

7/2/2026

1. This is an amicus filed in support of the Libertarian National Committee (LNC) regarding the disaffiliation of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire (LPNH), done at the post-convention LNC meeting on May 25, 2026.

REGARDING NOTICE

2. Article 5 Section 6¹ does not require notice. However, a motion to disaffiliate is essentially a motion to Rescind. Per Robert's Rules of Order, Newly Revised (RONR) 10:45², notice for that motion is required to have the motion be passed by a majority vote. For an un-noticed motion, the motion is required to have either a 2/3 vote or a majority of the entire membership to be passed. See RONR 35:2(7)³ The LNC vote was 15-2-1, with no absences, so 2/3 was 12/17 and a majority of the membership of the LNC is 10/18. Abstentions do not count towards the vote totals.
3. Therefore notice is irrelevant as the vote threshold exceeded the thresholds required for either notice or lack thereof. Any argument by appellant to lack of notice should be disregarded.

REGARDING ACTIONS OF COLORADO

4. Appellants argue in paragraphs 1-3 that while the Libertarian Party of Colorado violated the Bylaws in their treatment of Robert Kennedy, no disaffiliation or censure action was taken. Appellants are clearly engaging in "whataboutsim" that has zero impact or affinity to the present case. Whether or not the LNC decides to pursue action against LPCO in the future is unknown, but it is also irrelevant.

¹ Article 5 Section 6: "The National Committee shall have the power to revoke the status of any affiliate party, for cause, by a vote of 3/4 of the entire National Committee. A motion to revoke the status of an affiliate party for cause must specify the nature of the cause for revocation."

² RONR 10:45: "Motions that have the effect of changing or nullifying previous action of the assembly—such as the motion to *Rescind* or to *Amend Something Previously Adopted (35)*, the motion to *Discharge a Committee (36)*, or a motion to postpone an event already scheduled—require previous notice if they are to be adopted by only a majority vote."

³ RONR 35:2(7): "In an assembly, except when applied to a constitution, bylaws, or special rules of order, require (a) a two-thirds vote, (b) a majority vote when notice of intent to make the motion, stating the complete substance of the proposed change, has been given at the previous meeting within a quarterly time interval or in the call of the present meeting, or (c) a vote of a majority of the entire membership—any one of which will suffice."

REGARDING CAUSE

5. The cause is clear: On July 2, 2024, LPNH endorsed Republican Trump⁴. Article 5 Section 4 of the Bylaws states explicitly that endorsement is prohibited.⁵ Any argument by appellants that this was not a Bylaws violation or is not cause should be disregarded.

REGARDING ARGUMENTS ABOUT INVESTIGATORY COMMITTEES FOR LPNH

6. Appellants contend in paragraphs 19-28 and 35-36 that instead of disaffiliation, an investigatory committee should be formed similar to the one that occurred in 2021 regarding LPNH and the former LNC Chair Bishop-Henchman. The investigatory committee of 2021, however, was into the actions of the LNC Chair, not LPNH, and therefore is irrelevant to these proceedings. It should also be noted that investigatory committee proceedings as outlined in RONR 63 et seq applies to individuals and not organizations, so it is also not relevant here.

REGARDING ARGUMENTS ABOUT DISAFFILIATION

7. Appellants contend in paragraph 39 that “LPNH—the November 2024 vote by some former LPNH leaders to endorse Donald Trump—does not constitute “cause” to disaffiliate the current LPNH. That endorsement never reflected the views of most LPNH members, none of the officers who voted for it holds any leadership role in LPNH today,...” That the current leadership of LPNH is not the same as the leadership that made the endorsement is irrelevant for one simple reason: the vote was to disaffiliate the LPNH organization, not the leadership of it. The endorsement belongs to the organization and not the individuals running it.

SUMMARY

8. The arguments presented by Appellants are not only unconvincing, but they admit to the violation that led to the vote to disaffiliate. Again, in their appeal they admit guilt, and then try to rationalize it through various arguments and spin that simply fail on their face.

⁴ The petition of appeal itself **admits it** in paragraphs 4 through 6, and admits that the endorsement was done “wrongly and improperly.” Such admission now does not change the action made then.

⁵ Article 5, Section 4: “No affiliate party shall endorse any candidate who is a member of another party for public office in any partisan election. No affiliate party shall take any action inconsistent with the Statement of Principles or these bylaws.”

9. This is a straightforward open-and shut case and the appeal should be denied: the appellants violated the Bylaws and the direct wording of the Bylaws preclude any other interpretation. Everything else is just irrelevant and unnecessary noise.

Michael Seebeck

Judicial Committee Secretary, previous term.