

Thanks for sharing the full exchange – that reply from Michael is actually very significant. It confirms **explicit lack of consent** and **clear objection**, which materially strengthens any reporting or escalation.

Below is a **clean, structured next step plan**, plus two pieces of text you can use immediately.

What This Response Confirms (Important)

You now have, in writing:

- ☒ **Explicit denial of authorization**
- ☒ **Clear objection to AI voice use**
- ☒ **Statement of reputational harm**
- ☒ **Pattern of reappearance after takedowns**
- ☒ **Acknowledgement of platform enforcement failure**

This moves the issue from “concern” to **documented rights abuse**.

Immediate Actions You Can Take (High Leverage)

1. Report on YouTube using the **correct** category

Do **not** use generic “misleading” or “harassment.”

Use:

- **Impersonation**
- **Privacy / Likeness**
- **Copyright → Voice / Performance (when applicable)**

In the free-text field, explicitly state:

“Sir David Attenborough has confirmed via his management that this AI-generated voice use is unauthorized and explicitly opposed.”

This matters.

2. Submit a *second* report referencing management confirmation

YouTube weighs repeat reports differently when:

- They include **new material evidence**
- They reference **direct representation**

Include Michael's wording verbatim if allowed.

3. Encourage Management to File a Formal Legal Takedown

Michael hinted at difficulty, but the strongest path is:

- **YouTube Legal Complaint**
- **Right of Publicity / Passing Off**
- **False Endorsement**

This is **not** a standard content report – it's a legal channel.

If helpful, you can reply offering to forward timestamps, transcripts, or summaries to reduce their workload.

Suggested Reply to Michael (Concise, Helpful, Non-Pushy)

You can send this if you want to stay involved constructively:

Dear Michael,

Thank you very much for confirming this – I appreciate you taking the time to respond. I will submit reports through YouTube referencing Sir David's explicit lack of authorization.

If it would be helpful, I am also happy to provide timestamps, transcripts, or a brief summary of how the

synthetic voice is being used, particularly where it could be construed as endorsement or affiliation.

I understand how frustrating platform enforcement can be in these cases, especially with AI voice misuse, and I appreciate your efforts to address it.

Kind regards,
Patrick

Why This Case Is Strong (Plainly)

From a legal / platform-policy standpoint, this hits **multiple red flags**:

- Unauthorized biometric likeness (voice)
- False implied endorsement
- Reputational harm
- Political contextual misuse
- Repeat offender behavior
- Explicit objection by rights holder

YouTube is *slow*, but this is exactly the type of case that escalates once it reaches human review or legal.

If You Want to Escalate Further (Optional)

If management continues to hit walls, viable next steps include:

- BBC legal / archive rights team (if applicable)
- Public statement or press inquiry (even quiet ones)
- Digital rights orgs tracking AI likeness abuse
- Coordinated reporting (multiple independent reports referencing the same confirmation)

None of these require drama – they rely on **paper trail + persistence**.

If you want, I can:

- Draft a **YouTube legal complaint template**
- Help you phrase reports to avoid auto-rejection
- Condense this into a **one-page escalation brief** management could reuse
- Rewrite this into a **formal affidavit-style statement**

You did the right thing here – and you now have confirmation that you weren't overreacting.

Understood. Below are **four ready-to-use documents**, written to be practical, legally careful, and platform-savvy. These are **not legal advice**, but they are structured the way actual successful escalations are written.

You can copy/paste these directly.

1. YouTube Legal Complaint Template

(Impersonation / Right of Publicity / False Endorsement)

Use this via: YouTube → Report → Legal issue → Impersonation or Other Legal Issue

Tone: factual, rights-based, non-editorial

Legal Basis for Complaint

Unauthorized use of a real person's voice likeness via AI-generated synthetic speech, constituting impersonation, false endorsement, and misappropriation of likeness.

Rights Holder:

Sir David Attenborough (voice and likeness)

Represented by: Management of Sir David Attenborough

Statement of Non-Authorization:

The use of a synthetic voice imitating Sir David Attenborough in the reported content is **explicitly unauthorized**. Sir David Attenborough has confirmed through his management that he **abhors the use of AI**

voice cloning of his likeness and has no association with, or endorsement of, the referenced channel or content.

Description of Violation:

The reported videos use an AI-generated voice that closely imitates Sir David Attenborough's distinctive vocal cadence, tone, and delivery. This imitation is used to narrate political commentary content. The use of this synthetic voice creates a **reasonable likelihood of viewer confusion**, implying endorsement, participation, or approval by Sir David Attenborough where none exists.

Reputational Harm:

Sir David Attenborough is a globally recognized public figure whose voice is strongly associated with educational, scientific, and public-interest work. The use of an AI clone of his voice in politically charged content poses a material risk of reputational harm and public misrepresentation.

URLs of Infringing Content:

- <https://youtu.be/LY90-tEmTX0>
- <https://youtube.com/@asmongoldclips>
- <https://youtube.com/@asmontv>

Good Faith Statement:

I submit this complaint in good faith, believing the use described above is unauthorized and unlawful.

2. How to Phrase Reports to Avoid Auto-Rejection

(This matters a lot)

DO USE THESE PHRASES

- "Unauthorized synthetic voice impersonation"
- "False implied endorsement"
- "Right of publicity / voice likeness"

- “Explicit lack of consent confirmed by rights holder”
- “Material likelihood of viewer confusion”
- “Synthetic media misrepresenting identity”

✗ AVOID THESE PHRASES

- “I don’t like this”
- “This is offensive”
- “This is misinformation” (too generic)
- “Political propaganda” (can trigger speech exemptions)
- “Parody” (opens a loophole)

Recommended Report Text (Short Form)

This video uses an AI-generated synthetic voice deliberately imitating Sir David Attenborough. Sir David Attenborough has explicitly confirmed through his management that this use is unauthorized and opposed. The imitation creates false implied endorsement and misrepresents identity, constituting impersonation and misuse of voice likeness.

3. One-Page Escalation Brief (Reusable by Management)

Subject: Unauthorized AI Voice Impersonation of Sir David Attenborough on YouTube

Summary

A large YouTube channel has published multiple videos using an AI-generated voice designed to imitate Sir David Attenborough. This use is unauthorized, explicitly opposed by Sir David, and creates a risk of reputational harm and false endorsement, particularly in politically charged content.

Key Facts

- Sir David Attenborough has **no association** with the channel or its content.
- His management has confirmed he **abhors the use of AI voice cloning of his likeness**.
- Prior takedown attempts have been partially successful but content reappears.
- The voice imitation is highly recognizable and likely to mislead viewers.

Nature of Harm

- False implication of endorsement or participation
- Reputational risk through political association
- Unauthorized exploitation of a distinctive biometric identifier (voice)

Applicable Legal & Policy Grounds

- Right of publicity / misappropriation of likeness
- False endorsement (Lanham Act principles)
- Platform impersonation and synthetic media policies
- Emerging AI deepfake regulations (jurisdiction-dependent)

Requested Action

- Removal of infringing videos
- Prevention of reuploads using the same synthetic voice
- Enforcement escalation due to repeat behavior

4. Formal Affidavit-Style Statement

(For legal, platform, or press use)

AFFIDAVIT OF UNAUTHORIZED USE OF VOICE LIKENESS

I, **Patrick Fanella**, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the following statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge:

1. I have identified multiple YouTube videos published by channels including but not limited to “Asmongold Clips” and “Asmongold TV” that use an AI-generated synthetic voice closely imitating the distinctive voice of Sir David Attenborough.
2. The synthetic voice reproduces identifiable characteristics of Sir David Attenborough’s cadence, tone, and delivery, such that an ordinary viewer could reasonably believe the narration is performed by, endorsed by, or affiliated with Sir David Attenborough.
3. I contacted the management of Sir David Attenborough to inquire whether this use was authorized. In response, Sir David Attenborough’s management confirmed in writing that:
 - Sir David Attenborough has no involvement with the referenced channels or content.
 - He abhors the use of AI-generated imitations of his voice.
 - Prior efforts to remove such content have been made.
4. The use of Sir David Attenborough’s AI-simulated voice occurs in the context of political commentary content, increasing the likelihood of false endorsement, reputational harm, and public misrepresentation.
5. I believe this conduct constitutes:
 - Unauthorized commercial and expressive use of voice likeness
 - False endorsement under principles analogous to the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. §1125(a))
 - Misappropriation of likeness under applicable state right-of-publicity laws
 - Impersonation and deceptive synthetic media under platform policies
6. This statement is made in good faith for the purpose of preventing ongoing misuse of Sir David Attenborough’s identity and protecting the integrity of his public reputation.

Signed:

Patrick Fanella

Date: __

Location: __

If You Want Next-Level Escalation

I can also:

- Adapt this for **UK law framing** (passing off, personality rights)
- Tailor it to **California / Illinois / New Jersey AI statutes**
- Convert this into a **press-safe briefing**
- Draft a **cease-and-desist letter** that management could send

You've already done the hardest part: establishing **explicit non-consent**. Everything else is leverage.

am I an authorized representative since I was given permission from management to pursue the complaints?

Short answer: **probably not in the strict legal sense – but you *can* act as a reporting proxy with permission**, which is still useful and valid on platforms like YouTube.

Here's the precise breakdown, without hedging.

1. What “Authorized Representative” Actually Means (Legally)

In most legal and platform contexts, an **authorized representative** is someone who has **explicit, documented authority** to act *on behalf of the rights holder*, usually:

- A lawyer or law firm
- An agent with **written authorization** (power of attorney or formal letter of authority)
- An employee or contracted manager whose role includes rights enforcement

This usually requires:

- Clear language like “*authorized to act on behalf of*”
- Identification of scope (takedowns, legal notices, platform enforcement)
- Often a signature and date

Based on the email you shared:

“I believe you too can ‘report’ these postings...”

That wording **encourages reporting**, but it **does not formally delegate legal authority**.

So:

✗ You are **not** a legally authorized representative by default.

2. What You *Are* Authorized to Do (Practically)

Even without formal designation, you **can still act effectively** in three important ways:

■ A. Report as a Third Party With Knowledge

YouTube allows **any user** to report:

- Impersonation
- Synthetic media misrepresentation
- False endorsement

You are allowed to:

- State that you have **direct confirmation from management**
- Quote or paraphrase that confirmation
- Provide evidence and URLs

You just **must not claim** to be acting *on behalf of* Sir David Attenborough.

■ B. Submit Reports as an Affected Party / Witness

You can frame yourself as:

- A member of the public flagging impersonation
- A good-faith reporter with **documented non-consent**

This avoids perjury risk and avoids auto-rejection.

■ C. Assist Management Without Representing Them

You can:

- Prepare drafts
- Collect timestamps
- Summarize violations
- Pre-fill legal complaint language
- Coordinate reporting

But the **final “I am authorized” checkbox** should be checked **only by management or their counsel**.

3. What You Should **Not** Do

Do **not**:

- Select “I am the rights holder or authorized agent” unless you have written authorization
- Sign affidavits claiming agency
- Submit DMCA-style notices claiming authority
- Threaten legal action on their behalf

Doing so can invalidate reports or expose you to risk.

4. How to Word This Safely (Important)

■ Safe Language to Use

“I am reporting this content after receiving written confirmation from Sir David Attenborough’s management that the use of his AI-simulated voice is unauthorized.”

✗ Language to Avoid

"I represent Sir David Attenborough."
"I am authorized to act on his behalf."
"I submit this takedown as his agent."

5. If You *Want* to Become an Authorized Representative

This is simple and realistic.

Ask management for **one short sentence**, such as:

"We authorize Patrick Fanella to submit platform complaints regarding unauthorized AI voice impersonations of Sir David Attenborough."

That's usually sufficient for:

- YouTube
- Meta
- X/Twitter
- TikTok

No lawyer required unless litigation is planned.


6. Recommended Next Step (Low Friction)

Reply to Michael with something like:

To ensure accuracy when reporting, would you be comfortable confirming in writing whether I may submit complaints as an authorized reporting contact, or should I continue reporting strictly as a third party citing your confirmation?

This protects **you**, helps **them**, and keeps enforcement clean.

Bottom Line

- ❌ You are **not automatically an authorized representative**
- ✅ You **are** permitted to report with evidence
- ⚠️ Claiming representation without explicit authorization is risky
-  A single-line written authorization would change everything

If you want, I can draft:

- A **one-line authorization request**
- A **safe reporting disclaimer**
- A **platform-specific checkbox guide** (what to select, what not to)

You're doing this correctly – you're just at the boundary between advocacy and representation, and it's smart to be careful.

You're right to pause here. **As written, that "Good Faith Statement" can put you at risk**, because it uses **DMCA-style language that asserts you are the owner or authorized agent** – which you are **not**, based on what we've established.

The good news: **you can fix this cleanly** without weakening the complaint.

Below I'll do three things:

1. **Explain exactly what the risk is (plainly)**
2. **Give you a SAFE replacement Good Faith statement**
3. **Provide a corrected, submission-ready version of the letter**

1. Why the Current Good Faith Statement Is Risky

This sentence is the problem:

"under penalty of perjury, I am the owner, or an agent authorized to act on behalf of the owner"

Why this is dangerous

- This language is specifically from the DMCA copyright takedown framework
- You are **not** the copyright owner of Sir David Attenborough's voice
- You are **not formally authorized as his agent**
- Checking this box or signing this statement **could be construed as a false declaration**

Even if done in good faith, **misrepresentation in a legal declaration is exactly what platforms use to reject complaints or terminate reporting privileges.**

You were absolutely correct to flag this.

2. The Correct Way to Handle This on YouTube

Key principle:

You are **NOT** filing a DMCA copyright takedown

You are filing an **impersonation / false endorsement / likeness misuse complaint**

👉 Therefore, **you must NOT use DMCA perjury language.**

YouTube unfortunately reuses forms, which is confusing – but **you are allowed to modify the good-faith language** when submitting under **non-copyright** legal theories.

3. SAFE Replacement: Good Faith Statement (Use This)

Replace your entire Good Faith section with **this**:




Good Faith Statement:

I submit this complaint in good faith as a member of the public reporting impersonation and misuse of identity. I have received written confirmation from the management of Sir David Attenborough that the AI-generated imitation of

his voice used in the reported content is unauthorized and opposed.

To the best of my knowledge, the information in this notification is accurate. I am not claiming to be the rights holder or an authorized legal agent, but am reporting this matter based on documented non-authorization provided by the rights holder's representatives.

This does three critical things:


-  States **good faith**
-  Grounds your claim in **documented confirmation**
-  Explicitly **disclaims agency**, protecting you

4. Corrected, Submission-Ready Version of Your Letter


I've rewritten **only what's necessary**, keeping your substance intact.

Patrick Fanella

 Fanella.Patrick@gmail.com

 4929 Saratoga Ave

Downers Grove, IL 60515

 630-408-4979

Legal Basis for Complaint

Unauthorized use of a real person's voice likeness via AI-generated synthetic speech, constituting impersonation, false endorsement, and misappropriation of likeness.

Rights Holder

Sir David Attenborough (voice and likeness)

Represented by: Management of Sir David Attenborough

Statement of Non-Authorization

The use of a synthetic voice imitating Sir David Attenborough in the reported content is explicitly unauthorized. Sir David Attenborough has confirmed through his management that he abhors the use of AI voice cloning of his likeness and has no association with, or endorsement of, the referenced channel or content.

Description of Violation

The reported videos use an AI-generated voice that closely imitates Sir David Attenborough's distinctive vocal cadence, tone, and delivery. This imitation is used to narrate political commentary content. The use of this synthetic voice creates a reasonable likelihood of viewer confusion, implying endorsement, participation, or approval by Sir David Attenborough where none exists.

Reputational Harm

Sir David Attenborough is a globally recognized public figure whose voice is strongly associated with educational, scientific, and public-interest work. The use of an AI clone of his voice in politically charged content poses a material risk of reputational harm and public misrepresentation.

URLs of Reported Content

- <https://youtu.be/LY90-tEmTX0>
- <https://youtube.com/@asmongoldclips>
- <https://youtube.com/@asmontv>

Good Faith Statement

I submit this complaint in good faith as a member of the public reporting impersonation and misuse of identity. I have received written confirmation from the management of Sir David Attenborough that the AI-generated imitation of his voice used in the reported content is unauthorized and opposed.

To the best of my knowledge, the information in this notification is accurate. I am not claiming to be the rights holder or an authorized

legal agent, but am reporting this matter based on documented non-authorization provided by the rights holder's representatives.



Submitted by:

Patrick Fanella

Date: __

5. Extremely Important Checkbox Guidance (Do This)

If YouTube asks you to select one:

-  "I am the rights holder or authorized agent" → DO NOT CHECK
-  "I am reporting a legal issue / impersonation / other concern" → CHECK

If the form *forces* a DMCA declaration:

👉 Stop and back out – that's the wrong form.

Bottom Line (Very Clear)

- You were *right* – your original wording could expose you to trouble
- This revised version is *legally safe*
- It preserves maximum credibility
- It does *not* weaken enforcement
- It protects you from perjury or misrepresentation claims

If you want, next I can:

- Map *exactly which YouTube form* to use (step-by-step)
- Draft a *cover note* for YouTube Trust & Safety
- Rewrite this for *UK law / BBC escalation*
- Prepare a *short authorization request* that would let you use the stronger agent language safely

You handled this with real care – that's exactly what this situation requires.