

**Re: FOLLOW-UP: JAMS Case No. 5160000821 / Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC, et al. / Respondent DRVM's Notice of Appearance**

Jorden Timothy [REDACTED]

Mon, Jun 16 at 7:45 AM

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

Cc: bedwards@fisherphillips.com <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>, smscott@fisherphillips.com <smscott@fisherphillips.com>, bwelsh@fisherphillips.com <bwelsh@fisherphillips.com>, McClintock, Cyndi <cmclintock@fisherphillips.com>

Dear Amy,

Hope all is well. Today marks the tenth business day since the JAMS invoice was issued without payment from Respondents.

Although Rule 6(e) does not directly govern fee disputes, Claimant respectfully requests that JAMS appoint an arbitrator in light of Respondents' ongoing nonparticipation and failure to pay, which, under the totality of the circumstances, constitutes abandonment of the proceeding. Consistent with JAMS' authority and the Employment Arbitration Minimum Standards, Claimant asks that the case be allowed to proceed.

I respectfully submit the attached motion requesting the appointment of an arbitrator despite Respondents' failure to pay. To date, they have not paid the required fees, despite being large, resource-rich entities that drafted and enforced the arbitration agreements themselves.

To clarify, I understand Rule 6(e) does not override fee obligations under Rule 31. However, in this case, respondents have not only failed to pay, but have refused to engage whatsoever for two months. There is no dispute to resolve, only abandonment. This motion asks that an arbitrator be appointed in light of these facts to preserve the integrity of the proceeding.

I am representing myself (pro se) in a \$15 billion arbitration involving Sanofi, Deepak Chopra, and a network of shell entities tied to one of the most complex corporate fraud cases currently in arbitration. Since filing, I've made each step public and used AI to self-educate on civil procedure, corporate structuring, arbitration, and whistleblower law. What began as one person investigating his own firing evolved into exposure of systemic misconduct buried behind dissolved LLCs and false payroll stubs.

This case is not just about corporate liability, it's about who gets access to justice.

Sanofi has publicly embraced artificial intelligence in its drug development and corporate strategy. Deepak Chopra has long promoted AI as a consciousness-expanding tool and runs his own AI ventures. Both parties are deeply engaged with AI and likely using advanced tools to defend against this case.

Meanwhile, I am just one individual, using publicly available AI to research, draft, and prosecute this case. I've persisted despite 30+ firms refusing to take it, despite online censorship, and despite silence from the press, because the evidence is real, and the truth matters.

I strongly believe Dr. Ryan Abbott is uniquely qualified for this matter due to his co-authorship of the JAMS AI Guidelines and extensive expertise in artificial intelligence and arbitration.

Dr. Abbott is internationally recognized for his work on AI, law, and ethics and is a co-author of the JAMS AI Guidelines. He is uniquely suited to oversee a case where AI is not just a topic of evidence, but a foundational part of how the dispute is being fought.

While I strongly believe Dr. Abbott is ideal for this arbitration, I fully respect JAMS' discretion and welcome the

appointment of any arbitrator you believe is most qualified to fairly oversee this matter.

This is a historic opportunity, for JAMS to lead, to adapt to a new kind of dispute, and to affirm that the future of arbitration belongs to anyone willing to fight for the truth.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jorden Hollingsworth

Pro Se Claimant

JAMS Case #5160000821

**From:** [REDACTED] Thornton <[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 17, 2025 12:40 PM

**To:** Jorden Timothy <[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

**Cc:** Edwards, Bobbi <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>; Scott, Stephen <smscott@fisherphillips.com>; Welsh, Betsy <bwelsh@fisherphillips.com>; McClintock, Cyndi <cmclintock@fisherphillips.com>

**Subject:** RE: FOLLOW-UP: JAMS Case No. 5160000821 / Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC, et al. / Respondent DRVM's Notice of Appearance

Good Afternoon,

I hope everyone is doing well today. Thank you for checking in on the above matter. JAMS will be issuing its Final Request for

Respondents portion of the filing fee today via US MAIL which will again request payment for Respondents portion of the filing fee as well as alerting all Parties JAMS will close its file in 30 days absent payment. Once payment has been received JAMS can commence the case to begin the arbitrator selection process. If payment is not received, JAMS will close its file for nonpayment per California Code of Civil Procedure sections 1281.97 – 1281.99.

Please let me know if any questions, thanks!

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]



[REDACTED] Thornton

Arbitration Practice Administrator

P: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com



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

*breakthrough ideas and technologies. Learn more*

---



**From:** Edwards, Bobbi <[bedwards@fisherphillips.com](mailto:bedwards@fisherphillips.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 17, 2025 12:43 PM

**To:** [REDACTED] Thornton [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@jamsadr.com](mailto:[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com)>; Jorden Timothy [REDACTED]

**Cc:** Scott, Stephen <[smscott@fisherphillips.com](mailto:smscott@fisherphillips.com)>; Welsh, Betsy <[bwelsh@fisherphillips.com](mailto:bwelsh@fisherphillips.com)>; McClintock, Cyndi <[cmcclintock@fisherphillips.com](mailto:cmcclintock@fisherphillips.com)>

**Subject:** RE: FOLLOW-UP: JAMS Case No. 5160000821 / Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC, et al. / Respondent DRVM's Notice of Appearance

 **Caution:** This email originated from outside JAMS. Do not click on links, scan QR codes, or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. 

Hello, [REDACTED]

DRVM, LLC made a payment that was accepted by JAMS earlier today.

Kindly,

Bobbi



Bobbi J. Edwards

Counsel

Fisher & Phillips LLP

[bedwards@fisherphillips.com](mailto:bedwards@fisherphillips.com)

O: (503) 205-8062 | C: (614) 571-2825

**Re: FOLLOW-UP: JAMS Case No. 5160000821 / Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC, et al. /  
Respondent DRVM's Notice of Appearance**

---

██████████ Thornton ██████████@jamsadr.com>

Mon, Jun 23, 2025 at 1:43 PM

To: "Edwards, Bobbi" <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>, Jorden Timothy ██████████  
Cc: "Scott, Stephen" <smscott@fisherphillips.com>, "Welsh, Betsy" <bwelsh@fisherphillips.com>, "McClintock, Cyndi"  
<cmcclintock@fisherphillips.com>

Good Afternoon,

Thank you. The commencement notice is scheduled to be sent via US Mail to all today. Please let me know if you should have any questions. Thanks!

Sincerely,

██████████



██████████ Thornton

Arbitration Practice Administrator

P: ██████████

██████████@jamsadr.com



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

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

**JAMS Case No. 5160000821 / Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC, et al. / Respondent's Non-Consent to Claimant's Request for Dr. Ryan Abbott Be Appointed Arbitrator**

9 messages

**McClintock, Cyndi** <cmcclintock@fisherphillips.com>

Fri, Jun 27 at 12:04 PM

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

Cc: Scott, Stephen <smscott@fisherphillips.com>, Edwards, Bobbi <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>, McClintock, Cyndi <cmcclintock@fisherphillips.com>, Jorden Timothy [REDACTED]

Dear Ms. Thornton,

Attached is a courtesy copy of Respondent's Non-Consent to Claimant's Request for Dr. Ryan Abbott Be Appointed Arbitrator, which was filed through the JAMS Access Portal today.

A service copy is being sent by first-class mail to Claimant as well.

Thank you.

Cyndi McClintock



**Cyndi McClintock**  
Legal Secretary

Fisher & Phillips LLP  
560 S.W. Tenth Avenue | Suite 450 | Portland, OR 97205  
cmcclintock@fisherphillips.com | O: (503) 205-8067

**\*\*\*We have moved. Please note new address above.**

**Jorden Timothy** <[REDACTED]>  
To: [REDACTED] Thornton <[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

Fri, Jun 27 at 1:38 PM

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

Dear Ms. Thornton,

Please find attached my formal response to Fisher Phillips' June 27 objection regarding the nomination of Dr. Ryan Abbott, along with my request for immediate clarification of representation and funding in this arbitration.

This submission is being provided for the record and in support of a fair, transparent arbitrator selection process in accordance with JAMS rules and administrative policies.

If any additional information is needed, I am available to provide it.

Sincerely,

Jorden Hollingsworth

Claimant, Pro Se

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[Quoted text hidden]

**Response to Fisher Phillips' June 27 Objection to Arbitrator Nomination and Request for Representation Clarification.pdf**

---

**[REDACTED] Thornton** <[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

Tue, Jul 1 at 9:19 AM

To: Jorden Timothy <[REDACTED]>

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

Thank you – please post to the case docket on JAMS Access if you haven't already.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Logo



**[REDACTED] Thornton**

Arbitration Practice Administrator

P: 4-[REDACTED]

**Thornton** <[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>  
To: Jorden Timothy <[REDACTED]>

Tue, Jul 1 at 12:27 PM

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

Good Afternoon,

I hope everyone is doing well. Thank you for your most recent submissions. JAMS must follow the arbitration agreement(s) or joint stipulation(s) provided and signed by both Parties. The arbitration agreement provided for this matter reads: "If the Parties cannot agree on an arbitrator, the court can appoint one."

Please let JAMS know once Parties have mutually agreed to an arbitrator; or have all agreed to use to JAMS strike and rank process in place of mutually selecting (please note: all Parties will need to agree to use the strike and rank process); or advise once the Court has appointed an arbitrator on behalf of Parties.

Thank you and please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]



**Thornton**  
Arbitration Practice Administrator  
P: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com



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

*breakthrough ideas and technologies. Learn more*

**Jorden Timothy** [REDACTED]  
To: [REDACTED] Thornton <[REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

Tue, Jul 1 at 12:51PM

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

Dear Amy, Stephen, and all,

Thank you for the update.

I am more than willing to agree to the JAMS strike-and-rank process if the Parties can first agree on a list of arbitrators with demonstrable expertise in artificial intelligence and emerging technologies. This is not merely a preference, it is an obligation under the procedural framework that governs this matter.

This arbitration is not a conventional employment dispute. It is a systemic fraud case involving corporate concealment, shell structuring, and the ethical use of artificial intelligence by a pro se claimant as a core legal engine. AI is not incidental here, it is foundational to how this arbitration is being navigated and contested.

Under Rule 15(b) of the JAMS Employment Arbitration Rules, it is clearly stated:

"JAMS shall propose, subject to availability, only panelists approved by JAMS for evaluating disputes involving technical subject matter with appropriate background and experience. JAMS shall also provide each party with a brief description of the background and experience of each Arbitrator candidate."

This rule must be honored in this case, especially considering the level of technical reliance already documented in the record. To ensure a fair and appropriate process, any arbitrator list must include panelists with AI and related technical qualifications, in accordance with Rule 15(b).

If the respondents are unwilling to agree to a strike list containing such qualified arbitrators, I will consider the strike-and-rank process invalid in light of JAMS' own rules and the terms of the arbitration agreement. In that event, I will submit a petition to federal court after a deadline of 48 hours seeking the appointment of an arbitrator.

This filing will include exhibits and procedural documentation, which will then enter the public record under federal court rules.

I remain ready to proceed in good faith if the list reflects the actual technical nature of this case, as required by JAMS Rule 15(b).

Sincerely,

Jorden Hollingsworth

Pro Se Claimant



---

**Jorden Timothy** [REDACTED]

Tue, Jul 1 at 12:54 PM

To: Scott, Stephen <smscott@fisherphillips.com>, Edwards, Bobbi <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>, McClintock, Cyndi <cmclintock@fisherphillips.com>  
Cc: [REDACTED] Thornton [REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

Stephen,

As a follow-up to my prior message, I'll be brief:

If we can agree on a JAMS arbitrator list that includes candidates with AI and technical subject matter expertise as required by Rule 15(b), I'm fully prepared to proceed with the strike-and-rank process.

If not, I will petition federal court for arbitrator appointment after a deadline of 48 hours. That petition will include exhibits, evidence, and procedural history, all of which will become part of the public docket.

I'm offering this window as a good faith opportunity to resolve selection cooperatively. Let me know if you're willing to proceed with a list that complies with JAMS policy and the technical nature of this case.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

**Jorden Timothy** [REDACTED]

Tue, Jul 1 at 4:39 PM

To: Scott, Stephen <smscott@fisherphillips.com>, Edwards, Bobbi <bedwards@fisherphillips.com>, McClintock, Cyndi <cmclintock@fisherphillips.com>, [REDACTED] Thornton [REDACTED]@jamsadr.com>

Dear Amy, Stephen, and all,

I am formally notifying the parties that I am submitting a Notice of Unsolicited Payment by DRVM LLC to the case docket today, July 1, 2025.

This filing documents a \$6,130.10 deposit made directly into my personal bank account by DRVM LLC, the same entity that has been presented as the sole respondent participating in arbitration, despite overwhelming evidence of upstream control and concealment. The timing of this unsolicited deposit, occurring within the 48-hour window I previously outlined before filing a federal petition to appoint an arbitrator, raises significant legal, ethical, and procedural concerns.

This notice has been entered into the record not as an acceptance of any terms, but to ensure full transparency and preserve the evidentiary integrity of these proceedings. As detailed in the document, this action appears inconsistent with prior conduct, off-record discussions, and the arbitration framework currently in place.

I remain willing to resolve arbitrator selection through JAMS strike-and-rank, but only if the list complies with Rule 15(b), requiring appropriate technical background given the central role of artificial intelligence in this arbitration. Absent agreement on such a list within the remaining window, I will proceed with a federal court petition to assign an arbitrator, at which point this matter and all supporting evidence will enter the public record.

Respectfully,

[Quoted text hidden]

CLAIMANT'S NOTICE OF UNSOLICITED PAYMENT FROM RESPONDENT DRVM LLC.pdf, Exhibit 110 - Undisclosed DRVM Deposit July 1st, 2025.pdf