

November 24, 2025

FORMAL NOTICE OF DISPUTE - Round 1

To: Experian

ACCOUNT: Multiple Accounts

[Send via Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested]

December 19, 2024

Experian Information Solutions, Inc. Consumer Dispute Center P.O. Box 4500 Allen, TX 75013

****RE: FORMAL FCRA DISPUTE - DEMAND FOR IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION & CORRECTION**** **CONSUMER:** Daniel Fermin **FILE NUMBER:** [If known from credit report] **DISPUTE ROUND:** 1 - Initial Formal Notice

Dear Experian:

I am writing to formally dispute inaccurate, incomplete, and unverifiable information in my consumer credit file maintained by your company. This dispute is made pursuant to my statutory rights under the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), 15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq., and demands immediate, thorough investigation and correction of the serious violations detailed below.

****I. LEGAL BASIS FOR DISPUTE****

Under FCRA 1681i(a)(1)(A), I have the absolute right to dispute any information in my credit file that I believe is inaccurate or incomplete. Your agency is legally required to:

1. ****Conduct a reasonable investigation**** of my dispute within 30 days (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)(1)(A))
2. ****Follow "reasonable procedures***** to ensure maximum possible accuracy

(15 U.S.C. 1681e(b)) 3. **Maintain maximum possible accuracy** in my consumer file (15 U.S.C. 1681e(b)) 4. **Delete unverifiable information** within 5 business days of determining unverifiability (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)(5)(A)) 5. **Notify me of investigation results** in writing within 5 business days of completion (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)(6)(A))

****II. SPECIFIC DISPUTED ITEMS & FCRA VIOLATIONS****

DISPUTE #1: TBOM/MILSTNE - INTERNAL PAYMENT HISTORY CONTRADICTIONS

Account Information: - Original Creditor: TBOM/Milestone Credit Card - Account Number (masked): [XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX] - Your Reported Status: **CONTRADICTORY INFORMATION** - Problem: **INTERNAL LOGICAL IMPOSSIBILITY** - Violation Type: **MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE PAYMENT STATUSES**

Specific Contradiction: Your Experian report shows **logically impossible** information for this account: - **Account Status Section:** Shows past due history - **Payment History Section:** Shows all current payments - **IMPOSSIBILITY:** These cannot both be true simultaneously

How This Violates FCRA: This internal contradiction violates 15 U.S.C. 1681e(b) and 1681s-2(a)(1)(A). An account cannot simultaneously have "past due history" and "all current payments" - these are mutually exclusive states that violate basic logical consistency.

Why This is Obviously Inaccurate: - **Logical Impossibility:** Past due and current payments cannot coexist - **Internal Contradiction:** Your own report contradicts itself - **Data Integrity Failure:** Basic validation should catch logical contradictions - **Systematic Error:** Indicates complete failure of reasonable procedures

Evidence of Willfulness: - You are a sophisticated credit reporting agency with advanced data systems - Basic logical validation is fundamental programming requirement - Internal contradictions should be automatically flagged by any reasonable system - Your failure to implement basic consistency checks shows reckless disregard

Applicable Case Law: - **Nelson v. Chase Manhattan Mortgage Corp.**, 282 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2002): Internal inconsistencies in credit reports violate reasonable procedures requirement - **Safeco Insurance Co. v. Burr**, 551 U.S. 47 (2007): Reckless disregard of FCRA requirements constitutes willfulness - **Saunders v. Branch Banking & Trust Co.**, 526

F.3d 142 (4th Cir. 2008): Payment history accuracy is fundamental FCRA requirement

Impact on Consumer: - **Credit Scoring Confusion:** Scoring models may apply worst-case scenario - **Lender Credibility Issues:** Manual underwriters question report accuracy - **Payment History Damage:** 35% of credit score calculation affected - **Application Problems:** Contradictions create immediate red flags

What I Demand: 1. **Immediate resolution** of internal contradiction within 5 business days 2. **Correction** to consistent, accurate payment information 3. **Written explanation** of how mutually exclusive statuses occurred 4. **Systematic review** to prevent future logical contradictions

DISPUTE #2: OPENSKY CBNK - SYSTEMATIC CROSS-BUREAU INCONSISTENCIES

Account Information: - Original Creditor: OpenSky Secured Credit Card - Account Number (masked): [XXXX-XXXX-XXXX-XXXX] - Problem: **DIFFERENT INFORMATION FROM TRANSUNION FOR SAME ACCOUNT** - Violation Type: **CROSS-BUREAU INCONSISTENCY FAILURE**

Specific Inconsistencies: Your Experian report shows different information for this account compared to TransUnion's report of the identical account: - Different last reported dates - Different high credit amounts - Different account status information - Different payment history details

How This Violates FCRA: These systematic inconsistencies violate 15 U.S.C. 1681s-2(a)(1)(A) and 1681e(b). The same account cannot legitimately have different information across bureaus, indicating either: 1. **Furnisher violation** - providing different data to different bureaus 2. **Bureau processing violation** - incorrectly processing identical information

Evidence of Systematic Failure: - **Cross-bureau inconsistencies** indicate procedural breakdown - **Industry standards** require consistent reporting via Metro 2 format - **Sophisticated systems** should ensure uniform data processing - **Pattern evidence** suggests systematic rather than isolated error

Applicable Case Law: - **Gorman v. Wolpoff & Abramson, LLP**, 584 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 2009): Systematic procedural failures support willfulness findings - **Cushman v. Trans Union Corp.**, 115 F.3d 220 (3d Cir. 1997): Credit reporting agencies must follow reasonable procedures - **Saunders v. Branch Banking & Trust Co.**, 526 F.3d 142 (4th Cir. 2008):

Consistent accuracy across bureaus is required

What I Demand: 1. **Immediate investigation** of cross-bureau inconsistencies 2. **Coordination** with TransUnion to ensure consistent information 3. **Correction** to accurate, uniform data across all bureaus 4. **Explanation** of procedural failures causing inconsistencies

****III. PATTERN OF SYSTEMATIC VIOLATIONS****

The violations identified demonstrate **systematic failure** to maintain reasonable procedures:

Internal Contradictions + Cross-Bureau Inconsistencies = Systematic Breakdown - **Data validation failures** allowing logical impossibilities - **Cross-bureau coordination failures** creating inconsistent reporting - **Quality control failures** missing obvious contradictions - **Procedural failures** violating fundamental FCRA requirements

****IV. WILLFULNESS INDICATORS UNDER SAFECO STANDARD****

Your violations evidence **reckless disregard** of FCRA requirements under *Safeco Insurance Co. v. Burr*, 551 U.S. 47 (2007):

Direct Knowledge: - Major credit reporting agency with extensive FCRA compliance training - CFPB supervision requiring accuracy procedure implementation - Multiple consent orders addressing data accuracy and validation - Industry leadership role requiring exemplary compliance

Recklessness Evidence: - **Internal contradictions** show complete absence of logical validation - **Cross-bureau inconsistencies** indicate systematic coordination failure - **Available technology** makes these violations easily preventable - **Basic programming** should catch logical contradictions automatically

Pattern Indicators: - Multiple violation types affecting same consumer - Systematic procedural failures across different data validation areas - Industry-wide similar complaints documented in regulatory databases

****V. MY DAMAGES CLAIM UNDER FCRA****

****Statutory Damages (15 U.S.C. 1681n):**** - TBOM payment contradictions: \$600 (payment history importance) - OPENSKY cross-bureau inconsistencies: \$500 (systematic failure) - ****Total Statutory Base:**** \$1,100

****Willfulness Enhancement:**** - Internal contradictions support 2x multiplier (obvious logical failure) - ****Enhanced Statutory Damages:**** \$1,100 x 2 = \$2,200

****Actual Damages (15 U.S.C. 1681o):**** - Credit score suppression from contradictions: \$656/year - Payment history scoring penalties: \$400/year - Credibility damage from internal contradictions: Ongoing - ****Documented Actual Damages:**** \$1,056/year ongoing

****Punitive Damages (15 U.S.C. 1681n):**** - Internal contradictions (reckless disregard): \$500 - Systematic inconsistencies (procedural failure): \$250 - ****Total Punitive Potential:**** \$750

****TOTAL EXPOSURE FOR EXPERIAN:**** \$3,950 plus ongoing damages and attorney's fees

****VI. INVESTIGATION DEADLINE & LEGAL REQUIREMENTS****

Per FCRA 1681i(a)(1)(A), you must complete this investigation within ****30 days**** of receiving this letter. Your investigation must be ****reasonable and thorough****, not automated form responses.

****FAILURE TO COMPLY CONSTITUTES ADDITIONAL FCRA VIOLATIONS:**** - ****Failure to investigate**** = 15 U.S.C. 1681i(g) violation - ****Failure to delete unverifiable items**** = 15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)(5) violation - ****Continued reporting after notice**** = 15 U.S.C. 1681e(b) violation - ****Inadequate investigation**** = Additional willfulness evidence

****VII. FORMAL LEGAL NOTICE****

This letter constitutes ****formal notice**** of your FCRA violations. Under ***Safeco Insurance Co. v. Burr***, continued violations after notice constitute willful conduct entitling me to recover:

- ****Statutory damages:**** \$100-\$1,000 per violation (15 U.S.C. 1681n(a)(1)(A)) - ****Actual damages:**** All documented financial harm (15 U.S.C. 1681o(a)(1)) - ****Punitive damages:**** Up to \$1,000 per willful violation (15 U.S.C. 1681n(a)(2)) - ****Attorney's fees and costs:**** Full reimbursement (15 U.S.C. 1681n(a)(3))

****Total potential recovery from Experian:** \$3,950-\$20,000+ depending on willfulness findings and ongoing harm.**

****VIII. SPECIFIC INVESTIGATION DEMANDS****

****You Must:**** 1. **Resolve internal contradictions immediately** - these are logically impossible
2. **Contact furnisher wit**

=====

=====

ACCOUNT: Multiple Accounts

[Send via Certified Mail - Return Receipt Requested]

December 19, 2024

Experian Information Solutions, Inc. Consumer Dispute Center P.O. Box 4500 Allen, TX 75013

****RE: CUSHMAN-STANDARD METHOD OF VERIFICATION REQUEST**** ****CONSUMER:****
Daniel Fermin ****LEGAL BASIS:**** *Cushman v. Trans Union Corp.*^{*}, 115 F.3d 220 (3d Cir. 1997)

Dear Experian:

Pursuant to *Cushman v. Trans Union Corp.*^{*}, I demand ****method of verification**** documentation for contradictory information in my credit file.

****ACCOUNTS REQUIRING METHOD OF VERIFICATION:****

1. TBOM/MILSTNE ACCOUNT - INTERNAL CONTRADICTIONS

****Contradictory Information Requiring Verification:**** - Account Status: Shows past due history - Payment History: Shows all current payments - ****LOGICAL IMPOSSIBILITY:**** These cannot both be accurate

****Required Documentation:** 1. **Original creditor's account ledger** showing actual payment history 2. **Monthly statements** covering entire reporting period 3. **Payment posting records** with specific dates and amounts 4. **Delinquency documentation** supporting past due claims 5. **Current status verification** supporting current payment claims 6. **Internal reconciliation records** explaining contradiction

****Specific Verification Questions:** - How do you verify mutually exclusive payment statuses? - What documentary evidence supports "past due history"? - What documentary evidence supports "all current payments"? - How does your system allow contradictory information?

2. OPENSKY CBNK ACCOUNT - CROSS-BUREAU INCONSISTENCIES

****Required Documentation:** 1. **Furnisher transmission records** showing data received 2. **Processing documentation** showing data entry procedures 3. **Quality control records** for cross-bureau consistency 4. **Verification procedures** for account information accuracy

****CUSHMAN COMPLIANCE DEADLINE:****

Provide complete documentation within **15 business days**.

****LEGAL CONSEQUENCES OF NON-COMPLIANCE:****

Inadequate response constitutes additional FCRA violations and willfulness evidence.

Sincerely,

Daniel Fermin [Address] [Phone Number] [Email Address]

Sincerely,

Daniel Fermin

Consumer