

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL
SUPPLEMENTAL HOTLINE COMPLAINT, NOTICE OF CORRECTIONS,
EVIDENCE-PRESERVATION REQUEST, AND REQUEST FOR
INDEPENDENT INVESTIGATION / REFERRAL

Supplementing - not replacing - the notarized complaint executed 22 September 2025

Complainant	Larry Margulies
Citizenship	United States
Current location	Overseas - precise location withheld for safety
Mailing address	848 North Rainbow Blvd #4884, Las Vegas, NV 89107
Email	larry@diydetective.org
Telephone	(305) 367-7870
Prepared / execution	Prepared 20 September 2026; execution date:

TO: U.S. Department of State, Office of Inspector General, SA-06, Suite L600, 2201 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20522-0606; and via the State OIG Hotline.

CONFIDENTIALITY / REFERRAL POSITION: I request confidential treatment of my precise current location, non-public witness contact information, and sensitive operational details. I authorize OIG, when necessary to evaluate or investigate the allegations, to refer this complaint and my identity/contact information to another competent oversight or law-enforcement body. I request that my non-public current location not be disclosed unless operationally necessary or required by law.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This supplemental submission narrows, corrects, and strengthens my September 2025 notarized complaint. I allege a recurring cross-border pattern of threats, violent incidents, tracking, and official or official-appearing contacts in several jurisdictions. One investigative hypothesis I ask OIG to test is whether government, intelligence, diplomatic-security, law-enforcement, contractor, passport, or consular access was misused to share my location or personal information, coordinate with local authorities, or facilitate private actors who threatened or harmed me. Another possibility is that private actors falsely claimed or exploited government affiliations. I do not ask OIG to assume either explanation is established. I ask OIG to determine what Department records support, contradict, or exclude a Department nexus; verify affiliations; reconstruct what Department personnel were told about me and communicated to others; examine the handling of my consular and security reports; and refer any substantiated criminal, administrative, civil, privacy, or interagency matter to the competent authority.

The need for a supplement is substantial. My 22 September 2025 notarized complaint was prepared under pressure and contains useful facts and exhibits, but later source review and sworn filings in Florida and the Philippines have corrected dates, speaker attribution, exhibit descriptions, and the evidentiary status of several inferences. My later filings deliberately distinguish personal observation, witness reports, preserved writings, official records, present recollection, and investigative hypotheses. This supplemental OIG filing adopts that same source-controlled method.

The principal State Department record questions are concrete: the 2014 repatriation-loan file and liaison communications; any State-originated correspondence to Philippine authorities, including the reported NBI 'courtesy letter'; any Department or DSS record concerning foreign-law-enforcement assistance, police escorts, claimed credentials, or disclosure of my confidential address; the Dumaguete privacy-waiver call; January 2016 Manila Embassy/Mission ACS/RSO/DSS, visitor, appointment, and duty-officer records; the January 2016 Baguio hospital event insofar as any State or liaison record exists; the 2010 Hong Kong-to-Shenzhen-to-Seattle sequence, Seattle Passport Agency rejection, the subsequent Boston passport issuance and serious federal-investigation warning, and the separate Vancouver fingerprint/burn inquiry; the February 2017 Mongolia incident and the person

identified to me as 'Jason'; the 13 June 2019 Guangzhou notarized deposition and any referral or follow-up; Guangzhou passport-theft/DSS records; the 3 March 2020 Macao Border Gate official-channel event; the post-quarantine 2020 Hong Kong reports and 5 October SMS; any Department record containing mental-health characterizations supplied by third parties; the September 2025 Guangzhou notarization appointment and subsequent physical delivery of my remotely notarized complaint; and any internal routing, retention, referral, or destruction history for those materials.

I expressly do not rely on the fact that an allegation appears in a sworn document as proof that the allegation is true. I ask OIG to test each material proposition against objective records and independent witnesses, and to let contrary evidence control where it exists.

I. RELATIONSHIP TO THE SEPTEMBER 2025 NOTARIZED COMPLAINT

1. On 22 September 2025 I executed a complaint directed to federal oversight authorities. The declaration and notarial page show that I signed the complaint under penalty of perjury and that it was electronically notarized through the Proof platform on that date. The notarial block identifies Texas / Dallas, notary Pelard Faustin, commission no. 135507216, commission expiration 18 March 2029, and states that the document was electronically signed and notarized online using the Proof platform. The notarized packet remains part of the historical record and should not be discarded or silently rewritten.
2. This supplement does not withdraw the September 2025 complaint. Instead, it performs three functions: (a) it expressly corrects or qualifies statements for which later review showed that the earlier wording was too definite or inaccurate; (b) it adds post-2025 official filings and record locators; and (c) it restates the Department-specific investigative questions in a form that can be tested without requiring OIG to assume the truth of disputed cross-border connections.
3. Where this supplement expressly conflicts with an earlier statement made by me, this supplement states my present, source-controlled position for purposes of this OIG submission. Where an official contemporaneous record establishes a more precise date, location, identity, or sequence than my memory, I request that the official record control.
4. I am not asking OIG to treat the September 2025 complaint as a civil complaint already filed in federal court, nor as a charging instrument. It is an oversight complaint and evidence package. Any criminal statute referenced in an earlier draft should be treated as a potential referral issue only if investigators independently establish the statutory elements and jurisdiction.

II. SEPTEMBER 2025 CONSULAR NOTARIZATION / DELIVERY HISTORY - PRECISE CLARIFICATION

5. My present recollection is that I went to the U.S. Consulate General Guangzhou for a scheduled notarial appointment on or about 22 September 2025 with complaint materials. Consular personnel did not complete the requested notarization during that appointment. Earlier drafts written at the time describe personnel as reviewing and retaining materials for further review. I do not use that wording here to claim that the Consulate permanently retained every original document; the exact documents kept, copied, returned, or reviewed should be established from Consulate records.
6. I then obtained remote online notarization of the September 2025 complaint through the Proof platform. The notarial page itself is dated 22 September 2025.
7. My present recollection is that, approximately the following day, I returned to the Consulate and physically delivered a printed copy of the notarized complaint together with a printed cover sheet/letter. I ask that the precise date, time, recipient, and documents accepted be established from visitor-entry, security, appointment, intake, mailroom, ACS, document-scanning, internal-email, and other Consulate records.
8. My electronic archive contains drafts and later copies of the cover-letter language addressed to GuangzhouACS@state.gov and OCSmail@state.gov. The archive also shows items at approximately 18:21, 18:36, and 18:52 HKT on 22 September 2025. The same-evening sent item visible in the archive is addressed

to 623201509@qq.com, not to a State Department address. A 25 January 2026 self-forward is labeled "after cons letter notary." These artifacts corroborate drafting and later preservation of the cover-letter language, but they do not prove an outbound transmission to GuangzhouACS@state.gov or OCStmail@state.gov. I therefore do not represent in this supplement that the cover letter was emailed to Guangzhou ACS or OCS. My present claim is physical delivery, subject to verification from Consulate records.

9. This distinction matters. I request that OIG preserve both possibilities separately: (a) records of the scheduled notarial appointment and the non-completion of that service; and (b) records of my later physical delivery of the remotely notarized complaint. The absence of a surviving sent-email record should not be converted into a claim that no physical delivery occurred; conversely, my recollection of hand delivery should be tested against the Consulate's own records.

III. SOURCE-CONTROL AND EVIDENTIARY METHOD

10. I ask OIG to evaluate the record by source level rather than by repetition. Repetition of the same allegation in my own books, emails, complaints, and later summaries does not create multiple independent witnesses.

Source level	Examples	Use requested
A - Objective / official	Police/consular records; passport records; bank/transaction records; hotel/hospital records; native email/SMS metadata; official receipts; contemporaneous agency logs.	Primary basis for identity, date, location, transmission, and agency action.
B - Sworn / authenticated witness material	My notarized or sworn filings; Lesyl Medalla sworn materials; other independently executed witness statements.	Evidence of what the witness swore or reported; not automatic proof of every allegation.
C - Contemporaneous or near-contemporaneous private material	Emails, handwritten notes, preserved messages, third-party business records, photographs, receipts.	Chronology, source attribution, corroboration, and record locators.
D - Later recollection / interpretation / self-publication	Later reconstruction, books, marketplace publications, narrative summaries, pattern analysis.	Memory aid, prior-documentation chronology, and lead generation only unless independently corroborated.

11. I use terms such as "State Department," "DSS," "CIA," "agent," "investigator," "police," or "official" only according to the source actually supporting the term. If a person merely represented that affiliation to me, I state it as a representation and ask OIG to verify it. I do not ask OIG to infer CIA or other intelligence-agency participation merely because such a term appears in a message, a statement by another person, or an earlier publication.

12. Likewise, I do not identify any chemical substance as LSD, chloroform, or another specific agent unless an objective laboratory or medical record establishes it. Where I previously used "LSD-like," "hallucinogenic," "poisoning," or similar language, the controlling formulation is that I experienced symptoms or an exposure that I suspected involved an unknown substance; toxicological identity remains unproven unless an underlying record states otherwise.

13. I do not assume that the U.S.-Philippines Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty was invoked merely because a foreign national displayed a Philippine credential or appeared with police. The existence of any U.S. request, treaty request, embassy/consular communication, law-enforcement liaison, informal contact, or impersonation is an investigative question to be resolved from records.

14. I do not assume that any Consular Consolidated Database, CLASS, PIERS, passport, ACS, DSS, MED, or other system contains a particular mental-health notation. My evidence is that third parties made mental-health statements to or about me in contexts involving the Department, and that similar characterizations recur elsewhere. I request record access, preservation, source identification, and correction if an inaccurate agency record is actually located.

IV. MATERIAL CORRECTIONS TO PRIOR STATE OIG MATERIALS

Issue	Controlling correction / qualification	Investigative consequence
-------	--	---------------------------

Issue	Controlling correction / qualification	Investigative consequence
“That’s what you get for writing the letter” call	I am certain Evelyn Yudowitz and Bernard S. Yudowitz participated. I recall the statement being made during the call but do not presently assign the exact words to one speaker with greater certainty. I do not presently recall with sufficient certainty whether Martin Yudowitz participated. A separate Bernard/Martin email-related call must remain separate.	Search any surviving family/repatriation telephone and email records without using Martin’s presence in the quoted call as an established premise.
Exhibit 18 / Philippine police record	The document previously described in some U.S. materials as a Cebu City police blotter dated 21 July 2015 is Lesyl Medalla’s NBI Complaint Sheet dated 21 July 2015. A separate Cebu police record may still exist, but Exhibit 18 itself should not be mislabeled.	Avoid impeachment based on exhibit misdescription; search separately for any actual Cebu blotter.
Guangzhou Samsung passport theft date	The Samsung receipt is dated 25 May 2019 and the theft occurred on the later return visit to that store. Earlier 2017 descriptions are superseded for date purposes; exact return date should be established from police/Samsung/payment records.	Use 2019 passport/DSS/consular files and Samsung records as the date anchor.
Macao border event	The Macao Border Gate/COVID-screening event is presently reported as on or about 3 March 2020, subject to immigration/operational records. Earlier 2019 references are not controlling.	Search 2020 travel/border records, not 2019.
Hong Kong SMS	The principal preserved SMS incident is 5 October 2020 and the displayed number is +852 9342 8498. The screenshots contain ELDAVIDE, a C.I.A. reference, TRAINED TO DENY, and SCHIZOPHRENIC. The SMS does not establish sender identity or CIA participation.	Treat subscriber/account/device/routing and sender identity as matters for HKPF/telecom process and any relevant interagency comparison.
Baguio hospital timing	Later review places the Notre-Dame de Chartres Hospital incident in January 2016, not “mid-2015.” Final departure from the Philippines was in January 2016.	Use January 2016 records and avoid older date labels.
Manila Exit Bureau / U.S. Mission timing	Older Aventura/OIG wording grouped this event under 2015. The controlling Philippine chronology places the Exit Bureau exposure and final-departure sequence in January 2016, exact day unknown. Same-day Mission details are further reconstructed from prior publication and present recollection, subject to State records.	Search January 2016 Bureau of Immigration and Embassy/Mission records; do not use the older 2015 label, and keep the separate after-hours Manila duty-officer call distinct unless records connect them.
Chemical identity	No toxicology known to me establishes LSD, chloroform, or another specific chemical for the reported Philippine/China episodes.	Preserve symptoms, contemporaneous medical data, and exposure descriptions without overstating chemical identity.
“Ruby” source attribution	Lesyl Medalla’s handwritten statement does not itself print the name “Ruby.” The name “Ruby” was on a separate paper bearing a telephone number that Lesyl later gave me. Her statement separately records the woman associated with the gray SUV forcing a concealed number on her and a later taxi-driver reference to “the number.”	Keep the statement and separate Ruby paper/source attribution distinct; attempt recovery of the number from old records/devices.
Cebu hotel / gray-SUV sequence	Property name is uncertain: my present recollection is Holiday Inn; Lesyl’s statement says “HOLIDAY HOTEL”; an earlier description said Days Inn; PH-S1 is a Days Hotel-branded voucher. The shooting-related earlier preserved wording and my more specific present recollection must both be preserved.	Authenticate hotel/booking/consular/police records; do not force a property identity from memory alone.
MLAT / State facilitation	Prior drafts sometimes treated State/MLAT facilitation as established. The controlling position is that the reported police escort, credential, confidential-address access, and “courtesy letter” create record questions; any	Search cables, liaison, embassy, DOJ central-authority, ACS/RSO/DSS, and Philippine counterpart records as appropriate.

Issue	Controlling correction / qualification	Investigative consequence
	U.S. request or treaty channel must be proven from records.	
CIA / DSS affiliation	Benny and other persons made security/government-related representations, and later materials contain CIA references. Their true affiliation remains to be independently established.	Check employee/contractor/official records and refer to another IG only if a verified nexus emerges.
September 2025 Consulate cover letter	I have not located proof that the cover letter was emailed to GuangzhouACS/OCS. My present recollection is that a printed cover letter and notarized complaint were physically delivered after remote notarization.	Use Consulate physical intake/visitor/security/document records rather than assuming email transmission.

V. DEPARTMENT-SPECIFIC FACTUAL AND RECORD ISSUES

A. 2008 China detention - Jonathan Benny identification and information-source questions

15. I first knew the individual using the name Jonathan Benny during my 2008 detention in Mainland China. During that period Benny and another detainee made statements to me concerning government, security, passport, protection, or cross-border work. Benny stated that he had been to Langley and made other statements concerning security-related activity. I also remember him using a mobile telephone in the detention setting and receiving information characterizing me as “severely psychotic” and a “criminal.” My earlier writings preserve additional identity leads: I remember Benny holding or displaying Taiwanese and Nigerian passports and saying that he had a chloroform sales license. I report those details as identification and record-search leads only. I do not offer them as proof that Benny was a government undercover officer, that he lawfully possessed or sold chloroform, that he committed any chemical offense, or that he had any role in any later suspected exposure.

16. The same 2008 detention record supplies additional identity and information-source leads. I remember another detainee known to me as Sasha carrying a Ukrainian passport and having an MTV tattoo on the hand/thumb area. Both men asked about my visa. When Sasha entered the room, I remember Benny telling him that I was from Brookline, Massachusetts, although I had not told Benny that. I do not know who supplied Benny with that personal information. I ask OIG to compare any lawfully available Shenzhen/China detention or liaison records from the 2008 period and to search Department, DSS, consular, passport, contractor, and liaison records for Benny, Sasha, Brookline, my visa status, and any mental-health or criminal characterization transmitted about me.

17. A separate and important identification lead is Elissa Russell, whom I later met in Taiwan. When I referred to Benny, I remember her immediately identifying him in substance as “Benny from the State Department.” My later Macao police filing preserves that same recollection and identifies Russell as a potential witness who may assist investigators in establishing Benny’s identity, employment, associates, and activities. I do not offer her statement alone as proof of Benny’s precise title, agency, authority, or employment status. The Department question is whether official records corroborate or disprove that identification; whether Benny had lawful or unlawful access to information concerning my passport, visa, travel, location, or mental-health history; and how my 2019 Guangzhou affidavit concerning him was received, retained, referred, assessed, investigated, or closed.

B. 2014 Philippines repatriation process - liaison, funds, address, and third-party information

18. During the Philippines repatriation process, the Department advised that approximately US\$2,500 was required for airfare, exit-visa fines, and related processing. My family sent approximately US\$1,500, leaving the process incomplete. Bank records obtained years later are relevant to whether additional funds were available to a family account at that time, but the bank record does not itself prove any Department misconduct. My earlier materials also describe an attachment to the repatriation application concerning a Cayman Islands wire to “Distressed Assets Funds” originating from Professional Housing Ltd. (Glasgow). I

ask OIG to search the repatriation file for that attachment and related indexing or scanning records; until the underlying attachment is recovered, that description is a record locator rather than independent proof of its contents.

19. I remember Evelyn Yudowitz and Bernard S. Yudowitz directing or strongly influencing the routing of the repatriation matter through a particular State Department liaison associated in my memory with the Arlington, Massachusetts area. I observed communication between them and that liaison. I later asked the liaison whether they had told the Department that I was mentally ill; I remember the liaison laughing and answering “Yes.” OIG can test this through the complete repatriation file, case notes, emails, telephone records, financial-request records, and any communications with family members.

20. The address 26 C Imus Highway, Lorega, Cebu was used in connection with the repatriation process. A gray-haired American later arrived at that residence with uniformed Philippine police officers. I do not claim that the appearance proves that State disclosed the address. I request that OIG establish who within the Department and any associated contractor had the address, when it was recorded, whether it was disclosed outside the repatriation process, and whether any foreign-law-enforcement or liaison communication concerned that address or me.

C. Reported NBI “courtesy letter” and foreign-law-enforcement coordination

21. I was told by Philippine NBI personnel that they possessed a letter originating from the U.S. State Department, described to me as a “courtesy letter,” which they said was being kept in a safe. I did not see the letter and do not know its contents, sender, addressee, classification, legal basis, or purpose. This is hearsay as to the document’s existence and source unless the record is located.

22. The appropriate investigative step is a record search, not an inference. I request that OIG search Department, Embassy Manila, ACS, RSO, DSS, law-enforcement liaison, cable, correspondence, records-management, and other appropriate systems for outbound or inbound correspondence with NBI or Philippine authorities that can be matched to my name, repatriation matter, address, or reported security concerns. If no State-originated letter exists, that negative result is important and should control.

23. Similarly, I ask OIG to determine whether any Department request, informal liaison, treaty request, contractor communication, or other U.S. communication was connected to the Quezon City Drug Task Force credential I observed being displayed by the American known to me as “Jerry,” or to any reported police escort. I do not assert that MLAT use was legally required or actually occurred; that question should be determined from official records.

23A. My Philippine filings preserve several separate official-authority indicators that should be tested rather than merged or assumed authentic: a gray-haired American arrived at the Cebu address used in my repatriation process accompanied by uniformed Philippine police; I observed the American known to me as Jerry display a Quezon City Drug Task Force identification card to a Philippine police desk officer; during the Escario Hotel incident I observed immigration officers who showed official identification; my Philippine filing records a man described to a neighbor as an ‘undercover policeman’ whom I later recognized at Cebu Socorro Hospital and Baguio Notre-Dame de Chartres Hospital; and after the Baguio hospital incident a masked woman intercepted me and identified herself as an undercover police officer. I cannot independently verify the authenticity or lawful basis of every credential or claimed status. I ask OIG to determine whether any Embassy Manila, RSO/DSS, consular, liaison, cable, contractor, or interagency record corresponds to any of these persons, escorts, credentials, or contacts, and to preserve a negative finding if no Department nexus exists.

D. January 2016 Manila Bureau of Immigration / U.S. Mission same-day sequence; separate Manila duty-officer calls

24. The controlling Philippine chronology places this episode in January 2016, exact day presently unknown, during the same week as my final departure from the Philippines. I went to the Bureau of Immigration Exit Bureau in Manila to collect my exit visa. After that, I experienced acute symptoms that I believed followed exposure to an unknown substance, including violent shaking, difficulty breathing, extreme dizziness, blurred

vision, altered perception, and serious whole-body impairment. I state the timing and symptoms from my recollection and the Philippine filing. Because no toxicological testing was performed, I do not identify the substance as LSD, chloroform, or any other specific agent. The Philippine Complaint-Affidavit is the controlling sworn source for the January 2016 date and the reported symptoms; the unofficial merged publication archive is used only as a locator aid for additional details, and contemporaneous State records should control if they conflict.

25. The same day, I presently recall going to the U.S. Embassy/Mission in Manila twice. I had been invited or promised that I could speak that day with a federal officer about earlier events and threats I had reported. Inside the Mission, I was not given that meeting. During the Mission sequence, in a private room, at a window inside that private room - not a public waiting-hall counter - I remember hearing a woman at that window say words to the effect of, "Aren't they going to hypnotize him?" I also remember asking that the federal officer who had invited me be called and being told after calls were placed that he was not available. I do not claim that this statement establishes that anyone hypnotized me, that a CIA program existed, or that any criminal act occurred. I report it as words I remember hearing and as a State-record locator. An earlier published account says that I left the Mission and returned, told the guard it was an emergency, and was told to leave; my present recollection is that I went into the Mission twice that day. Visitor and security records should establish how each entry or attempted entry was recorded.

26. While in the waiting area that day, I presently recall using a Mission computer to book a notarial appointment. I was not seeking an ordinary notarial service; my purpose was to create a system record that I had been at the Mission in connection with the emergency and had returned there that day. I do not presently remember whether I signed a visitor log on either entry, and I do not want to reconstruct that detail from memory. OIG should obtain the visitor/security records and appointment-system record and let them control. For this same-day cluster, I request records sufficient to identify two visitor/security entries or attempted entries; the computer-booked notarial slot; ACS/RSO/duty/case notes; any record of the promised federal-officer meeting, including who invited me and why the meeting did not occur; any note of what I reported about my symptoms; and records sufficient to identify the woman at the private-room window and place her statement in context. The exact date and sequence should be fixed from State Department and Bureau of Immigration records.

26A. Separate Manila after-hours duty-officer call - "Whitey" / "warrant on my life." This is separate from the January 2016 Bureau of Immigration / private-room Mission day, separate from the Lapu-Lapu police-station referral, and separate from the Gecko Bar / "Bill" encounter. During the Philippine period I made several emergency calls to the U.S. Embassy/consular after-hours duty system. On one such call, after I had repeatedly asked for help because I feared for my life, I remember the night duty officer saying that he had done research and telling me, in substance, "there is a warrant on your life." When I asked by whom, I remember him answering, "Whitey." I report those words as what I heard on the call. I do not know whether "Whitey" was a person, nickname, file label, or something else, and I do not treat the statement as proof that any actual warrant existed. Older preserved writings identify the night duty officer as "Noel" and describe several calls; a later compiled filing linked the statement to the night of an Escario/Cebu episode. I do not presently have sufficient certainty to fix that exact date or linkage, so Department records should control. My older writings also recall that the night officer cut the call short and told me to call in the morning, and that a daytime duty officer then asked whether I had spoken with someone there at night. I ask OIG to identify the night duty officer, determine whether "Noel" was his name or identifier, and search Manila after-hours duty logs, emergency-call routing records, ACS notes, telephone logs, emails, RSO/DSS referrals, and any record containing my name together with "Whitey," "warrant," or similar wording.

E. 13 June 2019 Guangzhou notarized deposition and passport/DSS record

27. On 13 June 2019 I executed a notarized deposition/affidavit at the U.S. Consulate General Guangzhou concerning Jonathan Benny and related claimed government/security matters. The importance of that document is chronological and administrative: it establishes that I formally recorded these concerns at the Consulate before the March 2020 Macao event and before the October 2020 Hong Kong SMS.

28. I do not know from my present records whether the 2019 affidavit was merely notarized as a private document, retained in any Department file, copied by Consulate personnel, routed to DSS/RSO, referred elsewhere, or closed without further action. I have not received notice or records showing that the affidavit resulted in an investigation, but that absence of notice does not prove that no internal action occurred. OIG should determine the actual handling and disposition. The notarial-service register, appointment and payment record, ACS notes, internal emails, scanned attachments, routing history, referral records, and any RSO/DSS or other case/disposition entry may establish what occurred.

29. The Guangzhou passport theft also occurred in 2019. My corrected Guangzhou police report identifies the Samsung receipt dated 25 May 2019, a later return to the store, the theft of my U.S. passport, and my positive recognition of an older man present near the doorway as the same man I had encountered during an earlier Jiangxi incident. Older writings state my belief that the same broader group was involved in the Jiangxi and Guangzhou events; the controlling source-level position is narrower: my recognition of the older man is a direct identification I report with certainty, while the broader-group connection remains an allegation to be tested. I later reported the passport theft and the Jiangxi identification to U.S. Diplomatic Security. I have not received records showing what investigative, referral, or closure action followed. I request that OIG locate all responsive passport-fraud, lost/stolen-passport, ACS, DS/DSS interview, referral, case, disposition, CLASS, PIERS, CCD, or other passport/consular records, including records showing what I told DSS, what follow-up was considered, and whether any use of the stolen passport number, identity data, or Chinese visa was examined. My broader passport history also includes Seattle and Boston Passport Agency transactions, which should be used as additional record locators.

F. 5 October 2020 Hong Kong SMS and prior-publication chronology

30. My current Hong Kong and Aventura preservation record describes the complete surviving native screenshot set as showing one continuous SMS exchange displayed as originating from +852 9342 8498 on 5 October 2020, with four incoming messages. The transcriptions presently preserved are: 19:17 HKT, "...WEKNOW YOU ARE A FRIEND OF ELDAVIDE & THAT YOU WORK FOR THE C.I.A.,....."; 19:48 HKT, "...WE KNOW FACTS TO BE ASABOVE & THAT YOU ARE TRAINED TO DENY IT,...."; 19:51 HKT, "...SAY HELLO TO ELDAVIDE FOR US,....."; and 19:55 HKT, "...YOU SOUND SCHIZOPHRENIC LIKE MOSTT OF YOUR COWORKERS,....YOU ARE THE ONE THAT MADE THE CONTACT,....ADIOS & CIAO,....". The native images control over this transcription; if any character, time, or line in this paragraph differs from the native image, the native image should control. The screenshot establishes what was displayed on my receiving device. By itself it does not establish the subscriber, actual user, author, serving carrier, device operator, or whether the displayed originating number was technically genuine or spoofed. I reported the incident to the Hong Kong Police Force while the exchange was occurring.

31. My pre-October-2020 publications had already documented an American known to me as "David," government/intelligence-related representations made by persons I encountered, and mental-health/psychosis characterizations. I rely on those publications for prior-documentation chronology only. They do not prove the truth of the underlying events or identify the SMS sender.

32. The Department-specific question is whether any Department record, employee, contractor, liaison communication, passport/consular file, or third-party disclosure can explain how information similar to the earlier mental-health narrative or other non-public details reached persons contacting me. I do not claim the SMS itself proves Department, DSS, FBI, or CIA participation.

G. 2025 Guangzhou notarization appointment and subsequent physical delivery

33. The September 2025 appointment and later delivery should be treated as separate events. OIG should preserve appointment-booking data, ACS visitor and queue records, security/access logs, cashier/notarial service records, internal emails, scans, document-handling notes, correspondence with supervisors or RSO/DSS, and any record of a physical complaint packet left for the Consulate.

34. I also ask OIG to determine whether the Consulate forwarded, scanned, retained, destroyed, returned, or took no action on the physically delivered notarized complaint. If it was referred, the receiving office and reference should be identified internally so OIG can obtain the complete chain.

H. 2026 foreign and domestic sworn filings as record locators - not proof of federal guilt

35. In 2026 I prepared and submitted more disciplined complaints and supplemental materials to Aventura Police and prepared and/or submitted related materials to Philippine authorities, the Hong Kong Police Force, Macao Judiciary Police, and Guangzhou Public Security. Aventura Police previously confirmed to me by email that my complaint was submitted; I do not characterize that matter here as a formally opened police case because the source materials underlying this supplement do not establish that APD assigned a case/report number. These later materials are relevant to OIG because they correct earlier dates and source attributions and identify objective records that can confirm or disprove federal connections.

36. The Philippine Complaint-Affidavit was notarized at the Philippine Consulate General in Guangzhou on 25 August 2026 (Doc. No. 0699; Page No. 215; Book No. 17; Series of 2026). A revised Philippine Supplemental Complaint-Affidavit dated 19 September 2026 is presently treated as provisional/unsworn pending consular notarization; it should not be described as already sworn until executed. That supplemental preserves separate treatment of the gray-SUV/Ruby sequence, the Cebu hotel-window/consular-referral sequence, the Gecko Bar “Bill” lead, and other location-specific groups instead of merging them into one presumed organization.

37. The Aventura supplements correct the Martin/Bernard/Evelyn call attribution; correct the identification of Lesyl Medalla’s 21 July 2015 document as an NBI Complaint Sheet; correct the Baguio and final-departure chronology; qualify uncertain Shulman name-card recollections; and preserve the 5 October 2020 SMS as a comparison lead rather than proof of sender identity. I adopt those corrections for this State OIG record wherever an older State draft is inconsistent.

VI. ADDITIONAL PHILIPPINE RECORD LOCATORS RELEVANT TO STATE OIG

38. The revised Philippine supplemental filing identifies an especially important State Department record locator: during the Cebu hotel-window / gray-SUV sequence, I remember immediately telephoning a United States consular or State Department duty officer, reporting the SUV and what I had heard and seen, and receiving a confidential referral to a particular Lapu-Lapu police station. My present recollection is that it may have been Station No. 6, but I am not sufficiently certain of the number. The consular duty-call/referral record should control.

39. The same Philippine supplemental preserves the difference between an earlier account describing persons “discussing plans to shoot two people” and my more specific present recollection of a question, in substance, “Are we going to shoot them both?” I do not assign that wording to a named speaker. The exact hotel property is also uncertain and should be established from contemporaneous hotel and consular records rather than memory alone.

40. At a later Escario / Perpetual Succour Hospital event, I remember overhearing an American man on a telephone ask the other person to call the same Lapu-Lapu police station identifier I remembered from the duty-officer referral. I do not claim the American was a State employee or connected to the earlier SUV group. The value of this fact is that the consular referral may provide an objective station-number anchor capable of testing the later recollection.

41. The revised Philippine supplement also separates a Gecko Bar encounter involving an Australian man known to me as “Bill,” a separate male, and a waitress. That event should remain distinct from the gray-SUV sequence and other groups unless records establish a connection. I include it here only because earlier OIG drafts tended to merge multiple location-specific actors into one overarching theory; the controlling method is now to investigate each group separately and compare only objective identifiers.

VII. CROSS-BORDER COMPARISON LOCATORS RELEVANT TO STATE OIG

41A. I submit the following events as comparison and record locators, not as proof that one organization or the State Department caused every event. The question for OIG is whether objective Department records, personnel identities, passport/consular records, liaison communications, duty logs, or interagency records connect any of these

events to a Department function or person, or instead exclude such a connection. Sworn and official records control over older self-publications where they differ.

41B. 2010 Hong Kong - Shenzhen - Seattle. My Aventura complaint preserves a sequence in which I reported death threats and a bottle attack in Hong Kong, then travelled through Shenzhen and onward to Seattle. My Seattle Passport Agency application was rejected at the Jackson Federal Building. Immediately after leaving that building, I report that a heavy bottle fell near me at the entrance to Brooklyn Seafoods across the street. During the broader Seattle period, I remember a man who had been near me in line inviting me to sit at a table. I remember him extending a telephone under the table toward me with a recording function visible while asking me about companies in China; an earlier preserved account records the question as whether I knew any Chinese mining companies. His companion represented that the man had recently returned from the Middle East as a commando, and an older account records the man's own representation that he held a current security clearance. I do not know whether either representation was true or whether the men had any government connection. I also report that a bald American male I had previously seen in the Hong Kong threat sequence appeared in Seattle. I do not claim that the passport decision caused the Seattle incidents or that State personnel directed any of these persons. I ask OIG to preserve Passport Services records and any security, fraud, loss-history, investigative, contractor, or referral record capable of confirming or excluding a Department nexus.

41B.1. Boston Passport Agency. After Seattle rejected my passport application, I travelled to the Boston area and obtained a new passport. I clearly remember the employee who handed it to me telling me, in substance, that I was under a serious federal-government investigation concerning my history of several lost or stolen passports. I do not know which federal component conducted or contemplated that investigation, its scope, or whether it had any relationship to the events I reported in Seattle. I ask OIG to identify the Boston window officer, contemporaneous passport notes, fraud/loss referrals, case or investigation numbers, and any responsive CLASS, PIERS, CCD, DSS, or other Department record.

41B.2. Vancouver consular/passport locator. I separately remember Vancouver consular personnel taking my fingerprints and asking me about a burn on my fingers. I do not infer from that interaction why the fingerprints were taken or what record, investigation, or passport issue prompted the question. I ask OIG to locate the Vancouver consular/passport/ACS records and let those records establish the purpose and context.

41B.3. Dumaguete privacy-waiver call. During the Dumaguete period, approximately February-April 2015, I remember receiving a daytime call on my mobile telephone from a woman who identified herself as connected with the U.S. Embassy or Department of State and asked me to come sign a privacy waiver. I declined. I do not presently remember her name or the post from which she called. I ask OIG to search ACS/OCS outbound-call notes, case notes, privacy-waiver/consent records, and related communications, including any contemporaneous family-contact records.

41C. January 2016 Baguio. The controlling Philippine filing places the Notre-Dame de Chartres Hospital incident in January 2016. It reports an unknown-substance exposure during cardiac monitoring, an acute heart-rate increase, pursuit by hospital guards after I left, and a masked woman who intercepted me up the road and identified herself as an undercover police officer. The Philippine filing also separately describes police escorts, claimed police credentials, and other official-appearing contacts in Cebu and Davao. I do not treat those claims of authority as proof of lawful police status or State Department facilitation. I ask OIG to determine whether any Embassy Manila, RSO/DSS, liaison, consular, or other Department record corresponds to those persons or events, and to preserve a negative result if none exists.

41D. February 2017 Mongolia / 'Jason.' My older preserved writings report that, after entering Mongolia, two men entered my hotel room and a woman associated with the scene told me, in substance, 'they are going to kill you.' Police responded. I further recorded that Mongolian police placed telephone calls and handed me the phone to speak separately with a man identified to me as 'Jason' and with a female U.S. consular duty officer. I previously interpreted Jason as possibly connected with diplomatic security, but I do not treat that affiliation as established. Because this detail is presently supported principally by older preserved writings rather than a current foreign police file in this packet, I ask OIG to search U.S. Embassy Ulaanbaatar/ACS/duty-officer/RSO/DSS records, emergency

call logs, emails, and any communication with Mongolian police around the reported date, and to determine independently whether 'Jason' can be identified and whether he had any Department role.

41E. 3 March 2020 Macao Border Gate. My 2026 Macao Judiciary Police report identifies a reconstructable event during the official COVID-screening process. I was accompanied by an unusually tall Mainland Chinese plainclothes male whom I understood to be acting in an official or liaison role. While accompanying me, he received a telephone call and I distinctly remember him saying in English about me, 'He looks like he's been working out.' I could not hear the caller and do not know the caller's identity, nationality, agency, or purpose. I therefore do not describe the caller as an American agent. I ask OIG to determine whether any Department, consular, DSS, liaison, or interagency record identifies a U.S. participant or communication connected with that event; if no such record exists, that negative result should control.

41F. Post-quarantine Hong Kong and 5 October 2020 SMS. My Aventura/Hong Kong record states that after mandatory quarantine I made an HKPF report concerning the earlier Hong Kong threats before the later SMS incident. On 5 October 2020 I received the preserved messages displayed as coming from +852 9342 8498, including references to ELDAVIDE, C.I.A., TRAINED TO DENY, and SCHIZOPHRENIC. The sender identity remains unproven. I allege that the timing and apparent knowledge reflected in the messages make the source of information an important cross-border question, but I do not claim the SMS alone proves State, DSS, FBI, or CIA participation. I ask OIG to determine whether any Department record, disclosure, employee, contractor, liaison communication, passport/consular record, or interagency referral can explain or exclude a Department nexus.

41G. Philippines fetal-death emergency and warning-witness context. My Philippine and Aventura materials record that during Lesyl Medalla's pregnancy I contacted a U.S. Consulate duty officer and said I feared our unborn baby could die if we could not obtain adequate food. My Philippine filings separately allege serious criminal conduct surrounding the later fetal death, including third-party approaches to Lesyl and other events that Philippine investigators are asked to evaluate. I do not ask State OIG to determine the medical or criminal cause of the fetal death. I ask OIG to preserve any Department record of my emergency requests, the pregnancy/food warning, related family or liaison communications, and any referral or coordination concerning threats to us during that period.

41H. Warning woman / reported later death. An older preserved publication records my recollection that an elderly woman intervened between an approaching gunman and me and warned me by drawing a hand or finger across her throat. A later Philippine filing more cautiously records that a Lorega resident warned me of an active threat against my life and that Lesyl later told me, 'They killed her.' My present recollection is that these descriptions concern the same woman, but I do not have a death certificate, medical record, police finding, or other objective evidence establishing her death, cause of death, or who was responsible. I therefore do not present her reported death as a proven murder or as proof of State involvement. I include it to explain the seriousness of the threats I was reporting and ask OIG to preserve any consular, duty-officer, RSO/DSS, liaison, or referral record in which I reported this warning or later information about the woman.

VIII. SPECIFIC OIG INVESTIGATIVE AND PRESERVATION REQUESTS

42. I respectfully request that State OIG, within its authority and discretion, preserve and examine the following Department records. This is an evidence-preservation request, not a subpoena and not a demand that OIG adopt my interpretation of the evidence.

- 2014 Philippines repatriation-assistance/loan file, including intake, ACS/OCS notes, financial calculations, exit-visa/fine information, family contacts, liaison identity, emails, phone notes, cable traffic, address-disclosure history, and any attachment or scan matching my prior description of a Cayman Islands wire to "Distressed Assets Funds" originating from Professional Housing Ltd. (Glasgow).
- All Department records sufficient to identify the State Department liaison involved in the repatriation process and to reconstruct communications with Evelyn Yudowitz, Bernard S. Yudowitz, or other family representatives.
- Any State-originated or State-received correspondence with Philippine NBI/DOJ/police concerning me, including any record matching the reported "courtesy letter," my Lorega/Cebu address, repatriation matter, or requests for assistance.

- Any record of formal or informal U.S. coordination concerning the American known to me as Jerry, the Quezon City Drug Task Force credential I observed, the gray-haired American's police-escorted arrival at the Cebu address used in my repatriation process, immigration officers who displayed identification at Escario, the man reported as an 'undercover policeman' and later recognized at Cebu/Baguio hospitals, or the masked woman who identified herself as an undercover police officer after the Baguio incident. The authenticity and lawful basis of those claimed or displayed authorities are investigative questions, not presumed facts.
- January 2016 U.S. Embassy Manila / Mission ACS, OCS, RSO/DSS, appointment-system, visitor/security, telephone, email, emergency-assistance, case-note, and referral records for the same-day Bureau of Immigration / Mission sequence, including records sufficient to identify two entries or attempted entries, the computer-booked notarial appointment, the promised federal-officer meeting and why it did not occur, any report of acute symptoms, and the identity of the woman at the private-room window.
- Separately, U.S. Embassy Manila after-hours duty-officer and emergency-consular records for the Philippine-period call in which I remember the phrases "warrant on my life" and "Whitey," including duty rosters, call-routing or telephone logs, ACS case notes, emails, RSO/DSS referrals, and searches for the possible duty-officer identifier "Noel." My current recollection does not fix this call to the January 2016 Mission day or to any particular Cebu incident; contemporaneous Department records should establish the date and context.
- Any Department/consular/duty-officer/RSO/DSS record from the 2014-2016 Philippine period reflecting my reports that my pregnant partner and unborn child lacked adequate food or faced danger; my statement that I feared the unborn baby could die without adequate nutrition; any report of threats to Lesyl or me; any report of the warning woman/Lorega resident; and any later report that Lesyl told me, 'They killed her.' These are record locators only; OIG is not asked to determine fetal-death or homicide liability from this hotline complaint.
- Dumaguete period (approximately February-April 2015): ACS/OCS and Embassy/consular outbound-call logs, case notes, privacy-waiver or consent forms, and related emails sufficient to identify the woman who called my mobile phone asking me to come sign a privacy waiver, the post from which she called, the purpose of the requested waiver, and any related communications with family members or other third parties.
- Any Department record reflecting third-party mental-health statements about me, including the source, date, recipient, system, dissemination, and use of the statement. If no such record exists in a searched system, note that result rather than presuming an entry.
- 13 June 2019 Guangzhou notarial-service records, appointment and payment records, copy/scanning records, internal emails, routing and retention history, and any RSO/DSS/ACS or other referral, case, closure, or disposition record concerning my affidavit about Jonathan Benny. Identify whether the affidavit was merely notarized, copied, retained, referred, assessed, or otherwise acted upon.
- Passport Services records concerning my Seattle, Boston, and Vancouver passport/consular interactions and my 2019 Guangzhou lost/stolen-passport matter, including responsive passport-fraud, DSS/RSO interview, referral, case/disposition, ACS case-note, replacement, fingerprint, CLASS, PIERS, CCD, or related records. For Seattle, include the approximately 2010 application/rejection at the Jackson Federal Building and any security, fraud, loss-history, referral, internal note, or records concerning the man I remember recording me while asking about companies in China. For Boston, identify the window officer and the serious federal investigation concerning prior lost/stolen passports that I remember being told about, including any case or referral number. For Vancouver, locate the fingerprint record and the note or reason for asking about the burn on my fingers. For Guangzhou, identify what DSS recorded when I reported recognizing the older Jiangxi man at the Samsung store and what follow-up, referral, or closure action occurred. Search without presuming that any passport action was connected to a reported violent incident.
- Records sufficient to determine the true legal identity and status of the individual using the name Jonathan Benny, including whether he was ever a Department or DSS employee, contractor, locally employed staff member, source, consultant, grantee-related person, protected person, or private individual; and, subject to lawful privacy/classification limits, records capable of testing the following identity leads: Taiwanese and Nigerian passports, the claimed chloroform-sales-license statement, Langley/VIP-protection/security

representations, the 2008 Shenzhen/China detention period, Sasha / Ukrainian passport / MTV hand tattoo, the Brookline remark, questions concerning my visa, and any communication characterizing me as psychotic or criminal. These are search leads, not findings that any claimed status, license, chemical offense, or government role was genuine.

- Any Department communication with, record concerning, or lawful investigative lead to Elissa Russell capable of corroborating or disproving my recollection that she immediately identified the individual as “Benny from the State Department,” including the basis for that identification if OIG determines such inquiry is warranted.
- Any Department record concerning my post-quarantine 2020 Hong Kong reports or the 5 October 2020 SMS incident if either was reported, referred, or communicated to State, OCS, RSO/DSS, a consulate, Passport Services, or another U.S. agency; and any interagency record capable of confirming or excluding a Department disclosure or operational nexus.
- September 2025 Guangzhou notarial appointment, visitor/security, intake, ACS/RSO/DSS, document-handling, scanning, mailroom, internal-email, supervisor-review, and referral records, plus any record of my later hand delivery of the remotely notarized complaint.
- U.S. Embassy Ulaanbaatar/ACS/after-hours duty-officer/RSO/DSS records concerning the reported February 2017 Mongolia hotel/police event, including any communication from Mongolian police, any call or note involving a person identified to me as 'Jason,' and any contemporaneous contact with a female U.S. consular duty officer. Jason's Department or DSS affiliation is not presumed.
- Any Department, consular, DSS, liaison, or interagency record concerning the 3 March 2020 Macao Border Gate/COVID-screening event, including any U.S. contact with the plainclothes escort or Macao/Mainland authorities. I do not identify the unknown caller as American or as a U.S. official without records establishing that fact.
- 2026 correspondence or submissions from me to State/Consulate personnel relating to the Philippine, Hong Kong, Macao, Guangzhou, or Aventura matters, and any referral or preservation action taken in response.
- Records-retention and disposition information sufficient to determine whether any responsive record category was destroyed after notice of its potential evidentiary significance, by whom, under what schedule, and when.

IX. RECORD-LOCATOR MATRIX

Period / event	Likely State component / record set	Key search terms	Why material	Qualification
2008 China detention / Benny	DS/DSS; passport/security; consular or investigative referrals if any	Larry Margulies / Lawrence Yudowitz; Jonathan Benny; Elissa Russell; Sasha; Shenzhen detention; Taiwanese passport; Nigerian passport; Ukrainian passport; MTV tattoo; Brookline; visa; Langley; VIP protection; chloroform sales license; psychotic; criminal	Verify identity/status; test Elissa Russell identification; identify source of passport/visa/location/mental-health information; compare lawful detention/liaison records	Identity/search leads only. Benny affiliation, claimed passports/license, chemical offense, and government role are not independently established.
2014 repatriation	CA/OCS/ACS; repatriation assistance; cables; liaison notes	Yudowitz; Margulies; Cebu; 26 C Imus Highway; US\$2,500; US\$1,500; Distressed Assets Funds; Professional Housing Ltd.; Glasgow; Cayman; Arlington, Massachusetts	Identify liaison, family communications, address handling	Financial/attachment descriptions are locators unless underlying records are recovered
2014-2015 NBI letter / escort	Embassy Manila; RSO/DSS; liaison/cables; law-enforcement coordination	NBI; courtesy letter; Lorega; Cebu; Jerry; Drug Task Force	Confirm or refute State correspondence / coordination	MLAT use not presumed
Jan 2016 Manila Mission day; separate Philippine-period Manila duty-officer call	Embassy Manila ACS/OCS/RSO/DSS; visitor/security; appointment system; after-hours duty rosters/logs	Bureau of Immigration; Exit Bureau; unknown substance; two visits; private room; hypnotize; notarial appointment;	Reconstruct Jan 2016 Mission day and separately date/identify the after-hours Whitey/warrant call	Do not merge the two events unless records establish a connection; exact date of Whitey call

Period / event	Likely State component / record set	Key search terms	Why material	Qualification
		federal officer; Noel; night duty officer; warrant on my life; Whitey		presently uncertain
13 Jun 2019 affidavit	Guangzhou ACS notarial register; cashier; scans; RSO/DSS referral	Jonathan Benny; notarized affidavit; June 13 2019	Establish notice and handling	Notarial service does not itself prove agency adopted allegations
Passport/consular records - Vancouver / Seattle / Boston / 2019 Guangzhou	Passport Services; Vancouver consular/passport records; Seattle and Boston Passport Agencies; DSS/RSO; ACS; CLASS/PIERS/CCD if responsive	Vancouver fingerprints/burn; Seattle rejection; China-company questions/phone recording; Boston serious federal investigation re lost/stolen passports; Guangzhou/Jiangxi; May 2019	Reconstruct passport/consular record trail, referrals, and investigation identifiers	Representations and recollections require record verification; no assumption that any passport action caused a violent incident
3 Mar 2020 Macao	State/consular/DSS/liaison or interagency records only if a U.S. contact existed	Macao; Border Gate; COVID screening; plainclothes escort; 'He looks like he's been working out'	Identify or exclude any U.S./Department communications nexus to the official-channel event	Caller identity/nationality unknown; no U.S. role presumed
5 Oct 2020 HK SMS	State/OCS/RSO/DSS/Passport/interagency records only if notified, referred, or involved	+852 9342 8498; ELDAVIDE; C.I.A.; TRAINED TO DENY; SCHIZOPHRENIC; post-quarantine HKPF report	Determine whether any Department record explains or excludes an information/disclosure nexus	SMS does not prove sender or agency identity; HKPF/telecom evidence controls
Sep 2025 Guangzhou appointment / delivery	Guangzhou ACS; security; intake; RSO/DSS; internal mail/email	notary; complaint; Proof; OIG; Sept 22-24 2025	Verify non-completed appointment and physical delivery	No claim of email transmission without sent-mail record
2026 follow-up filings	OIG/ACS/OCS/RSO/DSS records if submitted or referred	Philippines Complaint-Affidavit; Aventura; HKPF; Macao; Guangzhou	Preserve corrected chronology and referral trail	Foreign filings are record locators, not proof of federal guilt
2010 Hong Kong -> Shenzhen -> Seattle	Passport Services; Seattle Passport Agency; DS/DSS/security or fraud referrals if any	Hong Kong threats; Shenzhen border; Jackson Federal Building; Seattle Passport Agency; Brooklyn Seafoods; bald American male	Test cross-border continuity and whether any State/passport record supplies a lawful explanation or exclusion	Aventura filing supports the sequence; no claim that passport action caused the reported Seattle incident
Jan 2016 Baguio	Embassy Manila/RSO/DSS/liaison records only if reported or coordinated	Notre-Dame de Chartres; cardiac monitor; unknown substance; hospital guards; masked woman; undercover police officer	Test official-claim / liaison nexus against Philippine sworn filing	Claimed police status and State facilitation are not presumed; Philippine filing controls date
Feb 2017 Mongolia / Jason	U.S. Embassy Ulaanbaatar ACS; after-hours duty; RSO/DSS; emergency communications if any	Mongolia; hotel; police; Jason; female consular duty officer; 27 Feb 2017	Identify Jason and any Department role; reconstruct police-to-consular calls	Present locator is principally from older preserved writings; affiliation not established
2014-2016 PH pregnancy / warning witness	Embassy Manila ACS/OCS; after-hours duty; RSO/DSS; liaison/referral records if reported	pregnant; unborn baby; food; nutrition; Lorega resident; warning woman; 'They killed her'	Locate State record of emergency reports and any referral/coordination	Fetal-death and reported witness-death liability are not OIG findings; PH/other records must establish cause and responsibility
2019 Guangzhou Benny affidavit / DSS passport report	Guangzhou ACS notarial records; RSO/DSS; Passport Services; referral/case/disposition systems	Jonathan Benny; June 13 2019; Samsung; Jiangxi; passport theft; DSS interview; referral; closure	Determine what State/DSS actually received, recorded, referred, investigated, or closed	No notice of follow-up is not proof that no internal action occurred; broader 'same group' theory remains to be tested

X. PRIVACY ACT / FOIA AND JUDICIAL-READINESS CLARIFICATION

43. My earlier cover letters asked the Consulate to amend any inaccurate CCD or other State Department record. I now clarify that this OIG supplement is not intended to substitute for the Department's formal Privacy Act access/amendment process. I request OIG to preserve and identify relevant records and to refer record-integrity issues to the proper Department component. I will use the formal Privacy Act/FOIA procedures for access and amendment as appropriate.

44. If an agency record about me is located and I contend that it is inaccurate, irrelevant, untimely, or incomplete, a separate amendment request can identify the exact record and requested correction. That approach is stronger than asking an office to “remove false mental-health notations” before the specific record and its source are known.

45. I am also preserving this chronology and the requested record categories because FOIA and the Privacy Act provide separate administrative and, after applicable prerequisites, judicial review mechanisms for qualifying record-access or amendment disputes. I do not ask OIG to decide a future federal lawsuit in this hotline complaint. I ask OIG to preserve the evidence and maintain an accurate referral/handling trail so that later administrative or judicial review, if necessary, rests on a clean record.

46. The applicable Inspector General provisions are now codified in Chapter 4 of Title 5, including 5 U.S.C. §§ 402, 404, and 406. I rely on those provisions and State OIG’s published hotline mission for OIG authority to review Department programs, operations, and employee/contractor misconduct. I do not claim that the Inspector General Act creates a private right to compel OIG to open an investigation.

47. 22 U.S.C. § 4802 is relevant to the Department’s diplomatic-security functions, overseas-post security, investigative functions authorized by law, coordination, and evacuation responsibilities. I no longer characterize that statute as creating a broad personal, non-discretionary duty to investigate every threat reported by a private U.S. citizen.

XI. REFERRAL REQUESTS AND JURISDICTIONAL DISCIPLINE

48. I request that State OIG investigate matters within its jurisdiction and refer discrete matters outside its jurisdiction when the evidence supports referral. State OIG’s published hotline guidance states that it may open an investigation, audit, evaluation, or inspection, refer a matter to Department management, or refer information to another federal agency or law-enforcement body.

49. I do not ask State OIG to investigate FBI personnel merely because I have separately complained that the FBI did not act on reports. Any alleged FBI/DOJ misconduct should be submitted through DOJ OIG or the appropriate DOJ/FBI professional-responsibility channel. If State OIG identifies an interagency record or verified FBI nexus in Department files, I authorize referral to the competent DOJ oversight component.

50. I similarly do not ask State OIG to treat CIA participation as established. If OIG independently verifies an intelligence-community nexus, I request that OIG coordinate or refer the matter through the legally appropriate classified or oversight channel. The public hotline submission should not contain classified information.

XII. REQUESTED OUTCOME

51. I respectfully request the following practical outcomes:

- Preserve the identifiable State Department records listed in this supplement while the allegations and related record requests are evaluated.
- Assign or route the complaint for independent OIG assessment of the Department-specific issues, rather than treating the entire matter as a generalized request that State investigate foreign crimes.
- Verify the identity/status of Jonathan Benny and the source of any Department-related information he may have received about me.
- Reconstruct the 2014 repatriation file, liaison communications, and handling/disclosure of my Cebu address and third-party mental-health assertions.
- Locate or rule out the reported State-originated NBI “courtesy letter” and any U.S. communication connected to the reported Philippine police/credential events.
- Reconstruct the 2014-2016 Philippine State-record trail, including repatriation/address handling, claimed official-authority contacts, pregnancy/emergency-assistance reports, the January 2016 Manila Bureau of Immigration / U.S. Mission same-day handling, the separate Manila after-hours duty-officer calls, and any State record of the warning witness; and reconstruct the 2019 Guangzhou Benny-affidavit and passport/DSS handling and the September 2025 notarization/delivery events.

- If OIG finds evidence of criminal conduct, privacy violations, record falsification, improper disclosure, abuse of authority, retaliation, obstruction, or other misconduct, refer the evidence to the competent prosecutorial, investigative, disciplinary, privacy, or records-management authority.
- If OIG determines that a major allegation is unsupported by State records, preserve that negative finding as part of the case assessment so future filings can be narrowed accordingly.
- Provide an acknowledgment or reference number if available, and advise me of any referral that OIG policy permits it to disclose. I understand OIG generally does not provide investigative status updates.

XIII. CONFIDENTIALITY, SENSITIVE SOURCES, AND COOPERATION

52. I am willing to provide original files, native electronic evidence, unredacted witness information, and additional identifiers directly to an assigned investigator through a secure method. I have intentionally omitted some non-public witness contact information and precise current-location/security information from this general submission.

53. I understand that OIG may need to reveal my identity or information during an investigation or referral and that excessive confidentiality can impede investigation. I therefore authorize necessary investigative referrals while requesting that my precise current location and sensitive witness information be limited to persons with a need to know, to the extent permitted by law.

54. I will correct the record promptly if I locate new objective evidence that materially changes any statement in this supplement. My purpose is not to preserve a theory at all costs; it is to obtain an accurate, testable record and determine which alleged connections are real, mistaken, coincidental, or unsupported.

XIV. VERIFICATION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1746

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my present knowledge and recollection. Where I expressly identify a statement as a belief, inference, report from another person, uncertain recollection, or matter requiring independent verification, I intend it to be evaluated according to that evidentiary status rather than treated as an established fact merely because it appears in this declaration.

Executed on: _____

Place of execution: _____

Signature: _____

LARRY MARGULIES

Optional notarial jurat may be attached if desired. This declaration is drafted to permit execution outside the United States under 28 U.S.C. § 1746; it is not necessary to represent that a U.S. consular officer notarized it unless a consular officer actually does so.

APPENDIX A - CONTROLLING SOURCE / CORRECTION SCHEDULE

This appendix is intended to prevent later reviewers from treating superseded wording as my current position. It should travel with any future federal submission that materially relies on the same facts.

Topic	Earlier problem	Current controlling source / position	Use in State OIG matter
September 2025 complaint	Notarized but compressed and legally over-assertive in places	Historical notarized submission; corrected by this supplement on specified points	Notice + source packet; not a charging instrument
Philippines core filing	Later supplements could be confused with original	25 Aug 2026 Philippine Complaint-Affidavit is controlling sworn core; 19 Sep 2026 revised supplement remains provisional/unsworn until notarized	Use as foreign sworn record locator; accurately label supplemental status
Martin call attribution	Older complaint treated Martin as definitely present	Evelyn + Bernard certain; exact speaker uncertain; Martin presence uncertain; separate Bernard/Martin email call preserved	Correct any State draft adopting older attribution
Lesyl / Ruby	Some cross-jurisdiction summaries blurred sources	Lesyl statement: concealed number + bad-things account; separate paper: "Ruby" + number; "take care of him" is separate Martin recollection	Prevent source contamination
Exhibit 18	Called Cebu police blotter	21 Jul 2015 NBI Complaint Sheet; separate Cebu record may exist	Correct exhibit descriptions
2019 Guangzhou theft	Older OIG drafts used 2017	2019; Samsung receipt 25 May 2019; exact return/theft date from records	Search correct State/passport record period
Macao event	Older OIG draft used 2019	On/about 3 Mar 2020, subject to immigration records	Avoid wrong-year search
HK SMS	Older draft variants used Oct 8 / number errors	5 Oct 2020; +852 9342 8498	Use preserved screenshots/native files
Baguio / departure	Older mid-2015 wording	Hospital incident Jan 2016; final Philippine departure Jan 2016	Correct timeline and requests
Manila Exit Bureau / Mission day	Older Aventura/OIG wording used 2015 or compressed separate Mission facts	January 2016, exact day unknown. Philippine sworn filing controls date/symptoms. Private-room, two-visit, and computer-booking details are present-recollection/prior-publication locators unless confirmed by State records.	Search Jan 2016 State records; keep the same-day Mission cluster distinct from the separate after-hours Manila duty-officer call.
State/CIA/DSS status	Older narrative sometimes used affiliations as facts	Treat as representations unless independently verified	OIG to verify personnel/contractor/status
Chemical identity	Specific drug/chemical labels used as conclusions	Unknown substance / suspected exposure absent toxicology	Request medical/incident records, not a predetermined toxin finding
MLAT / U.S. coordination	Older drafts treated treaty facilitation as established	Search for any formal/informal coordination; no treaty use presumed	Record question rather than legal conclusion
September 2025 cover sheet	Addressed to State emails, but sent-mail proof not located	Tuta archive shows drafting/preservation artifacts on 22 Sep 2025 and a 25 Jan 2026 self-forward; no located sent-mail proof to GuangzhouACS/OCS. Present recollection = printed physical delivery; exact date/recipient to be verified	Search Consulate intake/visitor/security/document records; do not infer State-email transmission
Macao caller identity	Older publication described the caller as American / probably an American agent	Current 2026 Macao police report states that I could not hear or identify the caller; the escort's English remark is preserved, but caller identity/nationality/agency remain unknown	Use current Macao report; ask OIG to verify any U.S. nexus rather than swear the older identification
Warning woman / reported death	Older publication describes throat-gesture warning and an approaching gunman; later PH filing uses a narrower warning/death formulation	Present recollection is that the descriptions concern the same woman; Lesyl's statement 'They killed her' is reported hearsay; no death/cause record presently establishes murder	Use as seriousness/record locator only; do not present murder or State responsibility as established
2019 passport / same-group theory	Older publications said the same group stole the passport	Corrected Guangzhou report supports the passport theft allegation and positive recognition of the older Jiangxi man; whether the broader group was the same remains an investigative question	Ask OIG for DSS/passport records and disposition without overstating group identity

APPENDIX B - PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL EXHIBIT REGISTER

The most effective first OIG submission is a curated record, not a bulk dump. I propose the following exhibit series. Large background files, including the unofficial merged publication archive, should be preserved and produced only as indexed source material or on request. Sworn filings and objective records control where they conflict with the unofficial archive.

Exhibit	Document	Purpose	Submission tier
OIG-S1	22 Sep 2025 notarized State/DOJ complaint, including Proof notarial page (Pelard Faustin; commission 135507216; exp. 18 Mar 2029)	Establish prior sworn submission, allegations, and evidence then available	Primary
OIG-S2	September 2025 cover-letter/draft records and email metadata	Establish cover-letter wording and archive chronology while preserving the limitation that State-email transmission is not presently proven	Primary
OIG-S3	13 Jun 2019 Guangzhou notarized deposition/affidavit	Establish pre-2020 formal documentation of Benny/security concerns	Primary
OIG-S4	25 Aug 2026 Philippine notarized Complaint-Affidavit	Controlling sworn Philippine source and official jurat	Primary / relevant excerpts plus complete copy available
OIG-S5	19 Sep 2026 revised Philippine Supplemental Complaint-Affidavit + provisional status notice	Current source attribution, hotel/SUV/Ruby/Gecko/consular record locators; clearly marked unsworn pending notarization	Primary if status marking retained
OIG-S6	Aventura Supplemental Sworn Affidavit of Corrections and Clarifications (14 Aug 2026)	Correct call attribution, dates, Exhibit 18, and other source issues	Primary
OIG-S7	Aventura Further/Third/Fourth supplements - selected pages	Publication/SMS chronology, trust records, and later correction discipline	Secondary / indexed
OIG-S8	5 Oct 2020 native-image SMS screenshot set (currently described in HKPF/Aventura submissions as four incoming messages) + hash manifest / HKPF references	Preserve exact native message text, times, displayed number, and chain of custody; native images control over transcription	Primary
OIG-S9	Macao Judiciary Police report (Aug 2026)	Source-controlled 3 Mar 2020 border event and Benny chronology	Secondary
OIG-S10	Guangzhou PSB supplemental report re 2019 passport theft	Detailed, corrected Samsung/Jiangxi/passport record locators	Secondary
OIG-S11	HKPF cross-border coordination materials and CMHK/OFCA preservation / carrier-routing records	Current police references and telecom preservation trail	Secondary
OIG-S12	Selected indexed excerpts from the unofficial merged publication archive	Prior-publication chronology and locator aid only; sworn filings and objective records control if inconsistent	Background only - do not submit full archive unless requested

APPENDIX C - LEGAL / PROCEDURAL AUTHORITY NOTES (CURRENT AS OF 20 SEPTEMBER 2026)

These notes are included to keep the complaint within the correct procedural lane. They are not presented as an exhaustive legal brief.

Authority / procedure	Relevance
State OIG authority	5 U.S.C. §§ 402, 404, and 406 establish and describe Inspector General purposes, duties, investigations, access to agency records, and requests for information/assistance.
State OIG hotline practice	State OIG's published hotline materials state that OIG may open an investigation/audit/evaluation/inspection, refer a matter to Department management, or refer it to another federal or law-enforcement agency; OIG decides what action to take and generally does not provide investigative status updates. The current online form asks whether additional evidence exists and states that OIG will determine whether it is needed and provide submission instructions.
State OIG current mailing address	U.S. Department of State, Office of Inspector General, SA-06, Suite L600, 2201 C Street NW, Washington, DC 20522-0606.
Privacy Act	5 U.S.C. § 552a provides access/amendment and civil-remedy

Authority / procedure	Relevance
	provisions subject to statutory requirements and exemptions. A strong amendment request identifies the actual record, the precise correction requested, and supporting documentation.
FOIA	5 U.S.C. § 552 provides a separate process for access to nonexempt agency records and judicial review after applicable administrative requirements.
Overseas declaration	28 U.S.C. § 1746 permits a written declaration executed outside the United States, in substantially the statutory form, to be used under penalty of perjury in many situations where a sworn declaration is permitted, subject to statutory exceptions.
Diplomatic Security statute	22 U.S.C. § 4802 describes the Secretary's diplomatic-security, mission-security, investigative, coordination, and evacuation responsibilities. This supplement does not treat § 4802 as a blanket private right to compel an investigation of every citizen complaint.
Separate DOJ/FBI oversight	Allegations concerning FBI/DOJ employee misconduct should be routed to DOJ OIG or the appropriate DOJ/FBI professional-responsibility component; State OIG should be asked to refer only any verified interagency nexus found in State records.

APPENDIX D - PORTAL SYNOPSIS

This synopsis can be pasted into the State OIG online hotline narrative field. The signed full supplement should be retained for mailing and for later production if OIG requests continuation material or supporting evidence. The current hotline form asks whether additional evidence exists and states that OIG will determine whether it is needed and provide instructions for submission.

I am supplementing a complaint I executed and remotely notarized on 22 September 2025 concerning possible U.S. Department of State / Diplomatic Security misconduct, record handling, and failure to follow up on reports I made while overseas. Later sworn filings and official records corrected important parts of my earlier narrative. I allege a recurring cross-border pattern of serious threats, violent incidents, tracking, and official or official-appearing contacts, and I ask OIG to test whether any Department, DSS, passport, consular, contractor, liaison, or interagency record shows misuse of government access, lawful coordination, private impersonation, or no Department nexus. Priority records include my 2014 Philippines repatriation/address file; any State-originated NBI/police correspondence; records concerning police escorts or claimed credentials; my Philippine emergency calls concerning threats, lack of food during pregnancy, and the later warning-witness information; January 2016 Manila Mission and duty-officer records; the Baguio official-claim issues; the 2010 Hong Kong-Shenzhen-Seattle sequence, Seattle rejection, Boston serious federal-investigation warning, and Vancouver fingerprint/burn locator; the Dumaguete privacy-waiver call; the February 2017 Mongolia police/consular contacts involving a person identified to me as 'Jason'; the 13 June 2019 Guangzhou Benny affidavit and its actual disposition; the 2019 Guangzhou passport-theft/DSS report and Jiangxi identification; the 3 March 2020 Macao Border Gate official-channel event; post-quarantine Hong Kong reports and the 5 October 2020 SMS; any State record containing third-party mental-health characterizations about me; and the September 2025 Guangzhou notarial appointment and subsequent physical delivery of my remotely notarized complaint. I do not claim that CIA involvement, MLAT use, a specific chemical agent, the identity of the Macao caller, the identity of the Hong Kong SMS sender, the cause of the fetal death, or the reported death of the warning woman has been established. I request preservation of the identified records, independent testing of these alleged connections, confidentiality for my precise current location, and referral of any substantiated criminal, privacy, records-integrity, or interagency issue to the competent authority.

END OF SUPPLEMENTAL SUBMISSION