

CLAIMANT'S NOTICE OF UNSOLICITED PAYMENT FROM RESPONDENT DRVM LLC (JULY 1, 2025)

JAMS Case No. 5160000821

Hollingsworth v. DRVM LLC, et al.

1. Introduction

On **July 1, 2025**, Claimant received an unsolicited deposit of **\$6,130.10** into a dormant personal checking account. The deposit was issued from DRVM LLC, the named respondent in this arbitration. Claimant has made no request, settlement acceptance, or agreement that would justify this deposit outside of formal proceedings.

2. Context of Payment

This amount aligns closely, though not exactly, with a prior informal settlement ballpark figure discussed with a Human Resources representative from DRVM LLC in early communications (see Exhibit 86). At the time of those discussions, Claimant had not yet uncovered the corporate fraud and shell structuring that now define the central theory of this case.

Claimant notes that Exhibit 86, already entered into the record, documents communications with an individual purporting to represent Human Resources for DRVM LLC during early wage discussions. While Claimant does not formally allege fraudulent identity here, the broader evidentiary pattern strongly suggests misrepresentation or lack of lawful authority on behalf of that individual.

3. Procedural and Ethical Concerns

The unsolicited deposit raises multiple procedural and ethical issues:

- **Jurisdictional Ambiguity:** Is this a settlement offer? A trap? An attempt to later claim waiver or mootness?
- **Entity Misrepresentation:** DRVM LLC has positioned itself as the sole participant in arbitration, yet all available evidence, including corporate filings and JAMS disclosures, show it operates as a shell entity controlled by upstream parties who have avoided participation.

- **Bypassing Due Process:** Attempting to settle outside the record contradicts the binding procedural requirements under JAMS.

Claimant has not accepted, used, or endorsed this payment and considers it procedurally improper and legally irrelevant to the pending arbitration unless formalized and approved by the Tribunal.

4. Request for Tribunal Review and Clarification

Claimant requests that the Tribunal take judicial notice of this attempted payment and issue any necessary procedural order or warning to prevent improper influence or spoliation of the arbitration record. Respondents must not be permitted to resolve such matters outside the forum they contractually agreed to and have delayed for months.

5. Supporting Exhibit

Claimant attaches Exhibit 110, a screenshot of the banking transaction showing the July 1, 2025 deposit of \$6,130.10 from DRVM LLC into Claimant's account.

6. Conclusion

Claimant makes this filing solely to preserve the integrity of the arbitration, not to imply acceptance or agreement. If Respondents wish to resolve any portion of this matter, it must be done transparently, on record, and with full participation of all implicated entities and upstream controlling parties.

Respectfully submitted,

Jorden Hollingsworth

Pro Se Claimant

July 1, 2025