

OBJECTION FOR ARBITRATOR STRIKE LIST

Jorden Hollingsworth

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION
BEFORE JAMS**

JORDEN HOLLINGSWORTH,

Petitioner,

JAMS Reference No. 5160000821

v.

SANOFI-AVENTIS US; CHATTEM INC.;
QUTEN RESEARCH INSTITUTE LLC; AMJ
SERVICES LLC; DRVM LLC; DEEPAK
CHOPRA; MAGED BOUTROS; ASHRAF
BOUTROS; MARIE-LAURIE AMIARD-
BOUTROS,

Respondents.

**OBJECTION FOR ARBITRATOR STRIKE LIST – LACK OF QUALIFIED NEUTRAL
FOR HEALTHCARE FRAUD AND AI CASE**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Claimant hereby formally objects to the arbitrator strike list issued in this matter, pursuant to JAMS Rule 15(b) and the July 2, 2025 agreement between the parties. The basis for this objection is detailed below.

1. This case involves highly complex, federally significant issues, including:
 - **Proven healthcare fraud by a global pharmaceutical company**
 - **Tax evasion using dissolved entities and shell structures**
 - **Confirmed IRS whistleblower submissions**
 - **AI-generated legal filings and forensic exhibit evidence**
 - **Multi-layered national payroll and labor law violations**
2. Before the strike list was issued, Claimant made it explicitly clear, and both parties agreed on July 2, 2025, that under JAMS Rule 15(b), **every arbitrator presented must have relevant experience in AI, emergent technology, and digital evidence.** That agreement was central, because AI is not a side element of this case. It is the core of how the fraud was identified, how the filings were produced, and how the evidence is structured.
3. The sectors involved—**healthcare fraud, tax concealment, whistleblower law, labor misclassification**—all intersect through AI-powered forensic investigation. Without arbitrators who understand that technological foundation, no fair or competent evaluation of the case can occur. The agreement applied to the entire list that was given.
4. Per **JAMS' Artificial Intelligence Dispute Rules (adopted in 2024)**, AI-related disputes require procedural oversight tailored to emerging tech, digital evidence handling, and

expert inspection. These responsibilities assume an arbitrator who understands AI-supported filings, data structures, and technology-integrated legal arguments.

5. Additionally, after a thorough review, not one arbitrator on this list has any documented experience handling a federal whistleblower case, including matters under the **False Claims Act, the IRS Whistleblower Program, or any large-scale healthcare fraud enforcement actions**. This omission is not procedural, it is foundational. The core of this case centers on **confirmed IRS submissions, pharmaceutical fraud, and complex shell structuring used to conceal payroll, taxes, and liability through dissolved and misrepresented entities**.
6. While all of the listed arbitrators are undoubtedly honorable and highly experienced in their respective fields —such as employment law, insurance defense, construction litigation, or probate — none possess the subject matter expertise required to fairly adjudicate this dispute. None of the arbitrators have:
 - **Presided over national-level healthcare fraud or global pharmaceutical concealment schemes**
 - **Adjudicated whistleblower claims involving tax fraud, entity structuring, or federal agency submissions**
 - **Worked with AI-generated legal filings, smart contracts, or technology-driven audit frameworks**
 - **Handled cases involving multi-billion-dollar fraud claims with federal enforcement implications**

7. None of the proposed arbitrators have any documented experience adjudicating shell structuring abuse, entity concealment, or layered corporate fraud. The entire scheme depends on fake or dissolved companies, off-book payroll, and concealment of liability across corporate layers. To ignore that in the selection of arbitrators is to erase the very nature of the fraud.
8. The result is a list that, while composed of accomplished neutrals, is categorically unfit to oversee a **whistleblower-led arbitration rooted in AI evidence, national healthcare fraud, and systemic shell structuring abuse**. This strike list fails to meet the agreed-upon standards set under **JAMS Rule 15(b) and the 2024 JAMS AI Dispute Guidelines**, and it **directly contradicts the subject matter agreement made by both parties on July 2, 2025**. As such, it jeopardizes the procedural integrity of the arbitration and must be corrected immediately.
9. **This list appears to be procedurally stacked against Claimant**. It does not reflect the qualifications agreed to on July 2, and it does not reflect what JAMS itself claims to offer under its 2024 AI framework. As such, it is both procedurally and ethically deficient.
10. JAMS has an affirmative duty to maintain the integrity and neutrality of the arbitration process, and to avoid even the appearance of bias or procedural stacking.

OBJECTION FOR ARBITRATOR STRIKE LIST

11. Claimant hereby gives JAMS **48 hours** from the date of this notice to issue a corrected strike list that includes arbitrators with the following qualifications:

1. **Documented experience in AI, smart contracts, cybersecurity, or digital evidence**
2. **Prior handling of healthcare fraud, billing concealment, or pharmaceutical oversight**
3. **Familiarity with whistleblower law and large-scale corporate structuring abuse**
4. **Demonstrated capacity to preside over multi-billion-dollar or federally triggered disputes**
5. **Demonstrated understanding of corporate shell structuring, entity-layer concealment, and the use of dissolved or fraudulent companies to evade payroll, tax, and regulatory obligations**

12. If JAMS does not correct the list within this window, **Claimant will proceed to request federal court oversight and judicial appointment of a qualified arbitrator**, pursuant to the procedural fairness required by the nature of this case and the rules already agreed upon.

13. This case has already triggered federal scrutiny and IRS action. If JAMS is unwilling or unable to provide a qualified neutral consistent with its own AI framework and the

OBJECTION FOR ARBITRATOR STRIKE LIST

parties' agreement, the matter will be immediately escalated to preserve procedural fairness.

14. Claimant respectfully requests confirmation of receipt and clarification on how JAMS intends to respond to this objection.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 29th, 2025

/s/ Jorden Hollingsworth
Jorden Hollingsworth
Pro Se Petitioner

[REDACTED]
Per [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]