AMANDA MORSE DIRECT COMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC-SAFE EXHIBIT PACKET | CONTACT | THERAPY | MEDICAL ACCESS | COMMUNICATION TONE

This packet collects sixteen sender-authenticated Gmail reply sequences relevant to implementation of parent-child contact, therapy logistics, medical participation, child-as-gatekeeper language, and the tone of adult communications. It is a public-accountability derivative, not a court finding.

METHOD AND FAIRNESS CONTROLS

Only Ms. Morse's top-level reply text is reproduced, except where multiple replies are necessary to prevent a misleading fragment. Each exhibit includes a neutral summary of the message that preceded it. Where Justin used pointed or insulting language, that reciprocal context is expressly disclosed. The native Gmail messages and full threads remain controlling.

WHAT THE PACKET PROVES

The packet proves the content, date, sender, and thread association of the extracted replies as preserved in Gmail. It does not prove the truth of every accusation, who caused a child's reported feelings, whether an order was violated, or whether any conduct amounted to contempt.

PUBLIC-SAFETY TREATMENT

The child's name, private telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location, direct minor quotations, and other identifying details are omitted. No reader is asked to contact or pressure any private person.

EXHIBIT INDEX

Ex.	Date	Headline
01	March 2, 2026	Daily contact placed at the child's discretion; implementation requests called "ridiculous emails"
02	March 9, 2026	In-person contact would not occur until Ms. Morse saw proof of compliance
03	March 15, 2026	Telephone contact framed as available only "if he chooses"
04	April 23-24, 2026	The "sole gatekeeper" position stated in writing
05	April 25, 2026, 5:42 p.m. ET	In-person contact described as the child's decision; ordinary email threatened with PFA reporting
06	June 26, 2026	Disputed dangerous-driving accusation and personal admonition
07	June 27, 2026	Dental-provider concern attributed to the father's possible attendance
08	June 28, 2026	Holiday request answered only with the child's stated refusal
09	July 12, 2026	Categorical denial of exposure; "I cannot force him to reply"
10	July 12, 2026	The complete "I don't care" / "if it is directly about the child, I care" exchange
11	July 13, 2026	No in-person progression because Ms. Morse had seen no proof of paragraphs 1-3 compliance
12	July 24, 2026	Direct clinical participation declined as unnecessary
13	July 29, 2026, 12:27 a.m. ET	Medical appointment attendance prohibited by Ms. Morse's stated PFA interpretation
14	August 1-2, 2026	"Ramblings," "tantrums," and "look in the mirror" in a child-contact exchange
15	August 4, 2026	Medical-office dispute: denial of involvement followed by "grow up" and shame language
16	August 8, 2026	No affirmative contact role accepted; reciprocal blame and personal "path in life" language

EXHIBIT 01 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Daily contact placed at the child's discretion; implementation requests called "ridiculous emails"

Date	March 2, 2026
Thread subject	Daily Electronic Contact - Documented Attempts
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19caffbdf4137829
Issue lanes	contact, child gatekeeper, communication tone

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

He has the one phone number that you have. He has no video platforms. If he is not messaging you back, it's because he does not want to. He's almost 16 years old, I am not going to dictate his time. This communication is at his discretion and what he is comfortable with. Please stop bombarding me with ridiculous emails.

Thanks,
Amanda

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed a dated list of unanswered text, photo, and call attempts and a request for an approved number, platform, and reasonable daily time window under the February 11 order.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records a written child-discretion position and the response to a logistics-focused request. It does not establish why the child did not respond or whether any particular facilitation measure was legally required.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message in the account of Justin Tahai; sender-authenticated Gmail metadata; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 02 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

In-person contact would not occur until Ms. Morse saw proof of compliance

Date	March 9, 2026
Thread subject	Scheduling Initial In-Person Contact
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19cd50307c2db9a1
Issue lanes	contact, compliance filter

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

> I have seen no proof of the things you were supposed to have done before an in person visit. Therefore, one will not take place until I do.

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed a request to identify a workable date and time before the stated March 13 contact deadline, with an offer to coordinate through the reunification therapist.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records that contact was being conditioned on Ms. Morse's receipt or review of proof. It does not decide whether the conditions had been satisfied or who had authority to determine compliance.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 03 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Telephone contact framed as available only "if he chooses"

Date	March 15, 2026
Thread subject	Contact and Visit Coordination
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19cf200cb4daff11
Issue lanes	contact, child gatekeeper

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

> You can text or call him anytime today, if he chooses to speak with you.

THREAD CONTEXT

The statement was sent during an active dispute over how the February 11 order's daily electronic contact and in-person progression would be implemented.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records conditional language. It does not establish whether the child was available, willing, or being affirmatively encouraged to participate.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 04 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

The "sole gatekeeper" position stated in writing

Date	April 23-24, 2026
Thread subject	Scheduled Counseling Session / Corrective Action
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19dbd68859149236, 19dbda883e4ad412, 19dbdb01697ed0c7
Issue lanes	contact, therapy, child gatekeeper, communication tone

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

He's a rational, independent, level headed 15 year old boy who is learning how to prioritize, be responsible and make his own decisions. You have to let him.

You can ask him about this weekend all by yourself. You do not need me to mediate. If you feel that you do need me to be a buffer in your communication with [the child] then it's not time for in person contact to start. That is going to be solely his decision.

The court order plainly states that [the child] is the sole gatekeeper of any contact decisions made and their frequency. It also states that it has to be around his schedule. Whether or not you agree with it is irrelevant. Whether one event was scheduled before the other is irrelevant. The timing of his schedule change not being in a time frame that you see fits is irrelevant.

It is not my "interpretation." It is verbatim.

THREAD CONTEXT

A provider-confirmed therapy/contact session was displaced by a driver-education appointment. Justin did not object to driver education and proposed either direct weekend time or a prompt make-up session. The messages above are assembled from three replies in the same sequence.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

This is the clearest direct-writing anchor for the disputed child-as-gatekeeper interpretation. The official order controls; the exhibit does not decide whether Ms. Morse's reading was legally correct.

SOURCE

Three native Gmail messages in one thread; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 05 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

In-person contact described as the child's decision; ordinary email threatened with PFA reporting

Date	April 25, 2026, 5:42 p.m. ET
Thread subject	Continued Nonresponse and Preservation of Counseling / Contact Time
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19dc6987479b58ea
Issue lanes	contact, child gatekeeper, communication restriction, pfa

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

To reiterate, it is not a burden being put on [the child] whether or not to have in person contact. It is a decision that he is able to make and have control of on his own. If he tells me that he wants in-person contact, I will gladly assist in scheduling. He has not wanted to. I will not force him to comply until you have complied with the terms of the order needed for in person contact to begin.

I did not say timing is irrelevant, I said your idea of how time frames should be structured is irrelevant.

Lastly, I again ask that you stop emailing me unless absolutely necessary (i.e., emergencies) or I will be forced to report them with NBPD as violations of the PFA. If and when there are issues you need to be aware of, I will inform you. No other contact is necessary.

-Amanda

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed a request to preserve, replace, or make up a displaced therapy/contact opportunity and to address an individual-counseling recommendation. The native thread contains the full wording of both sides.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records both the child-control position and the threatened police/PFA response to non-emergency email. It does not decide whether any email violated a protection order.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 06 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Disputed dangerous-driving accusation and personal admonition

Date	June 26, 2026
Thread subject	Who Is Picking Up the Child?
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19f04a2cb3756f6f
Issue lanes	communication tone, transportation, disputed accusation

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

> Please stop putting not only our child's life in danger, but my younger child's life as well with your erratic driving. Control your emotions like an adult and stop endangering innocent people.

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed a short logistics message stating that the child was outside waiting for the adult who had driven him. The public record presently available for this packet does not adjudicate the driving accusation.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Proves the accusation and tone were transmitted. It does not prove the accusation true, and the page labels it as disputed and unadjudicated.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 07 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Dental-provider concern attributed to the father's possible attendance

Date	June 27, 2026
Thread subject	Dentist
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19f0a6b11c20d733
Issue lanes	medical records, child narrative

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

> [The child] decided not to switch dentistry providers. His initial concern with going was that you would show up, however he has since seen them and been comfortable.

THREAD CONTEXT

The statement was sent as a standalone update concerning dental care.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records what Ms. Morse attributed to the child. It does not establish the source, accuracy, or cause of the reported concern.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 08 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Holiday request answered only with the child's stated refusal

Date	June 28, 2026
Thread subject	July 3 Fireworks / Fourth of July Holiday
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19f0eb0d0c4369ed
Issue lanes	holiday, contact, child gatekeeper

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

[The child] has stated that he doesn't want to go.

Thanks.

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed a written holiday request seeking a clear adult answer and logistics for a July 3 fireworks outing.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records the adult response and child-choice framing. It does not establish how the question was presented, what support was offered, or why the child declined.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 09 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Categorical denial of exposure; "I cannot force him to reply"

Date	July 12, 2026
Thread subject	Demand for Immediate Implementation of Parent-Child Contact
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19f570be50dbcfc1
Issue lanes	contact, child gatekeeper, disparagement dispute

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

He is not being exposed to anything. He hasn't seen any emails, motions, etc. and we don't talk about you at all. Around him or otherwise. His contact information remains the same. I cannot force him to reply to your messages.

-Amanda

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed a demand for concrete parent-child contact and a request that the child not be exposed to adult litigation, blame narratives, or disparagement.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records a categorical denial and the stated practical limit. The email does not resolve credibility or what affirmative facilitation occurred.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 10 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

The complete "I don't care" / "if it is directly about the child, I care" exchange

Date	July 12, 2026
Thread subject	Courtesy Notice
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19f570c9cbec93bc, 19f5751c65ca26bb
Issue lanes	communication tone, public accountability context

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

Please stop sending these to me. I really don't care.

It has nothing to do with [the child]. I just don't care about your ramblings. If it is directly about [the child], I care.

THREAD CONTEXT

The first reply was to a public-article courtesy notice. The second reply expressly clarified that the statement was about the article and "ramblings," not indifference toward the child.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

The two messages must be presented together. The isolated first sentence must not be represented as an admission that Ms. Morse does not care about the child.

SOURCE

Two native Gmail messages in the same thread; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 11 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

No in-person progression because Ms. Morse had seen no proof of paragraphs 1-3 compliance

Date	July 13, 2026
Thread subject	Immediate Scheduling of In-Person Contact
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19f5cded24d43aef
Issue lanes	contact, compliance filter

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

> There has been no proof of compliance with paragraphs 1-3, therefore the in person contact hasn't moved forward...

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed a request for two specific visit dates and a written position that adults, rather than the child, should schedule and facilitate the minimum contact contemplated by the order.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records the asserted reason for non-progression. It does not decide whether compliance had occurred or whether Ms. Morse had unilateral authority to withhold progression.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 12 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Direct clinical participation declined as unnecessary

Date	July 24, 2026
Thread subject	Therapy Appointment Reminder
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19f94c81ca0e9fb3
Issue lanes	therapy, adult coordination

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

I speak with Dan periodically by phone, so he has no reason to meet with me.

Thanks,
Amanda

THREAD CONTEXT

Justin had invited Ms. Morse to participate in a clinically supervised conversation and offered to wait outside or remain out of the session if the therapist considered that appropriate.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records the stated reason for not attending. It does not establish whether the provider requested or recommended her attendance.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 13 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Medical appointment attendance prohibited by Ms. Morse's stated PFA interpretation

Date	July 29, 2026, 12:27 a.m. ET
Thread subject	August 3 Physical - Time and Location
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19fac205bc1d9123
Issue lanes	medical records, pfa, parental access

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

> The appointment is at 10:30 a.m. at the provider office. You will not be able to attend per the current PFA order.

THREAD CONTEXT

The reply followed requests for the time, location, confirmation of attendance, and direct provider listing. The provider location has been omitted from this public derivative.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records a categorical legal position. It does not decide the proper interpretation of the PFA or family order; the operative orders control.

SOURCE

Native Gmail message; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 14 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

"Ramblings," "tantrums," and "look in the mirror" in a child-contact exchange

Date	August 1-2, 2026
Thread subject	Extended-Family Visit Is Not In-Person Contact With Father
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19fbfa2ab9796a06, 19fc3604bf15b78a
Issue lanes	contact, communication tone, disparagement

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

Not for nothing, I'm not going to take parenting or maturity advice from you. Clearly it's not working.

Parenthood has nothing to do with your online ramblings. If/when you bring up an actual issue that needs addressing, it will be addressed. Your tantrums about the court system and you not getting your way, as well as your opinions about what the order should say or mean is not that.

If you want to discuss what is and is not being followed accordingly in reference to the February 11, 2026 court order, you have not followed it either. I'm following it to the best of my ability. You're not even trying. Stop emailing me unless it's actually a real life importance regarding our son.

We literally wouldn't be in this situation if it weren't for your actions towards our son. How are you turning this into being my fault and what I'm doing wrong? Look in the mirror and fix the wrongs that got us here. Apologize to [the child]. Take accountability. Focus on the counseling and understanding how he's feeling through all of your lash outs. Adjust accordingly. Leave me out of it.

THREAD CONTEXT

The exchange began with a request to make clear that time with extended family did not substitute for direct father-child contact. Justin later responded with his own pointed criticism and a long list of asserted implementation issues. The native thread contains both sides.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records personal characterizations and blame allocation. It does not decide the merits of either party's account or whether any statement was heard by the child.

SOURCE

Two native Gmail messages in the same thread; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 15 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

Medical-office dispute: denial of involvement followed by "grow up" and shame language

Date	August 4, 2026
Thread subject	Medical Office / Child in the Middle
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19fcebe5d1881416, 19fcee423200e594
Issue lanes	medical records, child narrative, communication tone, disputed accusation

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

Considering he didn't know you were planning to go until you texted him had nothing to do with me. The fact he was uncomfortable with you being there had nothing to do with me. He's allowed to have feelings and to express them. Respect that.

Once again, I said nothing to him. He read your text and called you. I HAD NOTHING TO DO WITH IT. Stop blaming me. I don't talk about you, discuss you or even mention your name. I'm not embarrassed about anything. You're the only one who should be embarrassed and ashamed of your behavior. Grow up please. See our son as the whole human being, with feeling and opinions of his own. He's not 5. You're embarrassing him, and yourself, not me. Think about him when you lash out because I could care less what you do or say, until it hurts [the child].

THREAD CONTEXT

These replies followed Justin's accusation that Ms. Morse had placed the child in the middle at a medical appointment. His messages used pointed language including "shame on you" and asserted that her embarrassment was earned. The public derivative therefore preserves the reciprocal tone context.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records Ms. Morse's denial, blame response, and personal language. It does not identify the source of the child's belief or adjudicate who caused the medical-office conflict.

SOURCE

Two native Gmail messages in the same thread; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.

EXHIBIT 16 | DIRECT COMMUNICATION

No affirmative contact role accepted; reciprocal blame and personal "path in life" language

Date	August 8, 2026
Thread subject	Nearly Six Months of Refusal to Implement
Native Gmail message ID(s)	19fe318c426123f3, 19fe31d5a44c563b, 19fe4593fef3d738
Issue lanes	contact, child gatekeeper, communication restriction, communication tone, disparagement

PUBLIC-SAFE REPLY TEXT

I wasn't aware that you had contacted him therefore I wasn't aware he hadn't replied. How exactly do you propose I keep track of this? Also, how do you propose I force him to reply? Even if I said, "Ok every day at 6:45 p.m., there will be the allowed electronic contact," how exactly do I force him to reply to a text or answer the phone? ... Please stop blaming me for the problems you've caused. I've had enough of the disrespect from you.

Again, I will give you the necessary information according to the current court order solely pertaining to [the child]'s well being or any emergencies. No other contact between you and I is necessary at this time.

So you're saying it's my responsibility to make him aware of the love and safety he is supposed to feel toward you? You are his father. It is your responsibility to not make him question that. Had he not been made to feel unsafe or unloved in your presence, we wouldn't be here. No?

So stop obstructing it and leave me alone. Problem solved. I'm done. Don't email me again. Especially this late at night. Some of us are adults with children and jobs to be responsible for in the morning. Good thing your path in life has gotten you so far... don't mind me if I don't ask for your advice or teachings though. Thanks.

THREAD CONTEXT

The sequence followed strongly worded accusations from Justin, including "get the hell out of the way" and criticism of Ms. Morse's reading comprehension. The packet preserves that reciprocal tone context rather than presenting the replies as unprovoked.

RELEVANCE AND LIMIT

Directly records a refusal to assume the requested affirmative facilitation role, a limitation of adult-to-adult communication, blame statements, and personal language. It does not determine causation, contempt, or what the child experienced.

SOURCE

Three native Gmail messages in one thread; public-safe derivative.

Public-safety treatment: the minor is identified only as [the child]; private addresses, telephone numbers, email addresses, provider location details, direct minor quotations, and signatures are omitted. Typography and punctuation may be normalized for accessibility. This derivative proves what the sender transmitted; it does not prove motive, causation, contempt, or the truth of disputed assertions. The full native thread controls.