



**OPEN LETTER TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE, DIVISION OF ELECTIONS  
GENERAL COUNSEL BRADLEY R. MCVAY**

July 11, 2022

Dear Mr. McVay:

If Judge Monica Brasington decides to take jurisdiction over the Asensio adv. Waters matter who will have discretion to interpret the legislative purpose and intention of the 365-day-rule in the case and who will be responsible for protecting this election from Mr. Waters using the 365-day-rule in violation of the purpose and intention of the 365-day-rule. I will assume this will be you. If not, please advise me on who I should deal with on this matter.

Attached as Exhibit A is a copy of two email exchanges between me and Ashley E. Davis, Deputy General Counsel for the FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE (DOS), titled "Asensio adv. Waters - No Party Affiliation Candidate" and "Asensio adv. Waters."

In the "Asensio adv. Waters" email, Ms. Davis asserts that "whether or not you have actually, in fact, been a member of the party for the required time period is a matter of proof between the plaintiff and you."

I disagree. My reply papers and post-evidentiary filings argue, among other things, that the Florida DOS and the Florida Division of Elections have absolute control and custody of the only proof in this case and that they have only just begun their investigation into deciding the question.

I filed an open testimonial letter to Judge Brasington on July 8<sup>th</sup> and testified at the hearing to matters outside of the scope of the narrow issue of the proof of whether, or not, I was a member of the party for the required time to provide the Court with information applicable to this discovering whether, or not, Mr. Waters' petition violates the purpose and intention of the 365-day-rule. Assuming you are the authority who will decided whether a litigant is using the 365-day-rule contradiction to its purpose and intention and present you with the evidence.

The only reasonable purpose and intention of the legislature for creating this rule is to prevent organized political corruption. One party posing as a member of another party to poison an election. For instance, it would prevent a Democrat from registering as a Republican within 365 days of a primary election then registering to run for office and then fooling Republican voters into believing that he or she is a true, real Republican.

Exhibit B is a copy of the two laws that I testified having presented to Jeff Childers. Their intention is to end organized political corruption at the intersection of the three branches of the US federal



government. The joining of both parties to poison the Declaration of Independence, Constitution and Bill of Rights.

My campaign centers on the war in Alachua County against organized political corruption. I have accused Kat Cammack of being a product and a tool of organized political corruption in Alachua County. The genesis of my campaign against Kat Cammack is that she is a traitor to the Republican Party's political philosophy and ideology and the fundamental principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. I have also accused Congresswoman Cammack of being a liar or stealing votes based on her lies.

On April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022 I began an email campaign based on a press release issued that same day titled "Asensio Blasts Republican Congresswoman Kat Cammack for Stonewalling the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023 and Aiding the Cover-Up of the Destruction of the Rule of Law," and sub-heading "Kat Cammack Is Hiding from the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act to Avoid Political Suicide." Exhibit C is a copy this press release.

In the hearing I testified based upon knowledge and belief that Justin Waters is a front for the RINOs in Alachua County that control Congresswoman Cammack. I testified that Mr. Waters lacks the financial resources to pay for this litigation and using the 365-day-rule in violation of its intention and purpose.

Exhibit D is a transcript of an exchange between me and Mr. Waters showing Mr. Waters covering up Congresswoman Cammack's lies and lying about having read my two laws, slandering my law anyway, and then lying to coverup having been caught-red-handed lying about my laws without having read my laws, and lying to coverup Congresswoman Cammack's lies.

The opening paragraph of my press release says, "To end the Left's assault on the Constitution and rule of law, US Congressional candidate, Manuel P. Asensio, has introduced legislation titled the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023 (H.R. 1). H.R. 1 corrects the mistakes the 96th Congress made in their drafting of the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 that caused it to fail. The federal judges have used the 96th Congress's mistakes to break our educational institutions, economy, and government, and pave the way for the invasion of election fraud, woke culture, critical race theory, and open borders and defunding police policies in America."

I say in the press release, "Kat Cammack's politics are anti-natural rights, anti-family and parental rights, anti-presumption of innocence, anti-equal protection, anti-due process, anti-limits on government, anti-border security, anti-neutral principles, anti-separation of powers, and anti-separation of church and state. This makes Kat Cammack's ideology anti-rule of law, undemocratic and unconstitutional. Like woke, Cammack's beliefs have no place in the United States Congress."



The press release states, “Kat Cammack has a history of lying to her constituents about being homeless and having run a successful business. Now she is stonewalling the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act and hiding her affiliation with the RINO Republican establishment.

Cammack’s ideology clashes with those of any conservative Republican. Mr. Asensio launched his smoking-gun campaign against Kat Cammack’s because of her unholy alliance with the Left. She was installed in Congress by the political establishment as part of a dirty political trick involving Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez.” In fact, Donald J. Trump is a beloved President in this District and Congressman Cammack’s policies are identical to those of the Anti-Trump elite establishment. See the annex to this letter titled “Open Letter to President Trump Concerning His Endorsement In Florida’s 3<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District.”

The leadership of the Republican Party in Alachua County is secretly and fiercely opposing my legislative plan. They know that opposing my law in the public square would be political suicide for them and Congresswoman Cammack, so they are trying to conceal it. This is evidence of that. Their use of the 365-day-rule against me violates the rule’s purpose and intention.

For all intents and practical purposes, Mr. Waters’ petition conflicts with the intention and purpose of the 365-day-rule. In fact, the effect of his petition is opposite to the rule’s only reasonable purpose. Mr. Waters’ petition serves only to coverup political and constitutional corruption within the RINO leadership of the Republican Party in Alachua County.

In his proposed order, Mr. Waters claims that whether I was registered for the “entire period of 365 days preceding the applicable qualifying period — is the key and *only significant fact* determining the outcome of this case. A lot can change in 365 days before a primary, and 443 days before a general election.” Mr. Waters claims that I was 73 days late.

Disqualification of a candidate in any state race but especially in a federal race is a grave decision. Mr. Waters can use my disqualification based on the 365-day-rule to spread and support rumors that the disqualification is the result of other reasons. Congresswoman Cammack started taking slandering my credentials as a conservative Republican a long time ago. My May 9, 2022 open letter to Congresswoman Cammack documents a rumor about having an affiliation with Manal Fakhoury. This illustrated the importance of applying the 365-day-rule in accord with its purpose and not in contradiction to it. I attach this letter as Exhibit E.

Respectfully,

*Manuel P. Asensio*

Manuel P. Asensio  
Candidate for Republican Congressional  
Nomination



# ANNEX





## **OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT TRUMP CONCERNING HIS ENDORSEMENT IN FLORIDA'S 3<sup>RD</sup> CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT**

April 12, 2022

Dear President Trump:

I am running in the Republican Party primary in FL-3 against Kat Cammack. I am writing in response to reports that you have endorsed her. Kat Cammack has refused to take a position on any of the matters below. In this solidly conservative district, you have an opportunity to install a proven warrior who will fight on your behalf.

Kat Cammack is not a leader, and she lacks the capacity to fight the Leftists and the establishment Republicans who installed her in her seat.

I am certain that once you hear the truth about what Kat Cammack is tacitly opposing and covering up, you will withdraw your endorsement of Kat and will endorse me and my proposed legislation.

The truth is that through his sole control of the US Judicial Conference, Chief Justice John G. Roberts Jr. authorized federal trial court judges to exceed their authority and interfere with your presidential executive power. The judges were then able to order one nationwide injunction after another in violation of your constitutional power and political discretion.

The larger truth is that I have discovered the monumental mistakes that the 96th Congress made in the "Judicial Conduct Act of 1980." These mistakes provide a loophole that allows a chief justice to misuse his position as the presiding officer of the US Judicial Conference and exercise unconstitutional executive power. This is how Roberts directed and authorized the violations against you. This explains how the Constitution and its values and rights have been defeated. Knowing this makes it easy to understand the truth of many other national matters.

I used my discovery to create "The Eva Asensio Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023" in honor of my daughter. It closes the 96th Congress's loophole and abolishes the presiding officer of the US Judicial Conference's unconstitutional executive power. This is a power Congress did not intend to grant to the chief justice. Congress cannot grant any government official this type of power.



My legislation eliminates Roberts's ability to organize nationwide judicial misconduct and restores the rightful powers of Congress and the President to "take care that law is faithfully executed" in accordance with the Constitution.

With this new information, former Vice President Mike Pence should understand that he had a greater role in certifying the electoral votes than he was led to believe by the lawyers and the retired judge he trusted. All of them had interests in protecting Roberts's power over the US Judicial Conference's apparatus and were invested in pro-federal judiciary ideologies. Pence had a legal and moral duty to resist the federal judges and to turn the matter over to Congress for a full investigation into the constitutional and factual issues in the election.

By tacitly opposing and covering up my legislation, Kat Cammack is acting against the Constitution's doctrines, values, and principles, and the policies of the America First and Trump Movement. Kat is adopting anti-Trump positions.

Correcting the 96<sup>th</sup> Congress's errors in the Judicial Conduct Act paves the way for your triumphant return to the presidency. I wrote and produced a children's story book titled "*Trump Unites All Americans*" where Eva runs to you to inform you of the 96<sup>th</sup> Congress's mistake, and you straighten the whole mess out.

These truths will reunify all Americans under our nation's great Constitution. Only someone interested in protecting Roberts's insanely undemocratic power or the advancement of WOKE totalitarianism in America would oppose the Eva Act.

Your supporters deserve better than Kat Cammack. I am certain that once you hear the whole true story you will withdraw your endorsement of Kat and will endorse me and my proposed legislation.

Thank You and God Bless America.

Respectfully,

*Manuel P. Asensio*

Manuel P. Asensio  
Candidate for Republican  
Congressional Nomination



# EXHIBIT A



**From:** [Manuel P. Asensio-Garcia](#)  
**To:** [Davis, Ashley E.](#)  
**Subject:** Asensio adv. Waters - No Party Affiliation Candidate  
**Date:** Friday, July 8, 2022 5:03:00 PM

---

**Ashley E. Davis**

Deputy General Counsel

**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

500 South Bronough Street, Suite 100

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250

(p): (850) 245-6531

(f): (850) 245-6127

Ms. Davis,

This is a separate matter. If the DOS determines to grant the judicial discretion over its Qualification, and if the DOS declines to defend its discretion over my Qualification, will the DOS allow me to be on the ballot as a candidate with No Party Affiliation? If not will the DOS refund my \$10,000 fee?

**Manuel P. Asensio**

**Candidate for the Republican Congressional Nomination in Florida's 3<sup>rd</sup> District**

**Campaign Contact Information:**

**[www.asensio4congress.com](http://www.asensio4congress.com)**

**[info@asensio4congress.com](mailto:info@asensio4congress.com)**

**(352) WIN-RED1 and (814) ASENSIO**

**Asensio & Company, LLC**

**Main Number: (212) 702-8800**

**Direct Cell: (917) 515-5200**

**Business Email: [mpa@asensio.com](mailto:mpa@asensio.com)**

**[www.asensio.com](http://www.asensio.com)**

**From:** [Manuel P. Asensio-Garcia](#)  
**To:** [Davis, Ashley E.](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Asensio adv. Waters  
**Date:** Friday, July 8, 2022 4:38:00 PM

---

Ms. Davis,

Thank you very much for making me aware of your Answer. This is exactly what appears in Waters' petition and reply memo. Did you notice that Waters' (Childers') citation was wrong and the mistake is material? I did not use law to argue in the hearing but it is the point we are discussing, and it will be in my reply.

If Waters would have not delayed, this matter would have been resolved The harm is derived from Waters' delay and the executive's Qualification. .

Do you agree that is of material interest to Florida's Constitution, the Supervisors of Elections, or voters, and candidate for the executive to defer to the judicial unilaterally and for it to surrender discretion on any and in particular on this Qualification without process?

**Manuel P. Asensio**

**Candidate for the Republican Congressional Nomination in Florida's 3<sup>rd</sup> District**

**Campaign Contact Information:**

**[www.asensio4congress.com](http://www.asensio4congress.com)**

**[info@asensio4congress.com](mailto:info@asensio4congress.com)**

**(352) WIN-RED1 and (814) ASENSIO**

**Asensio & Company, LLC**

**Main Number: (212) 702-8800**

**Direct Cell: (917) 515-5200**

**Business Email: [mpa@asensio.com](mailto:mpa@asensio.com)**

**[www.asensio.com](http://www.asensio.com)**



---

**From:** Davis, Ashley E. <Ashley.Davis@dos.myflorida.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 8, 2022 4:18 PM  
**To:** Manuel P. Asensio-Garcia <mpa@asensio.com>  
**Subject:** RE: Asensio adv. Waters

As we stated in our Answer: “the Division ‘performs a ministerial function in reviewing qualifying papers’ and ‘may not determine whether the contents of the qualifying papers are accurate.’ § 99.061(7)(c), Fla. Stat. In qualifying Defendant Asensio for ballot placement, the Division was ‘without authority to pass judgment on questions de hors the filing instruments,’ including whether he has indeed been a member of the Republican Party for the required 365-day period as the qualifying form purports. *State ex rel. Cherry v. Stone*, 265 So. 2d 56, 58 (Fla. 1st DCA 1972).”

Whether or not you have actually, in fact, been a member of the party for the required time period is a matter of proof between the plaintiff and you.

**ASHLEY E. DAVIS**  
Deputy General Counsel  
**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE**  
500 South Bronough Street, Suite 100  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250  
(p): (850) 245-6531  
(f): (850) 245-6127

---

**From:** Manuel P. Asensio-Garcia <[mpa@asensio.com](mailto:mpa@asensio.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 8, 2022 4:08 PM  
**To:** Davis, Ashley E. <[Ashley.Davis@dos.myflorida.com](mailto:Ashley.Davis@dos.myflorida.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Asensio adv. Waters

---

Ms. Ashley,

Thank you. Would you like to read my final draft before I file it? I would appreciate your comments.

Candidates and county supervisors necessarily rely on the DOS discretion and Qualifications. I trust you agree that for the DOS to allow this extreme level of gamesmanship of the DOS' Qualification and the courts by a candidate is not in the interest of voter or our democracy, or Florida's Constitution. Can you refer me to someone at the DOS that would be interested in defending the DOS' discretion over this matter?

**Manuel P. Asensio**

**Candidate for the Republican Congressional Nomination in Florida's 3<sup>rd</sup> District**

**Campaign Contact Information:**

[www.asensio4congress.com](http://www.asensio4congress.com)

[info@asensio4congress.com](mailto:info@asensio4congress.com)

**(352) WIN-RED1 and (814) ASENSIO**

**Asensio & Company, LLC**

**Main Number: (212) 702-8800**

**Direct Cell: (917) 515-5200**

**Business Email: [mpa@asensio.com](mailto:mpa@asensio.com)**

**[www.asensio.com](http://www.asensio.com)**



**From:** Davis, Ashley E. <[Ashley.Davis@dos.myflorida.com](mailto:Ashley.Davis@dos.myflorida.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 8, 2022 3:58 PM  
**To:** Manuel P. Asensio-Garcia <[mpa@asensio.com](mailto:mpa@asensio.com)>  
**Subject:** RE: Asensio adv. Waters

Good afternoon. We will not be filing a reply.

**ASHLEY E. DAVIS**  
Deputy General Counsel  
**FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE**  
500 South Bronough Street, Suite 100  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250  
(p): (850) 245-6531  
(f): (850) 245-6127

---

**From:** Manuel P. Asensio-Garcia <[mpa@asensio.com](mailto:mpa@asensio.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 8, 2022 3:46 PM  
**To:** Davis, Ashley E. <[Ashley.Davis@dos.myflorida.com](mailto:Ashley.Davis@dos.myflorida.com)>  
**Subject:** Asensio adv. Waters

EMAIL RECEIVED FROM EXTERNAL SOURCE

Ashley E. Davis  
Deputy General Counsel  
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE  
500 South Bronough Street, Suite 100  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250  
(p): (850) 245-6531  
(f): (850) 245-6127

Ms. Davis,

Good afternoon. Two questions. Judge Brasington showed no interest 1.) the delay in bringing the case after the 8/24/2022 OVAR was filed or 2.) in my right to obtain information in Miami-Dade and Palm Beach Counties related to my registration. Will the DOS be filing a reply memo Judge Brasington's jurisdiction over the DOS' qualification under these circumstances?

Manuel P. Asensio  
Founder  
Asensio & Company, LLC  
Cellular: [917] 515-5200

Campaign Contact Information

[www.Asensio4Congress.com](http://www.Asensio4Congress.com)

[info@asensio4congress.com](mailto:info@asensio4congress.com)

(352) WIN-RED1 and (814) ASENSIO

**ASENSIO.COM**

*Pioneer of Activist Short Selling/Informational Arbitrage*

**Disclaimer**

Asensio & Company, LLC ("ACO"), is not a member of FINRA and SIPC, nor is ACO authorised and regulated by the U.K. Financial Conduct Authority. ACO does not make any representation or warranty regarding the correctness of any information contained herein, or the appropriateness, for any person, of any transaction. Without excepting and expressly stated without reservation or conditions, nothing herein shall be construed as a recommendation to buy or sell. The information in this email and its attachments is confidential and intended solely for the attention and use of the named addressee(s) and may be exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient or a person responsible for delivering it to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to and must not disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it. Further informaton please refer to asensio.com's Terms of Use located at

<http://www.asensio.com/termsfuse/> and <http://www.asensio.com/termsfuse-2/>



# EXHIBIT B



4/10/2022 4:26:39 AM  
118th Congress  
1st Session

# H.R. 1

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 3, 2023

---

## AN ACT

To abolish the unconstitutional executive power<sup>1</sup> that was wrongfully provided to the presiding officer of the US Judicial Conference (Conference) by the 96<sup>th</sup> US Congress in the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 (Act) by: (1) amending the Act to obligate the presiding officer to process and verify considerations filed under the Act concerning judicial misconduct alleged to defeat civil liberties, the doctrines of separation of church and state, separation of powers, and federalism, or the powers of the office of the American presidency or Congress; (2) by amending the Act to create a special impeachment mechanism that would permit claims to proceed against the presiding officer of the Conference for conduct executed in the processing of considerations; (3) abolishing the Federal Judiciary Center (FJC) and repealing the FJC Foundation Act; and (4) eliminating the chief justice’s position as Chancellor of the Smithsonian and as a ex officio member of the Smithsonian’s Board of Regents.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This act may be cited as the “Eva Asensio Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023.”

---

1. Errors, omissions, and mistakes in the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 provide the presiding officer of the US Judicial Conference the power to eliminate and expand rights under the Constitution through the combination of illegal rule making by the federal judges under the Rules Enabling Act of 1934 (28 U.S.C. § 2071-2077 with illegal judicial conduct in US courts. Under any standard or interpretation of the US Constitution this power can properly be described as an unethical, unprincipled, undemocratic concentration of power in one unelected person.

## **SECTION 2. ABOLITION OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER AND FEDERAL JUDICIARY CENTER FOUNDATION**

(A) Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, Section 629 is abolished, repealed, vacated, and removed in its entirety.

(B) Chapter 42 of Title 28, United States Code, Section 620 is abolished, repealed, vacated, and removed in its entirety.

## **SECTION 3: REMOVAL OF CHIEF JUSTICE FROM SMITHSONIAN BOARD OF REGENTS**

(A) Section 20 of Chapter 3 of title 20, United States Code is amended to remove the Chief Justice of the United States from the Board or Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

## **SECTION 4: ANY PERSON'S RIGHT TO FILE COMPLAINTS AGAINST A FEDERAL JUDGE**

(A) Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, Section 351 is amended to add the following subsection:

### **(e) Report by the Chief Judge**

Upon the filing of any complaint alleging that a judge has, or group of judges have, acted fraudulently or otherwise engaged in clearly discernable unauthorized, unreasonable, or illusory conduct with the clerk of court, the Chief Judge must within 30 days of the date of filing of the complaint produce a report containing a full recitation of the factual allegations of each overt fraudulent or illusory act performed by a judge or group of judges and include in the report how the each overt fraudulent or illusory act is alleged to have affected any right or doctrine guaranteed under the United States Constitution.

(B) Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, Section 352(a)(2) is amended to delete the phrase: "the chief judge may request the judge whose conduct is complained of to file a written response to the complaint," and replaced with

the phrase: “the chief judge must request the judge whose conduct is complained of to file a written response to the complaint.”

(C) Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, Section 352(c) is amended to delete the phrase “the denial of a petition for review of the chief judge’s order shall be final and conclusive and shall not be judicially reviewable on appeal or otherwise” and replaced with the phrase: “the denial of a petition for review of the chief judge’s order shall be immediately appealable to the full Judicial Conference.”

(D) Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, section 352 is amended to add the following subsection

**(e) Consideration by the Judicial Conference**

At any time during the proceedings, the complainant has a right to present to appeal to the full Judicial Conference a Demand for Consideration. Neither the subject judge or judges nor the verifying chief judge has any right to respond to the appeal. The US Judicial Conference’s presiding officer must acknowledge and verify the appeal within 5 days, and the Consideration must be processed in accordance with section 365.

**SECTION 5: TRANSPARENCY IN THE CONFERENCE**

(A) Section 351 of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding the following subsection:

**(e) Notification Requirements When Substituting Chief Judge –**

Should the Chief Judge of a Judicial Council transfer authority to review a complaint to another judge, the transfer is not valid unless and until the complainant is provided written notification of the transfer.”

(B) Section 352(b)(2) of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding the following language:

“The chief judge shall personally serve copies of the written order to the complainant and to the judge whose conduct is the

subject of the complaint within five business days. No order of the chief judge is effective unless and until personal service is completed during this timeframe.”

(D) Section 352 of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is amended by adding the following subsection:

**(e) Filing of Consideration in the District Court Docket. –**

In the event a complainant seeks review of a final order of the chief judge of a judicial council, the complaint and full record of the investigation shall be filed in the electronic docket of the case in the United States District Court that gave rise to the judicial complaint.

(D) Section 359 of Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code is repealed and replaced by adding the following subsections:

**(a) Restriction on Individuals Who Are Subject of Investigation.—**

No judge whose conduct is the subject of an investigation under this chapter shall serve appear at a judicial council or the Judicial Conference for any reason or purpose until all proceedings under this chapter relating to such investigation have been finally terminated.

**(b) Amicus Curiae.—**

Any person shall be granted the right to intervene or to appear as amicus curiae in any proceeding before a judicial council or the Judicial Conference under this chapter.

**SECTION 6: REMOVAL OF CONFIDENTIALITY PROVISIONS**

(A) In General – Section 360, Chapter 16 of Title 28, United States Code is amended by repealing subsection (a) and replacing it with the following subsection:

**(a) Confidentiality of Proceedings. –**

“No papers, documents or records of proceedings related to investigations conducted under this chapter shall be confidential.”

**SECTION 7. MECHANISMS FOR IMPEACHMENT OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES**

(A) In General – Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following section:

**Sec. 365. Mechanism for Impeachment**

(a) Creation of the Commission to Regulate Use of Judicial Raw Will and Coercion in US Courts –

- (1) On the first day of the legislative session of each new Congress, the President shall select five members from his Executive staff, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall select five members of the House of Representatives, and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall select five members from the Senate to serve on the Joint Executive and Congressional Commission to Regulate Use of Judicial Raw Will and Coercion in US Courts (Commission).
- (2) Each member of the Commission will serve a maximum period of two years or one term of Congress. Each member serves at the pleasure of the President, the House of Representative, and Senate and can be removed and replaced by them for any reason. Replacement members will serve shortened terms that end on the last day of the Congress for which they are appointed.
- (3) The Commission shall have jurisdiction to review any and all complaints of judicial misconduct filed by any person with the Judicial Council and Judicial Conference.

- (4) The Judicial Conference shall have 90 days to resolve a Consideration and report a full recitation of the allegations the Commission.
- (5) No complaints or Considerations may be filed directly with the Commission.
- (6) The Commission shall have the authority to investigate any Consideration filed at the Judicial Conference and remove any justice or judge from office under the standards set forth in Section 366 of this Act.
- (7) Not later than 100 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish written rules and procedures for the review of reports of judicial conduct complaints filed and Consideration with the Commission under this Act.

## **SECTION 8. STANDARDS FOR IMPEACHMENT OF JUSTICES AND JUDGES**

(A) In General – Chapter 16 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following sections:

### **Sec. 366. Standards for Impeachment**

#### **(a) Constitutional Basis –**

(1) A justice or judge of the United States shall be removed from office upon impeachment for, and conviction of, the infringement on individual liberties and inalienable rights, the creation of fabricated judge-made national policies that have no textual basis in the United States Constitution, or other high crimes and misdemeanors, as provided in Article II, section 4 of the United States Constitution.

(2) A justice or judge of the United States shall hold office during good behavior as provided in Article III, section 1 of the United States Constitution. As justice or judge failing to act with good behavior shall be removed from office by the

Commission to Regulate Use of Judicial Raw Will and Coercion in  
US Courts.”

[End]

118th Congress  
1st Session

# H.R. 2

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 3, 2023

---

## AN ACT

To end the use of raw will and force by the United States Federal Government to tyrannize the citizens of the United States of America and to commit treason against their US Constitution, which must above well things protect and secure their God-given unalienable rights of Life, Liberty, and pursuit of Happiness. This Act protects American citizens' right to self-government themselves by ending the private wide discretionary power of the individual federal judges of the US District Courts and the United States Attorney General over the Office of the American President's duty to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed."

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the  
United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This act may be cited as the "Anti-US Government Treason and Tyranny Act of 2023."

### SECTION 2. STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

- A. The purpose of this subchapter is to end the US Federal Government's opportunity to create and enforce national policy by raw will and force to harm the interests of the American people, their currency, the US Dollar, their private property, and their God-given unalienable rights of Life, Liberty, and pursuit of Happiness enshrined in the United States Constitution and the Declaration of Independence.

B. For too long the United States Federal Government and special private interest groups have trampled on the American citizen's private rights and private property, and the executive authority of the American Presidency to perform his or her US Constitutional duty to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed" intended to protect them from corruption in United State Federal Government.

### **SECTION 3. ELIMINATION OF US DISTRICT COURT SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OVER ANY ACT BY THE UNITED STATES PRESIDENT.**

(A) Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, Section 1331 amended with the following language:

(1) United States District Courts shall no longer have federal question subject matter jurisdiction over any act or omission of a sitting United States President or personal jurisdiction the occupant of the Office of the American Presidency.

(2) This section specifically ends the authority of United States District Court judges to review or enjoin any of the following:

- a. Office of the American President's duty to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed"
- b. An Executive Order signed by the United States President;
- c. An action by any agency of the Executive Branch undertaken at the direction or request of the United States President;

### **SECTION 4. EXPANSION OF THE ROLE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CONFERENCE**

The Members of the United States Judicial Conference shall have sole and exclusive original jurisdiction to resolve all civil actions arising out of any act or omission by the United States President or the occupant of the Office of the American President and shall resolve all civil actions related to these matters

using the processes and procedures adopted in the “Eva Asensio Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023.”

[End]



# EXHIBIT C






## Asensio Blasts Republican Congresswoman Kat Cammack for Stonewalling the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023 and Aiding the Cover-Up of the Destruction of the Rule of Law

### Kat Cammack Is Hiding from the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act to Avoid Political Suicide

GAINESVILLE, Fla.— April 25, 2022 — To end the Left’s assault on the Constitution



and rule of law, US Congressional candidate, Manuel P. Asensio, has introduced legislation titled the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023 (H.R. 1). H.R. 1 corrects the mistakes the 96th Congress made in their drafting of the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 that caused it to fail. The federal judges have used the 96<sup>th</sup> Congress’s mistakes to break our educational institutions, economy, and government, and pave the way for

the invasion of election fraud, woke culture, critical race theory, and open borders and defunding police policies in America.

“Kat Cammack’s political slogans and voting record cannot hide her true RINO ideology. I have repeatedly demanded that Kat Cammack address my legislation that will end the Left’s stranglehold on America. Kat Cammack is stonewalling because the RINO establishment that installed and maintains her will not allow her to endorse H.R. 1, but opposing my law is political suicide,” Mr. Asensio said.



H.R.1 closes the loopholes that allows the federal judges to illegally expand their authority over natural and civil rights. The Anti-Judicial Corruption Act would prohibit judges from deliberately violating rights and liberties that neither judges nor Congress have any right to govern — *at all no matter what the terms, conditions, or processes they offer.*

By tacitly opposing and covering up Asensio’s groundbreaking legislation, Kat Cammack is violating her duty to the US Constitution and demonstrating her ideological opposition to its values and the most basic conservative values

Mr. Asensio stated: “Kat Cammack’s politics are anti-natural rights, anti-family and parental rights, anti-presumption of innocence, anti-equal protection, anti-due process, anti-limits on government, anti-border security, anti-neutral principles,



anti-separation of powers, and anti-separation of church and state. This makes Kat Cammack's ideology anti-rule of law, undemocratic and unconstitutional. Like woke, Cammack's beliefs have no place in the United States Congress."

Kat Cammack has a history of lying to her constituents about being homeless and having run a successful business. Now she is stonewalling the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act and hiding her affiliation with the RINO Republican establishment.

Cammack's ideology clashes with those of any conservative Republican. Mr. Asensio launched his smoking-gun campaign against Kat Cammack's because of her unholy alliance with the Left. She was installed in Congress by the political establishment as part of a dirty political trick involving Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez.

Mr. Asensio is the founder of the Institute of Judicial Conduct (IJC), the nation's only independent authority on federal judiciary policy. He formed the IJC after discovering the mistakes the 96th Congress made in the Judicial Conduct Act and how the federal judges had used them to infringe on his natural and civil rights. As a result of federal judicial overreach, Mr. Asensio was not able to pass down his religious and political ideology and beliefs to his daughter, Eva Asensio. He vowed to end the federal government takeover of individual and family liberty and drafted H.R.1 to correct the mistakes the 96th Congress made in 1980.




Mr. Asensio stated, "The future of our nation depends on stopping the use of the federal judges to impose woke world views on American citizens. Federal judges who deliberately lie and act fraudulently in court betray our Founders, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. We must stop these judges from cheating everyday Americans, infringing on our rights, and destroying our economy. Kat Cammack cannot do it, so I must."


Please show your support of Anti-Judicial Corruption Act by [donating](#).

# DONATE

Learn more about Manuel P. Asensio and the background of the Anti-Judicial Corruption Act below.



Mr. Asensio is the founder of Asensio & Company LLC, the nation's first Wall Street firm dedicated to exposing stock fraud. Initially, the press dubbed him the "Most Hated Man on Wall Street," the "Demolition Man," and "Attila the Hun." Later, as the benefits of his work to the transparency in our capital market became well-known, he became officially recognized as the Pioneer of Informational Arbitrage."



Manuel authored the Wall Street classic "Sold Short: Uncovering Deception in the Markets. *Sold Short* chronicles Manuel's adventures battling Wall Street bankers and brokers, corporate executives, and the press who were either investing in or defending fraudulent stocks in the nation's securities marketplace while at the same time fighting off their protectors, FINRA, and SEC. All of this happened in the public arena under the watchful eyes of investors trying to separate the bad guys and gals from the good ones.

**Help Manuel End Federal Judicial Corruption and Protect Your, Your Children's, and Your Children's Children, God-Given Natural Rights.**

# **DONATE**

Read H.R. 1 The Eva Asensio Anti-Judicial Corruption Act of 2023.  
Support H.R. 1 and congressional candidate Manuel P. Asensio at  
[www.asensio4congress.com](http://www.asensio4congress.com)

For further information, please call (352) WIN-RED1 or email  
[info@Asensio4Congress.com](mailto:info@Asensio4Congress.com) or call (814) ASENSIO to leave questions and  
comments for the Asensio4Congress campaign



# EXHIBIT



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE  
EIGHTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT, IN  
AND FOR ALACHUA COUNTY, FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 01-2022-CA-001848

JUSTIN WATERS, candidate for U.S.  
Representative for Florida's  
3rd Congressional District,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MANUEL P. ASENSIO, candidate for U.S.  
Representative for Florida's 3rd  
Congressional District,

and

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF STATE, DIVISION OF  
ELECTIONS, KIM A. BARTON, in her official  
capacity as Alachua County Supervisor of  
Elections, CHRISTOPHER MILTON, in his official  
capacity as Baker County Supervisor of  
Elections, AMANDA SEYFANG, in her official  
capacity as Bradford County Supervisor of  
Elections, TOMI STINSON BROWN, in her official  
Capacity as Columbia County Supervisor of  
Elections, STARLET CANNON, in her official  
Capacity as Dixie County Supervisor of Elections,  
CONNIE SANCHEZ, in her official Capacity as  
Gilchrist County Supervisor of Elections,  
LAURA HUTTO, in her official capacity as Hamilton  
County Supervisor of Elections, TRAVIS HART, in his  
Official capacity as Lafayette County Supervisor  
of Elections, TAMMY JONES, in her official capacity  
as Levy County Supervisor of Elections,  
WESLEY WILCOX, in his Official Capacity as Marion  
County Supervisor of Elections, JENNIFER MUSGROVE  
KINSEY, in her official capacity as Suwannee County  
Supervisor of Elections, DEBORAH K. OSBORNE, in her  
Official capacity as Union County Supervisor of  
Elections,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**EXCERPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

"ON THE SPOT WITH DAVID RODGERS"

DATE: June 7, 2022

LOCATION: Facebook Live

REPORTED BY: Leah Underwood  
Notary Public

EXCERPT OF PROCEEDINGS

\* \* \* \* \*

1  
2  
3           DAVID RODGERS: Ladies and gentlemen, we've got a  
4 caller that's been a previous guest here. Manuel  
5 Asensio is -- is on the horn.

6           Welcome to the show, Manuel.

7           MANUEL ASENSIO: Hello, David. How are you?

8           DAVID RODGERS: I'm all right. Doing great, sir.  
9 How about yourself? I've got Justin Waters here. Can  
10 you hear us, Manuel?

11           MANUEL ASENSIO: Yes. I should turn off the radio,  
12 though. The delay --

13           DAVID RODGERS: Yes. Maybe you should. It gets  
14 hard -- that reverb.

15           MANUEL ASENSIO: The phone -- it's a little delayed  
16 between the phone and the --

17           DAVID RODGERS: Yeah, and the show. You've got,  
18 about, what is it, about 4 to 5 seconds, Dave? We've  
19 figured that.

20           So, welcome in, Manuel. I've got Justin Waters on.  
21 Glad that you could call in. Do you have a question or  
22 do you have a -- what do you have for Mr. Justin waters?

23           MANUEL ASENSIO: Well, I think it would be good for  
24 your audience: He said he met me and he was at my  
25 house.

1 JUSTIN WATERS: Yes.

2 MANUEL ASENSIO: And what was your impression,  
3 Justin? Did you like me? Did you like --

4 JUSTIN WATERS: Yes. I met you and your son. Your  
5 son seems like a nice guy. You -- you seem like a  
6 person knowledgeable in history.

7 That's generally my opinion.

8 MANUEL ASENSIO: Okay. Well, we haven't talked  
9 since then and I've been trying to reach you a lot.

10 JUSTIN WATERS: Well, if you want to -- if you want  
11 to talk politics, you can call me on my phone after the  
12 radio show. But if you have a specific question for --  
13 that the -- you think the audience might like to hear,  
14 I'm ready to answer it.

15 DAVID RODGERS: That's a great point.

16 MANUEL ASENSIO: The audience -- the audience  
17 should know the most important thing, I think a  
18 politician has to be as open and candid and  
19 straightforward. And there's a real issue here with  
20 regards to Kat and her honesty. And I just wanted to  
21 make sure that you and I are honest with the audience  
22 and with David. And I've tried to reach you and have  
23 not. And I've always been available to you. I'm 67 and  
24 a half, and you're 40 so -- and I run a busy portfolio  
25 and the like, but I have time for you always and I would

1 love to talk to you.

2 JUSTIN WATERS: Okay.

3 MANUEL ASENSIO: What are your issues concerning --  
4 what are your issues concerning Kat's -- Kat's honesty  
5 problems, which I discovered and I published on my  
6 website?

7 JUSTIN WATERS: You know, if you want to talk about  
8 her honesty, I think there's a range of -- a range of  
9 topics to talk about. But I -- I will say that her --  
10 her baby formula crisis at the border is to me,  
11 dishonest of her. She claims that Biden -- the Biden  
12 Administration is stockpiling formula at the border.  
13 The photo she showed was one shelf full of baby formula.  
14 The rest was applesauce, and the other pictures were of  
15 Nido, which is a milk -- a dry milk for toddlers, not  
16 for babies. So I do think that that was dishonest of  
17 her. And I think she did it to be on federal  
18 television. But -- but that's all I have.

19 MANUEL ASENSIO: Oh, but a second, she lied about  
20 being homeless on -- on -- on Fox, which she was asked  
21 --

22 DAVID RODGERS: Manuel, may I stop you right here?  
23 And, look -- look -- and I understand where you're going  
24 with this. And this will be great for a debate at -- at  
25 some point that we're gonna try to put together. Justin

1 is here on his -- for his time. If you have a specific  
2 question for Justin, he'll be more than glad to answer  
3 it, but I think -- and let me just go ahead and put it  
4 bluntly: Throwing shots right now is probably not the  
5 right way to go, because everybody's trying to get their  
6 time, their airtime. We can do that as we're gonna set  
7 up a debate. And I've already talked to all my  
8 gentlemen here. We are gonna set that up. As soon as  
9 Kat -- Kat Cammack reaches back to us so she can get her  
10 time as well, we're gonna set up a debate between you  
11 three. And I see it to be a good one.

12 So if you have a specific question for Justin, you  
13 can answer it, but the other stuff, Manuel, I would like  
14 to leave out, if -- for respect for our show and our  
15 viewers.

16 MANUEL ASENSIO: Okay. Let's just be clear on what  
17 we're talking about here, Dave, for a moment, if we may.

18 DAVID RODGERS: Sure.

19 MANUEL ASENSIO: May I?

20 DAVID RODGERS: Do you have -- is it gonna lead to  
21 a question?

22 MANUEL ASENSIO: Absolutely.

23 DAVID RODGERS: Okay. I'll give you 20 seconds.

24 MANUEL ASENSIO: All right. David, the -- the most  
25 important thing in politics is openness and candidness

1 and straightforwardness and making sure that people know  
2 who you are, okay.

3 MR. BAGWELL: I heard this.

4 DAVID RODGERS: Right.

5 MANUEL ASENSIO: And -- and wait, wait, wait.  
6 Hold. So I -- I want -- it is important -- it is  
7 important for your viewers to know how Justin feels  
8 about the issues concerning factual serious  
9 misstatements, false statements that Kat Cammack has  
10 made, which were substantial in her campaign, and are  
11 not being addressed by the media nor the GPO leadership  
12 in any one of the counties nor the state nor the federal  
13 level. And -- and that -- that -- that leads to other  
14 questions concerning this matter --

15 DAVID RODGERS: Okay.

16 MANUEL ASENSIO: -- about voting records to  
17 determine whether or not the voting record is really an  
18 insight into the person's political ideology. And the  
19 political ideology of -- of each one of us is very  
20 important.

21 So that's what I was leading to, and I thought that  
22 we would put it in context, because we need to know  
23 whether Justin -- what's Justin's position concerning  
24 the blatant lies that she used to get into congress --

25 JUSTIN WATERS: All right. Well, I can answer it.

1 MANUEL ASENSIO: -- And she's using to raise money.

2 JUSTIN WATERS: I can -- I can -- we can let you go  
3 and I can answer.

4 DAVID RODGERS: He -- he wants -- he wants to throw  
5 an answer to that, Manuel, if you'll give him a second.

6 JUSTIN WATERS: Yeah.

7 MANUEL ASENSIO: Absolutely. But are we clear now,  
8 David? Is that a correct line of questioning or not  
9 here?

10 DAVID RODGERS: Yeah. I just want -- I just want a  
11 question to him and let him get his turn to answer it,  
12 Manuel. Again, the other stuff that you're saying is  
13 debate stuff. I think my panel will agree here, we can  
14 use -- you can use that in a debate format. Right here,  
15 this is question to answer period for Justin waters, a  
16 person that's running against you in District 3.

17 MANUEL ASENSIO: David, do you want to re -- reword  
18 my question for -- for Justin?

19 DAVID RODGERS: No. Justin understood the question  
20 and he wants to answer it -- and he wants to answer it,  
21 sir.

22 MANUEL ASENSIO: Okay. Thank you.

23 JUSTIN WATERS: All right. So I think the -- the  
24 issue you're talking about is whether or not she lost --  
25 whether or not she first lived on the ranch; whether or

1 not she lost the ranch due to an Obama-era program. And  
2 I -- I think that the average viewer at this point  
3 really doesn't care whether she lived on a ranch or  
4 whether she just had family exposure to a ranch.

5 MR. BAGWELL: Absolutely.

6 JUSTIN WATERS: So -- so she might have embellished  
7 her story a little, but I don't think that the average  
8 voter really cares whether she lived on a ranch. And I  
9 don't think they really care about the details on  
10 whether she lost the -- the ranch due to bad financial  
11 decisions on her mother's part or due the Obama-era loan  
12 program. I think it was a HARP program. At this point,  
13 I don't think voters really care. It was a nice story  
14 that she used to get elected. It wasn't -- I wouldn't  
15 say it was false; it was probably embellished, but I --  
16 but I don't think voters really care.

17 MR. BAGWELL: And I'm gonna add a little something  
18 -- something to that. I hope the voters didn't vote for  
19 her because of that story.

20 DAVID RODGERS: Right.

21 MR. BAGWELL: I hope they listened to her ideas of  
22 what she wanted to do up there and then voted for her  
23 because she had those ideas.

24 DAVID RODGERS: Well, you know, we had her on the  
25 show. And, Justin, I don't know if you watched the show

1 back then; you know, a few years back there when we was  
2 actually at her place and we did an interview with her.  
3 And all the questions that we asked -- and we came up  
4 with some great questions -- she answered each and every  
5 one of them to the best of her ability. And what we  
6 thought, you know, at that particular point --

7 MR. BAGWELL: Sure.

8 DAVID RODGERS: -- you know, it was candid to us  
9 and candid to the viewers, obviously; right, Justin and  
10 Manuel, because they voted her in. And she right now is  
11 the incumbent. So you know, you and Mr. Waters, you  
12 know, have your work cut out to overthrow the incumbent.  
13 And again, there's a special time and place to do that.  
14 And again, that's in a debate format. I just wanted  
15 you, if you was wanting to ask Justin a question  
16 directly, you know, your freedom of speech, which I'm  
17 giving you --

18 MANUEL ASENSIO: Yes.

19 DAVID RODGERS: You know, you can ask him directly  
20 and then he can answer it as he see -- as he deems  
21 necessary to answer that.

22 MANUEL ASENSIO: Well, it's important to get things  
23 down to earth; right. Let's bring this thing down to  
24 ground.

25 So, Justin, I have two issues with what you said.

1 First of all, you're a leader. You have to be a leader.  
2 It's not just what you're gonna vote on and how you're  
3 gonna vote on; it's how you're gonna bring an issue that  
4 ends up being brought by any one of other 400  
5 congressmen -- well, actually 500, if you include the  
6 senators, and get -- get -- get change done. And a lot  
7 of change needs to be done. And you know I've done that  
8 with the Judicial Conduct Act reform.

9 Now, I'm asking you personally, are you -- and I'm  
10 not talking -- you said that it's not false. It's a  
11 blatant lie. You did not -- her mother did not have a  
12 cattle ranch, and she did not have a cattle business.  
13 But that's not what I was referring to. I was referring  
14 to --

15 DAVID RODGERS: And again, that's at another time  
16 and another place.

17 MANUEL ASENSIO: The homeless issue, though, and  
18 what do you -- what do you personally think about a  
19 congressperson that lied, especially about the homeless  
20 issue?

21 JUSTIN WATERS: She said that she lived in a hotel.  
22 So she disclosed her definition of homelessness. That's  
23 not my definition of homelessness; that's transitional  
24 housing. But she did disclose her definition of  
25 homelessness. So I don't think she lied. I -- I think

1 that she just --

2 DAVID RODGERS: Yeah. And you're right, Justin.  
3 And I'll tell you, Manuel, I'm gonna stop this right  
4 here. I appreciate the phone call. I've got a lot of  
5 viewers on here with some other questions and some other  
6 -- and some other things.

7 MANUEL ASENSIO: Yes. Okay.

8 DAVID RODGERS: I appreciate you coming on.

9 MANUEL ASENSIO: Just one more question and I'll  
10 get off -- I'll get off. He told me that he didn't feel  
11 she lied. That's okay.

12 One more question: How do you feel about my  
13 Anti-Judicial Corruption Act, Jason -- Justin?

14 JUSTIN WATERS: I have to see it written out as a  
15 bill. I understand Manuel thinks that the -- the  
16 judiciary has taken -- has too much power. But we do  
17 have a system in this country where we have separation  
18 of powers. The judiciary must be separate from the  
19 legislature. So the judiciary does have the right to  
20 write its own court rules. I don't think Manuel likes  
21 that. But -- but our system is based on three branches  
22 of government; judiciary, legislature and executive. So  
23 I -- I think that the judiciary is within its authority.  
24 And I -- I am open to hearing challenges to it, though.

25 DAVID RODGERS: All right, Manuel. There's your

1 answer, big guy. Thank you for calling in.

2 MANUEL ASENSIO: So you have not -- you have not  
3 read my Judicial Conduct Act, which is filed at the U.S.  
4 -- at the U.S. Judicial Conference and it's under review  
5 in congress?

6 JUSTIN WATERS: I may not have read all of it. I  
7 probably -- I probably glanced at it.

8 MANUEL ASENSIO: Okay. So the question -- you  
9 answered the question without any knowledge of what the  
10 law does.

11 DAVID RODGERS: Hey, Manuel. Hey, I appreciate it.  
12 I appreciate you calling in.

13 MANUEL ASENSIO: Thank you very much.

14 DAVID RODGERS: Yeah. Thank you.

15 (End of Excerpt.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25





# EXHIBIT E





## OPEN LETTER TO KAT CAMMACK CONCERNING MANAL FAKHOURY

May 9, 2021

Dear Ms. Cammack,

I have yet to receive one response to any of my open letters to you. Yesterday, I went to worship at Norman's Three Cross Church. I learned that you are spreading rumors that I am a spying for the Democratic Party and that I support the political ambitions and plans of a woman called Manal Fakhoury.

To avoid any confusion and remove any doubt, I never heard the name "Manal Fakhoury" before yesterday and never conduct any research on a woman named "Manal Fakhoury" until I heard that your agents are saying that I endorsed "Manal Fakhoury" in her race to be Mayor of Ocala in 2019.

First, I did not announce I would run against you until 2002 after the Yoho-AOC fiasco. Before then I had never been interested in running of public office. Second, it was only after hearing about your rumors that I read a report by Carlos E. Median a reporter for the Ocala Star Banner<sup>1</sup> that "Dr. Fakhoury is a woman, who along with her husband, believes in Sharia law. Who went to a Ramadan solidarity rally with the Gitmo (Guantanamo Bay) prisoners, one of which was the architect of the attack on the U.S.S. Cole."

I respectfully ask that you at once issue a statement disassociating yourself and your campaign from this "Manal Fakhoury" lie that is being use against me. If you have any questions call me.

Please govern yourself accordingly.

Sincerely,

*Manuel P. Asensio*

Candidate for Congress in  
Florida's 3<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ocala.com/story/news/local/2019/03/06/ocala-city-council-considers-peace/53193735007/>