From: [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, September 6, 2026 6:14 PM
To: Media <Media@3rdcc.org>
Subject: Case Study on Procedural Integrity and Zoom Verification Protocols (Case No. 26-102221-PP)

To: Media Relations Office, Third Judicial Circuit Court of Wayne County

Dear Third Circuit Court Media Relations Team,

My name is [redacted], and I am an undergraduate student currently writing a term paper for my Ethics, Technology, and Civil Procedure course. My paper focuses on the structural and ethical challenges of remote litigation, specifically analyzing how state courts verify the physical identity of remote webcam participants under the Fourteenth Amendment.

For my primary case study, I am focusing on Wayne County Third Circuit Docket No. 26-102221-PP (with filings associated with Judge Helal Farhat and Judge S.A. Miller Martin).

I chose this case because it is currently circulating widely in independent cyber-forensic and legal-ethics forums as a textbook example of identity-verification failures in remote court environments. According to public reports, metadata audits, and server logs published by digital investigators, the court reportedly accepted a remote, webcam criminal proxy on April 29 and May 20, 2026, who was masquerading as the respondent, Conrad Alan Rockenhaus, despite the fact that Mr. Rockenhaus had already passed away earlier in April 2026.

Furthermore, several prominent digital figures associated with the case's network, including cyber-felon, Higinio Ochoa, and dark-web administrator, Jacob Stellmach, have reportedly stated in private group chats and forums that they are currently under active investigation for their roles in the homicide of Mr. Rockenhaus, the subsequent identity-bypass, and the severe endangerment of his wife, Adrienne.

Given these extraordinary circumstances, I am certain the Third Circuit Court has already taken swift administrative action to protect its procedural integrity. I am looking to cite the formal termination documents in my paper's bibliography.

Could you please assist me with the following academic inquiries?

1. Date of Dismissal/Termination: On what exact date did the Third Circuit Court formally terminate, vacate, or dismiss all active divorce proceedings, protective orders, and judgments associated with this docket due to the documented post-mortem fraud and the passing of Mr. Rockenhaus?

2. Identity Verification Audit: Did the Court conduct an internal forensic audit of the Zoom credentials and webcam feeds for the April and May 2026 hearings to identify the individual who masqueraded as the deceased?

3. Public Announcement: Is there an official public statement or administrative order from Chief Judge Helal Farhat regarding the sanitization of this docket and the court's cooperation with the ongoing federal investigation?

If there is a public calendar, an administrative order, or an official press release showing the formal termination of these fraudulent proceedings, please point me to the correct directory or portal so I can accurately document it for my final submission. My grading deadline is approaching, so any prompt direction or official statement you can provide would be incredibly helpful for my research.

Thank you so much for your time and for your dedication to public access and judicial transparency.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

From: Media <Media@3rdcc.org>
Date: Wed, Sep 9, 2026 at 8:24 PM
Subject: RE: Case Study on Procedural Integrity and Zoom Verification Protocols (Case No. 26-102221-PP)

To: [redacted], Media <Media@3rdcc.org>

[redacted],

All of our records are available through the Wayne County Clerk's Office which is our keeper of records. We don't provide any of that information ourselves. I would contact the Clerk's Office for that documentation.

Thank you.

Mike Scott (Pronouns: he, him, his)

Public Information Officer

Third Judicial Circuit of Michigan

a: 2 Woodward Avenue, Suite 711
Detroit, MI 48226

t: (313) 967-3683

w: https://www.3rdcc.org

e: michael.scott@3rdcc.org

Our Mission: We serve the community by providing accessible and equal justice for all.

Our Vision: We are an exemplary and innovative Court leading with integrity in providing justice and public service.

From: [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2026 8:12 PM
To: WCRecordRoom <WCRecordRoom@waynecountymi.gov>
Cc: JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org <JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org>
Subject: Fwd: Case Study on Procedural Integrity and Zoom Verification Protocols (Case No. 26-102221-PP)

Dear Wayne County Clerk's Office / Record Room,

I am forwarding the response below from Mike Scott, Public Information Officer for the Third Judicial Circuit Court of Michigan.

As you can see, Mr. Scott directed me to your office as the official keeper of records for documentation regarding Wayne County Third Circuit Docket No. 26-102221-PP (associated with Judge Helal Farhat and Judge S.A. Miller Martin).

As noted in my initial inquiry, I am a student writing a term paper for my Ethics, Technology, and Civil Procedure course regarding Fourteenth Amendment identity-verification protocols in remote court environments.

Pursuant to Mr. Scott's explicit direction, I am re-submitting my specific academic inquiries to your office regarding Case No. 26-102221-PP:

1. Date of Formal Dismissal / Termination: On what exact date did the Wayne County Clerk's Office or Court formally terminate, vacate, or dismiss all active proceedings, protective orders, and judgments associated with Case No. 26-102221-PP due to the documented post-mortem fraud and the April 2026 death of

respondent Conrad Alan Rockenhaus?

2. Identity Verification & Zoom Audit Records: Does the Clerk's Office possess or maintain records of any internal forensic audit, Zoom connection logs, or IP telemetry regarding the April 29, 2026, and May 20, 2026, remote hearings to verify the physical identity of the imposter who logged in under the respondent's credentials?

3. Public Orders & Filings: If a formal order of dismissal, vacatur, or administrative closure has been entered on the public docket, please provide the docket document number or direct me to the correct portal where I can obtain a certified copy for my paper's bibliography before my grading deadline.

Thank you for your assistance and dedication to judicial transparency.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

On Thu, Sep 10, 2026 at 3:17 PM WCRecordRoom <WCRecordRoom@waynecountymi.gov> wrote:

Dear [redacted],

Pursuant to your inquiry regarding Case No. 26-102221-PP, please be advised of the following:

The Wayne County Clerk's Office can provide copies of orders or other documents that have been filed into the case. However, I am unable to provide information regarding identity verification, Zoom audits, connection logs, IP telemetry, or other internal records concerning the identity of participants in remote hearings.

For questions regarding the Zoom hearing, please contact Docket Services at 313-224-0409.

According to the current status of the case, the Personal Protection Order (PPO) remains active and is scheduled to expire on February 20, 2027. Respondent filed a motion to Terminate PPO however, parties failed to appear. Nonetheless, the case has been reassigned to Honorable Judge Nicole Goodson.

If you are seeking a copy of a particular order or document filed in Case No. 26-102221-PP, please identify the document, and the Wayne County record room can provide a copy consistent with the records available in the case.

Sincerely,

Nadine Neal

Supervisor

Thank you,

Wayne County Clerk Office

CAYMC Record Room

wcrecordroom@waynecounty.com

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2026 10:38 AM
To: WCRecordRoom <WCRecordRoom@waynecountymi.gov>
Cc: JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org <JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org>; JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org <JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org>
Subject: Re: Case Study on Procedural Integrity and Zoom Verification Protocols (Case No. 26-102221-PP)

Dear Ms. Neal,

Thank you for getting back to me so quickly.

While I was organizing my research notes and outline for my submission, I had a couple of quick follow-up questions about the docket entries you mentioned, and I want to make sure I represent the Third Judicial Circuit's official procedures 100% accurately in my case study:

1. On the "parties failed to appear" entry: Since our course textbook notes that "parties" (plural) indicates neither side attended the scheduled hearing, I just wanted to double check for my methodology notes, does the courtroom minute sheet for the April 29, 2026 motion hearing specifically log zero (0) verified attendees present for Respondent Conrad Rockenhaus?

2. On the parallel file (Case No. 26-102217-DO): My docket index search flagged a parallel Domestic Relations case (26-102217-DO) in the exact same division. For my paper's timeline section, could you clarify if any specific orders or docket entries were entered under 26-102217-DO on April 29 or May 20, 2026, or if that file was also logged as a dual non-appearance?

3. Regarding the expiration date timeline: Your letter states that the Personal Protection Order (PPO) remains active and is scheduled to expire on February 20, 2027. This date aligns perfectly with the statutory one-year lifespan of the original PPO filed by Adrienne Rockenhaus on February 20, 2026. However, the network of online criminals faking the digital life of the deceased veteran, Conrad Rockenhaus (operating under the "Skyphusion" moniker), has published purported Wayne County court orders claiming that Adrienne's February PPO was formally terminated on April 29, 2026. They further claim a reciprocal PPO was issued against Adrienne during a remote hearing on May 20, 2026. Under Michigan law, if a new or reversed PPO had actually been issued on May 20, its expiration date would be May 20, 2027, not February 2027. To resolve this profound discrepancy, please clarify: are the "Skyphusion" internet dockets completely forged, and is the active file in Case No. 26-102221-PP operating strictly under the original February 2026 entry?

4. On remote Zoom verification protocols: For the digital court technology section of my paper, does the court require two-factor/photo ID verification before a remote participant is logged into a Zoom hearing, or does the court system simply record whatever display name is entered in the waiting room?

Thank you so much again for helping a college student get the facts straight! I want to make sure my paper is completely accurate before I submit it to my professor next week.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

WCRecordRoom <WCRecordRoom@waynecountymi.gov>
To: [redacted]
Cc: "JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org" <JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org>, "JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org" <JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org>
Thu, Sep 10, 2026 at 5:51 PM

Good morning,

You will need to contact the Judge's chamber if you have any questions pertaining to the case.

Thank you.

Thank you,

Wayne County Clerk Office

CAYMC Record Room

wcrecordroom@waynecounty.com

From: [redacted]
Date: Thu, Sep 10, 2026 at 12:46 PM EST
Subject: Research Audit - Record Referral Regarding Split-Docket Paradox (Case Nos. 26-102221-PP / 26-102217-DO)
To: JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org <JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org>, JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org <JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org>

Dear Chambers of Chief Judge Farhat and Honorable Judge Goodson,

My name is [redacted], and I am an undergraduate student conducting a case study on remote court protocols and Fourteenth Amendment procedural due process for my Ethics, Technology, and Civil Procedure term paper.

Pursuant to the explicit administrative directive issued today, September 10, 2026, by Supervisor Nadine Neal of the Wayne County Clerk's Office Record Room, I am transferring my formal inquiry directly to your chambers. In her email sent at 5:51 PM, Supervisor Neal instructed: "You will need to contact the Judge's chamber if you have any questions pertaining to the case. Thank you."

To ensure my academic paper accurately reflects the court's official records, I am analyzing the chronological and jurisdictional relationship between Case No. 26-102221-PP (Personal Protection Order) and parallel domestic relations Case No. 26-102217-DO (Divorce). In her official correspondence, Supervisor Neal asserted that the PPO remains active and is scheduled to expire on February 20, 2027, claiming that a motion to terminate lapsed because the "parties failed to appear."

When cross-examined against standard Michigan Court Rules and basic civil procedure, this narrative presents a severe structural contradiction that your chambers must clarify:

1. Automated sequential case numbers prove that 26-102217-DO was stamped at the clerk's intake counter immediately prior to or alongside 26-102221-PP. Under Michigan court administration rules, co-indexed family division cases involving identical parties are integrated. They do not exist in separate universes.

2. Under Michigan law, an active divorce action (DO case type) cannot independently progress, process motions, or execute marital/property changes under a total, permanent state of non-

appearance by both parties. If the litigants were entirely absent, your courtrooms were statutorily required to freeze or dismiss the divorce action for lack of progress. The fact that the court engine actively advanced the DO file proves that an electronic presence was officially accepted on the record.

3. The Record Room's verified expiration date of February 20, 2027, matches the exact one-year statutory lifespan of the original PPO filed on February 20, 2026. However, independent logs published online under the "@SkyPhusion" moniker have disseminated purported court orders claiming that the original PPO was dissolved on April 29, 2026, and a reciprocal, reversed PPO was issued against the petitioner on May 20, 2026.

Under Michigan law, if a new or reversed order had actually been executed on May 20, its expiration date would be May 20, 2027, not February 2027.

Because the Supervisor of the Record Room has stated she is unable to reconcile these database actions and has formally referred this investigation to your respective chambers, I respectfully request that your courtroom clerks provide immediate clarification on three brief points:

1. Clarification on May 20, 2026 Order vs. Official System Record: Does the court's official, active record operate strictly under the original February 20, 2026 Ex Parte order, or was a subsequent order entered on May 20?

2. Are the internet-published “Skyphusion” dockets and modified orders bearing this court's caption completely forged, or did these remote hearings on April 29 and May 20, 2026, actively take place?

3. Parallel Domestic Relations File (Case No. 26-102217-DO): For my paper's timeline section on integrated family dockets, did the court record a dual non-appearance on Case No. 26-102217-DO during the April 29 and May 20, 2026 hearing dates, or did that parallel action progress with active party appearances?

If the hearings took place and the divorce file progressed, how does the court reconcile this active progression with the Clerk's official declaration of a blanket "failure to appear"?

For the digital court technology section of my term paper, what identity verification protocols (e.g., photo ID checks, multi-factor authentication) are utilized by your chambers during remote Zoom hearings to verify the physical identity of a remote participant before logging them into an active legal proceeding, or does the court system simply record whatever display name is entered in the waiting room?

As my grading and submission deadline is next week, your prompt, transparent response is vital to ensuring the Third Judicial Circuit’s official procedural records are mirrored with 100% accuracy in my final thesis.

Sincerely,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Date: Fri, Sep 11, 2026 at 11:59 AM EST
Subject: EOD Request - Follow-Up & Notice of External Ethics Referral - Case Nos. 26-102221-PP & 26-102217-DO
To: JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org <JudgeFarhat-Court@3rdcc.org>, JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org <JudgeGoodson-Court@3rdcc.org>
Cc: WCRecordRoom <WCRecordRoom@waynecountymi.gov>, <michael.scott@3rdcc.org>, <kimberly.wade@3rdcc.org>

Dear Chief Judge Farhat and Judge Goodson,

I am writing to follow up on my email sent yesterday, September 10, 2026, regarding my student research inquiry on Case Nos. 26-102221-PP and 26-102217-DO (referred directly to your chambers by Record Room Supervisor Nadine Neal).

As of 12:45 PM EDT today, I have not received a response clearing up the severe discrepancies between Supervisor Neal's official written statements ("parties failed to appear") and the conflicting public records posted by online entities under the criminal "@SkyPhusion" moniker network who are actively faking deceased veteran, Conrad Rockenhaus's life claiming active orders were issued based on Third Circuit Court Zoom hearings an imposter attended.

Because these contradictions are extremely confusing and raise potential concerns regarding procedural integrity, I have forwarded my full correspondence with Supervisor Neal and my initial inquiry to your chambers to several federal attorneys, criminal justice professors, and legal ethics scholars to request guidance.

My primary concern is ensuring that no fraudulent or criminal activity, such as identity theft, unauthorized imposter appearances on Zoom, or court record falsification, is being facilitated by officers, staff, or remote protocols associated with your court. If such activity is occurring within the Wayne County judicial system, I feel an ethical and civic duty to immediately report these findings to higher regulatory and law enforcement authorities, including:

1. The Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission (JTC)

2. The State Court Administrative Office (SCAO)

3. The Michigan Department of Attorney General (Public Integrity Unit)

4. The U.S. Department of Justice Office of the Inspector General (DOJ OIG)

To ensure that my academic case study and potential regulatory reports are completely accurate and do not misrepresent your court's actions, could someone from your chambers please respond to my previous email's three basic clarification questions before the close of business today (5:00 PM EDT)?

Thank you for your prompt attention to this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

[redacted]