



Ryan Hell <ryanbrooklyn2020@gmail.com>

Re: Please file for reconsideration on my preservation motion

Sean Esworthy <sean@wenatcheelaw.com>
To: Ryan Hell <ryanbrooklyn2020@gmail.com>

Thu, Jun 26, 2025 at 3:27 PM

If you want to put information in front of the court, we would need a declaration from you or someone else. Although, as I have previously indicated, it is usually advisable at this point to remain silent and not make any statements regarding the incident itself. However, as you seem to want to anyhow, it is ultimately your choice to remain silent or present your beliefs to the court.

If you want to file LLM generated motions, that is fine, but I am not going to sign off on them or endorse them. I would note as a word of caution that using LLM generated information which is false, especially citations, can be sanctionable.

I've asked the investigator to submit some a request to Rivercom for whatever triage system they use, if they have one at all. Also, for employment of Jana Johnson by Rivercom.

The CAD log on the initial call from you indicates that Kalah McCurdy was the calltaker.

The second CAD log indicates that there are several calltakers involved: Heidi Harvill, Cayla Rogers, Carleigh Smith, and Dee Gutierrez.

However, it could in fact be the case that the response to the initial call was improper and EMS should have been sent. I agree that it is also unusual for an off-duty dispatcher to take people to their property. I am not sure how exactly that will fit in the criminal allegation of whether there was a threat to get a gun if they took the truck unless the idea is to try and say they and the tow company fabricated the threat because they were trying to coverup the 911 call or something like that. As it stands, this seems like a relatively weak connection and requires that the tow company be "in on it" as well since the alleged threat is actually in relation to the tow and not the 911 call. An argument could be made that they get a lot of business from Rivercom or something to that effect, but it still seems shaky.

The state is going to have a much more straight-forward and buyable narrative. They may even acknowledge that they should have sent EMS and that it is unorthodox to take a person to a 911 dispatcher's property. I have a feeling, which we may uncover at the interview, that he will, in fact, concede that.

The bottom line, again, is if the case ends up going to trial, the jury will need to decide if the state has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that you made a threat to kill as defined in the law. If there is some actual evidence of evidence tampering prior to that, that would be a big deal. But you will also need to keep in mind that there are hours of video for every case these days, and virtually no one but you is claiming they are faked. They are not even faked in a way to frame you for a crime and they kept in the wife's own threats. Everyone, including the judge or jury, is likely to be extremely skeptical and think it is just searching for a conspiracy that does not exist.

If that is the only defense there is at trial, I will run with it, but I still do not think a jury is going to buy it.

At that point, I would still probably fall back to the legal defenses (not a true threat) based off their seeming non-fear, statements during, statements after, etc.

From: Ryan Hell <ryanbrooklyn2020@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 10:00 AM
To: Sean Esworthy <sean@wenatcheelaw.com>
Subject: Please file for reconsideration on my preservation motion

Sean, good afternoon

This email is for you only; do not file or disclose to anyone else

I need you to file for a reconsideration for the preservation motion using addendum you didn't read last time. I would like you to please file for a reconsideration on my motion for preservation that we had filed after some time to think about it and talk to some people and read some stuff about it. It looks like I have an ability to file for a reconsideration on a matter.

I think we would be trying to reconsider, and I'm hoping that the motion addendum that I had sent to you that you didn't read in a courtroom I would like to get that information in front of the judge and on the record to bring light to the to the to the Motion so that there's some background and he can understand what's going on

I also need to know what my next court date is and if that's a Zoom appearance or not

I realized in court at that motion, hearing for preservation that we just had also that there was a confirmation of the employment status of one of the victims Jeremiah working for the 91 dispatch company. I would like to press that we get it on the record who the spouse works for as well I think she is of the most important and that's for two reasons. that she was also a dispatcher. This is an actual is that she was also a dispatcher. This is an actual rivercom operation to pick me up and take me to that house THE OPPOSITE DIRECTION OF THE HOSPITAL which was unusual and unorthodox.

The other reason is is that she was the one fielding the calls I made. THE VICTIM INTENTIONALLY CREATED HER SITUATION. She knew I needed an ambulance

When I had watched the videos in your office I seen strong indication that she had been taking the calls all along. I showed other video analyst they also said as well that they believe that my phone calls were being fielded by either Jeremiah or his wife throughout this ordeal.

That is a startling revelation to me myself, and it really creates a real sketchy situation when somebody's trying to achieve an emergency medical assistance for a dying person (she was in fact dying) and myself also in a medical declared emergency for a possible stroke as I declared in 911.