CUSTOMER'S SWORN STATEMENT FOR FILING A CHALLENGE IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE US District Court (Name of District) DISTRICT OF Greenbelt, Maryland (State In Which Court Is Located)

Kenneth Scott
Customer
Moveant

V

Architect of the Capitol
Respondent

AAQ 2 6 CV 4 2 3 9

Miscellaneous No. _____
(Will be filled in by Court

SWORN STATEMENT OF MOVEANT

FINANCIAL PRIVACY ACT OF 1978

I, Kenneth Scott (Customer's Name), (am presently/**was previously**) (Show One) a customer of Truist Financial (Name of Financial Institution), and I am the customer whose records are being requested by the Government.

The financial records sought by the Architect of the Capitol are not relevant to the legitimate law enforcement inquiry stated in the Customer Notice that was sent to me because:

The records sought are not relevant to the legitimate law enforcement inquiry described in the Customer Notice. The Customer Notice states that the investigation concerns allegations relating to Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) benefits during the approximate period **June 26, 2020 to present**. However, the subpoena issued to Truist Financial demands records dating from **May 1, 2011 to present**, nearly a decade before the period identified in the Notice. This discrepancy demonstrates that the subpoena is **overbroad**, seeks information unrelated to the stated inquiry, and exceeds the scope permitted under the Right to Financial Privacy Act.

_____ or should not be disclosed because there has not been substantial compliance with the Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 in that or should not be disclosed on the following other legal basis:

The Government has not demonstrated substantial compliance with the Right to Financial Privacy Act (RFPA).

- The Customer Notice is dated **September 30, 2026**, but the subpoena to Truist Financial is dated **October 16, 2026**, meaning the Notice **predates the subpoena**.
- I received the Notice package on **October 6, 2026**, when it was sitting inside of my door.
- I received **no proof of mailing, no certified-mail receipt, no affidavit of service**, and **no documentation** establishing how notice was served or explaining the discrepancy in dates.
- RFPA requires **advance notice** and proper service; the Government has not shown compliance.

The Notice does not identify a lawful jurisdictional basis for the involvement of the Architect of the Capitol OIG. The Notice does not explain why the AOC OIG—an entity whose jurisdiction concerns the programs, operations, employees, contractors, and activities of the Architect of the Capitol—is conducting an investigation into **alleged SBA-related conduct**. The Notice provides **no connection** between the alleged conduct and any AOC program or operation. Without a jurisdictional basis, the inquiry cannot be considered a "legitimate law enforcement inquiry" under RFPA.

The Government has not established relevance. RFPA requires the Government to demonstrate that the records sought are relevant to a legitimate law enforcement inquiry. The Government has not done so. The subpoena's broad date range, the mismatch between the Notice and subpoena, and the lack of jurisdictional explanation all indicate that the Government has not met its burden.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Court prohibit Truist Financial from producing my financial records unless and until the Government demonstrates full compliance with RFPA, establishes the relevance of the records sought, and identifies the jurisdictional basis for the involvement of the AOC OIG.

10-08-26
(Month) (Day) (Year)

Heath Scott
(Customer's Signature)

Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978, Title 12 United States Code, Section 3410

SWORN STATEMENT OF CUSTOMER

I, **Kenneth Scott**, being duly sworn, state as follows:

1. **I am the customer whose financial records are being sought** by the Architect of the Capitol Office of Inspector General ("AOC OIG") pursuant to the subpoena directed to Truist Financial.

2. **The records sought are not relevant to the legitimate law enforcement inquiry described in the Customer Notice.** The Customer Notice states that the investigation concerns allegations relating to Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) benefits during the approximate period **June 26, 2020 to present**. However, the subpoena issued to Truist Financial demands records dating from **May 1, 2011 to present**, nearly a decade before the period identified in the Notice. This discrepancy demonstrates that the subpoena is **overbroad**, seeks information unrelated to the stated inquiry, and exceeds the scope permitted under the Right to Financial Privacy Act.

3. **The Government has not demonstrated substantial compliance with the Right to Financial Privacy Act (RFPA).**

    - The Customer Notice is dated **September 30, 2026**, but the subpoena to Truist Financial is dated **October 16, 2026**, meaning the Notice **predates the subpoena**.
    - I received the Notice package on **October 6, 2026**, when it was affixed to my residence.
    - I received **no proof of mailing**, **no certified-mail receipt**, **no affidavit of service**, and **no documentation** establishing how notice was served or explaining the discrepancy in dates.
    - RFPA requires **advance notice** and proper service; the Government has not shown compliance.

4. **The Notice does not identify a lawful jurisdictional basis for the involvement of the Architect of the Capitol OIG.** The Notice does not explain why the AOC OIG—an entity whose jurisdiction concerns the programs, operations, employees, contractors, and activities of the Architect of the Capitol—is conducting an investigation into alleged SBA-related conduct. The Notice provides **no connection** between the alleged conduct and any AOC program or operation. Without a jurisdictional basis, the inquiry cannot be considered a "legitimate law enforcement inquiry" under RFPA.

5. **The Government has not established relevance.** RFPA requires the Government to demonstrate that the records sought are relevant to a legitimate law enforcement inquiry. The Government has not done so. The subpoena's broad date range, the mismatch between the Notice and subpoena, and the lack of jurisdictional explanation all indicate that the Government has not met its burden.
6. **Accordingly, I respectfully request that the Court prohibit Truist Financial from producing my financial records** unless and until the Government demonstrates full compliance with RFPA, establishes the relevance of the records sought, and identifies the jurisdictional basis for the involvement of the AOC OIG.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: 10-08-26

Signature: Kenneth Scott

Printed Name: Kenneth Scott

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, **Kenneth Scott**, certify that on the date below, I served a copy of my **Motion** and **Sworn Statement** upon the Government authority requesting the records by **Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested**, addressed to:

Architect of the Capitol Office of Inspector General
Attn: Investigations Division
499 South Capitol Street, SW
Suite 518
Washington, DC 20515

10-08-26
Date of Mailing:

Kenneth Scott
Signature:

Kenneth Scott
Printed Name:

Enclosures:
1. Sworn Statement
2. Motion
3. Subpoena/Customer Notice