# Denis Preka Review, AG # 2024-0416659

From: Elve, Meagan (AG) (elvem@michigan.gov)

To: lindathom2013@yahoo.com; jamesgthom@gmail.com

Date: Thursday, April 9, 2026 at 03:14 PM EDT

Good afternoon,

Attached please find a letter from Criminal Bureau Chief Danielle Hagaman-Clark.

Thank you,

Meagan R. Elve
Executive Assistant to Danielle Hagaman-Clark
Criminal Justice Bureau

Division Head Secretary
Criminal Appellate and Parole Appeals Division
Michigan Department of Attorney General
Direct Line: 517-241-8624
Division Line: 517-335-7650

Preka Declination Letter.pdf
89.1 KB

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

CADILLAC PLACE
3030 WEST GRAND BOULEVARD
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

**DANA NESSEL**
ATTORNEY GENERAL

April 8, 2026

Linda Preka-Thom *Sent via Emal*

Re: Denis Preka review, AG # 2024-0416659

Dear Mr. Thom and Mrs. Preka-Thom:

The Michigan Department of Attorney General has completed our review and investigation of your son's death. At the outset we want to offer you our deepest condolences on the loss of your beloved son. We recognize your expressed frustration at the speed of our review process, please know that we dedicated to our review the requisite time to perform a thorough assessment of this case due to both the severity of this matter and the loss of a precious life.

During our review, we reviewed the actions taken by the Oakland County Prosecuting Attorney's Office regarding the prosecution of Nicholas Remington, reviewed the Novi Police file in the first investigation, conducted our own investigation, and reviewed the rulings of Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Valentine and Oakland County District Court Judge Jarbou in this matter.

Based on this review and investigation, we regret to inform you that the case will not be reopened for prosecution. The reasons are two-fold. First, we are unable to overcome the legal obstacles in this matter and the court's decision to suppress essential Snapchat evidence. Second, we were unable to locate new evidence that would enable us to prove beyond a reasonable doubt before a jury that a crime occurred and who committed the crime.

On the first point, the court excluded the Snapchat evidence because it had been tampered with, which affects its reliability and admissibility in court. The time limit to file an appeal has lapsed, and it lapsed long before the case was ever turned over to our office. Similarly, the rules relating to relief from judgment (Michigan Court Rule 2.612), which would be applicable to this case, have a 1-year limitations period. At this point, there is no way to get around the Court's decision

on this issue. We looked to discover admissible new evidence that would aid in challenging the court's ruling but did not uncover anything. Even if we had found something substantial, that evidence would have to be admissible in court—and again, we are well past the deadline to challenge the ruling of the court to get it admitted.

On the second issue and turning next to the remaining pieces of the case that were not suppressed or time-barred, there is not enough remaining admissible evidence to prove the crime of Delivery Causing Death beyond a reasonable doubt. Delivery Causing Death is the only possible applicable charge, and it requires proof that one or more of the three suspects present at Paul Wiedmaier's house on the night in question knowingly and intentionally delivered a controlled substance specifically to Denis with the intent that it be delivered. We have conflicting evidence on this issue. Those familiar with Denis and his behavior in his college social circle have advised that Denis was known to use MDMA on occasion. We presume that MDMA was present that night, but we do not know that it was directly given to your son without his consent. Nor do we know, in any definite sense, who provided the drug to Denis if in fact it was provided to him. Nobody present in Paul Wiedmaier's home with Denis on the night in question will currently testify that Denis was given anything.

We are aware that you believe that your son was duped into taking MDMA while thinking that he was being given Ritalin or Adderall as "study drugs." As you previously pointed out, in Paul Wiedmaier's second statement to the police about this incident, he told the police that your son had been asking for "study drugs." He also stated that Nick Remington approached Denis, handed him a tablet or pill and said, "take this, it will help you study." Our file also contains a recorded phone call involving you and Paul Wiedmaier in which threats were made to Paul Wiedmaier by telling him that "he had to come clean," that he had to tell the police that "Nick Remington gave [your] son drugs," and that Paul "would not sleep" unless he told the police that Nick Remington gave your son drugs. In the same conversation, Paul was told that "he would be protected" if he told police that Nick Remington had given your son drugs and that "no one would hurt him" if he told the police. He was also advised that he and his family would be destroyed and sued if he did not cooperate. This is only a partial summary of the call; there are other discrepancies on the call. It was only after that conversation that Paul Wiedmaier changed his story with the police. Even if Paul Wiedmaier were to testify, his testimony and credibility is tainted by this threatening call. A jury could easily conclude the first

statement was more reliable because he was still acting under the trauma of Denis's death and had not yet thought to lie or did not yet have a motivation to fabricate. Based upon the foregoing, and considering the case without the Snapchat evidence, we cannot conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that your son was given MDMA directly by Nick Remington when it is equally plausible that he was provided the drug by someone else or took it on his own volition. There are many conflicting statements about how the drugs arrived. What's more, there is no statement that he was given MDMA by anyone. To support a conviction, Michigan law requires more than a person having drugs present and accessible. There must be intentional delivery to that person by the other person.

Please know we do not condone the actions of any person the night of your son's death. Nevertheless, we are bound by Michigan Criminal Law and Procedure. There is simply no way to get around the evidentiary hurdles that we face, and our subsequent investigation did not develop any substantive independent evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt a crime occurred here. We are truly sorry we are unable to proceed.

Very truly yours,

Danielle Hagaman-Clark
Criminal Justice Bureau Chief
Michigan Department of Attorney General

# Re: Denis Preka Review, AG # 2024-0416659

From: lindathom2013@yahoo.com (lindathom2013@yahoo.com)

To: clarkd@michigan.gov

Cc: jamesgthom@gmail.com; hoffmanb5@michigan.gov; granod@michigan.gov; [redacted]fbi.gov; elvem@michigan.gov

Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 at 03:01 PM EDT

April 10, 2026 Re: Denis Preka review, AG # 2024-0416659

Ms Clark,

I received your letter, and I am not surprised by your response. From my first conversation with Bonnita Hoffman, I made it clear that I had no confidence in the Attorney General's office under Dana Nessel, and this outcome confirms those concerns.

On November 21, 2024, when Bonnita Hoffman contacted the Mike Morse Law Firm stating: "The Attorney General, Dana Nessel, has asked me to review the Denis Preka homicide… I have also been in contact with [redacted] from the FBI because your client, Linda Preka, contacted him," I already understood the circumstances under which this review was initiated.

In my view, this case was not taken up out of a genuine willingness to pursue it, but rather because outside pressure specifically the involvement of the FBI made it unavoidable.

From the outset, I believed the Attorney General's office would not reopen a case that could expose the actions of Prosecutor Karen McDonald. I made this clear early on to FBI Agent [redacted], Beth Hand, and journalists George Hunter (Detroit News) and Tresa Baldas (Detroit Free Press). While others expressed confidence in the process, I did not.

My lack of confidence is grounded in what I have observed, including the professional alignment and prior support between the Attorney General and Prosecutor McDonald. In that context, I had no expectation that this matter would be pursued in a way that would ensure accountability.

I strongly reject both of your conclusions and the reasoning used to justify them.
From the outset, I had serious concerns about whether this case would ever be fully and fairly addressed. After 18 months of delay, what your office has provided is not a resolution; it is a refusal to confront the evidence and the prosecutorial conduct that undermined and compromised this case, including the actions of Oakland County Prosecutor Karen McDonald and Assistant Prosecutor Marc Keast.

I will address your statements directly. You state that your office was unable to overcome legal obstacles due to the suppression of Snapchat evidence and the absence of new admissible evidence. That position is incomplete, as it fails to address how and why that evidence was excluded in the first place.

The Court's ruling did not occur in isolation. It was based on representations made to the Court specifically, statements by Assistant Prosecutor Marc Keast regarding alleged undisclosed "exculpatory" police reports. On March 9, 2021, and again on

April 14, 2021, Mr. Keast stated on the record that such reports existed in 2019, were favorable to the defense, and had not been disclosed. Those representations formed the basis for treating the issue as a Brady violation and directly shaped the Court's decision to exclude critical evidence, including the Snapchat material.

However, the underlying record raises serious questions about those claims. The timeline of the police reports including Reports #9 and #10, created on January 28, 2021 does not support the assertion that such reports existed in the form described in 2019. This discrepancy is not minor; it goes directly to the foundation of the Court's ruling.

Your letter does not address this issue. Instead, it accepts the outcome of that ruling without confronting the basis upon which it was made.

In addition, the record reflects conduct that raises further concerns regarding how this case was handled:
1. October 2020 – Campaign contribution of $7,150 from defense attorney Neil Rockind to Karen McDonald.

2. October 17, 2020 – Public endorsement of Karen McDonald by Neil Rockind.

3. December 2020 – Appointment of Neil Rockind to an advisory role during the transition of the Prosecutor's Office.

4. January 4, 2021 – Assignment of this case to Assistant Prosecutor Marc Keast, followed by direct communication between Mr. Keast and Mr. Rockind.

5. January 28, 2021 – Creation of Police Reports #9 and #10
Police Reports #9 and #10 were created on January 28, 2021. However, the content of these reports raises serious concerns regarding their accuracy and completeness.
Report #10 continues to state: "SEARCH WARRANT: On 10/03/2019, I obtained a search warrant for the Snapchat information of (HULKOLAS)… I am awaiting this information."
"At this time, no information has been obtained that can identify the publisher of the Snapchat… No identifying information from Snapchat or phone carrier services is available…"

This statement is inconsistent with the known timeline of the investigation.
On November 21, 2019, Detective Balog received a zip file containing data obtained pursuant to the Snapchat search warrant. That data included information relevant to identifying activity on the account, including evidence indicating who had access to and was using the account.
Despite this, no updated police report was generated at that time to reflect the receipt or analysis of that data, and the information was not documented in a way that reflects the actual state of the evidence.
More concerning, when reports #9 and #10 were later created on January 28, 2021 over a year after the data had been received, they still reflected that no identifying information had been obtained. That statement remained unchanged even after the case was reassigned and reviewed.
This raises serious questions:

• Why on November 21, 2019 the police report was not documented at the time it was received?

• Why do Reports #9 and #10 continue to reflect that no identifying information was available?

• Why were these reports not updated to accurately reflect the evidence already in possession of law enforcement?
The record shows a clear discrepancy between the evidence that existed and what was documented. Any evaluation of this case must address that discrepancy directly.

6. February 11, 2021 Pretrial proceedings
The record reflects an unusually informal dynamic between the prosecution and defense, including a defense calling a prosecutor by name such as:
Neil Rockind “I want to give Marc whatever time he needs…”

Rockind “How much time do you need to write an answer, Marc?”

Rockind “I’ll give you a call, Marc.”

Keast “Sounds good.”
and Keast’s making the court believe that this case: “It’s very complicated.”

7. March 9, 2021 – Bond Hearing
The March 9, 2021 bond hearing raises serious and unresolved concerns regarding the representations made to the Court about the existence of two alleged police reports.
The exchange on the record is clear:

THE COURT: “I am in receipt of a stipulated order requesting to reduce bond from $1 million to $10,000 and a tether. Correct?”

MR. KEAST: “That is correct, Judge.”

MR. ROCKIND: “Yes, Your Honor.”

THE COURT: “Mr. Keast, why don’t you go ahead and address the bond issue.”

MR. KEAST: “As the Court knows, I was assigned the case in January of this year. I spoke with Mr. Rockind a number of times regarding some issues regarding discovery. I did discover from the beginning, in January, obtained a copy of the police report from beginning to end, and sent it to defense counsel… Counsel and co-counsel… made me aware… that there were two reports in particular that were not turned over to defense. It appears that those two reports were in the prosecutor’s office possession in September or October of 2019. In my opinion, those two reports are exculpatory in nature and should have been turned over in a timely fashion. They were not… In my opinion, a remand, at a minimum, is necessary… the delay… is attributable to the State… I have informed the officer in charge, as well as the victim’s mother, of the decision that we have made. They both understand the situation that we’re in, Judge.”

These statements were not minor or incidental. They were central to the Court’s understanding of the case. The Court was told that exculpatory police reports existed in 2019, were in the prosecutor’s possession, and were not disclosed to the defense. That representation laid the groundwork for the Brady issue and directly affected the procedural path of the case.

The problem is that the later record raises serious questions about whether those representations were accurate. Police Reports #9 and #10 were created on January 28, 2021, not in September or October 2019. That discrepancy goes directly to the foundation of what the Court was told on March 9, 2021.

If the Court’s understanding of a Brady violation was based on a record that is now in question, then the rulings that followed must also be examined in light of that.

8. April 9, 2021 – People’s Brief Misstates the Police Report
The April 9, 2021 People’s brief also raises serious concerns because it appears to misstate a key police report.

In the brief, Mr. Keast wrote: “Supplemental report #10 details a conversation between Ms. Linda Preka (decedent's mother), former A.P.A. Hand (married name of Wiegand) and the officer in charge of the investigation. See Exhibit .1 That report reflects that Ms. Preka was shown a snapchat message sent on the Defendant's account ‘Hulkolas,’ while the Defendant was incarcerated in the Oakland County Jail. According to the report, Ms. Preka showed that snapchat message to both A.P.A. Hand and Detective Balog. As stated, it does not appear that the supplemental report, or information included in that supplemental report, was turned over to defense until undersigned A.P.A. obtained a copy from the Novi Police Department and mailed it in February of this year.”
But the police report itself states:

“On 09/27/2019 the preliminary exam was held on this matter at 52-1 District Court. After the hearing, the Oakland County Prosecutor, Beth Wiegand, was shown a new Snapchat on Nick Remington’s (‘HULKOLAS’) Snapchat account by the victim Preka’s stepfather Jamie Thom. Thom advised Wiegand that he was sent this Snapchat by one of Denis Preka’s friends named Avery Eckert on 09/26/2019.”
That is not a minor difference. The brief identifies Linda Preka as the person involved, while the report identifies Jamie Thom. The brief also reframes the context of how the information was presented. Accuracy matters, especially when the Court is being asked to evaluate alleged discovery failures and the significance of the underlying information.

Any fair review must address that discrepancy directly.

9. April 14, 2021 – Motion to Dismiss Hearing
The April 14, 2021 motion hearing further confirms that the prosecution itself accepted and advanced the Brady narrative before the Court.
The record reflects:

JUDGE VALENTINE: “And Prosecutor McDonald, did you want to put an appearance on?”

MS. McDONALD: “Karen McDonald on behalf of the People.”

JUDGE VALENTINE: “Let me hear from Mr. Keast.”

Keast then stated: “The first line to my response makes clear that I, neither myself nor Prosecutor McDonald, condones anything that happened prior to January 1 of 2021… The People must emphasize that this responsive pleading does not attempt to excuse or explain the non-disclosure of evidence favorable to defense. I absolutely agree with Mr. Rockind that this evidence should have been turned over in 2019. There is no argument there… My sole argument rests with the remedy that the defense is requesting. Not that a violation occurred, but the remedy…”

Rockind then argued:
“We aren't faulting Ms. McDonald or Mr. Keast… they're the ones who are left to sort of sweep up the remains here, but Mr. Remington is the one who has suffered throughout this because of those abuses. And there is a price to be paid and the People are the one that have to pay that price. And that price is dismissal.”
The Court then asked:

THE COURT: “Prosecutor McDonald, anything you want to state for the record?”

MS. McDONALD: “No, Your Honor. I have confidence in Mr. Keast that he articulated our position accurately.”

That statement was clear. Prosecutor McDonald was present. She had the opportunity to correct, clarify, or limit the representations being made to the Court. Instead, she expressly adopted Mr. Keast's position and was ok with defense argument to for dismissal.
These statements were central to the Court's understanding of the case. They reinforced the existence of a Brady violation, accepted the premise that favorable evidence had not been disclosed in 2019, and left the Court to determine the appropriate remedy based on that framework.
If that framework was inaccurate, incomplete, or based on questionable representations, then the rulings that followed cannot simply be treated as untouchable procedural history. They must be reevaluated in light of the actual record.
The Court was led to believe that: Exculpatory police reports existed in 2019 without asking for proof.

Keast lied about reports were in the possession of the prosecutor's office.

Keast lied about they were not disclosed to the defense.

Keast came up with a Brady violation had occurred.

The coward Keast even says "The delay in the case was attributable to the State"
That representation directly influenced the Court's decisions moving forward, including the procedural posture that ultimately led to the exclusion of critical evidence.

However, the subsequent record raises serious questions about the accuracy and foundation of those statements.

Police Reports #9 and #10 were created on January 28, 2021 well after the timeframe referenced by Mr. Keast. The timing and content of those reports do not clearly support the assertion that such exculpatory reports existed in September or October of 2019 in the form described to the Court. This discrepancy is not minor it is fundamental.

If the Court's understanding of a Brady violation was based on representations that are now in question, then the integrity of the rulings that followed including the suppression of the Snapchat evidence must also be reexamined.

Your letter does not address this issue. Instead, it accepts the outcome of the Court's ruling without addressing the basis upon which that ruling was made. You have a proof filing a motion and being honest with court?

Any claim that the Snapchat evidence cannot be revisited is incomplete without first addressing what was presented to the Court since February, 2021, and whether those representations were supported by the actual record.

Do you have any record of filing a motion to present to Judge Valentine the full extent of the misconduct by Karen McDonald and Marc Keast?
Your letter suggests that the Court's ruling cannot be revisited, yet you provide no indication that your office has taken any action to correct the record or to present the Court with the complete and accurate facts surrounding the alleged Brady violation.

There is nothing preventing your office from returning to the Court and presenting the full record, including the context of the alleged discovery violations and the sequence of events that led to the exclusion of the Snapchat evidence.
Instead, you claim that your office was "unable to overcome legal obstacles," specifically the suppression of the Snapchat evidence. That is not a legal impossibility—it is a choice.

Your office had the opportunity to return to the Court and present what is already on record: that Assistant Prosecutor Marc Keast and Prosecutor Karen McDonald acknowledged serious discovery violations, including the failure to disclose exculpatory evidence in a timely manner. Instead of addressing that misconduct, you chose to accept its consequences.

You further state that you were "unable to locate new evidence." This is misleading. There was no need to locate new evidence. The record already contains substantial and critical evidence, including communications, admissions, and police documentation. The issue is not the absence of evidence; it is the failure to properly present and act on it.

You claim the Snapchat evidence was excluded because it was "tampered with," yet you ignore the central question: who was responsible for that tampering.
The record contains evidence videos, transcripts, and communications implicating Nicholas Remington and Connor Gibaratz in activity related to that issue. However, your letter does not address them in this context at all. You do not explain their roles, you do not state why that issue was not pursued, and you do not account for it in your analysis.

Instead, you accept the exclusion of the evidence without addressing the cause.
That omission is significant.

If evidence was tampered with, identifying who was responsible is essential. Yet your office has not explained why no action was taken, why Nicholas Remington and Connor Gibaratz were not further investigated in that regard, and why this issue was not presented to the Court.

You had the information. You had the opportunity. You chose not to act.
Given the volume of evidence available including videos, transcripts, and documented communications this is not a lack of evidence. It is a failure to confront it. This is not a complete investigation. **It is pure coverup for Karen McDonald**, and it raises serious concerns about the integrity of the process.

Your reliance on procedural deadlines does not resolve these issues. The Court's ruling was based on a record that was incomplete and shaped by acknowledged misconduct. Procedural limitations should not be used as a shield to avoid addressing that reality.

More concerning is your conclusion that there is insufficient evidence to establish delivery or responsibility. That conclusion is directly contradicted by the existing record, including the following Snapchat communications involving Connor Gibaratz: "U have as much responsibility as me… you're trying to blame me for any fallout of u fucking killing Denis. You killed him. Not weighing it out. Giving him more while he was already fed. You gave him methylone and mol… you fucking killed him… legally speaking you're a murderer."
In addition, other Snapchat users questioned what had been given to Denis, including: "What did you give him?" "You gave him meth?"
Responses from Remington **"methylone and some moll**," and these exchanges were visible to 12 individuals.

These are not speculative statements they are direct communications reflecting knowledge, actions, and responsibility. To characterize the evidence as insufficient while disregarding these admissions is inconsistent with the record.

Further, as documented in the police report, Remington stated: "You have as much responsibility as me," to Connor Gibaratz indicating shared awareness and responsibility for what occurred.

These are not speculative statements. These are direct communications acknowledging actions, substances, and responsibility. To characterize this record as insufficient, while disregarding these admissions, is a failure to engage with the evidence.

I am also deeply disturbed by your decision to include unsupported statements about my son's alleged behavior. Assertions regarding prior drug use or references to a "social circle" are unsubstantiated and inappropriate. If your office is relying on such claims, I request demand that you identify the sources. Otherwise, including them in an official determination is both irresponsible and damaging.

Your characterization of the recorded conversation involving Paul Wiedmaier is similarly misleading. That conversation occurred after multiple inconsistent statements and reflects an effort to obtain the truth not to fabricate it. Ignoring the inconsistencies while focusing solely on that conversation is a selective and incomplete presentation of the facts.

What your letter ultimately reflects is a continuation of the same pattern: avoiding prosecutorial misconduct from Karen McDonald, minimizing evidence, and shifting focus away from accountability.

Let me be clear: I do not rely on assumptions. I rely on evidence. And the evidence both digital and

documented speaks for itself.

Despite everything, I acknowledge that your office has finally made a decision. After 18 months, that clarity matters. Now I will move forward.

I will be filing formal complaints, including against Judge Valentine, and your letter will be included as part of that record. I will also take the necessary steps to ensure that the full evidentiary record is made public and reviewed in its entirety including snapchats and all the evidence.

The Attorney General's office may choose not to act, but that does not end this matter. Accountability does not stop here.

You may consider this case closed. I do not.

I have one final word for all of you especially to the women who continue to cover for what I believe is one of the most untrustworthy and corrupt politicians, Karen McDonald, and to Dana Nessel for enabling and protecting McDonald's misconducts isn't surprising.

**Shame on Attorney General .** The complete lack of respect for human life is deeply disturbing.

If watching nine videos of a 21-year-old's life slipping away does not move this office, then I have to ask what will?

You chose to ignore the final hours of my son's life what was done to him, what was said, and how he was treated and instead shift the focus to a recorded conversation with Paul Wiedmaier. That decision is not only misplaced, it is indefensible.

Detective Balog testified on 9/27/2019 that several of the videos contained overlays words and images placed directly onto the footage capturing what was happening in real time. The content of those overlays, combined with the voices recorded, reflects conduct that cannot be ignored:
1. "He fucking knows how to run it. Going straight cross-eyed up in this b****.
GAME OVER. TIME TO SLEEP."*
Detective Balog testified that the voice belongs to the Remington, stating: "Keep your eyes straight… eyes straight… yeah, this is the best moment of your life, run it baby."

2. "I just want him to stop being cross-eyed. I spoke to Jesus. He said he wanted my guardian angels. WAVE CHECK."
Detective Balog testified that the loudest voice belonged to Remington, stating: "Hit it from the back, Denis… run it… pull it across."

3. "You can't handle the truth. The old whistle trick will get him, boyz."

4. “You got an exam at 8 a.m.? That’s what the coffee’s for.”

5. “He ripped himself a new vagina. Judgment day.”

6. “This man wins the Oscar for best drama.”

7. “Not an ordinary individual. Wait for it… lowers himself face down. CAN’T SLEEP.”

8. “Who else is up right now?”

9. “It’s watering time!”

These are not isolated or misunderstood statements. These are documented, recorded, and contemporaneous expressions during the final hours of my son’s life.
To disregard this evidence and instead redirect attention to unrelated narratives is not an evaluation of the facts. It is an avoidance of them.
On the second issue, your characterization of the audio recording is misleading and does not reflect the full context.

Your response raises another serious question: why was Paul Wiedmaier’s report was written by Novi Police more than five years later?

Your second issue also raises concerns about Karen McDonald’s involvement in the creation or timing of that report. The delay is not explained, and it calls into question how the record was developed. Rather than clarifying these issues, your response only brings more attention to them.

Let me be clear. Paul Wiedmaier was interviewed by police three times before I ever recorded him. His statements were already part of the record.

My conclusions today are based on the evidence not on speculation, and not on what I believed in June 2019 before I had access to the full record.

At that time, based on the limited information available to me, I believed Nicholas Remington was responsible. After reviewing the videos, transcripts, police reports, and communications, I now have a fuller understanding of what happened and of Paul Wiedmaier’s role.

No one arrives at someone’s house at 10:00 p.m. uninvited and remains there for hours by accident. My son was in Paul Wiedmaier’s home, in an environment controlled by Paul, Nicholas Remington, and Connor Gibaratz.

The evidence also shows that Nicholas Remington admitted to multiple people what he had given my son. You have those records as well. The problem is not the absence of evidence. The problem is your refusal to confront the court and tell the truth and coverup for a dirty politician called Karen McDonald .

If there is any question about what happened that night, I can point again to the videos. The first begins at approximately 11:38 p.m. and shows my son fully dressed, including his shoes. The final recordings show him in visible distress, struggling to breathe, while those around him continued to film, mock, and interact with him instead of helping him. At 3:04 a.m., Connor Gibaratz sent Nicholas Remington a private message stating: “Come-Wtf-Come-Just left me here-Holy fucking shit Youre the worst friend.”

The first police report was written on March 19, 2019, after my son had already been dead for 6 hours. Paul Wiedmaier called 911 and reported him as unresponsive, after his body had already gone cold. There was no mention of drugs, no mention of Snapchat, and no mention of Nicholas Remington, even though Connor had already left and returned later, according to the record. Paul also gave false and inconsistent explanations about what happened that night.

The second report, on March 20, 2019, came after Detective Balog confronted him with the fact that there was video evidence and that Denis may have died from drugs. Only then did Paul introduce the Adderall story.

The third interview took place on June 6, 2019, when Balog interviewed both Connor from jail and Paul again well before my recording Paul Wiedmaier provided a statement to police: “Wiedmaier stated that Nicholas Remington then came up to Denis and said, ‘Here, take this. It will help you study,’ and gave him a pill… Wiedmaier stated that he would testify in court that Nicholas Remington gave Denis Preka drugs on the night that Denis died

So the suggestion that my later recording somehow created the issue is false. Paul’s statements had already changed multiple times before I ever recorded him.

I recorded Paul after Remington had already been charged with delivery causing death, after the June 19, 2019 hearing, and after it was already established in court that Remington had delivered drugs. I did not invent a story. I asked Paul to tell the truth and come clean not force him to say was Remington. All I begged Paul to tell the truth and all I care until my last breath.

Now, after reviewing the full record, I know more than I did then. The evidence shows that Remington delivered the drugs and continued giving my son more while he was already fucked. The toxicology evidence also speaks for itself 80 times more than a human being can handle.

That is why the late creation and subsequent formalization of Paul Wiedmaier’s statement raises serious

concerns. The dates alone undermine your argument and call into question the credibility of your position and how your argument don't carry water.

If Paul had already been interviewed multiple times in 2019, why was this later report created years afterward? Why was it necessary then? And why now is that late report being used in a way that distorts the timeline and shifts attention away from the actual evidence? Why you are trying to cover up for Karen McDonald you are reveling yourself how low you can go.

These are not minor discrepancies. They go directly to the integrity of the record and the handling of this case.

At this point, you cannot cover for Karen McDonald by rewriting the record. I have the evidence now. The public record exists. And the facts can no longer be twisted without being confronted.

The recording involving Paul Wiedmaier was created and provided voluntarily to law enforcement to demonstrate inconsistencies in his statements. It was not evidence related to the night of the incident itself, but rather evidence of Paul changing his story over time.

What is critical and what your letter ignores is that the record already documented inconsistencies in witness statements well before that recording was made.
Now I have a proof that Paul was behind my son's death.
On April 4, 2019, it was documented: "Gibaratz stated that he understood this, but didn't want to ruin two lives… Gibaratz was reluctant to provide further information about the death of Denis Preka… and advised that Snapchat logs may assist with discovering further information."

These statements were made by Detective Balog weeks before the recording I later provided.

Your letter isolates my recording while ignoring the broader evidentiary record, including prior statements and documented inconsistencies. That is a selective and incomplete presentation of the facts.
A fair evaluation must consider the full timeline:
• Multiple witness statements were taken before the recording
• Those statements contained inconsistencies and evolving accounts
• The recording was provided to highlight those inconsistencies—not create them
To suggest otherwise is to mischaracterize both the purpose and the context of that recording.

What concerns me most is that your office chose to focus on this recording while minimizing or disregarding the substantial evidence relating to my son's final hours.
That approach does not reflect a full or balanced evaluation of the record.
I will be direct: I will not accept an interpretation of the evidence that shifts focus away from documented facts and toward selective narratives that undermine them.

My final words to you.
What AG office has done here is not a matter of legal limitation it is a matter of choice and cover up. You had the evidence. You had the record. You had the opportunity to act. You chose not to.

My son's final hours were recorded. The videos exist. The statements exist. The evidence exists. I have lived with those images every single day. And despite all of that, your office chose to look away.

For two years, the system recognized the danger. A magistrate set a $1 million bond based on the law and on the record of this individual's conduct. Judge Reeds denied bond for five months. Judge Alexander also upheld that position. Those decisions were grounded in the seriousness of the case and the risk to the public.
Then, after a change in leadership, that position changed. The record reflects that decisions were made that allowed the defendant to be released. Those decisions were not based on new evidence they were based on a different exercise of discretion.

Now AG Dana Nessel has made a similar choice. This is not about a lack of evidence. It is about a decision not to act on the evidence that exists. It is about a decision not to present the full record to the Court. It is about a decision not to confront what happened.

Instead of addressing the evidence, you minimized it. Instead of confronting the record, you avoided it. Instead of accountability, you chose not to pursue it.

That is not justice.

I no longer have confidence in this process. But understand this clearly this does not end here.

It's the beginning. I will continue to pursue the truth. I will continue to expose what has been ignored. And I will continue to stand not only for my son, but for every family that expects the justice system to act with honesty and integrity.

The Attorney General's office may consider Case #2024-0416659 closed.
Because, in the end, that is what this process has been.

My son's case did not require eighteen months of review. The evidence was already there. The record was already clear.
It does not take months to understand what happened it takes minutes.
If you are truly willing to see the truth, all it takes is 3 minutes and 52 seconds to watch how a human life was taken.

Yet despite that, your office chose not to act and instead chose to stand by and protect a corrupt individual Karen McDonald.

I will not. I will pursue justice for Denis until my very last breath.

Sincerely,
Linda Preka Thom

> On Thursday, April 9, 2026 at 05:03:16 PM EDT, lindathom2013@yahoo.com <lindathom2013@yahoo.com> wrote:
>
> Dear Danielle,
>
> I just received your email. To be honest, from the very beginning I knew and had a feeling this would be the outcome. I can't fully explain why, but even on the day your office began the investigation, I said the same thing while I was on the phone with the FBI [redacted]. They are not moving forward with this case. Karen McDonald has caused significant damage, and the Attorney General's office is unwilling to carry that burden.
>
> What I do want to acknowledge and the reason I am responding is that you finally made a decision and communicated it. I truly appreciate that. What has been most difficult over these past 17 months is not the outcome itself, but being held in uncertainty and given hope that ultimately led nowhere.
>
> I hope your office takes something from this experience. Prolonging a decision with ongoing hope is not helpful to a victim's family. It adds to the pain. Clarity, even when it's difficult, is far more respectful than delay.
>
> I am genuinely relieved that you sent this letter and did not continue to extend the process further. There is nothing more damaging than dragging a family through prolonged when the outcome is already clear.
>
> From the beginning, I was told it would be difficult to obtain evidence from Judge Valentine. I understand that now. However, I will be filing a complaint regarding the judge, and I will be attaching your letter as part of that process.
>
> Thank you again for making a final decision and communicating it directly. That, at the very least, brings closure to this stage.

Moving forward, I will take the necessary steps on my end. I firmly believe the law should be upheld, and I intend to pursue that accordingly.

Wishing you the best.

Linda

On Thursday, April 9, 2026 at 03:14:29 PM EDT, Elve, Meagan (AG) <elvem@michigan.gov> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Attached please find a letter from Criminal Bureau Chief Danielle Hagaman-Clark.

Thank you,

Meagan R. Elve
Executive Assistant to Danielle Hagaman-Clark
Criminal Justice Bureau

Division Head Secretary
Criminal Appellate and Parole Appeals Division
Michigan Department of Attorney General
Direct Line: 517-241-8624
Division Line: 517-335-7650


AG-Danielle.pdf
186.7 KB


AG-Danielle.pdf
186.7 KB