This lawsuit was originally filed on October 13, 2023, in the United States District Court for the Western District of Michigan (hereinafter "MIWD") as case no. 1:23-cv-01097. On October 25, 2024, MIWD transferred this lawsuit as ordered in ECF 127 to the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee (hereinafter "TNMD") as case no. 3:24-cv-01282. The language used in the file stamps of each page filed is slightly different between the two courts. MIWD uses the term "ECF No." (which I abbreviate as "ECF"), while in place of that, TNMD uses the term "Document" (which I abbreviate as "DOC"). Both courts use the term "PageID" (which I abbreviate as "PID"). Citations to the court record in this lawsuit will be notated without the case name or number, using the starting DOC/ECF number, followed by both the beginning and ending PID. The Notice of Electronic Filing for this transfer is recorded in TNMD DOC 131, at which point the DOC/ECF number from MIWD was retained and continued, but the PID was reset after DOC 130, PID 5727, to restart at zero.

Because this lawsuit was transferred from MIWD to TNMD on October 25, 2024, all filings up to that point (ECF 1-130, PID 1-5727) were transferred between courts using the same ECF/DOC numbers and PID ranges, with the only difference being the COURT-SPECIFIC ELECTRONIC FILE STAMPS on the HEADERS (MIWD) and FOOTERS (TNMD) of each page.

Since nothing in this docket was REDACTED or SEALED by the court prior to the transfer, I was able to purchase every document filed in this lawsuit up to that point (ECF 1-130, PID 1-5727) from PACER.

To provide a complete court record for TNMD while minimizing confusion, I SUBSTITUTED documents in ECF 1-130, PID 1-5727 that were REDACTED or SEALED (in their entirety) by TNMD with the corresponding documents from the MIWD docket. To clearly SPECIFY which documents I substituted, I appended **"_miwd"** to the end of the file names. (This was only done with documents specific to my MISCONDUCT COMPLAINTS.)

I also applied BLACK word-level or line-level REDACTIONS to some documents AFTER they were filed with the court (hereinafter referred to as "REDACTED AFTER FILING"), in response to some of the defendants' concerns, to protect their privacy without needing to redact or seal any full page or document in this lawsuit. In those instances, I appended **"_rd"** to the end of the file names to designate which files I manually added REDACTIONS AFTER FILING. (This was also only done with documents specific to these MISCONDUCT COMPLAINTS.)

These redactions were an AFTERTHOUGHT but were executed out of an ABUNDANCE OF CAUTION for the defendants' benefit.

My website now contains a mixture of use cases, since the defendants' concerns were first voiced by the UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE for the WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN in MIWD ECF 131, PID 5728-5729 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/131.pdf), filed on October 25, 2024, immediately AFTER this lawsuit was transferred from MIWD to TNMD.

Shortly afterward (approximately a year ago), I invested HUNDREDS OF HOURS performing WORD-LEVEL and LINE-LEVEL REDACTIONS to files throughout my website that I had already filed with the court and purchased through PACER (REDACTED AFTER FILING), to protect the defendants' stated concerns, despite this information being PUBLICLY AVAILABLE from multiple sources online. While doing so, I did NOT include the appended designators **"_miwd"** or **"_rd"** mentioned above, since my goal then was only to CONCEAL the HOME ADDRESSES of the individual defendants, and specifically the HOME ADDRESS of defendant WALKER. (These "REDACTED AFTER FILING" word-level and line-level redactions were applied using BLACK ink, making them clearly visible; hence, I wasn't aware of any need at that time for providing additional information by appending designators or "FLAGS" to the file name.)

> I submitted these "REDACTED AFTER FILING" documents to MIWD for refiling in MIWD ECF 139-1 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/139-1.pdf) and 139-2 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/139-2.pdf).
>
> MIWD MAGISTRATE JUDGE RAY KENT rejected my request in MIWD ECF 139: https://rico.fentonvstory.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/139.pdf.
>
> I resubmitted these "REDACTED AFTER FILING" documents to MIWD in ECF 141-1 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/141-1.pdf) for consideration by DISTRICT JUDGE PAUL L. MALONEY, along with a FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT OF ACCESS: OBJECTION, MOTION, AND DECLARATION FOR DISTRICT JUDGE PAUL L. MALONEY TO CORRECT & MINIMIZE OR REMOVE REDACTIONS.
>
> MIWD DISTRICT JUDGE PAUL L. MALONEY rejected both of my requests in MIWD ECF 141: https://rico.fentonvstory.com/1-23-cv-01097/ecf/141.pdf.
>
> I also submitted these "REDACTED AFTER FILING" documents to TNMD for refiling in TNMD DOC 211 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/211.pdf), 212 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/212.pdf), 212-1 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/212-1.pdf), and 212-2 (https://rico.fentonvstory.com/3-24-cv-01282/doc/212-2.pdf), none of which were ever heard or addressed by the court.

NOTE: I specify "MIWD ECF" for MIWD docket entries between ECF 131-142 because those docket entries are NOT the same in both MIWD and TNMD dockets. This lawsuit began transferring in ECF 127 (in both court dockets) and was completed in TNMD ECF 131. At the time of the transfer, all docket entries (ECF 1-127) were IDENTICAL, with the only difference being the COURT-SPECIFIC ELECTRONIC FILE STAMPS on the HEADERS (MIWD) and FOOTERS (TNMD) of each page.