Andrea Kulikowski

476 E Sycamore St

Columbus OH. 43206

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this as my request for reconsideration of the initial Finding of Fact and Decision for my Crime Victim’s Compensation Request.

Receipts, medical records, and only two police reports can only tell a biased story of the happenings that led up to my initial request. I requested radio runs from Columbus Police and a full spectrum of the police reports (all attached with notes in the margins) to respectfully request your consideration with this additional information in mind.

1. My Domestic Violence Protection Order against Mr. Joseph Finney was in force as of October 29, 2020 and continued in force until March 11, 2021, when I dropped the charges. My rationale for dropping the charges was that Mr. Finney had violated them anyway and would continue to do so regardless of whether they remained in force or not.
	1. Mr. Finney works/worked as a contractor for Homeland Security LIO Jennifer Thornton whose street alias is Jennifer Taurins. I was not aware of this until I caught them, on video, setting up surveillance in the yard behind mine on the evening of December 10 – 11, 2021. This is a direct violation of my protection order that Mr. Finney and his agents are to stay at least 500 ft away from me.

At your request I can supply video of this in a format that is readable by your computer – please advise.

* 1. Additionally, his driving by constantly was an attempt to intimidate me and make me fearful for my safety. See p. 6 of attachments. I can also include 30+ videos given to the prosecutor for my criminal case.
	2. One of my rights as a crime victim is to be able to attend every hearing. I was cyberbullied by Ms. Thorton and Mr. Finney so harshly on the evening of March 3-4, 2021, that I fled my house, with my dog, and was picked up and conveniently pink slipped by CPD so that I would not be able to attend Mr. Finney’s trial on March 4th.
1. On December 2, 2020, I made a call to CPD and officers came to my home (video available). They berated me and refused to make a report on Mr. Finney’s repeated drive bys. They told me that I was the stalker for looking at my video footage. One of the responding officers would be the one to try to get me to “have fun” in the backseat of his cruiser on the night of March 3-4, the alternative would be that the police would get to take my dog and it was inferred that I would not get my dog back. See p. 8 of attachments for radio run of this encounter.
2. On p. 9 of the attached files, you’ll see the radio run report of the events of 12/21/20 when a warrant was issued. The last comment “changed location on paper” leads me to believe that police changed a location on paper but no real warrant was issued.
3. Page 10 shows an alternative version of the actual police report for the events of 12/21/20, my guess is that they assumed Mr. Finney would either 1) never get remanded for this because he was currently contracted by DHS which gives him immunity 2) They simply didn’t feel that completing the warrant process was worth the time. Either way, multiple versions of the same police report should not exist.
4. Additionally, on 12/21/20 an Arrest Information Sheet was filed out as if Mr. Finney had been arrested, even noting that his parents were to meet him at the detective bureau at 9am the next day with Court at 1pm. Clearly this never happened as he continued to stalk me until 12/25/20—when he was actually “arrested” and gave up his federal ID number.
5. It would appear from viewing the radio run from 12/25/20 that Mr. Finney or his vehicle were already being monitored—see notes and highlights on document p.XXXX.
6. The next page in the attachment is the actual arrest report that includes the only two drive bys that police allowed to be counted against him and combined into one single charge in the end – my guess is because they never filed the warrant on 12/21/20 or notified Mr. Finney of the warrant. Technically, this should have been a felony arrest as it was a second violation. But, alas, Mr. Finney has special priviledges as a DHS contractor.
7. Mr. Attorney General: You note in your Findings of Fact that Mr. Finney was just driving by, that he was not actually stalking me. However, if you look at p. XXXX in the highlighted section, you’ll see that CPD rejects his claim of “just driving home from work” because to drive past my home again would be out of the way of his route (this was discussed again at arraignment for his criminal trial and again rejected by the judge and prosecutor. Mr. Finney then claims to “not know why” he drove by and finally laments his actions and says that “he is very sorry” for breaking the law. I seriously doubt his apology; he is only sorry that he got caught as his understanding is/was that is above the law.
8. On p. XXXX of the attachment provided we see an interestingly handwritten account of his arrest in which Officer Selhorst, who had been present at several of my reports notes that Mr. Finney “recklessly violated this protection order” as Officer Selhorst has seen the many videos