

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



DANA NESSEL
ATTORNEY GENERAL

CADILLAC PLACE
3030 WEST GRAND BOULEVARD
DETROIT, MICHIGAN 48202

April 8, 2026

Linda Preka-Thom

Sent via Email

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Danielle Hagaman-Clark".

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