

**United States Department of Energy  
Office of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of Maurice Parker )

)

)

Filing Date: March 4, 2026 )

Case No.: FIA-26-0021

)

Issued: March 9, 2026

**Decision and Order**

Maurice Parker (Appellant) appeals an Interim Response Letter issued to him from the Department of Energy (DOE), National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), Office of the General Counsel (OGC) concerning Request No. FOIA 26-00280-M, filed under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, as implemented by the DOE in 10 C.F.R. Part 1004. In its Interim Response Letter, OGC denied the Appellant’s request for expedited processing of his FOIA request. As explained below, we deny the appeal.

**I. Background**

On February 25, 2026, the Appellant submitted a FOIA request to the DOE, which sought the following records:

Re: Forensic Disclosure of Non-Biological Hardware – [Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)] Technical Review

- I. Subject of Request: I am requesting a comprehensive search of records, memoranda, and technical logs held by [LANL] involving the following: Project Nexus: Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) and telemetry node monitoring. Technical Identifier: Hardware exhibiting densities of 1,900+ Hounsfield Units (HU). Clinical Coordinates: Emory CT Head (Accession #E21031793), Series 5, Images 1–5 and 240–288.
- II. Forensic Requirement: I am a coherent historian conducting an active federal audit of Title Fraud and unauthorized hardware integration. I require all records that indicate LANL involvement in the calibration or signal-tracking of these specific “star-burst” artifacts located in my cranial soft tissue and nasal bridge.
- III. Data Integrity Warning: Do not apply “Noise Reduction” or “AI Smoothing” filters to the requested records. I am requesting the Raw DICOM Data and associated telemetry logs to ensure calibration accuracy for non-biological materials.

FOIA Request from Maurice Parker at 1 (February 25, 2026). The Appellant requested that his FOIA request receive expedited processing. Interim Response Letter from NNSA OGC to Maurice

Parker at 1 (March 2, 2026). In support of his request for expedited processing, the Appellant wrote: “This request is based on an ‘Urgency Justification’ regarding a compelling need to identify these materials to prevent further neural injury or systemic medical distress.” *Id.*

On March 2, 2026, the NNSA OGC issued an Interim Response Letter to the Appellant denying his request for expedited processing. Interim Response Letter at 1–3. In its Interim Response Letter, the NNSA OGC notified the Appellant that he was not entitled to expedited processing of his request because he did not establish that there was a “threat to the life or safety of an individual that would justify expeditious processing of the request.” *Id.* at 2.

On March 4, 2026, the Appellant appealed the NNSA OGC’s denial of expedited processing with the DOE’s Office of Hearings and Appeals (OHA). Appeal Letter Email from Maurice Parker to OHA (March 4, 2026). In the appeal, the Appellant asserted that the NNSA must provide responsive records “immediately to facilitate medical intervention.” Appeal at 1. The Appellant also provided the following information:

Clinical Evidence of Foreign Bodies: Existing Emory CT scans (Accession #E21031793) show “star-burst” metal artifacts in the nasal bridge and cranial soft tissue.

The Necessity of Raw Data: Standard clinical “smoothing” filters used in hospital PACS systems obscure the true density of these objects. I require the Raw DICOM Data and telemetry logs held by [LANL] to perform Hounsfield Unit (HU) calibration.

Active Injury:

These objects are associated with Intractable Thermal Paresthesia and localized thermal pulses. Without the calibration data requested, surgical extraction and forensic preservation are delayed, extending the duration of neural injury and systemic distress.

*Id.*

## II. Analysis

Under the FOIA, agencies generally process requests in the order they are received and must respond to a request within 20 business days. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(A)(i); 10 C.F.R. § 1004.5(d)(1), (6). However, a requester that is granted “expedited processing” receives a preference over other requests before the agency, and is entitled to have his or her request processed “as soon as practicable.” 10 C.F.R. § 1004.5(d)(6). The FOIA provides that expedited processing should be granted only in cases where a “compelling need” for the records exists and “in other cases determined by the agency.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(i); 10 C.F.R. § 1004.5(d)(6). A “compelling need” exists when either “a failure to obtain requested records on an expedited basis . . . could reasonably be expected to pose an imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual” or “with respect to a request made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information, [there is an] urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(I)–(II); 10 C.F.R. § 1004.5(d)(6). A FOIA requester bears the burden of demonstrating that a “compelling need” exists, entitling him or her to expedited

processing. 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(i); *Al-Fayed v. CIA*, 254 F.3d 300, 303 (D.C. Cir. 2001). In this case, the Appellant did not contend that he is primarily engaged in disseminating information, so we will determine whether the Appellant has demonstrated that an imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual exists.

The Appellant has not demonstrated that there is a current threat to his life. In his FOIA request, he asserted that “star-burst” artifacts are present in his head, specifically, his “cranial soft tissue and nasal bridge.” FOIA Request at 1. Upon appeal, he alleged that these objects are associated with a form of paresthesia, which he vaguely characterized as an “active injury.” Appeal at 1. The Appellant provided no evidence to support his claim that harmful artifacts have been implanted in his body, with the involvement of a DOE laboratory. Such a conspiratorial allegation does not establish a current threat to life or safety. Even were we to accept the veracity of the Appellant’s allegation, he failed to explain how the presence of “star-burst” artifacts in his head, or how his alleged paresthesia, currently poses an imminent threat to his life or physical safety that requires the expedited release of the requested records. *Id.*; see *Gregory Kucera*, OHA Case No. FIA-20-0009 at 1 (2019) (Appellant who claimed “several biological and/or biochemical agents” affected his nervous system, after being hospitalized in 2005, was denied expedited processing where he failed to allege a “new, time-sensitive threat that could be construed as ‘immediate.’”).

Therefore, the Appellant did not demonstrate that failure to receive the requested records on an expedited basis could reasonably be expected to pose an imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual.

### **III. Order**

It is hereby ordered that the appeal filed by Maurice Parker on March 4, 2026, Case No. FIA-26-0021, is denied.

This is a final order of the Department of Energy from which any aggrieved party may seek judicial review pursuant to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B). Judicial review may be sought in the district in which the requester resides or has a principal place of business, or in which the agency records are situated, or in the District of Columbia.

The 2007 FOIA amendments created the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) to offer mediation services to resolve disputes between FOIA requesters and Federal agencies as a non-exclusive alternative to litigation. Using OGIS services does not affect the right to pursue litigation. OGIS may be contacted in any of the following ways:

Office of Government Information Services  
National Archives and Records Administration  
8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS  
College Park, MD 20740  
Web: [ogis.archives.gov](http://ogis.archives.gov) Email: [ogis@nara.gov](mailto:ogis@nara.gov)  
Telephone: 202-741-5770 Fax: 202-741-5769  
Toll-free: 1-877-684-6448

Poli A. Marmolejos  
Director  
Office of Hearings and Appeals