
Follow-Up on Arbitrator Selection – Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC (Ref #5160000821)

3 messages

Jorden Timothy <[REDACTED]>

Fri, Jul 18 at 8:41AM

To: [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

Cc: Scott, Stephen <smscott@fisherphillips.com>, Edwards, Bobbi <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>, McClintock, Cyndi <mcclintock@fisherphillips.com>

Dear [REDACTED],

I hope you're well. I'm writing to follow up regarding the arbitrator selection in **Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC et al., Ref #5160000821**. <—

As of July 2, both parties agreed to proceed with a strike-and-rank selection process under Rule 15(b), with the understanding that proposed arbitrators would possess relevant experience in artificial intelligence and emerging technologies. It has now been more than 10 business days, and no list or update has been provided.

In that time, several material developments have occurred:

- **Unsolicited Deposit:** On July 1 — the same day I notified respondents of a pending federal petition, DRVM deposited \$6,000 into my personal account without any prior communication, agreement, or documentation. This unexplained transfer has been formally submitted into the record as Exhibit 110. Despite its direct relevance to the dispute, it was entirely omitted from their subsequent Answer, which instead claims “full payment” and “good faith.”
- **Answer Submission Without Arbitrator:** On July 16, Fisher Phillips submitted an Answer on behalf of respondents, even though no arbitrator has been appointed. This raises concern not only due to the omission of the July 1 deposit but also because of the factual contradictions and general denials contained in the filing.
- **Entity Conflict & Authority Questions:** Perhaps most troubling, Fisher Phillips first filed a Notice of Appearance on April 14, 2025 — a time when DRVM LLC was still dissolved in the Oregon business registry. DRVM was not reinstated until April 25. This means that Fisher Phillips's engagement occurred during a period when DRVM had no legal capacity to operate or retain counsel, raising serious questions about who retained and instructed the firm during that period. This aligns with the broader concern that upstream entities — potentially AMJ Services, Maged, Sanofi, or others — are directing this matter behind a shell.
- **JAMS Disclosure Conflict:** As you know, JAMS itself disclosed at case initiation that DRVM and AMJ Services are interlinked for purposes of conflict and disclosure. Despite this, respondents continue to insist that DRVM is independent. Their ongoing denial, in direct contradiction of JAMS's own statements, is not just misleading — it prejudices the forum and undermines confidence in a fair proceeding.

Additionally, Fisher Phillips claims to represent only DRVM LLC — not Maged “Mike” Boutros, the CEO of both DRVM and AMJ Services. These companies share leadership, address, and business function. Their separation in this forum is artificial and obstructive. Under ORS 63.654 and ORS 63.651, a dissolved Oregon LLC cannot maintain legal proceedings until reinstated. Yet counsel filed their notice of appearance on behalf of a dissolved entity,

adding to the confusion and reinforcing the need for transparency around control and authorization.

Given the timeline and prior communications, I trust that JAMS is aware of the urgency and the implications of further delay or deviation from our agreed scope under Rule 15(b).

I respectfully request two things:

1. Clarification on Timeline: Please confirm when the Rule 15(b) strike-and-rank list will be issued.

2. Confirmation on Arbitrator Criteria: As previously agreed, all proposed arbitrators should have demonstrable experience in AI and emerging technologies. A hybrid list containing only one qualifying arbitrator would not reflect the scope or complexity of this matter, especially given the scale of the allegations and the procedural irregularities already in the record.

Should this list not reflect our agreed criteria, or if further delay and disagreements on the arbitrator continue without explanation, I will have no choice but to explore all available procedural remedies. I have deferred action thus far out of respect for this forum's process, but continued procedural maneuvering or lack of transparency will necessitate immediate escalation.

Please confirm receipt of this message and let me know when I can expect the arbitrator list. Given the nature of the case and the continued pattern of omissions and contradictions, we need formal oversight in place as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Jorden Hollingsworth
Pro Se



[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

Tue, Jul 22 at 11:56 AM

To: Jorden Timothy <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Scott, Stephen <smscott@fisherphillips.com>, Edwards, Bobbi <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>, McClintock, Cyndi <cmclintock@fisherphillips.com>

Good Morning,

Thank you for the below update and my apologies for the delayed response. JAMS is currently working on the strike list for the above matter and Parties can expect to receive it via US Mail within the next week or so. Please let me know if Parties should need anything in the meantime.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Logo



[REDACTED]

Arbitration Practice Administrator

P: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com

f in X

The future of ADR is here, and JAMS Next is leading the way with

breakthrough ideas and technologies. [Learn more](#)