Law Office of R. Wyn Young, Esq.
(Ohio Bar #0064876)
1421 Lexington Ave. #180, Mansfield, OH 44907
Phone: (513) 238~2821
Email: *rwynyoung25@gmail.com*
LinkedIn: *www.linkedin.com/in/rwynyoung*

October 14, 2026

Via Email
Joshua W. Wolfshohl, Esq.
PORTER HEDGES LLP
1000 Main Street, 36th Floor
Houston, TX 77002-6341
jsolfshohl@porterhedges.com

Re: ***In re Robert Wyn Young, Reporting Attorney***
Richland County, Ohio, Common Pleas Court Case No. 2026 CV 0685
Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382,
of Treason Against the United States

Dear Attorney Wolfshohl:

I am writing in response to your Certified letter regarding the above~referenced matter dated September 29, 2026 (received by the undersigned on October 7, 2026), demanding, on behalf of Chapter 7 Trustee Christopher R. Murray, that the undersigned voluntarily dismiss the undersigned's federally~mandated report of treason (i.e., the Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States) which identifies Mr. Murray as a likely co~conspirator in the two~part and treasonous Sandy Hook conspiracy against the United States.

You apparently assert three (3) grounds supporting your demand for the voluntary dismissal of a report of treason.

First, you assert at Page 1 of your letter that: "Your allegations against the Trustee, parties in the Bankruptcy Case, and members of the federal judiciary are false and defamatory."

You fail to identify any false statement of fact contained in the 161~page Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States ["Misprision Report (written)"] or in the 56~page, 95 paragraph Affidavit of Reporting Attorney attached to and supporting same.

Further, submission of a federally~mandated report of treason to a statutorily~designated recipient of same (namely, Judge Brent N. Robinson of the Richland County, Ohio, Common

Pleas Court), in accordance with the terms of 18 U.S.C. § 2382, likely does **not** qualify as "publication" for purposes of alleged defamation, ***nor*** does the notice the undersigned was forced and duty~bound to send to the Interested Persons and Organizations (i.e., likely co~conspirators), including Christopher R. Murray. See attached October 14, 2026, Reporting Attorney's Response to Motion to Dismiss Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report of Treason Against the United States. Moreover, a reporter of treason is or should be entitled to immunity from defamation claims by those identified as likely co~conspirators, particularly because 18 U.S.C. § 2382 imposes a fine and/or seven (7) years of imprisonment for concealment and non~disclosure of any known treason against the United States.

Finally in this regard, in the unlikely event immunity under 18 U.S.C. § 2382 would not apply, you and/or Trustee Murray will have a difficult time proving negligence on my part, let alone any higher and properly~applicable standard of culpability for defamation, (1) given that my report of treason is fully~substantiated with and by court filings and legally~operative email communications and (2) given that my two~part public case, asserting Sandy Hook to be a two~part and **treasonous** conspiracy, has been endorsed (expressly or tacitly) by five (5) other attorneys, four (4) of whom are members of the Bar of the Court. See Misprision Report (written).

Second, you assert at Page 1 of your letter that: "The *Barton* Doctrine Bars the Miscellaneous Action", and you further state: You did not seek or obtain leave of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas before filing the Miscellaneous Action against the Trustee."

In support of this position, you cite *Barton v. Barbour*, 104 U.S. 126 (1881), which held: "The rule that a receiver cannot be sued without leave of the court of equity which appointed him applies to **suit against him** on a **money demand** or **for damages**, as well as to those the object of which is to **recover property** which he holds by order of that court." *Id.* at ¶ 1 of the Syllabus. [Emphasis added.] The progeny cases you cite, *Anderson*, *Villegas*, and *Carroll*, all support this same position.

The undersigned Reporting Attorney has not brought suit against Trustee Murray and has not asserted any claim against him for recovery of damages or for injunctive relief. The undersigned has named Trustee Murray as a likely co~conspirator in a treasonous conspiracy against the United States (i.e., Sandy Hook) in a federally~mandated 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason styled as a "Miscellaneous Action to Make Mandatory Report, Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 2382, of Treason Against the United States". The 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report is **not** a complaint or suit, and the *Barton* doctrine is **inapposite**.

Please do let me know if you ever find a case holding that a reporter of treason, though facing a fine and seven (7) years of imprisonment for noncompliance with 18 U.S.C. § 2382, **must first** obtain leave from a Bankruptcy Court before naming a bankruptcy trustee as a **likely co~conspirator** in a **treasonous conspiracy** against the United States.

Third, you assert at Page 2 of your letter that: "the same allegations and issues … have already been adjudicated against you by both the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of Texas and the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas."

Your assertion is patently false. Judge Lopez denied my intervention in Case No. 22-33553, and Judge Rosenthal affirmed the denial of intervention in Case. No. 4:25-cv-02057. What doctrine supposedly bars my alleged "re~litigation" of "the same allegations and issues" ?? Res judicata ?? Collateral estoppel ?? **Neither** of these doctrines applies to bar my 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report, as I was **never a party** to the bankruptcy case, and my allegations were **not fully or even partially adjudicated**, because my **intervention** in Case No. 22-33553 **was denied**. Neither res judicata, nor collateral estoppel, nor "any other theoretical bar" prevents alleged "re~litigation" of claims by one who was denied intervention in the original action. See *Jones v. Caddo Parish School Board*, 704 F.2d 206, 217 (5th Cir. 1983), and *Hopwood v. State of Tex.*, 78 F.3d 932, FN 62 (5th Cir. 1996).

The grounds you assert for the demand that I voluntarily "dismiss" a federally~mandated 18 U.S.C. § 2382 report of treason are **baseless**. Further, a reporter of treason likely doesn't even have the power or option to voluntarily dismiss or retract a submitted report of treason (which I would **not** do in any event). Your legally baseless arguments are **interposed in bad faith**, at the very least; and I will seek to have them deemed as such if ever presented in any filing against me.

Regards,

Wyn

R. Wyn Young, Esq.

RWY
Attachment