

To: Hunter Mitchell  
Investigator, Whistleblower Protection Program (WPP)  
U.S. Department of Labor, OHSA  
20425 72<sup>nd</sup> Ave S, Suite 150 A  
Kent, Washington 98032

**Whistleblower Complaint – Taxpayer First Act Filing (Aug 13, 2025)**  
**Jorden Hollingsworth via DRVM**

**1. What role/relationship do you perform/have with DRVM, LLC?**

I was employed as a W-2 hourly worker by DRVM LLC. I worked inside a Costco warehouse in Oregon as a product demonstrator, setting up displays, sampling products, and interacting with customers. All employment-related documents—including onboarding forms, timekeeping, and paystubs—listed DRVM LLC as my employer. I was never informed of any parent company or third-party structure.

**2. Is DRVM, LLC the company on your paystubs?**

Yes, DRVM LLC is the company listed on my paystubs. However, during my employment, I was told I was working for “Direct Demo,” and that name was used verbally and in general communication. Despite that, multiple other entities and abbreviations appeared in different places:

- A supposed HR representative signed emails as “AMJ”
- My employee handbook was labeled under “MK Marketing” via the internal dashboard
- Various forms and documents referenced different combinations of these names

This created a deliberately confusing structure, but the only company officially listed on my paystubs was DRVM LLC—a company that was dissolved in the State of Oregon during the time I was employed.

**3. What concerns did you report to the IRS?**

I reported what I believe to be payroll and tax fraud involving DRVM LLC and its concealed relationship to larger pharmaceutical entities. Specifically, I disclosed that DRVM LLC was a dissolved company at the time it issued W-2s and processed payroll for workers like myself, while appearing to function as a front for upstream corporate control. I alleged that DRVM was used as a shell company by Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC, Chattem Inc., and Quten Research Institute to obscure liability and reduce tax exposure.

On April 28, 2025, the IRS Whistleblower Office formally assigned three claim numbers corresponding to Sanofi, Chattem, and Quten. On June 26, 2025, I received notice that the matter

had advanced to the audit review stage. I will attach the original IRS filings that I submitted, as well as the official confirmation of claim numbers.

**3a. How did you come to learn about these concerns?**

After I was terminated and denied my final wages, I followed up through the generic HR email inbox that was provided during my employment. After several attempts, I received a response from someone who signed the email as “AMJ” and included a Tennessee phone number. This raised immediate concerns, as DRVM LLC was a dissolved Oregon company, and neither AMJ nor DRVM appeared to be registered in Tennessee. That email prompted me to begin researching the corporate structure. Through that research, I discovered that Sanofi, through Quten Research Institute and Chattem Inc. (headquartered in Tennessee), appeared to control multiple entities operating under the same address listed on my paystub. This discovery is what led me to pursue legal filings, including arbitration, under the agreement I was required to sign as a condition of employment.

**3b. Did you submit these concerns anonymously?**

No, I submitted my IRS whistleblower filings under my legal name. The filings included supporting exhibits, paystubs, and employer documents showing the use of dissolved entities and overlapping corporate structures tied to Sanofi, Quten Research Institute, and Chattem Inc. The claims were officially acknowledged by the IRS Whistleblower Office, with claim numbers issued on April 28, 2025.

**4. Did you discuss these concerns with your supervisor/management of DRVM, LLC?**

No, I did not raise the IRS-related concerns with DRVM management during my employment because I was not aware of the underlying corporate structure at the time. My only direct communications with DRVM were regarding wage-related issues, including unpaid final wages and penalties under Oregon labor law which was refused to resolve. Due to DRVM’s dissolved status and the absence of any clear or accessible management structure, there was no effective channel to report broader concerns. I did not discover the concealed corporate ownership or the connection to other entities until after my employment ended.

**4a. If so, when?**

In the final weeks of my employment in December 2024, I raised multiple concerns with DRVM LLC about unpaid wages, potential wage penalties, and legal violations under Oregon law. These conversations occurred after my departure, and before I discovered the broader ownership and structural issues that later formed the basis of my IRS whistleblower filing.

**4b. How did you express your concerns (verbally, text, email, etc.)?**

My initial concerns about unpaid wages were expressed through email and a phone call with someone from a generic HR inbox at DRVM LLC. The person eventually responded using the signature “AMJ” and provided a number I called. During the call, I was told they broke the law by missing deadlines but would not correct it.

At that time, I had not yet discovered the company’s dissolved status or the shell structure behind it. That research and discovery came afterward and is what ultimately led to my IRS whistleblower filings.

**4c. What was their response after you discussed these concerns?**

The person I spoke with over the phone acknowledged that DRVM LLC had violated Oregon law regarding timely final wage payment but stated that the company would not resolve the issue. No further explanation was given, and no corrective action was taken.

This refusal to correct an admitted wage violation, combined with the use of a generic HR inbox and signatures from unrelated entities like “AMJ,” raised serious concerns. After my employment ended, I investigated the company’s structure and discovered that DRVM LLC had been dissolved, yet was still being used to issue paychecks inside a Costco warehouse. I later uncovered that the address on the paystub tied back to multiple other entities — including Quten Research Institute, Chattem Inc., and ultimately the global pharmaceutical company Sanofi.

These findings became the basis for my IRS whistleblower submissions, which resulted in the issuance of three official claim numbers tied to Sanofi, Quten, and Chattem. As of June 26, 2025, those claims have advanced to the audit stage. No statement or acknowledgment was ever made by DRVM, AMJ, or any affiliated entity after the IRS filings were submitted.

**5. How do you believe your employer came to believe it was you that reported these concerns to the IRS?**

In February 2025, I submitted a formal arbitration demand through JAMS against DRVM LLC and its affiliated entities. The claims included wage violations, failure to pay final wages, fraud, shell company concealment, and suspected tax evasion tied to a broader corporate structure connected to Sanofi, Chattem Inc., and Quten Research Institute.

On April 6, 2025, I sent a formal settlement letter to the respondents, stating that if they failed to address the violations in good faith, I would submit the findings to federal agencies. After receiving no response, I submitted whistleblower filings to the IRS, DOJ, SEC, and OIG on April 8.

The very next day, I disclosed this submission through a filing on the JAMS arbitration dashboard, making it part of the official record. When I received three IRS claim numbers on April 28 — each corresponding to Sanofi, Chattem, and Quten — I submitted them into the arbitration record as an exhibit. I later included these same claim numbers in my federal petition (Hollingsworth v. Sanofi-Aventis U.S. et al. Case No. 3:25-cv-01342-AB), which is now on the public court docket.

On June 26, I received confirmation that the IRS matter had moved into audit. Given the detailed disclosures I made in arbitration, the filings uploaded to JAMS, and the public submission of claim numbers to federal court, I believe the employer knew as early as April 15, 2025, that I was the source of the whistleblower filings.

Yes — though the retaliation did not take the form of a traditional demotion or written termination, the adverse actions I’ve faced were far more targeted and damaging. After submitting IRS whistleblower claims against Sanofi, Chattem, and Quten in April 2025 — all tied to DRVM LLC’s concealed structure — I was met with systemic retaliation designed to obstruct my ability to pursue justice.

**This retaliation included:**

- Widespread digital suppression: I was permanently banned or shadowbanned from Reddit, X (Twitter), and other platforms — cutting off my access to witnesses, legal exposure, and public transparency. This occurred after I disclosed my whistleblower filings publicly.
- Procedural sabotage in arbitration: After both sides agreed to a list of qualified arbitrators with AI and wage law experience, respondents reversed their position and sought to discredit me — a pattern that began only after I submitted my filings to the IRS, DOJ, SEC, and OIG.
- A suspicious \$6,130 deposit was made directly into my bank account in July 2025, without any documentation, agreement, or arbitration forum oversight. This took place at a critical moment when the arbitrator was being selected — and I had previously warned the forum in writing that respondents may attempt to “buy out” or distort the record.
- Attempted sanctions and misrepresentation: When I raised legitimate objections and pursued my right to federal court under 9 U.S.C. § 5, the employer and its counsel

attempted to frame me as disruptive — despite following procedural rules and documenting every step.

These retaliatory actions began only after I notified all parties of my IRS whistleblower filings — filings that have since resulted in three active claim numbers and a confirmed audit. The employer was aware because I formally posted the filings and claim numbers on the JAMS arbitration dashboard, and later submitted them as public exhibits in my federal case, *Hollingsworth v. Sanofi-Aventis U.S., et al.*

This is classic post-disclosure retaliation: not through direct discipline, but by using private systems, platform suppression, and forum manipulation to isolate me, obstruct discovery, and punish my protected conduct under the Taxpayer First Act.

**6a. If yes, when and what was the reasoning given by your employer?**

Yes. After the IRS filings were submitted and publicly disclosed in arbitration, I experienced a series of adverse actions that appeared designed to isolate and discredit me. The employer delayed participation in arbitrator selection, retracted counsel representation without notice, and removed parties from the arbitration dashboard—all after I submitted whistleblower filings to the IRS, DOJ, SEC, and OIG and disclosed them on the JAMS record.

In addition, I was banned from internal platforms and faced obstruction throughout the arbitration process — including procedural manipulation by the employer and arbitration forum. I was also falsely accused of misconduct and mischaracterized in legal filings. The employer never provided a legitimate reason for these actions, and the timing makes clear they were retaliatory, following my protected disclosures.

**Note:**

I initially submitted this complaint via email on August 13, 2025, but I have not yet received a confirmation of receipt. For your reference, I am attaching the original PDF filing to ensure it is received and logged. Please confirm when this submission has been officially recorded.

This case does not resemble a typical employer retaliation complaint. I am a federally acknowledged whistleblower who exposed what I believe to be a \$15 billion shell company tax fraud scheme involving DRVM LLC and its controlling entities: Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC, Chattem Inc., and Quten Research Institute. My whistleblower submissions were made to the IRS, DOJ, SEC, and OIG, and the IRS confirmed jurisdiction by issuing claim numbers tied

directly to the parent corporations. Not to the shell, DRVM. This is not speculation. It is documented and under audit.

Since those filings, the retaliation has intensified and evolved into multiple forms, both procedural and systemic. Inside arbitration, respondents removed served parties from the dashboard, evaded formal responses, and used the forum's loopholes to derail accountability. They made a previously undisclosed \$6,130 deposit into my bank account—without notice or consent—during the exact window in which I was preparing to file my federal petition. Neither I nor JAMS was initially aware of this deposit. It was not posted publicly to the arbitration record and appeared deliberately timed to obstruct the federal process, delay judicial review, and undermine the urgency of my petition. This maneuver kept me, the claimant, in the dark and effectively manipulated both timelines and jurisdiction.

Outside the forum, I've been digitally suppressed. Social media platforms have shadowbanned or blocked my content merely for referencing the existence of a legal dispute. This is not just censorship—it functionally prevents me from locating witnesses, informing the public, seeking legal aid, or protecting myself. And it is no coincidence. The same institutional investors—BlackRock and Vanguard—who hold major stakes in Sanofi and its affiliates also hold controlling interest in these platforms. I state this not as conspiracy, but as a critical pattern of suppression that any investigator should note when considering motive, scale, and retaliation impact.

I've been met with language from respondents warning me about "sanctions" simply for posting evidence on public records. I've been painted as unstable, aggressive, or unintelligible to discredit my credibility—despite operating alone, pro se, against multinational legal teams. This isn't about workplace discipline or policy disagreements. This is about a whistleblower being isolated, erased, and cornered after exposing the use of fake companies to avoid liability, taxes, and wages across the United States. I am risking my life to bring this forward. I am not asking for sympathy. I am asking for intervention—because this is not just retaliation. It's a corporate countermeasure to bury one of the largest fraud schemes in the country.

Sincerely,

Jorden Hollingsworth

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date: August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2025