

1 RANDALL S. NEWMAN (SBN 190547)
 2 Attorney at Law
 3 99 Wall St., Suite 3727
 4 New York, NY 10005
 5 212.797.3735
 6 rsn@randallnewman.net
 7
 8 *Attorney for Plaintiff,*
 9 *Christopher J. Cordova*

10
 11
 12
 13
 14
 15
 16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

CHRISTOPHER J. CORDOVA,
 Plaintiff,
 vs.
 JONATHAN HUDON-HUNEULT,
 NNEKA OHIRI, 14693663 CANADA
 INC.,
 Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-04685-VKD

HON. VIRGINIA K. DEMARCHI

**DECLARATION OF RANDALL S.
 NEWMAN IN SUPPORT OF
 PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR LEAVE
 TO FILE SECOND AMENDED
 COMPLAINT**

HEARING:

Date: March 31, 2026
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Place: 280 South 1st St.
 Courtroom 2 (5th Floor)
 San Jose, CA 95113

1 retained all accrued causes of action. No transfer or assignment of enforcement rights to
2 Executive Lens LLC occurred. Plaintiff therefore has standing to assert the infringement
3 claim added by the proposed Second Amended Complaint.

4 9. Plaintiff now seeks leave to file a Second Amended Complaint to assert a
5 copyright infringement claim for *Courthouse Fail* based on the newly issued registration
6 and to conform the pleadings to intervening developments.

7 10. The proposed Second Amended Complaint is narrow and corrective in nature,
8 does not expand the factual scope of the case, and is based on statutory rights that accrued
9 only after the filing of the operative pleading.

10 11. A true and correct copy of the proposed Second Amended Complaint is
11 attached hereto as Exhibit A.

12 12. A redline comparison reflecting the changes between the First Amended
13 Complaint and the proposed Second Amended Complaint is attached hereto as Exhibit B.

14 13. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of
15 America that the foregoing is true and correct.

16 Executed on this 10th day of February, 2026.

17
18 s/ Randall S. Newman
19 Randall S. Newman
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 RANDALL S. NEWMAN (SBN 190547)
 2 Attorney at Law
 3 99 Wall St., Suite 3727
 4 New York, NY 10005
 5 212.797.3735
 6 rsn@randallnewman.net
 7 *Attorney for Plaintiff,*
 8 *Christopher J. Cordova*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11
 12 CHRISTOPHER J. CORDOVA,

13 Plaintiff,

14 vs.

15
 16 JONATHAN HUDON-HUNEAULT,
 17 NNEKA OHIRI and 14693663 CANADA
 18 INC.,

19 Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-04685-VKD

**[PROPOSED] SECOND AMENDED
 COMPLAINT
 FOR:**

1. **Copyright Infringement, 17 U.S.C. §§ 101 *et seq.*;**
2. **Misrepresentation, 17 U.S.C. § 512(f);**
3. **Circumvention of Technological Measures, 17 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1203**

1 Plaintiff, Christopher J. Cordova (“Plaintiff”), files this Second Amended Complaint
2 (the “SAC”)¹ against Defendants Jonathan Hudon-Huneault (“Huneault”), Nneka Ohiri
3 (“Ohiri”) and 14693663 Canada Inc. (“Canada Inc.”) (Huneault, Ohiri and Canada Inc. are
4 collectively referred to as the “Defendants”) who operate the Frauditor Troll YouTube
5 channel located at www.youtube.com/@frauditortroll (the “Frauditor Troll Channel”) and
6 alleges as follows:

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. This case arises from Defendants’ systematic theft and monetization of
9 Plaintiff’s copyrighted YouTube videos and their abuse of the Digital Millennium
10 Copyright Act’s (“DMCA”) counter-notice process, 17 U.S.C. § 512(g), to force those
11 stolen works back online.

12 2. Defendants built the Frauditor Troll Channel on wholesale misappropriation
13 of Plaintiff’s videos and the works of other First Amendment auditors (“Auditors”).

14 3. Instead of adding transformative commentary, critique, or analysis,
15 Defendants’ videos rely almost entirely on Plaintiff’s original footage, often playing for
16 extended durations, interspersed with brief derisive remarks, or unoriginal on-screen
17 memes. These token alterations serve no critical or educational purpose; they exist solely
18 to ridicule the subjects and harvest advertising revenue through YouTube’s Partner
19 Program.

20 4. Defendants obtained Plaintiff’s videos through unlawful circumvention of
21 YouTube’s rolling-cipher technology, software designed to prevent unauthorized
22 downloading, thereby violating both YouTube’s Terms of Service and the anti-
23 circumvention provisions of 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).² The result was a monetized archive of
24

25 ¹ Plaintiff previously filed an Amended Complaint before service of process (ECF No. 20) and a First
26 Amended Complaint after service of process (ECF No. 39). The current pleading is styled as the Second
27 Amended Complaint to reflect that it is the second amendment following service.

28 ² Plaintiff does not assert any independent claim under YouTube’s Terms of Service. Those terms are
referenced solely to illustrate the technological and contractual framework governing user access to

1 stolen content repackaged as so-called “fair use.”

2 5. Huneault has repeatedly bragged, both in Counter-Notices and on public
3 livestreams, that he has received over forty-eight copyright strikes and that every single
4 one has been overturned through the counter-notification process. His message is clear:
5 mass infringement pays, and the DMCA’s safeguards can be gamed indefinitely through
6 form responses, delay and the prohibitive cost of federal litigation.

7 6. Between July and October 2023, Huneault submitted at least nine Counter-
8 Notices to YouTube under § 512(g)(3), each signed under penalty of perjury, asserting that
9 the videos were protected by the non-existent “Fair Use Act of 1976” (the “Counter-
10 Notices”). Huneault also claimed to own the Frauditor Troll Channel when Google’s
11 records show the AdSense account belongs to Ohiri; later, Huneault asserted that the
12 Frauditor Troll Channel was owned by Canada Inc.

13 7. Defendants’ serial misrepresentations of ownership, combined with their use
14 of a fictitious U.S. service address, demonstrate deliberate deception intended to obstruct
15 enforcement and evade liability.

16 8. Every Counter-Notice contained the same boilerplate paragraph, copied
17 verbatim from prior counter-notices, asserting fair use without any reference to the actual
18 content, purpose, or substantiality of the copied works. This rote formula bears no
19 resemblance to a genuine fair-use analysis; it is merely a script crafted to exploit
20 YouTube’s automated reinstatement system.

21 9. Upon learning of this action, Huneault and Ohiri publicly admitted that they
22 permanently deleted more than 1,700 videos from the Frauditor Troll Channel in an effort
23 to conceal evidence and evade accountability for their mass infringement of Plaintiff’s and
24 other creators’ works. The scope and timing of the deletion demonstrate willful destruction
25 of relevant evidence and a deliberate attempt to obstruct discovery in this case.

26 10. After service of the Complaint, Huneault and Ohiri appeared on YouTube to
27

28 _____
YouTube’s platform. Defendants’ violations of those terms demonstrate their awareness that such conduct
was unauthorized and support the inference of willful circumvention under 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).

1 mock the proceedings, publicly declaring that it was a one-in-a-billion chance Plaintiff
2 would have filed this lawsuit and boasting that they would never settle. Those statements
3 expose Defendants' mindset: profit from theft while daring Plaintiff or anyone else to stop
4 them.

5 11. Defendants' conduct, mass theft, repeated infringement, false Counter-
6 Notices, circumvention of technological protections, and public taunting, reveals not
7 misunderstanding of fair use but malice. This pattern of willful defiance threatens not only
8 Plaintiff's rights but the integrity of the DMCA itself.

9 12. Plaintiff therefore brings this action under the Copyright Act for: (a) direct
10 infringement of his registered works, (b) knowing and material misrepresentations in
11 Counter-Notices submitted under 17 U.S.C. § 512(g), (c) declaratory relief, and (d)
12 circumvention of technological protection measures in violation of 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).
13 Plaintiff seeks damages, declaratory and injunctive relief, and all remedies available under
14 the Act to halt Defendants' unlawful enterprise and restore the meaning of fair use.

15 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 13. This action arises under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*, and
17 includes a claim for Declaratory Relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

18 14. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and
19 1338(a), as this case involves federal questions arising under the Copyright Act and the
20 Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

21 15. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(a)
22 because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred here and the
23 infringing content was published and distributed via YouTube, which maintains its
24 principal place of business in this District.

25 16. Defendants consented to jurisdiction in this District by submitting the
26 Counter-Notices under 17 U.S.C. § 512(g)(3).

1 **PARTIES**

2 17. Plaintiff is a resident of Colorado and the creator and operator of the YouTube
3 channel “Denver Metro Audits” (@DenverMetroAudits) (the “DMA Channel”).

4 18. Plaintiff is the author and original copyright owner of the audiovisual works
5 at issue. He retains all rights, title, and interest in the claims asserted in this action,
6 including those arising under 17 U.S.C. §§ 512(f) and 1201. Although Plaintiff later
7 assigned the copyrights in his broader catalog to Executive Lens LLC (“Executive Lens”),
8 his wholly-owned company, those assignments expressly excluded and reserved to
9 Plaintiff all accrued causes of action and claims relating to the infringements and DMCA
10 violations alleged herein.

11 19. Ohiri is an individual residing in Canada who co-owns and manages the
12 Frauditor Troll Channel.

13 20. Huneault is an individual residing in Canada who serves as the voice and
14 narrator for videos on the Frauditor Troll Channel and co-owns and manages the Frauditor
15 Troll Channel. Huneault and Ohiri are married.

16 21. Canada Inc. is a Canadian corporation owned and controlled by Huneault and
17 Ohiri, which acts as a co-owner or operating entity for the Frauditor Troll Channel.

18 22. Upon information and belief, Ohiri, Huneault, and Canada Inc. jointly operate
19 the Frauditor Troll Channel as a single business enterprise. They share access to the
20 Channel’s YouTube account, AdSense monetization, and related social media platforms,
21 and each Defendant participates in the selection, editing, publication, and monetization of
22 its videos. Defendants collectively profit from the unlawful conduct alleged herein and are
23 therefore jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for all resulting damages and statutory
24 violations.

25 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

26 23. YouTube is the largest video-sharing platform in the world and operates under
27 the framework established by the DMCA.

28 24. The DMCA provides a process by which copyright owners may request the

1 removal of infringing content through a notice-and-takedown mechanism. If the platform
2 receives a valid takedown notice, it typically disables access to the allegedly infringing
3 material.

4 25. The statute also gives the alleged infringer a way to respond: a counter-
5 notification claiming the use is authorized, lawful, or otherwise non-infringing. If the
6 copyright owner does not file a federal lawsuit within 10 business days of receiving a
7 counter-notice, YouTube must restore access to the disputed content. 17 U.S.C. § 512(g).

8 26. This framework shifts the burden onto copyright owners, often small creators
9 or publishers, to file suit quickly or see their work reposted.

10 27. Defendants exploited this imbalance by filing boilerplate Counter-Notices
11 under § 512(g) designed to intimidate Plaintiff into dropping the matter and force
12 reinstatement of stolen videos.

13 28. This abuse allowed Defendants' Frauditor Troll Channel, to continue
14 monetizing stolen infringing content while publicly claiming "fair use." In truth,
15 Defendants' uploads consist almost entirely of Plaintiff's unaltered footage, supplemented
16 by trivial mockery, recycled memes, and other non-transformative filler.

17 29. In the context of this FAC, the term "Auditor" refers to Plaintiff and other
18 independent content creators who record interactions with government officials in public
19 spaces to promote transparency, document public conduct, and assert constitutional rights,
20 particularly those protected by the First Amendment. These creators act as citizen
21 journalists, watchdogs, and public advocates, often filming police encounters, public
22 meetings, and other matters of public interest, and then editing and publishing that original
23 footage online, most prominently on YouTube.

24 30. The Auditor movement has become a significant presence on social media,
25 drawing millions of subscribers and billions of views, and generating substantial
26 advertising revenue. Many Auditors operate under pseudonyms but have nonetheless
27 become well-known figures within the digital civil rights community.

28 31. Plaintiff is an Auditor, activist, and content creator who documents

1 interactions with public officials, government employees, and law enforcement officers in
2 the course of his advocacy work. He spends significant time filming, editing, and
3 publishing these encounters to the DMA Channel, where the resulting videos serve both as
4 a public record of official conduct and as a means of promoting government transparency
5 and accountability. Plaintiff's work is part of the broader Auditor movement and has
6 developed a dedicated audience focused on constitutional rights, public oversight, and civil
7 liberties.

8 32. In response to the growing popularity of Auditors like Plaintiff, Defendants
9 created the Frauditor Troll Channel, an operation that purports to critique Auditor content
10 but in reality exists to misappropriate, ridicule, and monetize Auditors' videos. Cloaked in
11 the appearance of commentary, Defendants' videos rely on insult, mockery, and distortion
12 rather than genuine critique or transformative discussion.

13 33. The Frauditor Troll Channel is one of the largest Auditor-focused reaction
14 channels and operates as a commercial enterprise built on satire, appropriation, and
15 systematic infringement. It offers no new message, insight, or purpose. Instead, it
16 repackages Plaintiff's original videos with intermittent ridicule to attract viewers and
17 generate advertising revenue while contributing virtually no original content of its own.
18 Although other channels have occasionally used Plaintiff's videos, none has engaged in the
19 scale, volume, or deliberate exploitation of Plaintiff's works that defines Defendants'
20 operation. This action targets that uniquely pervasive infringement, not the existence of
21 criticism or commentary itself. The Frauditor Troll channel stands alone as the principal
22 vehicle for mass theft and monetization of Plaintiff's copyrighted content.

23 34. The Frauditor Troll Channel has repeatedly used Plaintiff's copyrighted works
24 without permission and without satisfying fair-use standards. Upon information and belief,
25 between 2022 and 2025, Defendants unlawfully obtained and reproduced dozens of
26 Plaintiff's videos, estimated between fifty and one hundred distinct works, uploading them
27
28

1 to the Frauditor Troll Channel to derive advertising revenue and other commercial gain.³

2 35. Upon information and belief, Defendants obtained the videos used from the
3 DMA Channel by circumventing YouTube’s technological protection measures, including
4 its “rolling cipher” system, which encrypts and dynamically alters the video stream’s URL
5 signatures to prevent unauthorized downloads. YouTube’s player software uses a
6 decryption routine embedded in JavaScript code to authenticate requests and deliver
7 content only through approved interfaces.

8 36. Upon information and belief, Defendants used software applications, ripping
9 utilities, or browser extensions specifically designed to bypass that rolling cipher and other
10 technological measures controlling access to the audiovisual works hosted on YouTube.
11 These tools retrieve and decrypt the obfuscated streaming URLs, enabling Defendants to
12 make local copies of Plaintiff’s videos in violation of YouTube’s Terms of Service and 17
13 U.S.C. § 1201(a).

14 37. The rolling cipher is a “technological protection measure” (“TPM”) as defined
15 in 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a)(3) because it controls access to Plaintiff’s copyrighted works by
16 requiring authorized software to decrypt and stream them in real time. By using programs
17 that strip away this cipher, Defendants intentionally circumvented a technological measure
18 and knowingly obtained unauthorized copies of Plaintiff’s copyrighted works.

19 38. Defendants’ circumvention was not incidental but systematic. The Frauditor
20 Troll Channel’s production speed, volume, quality, and uniform editing style demonstrate
21 the routine use of decryption software as part of a deliberate business model to acquire,
22 republish, and monetize Plaintiff’s copyrighted videos, in violation of YouTube’s Terms
23 of Service and 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).

24
25
26 ³ Plaintiff estimates the number of stolen and infringed works based on the number of videos Plaintiff
27 published and Defendants’ pattern of serial theft and infringement of nearly every video Plaintiff posted
28 shortly after learning of this lawsuit. The precise number of stolen and infringed works cannot presently
be determined due to Defendants’ unilateral destruction of that evidence.

1 39. When publicly discussing Plaintiff’s 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a) claim against
2 Defendants, Huneault did not deny the use of circumvention tools; instead, he suggested
3 that he had another “defense,” reinforcing the inference that Defendants used such software
4 to unlawfully obtain Plaintiff’s videos.

5 40. Federal courts have recognized that YouTube’s rolling cipher constitutes a
6 technological protection measure within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a)(3) and that it
7 “effectively controls access” to copyrighted works because it prevents users from
8 downloading video streams without first executing YouTube’s proprietary decryption
9 code.

10 **Plaintiff’s Copyrighted Works**

11 41. On or about March 16, 2022, Plaintiff published a video titled *ANOTHER*
12 *CHAD EXPOSED!!! Worthless Denver Cops...ASSAULTED!!!* (“*Another Chad*”), to the
13 DMA Channel.⁴

14 42. Plaintiff registered *Another Chad* with the U.S. Copyright Office under
15 Registration Number PA002457989 on February 6, 2024.

16 43. On or about October 1, 2023, Plaintiff published a video titled *ANGRY MOB*
17 *AT BELMAR LIBRARY!!! “CALL 911!” Cops don’t show up* to the DMA Channel
18 (“*Belmar Library*”).⁵

19 44. Plaintiff registered *Belmar Library* with the U.S. Copyright Office under
20 Registration Number PA0002549333 on June 3, 2025.

21 45. On or about February 2, 2022, Plaintiff published a video titled *FEDERAL*
22 *COURTHOUSE FAIL!!! Threatened with arrest for recording and not one officer*
23 *identifies!* (“*Courthouse Fail*”) to the DMA Channel.⁶

24 46. Plaintiff registered *Courthouse Fail* with the U.S Copyright Office under
25 Registration Number PA0002565781 on October 15, 2025.

26
27 ⁴ <https://youtu.be/bhgHsPl4Mr0?si=F-7EgMg0bBZiy-QY>.

28 ⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=86UKGVikxKQ&t>.

⁶ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=coiMQm_zzFE&t.

Defendants' Infringing Videos

1
2 47. On or about December 2, 2022, Defendants published a video titled *Frauditor*
3 *DMA Gets Confronted by Angry Citizen (Hilarious)* (“Infringing Video 1”) to the Frauditor
4 Troll Channel.⁷ Infringing Video 1 incorporates approximately twenty-five minutes and
5 fifty-four seconds of Plaintiff’s video *Another Chad* without authorization.

6 48. Infringing Video 1 reproduces Plaintiff’s footage in fifteen separate blocks
7 with no commentary, twelve of which exceed one minute, three of which exceed two
8 minutes, one exceeds three minutes, and one exceeds four minutes. This repeated use of
9 lengthy, uninterrupted segments underscores the absence of meaningful transformation or
10 interspersed analysis.

11 49. Plaintiff’s *Another Chad* video is forty-eight minutes and fourteen seconds in
12 length, meaning Defendants reproduced more than fifty-four percent of Plaintiff’s work.
13 Excluding the introductory and concluding segments, eighty-seven percent of Defendants’
14 video consists of Plaintiff’s footage presented in long, unaltered blocks. The remaining
15 thirteen percent comprises brief interjections totaling less than four minutes, primarily
16 mocking Plaintiff rather than analyzing the subject matter or providing substantive
17 commentary.

18 50. On or about February 4, 2022, Defendants published a video titled *Frauditors*
19 *Ejected from Federal Courthouse (NEW)* (“Infringing Video 2”) to the Frauditor Troll
20 Channel.⁸ Infringing Video 2 incorporates approximately eighteen minutes and forty-six
21 seconds of Plaintiff’s *Courthouse Fail* video without authorization.

22 51. Plaintiff’s *Courthouse Fail* video is thirty minutes and twenty-seven seconds
23 long, meaning Defendants misappropriated approximately sixty-two percent of Plaintiff’s
24 work. Excluding the brief introduction and outro, eighty-seven percent of Defendants’
25 video consists of Plaintiff’s footage, while Defendants’ commentary accounts for only
26

27 ⁷ The video was available at the URL <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I-J8sdKZ504>. The video was
28 removed after the filing of this action.

⁸ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eVe4eoOzPvc&t>.

1 thirteen percent, two minutes and forty-eight seconds in total. These brief interjections
2 provide no meaningful analysis or critique and do nothing to alter the expressive core of
3 Plaintiff’s work, which dominates the viewing experience.

4 52. Infringing Video 2 remains publicly available on the Frauditor Troll Channel
5 and continues to display and distribute substantial portions of Plaintiff’s *Courthouse Fail*
6 video without authorization.

7 53. Plaintiff did not become aware of Infringing Video 2 until June 2023.

8 54. On or about October 1, 2023, Defendants published a video titled *Frauditor*
9 *DMA gets Camera Touched and CRIES A RIVER* (“Infringing Video 3”) to the Frauditor
10 Troll Channel.⁹ Infringing Video 3 incorporates thirty-seven minutes and sixteen seconds
11 of Plaintiff’s *Belmar Library* video without authorization. (Infringing Video 1, Infringing
12 Video 2 and Infringing Video 3 are collectively referred to as the “Infringing Videos”).

13 55. Infringing Video 3 reproduces Plaintiff’s footage in twelve separate blocks
14 with no commentary. Each block exceeds one minute; eight blocks exceed two minutes;
15 three blocks exceed four minutes; and the longest uninterrupted segment runs over six
16 minutes. This repeated use of extended, uninterrupted sequences underscores the absence
17 of meaningful transformation or interspersed analysis.

18 56. Plaintiff’s *Belmar Library* video is forty-six minutes and fourteen seconds in
19 length, meaning Defendants misappropriated approximately eighty-one percent of
20 Plaintiff’s work. Excluding the introductory and concluding segments, ninety-two percent
21 of Defendants’ video consists of Plaintiff’s footage presented in long, uninterrupted blocks.
22 The remaining eight percent consists of brief interjections totaling under three and a half
23 minutes, primarily mocking Plaintiff rather than analyzing the subject matter or providing
24 any meaningful commentary.

25
26
27 ⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rSUT6MDdfoo>. The video was removed after the filing of this
28 action.

1 **Defendants’ Video - How to do Fair Use Properly and Avoid Copyright Strikes**

2 57. On or about May 24, 2022, the Frauditor Troll Channel (or a related channel
3 owned by Defendants) posted a video titled *How to do Fair Use Properly and Avoid*
4 *Copyright Strikes*. The video is narrated by Huneault.

5 58. In that video, Huneault claims to offer a formula for “100% safe fair use
6 commentary videos.” He instructs viewers that a “good amount of commentary is about 40
7 seconds to every minute so you say a little comment every minute that way you’ll be safe.”
8 He also advises creators to pad videos with lengthy intros and outros and to intersperse
9 other clips in order to “increase the proportion of time that is something else than one
10 specific video.” Finally, Huneault says that the goal is to use “less than fifty percent of a
11 specific video” and asserts that when you’re “only using 30% of someone’s video, you are
12 very unlikely to get a copyright strike.”

13 59. Although Plaintiff disagrees with Huneault’s oversimplistic take on fair use,
14 as discussed above, Huneault did not even follow his own purported “fair use” formula
15 when misappropriating Plaintiff’s Videos. This inconsistency demonstrates that Huneault
16 and Ohiri lacked a subjective good-faith belief that the Infringing Videos were protected
17 by fair use when submitting the Counter-Notices, satisfying the knowledge and bad-faith
18 elements of 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

19 **Plaintiff’s DMCA Takedowns and Defendants’ Abuse of the Counter-Notice System**

20 60. In June and October 2023, Plaintiff submitted twelve DMCA takedown
21 notices to YouTube identifying videos uploaded by Defendants to the Frauditor Troll
22 Channel that infringed Plaintiff’s copyrighted works.

23 61. Each Counter-Notice submitted by Defendants under penalty of perjury
24 contained substantially identical boilerplate language, including the following:

25 I am once again asking you to forward this counter notification to the plaintiff,
26 according to the fair use act of 1976 I am legally allowed to make these types
27 of videos. I am once again asking you to forward my counter notification to
28 the plaintiff so I can have a chance to defend myself in a court of Law. I have

1 a commentary channel where I provide review videos of 1st amendment
2 auditors, I provide commentary, I add memes and sound effects to completely
3 transform the original work into a Fair use video. On my channel I have
4 received 48 copyright strikes and every single one of my videos have been
5 reinstated through the counter notification system. I am willing to defend
6 myself in a court of law. I have already hired an attorney to defend my fair
7 use videos in court and I am asking you to forward my counter notification to
8 the plaintiff so he can decided for himself if he chooses to go that route. I am
9 the original creator of the Fair use videos on my channel and I know that my
10 videos were taken down by mistake because they fall under the Fair use act.
11 Please forward my counter notification so I can defend myself in a court of
12 Law. Thank you, Jonathan Huneault

13 62. The results were mixed. Defendants accepted two strikes without filing
14 counter-notices, YouTube declined to remove one video, and Defendants filed the nine
15 Counter-Notices under §512(g)(3) seeking reinstatement of the remaining works.¹⁰

16 63. Each of the Counter-Notices contained substantially identical boilerplate
17 language and multiple false statements, including that the uploads were protected by “fair
18 use,” that Huneault was “the original creator of the Fair Use videos on my channel,” and
19 that Defendants had retained legal counsel prepared to litigate the matter. These statements
20 were materially false. Upon information and belief, Defendants made inconsistent and
21 misleading representations about the ownership and monetization of the Frauditor Troll
22 Channel, at times claiming it was owned by Huneault personally, at other times by Ohiri,
23 and elsewhere by their Canadian corporation. Regardless of the claimed ownership, no
24 counsel had been retained, and the Counter-Notices were knowingly false when submitted.

25 64. Defendants further misrepresented their location by providing “99 Wall
26 Street, New York, NY” without a suite number, as their service address in each Counter-

27 _____
28 ¹⁰ Defendants filed eight counter-notices on or about July 5, 2023 and one counter-notice on or about
October 20, 2023.

1 Notice. In reality, Defendants are residents of Canada. This fictitious U.S. address
2 obstructed Plaintiff's ability to effect service of process and constitutes an additional
3 knowing misrepresentation to support the inference that Defendants' Counter-Notices were
4 not filed in good faith.

5 65. Defendants recently publicly admitted that they knew suite number 5892 was
6 assigned to their bogus 99 Wall Street address, further demonstrating that the omission of
7 the suite number was intentional and that the Counter-Notices were filed in bad faith.

8 66. Relying on Huneault's misrepresentations regarding fair use, YouTube
9 reinstated nine videos, resulting in financial benefit to all Defendants. After Plaintiff
10 commenced this action on June 3, 2025, Defendants deleted nine of the ten videos,¹¹
11 including eight of the nine that had been reinstated by the Counter-Notices. One infringing
12 video remains live on the Frauditor Troll Channel as of the filing of this FAC.

13 67. Defendants' repeated use of false claims of fair use, a sham address, and
14 fabricated assertions of ownership and legal representation demonstrate that the Counter-
15 Notices were not merely mistaken but knowingly false and submitted in bad faith.

16 68. On July 5, 2023, the same day Defendants submitted eight Counter-Notices
17 under 17 U.S.C. § 512(g), Huneault emailed Plaintiff, stating: "If I counter every strike and
18 they all get reinstated eventually it could penalize your channel. I'm going to keep making
19 fair use videos, I'm legally allowed to do so."

20 69. That evening, Huneault emailed again, identifying himself as "Josh," claiming
21 he had "talked to a lawyer," demanding \$9,000, and asserting: "You already know the
22 videos will be reinstated in 3 weeks through the counter notification system."

23 70. These contemporaneous emails confirm Defendants used the counter-notice
24 mechanism as a tactic to force automatic reinstatement, not to correct any mistake or
25 misidentification, and that Huneault deployed a false identity while doing so.

26 71. On July 6, 2023, Huneault posted a video titled *DMA disabled Frauditor Troll*
27

28 ¹¹ As alleged above, YouTube refused to remove one of the ten videos.

1 *for 3 Weeks, Big Mistake*, describing the counter-notice process and his expectation of
2 reinstatement. He stated, among other things: “Obviously all the counter notifications are
3 sent... I already filed the counter notifications... [Plaintiff] has 10 days to reply... then it
4 gets reinstated... I beat 35 copyright strikes.”

5 72. That video also directly contradicted the July 2023 Counter-Notices, which
6 stated: “I have already hired an attorney to defend my fair use videos in court.” In the July
7 6 video, Huneault admitted he had not retained counsel, saying: “A paralegal can take care
8 of that. I don’t need to hire an expensive lawyer... I’m not a lawyer... I’m going to talk to
9 a paralegal tomorrow.”

10 73. These contemporaneous statements constitute admissions of state of mind:
11 Defendants viewed counter-notices as an automatic reinstatement mechanism and had not
12 retained counsel despite swearing otherwise. They corroborate that Defendants’ Counter-
13 Notices were knowingly false and submitted in bad faith to force reinstatement, continue
14 monetization, and intimidate Plaintiff into abandoning the infringement claims against
15 them.

16 ***The Market for Plaintiff and other Auditors’ Footage***

17 74. Defendants’ dozens of stolen and uploaded videos serve as market substitutes
18 for Plaintiff’s original footage. For example, a legitimate commentary channel, Really Cool
19 News¹², discusses Auditors’ videos and conduct without reproducing a single frame of their
20 copyrighted footage. Its view counts are a fraction of those on the Frauditor Troll Channel.
21 This disparity demonstrates that audience demand for Defendants’ content is driven not by
22 any transformative commentary, but by the unauthorized display of Plaintiff’s original
23 works. Defendants’ reproductions therefore serve as market substitutes for the originals,
24 directly diminishing the market for authorized distribution and derivative works.

25 75. Upon information and belief, the Frauditor Troll Channel unlawfully obtained
26 and infringed between fifty and one hundred of Plaintiff’s copyrighted works. A serial
27

28 ¹² www.youtube.com/@ReallyCoolNews

1 misappropriation of Plaintiff's works on that scale functions as a market substitute: a
2 YouTube viewer can watch virtually all of Plaintiff's copyrighted material on the Frauditor
3 Troll Channel instead of on Plaintiff's own channel.

4 76. Indeed, many of Defendants' followers have publicly admitted that they watch
5 Plaintiff's copyrighted footage on Defendants' channel instead of viewing the originals,
6 often bragging that doing so "deprives the auditors of views and revenue." These
7 admissions confirm that Defendants' uploads displace legitimate consumption of
8 Plaintiff's content and usurp the economic incentive underlying copyright protection.

9 77. Plaintiff, through Executive Lens, is in the process of developing a licensing
10 program under which authorized YouTube channels may license and monetize Plaintiff's
11 footage in exchange for royalties. Plaintiff has already engaged in discussions with multiple
12 channels regarding such licensing. However, Defendants' ongoing theft, monetization, and
13 public rationalization of infringement have undermined this effort by fostering a belief
14 among anti-Auditor content creators that Plaintiff's videos are free for the taking under the
15 guise of "fair use." Until Defendants are held accountable, Plaintiff's ability to establish a
16 lawful licensing market remains severely impaired.

17 78. Defendants' wholesale reproduction and monetization of Plaintiff's videos
18 directly substitute for the originals, divert traffic, and poison the emerging licensing market
19 for Plaintiff's footage. By saturating YouTube with unauthorized copies of Plaintiff's
20 works, Defendants have not merely harmed the potential market—they have sought to
21 destroy it, ensuring that theft and infringement, not creativity, determine who profits from
22 Plaintiff's works.

23 **Defendants' Conduct After this Action was Initiated**

24 79. Plaintiff commenced this action on June 3, 2025.

25 80. Defendants were informed of this action via email on June 6, 2025.

26 81. On the same day that Defendants received notice of this action, they began a
27 campaign to mass-delete evidence in an effort to conceal their wrongdoing and avoid
28 accountability.

1 82. In total, Defendants deleted more than 1,700 videos from the Frauditor Troll
2 Channel which amounted to nearly ninety percent of the channel's video library.

3 83. After Huneault and Ohiri were formally served in this action, they publicly
4 admitted that the 1,700 videos were not just merely removed from YouTube but were
5 permanently destroyed because they were concerned about being held accountable for their
6 mass infringement scheme.

7 84. Huneault also publicly admitted that he knew Plaintiff was "broke" meaning
8 that he believed Plaintiff could not afford an attorney to pursue federal litigation, and that
9 it was a one-in-a-billion chance that Plaintiff would find counsel willing to hold Defendants
10 liable for their blatant copyright infringement scheme given the relatively modest monetary
11 damages.

12 85. Huneault admitted that he paid Patrick J. D'Arcy, Esq. \$2,800 before D'Arcy
13 filed an amicus brief in this matter, even though D'Arcy falsely represented to the Court
14 that he had not been compensated. The amicus filing was a bad-faith effort to inflate
15 Plaintiff's litigation costs and discourage Plaintiff and his counsel from pursuing legitimate
16 claims against Defendants. This conduct further demonstrates Defendants' bad faith
17 regarding the theft and monetization of Plaintiff's videos on the Frauditor Troll Channel.

18 86. Lastly, Huneault publicly admitted that the Frauditor Troll Channel was a
19 satire channel, further confirming Plaintiff's allegation that the Infringing Videos are not
20 fair use.

21 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

22 **Copyright Infringement**

23 **(17 U.S.C. § 501)**

24 ***(Infringement of Another Chad, Belmar Library and Courthouse Fail)***

25 87. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1
26 through 86.

27 88. Plaintiff is the creator and original author of the copyrighted audiovisual
28 works titled *Another Chad* (U.S. Copyright Reg. No. PA0002457989) *Belmar Library*

1 (U.S. Copyright Reg. No. PA0002549333) and *Courthouse Fail* (U.S. Copyright Reg. No.
2 PA0002565781).

3 89. Cordova subsequently assigned to Executive Lens all rights, title, and interest
4 in and to *Another Chad*, *Belmar Library* and *Courthouse Fail*, including the exclusive
5 rights under 17 U.S.C. § 106, while expressly reserving and retaining all causes of action
6 and claims for infringement, violations of 17 U.S.C. § 512(f), and circumvention under 17
7 U.S.C. § 1201 arising prior to the effective date of the assignment.

8 90. Accordingly, Executive Lens is the current owner of the copyrights, and
9 Plaintiff retains standing to pursue the pre-assignment infringement and DMCA-related
10 claims asserted herein.

11 91. Defendants copied, displayed, and distributed substantial portions of *Another*
12 *Chad*, *Belmar Library* and *Courthouse Fail* without authorization, including through the
13 publication of three infringing videos on YouTube. Infringing Video 1 incorporated
14 approximately 56% of *Another Chad* (Infringing Video 1 is approximately 87% of
15 Plaintiff's *Another Chad* footage excluding intro and outro material), Infringing Video 2
16 incorporated approximately 62% of *Courthouse Fail* (Infringing Video 2 is approximately
17 87% of Plaintiff's *Courthouse Fail* footage excluding intro and outro material), and
18 Infringing Video 3 incorporated approximately 81% of *Belmar Library* (Infringing Video
19 3 is approximately 92% of Plaintiff's *Belmar Library* footage excluding intro and outro
20 material).

21 92. Defendants' use of *Another Chad*, *Belmar Library* and *Courthouse Fail* was
22 for commercial purposes, including monetization through advertisements and the
23 promotion of merchandise and channel memberships.

24 93. Defendants' use was not transformative and does not qualify as fair use under
25 17 U.S.C. § 107. As alleged herein, Defendants' reproductions served as market substitutes
26 for Plaintiff's original works, diverting viewership and advertising revenue from the DMA
27 Channel.

1 94. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ infringement, Plaintiff has
2 suffered actual damages including lost viewership, lost advertising revenue, and
3 diminution of the market and licensing value of *Another Chad*, *Belmar Library* and
4 *Courthouse Fail*.

5 95. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), Plaintiff is entitled to recover actual damages
6 and any profits of Defendants attributable to the infringement.

7 96. Defendants’ infringement is ongoing, including because Infringing Video 2
8 remains live and continues to exploit Plaintiff’s *Courthouse Fail* video. Plaintiff is entitled
9 to injunctive relief under 17 U.S.C. §§ 502 and 503 requiring removal of infringing material
10 and preventing further infringement.

11 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **Misrepresentation in Counter-Notifications under the DMCA**

13 **(17 U.S.C. § 512(f))**

14 97. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1
15 through 96.

16 98. Section 512(f)(2) of the Copyright Act provides, in relevant part, that “any
17 person who knowingly materially misrepresents under this section . . . that material was
18 removed or disabled by mistake or misidentification, shall be liable for any damages,
19 including costs and attorneys’ fees, incurred by...any copyright owner...who is injured by
20 such misrepresentation.”

21 99. In the Counter-Notices submitted to YouTube under penalty of perjury,
22 Defendants represented, among other things, that: (a) the removals were the result of
23 “mistake or misidentification” and the Infringing Videos were protected by “fair use,”
24 citing a nonexistent “fair use act of 1976”; (b) Huneault owned the Frauditor Troll Channel
25 and the videos at issue; (c) Defendants had already hired an attorney and were prepared to
26 litigate; and (d) Defendants could be served at 99 Wall Street, New York, New York.

27 100. Those statements were false, and, critically, were made without a good-faith
28 belief at the time of each Counter-Notice that the videos were not infringing or the removals

1 were by mistake or misidentification. As alleged above, the Infringing Videos reproduce
2 the bulk of Plaintiff’s works in long, uninterrupted blocks with only token, non-
3 transformative interjections. Moreover, in or about May 2022, Defendants published a
4 video titled *How to Do Fair Use Properly and Avoid Copyright Strikes*, in which Huneault
5 instructed viewers to (a) insert commentary at least every 40 seconds, (b) limit use to less
6 than 50% of another’s work, and (c) pad videos with intros/outros to dilute the proportion
7 of infringing content. Defendants’ own infringing videos ignored each of those purported
8 safeguards. This objective contradiction between Huneault’s professed “fair use formula”
9 and his conduct demonstrates that he knew the videos were not fair use and nonetheless
10 represented otherwise under penalty of perjury in the Counter-Notices.¹³ On July 5–6,
11 2023, Huneault further admitted that he filed counter-notices to “penalize” Plaintiff’s
12 channel, expected automatic reinstatement within three weeks, and had not retained
13 counsel. YouTube relied on these misrepresentations to reinstate the removed videos,
14 causing Plaintiff to incur litigation costs and other damages that would not have occurred
15 but for Defendants’ fraudulent Counter-Notices. These contemporaneous admissions show
16 the Counter-Notices were tactical rather than truthful.

17 101. After being served, Huneault and Ohiri publicly admitted in a YouTube video
18 that there was a one-in-a-billion chance Plaintiff would actually hold Defendants
19 accountable for copyright infringement because they knew Plaintiff lacked the financial
20 resources to pursue federal litigation.

21 102. Huneault misrepresented facts essential to the statutory process under
22 §512(g)(3) which further demonstrates Defendants’ pattern of knowingly false statements.

23 103. The “already hired an attorney” assertion was false. As alleged above, the day
24 after submitting the July 2023 Counter-Notices Huneault publicly admitted he had not
25 hired a lawyer and would “talk to a paralegal” instead. Huneault made that statement
26

27 ¹³ Plaintiff does not concede that Huneault’s statements regarding fair use are correct—they are reproduced
28 solely to demonstrate that Huneault understood the principles he articulated and that his representations
in the Counter-Notices were knowingly false.

1 merely to mislead Plaintiff into believing that an attorney determined that Defendants’
2 dozens of infringing videos were fair use.

3 104. After being notified of this lawsuit, Defendants took no steps to appear or
4 defend; instead, they engaged in evasive tactics, refusing to accept service of process and
5 permanently destroying over 1,700 videos. These facts underscore that Defendants’
6 Counter-Notices were not only legally baseless but knowingly false.

7 105. Defendants publicly admitted that they destroyed the 1,700 videos to avoid
8 being held accountable for the massive copyright infringement claims Plaintiff and others
9 could have brought.

10 106. The New York service address was false and materially misleading. As
11 alleged above, Defendants are residents of Canada; listing “99 Wall Street, New York,
12 NY” impeded service and misrepresented their true location. Defendants knowingly
13 omitted suite number 5892 from the Counter-Notices to evade service and increase
14 Plaintiff’s litigation costs.

15 107. Defendants’ conduct epitomizes the systemic abuse Congress sought to
16 prevent in § 512(f). Having publicly instructed others on the requirements of fair use,
17 Huneault later admitted that Defendants simply file counter-notices without regard to the
18 law because they believe no one will enforce it. This is not a mistake or misidentification,
19 it is a deliberate exploitation of a flawed process, undertaken with knowledge that false
20 assertions of lawful use would go unchallenged unless Plaintiff shouldered the cost of
21 federal litigation Defendants believed he could not afford.

22 108. As a direct result of Defendants’ material misrepresentations regarding fair
23 use, Plaintiff was forced to initiate this action to have the Infringing Videos removed from
24 the Frauditor Troll Channel, and to prevent their re-upload. Plaintiff is entitled to recover
25 damages, costs, and attorneys’ fees under 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

26 109. Plaintiff is further entitled to injunctive relief requiring YouTube or its agents
27 to remove the Infringing Videos from the Frauditor Troll Channel and to prevent their re-
28 upload.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Circumvention of Technological Measures

(17 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1203)

1
2
3
4 110. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1
5 through 109.

6 111. Plaintiff is the author of the original audiovisual works published on his
7 YouTube channels.

8 112. Plaintiff owns all rights, title, and interest in and to the claims asserted in this
9 action, including all claims for violations of 17 U.S.C. § 1201.

10 113. Each of Plaintiff’s works was uploaded to YouTube through the platform’s
11 standard publishing system. When published, YouTube automatically applied TPMs that
12 control access to and prevent unauthorized copying or downloading of Plaintiff’s
13 audiovisual files, consistent with 17 U.S.C. § 1201.

14 114. Upon information and belief, Defendants intentionally circumvented these
15 TPMs by employing software tools commonly known as “rippers” or “downloaders” to
16 download native-quality copies of Plaintiff’s YouTube videos.

17 115. Upon information and belief, Defendants unlawfully obtained between fifty
18 and one hundred of Plaintiff’s videos using these tools, often on the same day that the
19 videos were posted to Plaintiff’s YouTube channels so that Defendants could post the
20 unlawfully obtained videos on the Frauditor Troll Channel.

21 116. Defendants used those unlawfully obtained copies to create monetized videos
22 for the Frauditor Troll Channel, reproducing extensive, unaltered portions of Plaintiff’s
23 works without license or authorization.

24 117. By using circumvention software and disabling or bypassing YouTube’s
25 copy-protection systems, Defendants violated 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a), which prohibits the
26 circumvention of a technological measure that effectively controls access to a copyrighted
27 work.
28

1 118. Defendants' conduct was willful, knowing, and undertaken for commercial
2 advantage, including the generation of advertising revenue through YouTube's AdSense
3 program.

4 119. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' circumvention, Plaintiff has
5 suffered actual damages, including loss of control over his copyrighted works, impairment
6 of market value, and costs incurred to identify, remove, and prevent further distribution of
7 infringing content.

8 120. Plaintiff is entitled to recover actual or statutory damages under 17 U.S.C. §
9 1203(c), together with attorney's fees and costs, and to obtain injunctive relief restraining
10 Defendants from further circumvention or trafficking in circumvention technology.

11 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

12 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

- 13 A. That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants for
14 monetary damages caused by their infringement of Plaintiff's *Another Chad*,
15 *Belmar Library* and *Courthouse Fail* copyrights;
- 16 B. That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants for
17 monetary damages caused by their knowing material misrepresentations in the
18 Counter-Notices pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(f);
- 19 C. That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants for their
20 unlawful circumvention of technological protection measures in violation of
21 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a), including statutory damages of \$2,500 per act of
22 circumvention, actual damages, attorneys' fees, and a permanent injunction
23 prohibiting further circumvention or distribution of works obtained through
24 circumvention;
- 25 D. That the Court enter a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from further
26 infringement of *Another Chad*, *Courthouse Fail* and *Belmar Library*, requiring
27 removal of the Infringing Videos (including Infringing Video 2 which remains
28 live), and requiring YouTube and any third-party platforms with notice to
disable access to and prevent re-upload or further dissemination of the
Infringing Videos;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- E. That the Court award Plaintiff costs and attorneys' fees as permitted by law;
- F. Any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: February __, 2026

/s/
Randall S. Newman, Esq. (SBN 190547)
99 Wall Street, Suite 3727
New York, NY 10005
(212) 797-3735
rsn@randallnewman.net

*Attorney for Plaintiff,
Christopher J. Cordova*

1 RANDALL S. NEWMAN (SBN 190547)
2 Attorney at Law
3 99 Wall St., Suite 3727
4 New York, NY 10005
5 212.797.3735
6 rsn@randallnewman.net
7 *Attorney for Plaintiff,*
8 *Christopher J. Cordova*

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 CHRISTOPHER J. CORDOVA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 JONATHAN HUDON-HUNEULT,
15 NNEKA OHIRI and 14693663 CANADA
16 INC.,

17 Defendants.

Case No. 25-cv-04685-VKD

~~FIRST~~**[PROPOSED]**~~SECOND~~
AMENDED COMPLAINT
FOR:

- 18 **1. Copyright Infringement, 17 U.S.C.**
19 **§§ 101 *et seq.*;**
- 20 **2. Misrepresentation, 17 U.S.C. §**
21 **512(f);**
- 22 ~~**3. Declaratory Relief, 28 U.S.C. § 2201**~~
23 ~~**and 17 U.S.C. § 512(g);**~~
- 24 ~~**4.3. Circumvention of Technological**~~
25 ~~**Measures, 17 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1203**~~

1
2 Plaintiff, Christopher J. Cordova (“Plaintiff”), files this ~~First~~Second Amended
3 Complaint (the “~~FACSAC~~”)¹ against Defendants Jonathan Hudon-Huneault (“Huneault”),
4 Nneka Ohiri (“Ohiri”) and 14693663 Canada Inc. (“Canada Inc.”) (Huneault, Ohiri and
5 Canada Inc. are collectively referred to as the “Defendants”) who operate the Frauditor
6 Troll YouTube channel located at www.youtube.com/@frauditortroll (the “Frauditor Troll
7 Channel”) and alleges as follows:

8 **INTRODUCTION**

9 1. This case arises from Defendants’ systematic theft and monetization of
10 Plaintiff’s copyrighted YouTube videos and their abuse of the Digital Millennium
11 Copyright Act’s (“DMCA”) counter-notice process, 17 U.S.C. § 512(g), to force those
12 stolen works back online.

13 2. Defendants built the Frauditor Troll Channel on wholesale misappropriation
14 of Plaintiff’s videos and the works of other First Amendment auditors (“Auditors”).

15 3. Instead of adding transformative commentary, critique, or analysis,
16 Defendants’ videos rely almost entirely on Plaintiff’s original footage, often playing for
17 extended durations, interspersed with brief derisive remarks, or unoriginal on-screen
18 memes. These token alterations serve no critical or educational purpose; they exist solely
19 to ridicule the subjects and harvest advertising revenue through YouTube’s Partner
20 Program.

21 4. Defendants obtained Plaintiff’s videos through unlawful circumvention of
22 YouTube’s rolling-cipher technology, software designed to prevent unauthorized
23 downloading, thereby violating both YouTube’s Terms of Service and the anti-
24

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

25 ¹ Plaintiff previously filed an Amended Complaint before service of process (ECF No. ~~20~~). ~~Because that~~
26 ~~amendment was made as~~20 ~~and a First Amended Complaint after service of right under Rule 15(a)(1)~~
27 ~~while the original complaint process~~ (ECF No. ~~1~~) ~~had not yet been served, the~~39. The current pleading is
28 ~~properly~~ styled as the ~~First~~Second Amended Complaint to reflect that it is the ~~first~~second amendment following service.

1 circumvention provisions of 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).² The result was a monetized archive of
2 stolen content repackaged as so-called “fair use.”

3 5. Huneault has repeatedly bragged, both in Counter-Notices and on public
4 livestreams, that he has received over forty-eight copyright strikes and that every single
5 one has been overturned through the counter-notification process. His message is clear:
6 mass infringement pays, and the DMCA’s safeguards can be gamed indefinitely through
7 form responses, delay and the prohibitive cost of federal litigation.

8 6. Between July and October 2023, Huneault submitted at least nine Counter-
9 Notices to YouTube under § 512(g)(3), each signed under penalty of perjury, asserting that
10 the videos were protected by the non-existent “Fair Use Act of 1976” (the “Counter-
11 Notices”). Huneault also claimed to own the Frauditor Troll Channel when Google’s
12 records show the AdSense account belongs to Ohiri; later, Huneault asserted that the
13 Frauditor Troll Channel was owned by Canada Inc.

14 7. Defendants’ serial misrepresentations of ownership, combined with their use
15 of a fictitious U.S. service address, demonstrate deliberate deception intended to obstruct
16 enforcement and evade liability.

17 8. Every Counter-Notice contained the same boilerplate paragraph, copied
18 verbatim from prior counter-notices, asserting fair use without any reference to the actual
19 content, purpose, or substantiality of the copied works. This rote formula bears no
20 resemblance to a genuine fair-use analysis; it is merely a script crafted to exploit
21 YouTube’s automated reinstatement system.

22 9. Upon learning of this action, Huneault and Ohiri publicly admitted that they
23 permanently deleted more than 1,700 videos from the Frauditor Troll Channel in an effort
24 to conceal evidence and evade accountability for their mass infringement of Plaintiff’s and
25

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

26
27 ² Plaintiff does not assert any independent claim under YouTube’s Terms of Service. Those terms are
28 referenced solely to illustrate the technological and contractual framework governing user access to
YouTube’s platform. Defendants’ violations of those terms demonstrate their awareness that such conduct
was unauthorized and support the inference of willful circumvention under 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).

1 other creators' works. The scope and timing of the deletion demonstrate willful destruction
2 of relevant evidence and a deliberate attempt to obstruct discovery in this case.

3 10. After service of the Complaint, Huneault and Ohiri appeared on YouTube to
4 mock the proceedings, publicly declaring that it was a one-in-a-billion chance Plaintiff
5 would have filed this lawsuit and boasting that they would never settle. Those statements
6 expose Defendants' mindset: profit from theft while daring Plaintiff or anyone else to stop
7 them.

8 11. Defendants' conduct, mass theft, repeated infringement, false Counter-
9 Notices, circumvention of technological protections, and public taunting, reveals not
10 misunderstanding of fair use but malice. This pattern of willful defiance threatens not only
11 Plaintiff's rights but the integrity of the DMCA itself.

12 12. Plaintiff therefore brings this action under the Copyright Act for: (a) direct
13 infringement of his registered works, (b) knowing and material misrepresentations in
14 Counter-Notices submitted under 17 U.S.C. § 512(g), (c) declaratory relief, and (d)
15 circumvention of technological protection measures in violation of 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).
16 Plaintiff seeks damages, declaratory and injunctive relief, and all remedies available under
17 the Act to halt Defendants' unlawful enterprise and restore the meaning of fair use.

18 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

19 13. This action arises under the Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. § 101 *et seq.*, and
20 includes a claim for Declaratory Relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

21 14. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and
22 1338(a), as this case involves federal questions arising under the Copyright Act and the
23 Digital Millennium Copyright Act.

24 15. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b) and 1400(a)
25 because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred here and the
26 infringing content was published and distributed via YouTube, which maintains its
27 principal place of business in this District.

1 16. Defendants consented to jurisdiction in this District by submitting the
2 Counter-Notices under 17 U.S.C. § 512(g)(3).
3
4

5 **PARTIES**

6 17. Plaintiff is a resident of Colorado and the creator and operator of the YouTube
7 channel “Denver Metro Audits” (@DenverMetroAudits) (the “DMA Channel”).

8 18. Plaintiff is the author and original copyright owner of the audiovisual works
9 at issue. He retains all rights, title, and interest in the claims asserted in this action,
10 including those arising under 17 U.S.C. §§ 512(f) and 1201. Although Plaintiff later
11 assigned the copyrights in his broader catalog to Executive Lens LLC (“Executive Lens”),
12 his wholly-owned company, those assignments expressly excluded and reserved to
13 Plaintiff all accrued causes of action and claims relating to the infringements and DMCA
14 violations alleged herein.

15 19. Ohiri is an individual residing in Canada who co-owns and manages the
16 Frauditor Troll Channel.

17 20. Huneault is an individual residing in Canada who serves as the voice and
18 narrator for videos on the Frauditor Troll Channel and co-owns and manages the Frauditor
19 Troll Channel. Huneault and Ohiri are married.

20 21. Canada Inc. is a Canadian corporation owned and controlled by Huneault and
21 Ohiri, which acts as a co-owner or operating entity for the Frauditor Troll Channel.

22 22. Upon information and belief, Ohiri, Huneault, and Canada Inc. jointly operate
23 the Frauditor Troll Channel as a single business enterprise. They share access to the
24 Channel’s YouTube account, AdSense monetization, and related social media platforms,
25 and each Defendant participates in the selection, editing, publication, and monetization of
26 its videos. Defendants collectively profit from the unlawful conduct alleged herein and are
27 therefore jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for all resulting damages and statutory
28 violations.

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

23. YouTube is the largest video-sharing platform in the world and operates under the framework established by the DMCA.

24. The DMCA provides a process by which copyright owners may request the removal of infringing content through a notice-and-takedown mechanism. If the platform receives a valid takedown notice, it typically disables access to the allegedly infringing material.

25. The statute also gives the alleged infringer a way to respond: a counter-notification claiming the use is authorized, lawful, or otherwise non-infringing. If the copyright owner does not file a federal lawsuit within 10 business days of receiving a counter-notice, YouTube must restore access to the disputed content. 17 U.S.C. § 512(g).

26. This framework shifts the burden onto copyright owners, often small creators or publishers, to file suit quickly or see their work reposted.

27. Defendants exploited this imbalance by filing boilerplate Counter-Notices under § 512(g) designed to intimidate Plaintiff into dropping the matter and force reinstatement -of stolen videos.

28. This abuse allowed Defendants’ Frauditor Troll Channel, to continue monetizing stolen infringing content while publicly claiming “fair use.” In truth, Defendants’ uploads consist almost entirely of Plaintiff’s unaltered footage, supplemented by trivial mockery, recycled memes, and other non-transformative filler.

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

29. In the context of this FAC, the term “Auditor” refers to Plaintiff and other independent content creators who record interactions with government officials in public spaces to promote transparency, document public conduct, and assert constitutional rights, particularly those protected by the First Amendment. These creators act as citizen journalists, watchdogs, and public advocates, often filming police encounters, public meetings, and other matters of public interest, and then editing and publishing that original

1 footage online, most prominently on YouTube.

2 30. The Auditor movement has become a significant presence on social media,
3 drawing millions of subscribers and billions of views, and generating substantial
4 advertising revenue. Many Auditors operate under pseudonyms but have nonetheless
5 become well-known figures within the digital civil rights community.

6 31. Plaintiff is an Auditor, activist, and content creator who documents
7 interactions with public officials, government employees, and law enforcement officers in
8 the course of his advocacy work. He spends significant time filming, editing, and
9 publishing these encounters to the DMA Channel, where the resulting videos serve both as
10 a public record of official conduct and as a means of promoting government transparency
11 and accountability. Plaintiff's work is part of the broader Auditor movement and has
12 developed a dedicated audience focused on constitutional rights, public oversight, and civil
13 liberties.

14 32. In response to the growing popularity of Auditors like Plaintiff, Defendants
15 created the Frauditor Troll Channel, an operation that purports to critique Auditor content
16 but in reality exists to misappropriate, ridicule, and monetize Auditors' videos. Cloaked in
17 the appearance of commentary, Defendants' videos rely on insult, mockery, and distortion
18 rather than genuine critique or transformative discussion.

19 33. The Frauditor Troll Channel is one of the largest Auditor-focused reaction
20 channels and operates as a commercial enterprise built on satire, appropriation, and
21 systematic infringement. It offers no new message, insight, or purpose. Instead, it
22 repackages Plaintiff's original videos with intermittent ridicule to attract viewers and
23 generate advertising revenue while contributing virtually no original content of its own.
24 Although other channels have occasionally used Plaintiff's videos, none has engaged in the
25 scale, volume, or deliberate exploitation of Plaintiff's works that defines Defendants'
26 operation. This action targets that uniquely pervasive infringement, not the existence of
27 criticism or commentary itself. The Frauditor Troll channel stands alone as the principal
28 vehicle for mass theft and monetization of Plaintiff's copyrighted content.

1 34. The Frauditor Troll Channel has repeatedly used Plaintiff’s copyrighted works
2 without permission and without satisfying fair-use standards. Upon information and belief,
3 between 2022 and 2025, Defendants unlawfully obtained and reproduced dozens of
4 Plaintiff’s videos, estimated between fifty and one hundred distinct works, uploading them
5 to the Frauditor Troll Channel to derive advertising revenue and other commercial gain.³

Formatted: Add space between paragraphs of the same style, No widow/orphan control

6 35. Upon information and belief, Defendants obtained the videos used from the
7 DMA Channel by circumventing YouTube’s technological protection measures, including
8 its “rolling cipher” system, which encrypts and dynamically alters the video stream’s URL
9 signatures to prevent unauthorized downloads. YouTube’s player software uses a
10 decryption routine embedded in JavaScript code to authenticate requests and deliver
11 content only through approved interfaces.

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

12 36. Upon information and belief, Defendants used software applications, ripping
13 utilities, or browser extensions specifically designed to bypass that rolling cipher and other
14 technological measures controlling access to the audiovisual works hosted on YouTube.
15 These tools retrieve and decrypt the obfuscated streaming URLs, enabling Defendants to
16 make local copies of Plaintiff’s videos in violation of YouTube’s Terms of Service and 17
17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).

18 37. The rolling cipher is a “technological protection measure” (“TPM”) as defined
19 in 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a)(3) because it controls access to Plaintiff’s copyrighted works by
20 requiring authorized software to decrypt and stream them in real time. By using programs
21 that strip away this cipher, Defendants intentionally circumvented a technological measure
22 and knowingly obtained unauthorized copies of Plaintiff’s copyrighted works.

23 38. Defendants’ circumvention was not incidental but systematic. The Frauditor
24 Troll Channel’s production speed, volume, quality, and uniform editing style demonstrate
25

26 ³ Plaintiff estimates the number of stolen and infringed works based on the number of videos Plaintiff
27 published and Defendants’ pattern of serial theft and infringement of nearly every video Plaintiff posted
28 prior to Defendants’ deletion and purported destruction of more than 1,700 videos and all related metadata shortly after learning of this lawsuit. The precise number of stolen and infringed works cannot presently be determined due to Defendants’ unilateral destruction of that evidence.

1 the routine use of decryption software as part of a deliberate business model to acquire,
2 republish, and monetize Plaintiff’s copyrighted videos, in violation of YouTube’s Terms
3 of Service and 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a).

4 39. When publicly discussing Plaintiff’s 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a) claim against
5 Defendants, Huneault did not deny the use of circumvention tools; instead, he suggested
6 that he had another “defense,” reinforcing the inference that Defendants used such software
7 to unlawfully obtain Plaintiff’s videos.

8 40. Federal courts have recognized that YouTube’s rolling cipher constitutes a
9 technological protection measure within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a)(3) and that it
10 “effectively controls access” to copyrighted works because it prevents users from
11 downloading video streams without first executing YouTube’s proprietary decryption
12 code.

13 **Plaintiff’s Copyrighted Works**

14 41. On or about March 16, 2022, Plaintiff published a video titled *ANOTHER*
15 *CHAD EXPOSED!!! Worthless Denver Cops...ASSAULTED!!!* (“*Another Chad*”), to the
16 DMA Channel.⁴

17 42. Plaintiff registered *Another Chad* with the U.S. Copyright Office under
18 Registration Number PA002457989 on February 6, 2024.

19 43. On or about October 1, 2023, Plaintiff published a video titled *ANGRY MOB*
20 *AT BELMAR LIBRARY!!! “CALL 911!” Cops don’t show up* to the DMA Channel
21 (“*Belmar Library*”).⁵

22 44. Plaintiff registered *Belmar Library* with the U.S. Copyright Office under
23 Registration Number PA0002549333 on June 3, 2025.

24
25
26
27
28 ⁴ <https://youtu.be/bhgHsPl4Mr0?si=F-7EgMg0bBZiy-QY>.

⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=86UKGVikxKQ&t=100s>.

1 45. On or about February 32, 2022, Plaintiff published a video titled *FEDERAL*
 2 *COURTHOUSE FAIL!!! Threatened with arrest for recording and not one officer*
 3 *identifies!* (“*Courthouse Fail*”) to the DMA Channel.⁶

4 45.46. Plaintiff registered *Courthouse Fail* with the U.S Copyright Office under
 5 Registration Number PA0002565781 on October 15, 2025.

6 ***Defendants’ Infringing Videos***

7 46.47. On or about December 2, 2022, Defendants published a video titled *Frauditor*
 8 *DMA Gets Confronted by Angry Citizen (Hilarious)* (“Infringing Video 1”) to the Frauditor
 9 Troll Channel.⁷ Infringing Video 1 incorporates approximately twenty-five minutes and
 10 fifty-four seconds of Plaintiff’s video *Another Chad* without authorization.

11 47.48. Infringing Video 1 reproduces Plaintiff’s footage in fifteen separate blocks
 12 with no commentary, twelve of which exceed one minute, three of which exceed two
 13 minutes, one exceeds three minutes, and one exceeds four minutes. This repeated use of
 14 lengthy, uninterrupted segments underscores the absence of meaningful transformation or
 15 interspersed analysis.

16 48.49. Plaintiff’s *Another Chad* video is forty-eight minutes and fourteen seconds in
 17 length, meaning Defendants reproduced more than fifty-four percent of Plaintiff’s work.
 18 Excluding the introductory and concluding segments, eighty-seven percent of Defendants’
 19 video consists of Plaintiff’s footage presented in long, unaltered blocks. The remaining
 20 thirteen percent comprises brief interjections totaling less than four minutes, primarily
 21 mocking Plaintiff rather than analyzing the subject matter or providing substantive
 22 commentary.

23 49.50. On or about February 4, 2022, Defendants published a video titled *Frauditors*
 24 *Ejected from Federal Courthouse (NEW)* (“Infringing Video 2”) to the Frauditor Troll
 25

26 ⁶ ~~https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=coiMQm_zzFE&t=1s. Registration of the *Courthouse Fail* video is~~
 27 ~~currently pending before the U.S. Copyright Office. Plaintiff intends to amend this FAC to include that~~
 28 ~~registration once it is issued.~~

⁷ The video was available at the URL <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I-J8sdKZ504>. The video was removed after the filing of this action.

1 Channel.⁸ Infringing Video 2 incorporates approximately eighteen minutes and forty-six
2 seconds of Plaintiff's *Courthouse Fail* video without authorization.

3 ~~50-51~~. Plaintiff's *Courthouse Fail* video is thirty minutes and twenty-seven seconds
4 long, meaning Defendants misappropriated approximately sixty-two percent of Plaintiff's
5 work. Excluding the brief introduction and outro, eighty-seven percent of Defendants'
6 video consists of Plaintiff's footage, while Defendants' commentary accounts for only
7 thirteen percent, two minutes and forty-eight seconds in total. These brief interjections
8 provide no meaningful analysis or critique and do nothing to alter the expressive core of
9 Plaintiff's work, which dominates the viewing experience.

10 52. Infringing Video 2 remains publicly available on the Frauditor Troll Channel
11 and continues to display and distribute substantial portions of Plaintiff's *Courthouse Fail*
12 video without authorization.

13 ~~51-53~~. Plaintiff did not become aware of Infringing Video 2 until June 2023.

14 ~~52-54~~. On or about October 1, 2023, Defendants published a video titled *Frauditor*
15 *DMA gets Camera Touched and CRIES A RIVER* ("Infringing Video 3") to the Frauditor
16 Troll Channel.⁹ Infringing Video 3 incorporates thirty-seven minutes and sixteen seconds
17 of Plaintiff's *Belmar Library* video without authorization. (Infringing Video 1, Infringing
18 Video 2 and Infringing Video 3 are collectively referred to as the "Infringing Videos").

19 ~~53-55~~. Infringing Video 3 reproduces Plaintiff's footage in twelve separate blocks
20 with no commentary. Each block exceeds one minute; eight blocks exceed two minutes;
21 three blocks exceed four minutes; and the longest uninterrupted segment runs over six
22 minutes. This repeated use of extended, uninterrupted sequences underscores the absence
23 of meaningful transformation or interspersed analysis.

24
25
26
27 ⁸ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eVe4eoOzPvc&t=700s>.

28 ⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rSUT6MDdfoo>. The video was removed after the filing of this
action.

1 [54-56](#). Plaintiff's *Belmar Library* video is forty-six minutes and fourteen seconds in
 2 length, meaning Defendants misappropriated approximately eighty-one percent of
 3 Plaintiff's work. Excluding the introductory and concluding segments, ninety-two percent
 4 of Defendants' video consists of Plaintiff's footage presented in long, uninterrupted blocks.
 5 The remaining eight percent consists of brief interjections totaling under three and a half
 6 minutes, primarily mocking Plaintiff rather than analyzing the subject matter or providing
 7 any meaningful commentary.

8
 9 **Defendants' Video - How to do Fair Use Properly and Avoid Copyright Strikes**

10 [55-57](#). On or about May 24, 2022, the Frauditor Troll Channel (or a related channel
 11 owned by Defendants) posted a video titled *How to do Fair Use Properly and Avoid*
 12 *Copyright Strikes*. The video is narrated by Huneault.

13 [56-58](#). In that video, Huneault claims to offer a formula for "100% safe fair use
 14 commentary videos." He instructs viewers that a "good amount of commentary is about 40
 15 seconds to every minute so you say a little comment every minute that way you'll be safe."
 16 He also advises creators to pad videos with lengthy intros and outros and to intersperse
 17 other clips in order to "increase the proportion of time that is something else than one
 18 specific video." Finally, Huneault says that the goal is to use "less than fifty percent of a
 19 specific video" and asserts that when you're "only using 30% of someone's video, you are
 20 very unlikely to get a copyright strike."

21 [57-59](#). Although Plaintiff disagrees with Huneault's oversimplistic take on fair use,
 22 as discussed above, Huneault did not even follow his own purported "fair use" formula
 23 when misappropriating Plaintiff's Videos. This inconsistency demonstrates that Huneault
 24 and Ohiri lacked a subjective good-faith belief that the Infringing Videos were protected
 25 by fair use when submitting the Counter-Notices, satisfying the knowledge and bad-faith
 26 elements of 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

27 **Plaintiff's DMCA Takedowns and Defendants' Abuse of the Counter-Notice System**
 28

1 58-60. In June and October 2023, Plaintiff submitted twelve DMCA takedown
2 notices to YouTube identifying videos uploaded by Defendants to the Frauditor Troll
3 Channel that infringed Plaintiff's copyrighted works.

4 59-61. Each Counter-Notice submitted by Defendants under penalty of perjury
5 contained substantially identical boilerplate language, including the following:

6 I am once again asking you to forward this counter notification to the plaintiff,
7 according to the fair use act of 1976 I am legally allowed to make these types
8 of videos. I am once again asking you to forward my counter notification to
9 the plaintiff so I can have a chance to defend myself in a court of Law. I have
10 a commentary channel where I provide review videos of 1st amendment
11 auditors, I provide commentary, I add memes and sound effects to completely
12 transform the original work into a Fair use video. On my channel I have
13 received 48 copyright strikes and every single one of my videos have been
14 reinstated through the counter notification system. I am willing to defend
15 myself in a court of law. I have already hired an attorney to defend my fair
16 use videos in court and I am asking you to forward my counter notification to
17 the plaintiff so he can decided for himself if he chooses to go that route. I am
18 the original creator of the Fair use videos on my channel and I know that my
19 videos were taken down by mistake because they fall under the Fair use act.
20 Please forward my counter notification so I can defend myself in a court of
21 Law. Thank you, Jonathan Huneault

22 60-62. The results were mixed. Defendants accepted two strikes without filing
23 counter-notices, YouTube declined to remove one video, and Defendants filed the nine
24 Counter-Notices under §512(g)(3) seeking reinstatement of the remaining works.¹⁰

25 61-63. Each of the Counter-Notices contained substantially identical boilerplate
26 language and multiple false statements, including that the uploads were protected by "fair
27

28 ¹⁰ Defendants filed eight counter-notices on or about July 5, 2023 and one counter-notice on or about October 20, 2023.

1 use,” that Huneault was “the original creator of the Fair Use videos on my channel,” and
 2 that Defendants had retained legal counsel prepared to litigate the matter. These statements
 3 were materially false. Upon information and belief, Defendants made inconsistent and
 4 misleading representations about the ownership and monetization of the Frauditor Troll
 5 Channel, at times claiming it was owned by Huneault personally, at other times by Ohiri,
 6 and elsewhere by their Canadian corporation. Regardless of the claimed ownership, no
 7 counsel had been retained, and the Counter-Notices were knowingly false when submitted.

8 [62-64](#). Defendants further misrepresented their location by providing “99 Wall
 9 Street, New York, NY” without a suite number, as their service address in each Counter-
 10 Notice. In reality, Defendants are residents of Canada. This fictitious U.S. address
 11 obstructed Plaintiff’s ability to effect service of process and constitutes an additional
 12 knowing misrepresentation to support the inference that Defendants’ Counter-Notices were
 13 not filed in good faith.

14 [63-65](#). Defendants recently publicly admitted that they knew suite number 5892 was
 15 assigned to their bogus 99 Wall Street address, further demonstrating that the omission of
 16 the suite number was intentional and that the Counter-Notices were filed in bad faith.

17 [64-66](#). Relying on Huneault’s misrepresentations regarding fair use, YouTube
 18 reinstated nine videos, resulting in financial benefit to all Defendants. After Plaintiff
 19 commenced this action on June 3, 2025, Defendants deleted nine of the ten videos,¹¹
 20 including eight of the nine that had been reinstated by the Counter-Notices. One infringing
 21 video remains live on the Frauditor Troll Channel as of the filing of this FAC.

22 [65-67](#). Defendants’ repeated use of false claims of fair use, a sham address, and
 23 fabricated assertions of ownership and legal representation demonstrate that the Counter-
 24 Notices were not merely mistaken but knowingly false and submitted in bad faith.

25 [66-68](#). On July 5, 2023, the same day Defendants submitted eight Counter-Notices
 26 under 17 U.S.C. § 512(g), Huneault emailed Plaintiff, stating: “If I counter every strike and
 27

28 ¹¹ As alleged above, YouTube refused to remove one of the ten videos.

1 they all get reinstated eventually it could penalize your channel. I’m going to keep making
2 fair use videos, I’m legally allowed to do so.”

3 [67-69](#). That evening, Huneault emailed again, identifying himself as “Josh,” claiming
4 he had “talked to a lawyer,” demanding \$9,000, and asserting: “You already know the
5 videos will be reinstated in 3 weeks through the counter notification system.”

6 [68-70](#). These contemporaneous emails confirm Defendants used the counter-notice
7 mechanism as a tactic to force automatic reinstatement, not to correct any mistake or
8 misidentification, and that Huneault deployed a false identity while doing so.

9 [69-71](#). On July 6, 2023, Huneault posted a video titled *DMA disabled Frauditor Troll*
10 *for 3 Weeks, Big Mistake*, describing the counter-notice process and his expectation of
11 reinstatement. He stated, among other things: “Obviously all the counter notifications are
12 sent... I already filed the counter notifications... [Plaintiff] has 10 days to reply... then it
13 gets reinstated... I beat 35 copyright strikes.”

14 [70-72](#). That video also directly contradicted the July 2023 Counter-Notices, which
15 stated: “I have already hired an attorney to defend my fair use videos in court.” In the July
16 6 video, Huneault admitted he had not retained counsel, saying: “A paralegal can take care
17 of that. I don’t need to hire an expensive lawyer... I’m not a lawyer... I’m going to talk to
18 a paralegal tomorrow.”

19 [71-73](#). These contemporaneous statements constitute admissions of state of mind:
20 Defendants viewed counter-notices as an automatic reinstatement mechanism and had not
21 retained counsel despite swearing otherwise. They corroborate that Defendants’ Counter-
22 Notices were knowingly false and submitted in bad faith to force reinstatement, continue
23 monetization, and intimidate Plaintiff into abandoning the infringement claims against
24 them.

25 ***The Market for Plaintiff and other Auditors’ Footage***

26 [72-74](#). Defendants’ dozens of stolen and uploaded videos serve as market substitutes
27 for Plaintiff’s original footage. For example, a legitimate commentary channel, Really Cool
28

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

Formatted: Centered

1 News¹², discusses Auditors’ videos and conduct without reproducing a single frame of their
2 copyrighted footage. Its view counts are a fraction of those on the Frauditor Troll Channel.
3 This disparity demonstrates that audience demand for Defendants’ content is driven not by
4 any transformative commentary, but by the unauthorized display of Plaintiff’s original
5 works. Defendants’ reproductions therefore serve as market substitutes for the originals,
6 directly diminishing the market for authorized distribution and derivative works.

7 73-75. Upon information and belief, the Frauditor Troll Channel unlawfully obtained
8 and infringed between fifty and one hundred of Plaintiff’s copyrighted works. A serial
9 misappropriation of Plaintiff’s works on that scale functions as a market substitute: a
10 YouTube viewer can watch virtually all of Plaintiff’s copyrighted material on the Frauditor
11 Troll Channel instead of on Plaintiff’s own channel.

12 74-76. Indeed, many of Defendants’ followers have publicly admitted that they watch
13 Plaintiff’s copyrighted footage on Defendants’ channel instead of viewing the originals,
14 often bragging that doing so “deprives the auditors of views and revenue.” These
15 admissions confirm that Defendants’ uploads displace legitimate consumption of
16 Plaintiff’s content and usurp the economic incentive underlying copyright protection.

17 75-77. Plaintiff, through Executive Lens, is in the process of developing a licensing
18 program under which authorized YouTube channels may license and monetize Plaintiff’s
19 footage in exchange for royalties. Plaintiff has already engaged in discussions with multiple
20 channels regarding such licensing. However, Defendants’ ongoing theft, monetization, and
21 public rationalization of infringement have undermined this effort by fostering a belief
22 among anti-Auditor content creators that Plaintiff’s videos are free for the taking under the
23 guise of “fair use.” Until Defendants are held accountable, Plaintiff’s ability to establish a
24 lawful licensing market remains severely impaired.

25 76-78. Defendants’ wholesale reproduction and monetization of Plaintiff’s videos
26 directly substitute for the originals, divert traffic, and poison the emerging licensing market
27

28 ¹² www.youtube.com/@ReallyCoolNews

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

1 for Plaintiff’s footage. By saturating YouTube with unauthorized copies of Plaintiff’s
2 works, Defendants have not merely harmed the potential market-they have sought to
3 destroy it, ensuring that theft and infringement, not creativity, determine who profits from
4 Plaintiff’s works.

5
6
7 ***Defendants’ Conduct After this Action was Initiated***

8 ~~77-79~~. Plaintiff commenced this action on June 3, 2025.

9 ~~78-80~~. Defendants were informed of this action via email on June 6, 2025.

10 ~~79-81~~. On the same day that Defendants received notice of this action, they began a
11 campaign to mass-delete evidence in an effort to conceal their wrongdoing and avoid
12 accountability.

13 ~~80-82~~. In total, Defendants deleted more than 1,700 videos from the Frauditor Troll
14 Channel which amounted to nearly ninety percent of the channel’s video library.

15 ~~81-83~~. After Huneault and Ohiri were formally served in this action, they publicly
16 admitted that the 1,700 videos were not just merely removed from YouTube but were
17 permanently destroyed because they were concerned about being held accountable for their
18 mass infringement scheme.

19 ~~82-84~~. Huneault also publicly admitted that he knew Plaintiff was “broke” meaning
20 that he believed Plaintiff could not afford an attorney to pursue federal litigation, and that
21 it was a one-in-a-billion chance that Plaintiff would find counsel willing to hold Defendants
22 liable for their blatant copyright infringement scheme given the relatively modest monetary
23 damages.

24 ~~83-85~~. Huneault admitted that he paid Patrick J. D’Arcy, Esq. \$2,800 before D’Arcy
25 filed an amicus brief in this matter, even though D’Arcy falsely represented to the Court
26 that he had not been compensated. The amicus filing was a bad-faith effort to inflate
27 Plaintiff’s litigation costs and discourage Plaintiff and his counsel from pursuing legitimate
28

Formatted: Centered

1 claims against Defendants. This conduct further demonstrates Defendants’ bad faith
2 regarding the theft and monetization of Plaintiff’s videos on the Frauditor Troll Channel.

3 ~~84:86~~. Lastly, Huneault publicly admitted that the Frauditor Troll Channel was a
4 satire channel, further confirming Plaintiff’s allegation that the Infringing Videos are not
5 fair use.

6
7
8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9 **Copyright Infringement**

10 **(17 U.S.C. § 501)**

11 ***(Infringement of Another Chad ~~and~~, Belmar Library and Courthouse Fail)***

12 ~~85:87~~. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1
13 through ~~84~~~~86~~.

14 ~~86:88~~. Plaintiff is the creator and original author of the copyrighted audiovisual
15 works titled *Another Chad* (U.S. Copyright Reg. No. PA0002457989) ~~and Belmar Library~~
16 (U.S. Copyright Reg. No. PA0002549333) and Courthouse Fail (U.S. Copyright Reg. No.
17 PA0002565781).

18 ~~87:89~~. Cordova subsequently assigned to Executive Lens ~~LLC~~ all rights, title, and
19 interest in and to *Another Chad ~~and~~, Belmar Library and Courthouse Fail*, including the
20 exclusive rights under 17 U.S.C. § 106, while expressly reserving and retaining all causes
21 of action and claims for infringement, violations of 17 U.S.C. § 512(f), and circumvention
22 under 17 U.S.C. § 1201 arising prior to the effective date of the assignment.

23 ~~88:90~~. Accordingly, Executive Lens is the current owner of the copyrights, and
24 Plaintiff retains standing to pursue the pre-assignment infringement and DMCA-related
25 claims asserted herein.

26 ~~89:91~~. Defendants copied, displayed, and distributed substantial portions of *Another*
27 *Chad ~~and~~, Belmar Library and Courthouse Fail* without authorization, including through
28 the publication of ~~two~~~~three~~ infringing videos on YouTube (“~~Infringing Video 1~~” and

1 ~~“Infringing Video 3”~~. Infringing Video 1 incorporated approximately 56% of *Another*
 2 *Chad* (Infringing Video 1 is approximately 87% of Plaintiff’s *Another Chad* footage
 3 excluding intro and outro material), Infringing Video 2 incorporated approximately 62%
 4 of *Courthouse Fail* (Infringing Video 2 is approximately 87% of Plaintiff’s *Courthouse*
 5 *Fail* footage excluding intro and outro material), and Infringing Video 3 incorporated
 6 approximately 81% of *Belmar Library* (Infringing Video 3 is approximately 92% of
 7 Plaintiff’s *Belmar Library* footage excluding intro and outro material).

8 90-92. Defendants’ use of *Another Chad* ~~and~~, *Belmar Library* and *Courthouse Fail*
 9 was for commercial purposes, including monetization through advertisements and the
 10 promotion of merchandise and channel memberships.

11 91-93. Defendants’ use was not transformative and does not qualify as fair use under
 12 17 U.S.C. § 107. As alleged herein, Defendants’ reproductions served as market substitutes
 13 for Plaintiff’s original works, diverting viewership and advertising revenue from the DMA
 14 Channel.

15 92-94. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ infringement, Plaintiff has
 16 suffered actual damages including lost viewership, lost advertising revenue, and
 17 diminution of the market and licensing value of *Another Chad* ~~and~~, *Belmar Library* and
 18 *Courthouse Fail*.

19 93-95. Pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 504(b), Plaintiff is entitled to recover actual damages
 20 and any profits of Defendants attributable to the infringement.

21 96. Defendants’ infringement is ongoing, including because Infringing Video 2
 22 remains live and continues to exploit Plaintiff’s *Courthouse Fail* video. Plaintiff is entitled
 23 to injunctive relief under 17 U.S.C. §§ 502 and 503 requiring removal of infringing material
 24 and preventing further infringement.

25 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

26 **Misrepresentation in Counter-Notifications under the DMCA**

27 **(17 U.S.C. § 512(f))**

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

1 94-97. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1
2 through ~~93~~96.

3 95-98. Section 512(f)(2) of the Copyright Act provides, in relevant part, that “any
4 person who knowingly materially misrepresents under this section . . . that material was
5 removed or disabled by mistake or misidentification, shall be liable for any damages,
6 including costs and attorneys’ fees, incurred by . . . any copyright owner . . . who is injured by
7 such misrepresentation.”

8 96-99. In the Counter-Notices submitted to YouTube under penalty of perjury,
9 Defendants represented, among other things, that: (a) the removals were the result of
10 “mistake or misidentification” and the Infringing Videos were protected by “fair use,”
11 citing a nonexistent “fair use act of 1976”; (b) Huneault owned the Frauditor Troll Channel
12 and the videos at issue; (c) Defendants had already hired an attorney and were prepared to
13 litigate; and (d) Defendants could be served at 99 Wall Street, New York, New York.

14 97-100. Those statements were false, and, critically, were made without a good-
15 faith belief at the time of each Counter-Notice that the videos were not infringing or the
16 removals were by mistake or misidentification. As alleged above, the Infringing Videos
17 reproduce the bulk of Plaintiff’s works in long, uninterrupted blocks with only token, non-
18 transformative interjections. Moreover, in or about May 2022, Defendants published a
19 video titled *How to Do Fair Use Properly and Avoid Copyright Strikes*, in which Huneault
20 instructed viewers to (a) insert commentary at least every 40 seconds, (b) limit use to less
21 than 50% of another’s work, and (c) pad videos with intros/outros to dilute the proportion
22 of infringing content. Defendants’ own infringing videos ignored each of those purported
23 safeguards. This objective contradiction between Huneault’s professed “fair use formula”
24 and his conduct demonstrates that he knew the videos were not fair use and nonetheless
25 represented otherwise under penalty of perjury in the Counter-Notices.¹³ On July 5–6,
26

27 ¹³ Plaintiff does not concede that Huneault’s statements regarding fair use are correct—they are reproduced
28 solely to demonstrate that Huneault understood the principles he articulated and that his representations
in the Counter-Notices were knowingly false.

1 2023, Huneault further admitted that he filed counter-notices to “penalize” Plaintiff’s
2 channel, expected automatic reinstatement within three weeks, and had not retained
3 counsel. YouTube relied on these misrepresentations to reinstate the removed videos,
4 causing Plaintiff to incur litigation costs and other damages that would not have occurred
5 but for Defendants’ fraudulent Counter-Notices. These contemporaneous admissions show
6 the Counter-Notices were tactical rather than truthful.

7 ~~98~~101. After being served, Huneault and Ohiri publicly admitted in a YouTube
8 video that there was a one-in-a-billion chance Plaintiff would actually hold Defendants
9 accountable for copyright infringement because they knew Plaintiff lacked the financial
10 resources to pursue federal litigation.

11 ~~99~~102. Huneault misrepresented facts essential to the statutory process under
12 §512(g)(3) which further demonstrates Defendants’ pattern of knowingly false statements.

13 ~~100~~103. The “already hired an attorney” assertion was false. As alleged above,
14 the day after submitting the July 2023 Counter-Notices Huneault publicly admitted he had
15 not hired a lawyer and would “talk to a paralegal” instead. Huneault made that statement
16 merely to mislead Plaintiff into believing that an attorney determined that Defendants’
17 dozens of infringing videos were fair use.

18 ~~101~~104. After being notified of this lawsuit, Defendants took no steps to appear
19 or defend; instead, they engaged in evasive tactics, refusing to accept service of process
20 and permanently destroying over 1,700 videos. These facts underscore that Defendants’
21 Counter-Notices were not only legally baseless but knowingly false.

22 ~~102~~105. Defendants publicly admitted that they destroyed the 1,700 videos to
23 avoid being held accountable for the massive copyright infringement claims Plaintiff and
24 others could have brought.

25 ~~103~~106. The New York service address was false and materially misleading. As
26 alleged above, Defendants are residents of Canada; listing “99 Wall Street, New York,
27 NY” impeded service and misrepresented their true location. Defendants knowingly
28

Formatted: No widow/orphan control

1 omitted suite number 5892 from the Counter-Notices to evade service and increase
2 Plaintiff's litigation costs.

3 ~~104,107.~~ Defendants' conduct epitomizes the systemic abuse Congress sought to
4 prevent in § 512(f). Having publicly instructed others on the requirements of fair use,
5 Huneault later admitted that Defendants simply file counter-notices without regard to the
6 law because they believe no one will enforce it. This is not a mistake or misidentification,
7 it is a deliberate exploitation of a flawed process, undertaken with knowledge that false
8 assertions of lawful use would go unchallenged unless Plaintiff shouldered the cost of
9 federal litigation Defendants believed he could not afford.

10 ~~105,108.~~ As a direct result of Defendants' material misrepresentations regarding
11 fair use, Plaintiff was forced to initiate this action to have the Infringing Videos removed
12 from the Frauditor Troll Channel, and to prevent their re-upload. Plaintiff is entitled to
13 recover damages, costs, and attorneys' fees under 17 U.S.C. § 512(f).

14 ~~106,109.~~ Plaintiff is further entitled to injunctive relief requiring YouTube or its
15 agents to remove the Infringing Videos from the Frauditor Troll Channel and to prevent
16 their re-upload.

17 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Declaratory Relief**

19 **(28 U.S.C. § 2201 and 17 U.S.C. § 512(g))**

20 **(Courthouse Fail)**

21 ~~107.— Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1~~
22 ~~through 106.~~

23 ~~108.— On or about February 4, 2022, Defendants published Infringing Video 2 to the~~
24 ~~Frauditor Troll Channel.¹⁴ Infringing Video 2 incorporates approximately eighteen minutes~~
25 ~~and forty-six seconds of Plaintiff's *Courthouse Fail* video without authorization.~~

26
27
28 ¹⁴ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eVe4eoOzPve&t=700s>.

~~109. Plaintiff's *Courthouse Fail* video is thirty minutes and twenty seven seconds long, meaning Defendants misappropriated approximately sixty two percent of Plaintiff's work. Excluding the brief introduction and outro, eighty seven percent of Defendants' video consists of Plaintiff's footage, while Defendants' commentary accounts for only thirteen percent, two minutes and forty eight seconds in total. These brief interjections provide no meaningful analysis or critique and do nothing to alter the expressive core of Plaintiff's work, which dominates the viewing experience.~~

~~110. An actual and justiciable controversy exists concerning Defendants' use of Plaintiff's *Courthouse Fail* video as that video remains live on the Frauditor Troll Channel and was subject to a DMCA Takedown and Counter Notice under 17 U.S.C. § 512(g)(3), each claiming that the removed material was lawful and protected by fair use.~~

~~111. YouTube reinstated Infringing Video 2 following a Counter Notice submitted by Defendants under § 512(g)(3), creating an actual, live controversy as to whether the continued display of Infringing Video 2 is lawful.~~

~~112. Plaintiff seeks a judicial declaration that Defendants' use of *Courthouse Fail* does not qualify as fair use under 17 U.S.C. § 107 and an injunction requiring YouTube to remove the video from its platform and prevent its re-upload.~~

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

Unlawful Circumvention of Technological Measures

(17 U.S.C. §§ 1201, 1203)

~~113;110.~~ Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through ~~112~~109.

~~114;111.~~ Plaintiff is the author of the original audiovisual works published on his YouTube channels.

~~115;112.~~ Plaintiff owns all rights, title, and interest in and to the claims asserted in this action, including all claims for violations of 17 U.S.C. § 1201.

~~116;113.~~ Each of Plaintiff's works was uploaded to YouTube through the platform's standard publishing system. When published, YouTube automatically applied

1 TPMs that control access to and prevent unauthorized copying or downloading of
2 Plaintiff's audiovisual files, consistent with 17 U.S.C. § 1201.

3 ~~117,114.~~ Upon information and belief, Defendants intentionally circumvented
4 these TPMs by employing software tools commonly known as "rippers" or "downloaders"
5 to download native-quality copies of Plaintiff's YouTube videos.

6 ~~118,115.~~ Upon information and belief, Defendants unlawfully obtained between
7 fifty and one hundred of Plaintiff's videos using these tools, often on the same day that the
8 videos were posted to Plaintiff's YouTube channels so that Defendants could post the
9 unlawfully obtained videos on the Frauditor Troll Channel.

10 ~~119,116.~~ Defendants used those unlawfully obtained copies to create monetized
11 videos for the Frauditor Troll Channel, reproducing extensive, unaltered portions of
12 Plaintiff's works without license or authorization.

13 ~~120,117.~~ By using circumvention software and disabling or bypassing
14 YouTube's copy-protection systems, Defendants violated 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a), which
15 prohibits the circumvention of a technological measure that effectively controls access to
16 a copyrighted work.

17 ~~121,118.~~ Defendants' conduct was willful, knowing, and undertaken for
18 commercial advantage, including the generation of advertising revenue through YouTube's
19 AdSense program.

20 ~~122,119.~~ As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' circumvention, Plaintiff
21 has suffered actual damages, including loss of control over his copyrighted works,
22 impairment of market value, and costs incurred to identify, remove, and prevent further
23 distribution of infringing content.

24 ~~123,120.~~ Plaintiff is entitled to recover actual or statutory damages under 17
25 U.S.C. § 1203(c), together with attorney's fees and costs, and to obtain injunctive relief
26 restraining Defendants from further circumvention or trafficking in circumvention
27 technology.

28 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

1 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants as follows:

2
3 A. That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants for
4 monetary damages caused by their infringement of Plaintiff's *Another Chad*
5 ~~and~~, *Belmar Library* and *Courthouse Fail* copyrights;

6 B. That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants for
7 monetary damages caused by their knowing material misrepresentations in the
8 Counter-Notices pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 512(f);

9 ~~C. That the Court enter a declaratory judgment that Defendants' use of
10 *Courthouse Fail* is not protected by 17 U.S.C. § 107;~~

11 ~~D.C.~~ That judgment be entered in favor of Plaintiff and against Defendants for their
12 unlawful circumvention of technological protection measures in violation of
13 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a), including statutory damages of \$2,500 per act of
14 circumvention, actual damages, attorneys' fees, and a permanent injunction
15 prohibiting further circumvention or distribution of works obtained through
16 circumvention;

17 ~~E.D.~~ That the Court enter a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from further
18 ~~useinfringement~~ of *Another Chad*, *Courthouse Fail* and *Belmar Library*,
19 ~~requiring removal of the Infringing Videos (including Infringing Video 2~~
20 ~~which remains live)~~, and requiring YouTube and any third-party platforms
21 ~~with notice to remove the Infringing Videosdisable access to~~ and prevent ~~re-~~
22 ~~upload or~~ further dissemination ~~of the Infringing Videos~~;

23 ~~F.E.~~ That the Court award Plaintiff costs and attorneys' fees ~~pursuant to 17 U.S.C.~~
24 ~~§ 512(f);as permitted by law;~~

25 ~~G.F.~~ Any other relief the Court deems just and proper.
26
27
28

Formatted: Font: Not Italic

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Dated: ~~November 3, 2025~~ February __, 2026

/s/ ~~Randall S. Newman~~
Randall S. Newman, Esq. (SBN 190547)
99 Wall Street, Suite 3727
New York, NY 10005
(212) 797-3735
rsn@randallnewman.net

*Attorney for Plaintiff,
Christopher J. Cordova*