DANIEL E. NORBY'S APPEARANCE IN THE MANUEL P. ASENSIO RICO ACTION AGAINST US CONGRESSWOMAN KATHRYN CAMMACK

August 24, 2022

Cord Byrd
Secretary of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250

Dear Secretary Byrd:

I copy Daniel E. Nordby who today filed his notice of appearance as counsel to US Congresswoman Kathryn Cammack in my RICO action against her. The purpose of this letter to connect you and the leaders of Governor Ron DeSantis' administration involved in the Asensio-Cammack case with Mr. Norby by providing him with a copy of the record that exist in your office concerning the matter.

The evidence shows Cammack is a pathological liar who colluded with leftists to get into Congress, fabricated her entire life story, lied about her relationship with the Hon. Ted Yoho who fired her, and her reasons for entering politics. Cammack and her co-conspirators put a patsy on the ballot to run against me and used her influence and campaign money to pay her patsy to sue me. Cammack's patsy lied about my legislation and lied to defend, protect, and publicize her lies about herself and me. Without help from persons in high state government and political offices Cammack could not have succeeded in avoiding debating me and in avoiding dealing with my proposed legislation. These persons protected Cammack from having to publicly oppose my proposed laws, which would have been political suicide and would have shown her to be a liar, an opportunist, anti-constitutionalist, anti-America First, anti-MAGA politician whose only interest for being in Congress is to make money she could not otherwise make.

These persons have a great interest in avoiding discovery and covering up their central roles in Cammack's dreadful and harmful scheme. It is unfortunate that you have not agreed to meet with me and James Uthmeire on this matter until now. I hope you will come to understand the importance of keeping Governor DeSantis fully briefed on these matters.

Respectfully,

Manuel P. Asensio

Manuel P. Asensio
Member of the Republican Party of Florida

James Uthmeire, Chief of Staff to Governor Ron DeSantis
Ryan Newman, General Counsel to Governor Ron DeSantis
Ray Treadwell, Chief Deputy General Counsel to Governor Ron DeSantis
Chris Spencer, Director of Policy & Budget for Governor Ron DeSantis
Daniel Pardo, Attorney to Governor Ron DeSantis

OPEN LETTER TO GOVERNOR RON DE SANTIS' CHIEF OF STAFF JAMES UTHMEIRE CONCERNING THE NEED FOR THE GOVERNOR'S URGENT ATTENTION

August 3, 2022

Dear Mr. Uthmeier:

The voters and leaders of the Republican Party of the Third Congressional District of Florida need Governor Ron DeSantis' urgent attention, guidance, and direction. In the absence of debate and media attention, they cannot discern the truth about the contest between me and Congresswoman Kat Cammack. The outcome of our contest will shape America's future. Our contest is of paramount importance to ending the federal government's use of raw will and force including against the political, legal, and regulatory status of the US president's take care of law power. This is what ruined the faithfulness to the Constitution of Vice President Mike Pence's certification of the 2020 electoral votes. I can resolve these issues in the next Congress so that the Republicans can win the 2024 election in a landslide.

On my website and in various position papers, I have proven beyond-a-shadow-of-doubt that lawless raw will and force are central to inflation and all the greatest issues facing our nation's security, and liberty and freedom. Despite the power of my ideas, Cammack will not debate me. Why? Because she is an opportunist who lacks respect for truth and a spirit of curiosity to deal with these issues. Governor DeSantis has been aware of all this for over a year. Unfortunately, it has not reached the point of urgency required for him to act. Now is the time.

The key to resolving the use of raw will and force in government is fixing the errors in the Judicial Conduct Act of 1980 (Act). I have written law that fixes the errors and filed the law and a Consideration at the US Judicial Conference. My law ends the federal government's ability to use of raw will and force against the president and American liberty. The problem are mistakes made by Congress in Act. These mistakes are what has caused our national issues to swirl out of control – like our Party's problem with Cammack.

Cammack has no interest in understanding how President Trump's closest associates used raw will and force against him and his office, or how this relates to inflation and liberty. The same is true for the nation's inflation and liberty crisis. Governor DeSantis had a fantastic opportunity to schedule the debate between me and Cammack at the Sunshine Summit. Over my objections and protest, he did not act. I have been speaking to the Governor DeSantis' closest advisors for over a year. Now with the primary election 21 days away time is of essence. Please accept this as my request for a meeting with Governor DeSantis on an emergency basis. Thank you and God Bless the Sunshine State and America.

Sincerely,

Manuel P. Asensio

Qualified Republican Party Candidate for Congress
in Florida's Third Congressional District

1401 N Main St. P.O. Box: 1633 Gainesville, FL 32601
Asensio4Congress.com • info@asensio4Congress.com • (352) WINRED-1

OPEN LETTER TO GOVERNOR RON DE SANTIS' CHIEF OF STAFF JAMES UTHMEIRE CONCERNING CONGRESSWOMAN KAT CAMMACK'S POLITICAL MONSTEROUSLY EVIL CONDUCT

August 5, 2022

Dear Mr. Uthmeier:

Last night, Suwannee Chairwoman Sheri Ortega made me sit in silence while she allowed Cammack to ad nauseam tell her bold-faced lies to the Republicans who attended a meeting she organized. Cammack was not just stealing votes. Cammack was lying to rob the nation of its only opportunity to debate in this mid-term election cycle how to save our constitutional democratic republic from treason; how to deal with the 2020 presidential election fiasco before the 2024 presidential election cycle begins. My information was Sheri's target.

My contest against Cammack is not a normal political skirmish. It is about us Republicans acknowledging William P. Barr's and John G. Roberts, Jr.'s leading roles in the treasonous acts that were committed by both sides against the Office of the American Presidency throughout President Donald J. Trump's term, in the 2020 election and the post-election litigation, and, most dramatically, in Vice President Mike Pence's absurd and dictatorial single-handed certification of the electoral votes of the 2020 presidential election.

Republicans voters here in the Third District know the problem with the 2020 election arises out of treason that both sides organized and executed that began in the origins of the Mueller Investigation before the traitors learned how to use open borders, police abuse, and other leftist ideologies in their treasonous plans.

However, Republican voters in the Third lack the information about the vital role that the Judicial Conduct Act, the US Judicial Councils, and US Judicial Conference played in the treasonous acts. They also lack information about Ted Cruz's and Jim Jordan's failure to deal with Barr and Roberts before matters rose to the level of the gamesmanship around Pence's preposterous certification. This information is what I brought to the Third and what Cammack is covering up. Cammack's personal knowledge about why I made the sacrifices necessary to obtain this information is what makes her conduct monstrously evil. I did it to defend my parental rights and those of every father in the nation.

So, who oversees Cammack's monstrous political conduct? Who is responsible to attending to the Cammack using our party to riding roughshod over human dignity, and her oath to the Constitution? Please accept this as my second request for a meeting with Governor DeSantis on an emergency basis. I attach a copy of my first request. God Bless America.

Sincerely,

Manuel P. Asensio

Qualified Republican Party Candidate for Congress
in Florida's Third Congressional District

1401 N Main St. P.O. Box: 1633 Gainesville, FL 32601
Asensio4Congress.com • info@asensio4Congress.com • (352) WINRED-1

REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE MANUEL P. ASENSIO'S WITHDRAWAL FROM FLORIDA'S REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY ELECTION OF 2022

August 24, 2022

Cord Byrd
Secretary of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250

Dear Secretary Byrd:

Attached, please find my letter to the Bureau of Election Results and their response. It explains my withdrawal from the race for the Republican Party's nomination for United States Congress in Florida's Third Congressional District.

The issue in my withdrawal is the controversy between the leaders of the Republican Party's federal judiciary policy and me. My concern is the policy itself and the process used by the legislative and private leaders of the Republican Party in making and enforcing the Party's national federal judiciary policy. Cammack stonewalled for a full year. Cammack's stonewalling protected her from having to deal with the controversy. Further, it protected these leaders having to deal with me and public scrutiny of process and policy.

Federal judiciary policy causes the polarization of politics and the nation's problems with radicalism, hyperinflation, trade and budget deficits, and border security. It is the issue that underlies the injunction against the Stop Wrongs to Our Kids and Employees Act.

Governor Ron DeSantis and his Chief of Staff, James Uthmeire, have adequate information about this matter for you to consult with them.

Therefore, I request an appointment with you to discuss this matter.

Respectfully,

Manuel P. Asensio

Manuel P. Asensio
Member of the Republican Party of Florida

1401 N Main St. P.O. Box: 1633 Gainesville, FL 32601
Asensio4Congress.com • info@asensio4Congress.com • (352) WINRED-1

NOTICE OF IRREVOCABLE AND DEFINITIVE WITHDRAWAL
FROM FLORIDA'S REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY ELECTION OF 2022

August 22, 2022

Donna S. Brown, Chief of Bureau of Election Results
Florida Department of State, Division of Elections
R.A. Gray Building, Room 316
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0250

Dear Chief Brown:

I entered the Republican Party of the Third Congressional District's (RPOTD) primary contest for its congressional nomination based on my information and belief that political corruption in both parties is destroying America. My internal polling confirmed that corruption was the primary issue of concern to voters in the Third District, even more than hyper-inflation. Hyper-inflation like the border crisis is a product of corruption. My legislative plan ends the use corruption, or so called "raw will and force," by the federal government. My plan targets the use of corruption by both parties at the US Judicial Conference with its members, and in its committees.

Since entering the primary, the RPOTD has silenced and cancelled me, and spread injurious and slanderous lies about me. I was the victim of a racketeering conspiracy in which Congresswoman Katherine Cammack and Justin Waters teamed up to remove me from the ballot and to buttress this slanderous campaign. Waters – who was acting on behalf of Cammack and others – filed a frivolous emergency lawsuit and emergency appeal. This prevented me from investing in my campaign until after the appeal, and cost me hundreds of hours of my strictest attention and substantial resources at the most critical time of any campaign. Meanwhile, Waters and Cammack were working together with others to sap my campaign funds, time, and energy, and ruin the effectiveness of my campaign. By engaging in an illegal conspiracy to create uncertainty and doubts my being a conservative Republican, and by pursuing unfounded claims against me, Cammack and Waters sabotaged my campaign and left me no choice but to give you this withdrawal notice today.

I believed that the RPOTD shared the principles and beliefs of the conservative voters in the Third District. The party leaders proved me wrong. Even though Cammack lied about the most formative aspects of her personal history and her political ideology, the RPOTD promoted and praised her. At the same time, the RPOTD spread lies about me, canceled me and the media's interest in any debate on my legislative plan and Republican Party's federal judiciary policy. RPOTD's leaders covered-up Cammack's personal and political corruption. For these reasons, I must and do hereby irrevocably and definitively withdraw from the Republican Party's congressional primary in Florida's Third Congressional District, which you will hold on August 23, 2022.

Respectfully,

Manuel P. Asensio

Manuel P. Asensio
Member of the Republican Party of Florida

1401 N Main St. P.O. Box: 1633 Gainesville, FL 32601
Asensio4Congress.com • info@asensio4Congress.com • (352) WINRED-1

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT of STATE

RON DESANTIS
Governor

CORD BYRD
Secretary of State

August 22, 2022

Manuel P. Asensio
Candidate for United States Representative (80139)
120 Northeast 4th Street, Unit 24
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Dear Mr. Asensio:

This will acknowledge receipt of the letter informing us of your withdrawal as a 2022 candidate for United States Representative. This information was placed on file in our office on August 22, 2022. Your name has been removed from the active candidate list.

Federal candidates should also contact the **Federal Election Commission** for further information on campaign finance and withdrawals. The website for the Federal Election Commission is www.fec.gov or call 1-800-424-9530.

If you have any questions, please call our office at (850) 245-6280.

Sincerely,

Donna S. Brown

Donna S. Brown, Chief
Bureau of Election Records

DSB/mcc

OPEN LETTER TO SECRETARY OF STATE CORD BYRD CONCERNING FLORIDA'S LEGAL DUTY TO RESOLVE JUDICIARY POLICY CONSPIRACY IN THE 2022 REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY ELECTION IN FLORIDA'S THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

September 19, 2022

Cord Byrd
Secretary of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250

Dear Secretary Byrd:

I include by reference my earlier letter to you to the Bureau of Election Results (Bureau), as well as the Bureau's response. I have had these personally served on you. They concern a conspiracy in the Republican Party's primary election for the nomination for US Congress in Florida's Third Congressional District by the leaders of the Republican Party's federal judiciary policy (GOP judiciary policy leaders), and the executives of the Republican Party of Florida and Third Congressional District, to cover up my legislative plan, which I filed with the US Judicial Conference in what is known as a Consideration. Because the GOP judiciary policy leaders executed their conspiracy in the State of Florida through the actions of executives of the State of Florida's GOP, and GOP executives in the twelve counties in Florida's Third Congressional District, you have an inexorable and direct administrative and legal duty to me to resolve this matter.

The conspiracy is necessary to cover up associations and proceedings between the GOP judiciary policy leaders and the members of the US Judicial Conference to create **Rules** that allow judges to use raw will and force to enforce fabricated national policies. This destroys American presumption of innocence, due process, equal protection, neutral principles, separation of powers, and separation of church and state, and it protects fabricated national policies that create inflation and political polarization. It is the origin of the Muller Investigation, the infringement on President Donald Trump's power to take care of law, and set immigration and cultural policies, as well as the constitutional issues with the 2020 presidential election and postelection litigation, and Vice President Mike Pence's certification of the election. The cover up is necessary because the law is inexorably in favor of my Consideration and legislative plan. Legal authorities are in absolute agreement with me. All relevant authorities show the GOP judiciary leaders' objections to my Consideration and legislative plan to be intentionally illogical, to be absurd political nonsense, and to be violations of the Constitution. Thus, the conspiracy is necessary.

Here are excerpts from the Annex hereto of legal authorities that show the use of the words "absurd" and "political nonsense," and that explain how the GOP judiciary policy leaders' opposition to my positions are intentionally illogical and unconstitutional: "The notion that by confining the **Rules** to matters of 'procedure,' as the Rules Enabling Act

(Act) directed, one could somehow prevent [the federal judges] from having important and controversial socio-economic and political consequences outside the courtroom is **absurd** . . . it is [also] unreasonable [and] anachronisti[c] to [claim Congress understands] how [rules] impact substantive policies . . . [problem is that] the words 'substantive' and 'procedural' are mere conceptual labels and in no sense talismanic. . . [and that] the line between procedural and substantive law is hazy …[t]he Act is intended to preserve Congress' legislative power . . . [t]he reasoning [was] that, where the Court merely promulgates rules of 'procedure,' it is not overstepping its constitutionally limited bounds because procedure is, by definition, internal to the operation of the judiciary; it has no impact outside the four walls of the courthouse. We now know—and [. . .] should have known at the time of the Act's passage—that this is **political nonsense . . .** procedural choices inevitably—and often **intentionally**—impact the scope of substantive political choices. This recognition should **logically** [show] that the Act unconstitutionally [and wrongfully] vest[ed] in the Supreme Court power that is reserved, in [America], for those who are representative of and accountable to the electorate."

I am not an academic, much less a legal scholar. I am a Wall Street pioneer of activist short selling. In 1996, shortly after the birth of the internet, I harnessed its power to investigate, expose, and defeat over fifty stock fraud conspiracies in a row. I used the skills I honed doing this work to discover the GOP judiciary policy leaders' role in making the Rule that infringed on my parental rights. This motivated me to create the nation's only independent federal judiciary policy organization focused on the law governing rulemaking at the US Judicial Conference and to file the nation's first federal criminal indifference to civil rights in family law action against the US Judicial Conference's unconstitutional rulemaking. I expanded my Consideration to incorporate the use of raw will and force in the status of abortion, against President Trump, and Pence's certification.

Governor Ron DeSantis and his chief of staff, James Uthmeire, have information about this matter and will be able to consult with you. They should be familiar with my work with the GOP, Bill Barr, J. Mike Luttig, Ted Cruz, and Jim Jordan, as well as my legislative plan, Consideration, and congressional campaign issues. You should also know that Kevin McCarthy is deeply involved. I have had lengthy discussions with Mr. McCarthy's most trusted advisor about Leonard Leo, who is inexorably and by far the most powerful and influential of the GOP's federal judiciary policy leaders who oppose me.

You and Mr. Uthmeire, as Governor DeSantis's agents, are the officials and members of the Republican Party of Florida who have a legal duty to me to resolve this matter. It is a matter that can be very easily resolved by using the honesty, common sense, and wisdom of our colonial founders. The November general midterm election is quickly approaching. Therefore, I respectfully request an appointment with you as soon as possible. Resolving this horribly unconstitutional, obviously illogical, and absurd political nonsense should not be a problem in the free, Republican-led State of Florida.

Respectfully,

Manuel P. Asensio

Manuel P. Asensio
Member of the Republican Party of Florida

1401 N Main St. P.O. Box: 1633 Gainesville, FL 32601
Asensio4Congress.com • info@asensio4Congress.com • **(352) WINRED-1**

Legal Authority Inexorably Showing Ruling Making at the US Judicial Conference to be Treasonous

"[T]he notion that by confining the Rules to matters of 'procedure,' as the Rules Enabling Act of 1934 directed, one could somehow prevent them [the federal judges] from having important and controversial socio-economic and political consequences outside the courtroom is absurd . . . it is perhaps unreasonable anachronistically to superimpose on the Congressional drafters a sophisticated understanding of how procedural choices may impact substantive policies." See 356 U.S. 525, 549 (1958) (Whittaker, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part.) ("The words 'substantive' and 'procedural' are mere conceptual labels and in no sense talismanic.") and 304 U.S. 64, 91–92 (1938) (Reed, J., concurring) ("The line between procedural and substantive law is hazy …"). [Emphasis added by author.]

The Rules Enabling Act is intended to preserve Congress' legislative power. In *The Supreme Court, The Rules Enabling Act, and the Politicization of the Federal Rules: Constitutional and Statutory Implications*, 90 MINN. L. REV. 1303, 1307–08, 1326 (2006), author Martin H. Redish wrote: "The reasoning appears to have been that where the Court merely promulgates rules of 'procedure,' it is not overstepping its constitutionally limited bounds because procedure is, by definition, internal to the operation of the judiciary; it has no impact outside the four walls of the courthouse. We now know—and probably should have known at the time of the Act's passage—that this is political nonsense. In numerous instances, procedural choices inevitably—and often intentionally—impact the scope of substantive political choices. This recognition should logically raise a concern that the Act unconstitutionally vests in the Supreme Court power that is reserved, in a constitutional democracy, for those who are representative of and accountable to the electorate."[Emphasis added by author.]

Karen Nelson Moore, *The Supreme Court's Role in Interpreting the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure*, 44 HASTINGS L.J. 1039, 1043 (1993) ("[C]ommentators have placed recent emphasis on the relationship between Congress and the Court in the rulemaking process as the source of the restriction against affecting substantive rights."); Martin H. Redish, *The Supreme Court, The Rules Enabling Act, and the Politicization of the Federal Rules: Constitutional and Statutory Implications*, 90 MINN. L. REV. 1303, 1307–08, 1326 (2006) ("arguing that current rulemaking oversteps constitutional bounds because the committee produces substantive rules and proposing that rules falling into a 'non-housekeeping' category of procedural rules or that 'are found to implicate significant economic, social, or political dispute(s)' should require Congressional and presidential approval"); Stephen B. Burbank, *Ignorance and Procedural Law Reform: A Call for a Moratorium*, 59 BROOK. L. REV. 841, 841–42 (1993) ("arguing that the rulemaking process should rely more heavily on empiricism and called for a moratorium on rulemaking pending further study"); Linda S. Mullenix, *Hope Over Experience: Mandatory Informal Discovery and the Politics of Rulemaking*, 69 N.C. L. REV. 795 (1991) ("arguing that the discovery proposals lacked empirical foundation and calling for reform of the rulemaking process"); Laurens Walker, *A Comprehensive Reform for Federal Civil*

Rulemaking, 61 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 455, 481 (1993) ("arguing for a limit on the Committee's discretion to be accomplished through a set of administrative agency-like guidelines"); Marc S. Galanter, *The Vanishing Trial: An Examination of Trials and Related Matters in Federal and State Courts*, 1 J. EMPIRICAL LEGAL STUD. 459, 491 (2004); Professor Richard L. Marcus has noted, we have a "litigation machine that often seems indifferent to the merits." Richard L. Marcus, Of Babies and Bathwater: The Prospects for Procedural Progress, 59 BROOK. L. REV. 761, 766 (1993).[Emphasis added by author.]

Sarah Staszak, "The Administrative Role of the Chief Justice: Law, Politics, and Procedure in the Roberts Court Era." *Laws* (ISSN 2075-471X), a peer-reviewed journal of legal systems, theory, and institutions, published quarterly online by MDPI: "The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court plays a critical role in shaping national politics and public policy. While political scientists tend to focus on the ways in which the chief affects the Court's jurisprudence, relatively little attention has been devoted to the unique administrative aspects of the position that allow for strategic influence over political and legal outcomes. This article examines the role of the chief justice as the head of the Judicial Conference, which is the primary policy making body for federal courts in the United States." [Emphasis added by author.]

Dawn M. Chutkow, "The Chief Justice as Executive: Judicial Conference Committee Appointments," *Journal of Law and Courts* 2, no. 2 (2014): 301–25. doi:10.1086/677172: "This article is the first comprehensive empirical study of chief justice appointments to the Judicial Conference committees of the US Courts, entities with influence over substantive public and legal policy. Using a newly created database of all judges appointed to serve on Judicial Conference committees between 1986 and 2012, the results indicate that a judge's partisan alignment with the chief justice matters, as do personal characteristics such as race, experience on the bench, and court level. These results support claims that Judicial Conference committee selection, membership, and participation may present a vehicle for advancing the chief justice's individual political and policy interests." https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/677172?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
[1]. "extreme vigilance against treading on contested fact issues or mixed questions of law and fact-even arguable ones-reserving them for evidentiary hearings . . . [u]nless the parties settled, disputes regarding intent, state-of-mind, and credibility were virtually always tried, often before a jury." Paul W. Mollica, Federal Summary Judgment at High Tide, 84 MARQ. L. REV. 141,147 (2000)

"A well-chronicled, decades-long effort ultimately led to the passage of the Rules Enabling Act of 1934 . . . The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure became law four years later . . . "the drafters of the Federal Rules wanted cases to be resolved on the merits" . . . those "core values of [federal] rules have been eviscerated by judicial decisions, interred by antipathy, and eulogized by none other than Wright and Miller" . . . "Federal Rules were premised on the notion that, once the parties learned the relevant facts, cases would either settle or go to trial." Stephen N. Subrin & Thomas O. Main, The Fourth Era of American Civil Procedure, 162 U. PA. L. REV. 1839 (2014)

"In 1951, the median time from filing to disposition for tried cases was 12.2 months. In 1962, that number was sixteen months. Since 1990, the median time to disposition for all

terminated cases is only seven to eight months. But as of 2012, the median time from filing to disposition remains twenty-three months in those cases where there is a trial, which, of course, these days are only one percent of all cases."

Harold Hongju Koh, The Just, Speedy, and Inexpensive Determination of Every Action? Yale Law School Faculty Scholarship (2014)