



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 F – No Sexual Assault and All Interactions Were Mutual

*Note: The purpose of this evidence was neither to point fingers nor revive the now long-ago case but solely to illustrate that the public narrative at the time was not accurate.*

---

**Overview:** Contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time, Justin did not manipulate, sexually assault, or otherwise engage in any nonmutual “predatory” behavior with either “Girl 1” or “Girl 2.” No coercive element, no animosity, and no behavior conducted against the will of another—which is the definition of sexual assault—ever occurred or existed. All behavior, communications, and interactions between Justin and both “Girl 1” and “Girl 2” were entirely mutual, and Justin was not the sole initiator or “mastermind.” In fact, Justin maintained boundaries and did not continue with any physical aspects beyond the singular events. It is important to note that Justin apologized and took responsibility for failing to uphold moral propriety, but he never admitted guilt to any untrue, sensationalized narratives (see [Exhibit G](#)).



The evidence herein is from 2016 unless noted otherwise. It was reviewed by a private investigator and filed with the 2022 legal action: Wisconsin Circuit Court – Walworth County (2022CV000728), and Wisconsin Appellate Court – District II (2023AP000644). It was used objectively in court filings and was/is not meant to be a spectacle.



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 1”). 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 1”

Overview | pg. [3](#)

Justin was not the “mastermind” as the public narrative at the time suggested | pgs. [3-4](#)

No animosity existed after the event in question | pg. [4](#)

“Girl 1” was sophisticated and already talked to older individuals | pg. [5](#)

“Girl 1” appears to have initially talked with Justin, she made her intentions clear, and they discussed hypothetically dating | pg. [6](#)

Their friendship was not based on sexual motives | pg. [7](#)

“Girl 1” and Justin’s conversation years later | pg. [8](#)

### “Girl 2”

Overview | pg. [9](#)

“Girl 2” sought out hanging out as well | pg. [9](#)

Justin was not the “mastermind” as the public narrative at the time suggested | pgs. [9-10](#)

No animosity existed after the event in question (1) | pg. [11](#)

“Girl 2” was sophisticated and more mature than guys in her age range (1) | pg. [12](#)

“Girl 2” made her intentions clear, and she was sophisticated | pgs. [12-13](#)

Their friendship was not based on sexual motives | pg. [14](#)

“Girl 2” was sophisticated and more mature than guys in her age range (2) | pg. [14](#)

No animosity existed after the event in question (2) | pg. [15](#)

Regarding the bail jump charge, the public narrative at the time wasn’t the full story |  
pg. [16](#)



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 1”

**Overview:** “Girl 1” and Justin were obviously friends and it also appeared that Justin was not the sole initiator, which was contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time. It was apparent that he and “Girl 1” had an interest in one another, and wanted to hang out, but they also seemed to want to maintain boundaries, so there was an inner conflict going on. And Justin, despite everything, sought to maintain boundaries. For instance, no intercourse of any kind ever occurred (not with “Girl 2” either), and he also never went to anyone’s house.

#### a) Justin Was Not the “Mastermind” as the Public Narrative at the Time Suggested.

These are from conversations with “Girl 1,” and they display when she’d initiate. This is not to point fingers at her or paint her in a negative light because Justin was interested in her as well. It’s merely to demonstrate that the public narrative at the time suggesting Justin was the “mastermind” was inaccurate.

8:21 PM We probably won't at first lol

8:21 PM We'll figure it out then haha

8:15 PM Where should we go? I mean we could just drive around or something

8:16 PM Of course (: I hope you can hang out Saturday too, it'd be nice to chill outside of a school setting lol

8:16 PM Yes, it would be different, that's for sure, but in a good way, obviously, haha.

11:53 AM I think it would be better, we wouldn't have to have a whole bunch of people around haha.

11:53 AM Okay sounds good, I can hang out literally whenever tomorrow so just let me know (:

11:22 AM I'm not sure, but my parents are gone tomorrow after school for a bit if you want to come over?

11:22 AM From: [REDACTED]  
Lol I knew that, I was just gonna ask if you maybe wanted to hang out if I end up not doing anything after school. Or I was actually thinking since I don

9:49:05 PM(UTC-6)

9:49:15 PM(UTC-6) From: [REDACTED]  
't have school on Monday we could chill. (:

11:48 AM It's comfy in there too I used to hang out in there all the time haha

11:49 AM Yeah, it is pretty cozy haha

11:49 AM They should put a couch in here

11:50 AM They really should lol. So do you think we can hang out tomorrow still?

6:50 PM Definitely (: I might go tomorrow I don't know tbh it just depends on how I feel in the morning lol. Are you gonna do that English subbing or?

6:51 PM I don't think so, no.

2:36 PM Thanks for looking out for me, [REDACTED] (:)




2:37 PM Of course (: lol and it's no problem, I just never want to put your job at risk is all. Do you want to come over after school tomorrow?




A [REDACTED]

PI & Skiptrace Services

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



b) **No Animosity Existed After the Event in Question.** Contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time, there was no evidence that animosity existed between Justin and “Girl 1” after the event in question. In fact, here is a conversation excerpt from afterward on that very night. “Girl 1” states that she “enjoyed it a lot” and they begin texting again the following day.



[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]

### “Girl 1” Was Sophisticated and Already Talked to Older Individuals

- c) It was apparent that “Girl 1” was more on the sophisticated side. In one conversation, she mentioned how she “mostly talks to older people.” This could help explain why they were attracted to one another (that and they are in the same generation years-wise).

1/29/2016 2:27:30 PM(UTC-6), [REDACTED] => justinbeaton, Deleted  
 Yeah a lot of girls I noticed are like that, I feel like that makes guys uncomfortable, I just stay chill, you have the best conversations like that. I feel like we get along well, which is nice. I usually talk to older people anyways so maybe that's why.

Participants:

Participant	Delivered	Read	Played
justinbeaton			

- d) Here is “Girl 1” and Justin discussing this same topic in 2016 (left) and several years later (right). “Girl 1” confirms her 2016 assessment of herself, and they even humorously reminisce—further confirming that no animosity ever existed between them at any time.

12:41 AM, 34% battery, 262 [REDACTED]

Justin: We make really good friends like we don't run out of conversation which is nice (:  
8:09 PM

Girl 1: Yes, and that's definitely something I appreciate. It's rare with high-schoolers usually, haha.  
8:09 PM

Justin: Well I think we definitely agree my maturity goes past high school haha.  
8:10 PM

Girl 1: Yes, I think we can both agree on that, for sure. Haha, which is probably why we've been able to talk for so long

10:02

Justin: That's true. Very good points  
5:45 PM ✓✓

Girl 1: Haha we used to talk about relationships 6 years ago and here we are again  
5:46 PM ✓✓

Justin: I think you and I clicked too because guys in high school typically respond with one word haha and you and I would have like week straight conversations  
5:46 PM ✓✓

Girl 1: Very true! I feel like I've always been more mature for my age, even back then compared to everyone else my age so it was always nice to have normal and deep conversations with you, instead of being asked wyd all day. 😂  
5:49 PM

Justin: Lolol!!!!  
5:50 PM ✓✓

Girl 1: Hahahaha  
5:51 PM ✓✓

Justin: So funny  
5:51 PM ✓✓

Girl 1: I can just picture that  
5:51 PM ✓✓

[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]

### “Girl 1” Appears to Have Initially Talked with Justin, She Made Her Intentions Clear, and They Discussed Hypothetically Dating

- e) “Girl 1” even appears to have sought Justin out to talk to when she first saw him in class, which contradicts the public narrative at the time that suggested he was the sole initiator.


1/29/2016 2:33:00 PM(UTC-6), [REDACTED] => Justinbeaton, Deleted  
Yeah you're really easy going which is something I like a lot. And you were sitting right next to me so I figured might as well talk to you lol. I'm glad I did though. (:

Participants:


Participant	Delivered	Read	Played
justinbeaton			

- f) Here they seem to be joking about something on Tumblr and “Girl 1” jokingly exclaims that she is a “bad influence” on him. This is not to point fingers because it was obvious that mutual interest existed, but it’s simply to illustrate that the public narrative at the time that suggested Justin was “enticing” her was not accurate.
- g) Contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time that suggested she was “child,” “Girl 1” made her intentions clear in this playful conversation. Again, this is not to point fingers because it was obvious that mutual interest existed, but it’s simply to illustrate that the public narrative at the time was not accurate.


f)



g)



- h) “Girl 1” and Justin discuss how they would feel about a hypothetical dating relationship. This was not a nonmutual “predatory” situation.








A [REDACTED]

PI & Skiptrace Services

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

i) **Their Friendship Was Not Based on Sexual Motives.** An example of what “Girl 1” and Justin’s conversations mostly consisted of back when he was subbing (i.e., non-sexual content):



[Back](#)






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 1” and Justin’s Conversation Years Later

- j) Justin and “Girl 1” have always been cordial with one another and discussed the case several years later. Here it displays that conversation in which they were friendly with one another—talking about each other’s lives and significant others, it shows “Girl 1” being sympathetic towards the way Justin was treated, and she even admonishes people to understand and forgive.







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 2”


**Overview:** It was apparent that Justin and “Girl 2” talked extensively about a variety of topics, and they appeared to be friends (the peak of their friendship occurred at a different time than Justin and “Girl 1”). Again, contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time, Justin was not the “mastermind” behind their hanging out. It was clear here as well that Justin and “Girl 2” had an interest in one another, and Justin utilized poor judgment because of this. It was also evident that “Girl 2”, who was just shy of her 18<sup>th</sup> birthday, had a car, a job, a high intellect, an acceptance to a prestigious college, a stated impatience for guys her age, and is in the same generation years-wise as Justin (like “Girl 1”), seemed to be why they could have potentially been a compatible choice for one another.

- k) **“Girl 2” Sought Out Hanging Out as Well.** Contrary to the public narrative at the time, the basis for “Girl 2” and Justin’s friendship was not sexually motivated. They genuinely had an interest in one another and were friends. Here is “Girl 2” bringing up hanging out early on (left). And here is “Girl 2” suggesting going for a drive (right). The public narrative at the time suggested that Justin “enticed,” her and “Girl 1,” but there is no evidence of that. They had a genuine interest in one another and were genuine friends.



### Justin Was Not the “Mastermind” as the Public Narrative at the Time Suggested

- l) Regarding the night they hung out, “Girl 2” is the one who comes up with the idea of going for a drive. It must be emphasized that this is not to point fingers or paint her in a negative light because their interest was mutual, but it is only to display that the public narrative at the time that suggested that he “enticed” her was not correct.






A


PI & Skiptrace Services

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


m) Contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time, it’s clear that Justin wanted to hang out with her as well, but he didn’t initiate the details of the plan. Here he asks her what the plan should be, and “Girl 2” says “Let’s meet somewhere and I’ll leave my car and hop in yours :)”



n) Here “Girl 2” suggests to “park it somewhere private.” It must be emphasized that, again, this is not to point fingers, but it’s to demonstrate that Justin was not behaving in a nonmutual “predatory” manner, and that mutual interest existed. In fact, Justin never wanted to point fingers at anyone. He has always acted kindly toward both “Girl 1” and “Girl 2” and could have realistically theoretically dated either one. However, it is important to include this because the public narrative at the time suggested that Justin was the sole initiator—i.e., behaving in a nonmutual “predatory” manner—but that’s simply inaccurate.



o) Justin jokingly asks her why she wants to take him somewhere private, and she responds jokingly and flirtatiously. Contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time, all their interactions were always mutual.





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 After the Event in Question (1)

- p) After hanging out and ultimately kissing, there was no animosity—which contradicts the sensationalized public narrative at the time. Here is “Girl 2” after the event in question asking Justin if he is still coming to sub the next day.

Conversation (SMS Message )

Export ▾ Enter text to filter ... ✕

Participants (1)

[REDACTED] 262 [REDACTED]

Conversation

– ✓ Select/Deselect all 422 messages

To: [REDACTED] ^  
Good morning, [REDACTED] :)  
 7:21:06 AM(UTC-6)

From: [REDACTED]  
How are you :)  
 7:22:37 AM(UTC-6)

To: [REDACTED] ^  
About to get my workout done for the day :) How's 1st hour?  
 7:40:22 AM(UTC-6)

From: [REDACTED]  
That's good :) and it's alright are you forsure coming tomorrow ?  
 7:43:51 AM(UTC-6)




A

PI & Skiptrace Services




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

- q) **“Girl 2” Was Sophisticated and More Mature Than Guys in Her Age Range (1).** The public narratives surrounding cases like these typically throw around the word “child” because it elicits a reaction. Justin would never be attracted to, have an interest in, or be involved with a child. “Girl 2,” just like “Girl 1,” and “Girl 3,” along with many other girls at the schools were not “children” and would take offense to such a characterization.



**“Girl 2” Made Her Intentions Clear, and She Was Sophisticated**

- r) Here Justin comments on something “Girl 2” suggested and says, “Lol that’s pretty sneaky haha :)” “Girl 2” responds by saying “We can be sneaky ;)” Again, this is not pointing fingers at “Girl 2” because their interest was obviously mutual. However, the public narrative at the time suggested that he was the sole initiator, which the evidence does not support.






A

PI & Skiptrace Services

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

- s) Regarding hanging out at “Girl 2’s” house, Justin says that he’s “not going to just show up unexpectedly” and “Girl 2” responds with “Haha I’ll sneak you in the back door haha jk ;)” Both “Girl 1” and “Girl 2” brought up or asked about Justin coming over, but he never did do so. “Girl 2” is not to blame in any way, nor is she, or “Girl 1,” or “Girl 3,” meant to be portrayed in a negative light. Evidence like this is solely included to demonstrate that the sensationalized public narrative at the time that suggested Justin was the sole initiator that “enticed” girls in a nonmutual “predatory” manner was completely unsupported by the evidence gleaned from their actual conversations. As with “Girl 1,” there was genuine, mutual interest here as well.






A [REDACTED]


PI & Skiptrace Services

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

- t) **Their Friendship Was Not Based on Sexual Motives.** An example of what “Girl 2” and Justin’s conversations mostly consisted of (i.e., non-sexual content):



- u) **“Girl 2” Was Sophisticated and More Mature Than Guys in Her Age Range (2).** Like a percentage of girls in this age range nowadays, “Girl 2” is far more mature than guys her own age and would be more interested in older guys. The sensationalized public narratives surrounding cases like this typically don’t account for this reality.






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 After the Event in Question (2)

- v) Here they discuss Justin getting an apartment by himself. “Girl 2” suggests that when he does, she “can sleepover.” This is noteworthy because the sensationalized public narrative at the time implied there was animosity between them after hanging out and kissing, yet this conversation occurred after that event, and there was no evidence at any point of there ever being animosity between them.



- w) Here is another conversation excerpt that occurred after the event in question. Again, no animosity exists here.





A

PI & Skiptrace Services

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

## Regarding the Bail Jump Charge, the Public Narrative at the Time Wasn't the Full Story

- x) This is noteworthy because a bail-jumping charge stemmed from it. The sensationalized public narrative at the time suggested that Justin initiated reaching out to "Girl 2" while on bond, thus violating his bond, but that isn't the full story. The screenshot below is from the first initiated call, which was a missed call on the Beaton home phone caller ID. The call comes from "Girl 2's" household, and nobody was home at the Beaton home at the time when the call came in. Justin never knew for sure if it was "Girl 2" calling or a member of her family, but it is highly possible that it was "Girl 2" because she would have known to call him on the home phone because she would have known that his cell phone had been confiscated.

It was at some point after this call occurred that the same inquiring party who contacted the other girls, and who knew the public narrative at the time was inaccurate and wanted to help, reached out to "Girl 2" to try and encourage her to help Justin. The inquiring party, however, was unaware that law enforcement had taken over "Girl 2's" accounts. Law enforcement then pretended to be "Girl 2" and led the inquiring party to believe that "Girl 2" (who was really law enforcement) wanted to talk to Justin. It was then that Justin reached out to "Girl 2's" cell phone and left her a voicemail asking if she was okay, and he was taken into custody on felony bail-jumping charges shortly thereafter. At the time of his reaching out, "Girl 2" was 19 years old.

Before being taken into custody, the judge even said, "We realize this communication is innocuous, but he has to follow the rules." Justin was not reaching out for any inappropriate reason. He was just genuinely concerned that she was alright, as he had never been able to touch base with her because of the no-contact rule in place. The public narrative at the time suggested that he contacted her "criminally," but he genuinely cared and wanted to make sure she was okay. Justin served nine months in jail on work release for this bail-jumping charge where he sought to be [helpful and encouraging to others](#).

### The Caller ID screenshot:

