



A

PI & Skiptrace Services


Ms. [REDACTED]  
PI & Skiptrace Professional since 2014  
Licensed in [REDACTED], Available in the U.S.  
e. [REDACTED].com  
p. [REDACTED]


## EXHIBIT H – “Harmful Material” Explained

*Note: The purpose of this evidence is neither to point fingers nor absolve blame, but solely to illustrate that the public narrative at the time was not accurate.*

**Overview:** Like many other staff and students at school, “Girl 3” was of many girls and guys (staff and students) that Justin knew from school and was friends with on social media at the time. In 2015, after Justin posted a photo one evening, “Girl 3” and he began a conversation. Unbeknownst to Justin at the time, it was not just “Girl 3” messaging with him, it was her and several of her friends. Because they thought he was attractive, they jokingly decided to try and get Justin to send them a more revealing photo of himself (“harmful material”) and even sent suggestive photos to try and coax him to do so.

Contrary to the public narrative at the time, neither Justin nor “Girl 3” were criminally “harmed” by the conversation, it ended unremarkably, and “Girl 3” and Justin even conversed after the fact at school without issue. Most notable about this interaction is that these girls were not “innocent children.” These were experienced girls who would never have referred to themselves as “children.” As you’ll read on [pg. 2, section b](#), “Girl 3” herself later stated that Justin “did not do anything to her” and she dismissed the police report’s narrative of events entirely. Also contrary to the public narrative at the time, no animosity ever existed between Justin and “Girl 3.”

 The evidence herein is from 2016 unless noted otherwise. It was reviewed by a private investigator and filed as a part of the 2022 legal action: Wisconsin Circuit Court – Walworth County (2022CV000728), and Wisconsin Appellate Court – District II (2023AP000644).

 All identifiable information has been redacted out of respect for the privacy of individuals and their current lives. This includes utilizing generic pseudonyms in place of names (e.g., “Girl 3”). All the original, unredacted evidence has been stored away indefinitely.



A

PI & Skiptrace Services

Ms. [REDACTED]  
PI & Skiptrace Professional since 2014  
Licensed in [REDACTED], Available in the U.S.  
e. [REDACTED].com  
p. [REDACTED]

**“Girl 3’s” statement after the fact in 2016 | pg. 2**


**Mischaracterization in the public narrative at the time – pg. 3 | No animosity existed – pg. 4**

**Justin did not admit to sending criminally “harmful material” to “children” | pg. 5**


**Conclusion – pg. 5**

**“Girl 3’s” Statement After the Fact in 2016.**

- a) The same inquiring party who knew the public narrative at the time wasn’t accurate, who wanted to help, and who contacted both “Girl 1” and “Girl 2,” also contacted “Girl 3” to get the real story of what happened.



- b) When asked, “Girl 3” directly states that Justin did nothing to her, and she dismisses the police report’s narrative of events entirely.



[Back to Top](#)



A

PI & Skiptrace Services


Ms. [REDACTED]  
PI & Skiptrace Professional since 2014  
Licensed in [REDACTED], Available in the U.S.  
e. [REDACTED].com  
p. [REDACTED]

### Mischaracterization in the Public Narrative at the Time

- c) The forensic investigation into Justin's phone stated that "no images found were indicative of a crime."

02-16-2016 at 2:14 p.m. The file report number of this download is [REDACTED]. This download contained over 12,000 images, 1368 text messages, 6940 SMS messages, and 619 calls in the call log. While reviewing both files that were provided, I did not see any images that were indicative of a crime. There were no inappropriate photos sent or received that I was able to see from either of the two downloaded files provided. After reviewing the images that were retrieved I did not see any

- d) The police report asserted that the "harmful material" was likely on Justin's previous phone from a few months prior that he replaced due to a broken screen. When Justin changed phones, he migrated all the data from the previous phone to the new one, which would have included any deleted data stored in the deep memory of the phone (a forensic investigation was performed on it). However, nothing criminal was found when the phone was investigated as noted in [Section C](#). Here was Justin having a conversation with "Girl 2" about when he changed phones. He states, "I'm in the process of trying to switch everything over now."






A

PI & Skiptrace Services


Ms. [REDACTED]  
PI & Skiptrace Professional since 2014  
Licensed in [REDACTED], Available in the U.S.  
e. [REDACTED].com  
p. [REDACTED]

### No Animosity Existed

- e) “Girl 3” and Justin are seen here conversing lightheartedly. “Girl 3” even mentions letting Justin know when she works—presumably so he can visit her (he did not). Contrary to the public narrative at the time, there was no evidence of animosity between them. They appeared to be amicable with one another.



- f) Here “Girl 3” amicably initiates a conversation sometime after the event in question. She is seeing how Justin is doing and providing him with her new username. No animosity exists here whatsoever, which is contrary to the public narrative at the time.





A

PI & Skiptrace Services

Ms. [REDACTED]  
PI & Skiptrace Professional since 2014  
Licensed in [REDACTED], Available in the U.S.  
e. [REDACTED].com  
p. [REDACTED]

## Justin Did Not “Admit” to Sending Criminally “Harmful Material” to “Children”

- g) The public narrative at the time suggested that Justin “admitted” to sending criminally “harmful material” during that [conversation](#) with “Girl 3” (and her friends) that had occurred a couple of months prior, but this is not the full story.

**Context:** The police report did not mention that Justin denied this more than once (the police report said it was only once). It did not mention that he was continually prodded to admit that he sent criminally “harmful material” even after he already denied it more than once. Finally, it did not mention that he was told that if he “told the truth” it would be “better for [him],” and that after *that* is when he “admitted” to it. The public narrative at the time implied that he freely confessed. In actuality, he had never been in a police interview before, and so, he said what he thought would get him out of there because he was absolutely terrified.

then told BEATON that it is believed that he sent a student a picture of his naked [REDACTED]. At first BEATON denied this but then he stated that he did do this one time, months ago.

---

**Conclusion:** The facts are that no criminal image was found from the deep forensic scan ([Section C](#)), and “Girl 3” said he did nothing to her ([Section B](#)). In short, no “children” were criminally “harmed” by “harmful material.”

It is also worth mentioning that many more girls in the high school age range nowadays are much older in appearance, behavior, maturity level, and life and relationship experience level than girls in the same age range were in earlier decades—with many seeking out, being friends with, and dating older individuals who are more in line with their level of sophistication. You could take one look at current social media sites, for example, and this reality will immediately become apparent. The way cases like these are typically handled does not genuinely consider any of this, however, and that's precisely why schools need to be unwavering in their prevention measures before it gets to that point.