

Request for Comment: Cornell Seven Representation, eCourtRecords.org, and Alleged Identity Exposure

From Richard A Luthmann <richard.luthmann@protonmail.com>

To JordanS@kollerlawfirm.com

CC Dick LaFontaine <RALaFontaine@protonmail.com>, Rick LaRivière <RickLaRiviere@proton.me>, Modern Thomas Nast <mthomasnast@protonmail.com>, Frankie Pressman <frankiepressman@protonmail.com>, Sully <msully0916@gmail.com>, Frank Parlato <frankparlato@gmail.com>, Michael Volpe <mvolpe998@gmail.com>, Cara Castronuova <cjcinvestigates@gmail.com>, jt@liquidlunchtv.com, Greg Maresca <greg_m@newsitem.com>

Date Sunday, October 4th, 2026 at 10:07 AM

Dear Mr. Santo:

I'm Richard Luthmann, an investigative journalist leading a group of independent journalists examining the Cornell Seven case, the government's response, and the online publication of information purporting to identify Lucy Craig as the Jane Doe accuser.

I'm asking whether you represent, advise, or otherwise work for the plaintiff or any of the seven named civil defendants: Matthew Ingalls, Johnathan Newell, Winston Lee, Gillio Lopes, Diego Sarabia, Scott Norris, and Scott Kretzschmar. This inquiry also concerns anyone retaining you to advance their interests, whether through litigation, crisis management, reputation defense, or media strategy.

Our investigation includes *Jane Doe v. Cornell University, Inc., et al.*, New York County Supreme Court, Index No. 161704/2026, and the provenance of material published through eCourtRecords.org. The complaint's filing stamp is September 16, 2026. The domain's [current registration record](#) begins September 17. Its [October 2 archived homepage](#) lists Cornell alongside Lindsay Clancy's civil case and a Braden Peters case. The timing and narrow selection warrant questions about the publisher's purpose, funding, and sources. They do not establish its operator.

We are examining two theories that could operate separately or simultaneously.

Political Psy-Op: I believe the political handling of the controversy warrants scrutiny as a possible coordinated persuasion campaign: disputed allegations becoming an electoral narrative benefiting Gov. Kathy Hochul, Attorney General Letitia James, and the Democratic Party. We are testing whether apparent alignment reflects actual coordination, ordinary political opportunism, or independent responses to a major news story.

Reputation defense: A separate possibility is a crisis-management engagement serving the plaintiff or one or more defendants, Cornell, or another interested party. Such an engagement could involve document distribution, press strategy, online publishing, or efforts to influence how the evidence and the accuser are perceived. We are investigating whether the reported identity exposure formed any part of such work, and who authorized it.

Those are investigative theories. We have not established a campaign, a client, or your involvement. Nor have we established who supplied the identifying information for Lucy Craig as the Jane Doe accuser.

Your name arose through a [Colorado business-directory listing](#) identifying “Jordan Santo” as an agent for Bevetta LLC, [linked to a website](#) where Lucy Craig was unmasked as the Cornell Seven Jane Doe accuser. Your [firm biography](#) describes substantial Army prosecution and defense experience, while your [claimed lawyer-directory profile](#) specifically describes sexual-assault litigation. That background makes a question about relevant legal advisory work reasonable. It does not establish a reputation-management or any other engagement.

Please address the following on the record:

1. **Representation:** Have you or Koller Law represented, advised, consulted for, or been retained by the plaintiff or any of the seven men in connection with this matter? Please identify any relationship you can publicly confirm, its dates, and whether it remains active.
2. **Related interests:** Have you performed Cornell-related work for a relative, employer, insurer, university, fraternity, consultant, or other person or entity seeking to advance the defendant’s interests? Have you worked for the plaintiff’s side or another interested party? Please identify the client or capacity to the extent you may disclose it.
3. **Bevetta:** Are you the Jordan Santo identified in the Bevetta LLC listing? If so, what is your role? Does Bevetta have any connection to the Cornell litigation, online case publishing, reputation management, or eCourtRecords.org?
4. **Website involvement:** Have you participated in registering, financing, developing, operating, editing, promoting, or supplying material to eCourtRecords.org, directly or through another person? Have you had any role in changing its case pages or making material unavailable?
5. **Reported unmasking:** Did you request, authorize, approve, assist with, or distribute material purporting to identify Lucy Craig as the Jane Doe accuser? When did you first learn of that publication, and do you know its source? Please address any role in creating or circulating an identifying case URL.
6. **Reputation-defense work:** Have you coordinated with a public-relations firm, crisis consultant, investigator, publisher, or online contractor concerning this case? What work was commissioned, by whom, and who paid for it? Please provide any nonprivileged records you are willing to share.
7. **Political coordination:** Have you participated in communications or planning concerning this case’s public presentation with Hochul’s office, James’s office, political organizations, plaintiff’s counsel Thomas Giuffra, or media intermediaries? If so, please explain the nature and purpose of that contact.
8. **Confirmation or denial:** Do you deny any role in a coordinated reputation-defense campaign, the operation of eCourtRecords.org, or the reported identity exposure? Please identify any premise you believe is wrong and provide corrections or supporting records.

I’m seeking facts and attribution. If confidentiality or privilege prevents an answer, please identify that limitation and answer the remaining questions as fully as you can.

Please respond as soon as possible, as we intend to go to press shortly. Your answers may be quoted in full or in part. If you decline to respond, the article will state that we provided you with these questions and you did not answer them. If we receive your responses after press time, we will incorporate them into a follow-up.

Thank you for your attention to this matter!

Regards,

Richard Luthmann

Writer, Journalist, and Commentator

Tips or Story Ideas:

(239) 631-5957

richard.luthmann@protonmail.com

[LINKTREE](#)

[Muck Rack Profile](#)

Substack: [This is For Real.](#)

Editor-In-Chief: [FLGulf.news](#)

Editor-In-Chief: [NYNewsPress.com](#)

Editor-In-Chief: [TheFamilyCourtCircus.com](#)

Contributor: [Frank Report](#)

Contributor: [Sun Bay Paper](#)

Follow Me on [Facebook](#) [X](#) [Instagram](#) [LinkedIn](#) [TRUTH](#) [Rumble](#) [SPOTIFY](#) [YouTube](#)

Sent with [Proton Mail](#) secure email.