

MITCH SNOW

What he told the courts. What he told the public. What does not line up.

Case: Harpole v. Owens, No. 3:26-cv-00556 (M.D. Tenn.) · **Prepared:** 9 September 2026 · osint-desk

Sources: 49 docket entries through Dkt 42 · 1,827 archived X posts · 16 recorded appearances · 21 podcast episodes · 2 GiveSendGo platform snapshots

AT A GLANCE

#	The question	Verdict	The one line that decides it
1	Did he watch Owens before Dec 2025?	DIRECT CONTRADICTION	Swore "I had not watched episodes of her program." Said on camera: "I've watched Candace Owens a few times."
2	Does he hold photos of the people at Fort Huachuca?	MISLED THE PUBLIC	Told the public he had HD zoom shots of license plates. Told an interviewer his phones were in a surrendered backpack: "No, I wish I had."
3	Did he accuse Harpole of involvement in a killing?	IRRECONCILABLE	Swore he never did. Published: "Statute of limitations on conspiracy to murder are forever" and "blood on their hands."
4	Did he want the fundraiser money?	IRRECONCILABLE	11 July: "we humbly accept." 18 July: "We are not asking." 6 Sept: wanted refunds "from first notice until now."
5	Where is the \$151,932?	NOT A CONTRADICTION	No recipient ever registered on the campaign, in two snapshots. On 8 Jan 2026, \$138,864.70 sat unpaid. He was telling the truth.
6	Who contacted whom on 8 Dec 2025?	SNOW WAS RIGHT	The plaintiff's brief says Snow initiated. The plaintiff's own complaint says "Owens phoned Snow."
7	What has the court heard about the phones?	OMISSION	Nothing, in three sworn declarations. Meanwhile: "Good luck trying to litigate a treasure hunt."
8	Will he hand the material over if a court orders it?	DEFIANCE OF COURT	On a livestream four days after he was served: "I ain't giving it up to nobody. Not even a - not even a court." He also says a lawyer had already told him he would have to produce it.

How to read the verdicts. **Direct contradiction** means two statements that cannot both be true, one of them sworn. **Misled the public** means a public statement that is false, or literally true but built to leave a false impression. **Irreconcilable** means public statements that cannot stand together, without a sworn falsehood. **Omission** means something material the court has never been told, which is not perjury. **Defiance of court** means a stated refusal to comply, made while the case was live. Entries 5 and 6 clear him, and are included because a file that only argues one way breaks the first time it is tested.

Every quotation is verbatim. Court quotations were checked against the filed page image, not the OCR layer. Post quotations come from a 1,827-post archive of @Ft_Banana_Snow captured 6 September 2026, and each carries its permalink. Full exhibits and page images are in the companion document, SNOW_REPORT.pdf.

CONTRADICTION 1

DIRECT CONTRADICTION

Did he watch Candace Owens before December 2025?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
"Before Candace Owens discussed my circumstances on Episode 277 of her program on December 9, 2025, I had not watched episodes of her program." <i>Sworn declaration, Dkt 39 para. 3, filed 31 Aug 2026, under penalty of perjury</i>	Owens, quoting his call of the night before, on air: "He said, You know, I watch your stuff and I can't believe that you got this email." <i>Candace Ep 277, 9 Dec 2025 - youtube.com/watch?v=t4U7NjnUEgc</i> Snow, in his own voice, describing the same moment: "And you know, I've watched Candace Owens a few times. You know, she's great lady." <i>Diligent Denizen interview, 10 Jan 2026 - youtube.com/watch?v=XcY_R0qWRo0</i>	Both statements cannot be true. He swore on 31 August that he had not watched her program. Seven months earlier he said on camera that he had watched it a few times, and eight months before that Owens quoted him saying the same thing on the day after their first call. This is the only sworn statement in the file flatly contradicted by his own recorded voice. The second source is not hearsay, not adversarial, and not ambiguous.

Fair caveat: a declarant might try to distinguish watching clips from watching "episodes." That defence is thin, because the purpose of paragraph 3 is to establish he came to Owens knowing nothing about her program or her disputes.

CONTRADICTION 2

MISLED THE PUBLIC

Does he hold photographs of the people he says were at Fort Huachuca?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
Three sworn declarations, forty paragraphs, filed across four weeks. The words photograph, image, video, recording, device, phone and metadata do not appear in any of them. <i>Dkt 34 (10 Aug), Dkt 39 (31 Aug), Dkt 42 (7 Sep 2026)</i> His account of what he did: "an observation, circumstances he found unusual, and an attempted later identification." <i>TPPA memorandum, Dkt 41 p. 7, 7 Sep 2026</i> Describes himself as "responding to an unsolicited source inquiry." <i>Reply brief, Dkt 38 p. 3, 31 Aug 2026</i>	"Photo. Video calls. Video. Architecture, lobby, dinning area, parking lot, vehicles, license plates, drones.... lots of background. Took all in HD. Lots of zoom." <i>X, 6 Jan 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2008338277217263995</i> "They took, searched my phones, returned them... Whats on images was caught naturally and unintrusively." <i>X, 2 Apr 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2039494460682424389</i> "I will release them at a time of my chosing at a time of most benefit to me and the nation... no man, no judge, no president can compel me." <i>X, 11 Jul 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2075800296069210276</i> Asked whether he holds pictures of Erika Kirk at the base: "Yes such pictures would be sensational... The photos you want are not what is needed." <i>X, 12 Aug 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2087500245966229527</i>	By his own account there is nothing to release. Asked directly whether he recorded the group or the vehicles, he answered: "No, I wish I had." He then explained both phones were "in the top flap of my my backpack, which they had me leave there" - inside the building he had just been removed from. He repeated it: "I didn't get to, I wish I'd record all this stuff." (<i>Diligent Denizen, 10 Jan 2026</i>) In May he was asked what made him capture images of the people: "there was nothing of intent for me to capture other people intentionally. It wasn't my purpose." The only encounter he describes is a near-collision in a hotel lobby the night before, not the meeting. (<i>Black Line Brief, 2 May 2026</i>) Owens defined the material on the broadcast itself: self-documentation, coffee, a directions video. "I can confirm everything with metadata. I obviously can't confirm that you saw who you say you saw." (<i>Ep 282, 18 Dec 2025</i>) He has never once said a photograph or clip shows Brian Harpole, Erika Kirk, the congressman, or anyone from the 9 September group. He has also never denied possession. Every answer defers.

The strongest finding in the file. It rests entirely on his own words in four separate settings and needs no adverse witness. Open item: on 31 July 2026 he released one image on air that he said he had never shown. That segment has not been verified.

CONTRADICTION 3

IRRECONCILABLE

Did he accuse Harpole of involvement in a killing?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
"I did not state that Brian Harpole attended an assassination-planning meeting, knew Charlie Kirk would be killed, participated in planning or carrying out a killing, or participated in a cover-up." <i>Sworn declaration, Dkt 42 para. 7, 7 Sep 2026. Note: the sentence carries no time limit</i> Lists five propositions Episode 282 contains no Snow statement of, and argues Owens's later conclusions "cannot automatically be attributed to Snow." <i>TPPA memorandum, Dkt 41 pp. 7-8, 7 Sep 2026</i>	"All photos and videos I took those days are for Mrs. Owens to use... Statute of limitations on conspiracy to murder are forever." <i>X, 24 Feb 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2026399879556370537</i> In a post whose subject is Harpole suing him: "the crazy people in this world who have blood on their hands are realizing their Judgement day is close." <i>X, 1 May 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2050248259390837086</i> Owens, quoting his 8 December call the next day: "I know how these meetings work. These are the meetings that are had ahead of an operation. Like when an operation is being confirmed, you have these final meetings..." <i>Candace Ep 277, 9 Dec 2025</i>	As to the broadcast, his sworn denial is accurate. Episode 282 contains the qualifier, the doppelganger, the 95-to-99 range, and his own limit: "I obviously didn't know what was going to happen the next 24 hours." The problem is everything after it. Between February and August 2026 he published the murder framing himself, in his own voice, with no Owens involved. His entire anti-SLAPP defence rests on separating his qualified tip from her conclusions. His own posts collapse that separation. The sworn sentence is not limited to the broadcast, so on its face it also covers the 8 December call - where Owens quotes him describing a pre-operation briefing.

The Owens quotation is hearsay. Its weight comes from timing: broadcast the day after the call, five months before any lawsuit, with no motive to invent it. "Operation" is not "assassination," so that strand is arguable. The February and May posts are not.

CONTRADICTION 4

IRRECONCILABLE

Did he want the fundraiser money?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
Did not request the fundraiser. Wrote to Owens's organisation on 19 Dec 2025 that he "could not accept the donations." Has "never received any proceeds." After suit, asked GiveSendGo to remove the fund from Owens's control, then "asked that the donations be returned to donors where possible." <i>Sworn declaration, Dkt 39 paras. 10-15, 31 Aug 2026</i>	"Amy and I have decided to accept the fundraiser by Candace Owens... The funds will be needed it seems. To bloody these people in court... If anyone else wants us donate, we humbly accept." <i>X, 11 Jul 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2075800296069210276</i> Seven days later: "I never asked for a dime... We are not asking. We are not begging for people to give us money." <i>X, 18 Jul 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2078349021064855765</i> "Ms. Owens has the GFM. She has our bank info. When she sends it, she sends it.... no, we have not recieved donations yet." <i>X, 21 Jul 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2079711478039609527</i> To a donor asking whether the funds ever reached him, six days after the sworn filing: "No. Not yet. ... I have elected from first notice until now to have the money returned to donors." <i>X, 6 Sep 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2096418879153291596</i>	The sworn version is not perjury. Refused in December, accepted in July when litigation costs became real, sought refunds in August once the chance to hire counsel had passed. Paragraphs 13 and 14 describe exactly that arc. Anyone claiming perjury here will lose. Two public statements fail. First: 11 July "we humbly accept" against 18 July "we are not asking," seven days apart, describing the same week. Second: "from first notice until now" is false on his own published record. On 11 July he accepted the fundraiser and solicited additional donations. He made that claim six days after swearing to a sequence that, stated correctly, would not support it.

Corroboration that cuts his way: Owens read his refusal email on air on 29 December 2025, and the platform record shows he has in fact never been paid. His refusal in December is real.

CONTRADICTION 5

NOT A CONTRADICTION

Where is the \$151,932, and did anyone ever collect it?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
"I have never received any proceeds from the GiveSendGo fundraiser referenced by Plaintiff." <i>Sworn declaration, Dkt 39 para. 12 and Dkt 42 para. 11</i> Asked GiveSendGo "to remove the fundraiser from Ms. Owens's control so that funds raised in my name could be properly administered." <i>Sworn declaration, Dkt 39 para. 13</i>	"She has our bank info. When she sends it, she sends it." <i>X, 21 Jul 2026</i> "No. Not yet." - answering a donor who asked directly whether the funds were sent to him. <i>X, 6 Sep 2026</i> Plaintiff's court filing records the fundraiser at \$150,422 as of 22 June 2026. <i>Preservation motion, Dkt 24 p. 5, 2 Jul 2026</i>	The platform record supports him. GiveSendGo campaign pages carry a recipient field. Across eleven control campaigns on two versions of the site, every campaign where anyone registered to receive funds shows a name. "For Mitch" shows null in both snapshots taken seven months apart. 8 Jan 2026 (archived): no recipient, and \$138,864.70 listed as "available for payout" - the entire net balance still sitting on the platform, untransferred. 9 Sep 2026 (live): still no recipient. \$151,932 raised. Donations closed by the owner's toggle. GiveSendGo's terms say funds go only to a verified recipient who has cleared identity, tax ID and bank verification. With no recipient, no transfer is possible. The raised total has also only ever risen, and the platform has said publicly that the total falls when refunds are issued - so no refunds have gone out either.

Limits: eleven controls on a single day. A recipient could in principle have been set, paid and later removed through support, and a pending invitation would also read null. The unverifiable window is 9 January to 9 September 2026. Only a subpoena to GiveSendGo closes it.

CONTRADICTION 6

SNOW WAS RIGHT

Who contacted whom on 8 December 2025?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
"I did not seek contact with Candace Owens or her organization. My first contact with Ms. Owens occurred when she contacted me after a member of her audience had referred me... I did not initiate that contact." <i>Sworn declaration, Dkt 39 paras. 7-8, and Dkt 42 para. 9</i>	Owens on air, the day after the call: "not even five minutes after this email hit my inbox, I was calling this person." <i>Candace Ep 277, 9 Dec 2025</i> Consistent across his January, April and May 2026 interviews: a friend emailed Owens after he had failed to interest two other shows. <i>Diligent Denizen 10 Jan; Black Line Brief 25 Apr and 2 May 2026</i>	Here it is the plaintiff's brief that does not line up, not Snow. Harpole's opposition says "On December 8, 2025, Snow initiated contact with Owens" and cites complaint paragraphs 127-128 for it. Those paragraphs say the opposite. Complaint para. 140: Owens "received an email from an unknown third-party recommending that Owens reach out and speak to Snow." Para. 141: "That evening, Owens phoned Snow." Para. 146: "Owens contacted Snow a second time" for the interview. Snow caught it himself and cited it by paragraph number in his own filing. Four independent sources agree with him, including the plaintiff's own pleading.

Why it probably happened: jurisdiction over Snow in Tennessee requires that Snow reached into Tennessee. Included here because anyone using this file must expect opposing counsel to lead with it.

CONTRADICTION 7

OMISSION

What has the court been told about the phones and photographs?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
Nothing. Across three sworn declarations and four briefs, the photographic material is never mentioned. <i>Dkt 32, 33, 34, 38, 39, 41, 42</i> The anti-SLAPP motion asks the court to dismiss on the basis that his account was a bare, qualified, good-faith observation. <i>Dkt 41, 7 Sep 2026</i>	"The phones are locked up in safety deposit." <i>X, 14 Jan 2026 - filed in court by plaintiff as Dkt 24-2</i> "I gave everything to Candace Owens." <i>X, 23 Apr 2026 - filed in court by plaintiff as Dkt 24-1</i> Original devices "sealed in plastic... faraday bags... water tight sealed box... bottom of a water channel 40 feet deep... Copies have been made. Dead drops set. Good luck trying to litigate a treasure hunt that will expire in 2028." <i>X, 13 Jul 2026 - x.com/Ft_Banana_Snow/status/2076536148265198054</i>	This is not perjury. A declaration limited to jurisdictional facts is not false for omitting what falls outside its scope, and Dkt 34 expressly limits itself that way. No question was put to him that he answered falsely. But the plaintiff went to court over exactly this. The preservation motion of 2 July quotes the two posts above by name and asks that the devices be preserved. Eleven days later Snow published the "treasure hunt" post. The motion has never been decided. Every judge in the Middle District of Tennessee recused on 8 July 2026 and no outside judge has been designated. Nobody has made him answer. Eleven days after the treasure-hunt post, and four days after he was served, he said the same thing out loud on a livestream and added a sentence the post does not contain. See Contradiction 8.

How much this matters depends on Contradiction 2. If there are no photographs of the group, the omission is venial. If there are, it is not.

CONTRADICTION 8

DEFIANCE OF COURT

Will he hand the material over if a court orders it?

WHAT HE TOLD THE COURT	WHAT HE TOLD THE PUBLIC	WHAT DOES NOT LINE UP
He is actively litigating. He asks the court to decide jurisdiction first and dismiss him, submits a proposed order for the judge to sign, requests his costs under Tenn. Code Ann. 20-17-107, and consented to electronic service of every filing. <i>Dkt 30 (consent, 3 Aug), Dkt 32 and 32-1, Dkt 41 and 41-1, 2026</i> Asks the court to limit discovery to his own Tennessee contacts and to defer merits discovery until jurisdiction is resolved. <i>Motion to dismiss, Dkt 32 p. 4, 10 Aug 2026</i> Nothing in any filing mentions the devices, the photographs, or their location. <i>Dkt 34, 39, 42 - three sworn declarations, forty paragraphs</i>	SNOW: "They think I'm kidding about putting the, you know, putting the phone and stuff in the uh in the river. All the phones and devices." HOST: "You put phones in a river?" SNOW: "Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah." <i>Livestream, 24 Jul 2026, approx. 3:24:19 - youtube.com/watch?v=mLIs1WL2Jhg</i> "Yes, it was Stu that made me overly apparent. We talked to him and he's just like, 'Yeah, don't put it in a safety deposit box or anything.'... So I'm like, 'Screw it. I'm just going to go for a dive.'... But yeah, no, we really did that.... we've got dead drops... I ain't giving it up to nobody. Not even a - not even a court." <i>Same stream, approx. 3:25:22-3:26:13. Stew Peters is on the panel</i> "So I was talking to a lawyer and they're like saying, 'Oh, you're gonna have to give it up.'" <i>Same stream, approx. 3:26:30</i> Answering a paying viewer who asked where the pictures were: "They're literally at the bottom of a river. I could give you guys great coordinates. It'll be fun watching you guys try."... "No, they're a river. It's a river."... "it's down river from Hanford. You know, figure it out." <i>Same stream, approx. 3:51:34-3:52:24</i>	He said this four days after he was served. The Franklin County Sheriff served him on 20 July 2026 (Dkt 29). This stream published 24 July 2026. He was a served defendant in a federal case when he said he would not give the material up to a court. He confirms it is not bravado. Asked directly, he answers "Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah," and later "we really did that." The 13 July post could be read as posturing. This cannot. He had already been told it was producible. A lawyer told him "you're gonna have to give it up." That goes directly to state of mind, which is what a spoliation finding turns on. He asks a court for relief while telling the public he will not obey it. In the same window he is asking that same court to dismiss him, to award him costs, and to sign his proposed order. The story also changed. On 14 January he said the phones were "locked up in safety deposit" - the post the plaintiff filed as Dkt 24-2 to justify a preservation order. Here he says Stew Peters talked him out of a safe deposit box and he dived instead.

Confirmed in two independently captioned cuts of the same stream: *alleytopfiles* (youtube.com/watch?v=7K3ctbit2oU, 4:20:13) and the *RealBayes* mirror (youtube.com/watch?v=mLIs1WL2Jhg, 4:07:06, 10,233 views). Timestamps are proportional estimates; captions carry no speaker labels, so watch 3:24-3:30 and 3:51-3:53 on the *RealBayes* cut before quoting in a filing. Whether the devices are literally in a river is unknown - the statement itself is the evidence. Full write-up: *notes/SNOW_RIVER_STATEMENT.md*