

Re: Michael Terrell posts may be forged

## Re: Michael Terrell posts may be forged

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.repair/2008-02/msg01447.html>

---

- *From:* "James Sweet" <[jamessweet@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jamessweet@xxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Tue, 26 Feb 2008 17:59:14 GMT
- 

"msg" <[msg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:msg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
<news:13s8kce7ctt2cad@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

James Sweet wrote:

"Michae A. Terrell" <[mike.temrell@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:mike.temrell@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:fq0v10\\$ve6\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxx](news:fq0v10$ve6$1@xxxxxxxxxxx)

"James Sweet" <[jamessweet@xxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jamessweet@xxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in  
message  
[news:JnCwj.7711\\$Sw6.2121@xxxxxxxxxxx](news:JnCwj.7711$Sw6.2121@xxxxxxxxxxx)

"msg" <[msg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:msg@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote  
in message  
<news:13s4uia844u9fa2@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Check the headers of the  
posts from "Michael A.  
Terrell" in the last  
few  
hours;  
they originate from different  
user agent (IE vs. Moz),  
providers  
(aioe.org  
vs supernews)  
and networks than is usual  
for Michael. They may be  
forged.

Ya think?

I'd say the content was a dead givaway.

Re: Michael Terrell posts may be forged

You mean my posts have no value at all to the readers?

I mean that you don't normally reply to a bunch of stuff with "You have no brain"

Perhaps I should have said lack of content.

You just replied to the forger, check the headers ;-)

I realized that right after I did it, ah well. The whole thing is somewhat amusing, but really only at the expense of the kid who's forging.

.