

**LIBERTARIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE
JUDICIAL COMMITTEE**

LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
Chartered Affiliate Party of the State of New Hampshire
PETITIONER

v.

LIBERTARIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE
RESPONDENT

In re: Revocation of Affiliate Status of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire

BRIEF PRO SE AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF THE PETITIONER

This statement contains an Amicus Curiae Brief submitted by former LNC Treasurer, Todd Hagopian, in support of the argument of the PETITIONER. I served on the Libertarian National Committee for the 2022 to 2024 term. I am a sustaining member of the Party under Bylaws Article 4 Section 4, and I file under Rule 5.1 of this Committee's Rules of Appellate Procedure, which permits members to file amicus briefs in support of either party.

Let me be direct about where I stand, because it bears on the weight of everything that follows. I am no ally of this affiliate. I opposed giving Donald Trump the Party's convention stage in 2024 and moved on the LNC to rescind that invitation; the motion was ruled out of order. The Libertarian Party of New Hampshire's (LPNH) endorsement of Trump was an indefensible violation of Article 5 Section 4, and much of that affiliate's public messaging has been crude, counterproductive, and hard to square with the Statement of Principles. I am filing anyway.

What follows is an argument that revocation on ideological grounds converts every change of LNC control into a license to purge. I then take up the New Mexico precedent the RESPONDENT relies on, which I have some standing to discuss because I sat on the LNC that voted it and I voted aye. From there I argue that the timing of the May 25 vote defeated the purpose of Article 5 Section 6, that the RESPONDENT's theory of disaffiliation as a mere motion to rescind cannot survive the mandatory chartering language of Article 5 Section 2, and that this Party has applied the revocation power to Colorado and New Hampshire by two different measures. Lastly, I address who actually pays for this decision.

Several thoughtful amici have already been filed in support of the LNC, among them those of Caryn Ann Harlos, Michael Seebeck, George Phillies, and Jake Leonard. I have read all of them and I take up their arguments directly where they touch mine. Ms. Harlos in particular has

forgotten more about our Bylaws than most of us will ever learn, and I have leaned on her judgment more than once over the years. On this question we simply land in different places.

AGREED UPON FACTS

On November 4, 2024, the LPNH Executive Committee held a meeting at which it endorsed Donald Trump for President. Nobody disputes that this happened, the PETITIONER admits it, and it violates Article 5 Section 4.

In September 2025 the previous LNC formally censured LPNH. That resolution rested on social media posts it described as antisemitic and bigoted, and it noted that an earlier censure attempt had been dismissed. It did not cite the Trump endorsement. It identified nothing LPNH was required to do, set no deadline, and gave no warning that revocation would follow. What it resolved instead was to censure LPNH "and invites them to disaffiliate and cease its use of the Libertarian Party name so as to allow another group more in line with the values of this Party to petition for affiliation."

The 2026 Regular Convention was held in Grand Rapids, Michigan, from May 21 to May 25, 2026, where LPNH's delegation was credentialed, seated, and heard. On June 4, 2026, the LPNH Executive Committee voted 5-0 to repudiate the 2024 endorsement and to reaffirm its compliance with the Bylaws and the Statement of Principles.

LNC ACTION

The convention adjourned on Monday, May 25, 2026, and the newly elected LNC convened one hour later. According to the joint amicus filed on July 10 by six affiliates, that session ran under thirty minutes.

Disaffiliation came up under new business. A motion to establish an investigatory committee was made first and rejected. No representative of LPNH was present, and the affiliate had not been told the motion was coming.

Three grounds were recited. First, that LPNH "openly and publicly endorsed President Trump during the election." Second, that it had "crudely and repeatedly undermined our own candidates." Third, that it had "espoused numerous anti-libertarian positions on a National level." The motion ordered LPNH to cease and desist use of the Party name and logo "until such a time as the LNC recognizes a new affiliate in New Hampshire that shares our Party's foundational values." It passed 15-2-1. New LNC Chair Evan McMahon (Chair EM) sent formal notice roughly ten days later, on June 4, 2026, and that letter recited only the first ground.

IDEOLOGICAL REVOCATION CONVERTS EVERY CHANGE OF CONTROL INTO A PURGE

The ideological center of gravity in this Party moves, and always has, and each faction in its turn has stood accused of holding positions inconsistent with libertarianism. Before 2022 a more moderate bloc held majority influence nationally, and conservatives complained constantly that national and state leaders were saying unlibertarian things. From 2022 through 2026 the Mises Caucus held the majority nationally and in many states, and its critics complained in identical terms. In May 2026 a different coalition took control. None of that is dysfunction. It is what a multi-tendency party looks like from the inside.

This Party has no magisterium. Article 3 Section 1 makes the Statement of Principles amendable only by 7/8 of registered delegates, and Article 17 reserves Bylaws amendment to a 2/3 vote of delegates at a regular convention. The delegates decide what this Party stands for. The LNC does not.

With that in mind, consider again the operative clause of the May 25 motion, which bars LPNH from the Party's name "until such a time as the LNC recognizes a new affiliate in New Hampshire that shares our Party's foundational values." The LNC has made ideological conformity, as measured by the LNC, the condition of a state's readmission.

Nor was that a drafting accident. Eight months earlier a differently composed LNC censured LPNH and invited it to leave "so as to allow another group more in line with the values of this Party to petition for affiliation." Two committees, two documents, one stated objective: replace this affiliate with one that holds acceptable values. Whatever you think of the result in this particular case, no future minority faction survives that standard.

THE RESPONDENT'S OWN ARGUMENT READS THIS COMMITTEE OUT OF THE BYLAWS

The RESPONDENT argues that "for cause" is ambiguous in the disaffiliation context, that neither the Policy Manual nor the parliamentary authority constrains it, and that its meaning is therefore "mostly at the discretion of the National Committee." If that is right, this Committee has nothing left to review.

Article 5 Section 6 gives a disaffiliated party the right to appeal here, and Article 8 Section 2(a) places that appeal inside your express jurisdiction. A right of appeal to a body obliged to defer completely to the decision under appeal is not a right of appeal at all. The RESPONDENT is not resolving an ambiguity so much as reading this Committee out of the Bylaws, which should give you pause about the rest of its brief.

I AM NOT ASKING YOU TO WRITE A NEW RULE

Ms. Harlos opens her amicus by saying that she supports notice and a hearing, or an investigatory committee with a written report, in matters such as this. She then characterizes that view as a personal and aspirational political preference rather than a Bylaws requirement, and urges the LNC to adopt a Policy Manual procedure for notice and hearings in disaffiliations. About the practice we agree. Where we part company is on what follows from it.

The move she makes, and that I expect the RESPONDENT to make, is to treat everything I say about process as a proposal for a rule this Party has not adopted, filed with a body that has no power to adopt it. Were that framing correct, this brief would belong at a convention rather than here.

It is not correct, for a simple reason: I am not asking anyone to add words to Article 5 Section 6. I am asking you to give meaning to the words already in it. "For cause" is in the Bylaws because the delegates put it there, and Article 8 Section 2(a) places appeals under Article 5 Section 6 within your express jurisdiction. Deciding what that phrase requires is not rule-writing. It is the only job the delegates gave you in this case.

And when you ask what "for cause" has meant in practice, the answer turns out not to be aspirational at all. It is documented. The only LNC ever to exercise this power gave the affiliate written charges, took a written answer, replied to it, deliberated for nine months, and acted only after a refusal to correct. When the Party's most exacting parliamentarian says that is the right way to do this, and when our sole precedent shows an LNC actually doing it, that is evidence of meaning rather than a wish list.

GROUND TWO AND THREE FAIL EITHER WAY

At minimum, "for cause" has to mean cause stated with enough particularity that somebody can review it.

Ground one is the November 4, 2024 endorsement, which is specific, which is a real violation of Article 5 Section 4, and which nobody disputes. Grounds two and three are that LPNH "crudely and repeatedly undermined our own candidates" and "espoused numerous anti-libertarian positions on a National level." There are only two things those grounds can refer to, and both of them sink this revocation.

Suppose they mean the conduct described in the September 2025 censure. Then the LNC has imposed the maximum sanction for conduct it already sanctioned, with no new conduct charged in the motion, which is a second bite rather than enforcement.

Suppose instead they mean something other than the censured conduct. Then they identify no statement, no date, no actor, and no plank or principle allegedly contradicted, and neither this Committee nor the affiliate can do anything with them.

Worth noting, too, what Chair EM's June 4, 2026 notice letter did with all this. It recited ground one and stopped. The LNC's own written notice to the affiliate abandoned grounds two and three.

THE BURDEN IS ON THE APPELLANT, AND I ACCEPT IT

I would rather meet the strongest version of the other side than the weakest, so let me take up the standard of review directly.

Article 5 Section 6 provides that at the hearing the burden of persuasion rests upon the appellant. Ms. Harlos describes the resulting presumption in favor of the LNC candidly, noting that she does not personally care for it but that the delegates decided the question. She is right on both counts, and I am not asking you to ignore the Bylaws in order to help LPNH.

A presumption, though, is not a blindfold, and deference requires something to defer to. On ground one there is something there. The LNC found a specific act on a specific date violating a specific Bylaw, and you can weigh whether that act, standing alone and since repudiated, amounts to cause for removing an affiliate. Defer to that finding as far as the Bylaws require.

Grounds two and three offer nothing in the motion to which deference can attach. No deferential standard known to any tribunal lets a reviewing body sustain a charge whose content the deciding body never stated; deference protects judgments, it does not manufacture them. Which matters to the outcome here, because if this revocation stands at all it stands on ground one alone: a single eighteen month old violation, never charged in the censure, since repudiated by the affiliate, and treated by the LNC's own notice letter as the whole of the case.

THE NEW MEXICO PRECEDENT: I WAS IN THE ROOM, AND I VOTED FOR IT

The RESPONDENT cites the September 11, 2022 disaffiliation of the Libertarian Party of New Mexico (LPNM) to establish that a disaffiliation may proceed "by motion without an investigatory committee." I voted for that motion. Here is what it actually was.

For months I opposed disaffiliating New Mexico. At the LNC's July 23, 2022 special meeting I argued that we had no proper standing to sit in judgment of a state affiliate's internal governing documents, and I was not alone; the Secretary stated at that same meeting that she was against disaffiliation, and other members held that view through the summer. What changed was not our appetite for the remedy.

On August 9, 2022, the LNC sent LPNM a letter setting out in detail why its July 12 convention was illegal and how it had trampled the rights of LPNM's own members. LPNM answered on August 17 and demanded we rescind the letter, and we sent a further response and rebuttal on August 21. LPNM's Chair had by then conceded that its January 6, 2022 convention was invalid for improper notice, and the July 12 convention had been held illegal by the LNC and by multiple parliamentarians. So New Mexico received written charges more than a month before the vote, answered them, heard back from us, and fixed nothing.

On August 25 and 26, 2022, the LPNM board tried to sever the affiliate relationship on its own. The LNC concluded that the board had acted without the authority of its members, since we could not obtain LPNM's membership list and the national members in New Mexico who could be polled did not support leaving. That conclusion sits on the face of the motion, which recites as cause "violating procedure and member rights (e.g., holding multiple illegal conventions with deficient notice and exclusion of members from attendance, and attempting to disaffiliate without the authority of its members assembled in convention)." The logic followed from there. If the board's exit was void for want of member authority, LPNM remained the affiliate, and only the LNC could resolve its status.

Which is why the second sentence of that motion concerns consequences rather than punishment, directing the Executive Committee "to take actions necessary to begin trademark protection on our name and symbols and consider other legal action recommended by LNC counsel." We then went into executive session on precisely those legal questions. Members said as much on the record: one stated that LPNM wanted disaffiliation and we should give it to them, warning about the legal costs of protecting the marks, while another said he must "reluctantly support."

Those were my reasons for voting aye. The purpose was to fix a status that had already broken, protect the Party's name, and clear the way to charter a new affiliate in New Mexico. What happened next confirms it. The LNC sent a cease and desist on October 4, 2022, an organizing convention was held on October 29, and a petition for affiliation was signed and presented to the LNC that same day, with the Secretary emailing the pre-credentialed New Mexico delegates and guests to bring them in. Because the trademark question remained unresolved, the new organization had to call itself the Free Libertarian Party of New Mexico. Seven weeks after the vote, the members who had been shut out of those illegal conventions had a party again.

THE TWO MOTIONS DO NOT SAY THE SAME THING

New Mexico's operative clause concerns trademark protection and counsel's advice. New Hampshire's operative clause conditions readmission on a future organization "that shares our Party's foundational values." The first is custodial, the second ideological, and they are not the same instrument used twice.

NINE MONTHS AGAINST THIRTY MINUTES

The Chair told the LNC on September 11, 2022 that the New Mexico motion had been workshopped across many LNC meetings and that we had deliberately avoided being hasty. That was not talk. A first motion to end debate failed that night, 3-8-4, because the LNC wanted more argument before it voted, and by then the affiliate had stopped responding to us entirely. The full New Mexico record runs from December 2021 to September 2022: nine months, three contested conventions, written parliamentary opinions, formal correspondence in both directions, and a conceded violation.

May 25, 2026 bears no resemblance. The motion arrived under new business one hour after adjournment, an investigatory committee was rejected, and the affiliate was neither present nor notified. And unlike New Mexico, LPNH has never tried to leave; it is fighting to stay, and its board has since formally repudiated the conduct at issue.

If the LNC wants New Mexico as its model, hold it to New Mexico's actual standard. Nine months of deliberation. Particularized findings of concrete governance violations. Written charges and a written answer. An affiliate that had already walked out. And a remedy aimed at protecting the Party rather than at correcting a state party's opinions.

NEW MEXICO WAS TOLD WHAT TO FIX. NEW HAMPSHIRE WAS TOLD TO LEAVE.

New Mexico was disaffiliated for violating member rights and then refusing to cure, and that is the whole shape of it. The LNC identified the defect in writing, gave the affiliate a chance to correct it, received a refusal, and only then revoked.

New Hampshire was never asked to cure anything. The September 2025 censure does not tell LPNH to delete a post, retract a statement, discipline an officer, or rescind an endorsement. It sets no deadline. It gives no warning that revocation follows non-compliance. Its operative language invites LPNH to disaffiliate and hand the Party name over to "another group more in line with the values of this Party." An invitation to leave is not a demand to fix, and LPNH cannot have refused to cure when nobody ever asked it to.

I expect the answer that the LNC tried censure twice and that this was simply the next rung on a ladder. A disciplinary ladder, though, requires each rung to tell the accused what to do differently, and neither of these did. The middle rung asked them to go away. When they declined the invitation, the LNC removed them anyway.

Note also what the censure never said. It never charged the Trump endorsement, though that endorsement was ten months old by then, public, and undisputed. The LNC that formally disciplined LPNH in September 2025 did not treat it as cause for anything. A different LNC picked it up eight months later and made it ground one.

THE TIMING DEFEATED THE PURPOSE OF ARTICLE 5 SECTION 6

Article 5 Section 6 provides that the LNC "shall not revoke the status of any affiliate party within six months prior to a regular convention." It requires this Committee to rule "in no case later than 90 days prior to a regular convention." And it provides that if this Committee's thirty day deadline falls inside that 90 day window, inaction produces reinstatement rather than affirmance. Every one of those provisions points the same direction: the framers cared about how close a revocation sits to a convention.

The reason is not obscure. A disaffiliated state loses its delegation, and with its delegation goes any ability to seek relief from the only body that outranks the LNC. Those rules exist to keep this power away from the convention, where its consequences are least reviewable and most likely to change who sits in the hall.

The LNC acted one hour after the 2026 Regular Convention adjourned, which violates no six month restriction but evades its purpose about as completely as the calendar allows. Any other moment in the two year cycle would have left the affiliate closer to a convention where delegates could weigh in. The LNC picked the one hour guaranteeing roughly twenty four months of insulation.

What the convention itself had just done sharpens the point. Every fact the LNC cited on May 25 was already known to those delegates: the 2024 endorsement, the treatment of our candidates, the public messaging, all of it long since aired and all of it having already produced a formal censure in September 2025. The delegates seated New Hampshire anyway. Sixty minutes later, a committee that owed its existence to those delegates reversed them.

The May 25 motion charges no conduct occurring between the September 2025 censure and the revocation. Others believe such conduct exists, and I take no position on that; my point is only that the LNC did not charge it. Ground one was already eighteen months old and had never been charged in the censure at all. A body that imposes a lesser sanction, charges nothing further, and then imposes the maximum sanction under new management is not enforcing a rule. It is relitigating a settled matter with a different majority.

THIS WAS NOT A MOTION TO RESCIND, BECAUSE CHARTERING WAS NEVER DISCRETIONARY

The RESPONDENT argues that revoking affiliate status "is de facto a motion to rescind" under RONR 35:2(7), and that the LNC is simply undoing its own earlier decision to charter a New Hampshire affiliate. The premise fails on the text.

Article 5 Section 2 says the LNC "shall charter state-level affiliate parties from any qualifying organization requesting such status," and then lists the qualifying conditions: a petition signed by no fewer than ten members of the Party residing in the state, adoption of the Statement of Principles, and filing of the organization's governing documents with the Secretary. That verb is mandatory. Chartering was never an act of LNC will that the LNC may reconsider at pleasure; it is a duty owed to any organization meeting stated conditions, and you do not rescind the performance of a duty.

Ms. Harlos reaches the opposite conclusion from the same provision. Distinguishing affiliate revocation from removal of an LNC member, she writes that revoking affiliation "merely reverses a prior decision of the LNC itself," and cites Article 5 Section 2 and Article 7 Section 3 for it. On my reading that citation works against her. A body that "shall charter" any organization

meeting stated conditions has not made a decision in the ordinary sense; it has discharged an obligation. Her distinction between overriding the delegates and reversing the LNC's own choice is sound, and I accept it. It simply does not reach this case, because chartering was never the LNC's choice to begin with. The delegates wrote the conditions and told the LNC to comply with them. If the LNC may unmake at pleasure what it was commanded to do upon satisfaction of those conditions, the mandatory language of Article 5 Section 2 is decorative.

Article 5 Section 5 confirms the structure: "The autonomy of the affiliate and sub-affiliate parties shall not be abridged by the National Committee or any other committee of the Party, except as provided by these bylaws." Autonomy is the rule and LNC power over affiliates the enumerated exception, and treating Section 6 as an ordinary rescission power flips that on its head.

Section 6's own text finishes the argument. An ordinary motion to rescind takes two thirds without notice. Section 6 demands three fourths of the entire LNC rather than of those present and voting, requires the motion to specify the nature of the cause, which RONR requires of no rescission, grants the affected party an appeal to this Committee, bars the action outright during a defined window, and places the final decision in a body the LNC does not control. Nobody drafts an exception that elaborate in order to enact an ordinary parliamentary motion. The framers wrote a disciplinary procedure and then hedged it.

The RESPONDENT cannot have this both ways. It cannot argue that Section 6's higher threshold proves the action proper while also arguing that the action is governed by the lower default Section 6 displaces. If Section 6 supplies the vote requirement, it supplies the rest of Section 6 too.

DOUBLE STANDARD: COLORADO DID SOMETHING FAR WORSE AND NOTHING HAPPENED

Whatever "for cause" means, it has to reach affiliates evenhandedly, and it has not.

In 2024 the Libertarian Party of Colorado (LPCO) refused to submit paperwork for our own Presidential ticket, having decided that the nominees chosen by the delegates did not share the state party's core values. LPCO then voted to name Robert F. Kennedy Jr. (RFK Jr.), who had sought the Democratic nomination and was running as an independent, as its Presidential nominee on the Libertarian line, describing the arrangement as a partnership with the Kennedy campaign. The effort failed only because the national Party's own filing for Chase Oliver and Mike ter Maat was accepted by the Colorado Secretary of State.

Consider what that was. A state affiliate attempted, during the general election, to hand the Party's Presidential ballot line to a non-Libertarian in direct defiance of the nomination made by the delegates in convention. There is no argument that this falls within any reading of Article 5 Section 4 that permits it. No disaffiliation followed, and no revocation motion was even brought.

New Hampshire's conduct was a board vote and a tweet on the eve of the election, endorsing a candidate already on every ballot in the country in a race that endorsement could not plausibly have moved. A violation, certainly. Not remotely in the same league.

To be clear, I did not think LPCO should have been disaffiliated, and I do not think so now. A remedy deployed against one affiliate and withheld from another whose conduct was far worse, inside the same two year term, is not a rule. It is a preference about which affiliates the LNC wants to keep.

Ms. Harlos answers this by supplying a standard, and I want to take her answer seriously, because it is the best one available. She argues that disaffiliation is discretionary, that LPCO self-corrected without being forced, that its members organized a slate and litigated the issue, that a June 2025 vote condemned the RFK Jr. endorsement and the board that made it, and that new leadership was elected on that platform at an October 2025 convention. Sound business judgment, she concludes, counseled letting the affiliate resolve the matter itself.

I accept every fact in that account. Now apply the standard she has just articulated.

Colorado's correction neither arrived on its own nor arrived quickly. The endorsement came in the summer of 2024, the condemnation roughly ten months later, and the leadership that ran on it was seated roughly fourteen months later, after a lawsuit and two conventions. LPNH's board turned over in early 2026, about fifteen months out, and repudiated the endorsement formally on June 4, 2026. Between those two timelines lies a matter of months.

The difference is not that one affiliate corrected while the other refused. It is that Colorado was permitted to finish and New Hampshire was not. The LNC severed the relationship first and received the repudiation ten days later. If business judgment counsels letting an affiliate resolve its own problems before severing the relationship, then that judgment was exercised in one state and withheld in the other, which is many things but not an evenhanded application of Article 5 Section 6.

THE PENALTY LANDS ON MEMBERS WHO DID NOTHING

Let me concede the attribution point up front, because it is correct and because two amici have made it well. Ms. Harlos writes that an organization acts only through its leaders and that treating leadership acts as unattributable would mean disaffiliation is never proper. Mr. Phillies makes the same point with a bank whose officers have since changed. The RESPONDENT adds that an affiliate's contracts, debts, and liabilities survive board turnover. All of that is right, and the November 2024 endorsement is LPNH's act rather than merely the act of whoever cast the votes. I do not contest it, and my argument does not require me to.

My objection runs to proportionality of remedy, not to attribution. Those are different questions, and answering the first does not answer the second. Were my point about attribution, Ms. Harlos

would be correct that it proves disaffiliation is never proper; it is not, and it does not. Article 5 Section 6 leaves the LNC a range of responses to affiliate misconduct, of which revocation is the most severe. The question is not whether the affiliate is responsible but whether the harshest available remedy fits, when a lesser one was imposed eight months earlier, when nothing further was charged, and when the affiliate corrected the violation as soon as it faced consequences.

On what the members actually lose I want to be precise rather than sweeping. Mr. Phillies has fairly pointed out that the next convention is in 2028 and that Libertarians in New Hampshire remain free to organize and campaign in the meantime. He is correct, and I will not overstate the harm.

Here is what is not speculative. Revocation strips every member of LPNH of the ability to run for office as a Libertarian in New Hampshire and of the use of the Party name and logo. That falls on members who opposed the endorsement, on members who never heard about it, and on members who joined afterward. For a state party, the ballot line and the name are close to everything. It amounts to a sanction on hundreds of people for the acts of a handful, imposed without any finding that the membership ratified those acts.

The Bylaws contemplate proportionality. The previous LNC censured this affiliate in September 2025 and stopped there. If particular officers are the problem, the Bylaws and the parliamentary authority supply remedies aimed at individuals. Instead the LNC reached for the one remedy incapable of telling the culpable from the uninvolved, and reached for it after the affiliate's board had formally repudiated the conduct. That is punishment looking for a target.

CONCLUSION

I write to you as a former Regional Chair, former State Treasurer, former National Treasurer, former local candidate, former statewide candidate, lifetime member of the Oklahoma and National Party, and as the LNC Treasurer who voted for the only affiliate disaffiliation this Party has carried out in the past decade. I write to you as a very concerned member of the Libertarian Party.

I hold no brief for LPNH's judgment, its messaging, or its 2024 endorsement. I opposed that endorsement, I opposed giving its beneficiary our stage, and I voted aye on New Mexico. That is exactly why I am asking you to reverse.

New Mexico was deliberate, particularized, custodial, and aimed at an affiliate that had already walked out. May 25, 2026 was immediate, partly unparticularized, ideological in its stated condition for readmission, and aimed at an affiliate demanding to stay. Uphold the second on the authority of the first and we will have established that a fresh LNC majority may remove the state parties tied to the majority it replaced, in its first hour of business, on grounds no reviewing body may second guess.

Reverse the May 25, 2026 revocation and order reinstatement of the Libertarian Party of New Hampshire as the recognized state-level affiliate. That is the one thing Article 5 Section 6 empowers you to do here, and it is the whole of what I am asking for.

Do your jobs and rule for the PETITIONER.

Respectfully Submitted,

Former National Treasurer

Todd Hagopian