

Cause No. \_\_\_\_\_



Seattle Police Department  
Federal Bureau of Investigation – Seattle Division  
Safe Streets Task Force

**Certification for Determination of Probable Cause**

That Len Carver III is a detective with the Seattle Police Department assigned to the FBI – Safe Streets Task Force and has reviewed the investigation conducted in Seattle Police Department Master Case Number 2014-269326;

There is probable cause to believe that Seul Ki Yum, DOB: 2/14/1991, committed the crime of Extortion (multiple counts), within the county of King, state of Washington.

This belief is predicated on the following facts and circumstances:

Count One – Victim N.R.

Victim N.R. met Seul Ki Yum in July 2010 through the online dating website “OK Cupid.” Victim N.R. and Yum dated for about one month before the relationship ended.

In July 2012, Victim N.R. received a text from Yum asking if he wanted to meet again. The two met and soon began dating. They dated regularly for about one month. Victim N.R. learned that Yum had been lying to him about her work and friends and came to believe that she may be seeing other men. Victim N.R. terminated the relationship. In August 2012, Victim N.R. obtained a court order which prohibited Yum from contacting him. The order, granted 8/28/2012, was valid for a one-year period.

After the expiration of the court order, on 11/7/2013, Yum sent a text message to Victim N.R. which read, “Hi, you owe me money. Victim N.R.?” Yum claims she became pregnant during the relationship and had since had the pregnancy terminated. Yum alleged she had paid a total of \$800 for the abortion, and demanded that Victim N.R. pay one-half of the cost. Victim N.R. paid the \$400 to Yum and asked her not to contact him again. Yum agreed not to contact Victim N.R. again.

Victim N.R. transferred \$400 to Yum’s Bank of America account on November 8, 2013. The following day, on 11/9/2013, Victim N.R. received a text message from Yum.

Yum wrote that she had changed her mind and "I had to get the abortion and then recover while dealing with your court order because you thought I was "obsessed" with you. I want you to pay the whole thing which is 800 total so an additional 400."

Victim N.R. did not respond to Yum's demand for an additional \$400; Yum texted to Victim N.R., "You owe me an additional 400 asshole. Don't make me come and get it from you at Milliman," Victim N.R.'s place of employment. Yum continued, "I'm going to start dialing all your coworkers in 15 minutes. I don't care if I humiliate you. I have no problem sending emails to everyone in your office so if I were you I'd send me the 400 right now." Yum continued to write texts to Victim N.R. threatening to contact co-workers if Victim N.R. did not pay to Yum an additional \$400.

Yum contacted Victim N.R. on 2/6/2014, and asked him for another \$600. Victim N.R. filed a report with Seattle police shortly thereafter.

On 9/5/2014, during an interview with Seattle police Detective Brad Craig, Victim N.R. positively identified Yum.

#### Count Two – Victim N.A.

In March 2013, Victim N.A. was completing surgical residency at Virginia Mason Medical Center in Seattle when he met Seul Ki Yum through the online dating website "OK Cupid." Victim N.A. and Yum soon began a dating relationship. Yum told Victim N.A. that she was employed as an actuary at JP Morgan Chase. During the weeks that followed, Yum and Victim N.A. had a regular and ongoing dating relationship and saw each other about six or seven times.

During one of their later dates, Yum told Victim N.A. that she planned to date other people. Victim N.A. told Yum that he too would date other women. Victim N.A. recalled that Yum's reaction to this assertion was overly-emotional and irrational. Based upon Yum's anger and the intensity of her reaction, Victim N.A. decided that he would no longer date Yum. Soon after, Victim N.A. met and began dating E.M. E.M. and Victim N.A. have since married.

In April 2013, about three weeks after their breakup, Yum contacted Victim N.A. and told him that she was pregnant with his child. Yum told Victim N.A. that if he did not begin to date her again, she would have the child and sue him for child support; however, Yum said that if Victim N.A. agreed to see her again, that she would be open to discussing an abortion. Victim N.A. met and pretended to date Yum in an effort to determine if Yum was indeed pregnant. During this time, Yum told Victim N.A. that she had, in fact, had an abortion. Following Yum's disclosure that she was no longer pregnant, Victim N.A. told Yum that he would not see her anymore. In response to Victim N.A.'s desire not to see her any longer, Yum told Victim N.A. that she actually did not have the abortion and was, in fact, pregnant with his child.

Some weeks later, Yum told Victim N.A. that she had the abortion and demanded that he pay her \$750 to cover one-half the cost of the abortion. Victim N.A. paid \$750 to Yum via a direct transfer from his Bank of America bank account to Yum's Bank of America bank account. In September, Yum told Victim N.A. that she wanted him to pay for the entire abortion, adding that he now owed her \$1,050. Again, Victim N.A. paid Yum via a direct transfer to her account.

In September 2013, Yum contacted Victim N.A. and told Victim N.A. that she knew of his current and ongoing relationship with E.M. Yum told Victim N.A. that if he did not pay to her \$15,000, she would disclose their dating relationship to E.M., including telling her about dating both women at the same time. Yum also told Victim N.A. that she would come to his place of employment and disclose the information about their relationship to his co-workers and others. Victim N.A. did not have \$15,000, but agreed to pay Yum in exchange for her silence. Victim N.A. did not want his relationship with Yum to be disclosed fearing the disclosure would injure his relationship with E.M. and negatively impact his reputation with his employer. On or about 9/6/2013, Victim N.A. began making a series of deposits to Yum's bank account in an attempt to prevent Yum's threatened disclosures.

Once Victim N.A. had made payments totaling \$15,000, Yum demanded an additional \$3,000, telling Victim N.A. that she had mental health complications as a result of the abortion. Yum again threatened to disclose their relationship to E.M. and to tell Victim N.A.'s co-workers about the relationship and pregnancy. Yum also threatened to publically post nude pictures of Victim N.A., taken during their relationship.

Victim N.A. ultimately made this additional \$3,000 payment to Yum. Nevertheless, Yum continued to demand additional sums; with each demand Yum threatened Victim N.A. with disclosure of the relationship to E.M. as well as his employer and co-workers.

During a 2/13-14/2014, text message exchange, Yum threatened Victim N.A. that she was going to send E.M. screen captures of text messages between Yum and Victim N.A. regarding a ring that Victim N.A. had given E.M. These text messages further detailed threats from Yum that instructed Victim N.A. to take the ring that he had given to E.M. and sell it so that he could give the proceeds of the sale to Yum. On 2/13/2014, Yum writes, "If I don't get my money by tomorrow, I will blow up your life." Victim N.A. responds, "Ok, I'll do it." Yum writes, "Do what?" Victim N.A. tells Yum, "get money." Yum inquires how Victim N.A. plans to get money to pay her and Victim N.A. says he will sell the ring or apply for an Internet loan to pay Yum. The following day, Yum writes to Victim N.A. asking if he has sold the ring. When Victim N.A. did not immediately respond to Yum, Yum texted, "I'm about to walk to your hospital." Victim N.A. tells Yum that he has just sold the ring, and that it needed to be inspected. Yum then provides Victim N.A. with her bank account information and instructs Victim N.A. to deposit the funds there.

In reality, Victim N.A. did not sell the ring. Additionally, he informed Yum that he had notified authorities, to which Yum replies, "I'm going to send the screen caps to E.M. and her parents ... her sister ... her nurse friends ... and then leave Madeline on your doorsteps. Good luck."

Between 9/6/2013 and 2/14/2014, Victim N.A. transferred \$21,185.00 to Yum's bank account in exchange for her silence. In total, Victim N.A. estimates that he has paid Yum over \$24,000 in extortion payments. Victim N.A. provided documentation of the money transfers to investigators.

Because Victim N.A. refused to pay Yum any more money, in February 2014, Yum posted a comment on a YouTube page, operated by friend of E.M. The post suggested that E.M. should ask Victim N.A. about his infidelity. E.M. confronted Victim N.A. and Victim N.A. disclosed his relationship with Yum, including the fact that he has been paying Yum for her silence. At some point, Yum posted nude pictures of Victim N.A. on E.M.'s Instagram page.

In March 2014, Victim N.A. reported the extortion to Seattle police. On 9/2/2014, Victim N.A. positively identified Seul Ki Yum, DOB: 2/14/1991, as the suspect.

### Count Three – Victim S.C.

In mid-April 2014, Victim S.C. met Seul Ki Yum on the dating website (application) "Tinder." Victim S.C. and Yum began dating and did so for about two weeks. Toward the end of May 2014, Yum terminated the relationship after Victim S.C. failed to promptly respond to Yum's text messages or emails. In one of the text messages, to Victim S.C., Yum wrote, "by the way, I lied about being on birth control."

On June 3, 2014, Yum contacted Victim S.C. and told him that she was pregnant with his child and demanded that Victim S.C. pay for an abortion. In a subsequent email to Victim S.C., Yum attached a photograph of an at home pregnancy test which shows a positive response. Yum told Victim S.C. that she would have the child and sue him for child support payments if he did not pay her. Additionally, Yum threatened to contact Victim S.C.' family, friends, clients and co-workers and tell them about their relationship and the pregnancy if Victim S.C. refused to pay her.

Victim S.C. works in his family-owned wealth management business, and Victim S.C. and his family were concerned that Yum's disclosures would seriously affect their business relationships and negatively impact the family's business

On June 10, 2014, in an email to Victim S.C., Yum wrote, "Today's your chance of getting me to get an abortion otherwise you're going to be a daddy." Victim S.C. responded that he would pay for the abortion and asked where the payment should be made. Yum responded that Victim S.C. should make payment directly to her Bank of America account and further asked, "are you going to wire it soon?"

The following day, on June 11, 2014, Victim S.C. again asks to which medical clinic the funds should be sent. Yum responds, "Nope wire it if you want me to get an abortion." Yum later wrote, "If you want me to get an abortion at all then wire it today otherwise good luck being a daddy in 8 months." About 15 minutes later, Yum wrote, "I guess you want me to keep it. Is it cool if I start telling your family and friends as well as the staff at your Dad's work and Mom's school?" Yum followed up, "Fine. I'm calling your Dad's office in about 20 minutes of [sic] I don't hear from you until then." Minutes later, Victim S.C. responded that his father would pay \$1,000. Yum instructed Victim S.C. to drop the check with the concierge at her downtown Seattle apartment.

On June 11, 2014, Victim S.C. paid \$1,000 (via personal check) to Yum for her silence.

After receiving the \$1,000 payment from Victim S.C., Yum continued to harass Victim S.C. and his family, writing that she was considering not having the abortion and also that she was filing charges against Victim S.C. for sexual harassment. At some point following Yum's continuing harassment, Victim S.C.'s family filed for an anti-harassment order which was subsequently served on Yum. According to Victim S.C., the communications ceased after service of the court's order.

Victim S.C. reported the extortion to Seattle police and was interviewed 8/14/2014. In that interview, Victim S.C. positively identified Yum as the suspect.

The cases involving Victim N.R., Victim N.A. and Victim S.C. were referred for felony charge consideration in September 2014 and cleared by the police department in January 2016 following the retirement of the initial case detective.

#### Count Four – Victim J.F.

On 8/25/2016, I was contacted by FBI Special Agent Scott Medearis from the FBI's Oakland, California, Resident Agency. Agent Medearis reported he was investigating a wire fraud case in Oakland. The suspect in Medearis' case is Victim J.F., a well-known, high-end wine retailer in Berkley, California. Victim J.F. is accused of running a Ponzi scheme in which he sold millions of dollars in non-existent wine futures. Victim J.F. has been federally indicted in California and is cooperating in this investigation.

During the course of the federal investigation, Victim J.F.'s banking records were made available and reviewed. Investigators learned that Victim J.F. had transferred almost \$240,000 to Seul Ki Yum of Seattle. When asked, Victim J.F. told the agents Yum was blackmailing him and that he had been transferring money to Yum since mid-2014. Victim J.F. said he met Yum on an Internet dating website and the two of them later met in person, in California, and had consensual sex. Soon after their meeting, Yum began threatening Victim J.F. with disclosure of their sexual encounter. Yum told Victim J.F. she would tell his wife and family if he did not pay her. Victim J.F. estimated he has paid Yum about \$10,000 monthly from 2014 through mid-2016.

On 5/10/2016, Victim J.F. reported that Yum called him demanding continued payment for her silence, told Victim J.F. he was late on the payments to her and is now running a deficit.

On 7/25/2016, investigators met with Victim J.F. and his attorney at the FBI Oakland Resident Agency in California. Victim J.F. provided email communications between he and Yum and receipts from cash deposits to Yum's Bank of America bank account. Victim J.F. placed a recorded call to Yum at (206) 718-6504 but there was no answer. Yum immediately emailed Victim J.F. asking if he was the caller. He responded that he was and Yum called him. The phone call was recorded. In the call, Yum continues to demand extortion payments from Victim J.F., threatens to disclose their relationship to his wife and tells Victim J.F. that he is behind on his payments to her. Victim J.F. tells Yum the money he has been paying her is "embezzled."

Through legal process, investigators obtained Yum's banking records. I have reviewed Yum's banking records. Yum's banking records reveal transfers and payments from the Seattle-based victims listed above as well as additional extortion victims.

#### Count Four – Victim J.H.

Victim J.H. was contacted by investigators on 9/28/2016 after Yum's banking records revealed Victim J.H. made two deposits to Yum's bank account, totaling \$7,700, in April and May 2014. Victim J.H., who is cooperating in this investigation told investigators that he met Seul Ki Yum in April 2014 via the online dating website "Seeking Arrangements."

Prior to meeting Yum in person, Victim J.H. said he provided a photograph of himself to Yum. The two soon met at a coffee shop in downtown Seattle and had coffee. Victim J.H. said there was never a sexual relationship between he and Yum and the only meeting the two had was for the coffee. After meeting Yum at the coffee shop, Victim J.H. later contacted Yum to determine if she was interested in meeting for a subsequent date. Yum told Victim J.H. that she had shared his photograph with her roommate and that her roommate said she recognized Victim J.H., knew his wife and would possibly disclose he and Yum's developing relationship.

Victim J.H. told Yum he was concerned because he did not want his wife to learn about the coffee date and his online dating efforts. Victim J.H. told Yum that if his wife learned of their meeting, it would ruin his marriage. Yum told Victim J.H. that her roommate was having financial difficulties, with mounting debt due to unpaid tuition. Victim J.H. and Yum discussed the matter and Victim J.H. suggested; that, perhaps, Victim J.H. could assist Yum's roommate with her financial situation and asked "would that make a difference?" Yum assured Victim J.H. that helping with finances would make a difference. Victim J.H. recalled that he shared with Yum that he had other, prior online dates with other women. In later telephone discussions, Yum relayed that she was sure her roommate would not disclose their relationship if a payment was made – "do a

favor and she won't do anything." After further discussion, it was determined Yum's roommate needed \$6,700 for her tuition. Yum provided information to Victim J.H. so that a deposit could be made directly into Yum's banking account. On or about 4/28/2014, Victim J.H. had a cashier's check drafted in the amount of \$6,700 payable to Seul Yum and deposited it into Yum's account at Bank of America. A couple of days after the payment was made, Yum told Victim J.H. that she needed a new laptop computer (hers was lost or broken – Victim J.H. could not remember which) and as a "goodwill gesture," Victim J.H. drafted a second cashier's check in the amount of \$1,000 and deposited it directly into Yum's account on 5/1/2014.

After making the second payment, Victim J.H. thought the matter was concluded and that he would not hear from Yum (or her roommate) again. Victim J.H. recalled that Yum called him on the day he made the \$1,000 deposit to her account (5/1/2014) and told Victim J.H. that her roommate was not satisfied, wanted to tell Victim J.H.'s wife about the incident with Yum and in exchange for her silence, the roommate wanted Victim J.H. to purchase a high-end purse for her. Victim J.H. recalled the purse was "thousands of dollars." Yum was the supposed intermediary for her roommate.

Victim J.H., an attorney himself, sought the advice of a colleague that he knew and trusted. Victim J.H. determined he was in fact an extortion victim and decided to disclose the matter to his wife and to make no more payments to Yum, effectively removing Yum's leverage. On the evening of 5/1/2014, Victim J.H. told his wife about his meeting Yum and the circumstances of that meeting. The following morning, during a phone call with Yum, Victim J.H. told Yum that he told his wife about the incident and that he would not be purchasing the purse. Victim J.H. recalled that Yum was "not happy."

Later that same day, Victim J.H. said he received an email from Yum which included a screenshot from his law firm's website. Yum asked Victim J.H. if his [Victim J.H.'s] law partners would be interested in knowing about the incident. Because of that email, Victim J.H. summoned his law partners and disclosed that he was being extorted and the circumstances of the extortion.

An attorney in Victim J.H.'s firm responded to Yum's email, telling her to stop extorting Victim J.H. or she could face legal repercussions.

Victim J.H. said he did not hear from Yum for about one month, when he received an email from her in which she wrote: "Hi. How are you?" Victim J.H. did not respond and referred the email to his attorney for response. Since that time, Victim J.H. has not heard from Yum.

Victim J.H. provided some of the emails between he and Yum.

Victim J.H. viewed the DOL photograph of Yum and identified her as the person he met for coffee. Victim J.H. did not report the extortion to law enforcement.

#### Count Five – Victim A.A.

Investigators contacted Victim A.A. on 10/4/2016. Yum's banking records revealed Victim A.A. made a \$1,000 deposit to Yum's bank account on 5/12/2014. Victim A.A. has made other deposits and online transfers to Yum's bank account as well.

When asked about Yum, Victim A.A. immediately recognized the name and said that he was extorted by Yum in April – May of 2014. The extortion was not reported to police. Victim A.A. said that he met Yum on the online dating website, "Seeking Arrangements." Victim A.A. and Yum met once for coffee at his office building and the two did not meet again and did not have a sexual or dating relationship.

About two weeks after meeting Yum for coffee, Yum threatened to disclose their meeting to Victim A.A.'s wife and family and to further disclose that he had been seeking an extra-marital affair and had met her during that effort. According to Victim A.A., Yum knew personal information about him and his family. Victim A.A. believes Yum may have learned the information about him from Facebook, but is not certain. Victim A.A. said Yum contacted him via telephone, text messaging and possibly email. Victim A.A. did not retain any of the text messages between he and Yum. Victim A.A. examined a check drawn on a corporate account, in the amount of \$1,000 and payable to Yum. The check was deposited into Yum's account on 5/12/2014. Victim A.A. confirmed that he wrote the check, drafted against his business account, and personally deposited the check into Yum's banking account at Bank of America. Yum provided her bank account information to Victim A.A. Victim A.A. reported that he also paid to Yum cash (via deposit to her account), approximately \$3,000 - \$4,000. The money was paid to Yum to ensure her silence about the coffee meeting and Victim A.A.'s "Seeking Arrangements" account. After paying Yum several thousand dollars, Yum continued to extort him for additional sums, threatening to disclose the information to Victim A.A.'s wife and family.

Victim A.A. sought the advice of a local attorney. Victim A.A.'s attorney provided Victim A.A. with a link to a *Seattle Times* newspaper article about a female who went to prison for a similar extortion. Victim A.A. forwarded the article's link to Yum. Yum continued to threaten Victim A.A. and demanded money, but Victim A.A. made no further payments to Yum. Weeks later, Yum told Victim A.A. that she was pregnant with Victim A.A.'s son's child and needed \$800 for an abortion. Victim A.A. spoke to his son and learned that his son does not know Yum and never had a relationship with Yum. Yum eventually ceased efforts to further extort Victim A.A.

Victim A.A., who is cooperating in this investigation, provided some of the email exchanges between he and Yum.

#### Count Six – Victim S.C.C.

On 10/13/2016, I learned Victim S.C.C. was a possible extortion victim and that the extortion efforts were ongoing.



Victim S.C.C. met Yum through the online dating website "Seeking Arrangements." Victim S.C.C. is the President and Chief Executive Officer of a local legal services firm. Victim S.C.C. is married with children. After a series of online exchanges, Yum and Victim S.C.C. met in person for the first time on or about 9/23/2016 in Seattle's Pioneer Square. After the initial meeting, Yum gave Victim S.C.C. a ride back to his office in her car. Victim S.C.C. reported he and Yum had "some physical contact" in her car and the two agreed to meet again at a later date.

On 9/28/2016, Victim S.C.C. was at the Bellevue Club Hotel in Bellevue. Late that evening Yum contacted Victim S.C.C. and the two met in the bar where Yum drank tea. Victim S.C.C. described the meeting as casual; there was no discussion of money or payments to Yum. Yum asked Victim S.C.C. if he wanted to "kick it." Victim S.C.C. and Yum went to Victim S.C.C.'s hotel room where the two engaged in consensual sex. During the evening, Victim S.C.C. never mentioned any details about his family or the fact that he was married. Yum did not stay the night and left soon after their sexual encounter.

The following week, Victim S.C.C. and his family travelled to Florida. While travelling, Yum began texting Victim S.C.C. She told Victim S.C.C., in the series of text messages, that she needed money for an apartment, was on sabbatical from Google, and had no income. Yum asked Victim S.C.C. if he would be willing to help her financially, specifically with money to rent an apartment for which she had recently made application. Victim S.C.C. thought Yum's request for financial assistance was strange given the two only recently met and he told her he was uncomfortable with the request. Victim S.C.C. reported Yum's tone became agitated.

Yum told Victim S.C.C. that she knew he was married with three children. Yum texted to Victim S.C.C. that she knew his wife's name, the names of his children, and included in the text his wife's name and her email address. Yum told Victim S.C.C. she would expose him as a "cheater." Yum told Victim S.C.C. she would also contact his children and tell them that he was having an extramarital affair. Yum demanded \$9,000 from Victim S.C.C. Yum told Victim S.C.C. that she would keep \$4,000 and repay \$5,000 over time. She told Victim S.C.C. that she would come to his office and home if he did not pay her. Victim S.C.C. told Yum that if she were to come to his office or home, he would call police and seek a restraining order. Yum told Victim S.C.C. that she too would call the police and report that he had "raped" her. Victim S.C.C. described the frequency of Yum's text messaging as "blowing me up." As a result, he blocked her cellular telephone number from further calls and text messages. Fearing his wife or family would discover the text messages on his phone, Victim S.C.C. deleted all of Yum's text messages to him.

After Victim S.C.C. blocked Yum's cell phone, she began sending emails to Victim S.C.C. In one of the emails, she included a photograph of Victim S.C.C.'s 15-year-old son. Victim S.C.C. believes Yum researched him and his family using open source information from the Internet, such as Facebook, public records and the like.

Upon his return to Seattle, Victim S.C.C. spoke with Yum by phone on or about 10/11/2016. In the phone call, Yum expressed displeasure with Victim S.C.C. for not telling her that he was married. Victim S.C.C. said he was contrite and apologized, saying the two had only met recently and spent no more than a couple of hours together. He agreed to pay Yum \$1,000. She sent to Victim S.C.C. her bank account information and he made the deposit to her bank account at a local branch that day.

That same evening, Yum again contacted Victim S.C.C. telling him that she wanted continued financial assistance and demanded \$9,000. Yum's terms would be to accept the \$9,000 payment from Victim S.C.C., retain \$4,000 and repay \$5,000 through yet-to-be negotiated terms. In exchange for the payment, Yum would not disclose their relationship to Victim S.C.C.'s wife or children.

Believing that he was an extortion victim, Victim S.C.C. called a Seattle police captain who is a friend. The captain referred him to investigators. Victim S.C.C. is cooperative with the investigation.

On 10/17/2016, investigators obtained judicial authority to intercept and record communications or conversations between Victim S.C.C. and Yum. That same day, Victim S.C.C. contacted Yum by telephone and the conversation was recorded. Victim S.C.C. told Yum that he could not get cash and that he would make the \$9,000 payment to her via a company check and disguise it as a payment for a software development project. Victim S.C.C. told Yum his attorney had prepared a settlement agreement and that he would ask her to read and sign it. Victim S.C.C. told Yum that her earlier threats to tell his wife and family about their affair scared him and made him feel sick. Yum told Victim S.C.C. that she felt betrayed after learning he was married and her "threats were fueled with, like, anger." After agreeing to accept a payment and sign the settlement agreement, Yum told Victim S.C.C. that she would not disclose their relationship because she thought he was a "good guy" and did not want his children to be angry and "hate you." The two agreed to meet at a nearby coffee shop.

Victim S.C.C. drafted a company check payable to Yum in the amount of \$5,000. Victim S.C.C. was provided a five-page settlement agreement drafted by the King County Prosecutors Office.

Later that same day, Victim S.C.C. and Yum met. Victim S.C.C. was equipped with a small audio recorder and the meeting was recorded. Victim S.C.C. gave a copy of the proposed settlement agreement to Yum and asked that she read and sign it. He asked that she change the amount of the payment from \$9,000 to \$5,000, telling Yum it would prevent him from having to file a tax document. Yum was upset the amount of the payment was less than the two discussed by telephone earlier in the day.

Yum signed the settlement agreement which read, in part:

"As consideration for payment of the amount specified in this agreement, Seul Ki Yum, the Releasing Party acknowledges and agrees that she

previously demanded and received monies in return for an agreement not to disclose information about an alleged relationship she'd had with the Released Part to the Released Party's family, friends, and co-workers, and now agreed that she will not communicate or disclose, verbally, in writing digitally, electronically or otherwise, any information pertaining to or relating to any alleged relationship with the Released Party to any third party. Moreover, the Releasing Party agrees to make no more demands of the Released party for any additional payment to further refrain from disclosing personal information."

Following the 10/17/2016 meeting with Victim S.C.C., Yum was arrested and transported to the Seattle Police Department for interview.

During a post-Miranda, audio-video recorded interview, Yum admitted to the crimes of extortion as outlined above. Specifically, Yum discussed the extortion of each of the identified victims and admitted that she accepted money from them to remain silent about a secret, which if exposed, tended to subject the victims to hatred, contempt or ridicule. Yum also admitted that she threatened to reveal information sought to be concealed by the victims and that she understood the threatened disclosure had the likelihood of substantially harming the victims with respect to their business financial condition or personal relationships.

Based on the information contained in this Certification, the results of the initial and subsequent police investigation, I believe there is probable cause to charge Seul Ki Yum with the crime of Extortion in the Second Degree, multiple counts, all felonies.

*Under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington, I certify that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.*

*Signed and dated by me this 1<sup>st</sup> day of November, 2016, at Seattle, Washington.*



---

Detective Len Carver III #6118  
Seattle Police Department  
FBI – Seattle Safe Streets Task Force