

A Forensic Case Study of Related-Party Disclosure Failures, Insider-Trading Pattern, and Concurrent Family-Court Proceedings in the Rosenwald–Glass House Brands Network (2018–2026)

Abraham Rosenwald

Independent Researcher · A.R. Pro Se Strategic Operations · arprose.com

Correspondence: aria@arprose.com

ABSTRACT

This paper documents a forensic case study of the related-party financial network surrounding Glass House Brands Inc. (NEO: GLAS / OTC: GLASF), a U.S. publicly-traded California-licensed cannabis cultivator, and the Rosenwald family — a private-investment family whose holdings comprise approximately 23.4 percent of the issuer's aggregate voting power and approximately eight of the issuer's thirteen designated founding entities. The study integrates SEC EDGAR filings, Canadian Securities Administrators' System for Electronic Disclosure by Insiders (SEDI) records, California Civil Rights Department public-record files, U.S. Department of Homeland Security press releases, and certified Connecticut Superior Court transcripts to map (i) the cash-extraction channels between the family's affiliated entities and the issuer; (ii) a Theory-9 insider-trading pattern executed across the issuer's senior-disclosable insiders during the seventeen trading days preceding and following the issuer's April 28, 2026 disclosure of materially adverse FY2026 guidance; (iii) a 1,786-day gap in Schedule 13D/G beneficial-ownership filings under the family's relevant CIK; (iv) a 1,840-day omission of the related-party-transaction schedule (Schedule 4.17) from non-founder shareholder proxy mailings dating to the May 6, 2021 SPAC-merger proxy; and (v) a 44-day Form 144 delinquency for cumulative April 2026 dispositions of \$656,733 by the senior-most disclosable insider. The paper additionally documents the concurrent Connecticut family-court dissolution proceedings against the present author (a member of the Rosenwald-family household by marriage) and a statistical analysis of the Connecticut family bench against which recusal and venue-transfer motions have been filed. The paper closes with a methodological-conflicts-of-interest disclosure and an outline of the six regulatory submissions filed by the author to date.

Keywords

Cannabis-industry corporate governance; related-party transactions; Schedule 13D non-disclosure; Form 144 delinquency; Theory-9 insider-trading; family-court restraining-order procedure; self-represented litigation; multi-jurisdictional whistleblower disclosure

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper documents a forensic case study at the intersection of three subject areas seldom treated together in the academic literature: (i) related-party-transaction disclosure failures by a publicly-traded U.S. cannabis cultivator; (ii) the simultaneous use of state-court restraining-order procedure against a member of the controlling-family household; and (iii) the comparative performance of a self-represented litigant using a custom-built artificial-intelligence litigation-operations system to surface, document, and disseminate the underlying financial structure to multi-sovereign regulators.

The case has unusual evidentiary characteristics. The author is concurrently the principal researcher, the principal whistleblower of record, and the respondent in the family-court proceedings against whom the controlling family has

pursued sanctions for the volume and substance of the very filings that catalogue the conduct described herein. The conflict-of-interest disclosure in § 8 addresses this directly. The factual record rests on documents in the public domain or in the certified court record.

2. THE ISSUER AND THE FAMILY NETWORK

Glass House Brands Inc. is a California-licensed cannabis cultivator domiciled in British Columbia, listed on the Cboe Canada exchange and quoted in the United States on the OTCQX. The issuer was formed by way of a SPAC merger that closed on June 29, 2021, with the merger proxy materials mailed to non-founder shareholders on May 6, 2021. The Rosenwald family — composed of James B. Rosenwald III ('Jamie '), Jocelyn M. Rosenwald, and a constellation of family trusts and family-office vehicles including the Rosenwald Family Trust ('RFT'), the James B.

Rosenwald IV Trust ('JBR IV Trust'), Rosenwald Capital Management ('RCM'), Dalton Investments LLC ('Dalton'), Beach Front Properties LLC and Beach Front Property Management Inc. ('BFPM'), Kings Bay Investment Co. Ltd. (Cayman), Rising Sun Management Ltd. (Cayman), and the Family Weinman Trust — together comprise eight of the issuer's thirteen designated founding entities per Exhibit B of the issuer's founding documentation (DocuSign Envelope ID E20E0E70-9DCB-4E5D-9665-EDED90003CD1).

On July 10, 2025, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement executed search warrants at two of the issuer's California cultivation facilities (Camarillo and Carpinteria). The operation resulted in 361 arrests, the rescue of fourteen unaccompanied minors from suspected forced labor, exploitation, and trafficking, and one worker fatality (Jaime Alanis Garcia, 57).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Data Sources

The analysis integrates (a) SEC EDGAR filings for the issuer's CIK and related-insider CIKs; (b) the System for Electronic Disclosure by Insiders (SEDI) maintained by the Canadian Securities Administrators; (c) the SEC Form ADV / Form D / Form 144 / Form 13D registries for the family's investment-advisory and related entities; (d) the California Secretary of State's business-entity filings for Beach Front Properties LLC and BFPM; (e) the California Civil Rights Department public-record file for the August 2024 housing-discrimination settlement; (f) U.S. Department of Homeland Security press releases of July 2025; (g) the November 2025 House Committee on Oversight and Accountability release of Epstein-related documents; (h) the Greenwich, Connecticut Land Records for the marital residence at issue in the family-court proceedings; (i) certified Connecticut Superior Court transcripts of the dissolution proceedings; and (j) the public-docket records of the Connecticut Judicial Branch.

3.2 Analytical Approach

Cash-extraction channels between the family's affiliated entities and the issuer were enumerated using related-party disclosures in the issuer's Form 40-F and incorporated by reference therein, cross-referenced against the related entities' California business-entity filings, the family's investment-advisory Form ADV filings, and the issuer's SEDI insider-transaction history.

Insider-trading patterns were tested against the framework commonly denoted 'Theory 9' in the SEC enforcement-policy literature: a concurrence between (a) substantial insider dispositions in the trading days immediately preceding the disclosure of materially adverse news, and (b) clustered selling in the trading days immediately following the same disclosure. Disposition-event timing was computed against the issuer's Form 6-K filings.

The Connecticut family-bench statistical analysis used a purpose-built scraper to retrieve 113,162 case-level records and 3,446,855 docket entries across all nine Connecticut judicial districts from the public Connecticut Judicial Branch e-Services system. Per-judge grant/deny ratios were modeled using the Pearson chi-squared test of independence and the Fisher exact test (two-tailed). Cluster-level results are reported in § 5.

3.3 Tools and Verification

The litigation-operations and forensic-analytics workflow was conducted in a hybrid stack of locally-hosted compute and commercial cloud-AI application programming interfaces, with privileged legal material isolated to the locally-hosted side. Every legal filing in the concurrent Connecticut Superior Court proceedings has been accompanied by a sworn Certification of Verification under Connecticut Practice Book § 4-2, a hash-chained Due Diligence Verification Report identifying every authority cited and the verification work performed, and a SHA-256 tamper-detection hash printed on the face of each Certification.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 Corporate Ownership and Voting Power

The Rosenwald family's combined direct and trust-held voting power in the issuer is approximately 23.4 percent, divided between Jamie Rosenwald III (approximately 14.1 percent) and Jocelyn M. Rosenwald (approximately 9.3 percent). In the absence of a majority shareholder, this constitutes a controlling block. The family additionally holds exchangeable, restricted, and multiple-voting-share classes through individual ownership and the RFT, the JBR IV Trust, and the Jocelyn M. Rosenwald Trust.

4.2 Cash-Extraction Channels

BFPM holds a \$140,000-per-annum consulting agreement with the issuer dating to September 2020. Jon A. Neu Insurance, majority-owned by BFPM, brokers the

issuer's California-operations insurance coverage at fiscal-year commissions of \$399,000 (FY2024) and \$298,000 (FY2025). Beach Front Properties LLC, co-founded by Jamie Rosenwald III and the issuer's Chief Executive Officer (Kyle Kazan), holds title to real estate the issuer operates on. RCM is listed as Beach Front Properties LLC's manager of record with the California Secretary of State. The relationship was not disclosed in RCM's Form ADV filings until March 30, 2026 — ten calendar days before a discovery deadline in the concurrent Connecticut family-court proceedings.

Beach Front Properties LLC additionally provided a \$2,000,000 convertible note to the issuer in February 2021, converted to preferred equity in June 2021. Related-party preferred-equity holders received approximately \$1,500,000 in dividends in FY2025 and participated in \$13,000,000 of new preferred issuances. Related-party rent payments to LLCs partially owned by issuer executives and board members totaled \$1,028,000 in FY2025.

4.3 Insider-Trading Pattern, April 2026

On April 27, 2026, Jamie Rosenwald III sold 15,000 shares of GLAS.A.U at a weighted-average price of \$10.5355, generating \$158,033 in a single transaction — the largest single-day insider sale of the month for him. Cumulative April 2026 public-market dispositions by this insider totaled approximately 70,000 shares for \$656,733.

On April 28, 2026 — zero trading days later — the issuer filed a Form 6-K disclosing reductions to FY2026 guidance: Adjusted EBITDA from the high \$40 millions to the high \$30 millions (a 25 percent reduction); FY2026 cash from \$50 million to the low \$40 millions; FY2026 gross-margin target from 48 percent to the mid-40s; and cost-of-production increased from \$100 per pound to \$111 per pound. Cumulative insider dispositions across seven members of the family-network insiders between April 1, 2026 and May 7, 2026 totaled approximately negative 384,209 shares for approximately \$3,650,000, with clustered selling on May 1 and May 7, 2026, immediately after the April 28, 2026 disclosure.

4.4 Form 144 Delinquency

Rule 144 of the Securities Act of 1933 requires insiders selling restricted stock above the lesser of 5,000 shares or \$50,000 to file Form 144 concurrent with the sale order. Jamie Rosenwald III's April 2026 dispositions of \$656,733 exceed the threshold by approximately a factor of fourteen. The earliest disposition in the April cluster occurred on

April 7, 2026. As of May 21, 2026, no corresponding Form 144 has been filed; the delinquency is approximately 44 calendar days against an at-or-before-sale obligation.

The same insider filed timely Form 144s for prior dispositions on May 16, 2025, August 14, 2025, and November 24, 2025. The November 24, 2025 filing covered \$396,468 / 51,632 shares — a smaller dollar volume than the April 2026 dispositions for which no Form 144 was filed. The pattern (timely filing for smaller dispositions; no filing for larger dispositions) is not consistent with administrative oversight.

4.5 Schedule 13D / 13G — 1,786-Day Gap

Sections 13(d) and 13(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 require persons or groups beneficially owning more than 5 percent of a class of registered equity securities to file Schedule 13D or Schedule 13G with the Commission. The Rosenwald family's aggregated beneficial holdings in the issuer have exceeded the 5 percent threshold since the SPAC-merger closing of June 29, 2021.

As of May 21, 2026, the Commission's EDGAR system records zero Schedule 13D, 13G, 13D/A, or 13G/A filings under the family's relevant CIK (0001848731). The gap is approximately 1,786 days. Eight of the issuer's thirteen designated founding entities are Rosenwald or Persky family vehicles. The Section 13(d)/13(g) aggregation requirement applies on the face of the issuer's own founding-documentation Exhibit B.

4.6 Schedule 4.17 Omission — 1,840 Days

The May 6, 2021 mailed proxy materials accompanying the SPAC merger (EDGAR accession 0001104659-21-125828, Exhibit 99.70) omitted Schedule 4.17, Schedule 4.4, and Schedule 2.5 — the related-party-transaction schedules disclosing the financial arrangements between the founding-family entities and the public company. The omission persists in continuous form from the May 6, 2021 mailing date through May 21, 2026 — a period of approximately 1,840 calendar days.

4.7 BFPM and the California Civil Rights Department Settlement

In August 2024, the California Civil Rights Department closed a complaint against BFPM. The complaint alleged that BFPM's leasing practices threatened the eviction of domestic-violence victims, a class protected under California Government Code § 12955 and the federal Fair Housing Act. BFPM agreed to a settlement that included a \$7,500 monetary payment to the complainant and a

mandatory policy-reform requirement obligating BFPM to revise its leasing protocols to comply with state and federal domestic-violence-victim protections.

4.8 Convergent Connecticut Family-Court Proceedings

The author is the respondent in dissolution proceedings filed in the Connecticut Superior Court, Judicial District of Stamford-Norwalk at Stamford, by James Benno Rosenwald IV (son of Jamie Rosenwald III) on January 14, 2026 (Docket No. FST-FA26-6078292-S). Concurrent ex-parte applications for civil restraining orders were filed in adjacent dockets (FA26-5033659, 5033652, 5033792, 5033793) and granted ex parte on or about January 14, 2026.

Following five evidentiary days, the Hon. Vikki Cooper ruled from the bench on March 4, 2026. With respect to the parties' minor children, the Court made an express finding of no harm: 'I don't believe, however, that your conduct is causing harm to the children. I don't believe that. I believe that you love your children. I believe you both love your children' (certified Cooper transcript, March 4, 2026). The reciprocal temporary restraining orders the author had filed against the petitioner — alleging that the petitioner's conduct created a risk of harm to the children — were dismissed; the Court further clarified, on the same record, that the restraining order issued against the author 'does not extend to the children. The order extends to Mr. Benno.' The Connecticut Department of Children and Families had separately investigated the underlying allegations against the author and unsubstantiated each.

Notwithstanding the express no-harm finding and the unsubstantiated child-protection record, the underlying restraining order against the author was continued. The Court articulated the basis for the continuation, also from the bench and in the same ruling: 'If Mr. Abraham had not violated, allegedly violated the restraining order, and he's been arrested here in court twice, the court would have a harder time making the argument that he presents as a threat to you. But because of all of those violations ... that's dangerous behavior' (certified Cooper transcript, March 4, 2026).

The disposition's legal structure presents what is denoted in the analytic literature a bootstrap: the order is sustained on the basis of alleged violations of the order itself. The underlying allegations of harm to the children — the substantive predicate on which an ex-parte civil restraining order is to be issued under Connecticut General Statutes § 46b-15 — having been refuted on the evidentiary record

and unsubstantiated by the state child-protection agency, the only remaining justification on the record for the order's continuation is the existence of the order and the noncompliance the order itself generates. The colloquial term for the same structure is a Catch-22. The case is, at present, a documented instance of the same.

4.9 Convergent Administrative Architecture

The procedural framework being applied in the proceedings against the author is itself the work of a single judicial officer who sits administratively above every other adjudicating judge of record. Hon. Leo V. Diana — Chief Administrative Judge of Family Matters (CAJ-Family) statewide since September 4, 2023 — authored the Statewide Family Trial Management Order effective January 1, 2025. That order's § A(6) five-business-day pre-hearing exchange rule is the dispositive procedural provision on which the author's pending Motion in Limine to Preclude Plaintiff's Evidence rests, and the order's enumerated sanctions — including exclusion of evidence — were re-warned to all parties in the May 13, 2026 JDNO Notice #4 entered by Hon. DeCastro-Tunnard, J. The CAJ-Family is the operational-policy authority for the judges adjudicating the case (Cooper, O'Neill, DeCastro-Tunnard, Kowalski), and prior to elevation to CAJ-Family, Diana served four consecutive years (September 2017 through September 2021) as the presiding judge of the Regional Family Trial Docket in Middletown — the same venue to which the matter is foreseen for referral on the certified May 19, 2026 record [22]. The 2026 Connecticut Judicial Branch Directory (JDP-ES-190) does not name a current presiding judge of the Regional Family Trial Docket; the slot is listed as vacant.

The Statewide Family TMO was, on the bench's own published account, the product of a multi-year (2019–2024) consultation that explicitly named the Connecticut Bar Association Family Law Section as an institutional participant [23]. The bench's published narrative documents at least seven meetings between the Judicial Branch (including the CAJ-Family) and the CBA Family Law Section during 2021–2024, and confirms that bar input materially altered the Practice Book text — including the change from 'five day' to the operative '**five business days**' that the author's Motion in Limine now invokes. Diana's co-authored 2025 article on the framework's origin cites, as its foundational scholarly authority (footnote 1), the prior published work of Samuel V. Schoonmaker IV [24] — the former Chair of the CBA Family Law Section

and a historical partner of the petitioner's law firm of record. The intellectual genealogy of the framework being applied in the proceeding is, by the bench's own published citation, drawn in first instance from the opposing-counsel firm's published prior work.

The institutional dialogue is, additionally, a matter of named and dated record. On March 29, 2022, Connecticut Bar Association Continuing Legal Education program EWL220329 ('Jennifer's Law: Its Impact on ROs, Divorces, and Family Law Cases') was held by the Connecticut Bar Institute, Inc. The program's published faculty biographies confirm that Aidan R. Welsh, a named partner of the petitioner's law firm of record, personally delivered the program's 5:00–5:10 PM 'Introductions,' and that Diana — then the immediate predecessor to his CAJ-Family elevation twelve months later — delivered the 6:25–6:50 PM session on judicial expectations at TRO hearings and trials [25]. The record of personal co-presentation between a named partner of the petitioner's law firm and the judicial officer who would subsequently author the procedural framework now applied against the author is documented in primary source materials. The current Secretary of the CBA Family Law Section, per the section's own 2025–2026 officer listing, is Molly C. Miller — counsel of record for the petitioner in the present matter [26].

The conjunction is the issue. Considered separately, no single element of the architecture above would compel disqualification under Code of Judicial Conduct Rule 2.11(a)(1). Considered together, however, the four-axis conjunction — the procedural framework being applied is the author's, the framework's scholarly foundation cites the opposing-firm partner's prior work, the judicial author was personally introduced at a continuing-education program by another opposing-firm partner, and the bar section in ongoing administrative dialogue with the CAJ-Family currently has as its Secretary the opposing-counsel-of-record in the present matter — meets the reasonable-perception threshold the Rule was framed to capture. The empirical record on the dissolution docket is consistent with the structural concern: the author has been denied PL alimony for the 130-plus-day separation period; the subpoenas the author filed to test the petitioner's financial disclosures were denied in fifteen-of-fifteen tranches; and the petitioner has, on the bench's own JDNO Notice #4 record, defaulted on the same § A(6) framework the author is seeking to enforce, with no sanctions response from the bench prior to the author's own Motion in Limine.

5. STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE CONNECTICUT FAMILY BENCH

5.1 *Dataset and Methods*

A 113,162-case dataset spanning all nine Connecticut judicial districts of the Family Division, comprising 3,446,855 docket entries and 174,661 individual grant/deny rulings, was assembled from the Connecticut Judicial Branch civilinquiry.jud.ct.gov public look-up system through a two-phase enumeration: an exhaustive two-letter-prefix party-name sweep across all 676 two-letter prefixes per judicial district (yielding the docket census), followed by docket-level extraction of metadata, entries, and party-attorney information. Data through March 14, 2026, with gap-fill operations through March 19, 2026, and SHA-256-certified preservation March 20, 2026. After case-type and procedural-entry exclusions the analyzable Stamford Judicial-District subset comprises 8,402 cases across 72 named judges.

Per-judge grant/deny ratios were tested against the population baseline using the Pearson chi-squared goodness-of-fit test, the odds ratio with Haldane-Anscombe continuity correction, and the two-sided Z-test on the log-odds ratio. For low-cell-frequency subsets the Fisher exact test (two-tailed) was substituted. All grant-rate findings were validated against a restricted subset limited to F00 (Dissolution of Marriage) and F40 (Custody Application) case types, controlling for case-type composition.

5.2 *Departures from Random Judge Assignment*

The Connecticut Judicial Branch's case-management policy contemplates allocation of matters to judges in proportion to judicial availability. The dataset permits a test of randomness in assignment by comparing observed per-judge case counts for matters represented by a given law firm against the expected counts under independent random allocation. For matters in which the firm Schoonmaker, George, Blomberg, Bryniczka & Welsh, P.C. (CT Juris No. 412222) — the petitioner's counsel in the present case — appears of record at the Stamford Judicial District, the Pearson chi-squared statistic is $\chi^2 = 141.50$ ($p < 10^{-12}$) after conservative exclusion of Family Support Magistrate entries, procedural 'by the court' / 'by the clerk' notations, and case-type categories assigned exclusively by the court (F70 foreign matrimonial judgments and F72 UCCJEA registrations). The same firm produces the highest chi-squared statistic of any firm tested in every time window, exceeding the next-most-non-random firm by a factor of 1.6

to 1.9. The non-random assignment finding survives the F00/F40 restriction.

5.3 Favorable Outcome Rates

Conditional on the non-random-assignment subset, observed favorable-order rates for movant-side relief sought by the same firm exceed the corresponding baseline. At the Stamford Judicial District the firm achieves an order-favorable rate of 83.4 percent against a district baseline of 74.2 percent (OR = 1.75, $p < 10^{-8}$). The differential is robust to exclusion of ORDER-type entries (81.4 percent vs. 75.3 percent, $p = 0.00013$) and to F00/F40 restriction (OR = 1.21, $p = 0.004$ over the ten-year window). Statewide pooled analysis yields OR = 1.20 with $p = 0.0037$. The time-windowed ratio is accelerating (1.50 → 1.54 → 1.75 across the ten-year, five-year, and three-year windows).

5.4 Convergence — Over-Assigned Judges

The most precise test of the relationship between non-random assignment and favorable outcome separates order rulings by whether the ruling judge is one of the judges to whom the firm is over-assigned. The firm's order-favorable premium from over-assigned judges, F00/F40-restricted, is +7.5 percentage points (OR = 1.53, $p = 0.00009$); from other judges it is +1.7 percentage points (not significant). The ten-year window yields +8.0 percentage points, OR = 1.589, $p = 0.000022$. Four of six over-assigned judges produce individually significant firm-favorable advantages; the methodology also identifies judges where the firm's outcomes are below baseline, establishing the test's directional sensitivity.

5.5 The Representation Inversion

Order-favorable rates for the same firm differ by represented status of the opposing party in a direction opposite to that predicted by a quality-of-representation hypothesis. The firm's order-favorable rate is 85.8 percent against represented opposing parties and 73.5 percent against pro se opposing parties — a 12.3-percentage-point swing in the opposite direction from the firm's peers. Auxiliary motion-pattern metrics indicate the firm files denial-heavy motions against pro se opponents at 2.7 times the per-case rate against represented opponents (1.18 per case vs. 0.43 per case). The inversion is consistent with an institutional-relationship explanation that disfavors a quality-of-argument explanation.

5.6 Protective-Order Patterns at the Stamford Judicial District

Civil temporary-restraining-order and protective-order activity at the Stamford Judicial District exhibits anomalous patterns across every metric tested. The Stamford dissolution-TRO rate is 3.4 times the pooled non-Stamford district rate (OR = 3.98, $p < 10^{-8}$). The Stamford district has 607 dissolution cases with five or more TRO events (5.3 percent of all Stamford dissolution cases) against 525 such cases across all other Connecticut judicial districts combined (0.5 percent), yielding OR = 10.81.

Timing is inverted relative to other Connecticut districts: the Stamford same-day TRO rate is 3.2 percent against a non-Stamford average of 19.6 percent; the Stamford within-thirty-day rate is 8.1 percent against a non-Stamford average of 26.1 percent; and the Stamford median number of days from case filing to first TRO is 365 days against 229 days statewide. Fifty percent of Stamford TROs are filed more than one year into the dissolution case. The petitioner's counsel achieves a TRO-grant rate of 90.3 percent at Stamford — the highest of any major firm operating in the district.

The civil-TRO pattern at Stamford is not mirrored in the criminal-enforcement record: the Stamford criminal restraining-order violation rate is 2.17 percent against a pooled non-Stamford rate of 3.18 percent (OR = 0.674, $p < 10^{-8}$), and the Stamford domestic-violence charge rate is the lowest of any district in the dataset at 5.82 percent. The civil-TRO apparatus at the Stamford Judicial District operates independently of, rather than in parallel to, the criminal-enforcement apparatus that would be expected to co-occur with a genuinely higher rate of domestic-violence incidents.

5.7 Cross-District Validation

A complementary subset comprising twenty-two matters of the same firm at the Danbury Judicial District — a district in which the firm has no comparable institutional history — yields an order-favorable rate of 73.2 percent against a district baseline of 73.5 percent (OR = 0.98, not significant) and a randomly-distributed judge assignment ($p = 0.81$). The result eliminates a quality-of-representation hypothesis: the same firm performs at baseline in a district without the institutional preconditions that obtain at Stamford. Detailed contingency tables, per-judge counts, and reproducibility scripts are tabulated in the underlying working paper of the present author [19].

6. DISCUSSION

The findings document four distinct categories of disclosure failure with respect to a single publicly-traded U.S. issuer: (i) a 44-day Form 144 delinquency for cumulative April 2026 dispositions of \$656,733 by the senior disclosable insider; (ii) a 1,786-day gap in Schedule 13D/G beneficial-ownership reporting by an aggregated family group whose own founding documentation establishes the aggregation; (iii) a 1,840-day omission of the related-party-transaction schedules from the proxy mailings circulated to non-founder shareholders ahead of the SPAC merger; and (iv) an April 2026 Theory-9-pattern insider-trading cluster spanning seven insiders in the family network, totaling negative 384,209 shares for approximately \$3.65 million across the seventeen trading days bracketing the issuer's April 28, 2026 disclosure of materially adverse FY2026 guidance.

In parallel, the family's controlling-block ownership of an issuer raided by federal agents for child labor and the family's leasing-company subsidiary's August 2024 settlement of a California Civil Rights Department complaint over domestic-violence-victim eviction practices coexist with the family's pursuit, through the Connecticut family-court system, of restraining-order procedure against a household member whose conduct toward the parties' minor children the court has expressly found not to be harmful and whom the state child-protection agency has unsubstantiated as to every allegation reviewed.

7. REGULATORY SUBMISSIONS FILED BY THE AUTHOR

The author has, on his own initiative and in his personal capacity, filed: six supplemental whistleblower submissions to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission Office of the Whistleblower under the Tip, Complaint, and Referral framework; two supplemental submissions to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service under the Form 211 whistleblower program; comprehensive submissions to the Ontario Securities Commission and the British Columbia Securities Commission; a complaint to the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board concerning audit-committee independence and certification reliability; and tier-one and tier-two federal political-corruption referrals (U.S. Department of Justice Public Integrity Section, U.S. Federal Election Commission, New York Attorney General, California Fair Political Practices Commission).

8. LIMITATIONS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author is the respondent in dissolution proceedings against a member of the controlling family and the principal whistleblower of record. The work product was developed while concurrently subject to a temporary restraining order, a GPS-monitoring condition imposed by a parallel criminal-process tribunal, homelessness, and the active pursuit of sanctions by the family's counsel for the volume of filings catalogued herein. The author has eligibility for the SEC, OSC, BCSC, IRS, and CRA whistleblower bounty programs corresponding to the submissions described in § 7. All factual claims rest on publicly-available documents or on the certified court record. Statistical claims in § 5 are reproducible from the Connecticut Judicial Branch public-docket data.

9. CONCLUSION

The case study demonstrates that contemporary U.S. capital-markets disclosure obligations — Section 13(d)/13(g), Rule 144, and proxy-transaction-schedule mailings — can be allowed to remain unmet for periods measured in years against a single issuer whose controlling-family network is otherwise well-disclosed in its individual components. The case study additionally documents the simultaneous use of family-court restraining-order procedure against a household member whose conduct toward the parties' minor children the issuing court has expressly found non-harmful. The convergence of these two fact-patterns under a single family-name presents a case study with implications for capital-markets enforcement priority, family-court procedural fairness, and the institutional posture of state judicial branches toward statistically-anomalous outcome distributions raised by self-represented parties.

REFERENCES.

- [1] Glass House Brands Inc. Form 40-F, fiscal year 2025. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, EDGAR system. Available at: <https://www.sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar?action=getcompany&CIK=0001848731>.
- [2] Glass House Brands Inc. SEDI insider-transaction history, April 1 – May 7, 2026. Canadian Securities Administrators, System for Electronic Disclosure by Insiders. Available at: <https://www.sedi.ca>.
- [3] Glass House Brands Inc. Form 6-K, filed April 29, 2026. Disclosure of FY2026 guidance reductions, warrant redemption notice, and Vireo joint-venture reference. EDGAR system.

- [4] DocuSign Envelope ID E20E0E70-9DCB-4E5D-9665-EDED90003CD1. Glass House Brands Inc. founding documentation, Exhibit B (Founders).
- [5] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Rule 144 under the Securities Act of 1933, 17 C.F.R. § 230.144.
- [6] U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, Sections 13(d) and 13(g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C. §§ 78m(d), 78m(g); Schedules 13D and 13G filing obligations.
- [7] EDGAR accession 0001104659-21-125828, Exhibit 99.70. Glass House Brands Inc. proxy materials, mailed May 6, 2021.
- [8] U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Press release, July 10, 2025. ICE worksite-enforcement operation at Glass House Farms, Camarillo and Carpinteria facilities.
- [9] California Civil Rights Department. Public-record file, August 2024 settlement, Beach Front Property Management Inc., California Government Code § 12955.
- [10] U.S. House Committee on Oversight and Accountability. Released documents, November 2025, Epstein-related correspondence collection.
- [11] Connecticut Superior Court, Judicial District of Stamford-Norwalk at Stamford. *Rosenwald v. Rosenwald*, Docket No. FST-FA26-6078292-S; FA26-5033659; FA26-5033652; FA26-5033792; FA26-5033793.
- [12] Connecticut Judicial Branch e-Services public-docket system. Statewide case-level and docket-level data, all nine judicial districts, scraped April – May 2026 (113,162 cases; 3,446,855 docket entries; 174,661 grant/deny rulings).
- [13] Certified Transcript of Proceedings, March 4, 2026, before Hon. Vikki Cooper, J., Connecticut Superior Court, Stamford. Certified by Court Recording Monitor.
- [14] Certified Transcript of Proceedings, May 13, 2026, before Hon. Jennifer DeCastro-Tunnard, J., Connecticut Superior Court, Stamford. Certified by Sarah F. Siladi, Court Recording Monitor, May 14, 2026.
- [15] Certified Transcript of Proceedings, May 19, 2026, before Hon. Ronald E. Kowalski II, P.J. Family Division, Connecticut Superior Court, Stamford. Certified by Melanie Pinto, Court Recording Monitor, May 20, 2026.
- [16] Greenwich, Connecticut Land Records. Mortgage release, Volume 8492, Page 193, recorded October 2, 2025.
- [17] California Secretary of State, business-entity filings. Beach Front Properties LLC and Beach Front Property Management Inc.
- [18] Connecticut Practice Book, § 4-2 (Certification of Verification on Pleadings, Motions, and Other Filings).
- [19] Rosenwald, A. (2026). Consolidated Statistical Analysis of Case Assignment, Judicial Outcomes, and Protective-Order Activity — Schoonmaker, George, Blomberg, Bryniczka & Welsh, P.C., Judicial District of Stamford/Norwalk and Statewide Comparison. Working paper (Document ID AR-SGA-2026-0317A), data through March 14, 2026 with verification re-run March 20, 2026; SHA-256-certified preserved archive.
- [20] *Hazelwood School District v. United States*, 433 U.S. 299 (1977) — chi-square methodology for testing observed-versus-expected distributions in institutional analysis.
- [21] *Castaneda v. Partida*, 430 U.S. 482 (1977) — accepted statistical methodology for measuring departures from expected institutional distribution.
- [22] Certified Transcript of Proceedings, May 19, 2026, before Hon. Ronald E. Kowalski II, P.J. Family, Connecticut Superior Court, Stamford-Norwalk, certified by Melanie Pinto, Court Recording Monitor, May 20, 2026, at Tr. 17:1 – 23:25 (Regional Family Trial Docket referral discussion) and Tr. 37:1-9 (May 27, 2026 hearing scope).
- [23] Harvey, A.J., Bozzuto, E.A., Albis, M.A., Ficeto, A.M., & Diana, L.V. (2025). Docket Management in Family Law Cases: The Connecticut Pathways Experience. *Journal of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers*, Vol. 38, Article 3, pp. 61-79. https://www.aaml.org/wp-content/uploads/38_Article-3.pdf. Documents the multi-year (2019-2024) consultation process, the at-least-seven CBA-Family-Law-Section meetings, and the 'five day' to 'five business days' Practice Book amendment.
- [24] Schoonmaker, S.V. IV (2020). How the Judiciary Has Driven Systemic Innovation During the Pandemic. *Family Law Quarterly*, 55(1), 87-111. Cited as foundational scholarly authority at footnote 1 of Harvey et al. (2025) — reference 23 above.
- [25] Connecticut Bar Institute, Inc. (2022, March 29). CBA CLE Program EWL220329: Jennifer's Law — Its Impact on ROs, Divorces, and Family Law Cases. Program materials and faculty biographies. <https://www.ctbar.org/docs/default-source/education/materials/2021-2022-materials/ewl220329-jennifer-s-law-final-materials.pdf>. Pages 6-8 document Aidan R. Welsh personally introducing Hon. Leo V. Diana at 5:00–5:10 PM and Diana's 6:25–6:50 PM session.
- [26] Connecticut Bar Association Family Law Section, 2025-2026 Officer Listing. <https://www.ctbar.org/members/sections-and-committees/sections/family-law>. Accessed May 21, 2026. Lists Molly C. Miller (Schoonmaker George Blomberg Bryniczka & Welsh PC) as current Secretary of the Section.
- [27] Connecticut Code of Judicial Conduct, Rule 2.11(a)(1) (disqualification of judge whose impartiality might reasonably be questioned).

Manuscript prepared 2026-05-21 · Doc ID: AR-PAPER-20260521-glasshouse · Preprint may be cited as: Rosenwald, A. (2026). A Forensic Case Study of Related-Party Disclosure Failures, Insider-Trading Pattern, and Concurrent Family-Court Proceedings in the Rosenwald–Glass House Brands Network (2018–2026). A.R. Pro Se Strategic Operations Working Paper Series, Vol. 1, No. 1.