

PROPOSED ORIGINAL JURISDICTION CASE BETWEEN THE PLAINTIFF STATES REGARDING EVIDENCE OF MASSIVE ELECTION FRAUD AND A CRIMINAL EFFORT TO COVER UP THAT FRAUD IN NUMEROUS DEFENDANT STATES

PURPOSE: This outline is designed as an advisory report based on existing massive evidence of election misdeeds performed by numerous actors at the national, state and local levels, with the clear intent to manipulate the outcome of the 2020 elections, specifically, but not limited to, the defendant states and actors recommended below.

The objective is as follows,

- 1) Appeal directly to the US Supreme Court under its original jurisdiction pertaining to constitutional cases involving two or more states;
- 2) Declaring proper legal standing as a result of all 50 states and 332 million Citizens being subject to the fraudulent results of elections in the defendant states;
- 3) To bring evidence to the highest court in the land, of massive and highly coordinated election tampering in numerous states, to prevent the United States from breaking apart as a direct result of the actions taken unlawfully in the defendant states;
- 4) Provide for an immediate legal and constitutional solution to the most fraudulent election cycle in USA history, before American citizens lose all faith and trust in our Republican forms of government and attempt to resolve this constitutional crisis themselves;

PROPOSED PLAINTIFFS

STATE OF TEXAS, ATTORNEY GENERAL KEN PAXTON

STATE OF ALABAMA, ATTORNEY GENERAL STEVE MARSHALL

STATE OF ARKANSAS, ATTORNEY GENERAL LESLIE RUTLEDGE

STATE OF FLORIDA, ATTORNEY GENERAL ASHLEY MOODY

STATE OF KENTUCKY, ATTORNEY GENERAL DANIEL CAMERON

STATE OF LOUISIANA, ATTORNEY GENERAL JEFF LANDRY

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, ATTORNEY GENERAL LYNN FITCH

STATE OF MISSOURI, ATTORNEY GENERAL ERIC SCHMITT

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ATTORNEY GENERAL ALAN WILSON

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, ATTORNEY GENERAL JASON RAVNBORG

STATE OF OHIO, ATTORNEY GENERAL DAVE YOST

STATE OF OKLAHOMA, ATTORNEY GENERAL MIKE HUNTER

OTHER STATES WELCOME TO JOIN...

PROPOSED DEFENDANTS

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, GOVERNOR TOM WOLF, SECRETARY OF STATE KATHY BOOKVAR, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUALLY;

STATE OF MICHIGAN, GOVERNOR GRETCHEN WHITMER, SECRETARY OF STATE JOCELYN BENSON, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUALLY;

STATE OF WISCONSIN, GOVERNOR TONY EVERS, SECRETARY OF STATE DOUG La FOLLETTE, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUALLY;

STATE OF GEORGIA, GOVERNOR BRIAN KEMP, SECRETARY OF STATE BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUALLY;

STATE OF NEVADA, GOVERNOR STEVE SISOLAK, SECRETARY OF STATE BARBARA CEGAVSKE, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUALLY;

STATE OF ARIZONA, GOVERNOR DOUG DUCEY, SECRETARY OF STATE KATIE HOBBS, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUALLY;

STATE OF WASHINGTON, GOVERNOR JAY INSLEE, SECRETARY OF STATE KIM WYMAN, IN THEIR OFFICIAL CAPACITY AND INDIVIDUALLY;

Initial **PLANTIFFS** were chosen on the basis of their courage and honor in joining an existing case against Pennsylvania for violating their own State election laws, State Constitution and U.S. Constitution in their intentional mishandling of the 2020 elections.

<https://ago.mo.gov/home/news/2020/11/09/missouri-attorney-general-nine-state-attorneys-general-file-amicus-brief-in-pennsylvania-supreme-court-voting-case>

For the first argument, the brief states that the decision by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, “(1) admitted that the Legislature’s Election Day deadline was unambiguous, (2) conceded that the Election Day deadline was constitutional on its face, (3) relied on the slimmest of evidentiary rationales for its decision, (4) departed its own prior holding on the exact same question just a few months earlier, and (5) disregarded an admirably clear severability clause that was enacted by the Pennsylvania legislature for the very purpose of preventing Pennsylvania courts from making such post-hoc changes to Pennsylvania’s mail-in voting system.”

To illustrate the risks of voter fraud in mail in voting and absentee ballot voting, the brief cites several sources that all express the same concerns about mail in voting and absentee ballot voting, including the U.S. Supreme Court case Crawford v. Marion County Election Board, the Carter-Baker Commission on Federal Election Reform, the U.S. Department of Justice’s manual on Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses, the U.S. Government Accountability Office, and more.

Additionally, the brief cites several previous examples of voter fraud by mail in or absentee voting, including:

In November 2019, the Berkeley, Missouri Mayor Ted Hoskins was indicted on five felony counts of absentee ballot fraud. Mayor Hoskins allegedly went to the homes of elderly residents to harvest absentee ballots and altered absentee ballots after he had procured them from voters;

In May 2020, the leader of the New Jersey NAACP called for a new election for a city council position in Paterson, New Jersey citing allegations of vote-by-mail fraud.

In 2016, Hector Ramirez, a candidate for Assembly in the Bronx, was indicted on 242 counts related to voter fraud. Prosecutors alleged that Ramirez wrote his name in on forged absentee ballots;

A 2018 federal Congressional race in North Carolina was overturned after political operatives were indicted and arrested for absentee ballot fraud. The charges alleged that the operatives improperly collected and potentially tampered with ballots to swing the close election in their favor;

A 2016 State House race in Missouri was overturned and a special election was ordered after allegations of absentee ballot fraud surfaced.

The brief also cites previous examples of vote-by-mail or absentee ballot fraud, specifically in Pennsylvania, including:

In 2018, a Delaware County man was charged with voter fraud after admitting to signing the absentee ballot for a deceased voter;

In 2014, the ex-Harmer Police Chief pled guilty to voter fraud after he admitted to soliciting absentee ballots for his wife in a 2009 Democratic primary for township supervisor;

The brief then argues that the decision by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court exacerbated the risks of ballot fraud, stating, "First, it created a post-election window of time during which nefarious actors could wait and see whether the Presidential election would be close, and whether perpetrating fraud in Pennsylvania would be worthwhile. Second, it enhanced the opportunities for fraud by mandating, in a cursory footnote, that late ballots must be counted even when they are not postmarked or have no legible postmark, and thus there is no evidence they were mailed by Election Day. This decision created needless vulnerability to actual fraud and undermined public confidence in a Presidential election."

Lastly, the brief notes recently decided Missouri election cases that dealt with potential election fraud, including *Mo. State Conference of the NAACP v. State*. In that case, the court concluded that, "fraud in voting by mail is a recurrent problem, that it is hard to detect and prosecute, that there are strong incentives and weak penalties for doing so, and that it has the capacity to affect the outcome of close elections."

The brief finishes by urging the Supreme Court of the United States to grant the petitions for writ of certiorari, grant expedited review, and reverse the decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court.

"Free and fair elections are a cornerstone of our republic and make the United States the envy of nations across the globe. To keep those elections free and fair, we must ensure that every legal vote is counted and every illegal vote is not. To not do so would disenfranchise millions of Americans. That's why my office led a coalition of 10 state attorneys general in filing this amicus brief to urge the Supreme Court of the United States to grant a writ of certiorari in *Republican Party of Pennsylvania vs. Boockvar*," said Attorney General Schmitt.

Initial **PROPOSED DEFENDANTS** were chosen on the basis of their direct responsibility and involvement in the 2020 election, in which significant evidence of illegal and possibly fraudulent criminal activities, designed to alter the outcome of the election on behalf of Presidential candidate Joseph Biden, Vice Presidential Candidate Kamala Harris and other down-ballot candidates, then working to cover up evidence of those activities, operating under the color of law and in direct violation of their oaths of office, their State Election Laws and both State and Federal Constitutional requirements for a free, fair and transparent election process.

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION at the United States Supreme Court is based upon Article III – Section II of the United States Constitution, which reads in part as follows;

"The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority;--to all cases affecting ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls;--to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction;--to controversies to which the United States shall be a party;--to controversies between two or more states;"

The case for **LEGAL STANDING** is based upon the fact that all fifty member states of the union are directly impacted and damaged, by unlawful and unconstitutional acts of the defendants in this matter, in direct violation of “equal protection” Rights of all States and legal U.S. Citizens to receive “equal treatment under the law” – and are harmed and damaged by actions of the defendants, rising potentially to the level of threatening the peace, tranquility and indeed, the very existence of our Republican form of government as guaranteed by Article IV – Section IV of the United States Constitution, which binds together our Union of States.

Article IV, Section 4:

“The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; and on Application of the Legislature, or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened) against domestic Violence.”

The case for an **IMMEDIATE INJUNCTION** preventing the Presidential Electors from these defendant States from seating any Electors on December 14, 2020, resulting from an election process rife with potential fraud, as demonstrated by evidence to be presented to the United States Supreme Court in support of these claims which rise to the level of “Constitutional Crisis” threatening an end to public trust in our election processes, and potentially a break up of our Constitutional Republic.

The entire Constitutional Republic, peace, freedom, liberty and justice hang in the balance of the 2020 elections. All 50 states will be negatively and directly impacted by the fraud evidenced in just six states. The people of those six states are failing to rein in their own corrupt government systems, placing all 44 fellow states in grave danger. The actions of those six states must not be allowed to destroy our entire country, setting our nation on the path to Civil War or the break-up on our union of states.

THIS IS THE GREATEST CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS IN OUR 244-YEAR HISTORY. It is the duty of all states to stop this steal and hold those responsible, fully accountable. The evidence is overwhelming. The time is short. The consequences of allowing this to stand are immense. **IMMEDIATE ACTION IS REQUIRED.**

Appropriate Relief and Remedy sought in this case should be determined by the PLAINTIFFS legal counsel.

ADDITION CITATIONS:

[18 US Code 241 - Conspiracy Against Rights](#)

[18 US Code 242 - Deprivation Of Rights Under Color Of Law](#)

NOTE: This proposal is based upon the research and strategic planning as performed by The North American Law Center (TNALC), a citizen Constitutional Accountability group. TNALC is not a law firm, nor does TNALC represent itself as a licensed law practice of any type. CONTACT TNALC at TNALC.org - DATED: December 3, 2020