



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 E – Police Report Discrepancies

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: According to “Girl 1,” the police report narrative did not reflect an accurate narrative of events, which is what ended up in news reports at the time. “Girl 1” details in this evidence document how her actual statements were not recorded in the police report, how she was influenced to respond a certain way, how she did not want to participate, how she tried to say that Justin was a great guy but it was not recorded in the report, and how she tried to say that nothing with Justin occurred against her will which was also not recorded the report. In a conversation with Justin years later, she corroborated her original statements and mentioned how the public narrative at the time was not accurate, how his fate had already been decided because he didn’t have the power, and she apologized that everything was blown out of proportion.

Had the police report reflected the actual narrative of events from the very beginning, Justin’s attorney could’ve potentially filed to have the charges dismissed due to lack of evidence. However, much of the evidence supporting the correct narrative of events wasn’t uncovered until the case was significantly far along, with more of it not emerging until years later.

For what was known at the time, Justin’s attorney did attempt to inform the DA, but the DA declined to entertain it as a possibility and never saw the evidence. Justin’s attorney wanted to protect him as best he could, and knowing that provoking an “accepted” criminal complaint narrative could be risky, he elected to “play it safe” as the damage had also already been done in the “court of public opinion.” Thus, he reluctantly acquiesced to get the best available deal for Justin despite knowing the narrative of events disseminated to the public at the time was not accurate. This may seem like a poor decision, but when there’s an “accepted” public narrative piled on against a defendant, it is very difficult to challenge that in the heat of the moment. This decision was also made to protect Justin’s family and the young women involved and their families from a continued circus. Overall, it appears that the investigation was conducted through a lens of presupposition about Justin, and the reports were crafted in a way that reflected that presumption.



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’s” statements after the fact in 2016 overview | pgs. [2-3](#)
- Justin was a “great guy” and nothing was “against” her will | pg. [3](#)
- She didn’t want to cooperate and was “made to think things” | pgs. [4-5](#)
- The police report purported statements to be from her that weren’t | pg. [5](#)
- She wanted to try and help Justin if she could | pg. [6](#)
- “Girl 1” and Justin discussing the case years later | pgs. [6-7](#)
- “Girl 1” and Justin discussing the news reports years later | pgs. [7-8](#)
- Conclusion | pg. [8](#)

“Girl 1’s” Statements After the Fact in 2016 Overview

Overview: An inquiring party who knew the public narrative at the time wasn’t accurate and who wanted to help reached out to the girls after the fact in 2016 to get the real story. Pages 2-6 display excerpts from that conversation with “Girl 1.”






A

PI & Skiptrace Services


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

a) The inquiring party had first tried to contact “Girl 1” via email.




Justin Was a “Great Guy” and Nothing Was “Against” Her Will


b) “Girl 1” states that she repeatedly tried to make it clear that nothing happened that she didn't want and that nothing was forced, coerced, or pressured, but the police report did not reflect those statements.



c) “Girl 1” states that they did hang out and kiss/make out, but that it was not against her will. That is not how the version of events portrayed in the sensationalized public narrative at the time made it seem.



d) “Girl 1” states that she said that Justin was a “great guy” and that he “didn’t pressure her into anything,” but the police report did not reflect those statements.





A

PI & Skiptrace Services

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

She Didn't Want to Cooperate and Was "Made to Think Things"

- e) "Girl 1" states that she felt intimidated and was led to believe that *she* could get in trouble if she didn't cooperate (unbeknownst to "Girl 1" at the time, she did not legally have to cooperate).



2:49 PM

I was in school and they went through my phone. They also said if I didn't they could bring me in. Obviously I was scared.

- f) "Girl 1" states that she was "pulled from class with five cops around, being questioned" and was "made to think things." She did not come forward and did not want to cooperate because nothing occurred that was against her will. According to this statement, she was forced from her class, forced to be questioned, forced to accept a different version of events, and forced to give up her phone. Based on this statement, it appears that she was treated as though *she* were a suspect. She appears to be frightened, upset, and confused, and it appears that her emotional state was taken advantage of.




3:16 PM

When you're pulled from class with five cops around you and are being questioned and your phone searched and talked to and made think things you don't kn

3:16 PM

ow what to do

- g) According to this statement, "Girl 1" did not want to talk to, give her phone to, or cooperate at all because Justin did not criminally "harm" her in any way, but she was led into thinking that she would get in trouble if she didn't cooperate. She states that she "wouldn't have if [she] didn't have to." She did not legally have to cooperate.



2:35 PM

talk to them?

2:36 PM

I didn't purposely do anything I promise! I wouldn't have if I didn't have to. It was never my intention.



A

PI & Skiptrace Services

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

- h) "Girl 1" was not upset at Justin; she was not vengeful, and nothing occurred against her will in any way. Contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time, she never meant any harm to Justin or his family.

1 (262) [REDACTED]

2:40 PM

I can't and I don't really think I need to. I truly didn't mean any harm to him or his family.

The Police Report Purported Statements to Be from Her That Were Not

- i) The inquiring party brings up to "Girl 1" how it said in the police report that Justin manipulated her.

3:14 PM

the report, you said he manipulated you :/

- j) "Girl 1" outrightly rejects that claim by alluding to having been pressured into agreeing with that premise. She said, "The cops said that to me, I didn't..." This notion is what ended up being disseminated because the public narrative was based solely on the police report.

1 (262) [REDACTED]

3:15 PM

The cops said that to me, I didn't, I was just

- k) It appears that "Girl 1" was obviously scared and hysterical, as anyone would be. She was frightened, upset, felt intimidated, and acquiesced to what was being told to her because of her emotional state. It appears that her emotional state was taken advantage of.

[REDACTED]

3:15 PM

ng to me I just nodded and was crying

- l) It appears that the investigation was conducted through a lens of presupposition about Justin, and the reports were crafted in a way that reflected that presumption. "Girl 1" appears to have been utilized for that objective.

3:17 PM

They said he manipulated me




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]

She Wanted to Try and Help Justin if She Could

m) “Girl 1” *wanted* to help, which is contrary to the public narrative at the time that made it seem as though animosity existed. She states, "If I can do anything I'll try."




n) “Girl 1” offers to be contacted anytime.



“Girl 1” and Justin Discussing the Case Years Later

Overview: Contrary to the sensationalized public narrative at the time, no animosity existed between Justin and either “Girl 1,” “Girl 2,” or “Girl 3.” Regarding “Girl 1” specifically, she and Justin have always been cordial with one another. Here they are catching up with one another and discussing the case several years later.

o) “Girl 1” confirms in this conversation that it was “blown out of proportion” and that she was forced to participate—the same account she gave in 2016. She even says to Justin, “I’m sorry for what you went through...”





A

PI & Skiptrace Services

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

- r) “Girl 1” further states that all she knew was “what I was being told through police...”, which is the same account she gave in 2016. “Girl 1” also mentions the news reports as being the only other source of information that she received. She says that she never got to hear Justin’s side of anything, only what she was being told through “police and reports.”



Conclusion

It’s clear that “Girl 1” in this evidence document and “Girl 3” in [Exhibit H](#) both stated that the police report, which the sensationalized public narratives in the news reports at the time were solely based on, did not accurately portray the actual narrative of events. “Girl 2” did not state this outrightly but based on the evidence in [Exhibit F](#), it is clear that the police report did not reflect an accurate narrative of events regarding her either. It appears that the investigation was conducted through a lens of presupposition about Justin, and the reports were crafted in a way that reflected that presumption.

Since Justin was [well-liked](#) at the schools, the inaccurate public narrative at the time that suggested that the girls in the case had claimed that he “manipulated” them made them a target of harassment from other girls seeking to defend Justin, which caused unfortunate collateral effects. “Girl 1” mentioned in other conversations with Justin about how she had to switch schools for her last few months before graduation because other girls harassed her, and “Girl 2” experienced emotional trauma as well.

After the case ended, an attempt was made to file a complaint due to the police report discrepancies that perpetuated the inaccurate public narrative, but it was withdrawn upon realizing that it would likely not have been investigated in good faith. Ironically, someone from the public at the time observed how the case was handled and [left this comment](#) on a since-removed news article. It is also 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](#)).