

FRAUDULENT USPS RETURNED MAIL FILINGS IN SYNTHETIC MCRO RECORDS

I. SUMMARY

Fraudulent “Returned Mail” docket entries were inserted into synthetic court case files to feign due process (i.e. to show that mailed notices to defendants were sent back undelivered). A forensic review of these entries reveals clear patterns of duplication and fabrication. Numerous cases share identical returned-mail envelope scans and even the same mailing addresses, indicating the evidence was recycled across different fake defendants. These anomalies serve as a proof point that the court records were systematically forged rather than genuine.

II. DUPLICATE RETURNED MAIL IMAGES

A | Reused Envelope Scans

14 distinct returned-mail scans were duplicated across multiple filings, appearing a combined 40 times in the dataset. In other words, the same USPS “Returned Mail” image was reused in dozens of separate court filings instead of each case having a unique mail piece.

B | Cross-Case Hash Matches

These 14 scan images span at least 8 different defendants’ cases, as indicated by identical SHA-256 hash values repeating across those names. Such hash duplicates are a digital fingerprint proving the *exact same* content was uploaded multiple times in what should be unrelated records.

C | Extreme Example – 6× Reuse

One returned envelope image (SHA-256 hash 7692d2f491e4...bcda02b2) was used six times across filings for the purported defendant “Makis Devell Lane” – including slight name variants like “Makis Devil Lane” and “Makis Duvell Lane”. This single image’s reuse in half a dozen different docket entries underscores the deliberate replication of evidence under different aliases (all ostensibly the same person).

III. SUSPICIOUS ADDRESS CLUSTERS

A | 740 E 17th Address (32 filings)

There are 32 returned-mail entries that all list the mailing address “740 E 17TH” (with minor formatting variations) as the destination on the envelopes. These 32 filings span five supposed defendants – not counting slight naming overlaps that appear intended to represent the same individual. It is implausible that five unrelated people’s mail would coincidentally share this exact address, pointing to a fabricated batch of entries.

B | 1010 Curry Ave Address (7 filings)

Another 7 returned-mail filings used an address at “1010 Curry” or “Currie” Avenue. These involve two different defendant names, again suggesting that a fake address was recycled to produce multiple bogus returned mail records.

C | Fabricated Mail Destinations

The repetition of identical or nearly identical addresses across numerous cases indicates the fraudsters created fake envelope labels. Rather than representing actual mailing attempts, these address clusters were likely copied-and-pasted artifacts to lend an appearance of undeliverable mail in bulk.

IV. TOTAL FILINGS AND USE OF SCANS VS. TEXT

A | Volume of Returned Mail Filings

In total, 238 “Returned Mail” docket entries were identified across the synthetic case dataset – a remarkably high number given the niche nature of returned mail in legitimate cases. This volume suggests an effort to inject false proof of mailing failures into many fake cases.

B | Implication

Many docket entries noted “Returned Mail” without providing any envelope image evidence, further indicating these were programmatically generated events. The use of dummy files or text-only records in lieu of real postal scans highlights the synthetic nature of the operation – the forgers sometimes didn’t even bother to attach a fake image for every fake entry.

V. CONCLUSION

The patterns above provide strong, metadata-grounded evidence that the USPS “Returned Mail” filings were systematically falsified as part of the broader court document forgery scheme. Identical SHA-256 hashes appearing across different case files, repeated use of the same mailing addresses in unrelated cases, and the presence of placeholder entries all reveal a coordinated effort to fabricate due process records. In a legitimate context, each returned mail would be a unique event; here, the digital fingerprints prove that the same few images and addresses were copied across dozens of files. This conclusively ties the returned-mail fraud to the larger pattern of document forgery, showing that purported mail delivery failures were concocted en masse to bolster the fake case narrative.

A | Sources

<https://link.storjshare.io/s/jxhrc32fcyzwupkfufv5rx6zjklq/evidence/USPS-Mail-Fraud/>

<https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jx74g3buiw3c7e2fxvpjm7pputea/evidence/USPS-Mail-Fraud.zip>

<https://link.storjshare.io/s/jwmw6bwov7xep1ln53p67n3zogmq/evidence/SHA-256/>

<https://link.storjshare.io/raw/jue66sduck57rknick6am45yegwa/evidence/SHA-256.zip>

<https://link.storjshare.io/s/ju3mf5uvdrmcbbhch5ga3koduwp4q/evidence>