

Analyzing Direct Threats in Kurdish Extortion Texts: A Forensic Pragmatic Approach

Rubar Sadq Saeed and Jamal Anwar Taha

Department of English, College of Basic Education, University of Sulaimani, Sulaimani, Kurdistan Region – F.R. Iraq

Abstract—It is noteworthy that limited attention by linguists has been paid to the construction and analysis of direct threats in extortion texts, particularly those that could result in linguistic crimes from a forensic linguistic standpoint in the digital age. Specifically, the common linguistic strategies employed by extortionists to pragmatically threaten and coerce victims into meeting their demands require further exploration. Utilizing relevant pragmatic theories, particularly speech act theory, can greatly enhance the analysis of extortionate texts and illuminate how they intimidate and influence victims. Ultimately, these victims are often compelled to pursue legal action against their aggressors in court.

This study aims to bridge a gap in the existing literature by constructing a common linguistic pattern of Kurdish direct threats, along with identifying the most prevalent types of extortion texts based on the collected data. To achieve these objectives, a specific analytical framework is developed to analyze research data drawn from Sulaimani Court cases related to Article 430 of the Iraqi Penal Code. Despite variations in context and content across extortionate communications, the research concludes by offering a classification of threats in the context of extortion into direct and indirect types. It further reveals that most direct threats related to extortion exhibit a recurring linguistic pattern, typically structured as explicit conditional statements. Especially, those clauses that begin with the cohesive device “if” serve to subordinate the unpleasant hypothesis to the main clause, which conveys the threat. Additionally, the study identifies sextortion as the most prevalent category of Kurdish extortion texts.

Index Terms— extortion text, (in) direct threat, speech act theory, forensic pragmatics, felicity conditions

I. INTRODUCTION

With the advancement of technology, diverse forms of linguistic crimes have emerged. One critical category of such malicious communications that are used to create fear among individuals through making threats is extortion text. Since extortionate threats through text messages are transmitted via various social platforms, it can be counted as a cyber-linguistic crime from a forensic linguistic perspective. This study is characterized by the limitation of direct extortionate messages, merely found in written texts, which can be easily exchanged

among social media users.

Considering the severity and seriousness of the direct threats made by perpetrators to control and coerce victims into complying with their demands, it becomes evident that these threats can cause significant psychological pressure on victims. It may lead to undesirable consequences for both parties involved. To the best of the researcher’s knowledge, almost no studies have applied pragmatic theories in examining direct threats in the frame of extortion texts. Rather, they have focused either on the legal proceedings taken by victims against this form of behavioral linguistic crime or on the technological devices employed to effectively to encounter such cyber-attacks, particularly in the case of SE based-extortion. Therefore, this issue requires multiple attention and exploration, not only from forensic linguistics but also from other disciplines, namely psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics, along with legal frameworks.

Notably, O’Toole’s (2004) key study, concerning differentiating among diverse categories of threats and their assessment, characterizes conditional threats with often occurring in extortion cases. It means that a harmful act will take place if certain demands are not satisfied (O’Toole, 2004). In identifying the levels of threats, O’Toole (2004) further attempts to correspond this extortionate threat type to a high-level of threat in terms of directness, specificity and plausibility, suggesting that concrete steps have been taken to execute the threat.

The present study aims to answer the following questions:

1. What are the main types of threats in extortion-related communications, and which type occurs most frequently based on the data derived from the court cases?
2. Which type of extortion text appears to be most prevalent based on cases sourced from court and legal settings?
3. What is the general pattern of a Kurdish direct threat in extortion texts, distinguishing it from indirect threats?

The aims of the current study are as follows:

1. Outlining a typical classification of threats and determine the type which occurs most frequently according to the

collective data.

2. Identifying the most dominant type of extortion texts in threatening communications based on the cases rooted in court.

3. Establishing a common linguistic pattern of Kurdish direct threats in the context of extortion based on the data sourced from the court cases.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Extortion as a Crime in Forensic Linguistics

Language serves as a vital tool in the commission of crimes, especially in areas where threats and extortion are involved. Expanding on this concept, Sousa-Silva (2022) and Shuy (2005) refer to crimes conducted through verbal communication or without occurring physical violence as "language crimes," which include defamation, solicitation to murder, sex solicitation, selling stolen property, perjury, threats, bribery, and extortion. Evidence for these crimes can be written or spoken, with spoken evidence typically in audio or video formats, while written evidence often appears in legal documents (Shuy, 2005).

One significant area within applied linguistics that has experienced a growing trend is forensic linguistics, which is also recognized as an emerging field in forensic science. McMenamain defines it as the "scientific study of language as applied to forensic purposes" (p. 67). Forensic linguists utilize various analytical methods to interpret the language used in these texts, contributing significantly to criminal investigations and the broader field of forensic linguistics. Olsson (2008) emphasizes that the analysis of such texts is crucial for understanding the dynamics of threats and the communicative strategies employed by perpetrators.

However, The Iraqi Penal Code No. 111 of 1969 does not explicitly define the term "extortion," but it identifies diverse forms of threats associated equivalently with extortion and their penalties, particularly that type of threat which falls under Article 430 of the Iraqi Penal Code. To elaborate on this, this article states that individuals who threaten others with harm or felony or reveal their sensitive information in conjunction with a certain demand can face imprisonment for up to seven years or detention.

In his paper 'The process of extortion: Problems and qualifications' (2012), Van Putten highlights that threats or violence are essential for qualifying extortion, as they create fear in the victim. Sancho (2017) emphasizes that extortion is the coercion of individuals through threats of violence, property destruction, or destroying data unless their certain demand is met, particularly in the context of digital extortions.

Shavell (1993) distinguishes extortion from the other forms of threat or robbery by defining it as a "threat to cause injury to a person or to his property in the future." (p. 1877). This perspective focuses on extortion and is essentially based on future harm. Neumann and Elsenbroich (2017) clarify that robbery entails taking property without consent, while extortion involves obtaining property through coercion where victims consent to avoid future harm. They note that robbery threats are immediate, while extortion threats relate to potential future

harm (as cited in United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, n.d.).

B. Types of Extortion Texts

In the context of extortion, the act of threatening diverse victims performed by the perpetrators can take multiple criminal action forms, including the following.

1. **Physical Extortion (physical harm)** involves threats or acts of physical violence against a victim or their loved ones if demands are not fulfilled (Study Smarter, n.d.).

2. **Blackmail (reputational harm)** is debated among scholars regarding its relationship to extortion. While they are often used interchangeably, they have distinct legal implications as emphasized by Al Asfer (2021). Despite their distinctive features, Albanese (2007) notes that blackmail could be considered synonymous with extortion. Merriam Webster (2021) provides key evidence supporting the notion that blackmail is a type of extortion as she defines it as "extortion or coercion by threats." Most scholars view blackmail as a category of extortion (Brenner, 2010, pp. 80-3; Justia, 2018, para. 5, as cited in Al Asfer, 2021)).

Sancho legally describes it as "a criminal activity involving coercion through the threat of revealing information about an individual or their family members", relevant to "embarrassing, incriminating, or damaging information." (2017, p. 4). This aligns with the definition under Iraqi law, where blackmail includes the act of urging a victim by threatening to reveal "certain sensitive or compromising information about a person or committing an act with the intent to damage the reputation of a person if he/she does not fulfil the offender's requests" (Simaet Bhattha, 2024, Blackmail section, para. 3).

3. **Ransomware Extortion (data related harm)** is a form of digital extortion wherein the cybercriminal, through the use of malware, encrypts a victim's data, demanding payment for decryption. Unlike traditional extortion, it exploits digital assets, making it a prevalent cybercrime (Sancho, 2017, p. 4; Study Smarter, n.d.; Forbes, 2023, accessed on August 10th).

4. **Sextortion (sexual extortion)** is a form of coercion where victims are forced to perform sexual acts or pay money under threat of exposing explicit content (Sancho, 2017).

5. Another form of digital extortion is **social engineering-based extortion**, which involves human manipulation to extract confidential information. The FBI (n.d.) highlights how victims are tricked and psychologically manipulated into sharing access to their protected information or assets with the adversaries. Social engineering tactics are characterized by the interaction between a social engineer, the target, and the medium, a purpose, one or more compliance principles or strategies achieved either in direct or indirect communication (Mouton et al., 2014).

From the light of the previous discussion on SE-based extortion, Sonowal (2023) concludes by defining it as "a deception tactic that takes advantage of human error to gain access to, or assets from, a person or group of people" (p. 11). Accordingly, Sonowal (2023) also refers to it as "human hacking" due to the utilizations of a variant range of techniques and channels of communication.

C. Characteristics of Extortion Texts

According to Van Putten (2012), extortion, which is a complex psychological crime, is characterized by three major properties:

1. **Multiple Perpetrators:** Extortion often involves several individuals working in a group.
2. **Gradual Development:** The process escalates from manipulating the victims to threatening or acting of violence over time
3. **Deceit and Manipulation:** Before using threats or violence, extortionists begin with psychological tactics.

These characteristics emphasize its psychological dimensions and the dynamic nature between perpetrators and victims

D. Phases of Extortion

Van Putten (2012) clarifies the pathway to extortion as he argues that this process is more intricate than direct threats with violence. It typically incorporates serial activities that gradually create fear in the victim and coerce them into compliance. This indirect approach complicates the crime to be detected and prosecuted (Van Putten, 2012). The following table involves the key phases and related actors in this process:

Table 1: Pathway to Extortion and Relevant Actors (adapted from Van Putten, 2012)

| Key Phrases | Actors |
|---------------------------|--|
| Contact Phase | The contact maker initiates relationship and builds a bond. |
| Negotiation Phase | The negotiator presents offers to the victim. |
| Pressure Phase | The perpetrator applies intimidation to coerce compliance. |
| Violence or Threats Phase | The victim's fear of potential violence results in compliance. |

Understanding these sophisticated tactics dynamics is essential for the individuals within the society for effective prevention and intervention (Van Putten, 2012).

E. Distinguishing Threats from Promises and Warnings

The distinctions among threats, warnings, and promises rely on the speaker's intentions and the impact on the hearer (Fraser, 1998). Threats encompass undesirable outcomes, instilling fear or coercing the victim into compliance. Searle (2008 [1965]) highlights a significant difference between threats and promises by stating, "a promise is to do something for you, not to you, but a threat is to do something to you, not for you" (as cited in Christensen, 2019, p. 118). In contrast, promises are intended to benefit the addressee by creating positive expectations rather than fear or tension (Fraser, 1998, p. 161). Fraser (1998) points out two key differences: the intention to act encompasses a favorable act to promote good feelings, while a commitment to act involves an unfavorable act intended to instill fear. Warnings, though similar to threats, focus on informing the

addressee about potential harm without intimidation, such as "The ice is thin." They often address situations the speaker cannot control and should be contextually relevant. The line between warnings and threats can blur if a warning is delivered with the intent to cause intimidation and coercion. Christensen (2019) further clarifies this ambiguity. She treats indirect threats as a unique category within threats, where implicit language suggests harmful outcomes without directly stating them (p. 113).

F. Classification and Conditions for Threats

As established in O'Toole's (2004) Threat Assessment Model, threats in extortion texts can be categorized into four main types:

1. **Direct/specific threats** are clear and explicit as they require no inferential interpretation in conveying their meanings. For instance, statements like "I am going to place a bomb in the school gym" directly indicate a specific act aimed at a certain target (O'Toole, 2004; Surface, 2011).
2. **Indirect threats** imply harm without commitment because of their vagueness and ambiguous nature, such as "If I wanted to, I could kill everyone at this school," leaving interpretation to the recipient (O'Toole, 2004; Surface, 2011).
3. **Veiled threats** suggest violence without overtly stating it, like "We would be better off without you around," allowing the target to assess the risk (Surface, 2011).
4. **Conditional threats** are common in extortion. They are characterized for outlining undesirable consequences for the victims in the case of non-compliance in an attempt to intimidate and coerce them into compliance (O'Toole, 2004; Surface, 2011). For example:
- "If you don't pay me 10 thousand dollars within 24 hours, your company will no longer be as safe as before."
Napier and Mardigian (2003) further refined this into three categories: direct, conditional, and indirect threats. In addition, Muschalik (2018, as cited in Abrams, 2019) presents a dichotomy of two macro functions of threats:

1. **Retaliative threats** are reactions to past actions. Such types of threats operate as a consequence of the former action without presenting alternatives to distance harm, such as "You made a mistake. You will die hard," signifying a severe punishment.

2. **Manipulative threats** aim to influence the victim's future behavior with employing conditional statements, like "If you call the police, I will kill you," establishing coercive relationships.

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Pragmatics, in analyzing threats in extortion cases, presents a framework that emphasizes the intention behind a speaker's utterances rather than their literal meaning. Yule suggests that "pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader)" (1996, p. 3). Leech (1983, p. 6) further elaborates this by treating pragmatics as "the study of meaning in relation to speech situation", emphasizing that the focus of pragmatics occurs in how language is situationally employed

by their users. This perspective highlights concepts like deixis, implicature, presupposition, and speech acts, which help in understanding the dynamics of threats within extortion texts.

A. *Speech Act Theory*

Regarding speech act theory, that was originally introduced by J.L. Austin (1962) in 'How to Do Things with Words', John Searle (1969) highlights that all linguistic communications involve speech acts. For this reason, he suggests that "speaking a language is performing speech acts" (p. 16), including acts such as making statements, promises, commands, questions, threats, etc.

Concerning its significance, Verschuren (1999, p.22) argues that "it has been one of the basic ingredients of pragmatics for a long time". In his book 'Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts', Searle (1979) further identifies this concept by stating, "in any speech situation there is a speaker, a hearer and a speech act being performed by the speaker. The speaker and the hearer share a mutual knowledge of those facts with a mutual knowledge of the rules of performing the various kinds of speech acts" (p. 169). This mutual understanding between speakers and listeners establishes the basis of effective communication and strengthens the meaning conveyed through speech acts.

Regarding the performance of speech acts, effective communication as underscored by Searle (1979), hinges on the mutual knowledge shared between the speaker and listener. Building on these perspectives, Crystal (2008, p. 446) specifies speech act as not solely "an 'act of speech' (in the sense of parole), but a communicative activity (a locutionary act), defined with reference to the intentions of speakers." These notions underline the significance of speech acts in conveying meaning effectively, particularly in the context of malicious communications such as extortion texts.

B. *Direct and Indirect Speech Acts in Threats*

Gingiss (1986) points out a gap in the criteria for distinguishing between direct and indirect threats, relying on the assumption that threats are inherently recognizable by both the speaker and the hearer. This lack of differentiation highlights the need to explore their functions in discourse, particularly through speech acts.

In terms of speech acts, Yule (1996) differentiates direct from indirect speech acts based on the relationship between a sentence's structure and its communicative function. In English, declarative, interrogative, and imperative forms are tied to statements, questions, and commands/requests, respectively. In the case of a direct speech act, there is a clear link between structure and function, while an indirect speech act involves a mismatch or indirect relationship.

Kroeger (2024) views indirect speech acts as utterances where one illocutionary act is carried out through another. For example:

- "It is cold outside" (Yule, 1996, p.55).

This statement, on the one hand, functions as a direct speech act when it declares information about the weather. On the other hand, it becomes an indirect one when it is perceived by hearers as a request to close the door (Yule, 1996).

Verschueren (1999) notes that performative verbs, such as threatening, which are part of illocutionary force-indicating devices (IFIDs), indicate illocutionary force through sentence structure, word choice, adverbs, stress, and intonation. Threats are often conveyed indirectly and may lack explicit performative markers. As pointed out by Verschueren (1999), any disruptions taking place to the typical speech act patterns could lead to indirect speech acts, as shown in the following example:

- "Can you call me a taxi?"

This statement implies a request rather than a question about the hearer's ability to call a taxi as the illocutionary force alters from the literal question to the implied request for an action.

Unlike indirect threats, direct threats are characterized by providing a detailed expression of intent, usually in an overt and clear manner. Fraser (1975) and Sadock (1974) argue that most of the direct threats are conditional and stated in full form, requiring the reader to fulfill a condition to avoid an unfavorable consequence, like 'I will do X' (as cited in Gingiss, 1986, p. 153; Fraser, 1998), as exhibited in the following examples:

- "If you don't stop talking, I'm going to punish you."

- "Stop talking or I'm going to punish you."

- "Don't stop talking, and I'm going to punish you."

- "Unless you stop talking, I'm going to punish you."

- "Hand over your money, or I will shoot you" (Gingiss, 1986, p. 153).

Regarding interrogative forms, Yule (1996) also views them as the most common sort of indirect speech acts. They are grammatically structured as questions to request an action rather than asking a question. For example:

- "Would you open this?" (Yule, 1996, p. 0.56).

Overall, threats demonstrate notable distinctions between their direct and indirect forms. Direct threats openly exhibit an explicit relationship between their structure and illocutionary force. Conversely, indirect threats employ various IFIDs to cover their genuine illocutionary force.

C. *Illocutionary Acts*

Levinson (1983, p. 236) describes an illocutionary act as the act of making a statement, offer, or promise through a sentence that shapes its conventional force. Yule (1996) highlights the importance of speech acts by stating, "the illocutionary act is performed via the communicative force of an utterance" (p. 48), meaning that speech acts serve specific functions beyond mere utterances. He further points out that a single locutionary act may involve multiple interpretations based on context. For example:

- "I'll see you later" (Yule, 1996, p. 56).

This utterance can operate as a prediction, promise, or warning. These variations in function elucidate diverse illocutionary forces corresponding to the utterance. This utterance can operate as a prediction, promise, or warning. These variations in function elucidate diverse illocutionary forces, corresponding to the utterance.

Searle's taxonomy classifies illocutionary acts into five types: representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. They were initially established by Austin (1962) and later reviewed by Searle (1979) that can be found in

promising, apologizing, ordering and threatening behaviors related to extortion cases.

D. The Felicity Conditions of a Threat

In speech-act theory, Allott (2010) argues that felicity conditions are essential for a speech act to be successful. "If they are not satisfied then the act is either a misfire (i.e. the action is not really accomplished) or an abuse (the action is accomplished, but insincerely)" (Allott, 2010, p. 76). For example, if an unqualified person declares a couple's marriage process, the marriage does not occur (misfire). In contrast, a couple married each other just to meet a will's terms but without sincere intent represents an abuse of the act.

Searle (1979) and Cutting (2002) emphasize the fulfillment of the felicity conditions, such as participants recognizing their roles, the action being fully performed, and appropriate intentions being met for effective speech acts. Searle adds that the addresser must understand the language and the addressee must not be pretending (Cutting, 2002). Yule (1996) also points out the cases where "the performance will be infelicitous (inappropriate) if the speaker is not a specific person in a special context" (p.50). For instance, saying "I love your left hand" cannot be interpreted as a request for tea since it does not meet the necessary conditions (Kroger, 2024).

Christensen (2019) classifies threats as commissive speech acts, particularly in the sense of an "evil promise." Searle (2008 [1965]) defines a felicitous promise as one that sincerely commits the speaker to a desirable action for the hearer. To distinguish threats from promises, Christensen characterizes threats as containing undesirable actions to the hearer that are not intended to be carried out by the speaker. Instead, they aim to manipulate and intimidate the recipient into compliance (Christensen, 2019).

Table 2: The Felicity Conditions of a Threat adopted from Christensen (2019, p. 122)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Propositional condition | Speaker predicates a future act A |
| Preparatory conditions | (Hearer believes that) speaker is able to cause A to happen; (Speaker believes that) Hearer does not wish A to happen |
| Sincerity condition | Speaker intends to (make Hearer believe he will) cause A to happen |
| Essential condition | Speaker's utterance counts as an attempt to intimidate Hearer |

The summary of the felicity condition concepts presented by Christensen (2019) in the table above concerning a threat can be utilized to assess the validity and effectiveness of each threatening act found in the extortion texts during data analysis.

IV. METHODOLOGY

A. Data Collection

Out of twenty authentic extortion texts listed in the appendix and completely analyzed in the initial stage of the research, only four texts analyzed for detailed qualitative analysis. These

samples were selected as a representative subset of the whole dataset due to the page limitations of the study.

The study's data, which were collected from the Sulaimani court, covers cases from the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic to 2025. The cases are categorized into four types, based on the frameworks of Sancho (2017), Sonowal (2023), and Study Smarter (n.d.). These randomly collected cases fall under Article 430 of the Iraqi Penal Code. Each extortion case involves a specific demand issued under threat, demonstrating the defendant's intent to coerce the victim into compliance.

B. Model of Analysis

An analytical model is formulated by the researcher to analyze the present data. It focuses on the pragmatic strategies used by the extortionists to carry out the extortionist's goal. It is primarily grounded on Searle's (1979) and Yule's (1996) model for speech act theory and Christensen's (2019) felicity conditions for a threat. Beginning with providing contextual data to clarify the incidents behind the text, categorizing each extortion text into its appropriate type based on the content of the text, and then followed by analyzing the perpetrator's pragmatic strategies used within them.

C. Data Analysis Procedures

The current study is based on exploring the pragmatic strategies employed by extortionists in composing the language of threats in their extortionate communications. It adopts a mixed approach with qualitative and quantitative methods to investigate the aims of the study. The qualitative approach focuses on the multiple meanings conveyed by the speaker concerning time, place, and other contextual factors (Heigham & Croker, 2009). The quantitative approach supports the qualitative findings by providing tables of percentages and frequencies to illustrate and compare the results. The quantitative data for this study is processed using the online version of Microsoft Excel, which was employed for data entry, organization, and basic statistical analysis.

The following procedures are going to be adopted in carrying out this research:

1. Collecting data sourced from Sulaimani Curt cases.
2. Transliteration and translation of extortion texts from Kurdish to English, following Boskany (2014) for the transliterated versions of the texts.
3. Organizing and numbering the selected extortion texts chronologically, starting from the oldest cases and ending with the newest one.
4. Dividing the body content of each extortion text into numbered excerpts if it contains more than one extortionate threat.
5. Employing a purely qualitative method of analysis to provide a sufficient description and clarification of the pragmatic strategies used in extortion texts
6. Numbering the utterances of those excerpted samples that encompass more than one utterance to be examined with reference to their numbers.
7. Formatting the selected samples, as illustrated in the following steps:

- Placing the original texts in text boxes.
 - Using quotation marks to enclose the extortionate texts.
 - Utilizing superscript numbers for the multiple statements within each text to ensure clarity and recognition for both native and foreign readers.
 - Making the entire case texts italicized.
 - Bolding the direct threats within each case text to distinguish them from the rest of the texts that function as a conceptual completion.
 - Encrypting certain words with asterisks for privacy issues.
 - Using abbreviations for some terms that are repeatedly used in the analysis. These include direct threat (DT), indirect threat (IT), victim (VIC), Social Engineering (SE), speech act theory (SAT), direct speech act (DSA), indirect speech act (ISA), social engineering (SE), representative (REP), directive (DIR), commissive (COM), and condition (C).
8. Discussing the results at which the analysis has arrived about the study's issue in order to answer the proposed question of the research and drawing conclusions from them.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Case Text No. 1

"نهنگه له مهوودوا نهی به خوشهویستم وهک پینشو رهفزم کهی،¹ منیش کچیک دهه نینم ریک دهنگی له دهنگی تو بچن قسهی سیکسی له گهل دهکمه² دواتر قسهکان دهخه مه سهه وینهکانی تو و بلاوی نهکه مه وه له سوشیال میدیا³ بو نهوهی حهیات بچن له هه موو شماره که⁴ توش بو خوت هس رهفزم بهرین."⁵

"*Agar lamawdwa: nabi ba xošawi:stim wak pêšu: řafzim kay,¹ mni:š kčék dahénim řék danj la danj to bičé qisay séksi lagal' dakam² dwa:tir qisaka:n daxama sar wénaka:ni to u bil'a:wi akamawa la sošya:P mi:dya:³ bo away ĥaya:t bičé la hamu: ša:raka.⁴Toš bo xot har řafzim baré.⁵*"

"*From now on, if you do not agree to be my lover and refuse me as before,¹ I will bring a girl whose voice is similar to yours and talk about sexual matters with her. Then I will post the speech along with on your photos on social media³ to disgrace you publicly in the city in the city.⁴ Extra, you can keep refusing me.⁵*"

The text discussed represents a form of **sextortion**. The sextortionist attempts to coerce the teenage girl into initiating a sexual relationship with him by employing a threatening language, as easily recognized in the conditional clauses ¹ and

2.

For privacy reasons, the identities of the teenagers included have been removed. On October 13, 2019, a case was reported in court due to the leaking of a teenage girl's photos from H***** city by an aggressor who had previously sent her a friend request on Facebook, but she rejected it. Consequently, He threatened the teenage girl via Telegram by distributing her leaked and digitally altered photos on social media, demanding that she enter into a romantic relationship with him. Notably, three days before filing the complaint, the victim discovered that the extortionist had sent her photos and fabricated scandalous letters to several boys, pretending to be her.

The sextortionist, far removed from ethical principles, subtly plans to tarnish the girl's honor within society, taking a step-by-step method. After the victim's subsequent refusals to accept his friend request, it appears that he makes one more attempt to persuade her to initiate an intimate relationship with him through the employment of a severe threat. In the text message, since the statement leaves no space for implicature to get the author's true intent by clearly communicating his ultimatum and the scandalous consequences, it is qualified as a **DT**.

According to Searle's speech act theory, the threat serves as a **DSA**. The literal meaning of the utterance directly conveys the author's intended illocutionary act. It functions as **DIR** (a coercive command) and **COM** Acts (threatening to cause a scandalous outcome of disobedience). The sextortionist's purpose behind such forms of threat is to persuade the victim to become her girlfriend, and then compel her to fulfill his sexual desires.

To analyze a threat based on Searle's felicity Cs, it must meet specific Cs which helps determine its legitimacy and effectiveness as a speech act. In this case, the statement **meets all four felicity Cs for a valid threat**. It has clear propositional content C, implied capability, serious intent, and social recognition of the threat as real and serious. This confirms that it functions as a direct threat within Searle's framework.

Case Text No. 12

"هه مو جار يك و تك جاري بيشو شانست نابي¹ لتبهر نهوه بو اخر جار ناگادارت نهكتموه واز لتو خانوه بينه² برو بهلاي ژباني خوتنه³ نهنگه جاريكي تراسي نهوه خانوه بكهيت⁴ ياك فيشهكت بيوه دنيم دهتنيرم بو ناو گور⁵ نيتير كچه ناز دار كشت بي دايك گهورة دهبي."⁶

"*hamw ja:rêk wak ja:rî pêşw şa:nsit na:bê¹ labarawa bo a:xir ja:r a:ga:da:rit akamawa wa:z law xanwa bêna² bro bala:y žya:ni xotawa.³ Agar ja:rêki tir ba:si aw xa:nwa bkayt⁴ yak fişakit pêwa danêm datnêrm bo na:w goř.⁵ Iytir kča na:zda:rakašit bê da:yk gawra dabê.⁶*"

"*You won't always be as lucky as you were before.¹ So, I am warning you for the last time to give up the house² and move on with your life.³ If you mention the house one more time.⁴ I will shoot you and send you to the grave.⁵ Then your beloved*

daughter will grow up without her mother." 6

بو ناول گور 5 نيتير كجة نازدار كشت بي دايك گتوره دقبي 6.

This text can be categorized as **physical extortion**. The extortionist uses threatening language in an attempt to prevent his ex-wife from investigating her legal entitlements concerning the house they previously lived in, as referenced in the conditional clauses 4 and 5.

To secure confidentiality, the identities of the former spouses involved have been withheld. On July 25, 2023, the accused's ex-wife filed a formal complaint in the court. Based on the VIC's statement, he had been constantly threatening her with murder via Viber if she refused to relinquish her legal claim to the house they had shared during their marriage. Even, she asserted that, in the past, she has been shot once by her husband while she was shopping with her brother, but was rescued by chance.

Excerpt 1

هه موجداريك ورك جاري بيشو شانست نايبي 1 لتيتر نومه بو اخر جار ناگادارت نهكتمتوه واز لتهو خانوه بينه 2 برو بهلاي ژياني خوتنوه 3.

The defendant's statement is classified as an **IT**. He does not explicitly state what harmful action will occur if the victim disagrees with his demand to give up her legal right. Regardless of the context, it looks like a statement describing a prediction. Within this context, it reveals that the statement is not merely describing reality but implying a negative consequence. Notably, the extortionist avoids issuing an explicit threat, such as saying "I will kill you with a bullet". Instead, he depends on implicature to convey his intent. Thus, by asserting that **the Vic. is no longer as fortunate as before, which is depicted in 1**, the speaker prompts the recipient to infer the underlying threat.

This unified utterance functions as an **ISA**. The surface form of the statement differs from its intended illocutionary force. The threat is realized by taking the form of a **REP** speech act (describing future events) with a warning function to indirectly accomplish both **DIR** and **COM** speech acts of the threat (covertly warning the Vic. to leave the house for her ex-husband by guaranteeing unpleasant consequences for her in the event of disobedience).

In terms of felicity Cs, both the **propositional content** and **preparatory Cs** are **somewhat observed** because the statement implies that the author has some perceived ability to cause harm, especially after referencing the previous time "جاري بيشو" as mentioned in the contextual data. However, for a threat to be fully effective, the sincerity and essential Cs must also be met in which the victim must believe that the speaker intends to act and perceive the threat as real. Regarding the rest of the text, the utterance can be considered as a fulfillment of an essential C as well. Yet, **the lack of explicitness within the statement diminishes the act's effectiveness**, as it does not directly state a harmful consequence or coercive demand.

Excerpt 2

نهگه جاريكي تريباسي نهو خانوه بكهيت 4، يهك فيشهكت ببوه دنيم دقتنيرم

Here, the defendant moves to make a **DT** with a deadly consequence for the VIC in the event of refusing submission. The statement is based on the if-clause presenting a hypothetical condition; where the condition (seeking her legal rights concerning the house) is strictly linked to the consequence of being shot.

Because the speaker explicitly threatens the Vic. and persuades her to relinquish her legal rights regarding the house, the utterance is a clear example of a **DSA**, as indicated by the subordinating clause. It means that the illocutionary force of the threat is immediately recognizable without the need for inference from the recipient, since the author explicitly states his intention to carry out the threat in the case of rejecting his demand. Thus, the illocutionary act of this statement falls under the category of a **DIR** speech act prohibiting her from seeking her legal rights and asking her to permanently forget about the house. It also realizes the **COM** speech act, threatening to shoot her and inflict serious harm. It is noteworthy that the future consequence of this conditional hypothesis and most of the other threatening acts is represented by the use of **MAV** "will" when translated into English, as referenced in the excerpt 5.

As the result of satisfying all the felicity Cs necessary for a successful threatening act, it is considered a **valid threat**; The propositional content and preparatory Cs are fulfilled since the author implies they can carry out the threat, which is unwanted by the VIC, the sincerity C is satisfied as long as he genuinely intends to kill her if she rejects his demand, and the essential C holds because the entire utterance is perceived as a series threat. In particular, the assertion that the victim will be sent to the grave, permanently separated her from her only daughter, intensifies the severity of the threat articulated by the aggressor.

Case Text No. 13

گيانهكهم من توم زور خوشوي نهموئ هميشه لهگهلتيم 1 بهلام
توههردمهو به بيانويهك خوتم لنيهدور نهگريت 2 ومخته شنيتم
بههوي تووه 3. گولهكهم قات حازناكهم تورمكهه بهلام با هميشه
له بيرتبي 4 نهگهس بههوي كوتايي بهم پيوهندبيهي نيوانمان بيني 5
ههس چيت ههيووه لهگهل 6 *** به بهلنگهوه بهميردهكهي نهلتيم
بهلام نهگهس لهگهلم بيت 7 ههسو نهپنيهكانت نهپاريزم 8.

"Gya:nakam min tom zor xošwé amawé hamí:ša lagal'itbim.¹ Ba'la:m to har damaw ba bya:nuyak xotim lé ba du:r agri:t,² waxta sétbim ba hoy towa.³ Gul'akam qat házna:kam tu'atkam ba'la:m ba: hami:ša la bi:ritbé:⁴ agar bitawé kota:yi bam péwandyai néwa:nma:n béni,⁵ awa: har'it habwa lagal' A*** ba mérdakati al'ém.⁶ Ba'la:m agar lagal'imbit,⁷ hamu: nihényaka:nit apa:rézim.⁸"

"My sweetheart, I love you so much and want to be with you always.¹ But you always keep your distance from me.² In one way or another it leads me to foolishness.³ I never want you become angry but always remember this:⁴ if you ever attempt to end this romantic relationship between us,⁵ I will tell your husband everything about your affair with A***. ⁶ But if you continue with me,⁷ I will keep all your secrets.⁸"

This text can be classified as a form of **blackmail** with some traits of **sextortion** because the blackmailer threatens to expose the victim's personal and damaging information to her husband if she refuses his demands to continue their romantic relationship. As exhibited in the conditional clauses distinguished by ⁵ and ⁶.

The case involves a married woman who is a mother of two children, simultaneously engaged in a secret intimate relationship with her uncle's son for years. This incident dates back to one and a half years ago in D**** town, when her uncle's son-in-law discovered this relationship. He exploited this knowledge by threatening her to reveal her confidential affair with her cousin if she rejected initiating a romantic relationship with him as well. Each time she attempted to end this coerced relationship, he escalated his threats and repeatedly emphasized that he would uncover her prior intimate relationship with her cousin to her husband. Consequently, on December 3, 2023, she initiated legal proceedings against him before the court.

There's only one overt threat within this text that consists of two parts; the first part is the threat itself, while the second one is not a threat but a manipulative reward in the form of a conditional promise or inducement suggested by the perpetrator to keep the victim's romantic affairs confidential. The bolded utterance functions primarily as a **DT**, following the structure of a conditional threat (If you do X, I will do Y). He clearly links the victim's decision to end the coerced relationship with the negative consequences of informing her husband about her intimate affairs with her cousin. Both the action that the offender wants to prevent and the repercussions of disobedience are explicitly stated. This clarity and explicitness leave no room for the VIC to misunderstand his true intent.

The threat is categorized as a **DSA**. There is alignment between the surface form of the utterance and its intended pragmatic force; the utterance fully performs that threat with clear conditional language.

The illocutionary force of the statement is classified as both **DIR** and **COM** acts, where the sender pressures the reader to continue the coerced relationship. Additionally, he commits to exposing the recipient's romantic affair if she ignores her demand. Thus, the formulation of the threat leans strongly on intertwining both **DIR** (command) and **COM** (threat) forces.

Since all Cs required for the effectiveness and validity of the threat are met, the **threat is pragmatically regarded felicitous**. The extortionist predicates a harmful act that is revealing the victim's intimate affairs with her cousin, (propositional content C). Considering his claim to possess evidence of her secret romantic interaction, it is assumed that he can disclose the secret to her husband which would be distressing for her (preparatory C). He seems sincere in his intention to perform the threat if she disobeys (sincerity C). Lastly, the extortionist's

expression of his intent is recognized by the recipient as a serious threat, leading her to take certain actions, such as filing a formal complaint against him in court (essential C).

Case Text No. 15

"Bash bzana:¹ agar hata 48 katzhmeri tr bry 10 hazar dolar la shweni diarikraw nabe,² awa binarba la Facebook u TikTok hamu wena rutakanti tya blaw akamawa.³ Mabastm aw wenanaya ka lai xomawa screen shotm krdown be awai bhelm hastipekait. ⁴Kai parakat hazrkrd nama bnera. ⁵"

"Ba:š biza:na:¹ agar hata: 48 ka:tžiméri tir bři 10 haza:r dolara la šwéni dya:ri:kra:w nabé,² awa: bi:narba la Fays Buk u Ti:kTok, hamu: wéna rutaka:niti tya: bPa:w akamawa.³ Mabastim aw wéna:naya ka la:y xomawa skri:n šotim kirdun bé away bihel'im hasti pébkayt. ⁴Kay pa:rakat ĥa:zir kird na:ma binéra. ⁵"

"Know this well: ¹ if you don't send 10 thousand dollars to the specified place within 48 hours,² I'll expose all your private videos and photos on Facebook and TikTok.³ I mean those images which I captured screenshots of them without letting you realize. ⁴Once you prepare the money call me. ⁵"

This particular text seems to be a form of **blackmail** with elements of **sextortion**. The VIC is threatened with the release of his naked images unless a large sum of money is paid. Particularly, when sexual contents are involved in the incident, as shown in a conditional clause of ² and ³.

This case centers on a boy who received a friend request from an unknown girl named J***** on Snapchat. After becoming friends, she shared her nude photos with him without ever showing her face. One night, while he was chatting with her nakedly, he received a video link via Snapchat. While opening it, he was horrified to see a recording video of himself, captured without his knowledge. Afterwards, the extortionist immediately threatened him to release all his nude images unless her demand was satisfied. After a deep exploration, the victim revealed that the girl was actually the girlfriend of one of his friends, working as a band to sexually exploit the individuals for their financial gain. Consequently, the victim filed a formal complaint in court against them on February 5, 2024.

The language employed in this text represents a **DT** in which both the author's true intent to damage the victim's reputation and the financial demand to prevent the unwanted consequences are openly communicated. This threat is also conveyed through the use of a conditional structure.

From a pragmatic perspective, it functions as a **DSA** as there's an alignment between the form of the statement and its intended function to scare and coerce the victim into submission. The statement falls under the categories of both **DIR** and **COM** acts. The perpetrator simultaneously commits

to releasing the images unless he pays and commands the recipient to place money in the designated time.

The statement **meets all the necessary Cs** for a successful threat. The sender refers to exposing images that would be distressing for the victim (propositional content C). She is capable of carrying out this act, and the recipient believes it to be true due to the sender's possession of the images and her capacity to release them (preparatory C). In the event of non-compliance, the sender appears sincere in her intention to release the images, as she insists on meeting her demands (sincerity C). Finally, the victim acknowledges this threat as a serious matter as financial gain is her primary aim in performing such threats (essential C).

VI. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the results of analyzing the twenty extortion texts as a whole, including frequencies and percentages of occurrences displayed in tables, along with the findings derived from them.

A. Results on providing a typical classification of Threats related to Extortion and their frequent usages

Beginning with the initial finding, in contrast to O'Toole's (2004) broader classification of threats into four types, as highlighted in the literature review, the data analysis in this study automatically reduces the possible types of threats in extortion contexts to only two kinds. This limitation of categories arises from the classification of extortion as an ultimatum-based offence. **First, direct threats**, which are always associated with conditional threats, follow a common pattern of conditional structure to introduce both the coercive demand and the extortionist's genuine intention to inflict harm in the event of non-compliance. Furthermore, direct threats often manifest the extortionist's impoliteness by ordering victims with imperatives and harsh language. **Second, indirect threats** which lack a distinctive concrete structure: mostly relying on the contextual data, implicature and shared background knowledge between the parties to convey their message as a result of employing vague language. Ultimately, such an implicit nature of indirect threats can portray them as more polite and persuasive, which may encourage the victim to comply with the extortionist's demands. Therefore, the primary finding of this study indicates that extortion communications are clearly and concisely delivered through either direct threats or indirect threats.

Turning to the prominent subsequent finding, the data analysis due to their alignment with conditional structure, further demonstrates most Kurdish extortion text takes the form of direct threats, expressing the extortionate intent straightforwardly and leaving no space for additional interpretation.

The analysis of the full corpus of 20 extortion texts reveals distinct differences between direct and indirect threats regarding their frequency. The findings indicate that Kurdish extortionists have a strong preference for using direct threats over indirect ones. Although the dataset consists of 20 texts, the total number of threat instances exceeds the number of texts

because some contain more than one threatening excerpt, resulting in a total of 26 instances. Among these identified threats in the Kurdish extortion texts from the Sulaimani Court, direct threats occurred significantly more frequently than indirect threats, surpassing them by 21 occurrences. This outcome clearly shows the dominance of direct threats in Kurdish extortion discourse, both in terms of frequency and percentage. Table (1) demonstrates the total usage of both types of threats and illustrates the differences:

Table 1: Total usage of Direct and Indirect Threats in Extortion Texts

| No. | DT and IT in Extortion Texts | Fr. | Pr. |
|--------------|------------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Direct Threat (DSA) | 21 | 80.77% |
| 2 | Indirect Threat (ISA) | 5 | 19.23% |
| Total | | 26 | 100.00% |

B. Results on identifying the dominant Type of Extortion Texts

The same approach is applied to the categorization of extortion types due to simultaneously displaying elements of more than one extortion type in some texts. This overlapping results in a total of 30 occurrences of extortion types, even though only 20 texts have been examined. The study's data analysis demonstrates that sextortion is the most prevalent type of extortion texts, wherein the perpetrator leverages intimate or sexual information to coerce the victim into meeting their demands. Eleven texts are primarily or partially categorized as sextortion, occupying 36.67%. Nine texts qualify as blackmail which represents 30%. Regarding physical extortion, eight texts also fall into this category (26.67%), while only two texts (6.67%) are categorized as SE-based extortion. Notably, there are no cases obtained from the court that could exemplify ransomware extortion. This type of extortion generally is characterized by using malicious software (malware) to lock the victim's data or device, where the threat revolves around a ransom demanded by the cyber-attacker for restoring access to encrypted files or systems, rather than for preventing data exposure. Therefore, sextortion is the most common type of extortion text in terms of both frequency and percentage. Table (2) summarizes the occurrence of the various categories of extortion texts:

Table 2: Types of Extortion Texts

| No. | Types of Extortion Texts | Fr. | Pr. |
|--------------|--------------------------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | Physical Extortion | 8 | 40.00% |
| 2 | Blackmail | 9 | 45.00% |
| 3 | Sextortion | 11 | 55.00% |
| 4 | Ransomware Extortion | 0 | 0.00% |
| 5 | SE-Based Extortion | 2 | 10.00% |
| Total | | 30 | 150.00% |

C. Results on establishing a Common Linguistic Pattern of Kurdish Direct Threats related to Extortion

Considering O’Toole’s (2004) perspective on direct threats, it can be observed that Kurdish direct threats, particularly in the context of extortion, are also associated with conditional threats and represent a high level of danger due to their specific and plausible nature. Consequently, the data analysis results indicate that Kurdish direct threats exhibit a common linguistic pattern characterized by conditional structures, in which both the demands (actions or inactions) and the potential harmful outcomes are explicitly stated to pressure and intimidate victims into complying with the extortionists’ demands.

To elaborate further, the extortionists’ demands in direct extortionate threats, which have been previously examined, are often expressed through directive acts within a hypothetical framework (e.g., “if you do (don’t do) X”). Meanwhile, the potential violent consequences are conveyed through commissive acts (e.g., “I will do Y”), emphasizing that the perpetrators will carry out their threats if their demands are not met.

Based on the selected samples within this study, along with the case texts listed in the appendix (numbers 3,4,6,9,17) the general pattern of Kurdish direct threats in extortion texts mostly takes the form of conditional clauses such as “IF YOU DO (DO NOT DO) X, I WILL DO Y” or “IF X HAPPENS, I WILL DO Y.” In these expressions, ‘X’ represents the demands imposed by the perpetrators, while ‘Y’ signifies the undesirable outcomes that victims may face if they fail to comply. Notably, authors with various extortionate motivations within these direct threats utilize first-person singular constructions (e.g., “I will...”) followed by harmful performative verbs that involve actions such as killing, murdering, or damaging the victims’ reputations by revealing sensitive information.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the results of the data analysis indicate that threats related to extortion can be broadly classified into two main categories: direct and indirect threats. The findings show that while both types operate within extortion discourse, direct threats occur more frequently and are structurally more explicit, making them easier to detect linguistically. In contrast, indirect threats require more contextual interpretation and are less common. Additionally, the results suggest that sextortion is the most prevalent form of extortion in the dataset, mirroring larger trends in online and interpersonal coercion.

The analysis reveals that most Kurdish direct threats in extortion texts are framed by aggressors using clear conditional structures. In these cases, the extortionists’ demands are introduced through an “if” clause in which certain actions or inactions by the victims are directly linked to the negative consequences that may happen in the event of non-compliance.

According to Searle’s speech act theory, these threats qualify as direct speech acts, primarily falling under the categories of both commissive and directive illocutionary acts. The perpetrators instruct the victims to comply with their demands

while simultaneously indicating their intention to carry out the threat unless the demands are met.

The frequent use of direct threats among extortionists in the Kurdish language may be attributed to their aim of achieving an immediate psychological impact on the victims, thereby amplifying fear and pressure to a point where the victim feels left with no option but to comply.

Ultimately, the study underlines the importance of distinguishing between threat types and extortion categories when conducting forensic linguistic analysis. Each form exhibits unique linguistic markers that can aid in authorship attribution, legal classification, and investigative procedures.

APPENDIX

CASE TEXT No.1

“نهگەر له مهوودا نهی بی به خوشهویستم وهک پیشو رهفزم که ی،¹ منیش کچیک دههینیم ریک دهنگی له دهنگی تو بچن قسه ی سنیکی له گهل دهکهه² دواتر قسهکان دهخمه سهس وینهکانی تو و بلاوی نهکهمهوه له سو شیا ل میدیا³ بۆ نهوه ی حهیا ت بچن له هه موو شاره که⁴ توش بو خوت هه ر رهفزم بهری⁵.”

CASE TEXT No.2

“شیری بهری دایکم بهمن حهرا مین¹ نهگه ر رۆژیک بهگریانهوه خوت تیتت بۆم نهکرد² بهس نهوکات منیش نهمرۆت بیردههینمهوه³. کۆتایی ئه م مهسه له بهم شتوازه دیه دنیابه⁴ خونی چهند که سنیک ده رتۆم و دهسگیر ده کرتیم⁵ بیان راده کهه⁶ بیان من و چهند که سنیکی تر ده کو ژری⁷ بیان 9 ملنۆن دینارم پنده ده ن⁸ منیش قه مر زه کان ده ده مه وه ماله کهه و ده ر ده گ رمه وه⁹ نیتر کۆتایی به مه سه له که دیت¹⁰.”

CASE TEXT No.3

“بهر قلا بی ساحب¹ تو خوت شترت له کتیل ماله وه تانیوه رانکردوه بو شیلتر² تاوانی من جی³ به باوکت بلی⁴ نه که تر تازول له وه دعوا به نه کات بکیریم له ستر نیوه⁵ نهوا نه ی فیشه کانه ی نه مرو نام به خانوه که تانه وه⁶ بهس به ریم نه یینیم به خوتانه وه هه موتان نه کو ژم له بیش هه مویان تو⁶.”

CASE TEXT No.4

“ژور چاک بزانه¹ له مهوولا دهقهه سانیه بهدواته وه نهیم² تانه وه رۆژه ی دهست له نه که هت هه له گری بیکی شه³. درۆ ناکم سهس متاخوشم نه ده مویست به لام تییستا خوشمه وئ⁴ ناماده م خونی خومی له سهس برتۆم⁵ چونکه وهک هواسه ری خۆم ته سهس وه م له گهل کردوه⁶ برۆ تا ک به تاکی نامه کانم نیشانی دام و ده ز گاکان به⁷ له توو نهوانیش بی منتهم که بهدوا ی من نه گه رین⁸ به لام نه گه ر بهک په نهجه ی نه ی نافرته خونی لنین⁹ وادفت نه کهه هه ر چوار پارچه ی کور دهستان به گه رین نه تندۆز نه وه نه تناسنه وه¹⁰.”

CASE TEXT No.5

"Bzane chon heyat debem le naw mali xot u le shweni kareket' le pay ew hamu dro u desy desy krndat be mn sebarete be zewajekeman.² Her em shew be simeki nenasraw qse legel kake **** u bawkt dekem³ u hemw wenekani toshyan bo denerm wek belge.⁴ Dwayish gleyi le xot bke.⁵"

CASE TEXT No.6

"چون بونهه بهلا بو گیانی نیمه ق **** ی بارهکان. ¹ نهگه نه مېرو و سبهی خوت و کچهکته خانوه دهکمه بو چول نهکهن² دو پیاوتان بو نهگرم بهکری شرو شیتانان هه لیهنه دهرهوه³ خوشم ههردوکتان نهکوژم به یهکجاری له کوژ دنیاتان نهخه⁴."

CASE TEXT No.7

"یان نهبن طلاق خوت له منیرهکته بسینیت و من مارهت کهمو¹ یان ههفتهی جاریک گویم له دهنگت بن هیجی ترم ناوی² بهلام برۆم بو خارج ههرجی فیلمی روتی خومو خوته بلای نهکهمو له دنیا یا حیات نههم³ خوشم تا ئه روژدی نهمرم سهراکهمو بهم و لاتیا.⁴"

CASE TEXT No.8

"کوریم یان کچ کیشهی تونه¹ لهیس خرابیت نهلم واز یلینینه² نهه کچه حیزوبسه لایه بهکلهکی تونایت سهرت شور دهکا³ خوت مهخه کیشه تاههتایه باجی نهو به قورسی نهیهی⁴ واز یلینینه⁵ واز یلینینه هینی ههرجی رهسه روتهکاتیتهی دهینیرم بو خوت وکسو کارهکته له شهوی زاوایهتیت⁶."

CASE TEXT No.9

"نهو مندالم دویت¹ هه له نیستاهه قبولیکه دهیت لای من بیت² نهگه نهو منداله شتیکی لیبتیت³ نهوا خوینی خوت ویاوکیشته دهخهتیه جامهوه⁴."

CASE TEXT No.10

"سهی شامی سهعات ۳۰:۱۰ بو ۱۱ نهو پارویه نهگاته دهستان¹ بهتهمای کورکته مهیه واز ناهینن تانهیکورین² دوینی شهویش خهفتر بوی نیستاش و له عیادهکتی³ بهلام نابی بولیس و ناسایش ناگادارکتی⁴ قهینا دو دفتر دولار بینه واز نههینن⁵ شوین ریگای پ ****⁶."

CASE TEXT No.11

"تو گه مژمیت¹ واز نهزانی من بهدرۆشت نهلم² ههمو شتیکی له بارهی ژبانتهوه نهزانی³ چیکردوه و چیت نهکردوه⁴ تهنا ته فیدیوی روتیشم گرتویت بن نهوهی ناگادار بیت⁵ کهواته نهوهنده کهلههرق مهیه⁶ باتوشی کارهسات نهبیت⁷ من نهموست بیزارتکه⁸ تهنا ویستم ناگام لنتیبت هیجت بهسه نهیهت⁹ روژیک دیت له کهمو کوری خوت تیگیهت¹⁰."

CASE TEXT No.12

"ههمو جاریک وک جار ی بیهو شانس نابی¹ لهیتیر نهوه بو اخر جار ناگادارته نهکتهمه واز لهو خانوه بینه² برو بهلای ژبانی خوتوه³ نهگه جار یکی تر یاسی نهو خانوه بکتهت⁴ یهک فیسهکت بیوه دنیم دهتیریم بو ناو گور⁵ نیتر کچه نازدار کشت بی دایک گهوه دهقی⁶."

CASE TEXT No.13

"گیانهکه من توم زور خوشوی نهموئ هه میسه لهگهلتیم¹ بهلام تو هه دهمو به بیانو یهک خوتم لینهههه نهگرت² ومخته شینیم بههوی تووه³ گولهکه قهت حمزناکه تورنهکه بهلام با هه میسه له بیر نیی⁴ نهگه بههوی کوتایی بهم پیهههه نیوانمان بینی⁵ ههرجیت هه بووه لهگهئ⁶ **** بهیهههه به منیرهکتهی نهلم⁷ بهلام نهگه لهگهلم بیت⁷ ههمو نههینیهکانت نهپار نزم⁸."

CASE TEXT No.14

"Balle, Mn hackarrm chuzann to ket u chet.¹ Ba haramake xalk hack akam bo para.² Ta sahat 8 shaw chawarem³ yan 200\$ karte korak bnera⁴ yan rasmakant post akret.⁵ Dway nardne paraka dllyaba ba rekordawa hamu sht rash akretawa.⁶ Ka xot yaklay krdawa rasme kartakan bnera⁷ xom la online bot akam ba bitkoin⁸ awash hamu layak salamat abet.⁹"

CASE TEXT No.15

"Bash bzana:¹ agar hata 48 katzhmeri tr bry 10 hazar dolar la shweni diarikraw nabe,² awa binarba la Facebook u TikTok hamu wena rutakanti tya blaw akamawa.³ Mabastm aw wenanaya ka lai xomawa screen shotm krdwn be awai bhelm hastepekait.⁴ Kai parakat hazrkrd nama bnera.⁵"

CASE TEXT No.16

"له کهیهه بوی بهوژنه سکالا لهسهه برای من تو مارکهی هه بی نابرو¹ تازوه تنازول له سکالا کهت بکه² نهگینا له فهیسیوک ههمو رهسو فیدیو روتانهی زو زو بوتهگرتم بلوه کهمهوه و سوکتهکه له ناوکه سوکارت³ تهلافیشت نهیهه بهتاوانی خیانته⁴."

- Sousa-Silva, R. (2022). Fighting the fake: A forensic linguistic analysis to fake news detection. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, 35, 2409–2433. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-022-09901-w>
- StudySmarter. (n.d.). *Extortion: Elements, Laws and Online Context*. <https://www.studysmarter.co.uk/explanations/law/uk-criminal-law/extortion/>
- Sulaimani Court. (2019–2025). *Data on extortion cases relevant to Article 430 of the Iraqi Penal Code* [Unpublished dataset]. Sulaimani. Kurdistan Region, Iraq.
- Surface, J. L. (2011). Not all threats are equal. *Educational Leadership Faculty Publications*, 12. University of Nebraska at Omaha. Retrieved From <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/edadfacpub/12>
- United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (n.d.). *extortion racketeering*. In *UNODC teaching module series: Organized crime*. Retrieved from <https://sherloc.unodc.org/cld/ru/education/tertiary/organized-crime/module-4/key-issues/extortion-racketeering.html>
- Van Putten, C. (2012). The process of extortion: Problems and qualifications. *Paper presented at the Gloders Conference on 'Extortion Racket Services*, Vienna, Austria
- Verschueren, J. (1999). *Understanding pragmatics*. London.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.