

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

Case: Jorden Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC, et al.

JAMS Ref No.: 5160000821

Dear Ms. Thornton,

This letter responds to Fisher Phillips' June 27 objection to the appointment of Dr. Ryan Abbott as arbitrator.

Let me be absolutely clear: **this is not a simple Oregon wage dispute, and any attempt to frame it as such misrepresents** the procedural history, the corporate structuring, and the fraudulent conduct that has now come to light.

This letter not only responds to Fisher Phillips' objection but places on record the broader procedural concerns that have emerged in this arbitration. While Respondents seek to minimize the nature of this case, the facts, structure, and procedural history demand a transparent and

appropriately informed arbitrator. **The objections raised by Fisher Phillips require a full response**, not only to preserve fairness but to protect the institutional integrity of JAMS.

This Case Is Not “Uncomplicated”

This matter began with a local Oregon payroll issue. But what followed, and is now firmly documented, includes:

- **The discovery of a nationwide fraudulent employment scheme, anchored by a Nevada-based shell company (DRVM LLC) that has since been dissolved in Oregon, yet is being used by all respondents to avoid transparency. Multiple business entities tied to respondents were reinstated or reactivated during arbitration, suggesting reactive concealment behavior.**
- **The entire employment arrangement was fabricated, not just wage issues. From onboarding to benefits to classification, the employment was misrepresented at every level.**
- **GRSM LLP previously represented DRVM, then withdrew without disclosing who authorized the withdrawal. Fisher Phillips now claims to represent DRVM, but partner Stephen Scott previously denied awareness of GRSM’s involvement, despite both firms being tied to the same entity.**
- **No party has disclosed who is funding Fisher Phillips or whether representation extends to Sanofi, Chattem, Deepak Chopra, or Quten Research Institute, all of whom are connected through filed exhibits and government submissions.**
- **This case includes IRS whistleblower claims, active documentation of shell entity fraud, and evidence of coordinated misrepresentation.**

This is not just a “wage claim.” This is an **employment fraud structure masquerading as legitimate work**, with parties now stalling while **hiding behind a shell corporation dissolved in Oregon**.

Dr. Ryan Abbott’s Appointment Is Not Only Relevant, It’s Necessary

Fisher Phillips describes **Dr. Abbott’s AI expertise as irrelevant**. That assertion is both **misleading and strategically self-serving**.

- **As a pro se claimant, I have used artificial intelligence to investigate, draft, file, and pursue this case from day one, against an entire billion-dollar legal and corporate infrastructure.**
- **My AI usage has been public, transparent, and consistent. I am not abusing technology. I am using it to survive a process designed to favor wealth and institutional power.**
- **If there is any case in JAMS history that merits the presence of an arbitrator who understands the intersection of AI, transparency, and legal ethics, it is this one.**
- **The objection to Dr. Abbott is not about his qualifications. It is about avoiding a sophisticated neutral who cannot be easily manipulated.**

III. JAMS Rules Now Require Clarification of Representation and Payment

Fisher Phillips now confirms it represents DRVM LLC, but still **fails to disclose who retained them, who is paying them, or whether that authorization came from Sanofi, Chattem, Chopra, or any upstream party**.

GRSM LLP initially represented DRVM, then **withdrew without identifying who authorized it**. Fisher Phillips then entered quietly, with partner **Stephen Scott previously claiming he had no awareness of GRSM's involvement**. Now that I have exposed the truth and nominated a qualified arbitrator, Mr. Scott has chosen to speak up after silence for two months, not to clarify the party structure, **but to minimize the case and downplay the silence**.

Under JAMS Administrative Policies, and the **service agreement that applies to attorneys as well as parties**, I formally request that JAMS compel immediate disclosure of:

- **The party or parties instructing Fisher Phillips;**
- **The entity funding Fisher Phillips' legal work;**
- **Whether representation extends to any respondent other than DRVM;**
- **And whether DRVM is the party of record for itself or on behalf of a concealed parent or funder.**

JAMS must not allow counsel to litigate in the dark.

The Record Shows Mid-Arbitration Entity Manipulation

Since this arbitration began:

- **Entities have been reactivated or altered mid-proceeding;**
- **Names and roles of respondents remain unconfirmed;**
- **And procedural silence has been used to shield higher-level actors from accountability.**

This violates the spirit of JAMS's commitment to neutrality, fairness, and procedural clarity.

This Is the First Documented AI-Assisted Pro Se Case Against a Billion-Dollar Structure

To my knowledge, and based on JAMS' own docket disclosures, this is the first known case in which:

- **A single pro se claimant is using artificial intelligence as a litigation tool,**
- **To go up against multiple law firms and a billion-dollar corporate network,**
- **While doing so publicly, ethically, and transparently.**

In this context, appointing Dr. Ryan Abbott, **the co-author of JAMS's own AI Guideline,** is not just fair, **it is essential.**

If the respondents are not misusing AI (**being the self-proclaimed leading AI pharmaceutical company in the world**), and if I am using it transparently, **then there should be no objection to having a neutral who is equipped to understand and navigate these dynamics.**

Requests for Immediate Action

I respectfully request that JAMS:

1. **Reject or disregard Fisher Phillips' objection to Dr. Abbott or proceed with arbitrator selection without deference to their framing;**
2. **Compel full representation and funding disclosure before arbitrator selection moves forward;**
3. **Review and address the mid-arbitration reactivation of entities as a procedural warning sign;**
4. **Acknowledge the uniqueness of this case as a landmark example of AI-assisted arbitration, and ensure that arbitrator selection reflects the technological, ethical, and structural complexity now in the record.**

This is not a routine wage dispute. **This is a systemic fraud case**, one that has been exposed and advanced almost entirely through the **transparent, ethical use of artificial intelligence by a pro se claimant up against a billion-dollar legal and corporate structure**. I did not nominate Dr. Ryan Abbott because I believe he will rule in my favor. **I nominated him because he is the co-author of JAMS's own AI Guidelines, and this is the first arbitration in which AI is being used openly and substantively by a party navigating the system alone**. We need an arbitrator who understands not just shell structures and employment law, but how modern legal tools like AI are shaping the pursuit of truth itself. **Appointing Dr. Abbott would not tilt the case, it would protect the integrity of the process**. JAMS now has an opportunity to show that it takes its own standards seriously and that it can evolve alongside the very technologies it claims to regulate.

I appreciate your attention to this matter and ask that this letter be included in the case file and considered as part of the arbitrator selection process.