

Jorden Hollingsworth
15919 SE McLoughlin Blvd #4
Portland, Oregon 97267
503-488-9680
Jordentimothy11@gmail.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

JORDEN HOLLINGSWORTH,

Case No. 3:25-cv-01342-AB

Petitioner,

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.

**NOTICE OF FEDERAL WHISTLEBLOWER FILING AND MATERIAL
DEVELOPMENTS RELEVANT TO THE PETITION**

To the Honorable Judge Amy M. Baggio,

1. Petitioner respectfully submits this notice to inform the Court of material developments following the submission of the **Petition to Compel Arbitrator Appointment under 9 U.S.C. § 5** on July 31, 2025.

1. Department of Labor / OSHA Filing for Retaliation

2. On **August 13, 2025**, Petitioner formally submitted a whistleblower retaliation complaint to the **U.S. Department of Labor (OSHA) under the Taxpayer First Act**.

This federal filing was based on a pattern of retaliatory conduct following Petitioner's IRS whistleblower submissions—now confirmed with assigned claim numbers—concerning alleged payroll and tax fraud through dissolved shell companies operated by **SanofiAventis U.S. LLC, Chattem Inc., and Quten Research Institute**, the entities believed to control Respondent DRVM LLC.

3. The retaliation includes digital censorship, unexplained procedural obstruction, and financial manipulation within the arbitration forum. These patterns escalated after IRS whistleblower filings were acknowledged and advanced into the review and auditing process. They have now continued in federal court, where Petitioner, a federally protected whistleblower with confirmed claims under active evaluation by the IRS Whistleblower Office, has been met with an immediate procedural objection prior to any service or IFP ruling.

4. Most notably, respondents and/or their counsel have recently invoked potential sanctions language in this matter. Petitioner respectfully asserts that such language, when aimed at a pro se federal whistleblower in active engagement with both the IRS and Department of Labor, constitutes clear and ongoing retaliation—further justifying OSHA's current involvement.

2. Premature Procedural Action by Respondents

5. Before the Court has ruled on the in forma pauperis application or directed service—as required under **FRCP 4**—counsel for DRVM LLC (Fisher Phillips LLP) submitted a filing without a formal notice of appearance, an irregularity under **FRCP 12(a)** (responses due 21 days post-service). Petitioner raises this not to challenge their right to be heard, but to underscore the preemptive and irregular timing, suggesting urgency to influence proceedings pre-IFP.

6. The objection concedes that the parties had previously agreed to arbitrator qualifications involving AI and emerging technologies, yet it now disparages Petitioner for adhering to those same criteria and urges the Court to disregard the very standards Respondents themselves accepted — a reversal that underscores a broader pattern of procedural inconsistency and tactical misrepresentation designed to obscure the original agreement.

7. Additionally, Respondents is now acknowledging making a \$6,130 deposit (\$7,795.50 noted by Respondents) but omit critical context surrounding its delivery. The deposit was made unilaterally during the middle of arbitration, without any notice, consent, or settlement agreement, and was timed immediately inside Petitioner’s deadline to file in federal court. Petitioner rejected the deposit upon receipt and has not accessed the funds. While respondents question Petitioner’s financial motivations, they fail to disclose that this payment was unsolicited and procedurally irregular. Petitioner raises this solely for context—not as a claim of entitlement—and reserves the right to address it further once service is effectuated.

8. Given the nature of the allegations, the confirmed IRS claims, and the active whistleblower retaliation filing now under review by the U.S. Department of Labor, this matter is no longer routine. It implicates complex and sensitive issues of fraud reporting, procedural abuse, and federally protected activity—factors that may become relevant to any future determinations by the Court or arbitrator.

3. Ongoing Public Interest and Case Transparency

9. This case is of emerging public interest due to its national significance — including the scale of the alleged fraud, the involvement of major pharmaceutical entities, and the unprecedented role of artificial intelligence in prosecuting a pro se federal whistleblower claim. After months of being procedurally stalled and obscured in arbitration, and in realizing the seriousness of pursuing this case against globally powerful entities, Petitioner began documenting the full evidentiary archive, legal filings, and developments in real time at 15BillionDollarCase.com to preserve transparency and ensure public accountability.

Closing

10. Petitioner submits this notice in good faith to preserve the integrity of the judicial process and to formally notify the Court that retaliation is ongoing, and now the subject of a federal complaint to the U.S. Department of Labor.

11. A copy of the DOL/OSHA complaint is available upon the Court's request, should it become relevant to the pending matter or any future ruling.

12. Petitioner reserves the right to respond more fully to any objection once the Court has ruled on the IFP application and service has been effectuated.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Jorden Hollingsworth
Jorden Hollingsworth
Pro Se Petitioner
15919 SE McLoughlin Blvd #4
Portland, Oregon 97267
503-488-9680
Jordentimothy11@gmail.com