Twitter Thread by Sir Aaron



Sir Aaron
@SirAaron_

I’m going to riff on this for a bit about how this works in the real world.

—-Every Deleted Parler Post, Many With Users' Location Data, Has Been Archived

Law enforcement generally doesn’t use work by hackers i their investigations because ■■■■■■■ ■■ ■■■■■■■. And while it’s permissible for law enforcement to use evidence that was illegally obtained by a private citizen, the government doesn’t like to do it.

The first reason for this is because the government doesn’t want to be perceived as encouraging illegal activity. In fact, if the government goes over the line the court might and has in many cases said the private party was acting on behalf of the government.

If the evidence is thrown out then you risk losing the evidence and everything you leaned from that evidence.

The second reason is that LE doesn’t need somebody else to archive the data during an active investigation. Law enforcement does this all day everyday with the company

It’s called a preservation letter and it requires the company to keep all data it has at that moment for the length of time stated in the letter (usually 90 days).

The third reason is that in order to use the data in a trial you must authenticate the data. You want to use a hacker to authenticate the data? Probably not. You’ll want a company employee to do that.

Another problem here is that many people get on social media and mouth off. Indeed one of the parleys listed in the article isn’t a crime. Wishing for a bad act to happen isn’t a threat nor is it a crime. And there was a LOT of talk on Parler and this site too.

I’ve seen little evidence that Parler was used to coordinate anything much less anything illegal. And I’ve got more news for the left. This wasn’t an insurrection or sedition.

What law enforcement might do is use the data to find videos they might want to use then get Parler to identify the users so they can contact that individual to get the video. In some cases they may want to charge the person taking the video if they were doing something illegal.

But all of that means they still have to go to Parler and get the original data. They're generally not going to use the internet archive (although I have) and certainly not going to have some self proclaimed hacker.

As for the hacker, I don't see any evidence there was any hacking. Generally speaking, crawling a site is not illegal. Google and the internet archive do it all day everyday. So all this hacker is doing is storing information that was already public.

Just because it's legal doesn't mean law enforcement will use it. We have lots of people who setup honeypots that DOJ has decided we can't use due to some legal concerns. Now keep in mind these are illegal users intentionally logging into somebody else's server and that person

merely recoding the traffic on his own server. DOJ won't use it. So that gives you some idea how DOJ feels about this sorta thing.

Mostly what these hackers are doing are using this to doxx people online. That's also illegal and that would subject them to civil suits. But in most cases a regular jo doesn't have the resources to pursue it.

Having said that, Parler only used identifications to give you a verified user badge. Most people who wanted to remain anonymous or were super concerned about it didn't do it. So I doubt they accomplish much.

Having said all that, it's a reminder that the internet is forever. If you post something it can be saved forever using a variety of means including a simple screenshot. Same with photos, videos, text messages, and emails. It's not safe if it's online.

Also, I recommend using a delete service to regularly purge your tweets and likes. These leftists are trying to find any little nugget they can to dox you and ruin your life. Proactively block leftists and trolls to limit your exposure.

I used a legal term in the middle of this tweet thread. @shipwreckedcrew is an attorney who can explain better, but that word is "authenticate." In order to introduce a document or evidence at trial you need to have it authenticated.

What that means is what it sounds like: that the document is authentic (not a fake or forgery) and that it is what it you purport it to be. This often comes up in records seized from a search warrant.

For example, bank records from a subjects house are seized showing $100k in a nominee bank account. Well you can't usually introduce that at trial (by itself) as proof of a bank account.

That's because you can't prove that the bank account is real by just the document. You can't prove it's not a fake made for any number of purposes (loan fraud). So what you'd do is subpoena the bank get the bank to provide records and testify to their authenticity.

Then you'd introduce the records from the search warrant to show the exact same records were in the subject's possession.

There are always exceptions and exceptional circumstances. And most times if the records are really legit the defense may not even dispute their authenticity.

Also, the authenticity of a record is different than proving a person is attached to them. You can introduce a text message as authentic..that is it's a real text message. But you still have to prove that the text message was sent by the person in question.

And with words there's another problem. Let's say for example, I say to my friend..."it would be so easy to rob a bank. We should totally hit up that BofA."

Then my friend gets caught robbing a bank. Am I guilty of a crime because he did that? Based on that one statement?

You don't know any other facts. Just that? Am I guilty? See the problem? Now take that and make the statement more nebulous. "BofA doesn't have much security. They're just begging for a problem." Is that a crime?

Don't even think about the law, just think about it from a

Moral view. You hold me to be guilty under just those facts? Don't add any facts or assumptions. Just go under those facts. In a trial you don't get to assume anything nor do you get all the facts. You get only what the judge allows you to hear.