

I Am Jane Doe

The Cornell Case, the Hunt for a Name, and the Questions That Belong Elsewhere

FIRST AMENDMENT TELEVISION

Civic Advocacy Position Paper

Publication No. CV-010

Version 1.2

Date October 4, 2026 (attribution revision)

Status Editorial Review Copy

Published by First Amendment Television LLC

Record current as of October 2, 2026.

Editorial source note: This paper was prompted by a spoken-word video encountered online. Appendix A presents an adapted statement derived from its transcription. The video bears the TikTok handle @themisunderstoodaquarius and was encountered in a Facebook post under the account name Tiffany Cole. These account identifiers are source leads; the original speaker and author have not yet been independently verified. The source acknowledgment applies to the adapted statement and to language drawn from it elsewhere in this paper.

Content advisory: This paper describes allegations of drugging and sexual assault and quotes explicit language from a court filing. Appendix A contains strong profanity.

I. SUMMARY

In September 2026, a former Cornell University student filed a civil lawsuit alleging that seven fraternity members drugged and sexually assaulted her for more than four hours in October 2024.

No one was criminally charged at the time.

Since the filing, the case has received renewed scrutiny. A criminal investigation was reopened. Cornell University agreed to an independent outside review of its handling of the allegations. On October 1, 2026, New York Governor Kathy Hochul appointed New York Attorney General Letitia James as special prosecutor, authorizing her to investigate the allegations and, if warranted by the evidence, prosecute offenses and present evidence to a grand jury.

The lawsuit also set off fierce public attention, and much of it turned toward the wrong person: the woman who brought it.

She filed as Jane Doe.

Her name is not part of the public record, and it should not become part of the public record by way of the internet.

This paper takes no position on whether the allegations are true or what a court, grand jury or investigation ultimately will find.

Its position is narrower and firmer.

The questions in this case belong to the accused, to the witnesses, to the evidence and to the institutions responsible for investigating it.

They do not belong to her.

II. THE CASE ON THE RECORD

What the complaint alleges

The plaintiff, identified as Jane Doe, filed a lengthy civil complaint in New York State Supreme Court. She was 20 years old on October 19, 2024, when she says the assault began at the Chi Phi fraternity house in Ithaca, New York.

According to the complaint:

- Earlier that night, at a sorority event at a local bar, she was served alcohol although she was under 21.

- At the fraternity house, she alleges that members forced or pressured her to consume additional alcohol, marijuana and ketamine.
- She alleges that two men began sexually assaulting her without her consent.
- At about 1:42 a.m., according to the filing, one of the men sent a Snapchat message to a chapter group chat titled "Chi Phi Actives" saying there was "free pussy" upstairs. An image of the alleged message is included in the filing.
- She alleges that additional men subsequently entered the room and sexually assaulted her while she was incapacitated.
- The complaint alleges that the seven named defendants poured lines of ketamine on her body and snorted them.
- She alleges that the assaults continued before she passed out at approximately 5:45 a.m.

These are allegations. They have not been established as facts in a criminal court.

Who is named

The civil complaint names seven current or former Cornell students and Chi Phi members: Matthew Ingalls, Johnathan Newell, Winston Lee, Gillio Lopes, Diego Sarabia, Scott Norris and Scott Kretschmar.

The complaint accuses them of sexual assault, sexual battery and intentional infliction of emotional distress.

As of October 2, 2026, none of the seven has been criminally charged in connection with the allegations.

The suit also names Cornell University, Chi Phi fraternity organizations, Tri Delta sorority organizations, the former president of Cornell's Chi Phi chapter, the bar Moonies and unnamed individuals.

What the other parties and institutions say

The District Attorney

Tompkins County District Attorney Matthew Van Houten did not bring criminal charges in 2024.

Van Houten has said that the plaintiff's November 2024 sworn statement differed significantly from the allegations later made in the civil lawsuit. He has also acknowledged that his office relied on the investigation conducted by Cornell University Police and did not conduct an independent investigation of its own.

The criminal investigation was reopened in September 2026.

On October 1, Governor Kathy Hochul removed the matter from the Tompkins County District Attorney and appointed New York Attorney General Letitia James as special prosecutor.

The Attorney General now has authority to investigate the allegations and, if warranted by the evidence, prosecute offenses arising from that investigation and present evidence to a grand jury.

Cornell University

Cornell says its internal Title IX process included an investigation and a hearing before a panel of trained faculty and staff.

The University says the disciplinary process resulted in expulsions and suspensions. Cornell has not publicly identified which individuals received which sanctions.

The plaintiff's attorney has said that two of the seven defendants were expelled.

Cornell disputes claims that students were permitted simply to write essays in place of meaningful punishment. The University has said essay-writing was not imposed as the sole consequence for any defendant.

The Chi Phi chapter was closed in 2024 and remains barred from campus.

Cornell has also agreed to an independent outside review of its handling of the matter.

The evidence provided to prosecutors

A significant factual dispute has emerged concerning what evidence Cornell University Police provided to the Tompkins County District Attorney's Office in 2024.

Cornell has stated that the plaintiff's sworn statement and the Snapchat screenshot included in the civil complaint were provided to the District Attorney.

Van Houten has publicly said that his office did not receive the Snapchat image.

Cornell's public FAQ concerning the case has itself been revised. An earlier version stated that "all investigatory information" had been shared with the District Attorney. That language was subsequently removed and replaced with more specific language stating that the plaintiff's sworn statement and the Snapchat screenshot were shared.

These accounts cannot presently be reconciled from the public record.

First Amendment Television therefore does not determine which account is correct.

The contradiction is itself a matter requiring independent investigation.

The accused

At least one attorney representing a named defendant has publicly denied the allegations.

Another defendant has denied drug use and participation in sexual activity while acknowledging sending a message included in the filing, according to published reporting.

Not every named defendant has publicly responded to the allegations.

The allegations in the civil complaint have not been proven in court.

Every person named is entitled to the presumption of innocence in the criminal justice system and to a fair process.

III. THE WRONG QUESTIONS

When the lawsuit became public, the case drew fierce scrutiny on social media.

A familiar pattern followed.

Strangers wanted to know who she was.

They asked what she drank, why she was there, why she stayed and why she did not fight harder.

Those questions are aimed at the one person in this case who has asked the court to protect her identity.

Courts may permit plaintiffs in sexual-assault cases to proceed under a pseudonym when the circumstances justify protecting their identity.

Exposure can invite harassment, threats and another injury on top of the first.

A name discovered by the crowd adds nothing to the evidence.

It only adds risk.

The same kinds of questions are repeatedly asked of women who report sexual assault.

They reflect a burden women already carry every day: Where should I park? Is somebody following me? Should I watch my drink? Should I share my location? Could saying no get me hurt?

When something happens, those precautions can be transformed into accusations against the person reporting the assault.

She does not owe the public her name. She does not owe the public her face. She does not owe the public her address. She does not owe the public her family.

The public record already contains what the justice system needs to investigate: the allegations, the witnesses, the evidence, the institutional record, and the identities of the people accused.

IV. THE RIGHT QUESTIONS

The questions that matter concern evidence, conduct and institutional responsibility. They include:

1. What happened in that room between the evening of October 19 and approximately 5:45 the following morning?
2. Who was present, and who entered after the group-chat message was sent?
3. What do the messages say, and who sent, received and read them?
4. What evidence exists on the relevant phones, including photographs, videos, messages, location information and recoverable deleted material?
5. Who observed Jane Doe's condition, and what did those witnesses understand about her capacity to consent?
6. Why are there differences between accounts attributed to Jane Doe in 2024 and the allegations contained in the 2026 civil complaint, and under what circumstances were the earlier statements obtained and recorded?
7. What evidence did Cornell University Police collect in 2024?
8. What evidence did Cornell University Police provide to the Tompkins County District Attorney's Office, and when was it provided?
9. Was the Snapchat screenshot provided to prosecutors in 2024? Cornell says it was. The former prosecutor handling the matter said it was not. What documentary record establishes what actually occurred?

handling the matter said it was not. What documentary record establishes what actually occurred:

10. Why did the District Attorney's Office rely on Cornell University Police rather than conduct an independent investigation?
11. Were all relevant witnesses interviewed?
12. Were the seven men later named in the lawsuit interviewed as part of the original criminal investigation?
13. What did Cornell University, Chi Phi and Tri Delta know, when did they know it, and what actions did they take?
14. Why was a 20-year-old served alcohol at a bar that night?
15. What did Cornell's Title IX investigation establish, what evidence did its hearing panel consider, and what sanctions resulted?
16. Why did Cornell initially state publicly that "all investigatory information" had been provided to prosecutors and subsequently revise that description?

These are questions for investigators, lawyers, witnesses, records and evidence.

They are not questions for an internet crowd to answer.

The differences between Jane Doe's earlier statements and her later civil complaint are legitimate subjects of investigation. The defense is entitled to examine those differences.

But that is precisely why an independent investigation is necessary.

Contradictions are evidence to be examined.

They are not verdicts.

V. THE STANDARD

First Amendment Television holds that the proper response to an allegation of sexual violence is neither outrage alone nor silence.

It is the record.

FIRST AMENDMENT TELEVISION STANDARD

Where an allegation of sexual violence is brought, those responsible for investigating it should preserve every record, question every relevant witness, follow every legitimate lead, and extend no special treatment because of wealth, school, fraternity, family, reputation or social standing.

The person who brings the allegation is owed protection of her identity.

The people accused are owed the presumption of innocence and a fair process.

The public is owed the truth, established by evidence.

PRESERVE THE EVIDENCE.

Group chats, phone data, photographs, videos, location records, institutional records, investigative files and other relevant material should be secured before they disappear.

INVESTIGATE INDEPENDENTLY.

The special prosecutor's investigation and Cornell's independent review should follow the evidence wherever it leads, without deference to the reputations or institutions involved.

RECONCILE THE RECORD.

The conflicting public accounts concerning what Cornell University Police provided to prosecutors in 2024 should be resolved through documents, transmission records, investigative files and testimony - not competing press statements.

REPORT IN PUBLIC.

To the extent permitted by law and consistent with the rights and privacy of those involved, institutions conducting reviews should disclose their findings, methodology and reasoning, not merely their conclusions.

PRESERVE THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE.

Public anger is not evidence. An accusation is not a conviction. No person should be declared guilty because an allegation is disturbing or because public opinion demands an immediate verdict.

LEAVE HER NAME ALONE.

Journalists, commentators and members of the public should not seek, publish or speculate about the identity of the plaintiff. Her identity does not establish what happened. Evidence does.

Women are reading the files. They are watching the courts. They are watching prosecutors. They are watching

women are reading the filing. They are watching the courts. They are watching prosecutors. They are watching universities.

They are tired, and they are still here.

The record is the resistance.

APPENDIX A: I AM JANE DOE — AN ADAPTED PUBLIC STATEMENT

SOURCE AND ATTRIBUTION

Adapted from a transcription of a spoken-word video bearing the TikTok handle @themisunderstoodaquarius, encountered through a Facebook post under the account name Tiffany Cole. The account sharing the video is not confirmed as its author or speaker. The speaker's identity and original authorship have not yet been independently verified.

This appendix is an edited adaptation, not a verified verbatim transcript. Its wording has been revised for this paper, including language distinguishing allegations from established facts. First Amendment Television acknowledges the source and claims no authorship or ownership of the original spoken-word piece. Inclusion does not imply endorsement by the original creator.

Source supplied: <https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1EWuJAYqkG/> (link supplied October 4, 2026; video not independently accessible for verification).

Anyone with reliable information identifying the original speaker, author or recording is invited to contact info@firstatv.com. The attribution will be updated when verified information becomes available.

Contains strong language.

I'm pissed, and I'm done trying to make this shit sound pretty.

A woman filed a lawsuit alleging she was drugged, incapacitated, and sexually assaulted by multiple men.

And people want to know her name.

Her name is Jane Doe.

That's all you need.

And if you need another name -

I am Jane Doe.

I am Jane Doe.

You want names?

There are already seven in the lawsuit.

Matthew Ingalls.

Johnathan Newell.

Winston Lee.

Gillio Lopes.

Diego Sarabia.

Scott Norris.

Scott Kretzschmar.

Seven fucking names.

So quit hunting her.

You want the fucking truth?

What happened?

Who was there?

What do the messages say?

Who saw her condition?

What do the phones show?

Who were the witnesses?

Who knew what the fuck was happening?

Those are the fucking questions.

I am Jane Doe.

And that disgusting phrase alleged in the complaint - a woman is not "free pussy."

She is not a fucking party favor.

She is not a fraternity perk.

She is not property.

She is not something you advertise.

She is a fucking human being.

And women are sick to fucking death of being reduced to body parts while somebody else laughs.

I'm fucking done.

Women all over this fucking world live with fear every damn day.

Where do I park?

Is somebody following me?

Do I have my keys ready?

Should I walk alone?

Should I trust him?

Should I watch my drink?

Should I share my location?

Should I smile so he doesn't get angry?

Should I reject him gently so he doesn't fucking hurt me?

Do you understand how fucked up that is?

Women spend their lives calculating danger, and when something happens, we get questions.

What did she drink?

Why was she there?

Why did she stay?

Why didn't she fight harder?

Start asking the people accused of wrongdoing some fucking questions.

And start asking the institutions responsible for investigating them some questions too.

God, we're fucking done.

We are done.

Done being afraid.

Done whispering.

Done apologizing.

Done being told not to make a scene.

Done treating men's reputations as more important than investigating what women report.

Done hearing, "Don't ruin his future."

Women have futures too.

Jane Doe has a future too.

And she does not owe the internet one more fucking piece of herself.

Not her name.

Not her face.

Not her address.

Not her family.

Not a goddamn thing.

And no, this is not women declaring war on men.

This is women declaring war on silence.

On shame.

On intimidation.

On victim-blaming.

On the idea that women should quietly accept what somebody else is accused of doing.

On the idea that women should quietly carry what somebody else is accused of doing.

That shit is over.

Women are coming for answers.

Women are coming for accountability.

Women are reading the filing.

Women are watching the courts.

Watching the prosecutors.

Watching the universities.

Watching every institution that thinks we'll eventually get tired and disappear.

We are already fucking tired.

And we are still here.

I don't give a fuck how much money somebody has.

I don't give a fuck what school they attended.

I don't give a fuck what fraternity they joined.

I don't give a fuck who their family knows.

A Harvard or Cornell education buys you nothing here.

I am Jane Doe.

If evidence shows crimes were committed, then use the fucking law.

Investigate.

Preserve every record.

Question everybody.

Follow every lead.

No special treatment.

No protecting reputations.

No protecting somebody's bright future.

Bring the fucking truth.

And women -

every woman who has ever been afraid,

every woman who has ever been silent,

every woman who has ever been blamed,

every woman who ever had to calculate whether saying no could get her hurt -

stand the fuck up.

I am Jane Doe.

I am Jane Doe.

We're done being quiet.

We're done being scared.

We're done protecting everybody else's comfort.

Leave her name alone.

Investigate the allegations.

Examine the evidence.

Demand accountability.

Stop asking women.

We're done.

We're done.

We're done.

We're done.

IF YOU NEED HELP

IF YOU NEED HELP

The National Sexual Assault Hotline (RAINN) is free, confidential and available 24 hours a day:

800-656-HOPE (4673)

online.rainn.org

SOURCES

Spoken-word source for Appendix A and related language: video bearing TikTok handle @themisunderstoodaquarius, shared on Facebook under the account name Tiffany Cole. Original speaker and author unverified. Facebook source link: <https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1EWuJAYqkG/>. See the attribution and adaptation note above Appendix A.

- Associated Press, "New York's governor removes DA in Cornell rape allegations, appoints AG Letitia James to take over," October 2, 2026.
- CBS News, reporting on the Cornell University sexual-assault allegations and Title IX investigation, updated October 1, 2026.
- ABC News, reporting on the reopened Cornell investigation and appointment of Attorney General Letitia James as special prosecutor, September-October 2026.
- The Cornell Daily Sun, reporting on Cornell University's response, disciplinary process, independent review and revisions to its public FAQ concerning evidence provided to the District Attorney, September-October 2026.
- Tompkins County District Attorney's Office, Statement Regarding Jane Doe v. Cornell University, et al., September 28, 2026.
- Cornell University, public statements and FAQ concerning the 2024 sexual-assault allegations and University response, September-October 2026.

FIRST AMENDMENT TELEVISION
Free Press. Free Speech. Free to Create.

Because history deserves more than memory.
It deserves a record.

Published by First Amendment Television LLC
© 2026 First Amendment Television LLC, for its original editorial material. No claim of authorship or ownership is made over the original spoken-word piece underlying Appendix A or other externally sourced material.

FIRST AMENDMENT TELEVISION | CV-010 | Version 1.2