCEEDINGS

Litigation will require you to disclose under court order:

1. All persons involved in preparing, funding, or disseminating the Report: including employees, contractors, third party vendors, [REDACTED], and others;
2. All communications with Mr Reiners and his associates, including their published and true identities;
3. All recipients of the Report;

4. Your prior personal and professional relationships with Mr Reiners and Mr Czapiewski, including your shared time at Cambridge University and any subsequent connections

I will seek Norwich Pharmacal orders to identify anonymous participants in the subsequent harassment campaign. All identified parties will be joined as co-defendants on conspiracy grounds, with joint and several liability for damages and costs.

Any coordination with other defendants or destruction of evidence will be treated as contempt of court.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE HELD (NOT ENCLOSED)

I hold extensive primary evidence substantiating every material fact stated above. For the avoidance of doubt, the following categories of evidence exist and are preserved in their original digital form. Copies will be produced to the Court or to properly instructed legal representatives under appropriate confidentiality undertakings.

- A. Original Article and Publication Records – full digital archives of The Restorationist article dated 31 October 2025, together with server logs, metadata, and screenshots demonstrating time, authorship, and absence of alteration.
- B. Source Allegations and Witness Statements – contemporaneous communications and declarations from at least four separate women describing their experiences with Mr Reiners. These statements pre-date my publication and show that I was reporting existing complaints, not originating them.
- C. Police Correspondence and Case References – email confirmations and reference numbers from Hampshire & Isle of Wight Police evidencing lawful referral of those complaints and cooperation from affected parties.
- D. Harassment and Intimidation Records – messages, emails, and social-media posts sent by or on behalf of Mr Reiners after publication, including threats, false accusations, and attempts to coerce deletion of the article. Metadata confirms their origin and timing.

- E. Evidence of Impersonation and Domain Fraud – screenshots, registrar data, and WHOIS records showing registration or attempted registration of deceptive domains (including azcameron.co.uk) intended to impersonate or discredit me.
- F. Evidence of Dissemination and Malicious Coordination – logs of group-chat and social-media activity linking your client to coordinated campaigns to spread defamatory material and contact third parties named in the article.
- G. Internal Server and Platform Data – audit logs from restorationist.org.uk and associated services proving sole ownership and administrative control since May 2025.
- H. Evidence of False Statements Concerning Criminal Conduct – copies of passages and transcripts from the “investigative report” and related communications falsely suggesting criminal, violent, or abusive behaviour by me, none of which have ever been alleged, charged, or proven in any jurisdiction.
- I. Proof of Harm and Distress – records of professional, financial, and emotional harm arising from the dissemination of false material, including corroborating correspondence from colleagues and professional bodies.

All items above are retained with full metadata and checksum verification to ensure evidential integrity. They will be disclosed under the supervision of counsel or upon formal direction of the Court.

CONFIDENTIAL HANDLING OF EVIDENCE

Given the demonstrably hostile conduct of your client and the risk of further dissemination, no underlying exhibits are enclosed with this correspondence. Evidence referenced herein will be provided only through counsel or by court order, under express conditions restricting use to the purpose of resolving this dispute. Any unauthorised sharing, publication, or disclosure of such materials will be treated as a further act of harassment and as misuse of private information.

RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

For the avoidance of doubt, documentary and digital evidence substantiating each of the matters set out above is held securely. These materials will be produced to the Court or to your firm upon

receipt of written undertakings limiting their use to the resolution of this dispute. No consent is granted for circulation, publication, or sharing of any such material outside of those terms.

This letter is sent in compliance with the Pre-Action Protocol for Media and Communications Claims. It is not exhaustive of all complaints or evidence and does not waive any rights or remedies available to me in any jurisdiction.

All rights are expressly reserved.

Yours Sincerely,

Alexander Cameron

Alex Cameron/Coppen