FINAL WRITTEN DETERMINATION

Name of Decision Makers:

District Sexual Harassment Case No.: 2025-10

Date of Final Determination: January 30, 2025

Name of Complainant: Natasha Romanoff

Name of Respondent: Loki Odison

A. IDENTIFICATION OF ALLEGATIONS

Complainant N.R. alleged that Respondent L.O., followed her, sent her unwelcome text messages, and posted untrue statements on social media about Respondent's sexual interaction with Complainant.

Specifically, Complainant alleged Respondent waited for her after Complainant's classes and followed her to her next class. At one point, Complainant alleged that Respondent attempted to have his schedule changed so he had all the same classes as Complainant. Complainant alleged that Respondent followed her home in his car and sat in his car outside her house for hours. Most recently, Complainant alleged that Respondent blocked her car with his car when she was trying to leave the parking lot and would not move until the School Resource Officer approached him.

Complainant also reported that Respondent sent her text messages saying she looks good when he is not anywhere in the vicinity; telling her she is a "slut" and a "whore"; and telling her that if she does not date him, he will commit suicide.

Finally, Complainant alleged that Respondent posted numerous social media posts, on TikTok and Snapchat primarily, about his supposed relationship with Complainant, despite the fact that they are not in a relationship. Complainant alleged that the social media posts included statements about sexual interactions between Complainant and Respondent that Complainant stated are not true. Complainant alleged Respondent showed these posts to other students during school.

B. PROCEDURAL STEPS

1. Formal Complaint

Complainant reported her concerns about Respondent to her Counselor at Avenger High School on November 29, 2025, who then notified the school principal. Avenger High School Principal contacted the District's Title IX Coordinator that same day and the Title IX Coordinator met with Complainant in person the following day, November 30, 2025, and explained the Title IX process. Complainant filed a Formal Complaint on December 1, 2025.[1]

2. Supportive Measures

Complainant was offered a safety plan, which was implemented on December 1, 2025. The safety plan ensured that Respondent and Complainant would not be in any of the same classes throughout the rest of the school year. Also, Complainant may visit with the counselor whenever she feels she is unsafe. Respondent was also offered counselor services and both parties have been given the option to do online school if they preferred. Both parties declined online school.

3. Notice of Allegations

The Title IX Coordinator sent both parties the Notice of the Allegations on December 2, 2025. The Notice included Complainant's specific allegations, and: a statement that there is a presumption the Respondent is not responsible unless and until the evidence supports a finding of responsibility; information regarding the process, including an appointment of an impartial Investigator without bias towards or against either party; a statement that a preponderance of the evidence standard will be applied; directives to the Respondent not to retaliate; and information about and offer of the Informal Resolution Process.

4. Notice of Interviews

The Investigator(s) provided Notice of Interview to Complainant on December 3, 2025. The Notice included the date, time, and location of the interview; the purpose of the interview; the participants expected to be at the interview; a provision that the Complainant may bring an advisor or attorney; and a provision that the Complainant bring any documents, evidence, or other information the Complainant would like the Investigator to consider.

The Investigator(s) provided Notice of Interview to Respondent on December 3, 2025. The Notice included the date, time, and location of the interview; the purpose of the interview; the participants expected to be at the interview; a provision that the Respondent may bring an advisor or attorney; and a directive that the Respondent bring any documents, evidence, or other information the Respondent would like the Investigator to consider.

[1] **Training Tip:** Had Complainant filed a police report, which, in this scenario, she did not, there would be a section here about the law enforcement investigation. Be sure to include that the Title IX Coordinator regularly followed up with law enforcement to minimize delay of the District's investigation.

5. Interviews

Complainant
Complainant was interviewed for the first time on December 6, 2025, from 9:00 a.m. to 10:15 a.m. The interview took place at Avenger High School. The following individuals were present: Complainant, Complainant's mother Melina Vostokoff, and Investigator Nick Fury. Investigator Fury took notes of the interviews which have been provided to both parties and to the Decision-Maker/s for review.

Respondent
Respondent was interviewed for the first time on December 6, 2025, from 10:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. at Avenger High School. The following individuals were present: Respondent, Respondent's father Oden Asgaard, and Investigator Nick Fury. Investigator Fury took notes of the interviews which have been provided to both parties and to the Decision-Maker/s for review.

Witnesses
Investigator Fury interviewed the following witnesses between December 9 and December 15, 2025:

- Tony Stark (TS), Student
- Pepper Potts (PP), Student
- Bruce Banner (BB), Student
- Thor Odison (TO), Student
- Peter Quill (PQ), Student
- Mary Jane Watson (MJW), Student
- James Rhoes (JR), School Resource Officer
- Scott Lang (SL), Teacher
- Hope Pym (HP), Counselor

The witnesses were interviewed between December 9 through December 15, 2025, except for MJW, who was interviewed on January 4. The witnesses' interviews were not recorded and witnesses did not write statements. Investigator Fury took notes of the interviews and those notes have been provided to both parties and to the Decision-Maker/s for review.

6. Method of Gathering Evidence

Between December 6 and December 15, 2025, Investigator Fury gathered evidence through interviews, a review of school security cameras, review of schedules and grades, collection and review of the following documents from the parties: text messages, TikTok video posted by Respondent on September 25, 2025; screenshot of snapchat post by Respondent on October 10, 2025; and Complainant's Instagram account post from October 15, 2025.

7. Production of Evidence

Evidence and summaries of interviews with witnesses was shared by the Investigator with the parties on December 18, 2025. Each party had ten (10) days to respond to the evidence.[2] Complainant responded by submitting additional screenshots of messages between Complainant and herself; Respondent requested that an additional witness, MJW, be interviewed. The Investigator interviewed MJW and included a summary of that interview in this Report. The Investigator also reviewed the screenshots of messages submitted by Complainant and included those screenshots and a description in this Report.

8. Submission of Investigative Report to Parties and Decision Makers

On January 10, 2026, the Investigator submitted a Final Investigative Report to the Title IX Coordinator for distribution to the parties and the Decision- Maker/s. The Title IX Coordinator sent the Final Investigative Report to both parties on January 11, 2026, with a notice that both parties had ten days to submit questions to each other and to any witness. The notice also included an explanation of the procedures for the remainder of the process. Neither party submitted questions for the other party.

On January 25, 2026 the Decision-Maker/s completed this Final Written Determination.

C. FINDINGS OF FACT

Undisputed Facts

1. Both students are 11th grade students at Avenger High School.
2. Complainant and Respondent had a short romantic relationship in the summer before 11th grade.
3. Complainant broke up with Respondent sometime in the summer before 11th grade.
4. While Complainant and Respondent were together in the summer before 11th grade, they sent mutually friendly texts to each other.

[2] Parties were given additional days to respond to the evidence because of Christmas break, which began December 18, 2025. School resumed January 3, 2026.

5. After the parties broke up, Respondent sent text messages to Complainant, some of which included statements suggesting Respondent would kill himself if Complainant did not respond to his messages in a more timely manner. It is disputed whether Respondent was serious or kidding in those messages.

6. At the beginning of 11th grade, Complainant and Respondent had two classes together.

7. Around October, Complainant switched her classes so she no longer had any classes with Respondent.

8. Respondent posted a TikTok video in mid-October where Respondent sang a song about Complainant, including making a vague reference to having sexual intercourse with the Complainant.

9. Both parties agreed that Respondent posted a SnapChat with a picture of the two of them and a caption stating, "Best. Fuck. Ever."

10. Both parties agreed that Respondent sent Complainant "one or two" text messages where Respondent called Complainant sexually offensive names. Complainant alleged there were more than two, but could not remember how many and deleted the texts when she read them.

11. It is undisputed that a post appeared on Complainant's Instagram account showing a picture of Complainant having oral sex with the caption, "I love this shit." Respondent's friend admitted to hacking into Complainant's account and posting this picture. Neither Respondent nor Complainant were aware of this confession prior to this investigation.

12. Both parties agree that Complainant was blocked in by Respondent's car, but it is disputed as to whether Respondent intentionally blocked Complainant or if Respondent's car stalled right behind Complainant's car.

Disputed Facts

1. Respondent claims that the parties had sex. Complainant denies that parties had sex.

   Finding: We find that it is more likely than not that Complainant had sex with Respondent one time when they were dating in the summer before their 11th grade year. Complainant's best friend P.P. reported to the counselor H.P. that Complainant had sex with Respondent. P.P. had no reason to make this information up, and was worried about reporting it at all because Complainant asked her not to. Also, Respondent's brother T.O. and best friend P.Q. reported Respondent told them that Respondent had sex with Complainant immediately after it happened. Respondent does not claim they had sex more than once.

2. Complainant said that Respondent sent her texts obsessively after they broke up and he threatened to kill himself if she didn't respond; Respondent said that he sent Complainant texts because he wanted to be friends after the break-up and was only kidding about killing himself.

   Finding: We find that Respondent did send Complainant dozens of texts after they broke up between August and November but that Complainant responded to most of the texts without any indication that she was bothered, annoyed, intimidated, or scared. We also find that Respondent did make vague references to killing himself. But based on his own and B.B.'s statement, he was not actually suicidal and would not have carried out this threat. Regardless of whether he intended to kill himself, we find the threats genuinely concerned Complainant.

3. Complainant alleged Respondent posted untrue statements that they had sex online, both through a TikTok video and a SnapChat post.

   Finding: We find that Respondent's social media posts in which he implied or stated outright that he and Complainant had sex were not untrue statements based on the Finding #1 that Complainant and Respondent did actually have sex.

4. Complainant said that Respondent followed her often at school and would not leave her alone. Respondent said that at the beginning of the school year he had two classes with Complainant and even after Respondent checked out of those classes, they still had classes that were near each other and he just happened to be in the same hallway with Complainant.

   Finding: We find, upon a review of the parties' class schedules, that Respondent did in fact have classes in the same part of the school that Complainant did. We also find it more likely than not, based on Respondent's admission of how much he liked Complainant, that Respondent tried to wait for Complainant and/or be near her as they were both walking to class. This finding is also somewhat supported by the school security camera footage.

5. Complainant states that the stalking was so bad she decided not to try out for volleyball to avoid Respondent. Respondent contends this was not the reason Complainant did not try out for volleyball.

   Finding: We find that Complainant decided not to try out for volleyball because her parents wanted Complainant to focus on the piano, and not because Complainant was worried about Respondent stalking her. We find, based on reports by P.P. and M.J.W., that Complainant had decided to not try out for volleyball before Complainant even knew Respondent.

6. Complainant said that Respondent hacked her Instagram account and posted a manipulated picture of her giving oral sex; Respondent said he did not do this and that he does not know how to hack an Instagram account.

   Finding: We find, based on P.Q.'s admission that he was the one who hacked into Complainant's account, that Respondent did not hack into Complainant's Instagram account.

7. Complainant alleged that Respondent followed her and once blocked her car in the school parking lot; Respondent said he did not intentionally block her car, but his car stalled behind hers.

   Finding: We find that Respondent's car did not stall, but rather, more likely than not, Respondent did in fact park his car behind Complainant. Neither Respondent's brother or best friend could confirm that Respondent's car had a tendency to stall and both T.O. and P.Q had been in Respondent's car several times.

D. CONCLUSIONS RE: APPLICATION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

The allegations in the Formal Complaint most closely align with the following marked definition of sexual harassment:

_____ quid pro quo sexual harassment
_____ severe, pervasive, and objectively offensive conduct that deprives Complainant of equal access to educational opportunities
_____ sexual assault
__x__ stalking
_____ dating violence
_____ domestic violence

We conclude that Respondent did not violate [School District's Sexual Harassment Policy ABCD] by engaging in stalking for the following reasons:

"Stalking" is defined in the Policy [ABCD] as "engaging in a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of others or suffer substantial emotional distress." The Policy also defines "course of conduct" as "two or more acts, including, but not limited to, acts in which the stalker directly, indirectly, or through third parties, by any action, method, device, or means, follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to or about, a person, or interferes with a person's property." And finally, "substantial emotional distress" means "significant mental suffering or anguish that may, but does not necessarily require medical or other professional treatment or counseling."

We conclude that Respondent engaged in several identifiable acts that Complainant believed to be stalking, namely: text messages, following Complainant, posting on social media about their relationship, and blocking Complainant's car with his own. However, we conclude that none of these acts would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety or cause emotional distress. Nothing Respondent texted or posted was threatening to Complainant's physical well-being and following Complainant in school, when he could have been going to his own classes near Complainant's, was also not physically threatening. There is insufficient evidence to suggest that Complainant suffered substantial emotional distress by Respondent's actions. There is very little evidence to suggest Complainant suffered emotional distress at all. Her grades did not drop, she continued to go to school and remain socially active, neither Complainant's best friend nor her boyfriend reported noticing that Complainant seemed distressed, and Complainant never spoke to her counselor about her concerns until Respondent blocked her car in the parking lot. Also, Complainant's assertion that she didn't try out for volleyball because of Respondent is not supported by the evidence. We conclude that the totality of the evidence does not support that Complainant had significant mental suffering or anguish.

For the reasons stated above, we conclude that Respondent did not sexually harass Complainant by stalking her.

E. DETERMINATION REGARDING RESPONSIBILITY

We determine that Respondent is not responsible for sexual harassment under [School District Policy ABCD] and Section 106.45 of the Title IX regulations.

F. RECOMMENDED DISCIPLINARY SANCTIONS

We recommend that Respondent receive no disciplinary action for his conduct. Rather, we recommend that Respondent should be offered counseling to help him develop more appropriate social skills. We also recommend that Respondent's administrator caution Respondent against blocking cars in the parking lot with his car.

G. REMEDIES TO RESTORE OR PRESERVE EQUAL ACCESS

We recommend that Complainant's and Respondent's schedules are adjusted so that they do not have shared classes or classes near each other, to the extent the latter can be controlled. We also recommend Complainant and Respondent continue to visit with their respective school counselors to address future concerns with each other.

H. PROCEDURES FOR APPEAL

Either party is entitled to appeal this Determination to the Title IX Coordinator within five (5) business days of receiving this Determination. A party will be granted an appeal by the Superintendent if the requesting party presents evidence of procedural irregularity that affected the outcome of the matter; presents new evidence that was not reasonable available at the time the determination was made that could affect the outcome of the matter; or the Title IX Coordinator, Investigator(s) or Decision-Maker/s members have conflicts of interest or bias for or against the requesting party such that it affected the outcome of the matter. The Superintendent may grant the requesting party an appeal on additional bases in the Superintendent's discretion. If an appeal is granted, both parties will be given reasonable, equal opportunity to submit a written statement in support of, or challenging the outcome. Upon review of the written statements, the Superintendent will issue a Written Decision describing the result of the appeal and the rationale for the result and will provide the Written Decision simultaneously to both parties. The Written Decision on the appeal will take one of the following three positions: Affirm the Determination; Repeal the Determination; or Remand the Determination.

/s/_____ _____

Decision-Maker/s Date