

LA

Index Case NO.# 2:22-cv-00305-LA Filed 03/10/22  
In the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN  
DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN (MILWAUKEE DIVISION)

CLERK USDC EDWI  
FILED

2022 APR -1 P 1:40

NANCY A. STENCIL, DANIEL C. RUSSLER, LISA C.  
MUELLER, CHERYL L. MARANTO, GERARD D. LISI,  
JAMES B. KURZ, MARGARET L. DEMUTH, PAUL  
DEMAIN, JAMES R. BOTSFORD AND RICHARD  
BECHEN,

Petitioners

VS

RONALD H. JOHNSON, THOMAS P. TIFFANY, AND  
SCOTT L. FITZGERALD,

Defendants

AN AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF in SUPPORT of the  
Defendants with a CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION,  
AFFIDAVIT of, COMPLAINT of and NOTICE of HIGH  
CRIMES and MISDEMEANORS of FIVE STATES of the  
UNION; ARIZONA, MICHIGAN, COMMONWEALTH of  
PENNSYLVANIA, GEORGIA and WISCONSIN FROM  
ONE OF THE PEOPLE, AN AMERICAN, A NEW  
YORKER FROM ORLEANS COUNTY, VILLAGE OF  
LYNDONVILLE 14098, SUPPORTING THE  
PETITIONERS and FILING A FORMAL COMPLAINT of  
HIGH CRIMES, MISDEMEANORS and TREASON

***I, Steven A. Colon, one of the People, as seen in the New York & the United States Constitutions, Suri Juris "of one's own right", am giving you a Brief of Amicus Curiae supporting the Defendants; Submitting an Affidavit of, Notice of a Prima Facie Case of, and Complaint of High Crimes, Misdemeanors and Treason, using the Constitution, a few State Constitutions and Court Precedent as reference along with some Political Theory and some statute laws.***

**Constitutional Question, Affidavit of, Notice of a Prima Facie Case of and Complaint of High Crimes, Misdemeanors and Treason, the Demand for Justice to be Administered. Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal and Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent**

**My Standing is established by several facts. First I, Steven A. Colon, am One of the PEOPLE; 28 U.S.C. § 2201, 28 U. S. C. § 2403(b) may apply and shall be served on the Attorney General of that State. In such a proceeding from any court of the United States, as defined by 28 U. S. C. § 451, the initial document also shall state whether that court, pursuant to 28 U. S. C. § 2403(b), certified to the State Attorney General the fact that the constitutionality of a statute of that State was drawn into question. See Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States, 14.1(e)(v), 29(4)(c). I have been injured by Wisconsin public servants and Nefarious characters who ran and certified unlawful 2020 elections allowing Intruders to occupy Public Offices of Trust, Honor or Profit under the United States; using the color of law to injure myself and my fellow Americans and the standing of the United States on the World Stage. 14th Amendment, Statute law 1983, NY Civil Rights law, 18 US code. I am a Victim of nefarious Intruders and bad actors. The Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and parties pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1331, because the case involves issues of Federal Law. The action seeks Writ of Mandamus issued for a grand jury to investigate the 2020 elections and all elections after to include all machines and ballots led by a special prosecutor; issuance of a Writ of Mandamus for full forensic audits, including all electronic devices and ballots, in all 50 states of the Union. A recommendation from this court for the death penalty if appropriate and a recommendation of the highest fines if appropriate. The action seeks a Writ of Mandamus instructing Wisconsin government to decertify the 2020 elections because they were ran and certified unlawful 2020 elections and a Writ of Mandamus to prosecute all parties found with culpability of wrongdoing, including all minor Maladministration, 28 U.S.C. § 2201; creation of a remedy, 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). A Writ of Quo Warranto issued to all so-called winners to prove they indeed won the 2020 elections and any elections after which can be proven with the paper ballots. A Writ of Mandamus instructing all Attorney Generals to prosecute all public servants who destroyed election materials related to the 2020 election or any federal election after because of federal law, 52 USC 20701: Retention and preservation of records and papers by officers of elections and 18 U.S.C. § 1503 which defines "obstruction of justice" as an act that "corruptly or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication, influences, obstructs, or impedes, or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede, the due administration of justice."**

**"The two enemies of the People are criminals and the government, so let us tie the second down with the chains of the Constitution so the second will not become the legalized version of the first." Thomas Jefferson.**

**The blessings of a free government can only be maintained by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles; Wisconsin Constitution.**

***The main object of government is the protection and preservation of personal rights, private property and public liberties and upholding the law of God. A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles and a firm adherence to justice, virtue and original law, are indispensably necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty and good government. American Maxim***

***Whereas the most sacred of liberties of which Justice Tolman spoke was personal***

*liberty. The definition of personal liberty is; Personal liberty, or the Right to enjoyment of life and liberty, is one of the Fundamental or Natural Rights, which has been protected by its inclusion as a guarantee in the various constitutions, which is not derived from, or dependent on, the U.S. Constitution, which may not be submitted to a vote and may not depend on the outcome of an election. It is one of the most sacred and valuable Rights, as sacred as the Right to private property ... and is regarded as inalienable.*

Whereas preamble to the Wisconsin Constitution states: We, the people of Wisconsin, grateful to Almighty God for our freedom, in order to secure its blessings, form a more perfect government, insure domestic tranquility and promote the general welfare, do establish this constitution.

Whereas Article one of the Wisconsin Constitution reads: All people are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent rights; among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; to secure these rights, governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Whereas Article one section three of the Wisconsin Constitution reads: Every person may freely speak, write and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that right, and no laws shall be passed to restrain or abridge the liberty of speech or of the press. In all criminal prosecutions or indictments for libel, the truth may be given in evidence, and if it appears to the jury that the matter charged as libelous be true, and was published with good motives and for justifiable ends, the party shall be acquitted; and the jury shall have the right to determine the law and fact.

Whereas the Wisconsin Constitution Article one section four reads; The right of the people peaceably to assemble, to consult for the common good, and to petition the government, or any department thereof, shall never be abridged.

Whereas the Wisconsin Constitution in Article one section nine I give Notice that I am entitled to remedy for wrongs carried out by Wisconsin public officials or anyone who has connection to the Wisconsin 2020 election results being manipulated; Every person is entitled to a certain remedy in the laws for all injuries, or wrongs which he may receive in his person, property, or character; he ought to obtain justice freely, and without being obliged to purchase it, completely and without denial, promptly and without delay, conformably to the laws.

Whereas in the New Hampshire Constitution..Art. 2-a. [The Bearing of Arms.] *All persons have the right to keep and bear arms in defense of themselves, their families, their property and the state.*

*[Art.] 2. [Natural Rights.] All men have certain natural, essential, and inherent rights among which are, the enjoying and defending life and liberty; acquiring, possessing, and protecting, property; and, in a word, of seeking and obtaining happiness. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by this state on account of race, creed, color, sex or national origin. Article 1. [Equality of Men; Origin and Object of Government.]. All men are born equally free and independent; Therefore, all government of right originates from the people, is founded in consent, and instituted for the general good.*

*Whereas when Natural Rights are involved no legislation can be made against them. A Right that is declared to be a Natural Right in the New Hampshire State Constitution; Article 10, Right of Revolution; Government being instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security, of the whole community, and not for private interest or emolument of any one man, family, or class of men; therefore, whenever the ends of government are perverted and public liberty manifestly endangered, and all other means of redress are effectual, the People may, and of right ought to reform the old, or establish a new government. The doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power, oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind, June 2, 1784.*

*Whereas in political philosophy, the right of revolution or the right of rebellion, is a Duty, a Right of the People to alter or abolish a government that acts against the People and the common good or the best interest and threatens the safety of the People without cause. Another example is that the right to revolt or rebel is a Natural Right. It only makes sense when the First Amendment does not work, the Second Amendment will be needed.*

*"EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW"-These words, written above the main entrance to the Supreme Court Building, express the ultimate responsibility of the Supreme Court of the United States. The Court is the highest tribunal in the Nation for all cases and controversies arising under the Constitution or the laws of the United States. As the final arbiter of the law, the Court is charged with ensuring the American people the promise of equal justice under law and, thereby, also functions as guardian and interpreter of the Constitution. The French political observer Alexis de Tocqueville noted the unique position of the Supreme Court in the history of nations and of jurisprudence. "The representative system of government has been adopted in several states of Europe," he remarked, "but I am unaware that any nation of the globe has hitherto organized a judicial power in the same manner as the Americans. . . . A more imposing judicial power was never constituted by any people." Whereas the Constitution, Article VI, Clause 2: This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the Supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, any Thing in the Constitution or Laws of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding. The Constitution of the United States is the Supreme law of the land.(Marbury vsMadison) Its first three words- "We the People" - affirm that the government of the United States exists to serve its citizens.*

*Whereas N.Y. Civil Rights Law Article 2 chapter 6 section 2: Supreme sovereignty in the people. No authority can, on any pretense whatsoever, be exercised over the citizens of this state, but such as is or shall be derived from and granted by the people from this state. N.Y. Civil Rights Law Article 2 chapter 6 section 10; Justice is administered without favor and speedily. Neither justice nor right should be sold to any person, nor denied, nor deferred; and writs and process ought to be granted freely and without delay, to all persons requiring the same, on payment of the fees established by law.*

*Whereas the Constitution Fourteenth Amendment section one: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.*

*Whereas the Constitution does not give the authority to any branch of government to limit or infringe or abrogate or abridge the rights of the People. I, one of the People realizes that as servants, they are not granted authority by any State Constitution or the Constitution to force mandates, mask, any vaccine, drug or any other thing that may infringe on any of the liberties of the People. I, one of the People, finds the opposite; it makes it a crime for any government worker to plot and conspire to oppress the People.*

*Whereas all Men are created equal. All Men can be held accountable for their actions. Any law that implies a Man has a privilege of immunity not only violates the Constitution but also violates the Natural Law of Men. I, one of the People, do realize that the courts have a hard time prosecuting public servants in positions of power, government officials who refuse to follow the statute law and the Supreme Law of the Land, the Constitution that govern them; And those as private entities partnering with federal programs that oppress the People in administrative tribunals and the like, that are foreign to the State Constitutions and the*



*Constitution. Examples of these are the B.A.T.F.E., the I.R.S. & the E.P.A taking the property of the People without Due Process .*

Whereas Tyranny is a form of government rule which is characterized by violation of those laws which regulate the division and the exercises of the sovereign power of the state. It is a violation of its constitution. A Tyrannical government takes action to oppress the rights of the People. Tyrannical governments usurpation of charters or a constitution is the exercise of power, which another has a right to; so tyranny is the exercise of power beyond right, which nobody can have a right to.

Whereas Civil and political rights are a class of rights that protect individuals; freedom from infringement by governments, social organizations, and private individuals. They ensure one's entitlement to participate in the civil and political life of the society and State without discrimination or repression. I as one of the People can plead with the Court for justice when public servants or other persons infringe or encroach on the Civil Rights and the Civil Liberties of the People.

Whereas no State may convert a secure liberty into a privilege and then issue a license and a fee for it (Murdoch vs Pennsylvania) I can ignore the license and engage in the right with impunity, that means I can't be punished for it (Shuttlesworth vs Birmingham Alabama).

I give Notice that an unconstitutional act is not law. It confers no rights and poses no duties, affords no protections, and creates no office. It is in legal contemplation as inoperative though it had never been passed (Norton vs Shelby County).

I give Notice all laws, rules and practices which are repugnant to the Constitution are null and void (Marbury v. Madison).

Whereas according to The Constitution of the United States of America Article I section 9, no Bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed. Ex Post Facto law means a law passed after a Right is numbered in the Bill of Rights and some Tyrant wants to infringe upon that Right it is unconstitutional.

Whereas willfulness is an evil motive or intent to avoid a known duty or task under law with immoral certainty. I am using the Constitution and Supreme Court cases so I am not using evil motives or intents (US vs Bishop) De Jure Law; It shall be interpreted in my favor because I am the clearly intended and expressly designated beneficiary for the protection of my rights and property. Government is foreclosed from Parity with Real People.

Whereas the legal manifestation, that is supposed to be in play, is that no government, as well as any law, agency, aspect, court, etc. can concern itself with anything other than corporate, artificial persons and the contracts between them. Whereas every man is independent of all laws, except those prescribed by nature. He is not bound by any institutions formed by his fellowmen without his consent (CRUDEN vs NEALE).

Whereas the US Supreme Court wrote the truth in Miranda vs AZ, "When rights secured by the Constitution are involved, there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them."

Whereas Nunn v. State, 1 Ga. (1 Kel.) 243 (1846) is a GA Supreme Court set into court record "Our opinion is, that any law, State or Federal, is repugnant to the Constitution, and void".

Whereas 28 US Code section 1651- Writs gives authority to The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law. With an alternative writ or rule nisi may be issued by a justice or judge of a court which has jurisdiction. I may request Writs from this Court in this case to clarify and enforce

the law. Two examples of Writs are: a Writ of Mandamus and a Writ of Quo Warranto.

Whereas the Oath of Office is a contract; "I do solemnly swear ( or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter; So help me God."

Whereas any public servants offending against any Americans by : malfeasance, misfeasance, maladministration in office, corruption, neglect of duty, negligence, treason, bribery, offense of moral turpitude or oppression, misconduct in office, misbehavior in office, malpractice in office, intemperance or habitual drunkenness, incompetence, incapacity, corrupt conduct in office, crimes, gross immorality, high crimes and misdemeanors are all impeachable actions and must be held accountable. These are found in several State Constitutions but can be applied by I, one of the People because of the Constitution; Article 4 section 2. I, one of the People, can seek an investigation by the Grand Jury of the People by the State of New York Constitution Article 1 sections 6 & 9. Which guarantees the power of the People's Grand Juries to inquire into the willful misconduct in Offices of public officers, and to find indictments or to direct the filing of information in connection with such inquiries, Shall never be suspended or impaired by law.

Whereas High Crimes and Misdemeanors and Treason are unique offenses in our constitutional order— crimes mentioned in the Constitution, and applying only to Americans who have betrayed the ALLEGIANCE they are presumed to owe the United States. Since all public servants swear that they have ALLEGIANCE to the Constitution by taking the Oath of Office; "I do solemnly swear ( or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and ALLEGIANCE to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter; So help me God.". ALLEGIANCE is then established for all public servants like governors, secretaries of states, Congress members, vice presidents, policemen and justices all can be charged with High Crimes and Misdemeanors or Treason when Constitutional Law is not followed as it is written.

I give notice that color of law refers to an appearance of legal power to act that may operate in violation of law. That is why it is a federal crime for anyone acting under "color of law" to willfully deprive or conspire to deprive a person of a right protected by the Constitution or U.S. law. " the color of law" simply means the person is using authority given to him or her by a local, state, or federal government agency to do wrong.

Whereas 18 US Code section 242 reads: Whoever, under the color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects any person in any State, Territory, Commonwealth, Possession, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, ... shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both; and if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both; and if death results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include kidnapping or an attempt to kidnap, aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to commit aggravated sexual abuse, or an attempt to kill, shall be fined under this title, or imprisoned for any term of years or for life, or both, or may be sentenced to death. The Court has a Duty an obligation to take all steps necessary to weed out all the lawless actors stained in "the color of law " who masquerade as trustworthy public servants.

Whereas this is a summary of 18 US Code section 242 reads : Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. It is not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin of the victim. The offense is punishable by a range of imprisonment up to a life term, or the death penalty, depending upon the circumstances of the crime, and the resulting injury, if any.

Whereas the 14th Amendment to the U.S Constitution protects against States abridging rights of citizens. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. This clause clearly makes the point that States can in no way undermine the laws as defined by the Constitution of the United States.

Whereas the N.Y. Constitution Article 1 § 11 Equal protection of laws; discrimination in civil rights prohibited; No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws of this state or any subdivision thereof. No person shall, because of race, color, creed (a set of beliefs or aims which guide someone's actions, the way they live) or religion, be subjected to any discrimination in his or her civil rights by any other person or by any firm, corporation, or institution, or by the State or any agency or subdivision of the state.

Whereas the Preamble to the Bill of Rights. "The Conventions of a number of States, having at a time of their adopting the Constitution expressed a desire in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added: And extending the ground of public confidence in the Government will best ensure the beneficent ends of its institution.

Whereas the Founding Fathers wrote in the Preamble of the Bill of Rights to limit the power of the established Government so it would not be able to abuse the People or the States. The Founding Fathers used the word "misconstruction" is defined as the action of misconstruing words or actions; misinterpretation. The States all agreed on the Bill of Rights being added to prevent misinterpretation of the government's power so it could not abuse the individual. They also used declaratory which means declaring or explaining something clauses; And restrictive clauses which means they are restrictive clauses restrict or define the meaning of a noun or noun phrase and provide necessary information about the noun in the sentence. It is not separated from the rest of the sentence by commas. The restrictions of power are on the government not on the People.

Whereas Article 4 section 4 reads : The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union, a Republican Form of Government. Absolute and arbitrary powers over the lives, liberty and property of Free Men exist nowhere in a Republic, not even in the largest majority. Republic : A State in which supreme power is held by the People. I give Notice that the Constitution is the assembly manual for the government of the United States, and is the source of authority for the government to do the business of the People.

Whereas the People realize that Tyrannical wicked public servants infringe and write unlawful laws and set up administrations such as the Internal Revenue Service, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, Explosives and the Environmental Protection Agency, that oppress the People with no authority to do so. These unlawful actions cause unnecessary hardships on the People. So the People and I being one of the People are requesting this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus for the People to use the Grand Jury to investigate the 2020 Elections and how the before mentioned government agencies can steal the People's' property without Due Process; I

remind the Court the People have the right to the Grand jury to investigate the culpability of bad acting public servants and Intruders by the authority granted to them in the NY Constitution Article 1 sections 6 & 9.

Now comes documented facts of my Prima Facie case, Notice of, Affidavit of, Formal Complaint of High Crimes, Misdemeanors and Treason and a Demand for Justice to be Administered, presented by I, *Steven A. Colon* who swears them to be factual, The whole Truth and nothing but the Truth; So now comes my testimony of my understanding of Legal Documents and Court Precedents which prove the United States government has Intruders pretending to be lawful actors. I will prove to you that the US Executive Branch has no authority and the US 117th Congress has no authority. The US Judicial Branch may have unlawful actors pretending to be Judges but they have no authority.

You will understand the gravity of the situation. The government outlined in the Constitution of the United States does not exist at this date in Time, March 2022.

I give Notice this is from the Constitution, Article VI, Clause 2: This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

Take Notice the Constitution is the supreme Law, the Law of the Land. I give notice, the Constitution of the United States is the Supreme law of the land. – *Marbury V. Madison* 5 U.S. 137 which sets Court Precedent.

The U.S. Constitution calls itself the "supreme law of the land." This clause is taken to mean that when State Constitutions or laws passed by State legislatures or the National Congress are found to conflict with the Federal Constitution, they have no force. A factual Truth.

I give Notice this is the Preamble of the Constitution. "We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Prosperity, do Ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." Its first three words- "*We the People*" - *affirm that the government of the United States exists to serve its citizens.*

Whereas 3 U.S. Code section 2 reads: "Whenever any State has held an election for the purposes of choosing electors and has failed to make a choice on the day prescribed by law, the electors may be appointed on a subsequent day in such a manner as the legislature of such State may direct." So the choice was made to do the unlawful certification establishing Culpability. 3 US Code section 2 establishes my standing as I, *Steven A. Colon*, am an American and a victim of bad actors and Intruders occupying US Offices of Trust, Honor and Profit.

Whereas 52 USC § 20701, requires a 22-month retention period for such records, and O.C.G.A. § 21- 2-73 which requires a 24-month retention period for such records; any public servant that destroys such records establishes his or her culpability for violating 52 US Code section 20701. 52 US Code section 20701 establishes my standing as I, *Steven A. Colon*, am an American and a victim of bad actors and Intruders occupying US Offices of Trust, Honor and Profit.

Whereas the summary of 18 US Code section 242 reads: Section 242 of Title 18 makes it a crime for a person acting under color of any law to willfully deprive a person of a right or privilege protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States. For the purpose of Section 242, acts under "color of law" include acts not only done by federal, state, or local officials within their lawful authority, but also acts done beyond the bounds of that official's lawful authority, if the acts are done while the official is purporting to or pretending to act in the performance of his/her official duties. Persons acting under color of law within the meaning of this statute include police officers, prisons guards and other law enforcement officials, as well as judges, care providers in public health facilities, and others who are acting as public officials. It is not necessary that the crime be motivated by animus toward the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin of the victim. The offense is punishable by a range of imprisonment up to a life term, or the death penalty, depending upon the circumstances of the crime, and the resulting injury, if any. Therefore any public servant that violates 18 US Code section 242 establishes his or her culpability. 18 US Code section 242 establishes my standing



as I, Steven A. Colon, am an American and a victim of bad actors and Intruders occupying US Offices of Trust, Honor and Profit.

Whereas 18 US Code section 371 is a Conspiracy to Defraud the United States. The general conspiracy statute, 18 U.S.C. § 371, creates an offense "[i]f two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose. Therefore any public servant or anyone's actions cause fraud or harm to come to the government of the United States structured in the Constitution of the United States establishes their culpability. 18 US Code section 371 establishes my standing as I, Steven A. Colon, am an American and a victim of bad actors and Intruders occupying US Offices of Trust, Honor and Profit.

I give Notice that 42 U.S.Code Section 1983 provides an individual the right to sue state government employees and others acting "under color of state law" for civil rights violations. 42 US Code section 1983 establishes my standing as I, Steven A. Colon, am an American and a victim of bad actors and Intruders occupying US Offices of Trust, Honor and Profit.

Whereas whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money( Public Job) or property( Office of Trust) by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimidated( Intimidation took place) or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so to do, places in any US Post Office or authorized depository for mail matter, any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service, or deposits or causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier, or takes or receives therefrom, any such matter or thing, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail or such carrier according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. If the violation occurs in relation to, or involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted, transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection with, a presidentially declared major disaster or emergency (as those terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), or affects a financial institution, such person shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both. Mail fraud occurs when the U.S. Mail is used in furtherance of a criminal act. In order for a defendant to be convicted under 18 U.S.C. 1341 for committing mail fraud, the follow elements must be satisfied: (1) the defendant must have been engaged in a scheme to defraud; (2) the scheme must have involved material misstatements or omissions; (3) the scheme resulted, or would have resulted upon completion, in the loss of money, property, or honest services; (4) the defendant must have used the U.S. mail in furtherance of scheme to defraud; and (5) the defendant used or caused the use of U.S.mail. Therefore if the United States Mail was used in any nefarious scheme his or her culpability is established and victimized me, Steven A. Colon;By allowing Intruders and bad actors to occupy US government Offices of Honor,Trust and Profit.

Whereas Prima Facie Evidence means "on its first appearance" this is evidence presented before a trial that is enough to prove something until it is successfully disproved or rebutted at trial. This is also called "presumptive evidence". In order to establish a Prima Facie Case; the Prosecutor needs only to offer credible evidence in support of each element of a crime.

Whereas 5 USC PART III, Subpart B, CHAPTER 33, SUBCHAPTER II: OATH OF OFFICE § 3333. Employee affidavit; loyalty and striking against the Government. (a) Except as provided by subsection (b) of this section, an individual who accepts office or employment in the Government of the United States or in the government of the District of Columbia shall execute an affidavit within 60 days after accepting the office or employment that his acceptance and holding of the office or employment does not or will not violate section 7311 of this title. The affidavit (Oath of Office) is Prima Facie evidence that the acceptance and holding of office or employment by the affiant does not or will not violate section 7311 of this title. Further Notice is

given that Executive Order 12731 orders that, (A)Public service is a public trust, requiring employees to place loyalty to the Constitution, the laws, and ethical principles above private gain.(k) Employees shall disclose waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption to appropriate authorities.(n) Employees shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that they are violating the law or the ethical standards promulgated pursuant to this order. The threshold of culpability is established by creating the appearance that they are violating the law or ethical standards and justifies a Writ of Mandamus to a Grand Jury to investigate Intruders and bad actors occupying US government Offices of Honor,Trust and Profit.

I give Notice that the definition of Maladministration is wide and can include: Delay, Incorrect action or Failure to take any action, Failure to follow procedures or the law, Failure to provide information, Inadequate record-keeping, Failure to investigate, Failure to reply, Misleading or inaccurate statements, Inadequate liaison, Inadequate consultation and Broken promises. Maladministration is the actions of a government body which can be seen as causing an injustice; corrupt or Incompetent administration (as of a public office). Maladministration is further defined as conduct that involves action or inaction of a serious nature that is: contrary to law; or. unreasonable, unjust, oppressive or improperly discriminatory; or. based wholly or partly on improper motives. Obviously describing the Unlawful Biden Administration and the 117th US Congress. There actions hurt America and that establishes their culpability so a Writ of Mandamus to a Grand Jury to investigate them is justified.

I, Steven A. Colon, give Notice that this is a Formal Complaint against the Biden Administration for Maladministration which results in my Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights, my safety, and my standing as an American all being injured.

I, Steven A. Colon, give you Notice of a Formal Complaint against the 117th US Congress for Maladministration which results in my Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights, my safety and my standing as an American all being injured.

I, Steven A. Colon, give you Notice I am making a Formal Complaint against the State of Arizona for Maladministration which resulted in my Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights, my safety and my standing as an American all being injured.

I, Steven A. Colon, give you Notice I am making a Formal Complaint against the State of Georgia for Maladministration which resulted in my Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights, my safety and my standing as an American all being injured.

I, Steven A. Colon, give you Notice I am making a Formal Complaint against the State of Wisconsin for Maladministration which resulted in my Constitutional Rights, my Civil Rights, my safety and my standing of being an American all being injured.

I, Steven A. Colon, am making a Formal Complaint against the State of Michigan for Maladministration which resulted in my Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights, my safety and my standing as an American all being injured.

I, Steven A. Colon, give you Notice that I am filing a Formal Complaint against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for Maladministration which resulted in my Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights, my safety and my standing as an American all being injured.

Whereas the State of Virginia Constitution reads and mentions Maladministration: Article I. Bill of Rights, Section 3. Government instituted for common benefit: That government is, or ought to be, instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security of the People, Nation, or Community; of all the various modes and forms of government, that is best which is capable of producing the greatest degree of happiness and safety, and is most effectually secured against The Danger (not just occurrences) of MALADMINISTRATION; and, whenever any government shall be found Inadequate or Contrary to these purposes, a majority of the community hath an indubitable, inalienable, and indefeasible right to reform, alter, or abolish it, in such manner as shall be judged most conducive to the public weal. I give notice that the People of the Nation or the Community not just the State of Virginia but anyone in the Republic can use this Right. It is a Natural Right to have and desire a government that provides the greatest degree of happiness, safety and most effectually secured against the Danger of Maladministration, which

sets the *threshold* of just the appearance of Maladministration for exercising the inalienable and indefeasible Right to reform, alter or abolish it. I give testimony that Danger is the possibility of something. In both the N.H. and Massachusetts Constitutions also guarantees the People have the Natural Right and the Duty to rebel against bad government.

Whereas the Preamble of the Massachusetts Constitution reads: The end of the institution, maintenance, and administration of government, is to secure the existence of the body politic, to protect it, and to furnish the individuals who compose it with the power of enjoying in safety and tranquillity their Natural Rights, and the blessings of life: and whenever these great objects are not obtained, the people have a Right to alter the government, and to take measures necessary for their safety, prosperity and happiness. I give testimony that when Natural Rights are involved no legislation can be made against them. A Right that is declared to be a Natural Right in the New Hampshire State Constitution; Article 10, Right of Revolution; Government being instituted for the common benefit, protection, and security, of the whole community, and not for private interest or emolument of any one man, family, or class of men; therefore, whenever the ends of government are Perverted and Public Liberty Manifestly Endangered, and all other means of redress are effectual, the People may, and of Right ought to reform the old, or establish a new government. The doctrine of nonresistance against arbitrary power, oppression, is absurd, slavish, and destructive of the good and happiness of mankind, June 2, 1784. I give you further testimony that in Political Philosophy, the Right of Revolution or the Right of Rebellion, is a Duty, a Right of the People to alter or abolish a government that acts against the People's common good or the best interest and threatens the safety of the People without cause. This is another example of the Right to Revolt or Rebel being a Natural Right.

Whereas, at all times public servants are amenable to the People.VA Constitution and others.

I give Notice that government workers are the servants and trustees of the People as seen in the Georgia, Virginia and Massachusetts Constitutions as they described the role of the government worker in a Republic. Georgia Bill of Rights section 2 paragraph 1 : Origin and Foundation of Government : All government of right, originates with the People, and is founded upon their will only and is instituted solely for the good of the whole. Public officers are the trustees and servants of the People and are at all times amenable to them. Virginia Constitution Bill of Rights section 2: People the source of all power is vested in, consequently derived from the People, that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times *amenable* to them. Massachusetts Declaration of Rights, Article 5; All power residing originally in the People and being derived from them, the several magistrates and officers of government, vested with authority, whether legislative, executive, or judicial are their substitutes and agents, and are at all times accountable to them. Please take further notice that the forefathers in this land considered public officers to just be servants, trustees, and agents as substitutes of the People and in no way higher than or a special class that is greater than the People, and are subject to the same laws. In conclusion, nowhere in any of the fifty Republican governments does the government have power over the People

I give you Notice that the government was established to benefit the common good of the People and to carry out the business of the People.

I give you Notice that government workers work for the People and do not have authority over the People and are subject to laws and ethics that apply only to the public servant and the same laws that apply to the People.

Whereas Executive Order 12674 establishes the concept that: Thomas Jefferson enunciated the basic principle of public service. "When a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property." This sentiment has been expressed by numerous others, over time becoming the familiar principle "Public service is a public trust." Public service is a public trust, requiring you to place loyalty to the Constitution, the laws, and ethical principles above private gain.

You shall not hold financial interests that conflict with the conscientious performance of duty. You shall not engage in financial transactions using non-public Government information or allow improper use of such information to further any private interest.

You shall not, except pursuant to such reasonable exceptions as are provided by regulation, solicit or accept any gift or other item of monetary value from any person or entity seeking official action from, doing business with, or conducting activities regulated by your agency, or whose interests may be substantially affected by the performance or nonperformance of your duties.

You shall make no unauthorized commitments or promises of any kind purporting to bind the Government.

You shall put forth an honest effort in the performance of your duties.

You shall not engage in outside employment or activities, including seeking or negotiating for employment, that conflict with your official Government duties and responsibilities.  
You shall disclose waste, fraud, abuse, and corruption to appropriate authorities.  
You shall satisfy in good faith your obligations as citizens, including all just financial obligations, especially those such as Federal, state, or local taxes that are imposed by law.  
You shall adhere to all laws and regulations that provide equal opportunities for all Americans regardless of race, religion, color, sex (including pregnancy, gender identity, and sexual orientation), parental status, national origin, age, disability, family medical history or genetic information, political affiliation, and military service.  
You shall not use your public office for private gain.  
You shall act impartially and not give preferential treatment to any private organization or individual.

You shall protect and conserve Federal Property and shall not use it for other than authorized activity.

You shall endeavor to avoid any actions creating the appearance that you are violating the law, the *Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch* (5 C.F.R. § part 2635), DOI Supplemental ethics regulations, or Executive Order 12674.

A collection of statutes, executive orders, and regulations underscore the notion that public service is a public trust. The criminal bribery and conflict of interest statutes (18 U.S.C. §§ 201 and 202-209, respectively) are the core of the Federal ethics program. These statutes are implemented, in large part, by the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch (Standards), 5 C.F.R. part 2635, and the Supplemental Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Department of the Interior (DOI Supplemental Standards), 5 C.F.R. part 3501. Violations of ethics laws are subject to criminal or civil action by the Department of Justice.

I give you Notice that a government worker who gives the appearance of wrongdoing establishes his or her culpability and a Writ of Mandamus of an investigation is justified.

Whereas federal law regulating Oath of Office by government officials is divided into four parts along with Executive Orders which further defines the law for purposes of enforcement. 5 U.S.C. 3331, provides the text of the actual Oath of Office members of Congress are required to take before assuming office. 5 U.S.C. 3333 requires members of Congress sign an affidavit that they have taken the Oath of Office required by 5 U.S.C. 3331 and have not or will not violate that oath of office during their tenure of office as defined by the third part of the law, 5 U.S.C. 7311 which explicitly makes it a federal criminal offense (and a violation of Oath of Office) for anyone employed in the United States Government (including members of Congress) to "advocate the overthrow of our Constitutional form of government". The fourth federal law, 18 U.S.C. 1918 provides penalties for violation of Oath of Office described in 5 U.S.C. 7311 which include: (1) removal from office and; (2) confinement or a fine.

I, Steven A Colon, give you Notice this is a Formal Complaint that the public servants in five States of AZ, MI, WI, GA and PA violated their Oath of Office, Civil Right law and State statute law and I want them held accountable. I, Steven A. Colon, am filing a formal complaint with you against Members of the US 117th Congress and the 46 Executive Administration for violating my Constitutional Rights, Civil Rights, endangerment and violating the Oath of Office, Executive Orders, the Constitution and Federal & State statute law. I also demand a Mail Fraud or other criminal investigation against the persons on video dropping many ballots in drop boxes throughout the country and the Wisconsin Election Commission (W.E.C.) and all persons from the aforementioned States.

Whereas Culpable behaviors are those in which the employee is in control and responsible for their actions. Some examples include calling in sick when they are not, choosing to not perform their duties well or at all, wilful disregard for safety measures, or instances of theft.

I give Notice that all public servants can have Culpable behaviors and just like private employees can be held accountable for all Men are created equal and public servants must answer to the People at all times. To say some have Qualified Immunity is unconstitutional and an insult because All Men Are Created Equal. All Men Are Entitled To Justice.

I give Notice that the government was established by the People to serve the People and carry out the business of the People at all times amenable to them.

Whereas the 14th Amendment to the U.S Constitution protects against States abridging rights of citizens. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities



of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws. This clause clearly makes the point that States can in no way undermine the laws as defined by the Constitution of the United States. Since laws of the Constitution were undermined by the States of AZ, MI, PA, GA and WI culpability is established and a Writ of Mandamus for investigation is Justified. ( note must be added more States may have been compromised )

Whereas the N.Y. Constitution Article 1 § 11 Equal protection of laws; discrimination in civil rights prohibited; No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws of this state or any subdivision thereof. No person shall, because of race, color, creed (a set of beliefs or aims which guide someone's actions, the way they live) or religion, be subjected to any discrimination in his or her civil rights by any other person or by any firm, corporation, or institution, or by the State or any agency or subdivision of the state.

I give Notice that this is the Factual Truth about the 2020 Elections that resulted in unlawful Intruders filling Offices of Trust, Honor and Profit and acting as though they have the authority of the Office; endangering myself and the entire World.

- 1) Whereas the Constitution of the United States is the Supreme Law of the United States. I will write them word for word out of the Assembly Manual of the government of the United States, the Constitution. From the Constitution, Article 1 section 4 the Law is Written as follows : The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of chusing Senators. From the Constitution, Article 2 section 1, clause 2 the Law is written as follows : Each State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors, equal to the whole Number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress: but no Senator or Representative, or Person holding an Office of Trust or Profit under the United States, shall be appointed an Elector.
- 2) Whereas the United States Court Precedent, Law Maxim and Congressional Precedent to prove to you that unconstitutional laws create no Office, weld no authority and only the State legislatures can make a State's election manners.
  - A) The Constitution of the United States is the Supreme law of the land. -- *Marbury V. Madison* 5 U.S. 137 *Marbury v. Madison* strengthened the federal judiciary by establishing for it the power of judicial review, by which the federal courts could declare legislation, as well as executive and administrative actions, inconsistent with the U.S. Constitution ("unconstitutional") and therefore null and void.
  - B) *Miranda v. Arizona* 1966, The Court demonstrated that even a criminal case could easily be overturned or grounds for a mistrial due to unconstitutional methods of interrogation.
  - C) *Nunn v. Georgia*, 1 Ga. 243, 250 (1846); Our opinion is, that any law, State or Federal, is repugnant to the Constitution, and void, which contravenes this right,
  - D) *Stare Decisis* established in the United States Courts by *Bush vs Gore* where it is in court record that Non-legislative actors lack authority to amend or nullify election statutes. *Bush II*, 531 U.S. at 104 (quoted *supra*). Then again in *McPherson vs Blacker*; the Court explained that Article 2 section 1 clause 2 conveying the broadest power of determination leaves it to the legislature exclusively to define the method of appointment.

....

- E) Norton vs Shelby County, The Court ruled that; An unconstitutional act is not law. It confers no rights and poses no duties, affords no protections, and creates no office. It is in legal contemplation as inoperative though it had never been passed.
- F) U.S. vs. Throckmorton, a 1878 landmark decision, where the Court found that fraud "vitiates" (voids, invalidates) everything: contracts, documents, court rulings — and elections.
- G) Daniels vs Mack in FL. The judge, Honorable Kevin Weiss, has ruled that one Eatonville town councilman must give up his seat because of election fraud. "Mack shall be and hereby is ousted from Seat 4 of the Eatonville Town Council."
- H) Election case of Finley v. Walls; The law is, that where fraud is proved to have been committed by the officers of an election in conducting the election, no reliance can be placed upon any of their acts and their return must be rejected as wholly unreliable. The party claiming under the election must prove the actual vote in some other way. The only evidence as to what the vote was is from John V. Brown (p. 79), one of the challengers, a Conservative, who says: "Finley got 11 and Walls 588, I think. I derived my information from being present and keeping a tally sheet." This certainly can not establish the vote, as his testimony at most can only be evidence of the actual number of votes cast, but one of the principal objections is that illegal votes were cast, and this, too, with the guilty knowledge of the officers of the election. There being proof that such illegal votes were cast and the real number of legal votes not being proved, there is nothing upon which the true vote can be ascertained, and, therefore, the entire poll must be rejected; and your committee so find and determine. Election officers fraudulently chosen and acting illegally were held to be intruders and not de facto officers.
- I) Whereas the Law Maxim: Crimen omnia ex se nata vitiat is a Latin phrase retained from Roman law. Which means 'crime vitiates everything which springs from it.' This phrase is a part of both civil and common law. It states that a crime vitiates everything that proceeds from the crime.

Third, the "How" unconstitutional laws were used in the five States of the Union that allowed Intruders to fill Offices of Trust and act as if they have authority to carry out the People's business. The five States of the Union are Arizona, (AZ), Georgia (GA), Wisconsin (WI), Michigan (MI) and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (PA).

1 AZ.) The State of Arizona's electoral votes were unlawfully certified and counted. The number of illegal votes and votes affected by the various constitutional violations far exceeds the margin of votes separating the candidates. Arizona's election violated the Electors' Clause. Since 1990, Arizona law has required that residents wishing to participate in an election submit their voter registration materials no later than 29 days prior to election day in order to vote in that election. Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 16-120(A). For 2020, that deadline was October 5.

Then in *Mi Familia Vota vs. Hobbs*, 492 F. Supp. 3d 980 (D. Ariz. 2020), however, a federal district court violated the Electors Clause and changed that law without legislative approval, extending the registration deadline to October 23, 2020. The Ninth Circuit stayed that order on October 13, 2020, with a two-day grace period, *Mi Familia Vota vs. Hobbs*, 977 F.3d 948, 955 (9th Cir. 2020).

Nonetheless, the Ninth Circuit did not apply the stay retroactively because neither the Arizona Secretary of State nor the Arizona Attorney General requested retroactive relief. *Id.* at 954-55. As a net result, the deadline was unconstitutionally extended from the statutory deadline of October 5 to October 15, 2021, thereby allowing more than 52,000 registrations in violation of Arizona law. Brahm Resnik, Court cuts off extension of Arizona voter registration on Thursday, 12 NEWS, Oct. 13, 2020.<sup>9</sup>

Whereas it is Fact that the Ninth Circuit Court changed AZ lawful election manners by using an authority that only belongs to the AZ legislature. Whereas it is Fact the Ninth Circuit Court legislated which is an unlawful act. Regardless of the number of votes affected, the unconstitutional act Resulted in unlawful elections in AZ. Resulting in Intruders occupying Offices of Public Trust with no authority to do the job and changed the form of government of the United States as assembled and defined in the Constitution of the United States. I give Notice that with no authority to legislate but chose to legislate establishes culpability of the Ninth Circuit Court.

I give Notice that the Audits of Maricopa County found outcome-determinative Numbers of unlawful votes. In addition to the foregoing purely legal Electors Clause violation, audits of the 2020 election results in Maricopa County discovered evidence of outcome-determinative discrepancies and fraud. On December 15, 2020, the Arizona

State senate served two subpoenas on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors (the "Maricopa Board") to audit scanned ballots, voting machines, and software based on voting irregularities. The Arizona Senate Judiciary Chairman stated in a public hearing earlier that day that "[t]here is evidence of tampering, there is evidence of fraud" with vote in Maricopa County.

Rather than comply with the subpoenas, the Maricopa Board fought the subpoenas in state court which established culpability, which resulted in the issuance of two new, superseding subpoenas on January 12, 2021. Although the Maricopa Board complied in part, it continued to seek to withhold (culpability established) the balance of the subpoenaed election materials (e.g., ballots, voting equipment) needed to audit election results. Although the Arizona Senate prevailed on the lawfulness of the subpoenas, *Maricopa County. vs. Fann*, No. CV 2020-016840 (Maricopa County. Super. Ct. Feb. 25, 2021), the Maricopa Board and other County officials continued to obstruct (establishing culpability) the audit and withheld materials covered by the subpoenas (e.g., splunk logs, routers, and equipment) that could determine the extent of internet connectedness or intrusions. After the Maricopa County Superior Court upheld the issuance of the operative subpoenas, on March 3, 2021, someone using an administrative account from a valid local network address accessed Maricopa County's Election Management System ("EMS") server and executed a script 37,686 times, with each execution resulting on the overwriting of one entry in the EMS server's security log (i.e. The log has a fixed capacity, and each new entry displaced the oldest entry), thereby destroying evidence( established culpability) of the network accesses to the EMS during the 2020 election. The Arizona Senate engaged systems and cybersecurity firms to audit the election materials produced by the County using forensic methods that exceed the type of hand recount typically conducted in close elections. Unlike a forensic audit, a recount would not detect fraud in the same way that recounting the money in a cash register would not detect whether a business had passed counterfeit currency { see *Finely vs Walls*}. On September 24, 2021, the forensic auditors presented their reports to the Arizona State Senate in both written form and testimony. The forensic auditors found numerous anomalies and outcome-determinative discrepancies with the Maricopa County election materials made available to them, including: 255,326 ballots included in the "final voted file" (the "VM55" file) as having voted early that were not included in the "early voting returns file" (the "EV33" file), when the EV33 file should have an entry for each early vote cast (whether by mail or in person) with the details as to when and how that vote was cast; 23,344 mail-in ballots cast when the registered voter had moved( maladministration) and where no one with the same surname remained at the address; 5,295 instances of multiple ballots from the same person( maladministration); 3,432 more votes in the official results than in the final-voted ("VM55") file( established maladministration); 2,592 more duplicate ballots than ballots sent for duplication( maladministration); 1,528 voters who had moved to another state; 618 votes by persons not on the official precinct register 10 days prior to election; 397 mail-in ballots returned without any record of a ballot having been sent to the voter; 282 registered voters who died before October 5, 2020, and nonetheless voted; 198 votes by persons who registered after the cut-off date for registering to vote in the 2020 election. Whereas the *Cyber Ninjas*, Maricopa County Forensic Election Audit, vol. III, at 6, 51, 10, 12-14, 20-21, 25-26, 29-30, 34-36 (Sept. 24, 2021) (Tab 20) states: Although Maricopa County withholding the router, Splunk, and NetFlow data prevented an audit of all internet connections with the Maricopa County election system, the audit network auditors did find evidence of internet activity in unallocated space—i.e., portions of deleted files—on the Maricopa County election systems dated after the installation of the Dominion voting software suite on August 6, 2020. This finding proves that Maricopa County's claim that its election systems were not connected to the internet is false; since a lie was told, culpability was established and since the numbers did not match Maladministration was established. The forensic auditors were unable to determine whether votes or results had been electronically altered from the materials initially provided because Maricopa County officials withheld or overwrote equipment and data that would allow forensic auditors to determine whether intrusions had—or had not—occurred and, if so, from where those intrusions came. In addition, A. V. Shiva Ayyadurai, Ph.D., analyzed signatures from the images of early voting ballot envelopes that Maricopa County provided to the Arizona Senate. His findings included the following anomalies and outcome-determinative discrepancies from an analysis of the signature regions of the 1,929,240 early-voting ballot ("EVB") return envelope images provided: 17,322 duplicate mail-in voting early ballots by 17,126 voters who voted twice (16,934 voters), thrice (188 voters), or four times (4 voters); 9,589 fewer EVB return envelopes identified as even having a signature than Maricopa County submitted for signature verification; A 59.7% decrease in the number of EVB return envelopes rejected as having a signature mismatch versus the 2016 election, notwithstanding that the number of EVB return envelopes increased 52.6% from 2016 to 2020; 6,545 fewer EVB return envelope

images made available than reported by Maricopa County's canvass report on the 2020 general election; 2,580 "scribbles" in the signature region— which would indicate a "bad signature" if a review were commissioned to analyze signatures—when Maricopa County reported having rejected only 587 "bad signature" EVB return envelopes in its canvass report on the 2020 general election; 464 more "no signature" EVB return envelopes—a total of 1,919—when Maricopa County reported having rejected only 1,455 "no signature" EVB return envelopes in its canvass report on the 2020 general election. A. V. Shiva Ayyadurai, Ph.D., Pattern Recognition Classification of Early Voting Ballot (EVB) Return Envelope Images for Signature Presence Detection: An Engineering Systems Approach to Identify Anomalies to Advance the Integrity of US. Election Processes. Based on his review of the signature region on the EVB return envelopes, Dr. Shiva concluded that a full audit (e.g., comparing the signature on EVB return envelope images with voters' signatures from voter registration files) of the Maricopa signature verification process is needed. I declare that I found that thirty plus AZ Statute laws were broken.

I give Notice that Mail Fraud must also be addressed since the US Mail was used during the 2020 AZ Election. If the stuffing of the Drop Boxes is not Mail Fraud then you must notify the State legislature to address the problem of the Drop Boxes being exempt from Mail Fraud laws and other statute laws are needed to prosecute those that stuff Drop Boxes. I, Steven A. Colon give you Notice that I am filing a formal complaint against the State of Arizona for certifying the 2020 Arizona elections which allowed Intruders to fill Offices of Public Trust, Honor and Profit with no authority and allowing the government of the United States to be unlawfully changed; causing injury to me violating my Constitutional Rights, my Civil rights, my safety and my standing as an American.

2 GA) Whereas the violations of Article II in Georgia resulted in outcome-determinative numbers of unlawful votes. In July 2020, Georgia Secretary of State Raffensperger and the Georgia State Election Board, without legislative approval as required under Georgia's Constitution, authorized the use of 300 absentee ballot drop boxes beginning 49 days before the November 2020 election. Rule 183-1-14-0.8-.14 Secure Absentee Ballot Drop Boxes. Under this Rule, each of Georgia's 159 counties is responsible for documenting the transfer of every batch of absentee ballots picked up at drop boxes and delivered to the county election offices with ballot transfer forms. The forms are required to be signed and dated, with time of pick up by the collection team upon pick up, and then signed, dated, with time of delivery by the registrar or designee upon receipt and accepted. As of April 2021, officials at the state and county level in Georgia have failed to produce chain of custody records for more than 355,000 absentee votes by mail ballots deposited in drop boxes located around the state for that election; establishing maladministration. In addition, Georgia's Secretary of State, Brad Raffensperger, without legislative approval, unilaterally abrogated( establishing culpability )Georgia's statutes governing the date a ballot may be opened, and the signature verification process for absentee ballots. O.C.G.A. § 21-2-386(a)(2) prohibits the opening of absentee ballots until after the polls open on Election Day. In April 2020, however, the State Election Board adopted Secretary of State Rule 183-1-14-0.9-.15, Processing Ballots Prior to Election Day. That rule purports to authorize county election officials to begin processing absentee ballots up to three weeks before Election Day. Outside parties were then given early and illegal access to purportedly defective ballots to "cure" them in violation of O.C.G.A. §§ 21-2-386(a)(1)(C), 21-2-419(c)(2) establishing culpability and demonstrating maladministration.

I give Notice that I have never come across an instance where an unlawful act settled a lawsuit till the 2020 elections.

I give Notice that an unauthorized act took place on March 6, 2020, in Democratic Party of Georgia v. Raffensperger, No. 1:19-cv-5028-WMR (N.D. Ga.), Georgia's Secretary of State, a non-legislative actor, entered a Compromise Settlement Agreement and Release with the Democratic Party of Georgia (the "Settlement") to materially change the legislature's statutory requirements for reviewing signatures on absentee ballot envelopes to confirm the voter's identity by making it far more difficult to challenge defective signatures beyond the express mandatory procedures set forth at GA. CODE § 21-2-386(a)(1)(B) establishing culpability. Among other things, before a ballot could be rejected, the Settlement required a registrar who found a defective signature to now seek a review by two other registrars, and only if a majority of the registrars agreed that the signature was defective could the ballot be rejected but not before all three registrars' names were written on the ballot envelope along with the reason for the rejection. These non-legislative procedures are in direct conflict with Georgia's statutory requirements establishing culpability, as is the Settlement's requirement that notice be provided by telephone (i.e., not in writing) if a telephone number is available. Finally, the Settlement purports to require State election officials to consider issuing guidance and



training materials drafted by an expert retained by the Democratic Party of Georgia. Why just the Democratic Party? Georgia's legislature has not ratified these material purported changes to statutory law mandated by the Compromise Settlement Agreement and Release, including altered signature verification requirements and early opening of ballots; because the Georgia legislature did not ratify the before mentioned alterations culpability is established and the use of the non-legislative changes establishes maladministration.

The relevant legislation that was violated by the Compromise Settlement Agreement and Release did not include a severability clause. These non legislative procedures are in direct conflict with Georgia's statutory requirements, as is the Settlement's requirement that notice be provided by telephone (i.e., not in writing) if a telephone number is available. The Settlement purports to require State election officials to consider issuing guidance and training materials drafted by an expert retained by the Democratic Party of Georgia. Georgia's legislature has not ratified these material purported changes to statutory law mandated by the Compromise Settlement Agreement and Release. Regardless of the number of ballots affected, the non-legislative changes to the election rules violated the Electors Clause and the use of the non-legislative changes established culpability and maladministration resulting in unlawful GA 2020 elections and GA US Senate elections of 2021. Resulting in unlawful actors and intruders occupying Offices of Trust, Honor and Profit with no authority to do the job; Norton vs Shelby County.

I, Steven A. Colon, give Notice of a Formal Complaint that the aforementioned unconstitutional changes to Georgia's election manners and the maladministration in Georgia violated my Constitutional Rights, my Civil rights, my safety and affected my standing as an American; because the unconstitutional alterations resulted in intruders filling Public Offices of Trust with no authority and resulted in the form of government of the United States to be unlawfully changed with no authority to do the People's Business; Norton vs Shelby County, US vs Throckmorton, Finely vs Walls and Crimen omnia ex se nata vitiat.

Whereas in a November 4, 2020, video interview, Fulton County, Georgia Director of Elections, Richard Barron, stated that the tallied vote of over 93% of ballots were based on a "review [panel's]" determination of the voter's "intent"—not what the voter actually voted for. Specifically, he stated that "so far we've scanned 113,130 ballots, we've adjudicated over 106,000. . . . The only ballots that are adjudicated are if we have a ballot with a contest on it in which there's some question as to how the computer reads it so that the vote review panel then determines voter intent."<sup>10</sup> There is no way to know whether that vast number of ballots were accurately adjudicated in that short period of time to reflect the true vote. See Finely vs Walls.

Whereas on November 9, 2021, a voting rights group, VoterGA, announced that 56 Georgia counties admitted that most or all of the images created automatically by the Dominion voting system for results tabulation have been destroyed, and that a total of 74 Georgia counties have been unable to produce all the original ballot images from the November 2020 election violating statute laws proving culpability of bad acting public servants. Fulton County apparently destroyed over 350,000 ballot images—the only records which can show the authenticity of the ballot cast, such as through the proof of date and time when cast based on metadata contained on the images. Paper ballots have no such evidence that proves their authenticity; see Finely vs Walls. Whereas the destruction of these election records violated 52 USC § 20701, which requires a 22-month retention period for such records, and O.C.G.A. § 21- 2-73 which requires a 24-month retention period for such records culpability is established and maladministration took place.

I give Notice that large sums of money was passed around in the State of Georgia to influence the 2020 election outcome and I demand an investigation to determine if money influenced the maladministration and the 2020 election outcome.

Regardless of the number of ballots affected, the non-legislative changes to the election manners violated the Electors Clause, establishes culpability and establishes maladministration. Resulting in unlawful GA 2020 elections and GA US Senate elections of 2021. Resulting in unlawful actors and intruders occupying Offices of Trust with no authority to do the Peoples' business.

I, Steven A. Colon give you Notice that I am filing a formal complaint against the State of Georgia for certifying the 2020 Georgia elections which allowed intruders to fill Offices of Public Trust with no authority and allowing the government of the United States to be unlawfully changed; causing injury to me violating my Constitutional Rights, my Civil rights, my safety and my standing as an American.

3 W) Leading up to the November 2020 election, in direct contravention of Wisconsin law, the Wisconsin Elections Commission ("WEC") and other local officials unconstitutionally weakened or completely abrogated Wisconsin election laws—each

time taking steps that did away with established security procedures put in place by the Wisconsin legislature to ensure absentee ballot integrity establishing culpability and maladministration.

In October 2021, the nonpartisan LAB, and the Racine County Sheriff, revealed lengthy investigations that confirmed the WEC's massive violations of Wisconsin election law, including at least one felony and three misdemeanors caused by their illegal instructions to disregard Wisconsin election laws designed to ensure that fake ballots did not affect the integrity of the vote. The Racine County Sheriff found that the WEC knowingly "shattered" at least one statute likely causing fraudulent votes in nursing homes in all 72 counties across the State of Wisconsin. The Racine County Sheriff found the WEC committed a felony and three misdemeanors by encouraging voter fraud in nursing homes.

The Sheriff's investigators discovered that the WEC expressly discussed that their proposed conduct for the 2020 election would violate state law, and yet they decided to do it anyway, and memorialized their decision in letters disseminated to every single county clerk's office in Wisconsin. As such, the Sheriff concluded members of the WEC committed at least one felony and three misdemeanor crimes. An eight-month investigation the Sheriff's investigation discovered, inter alia, that the WEC sent nursing homes across the state letters March 12, 2020, June 24, 2020, and September 25, 2020, stating that "Municipalities shall not use the Special Voting Deputy process"—a key requirement under WISC. STAT. § 6.875(4)(a) to ensure that nursing home residents are not taken advantage of to cast false ballots, and should instead mail the absentee ballots. A plan in writing that mayors of Wisconsin's five largest cities—Green Bay, Kenosha, Madison, Milwaukee, and Racine, which all have Democratic majorities—joined in this effort, and together, developed a plan to use purportedly "secure drop-boxes to facilitate the return of absentee ballots." Wisconsin Safe Voting Plan 2020 Submitted to the Center for Tech & Civic Life, June 15, 2020, by the Mayors of Madison, Milwaukee, Racine, Kenosha and Green Bay. The use of any drop box—whether manned or unmanned—is directly prohibited by Wisconsin statute. WIS. STAT. 6.855(1), WIS. STAT. 6.855(3), WIS. STAT. 7.15(2m), Unmanned absentee ballot drop-off sites are prohibited by the Wisconsin Legislature as they do not comply with Wisconsin law expressly defining "alternate absentee ballot site[s]." WIS. STAT. 6.855(1), (3). In addition, the use of drop boxes for the collection of absentee ballots, positioned predominantly in Wisconsin's largest cities, is directly contrary to Wisconsin law providing that absentee ballots may only be "mailed by the elector, or delivered in person to the municipal clerk issuing the ballot or ballots." WIS. STAT. § 6.87(4)(b)1 (emphasis added).

Democrat operatives were given access to "hidden" networks connecting "sensitive machines" at the ballot tabulation center in Green Bay, WI. In Wisconsin, Dominion machines that were not supposed to be connected to the internet were in fact connected to a "hidden" Wi-Fi network during voting. Specifically, Michael Spitzer Rubenstein, a Democrat political operative, was given internet access to a hidden Wi-Fi network at the Wisconsin election center where votes were being counted. M.D. Kittle, Democrats' Operative Got Secret Internet Connection at Wisconsin Election Center, Emails Show, DAILY SIGNAL, Mar. 23, 2021.20 Spitzer Rubenstein received an email from Trent James, director of event technology at Green Bay's Central Count location, which stated, "One SSID [for a Wi-Fi network] will be hidden and it's: 2020 vote. There will be no passwords or splash page for this one and it should only be used for the sensitive machines that need to be connected to the internet." . Four other individuals were copied on the email. Regardless how many WI laws were unlawfully abridged, abrogated, violated, my point is Wisconsin ran and certified unlawful elections in November 2020 and I want bad public servants and whoever else held accountable. Wisconsin held and certified unconstitutional 2020 elections resulting in unlawful actors and intruders occupying Offices of Trust with no authority acting as though they are lawful even though the Law proves they are not.

I give Notice that it is a fact that the US Mail was used for fraud culpability has been established. Maladministration has been established. I give further Notice that the Wisconsin Attorney General has a Duty to press charges against all persons, public servants or not. I give Notice to the WI AG, press charges or resign.

I give Notice that large sums of money was passed around in the State of WI. to influence the 2020 election outcome and I demand an investigation to determine if money influenced the maladministration and the 2020 election outcome.

I, Steven A. Colon give you Notice that I am filing a formal complaint against the State of Wisconsin for certifying the 2020 Wisconsin elections which allowed intruders to fill Offices of Public Trust with no authority and allowing the government of the United States to be unlawfully changed; causing injury to me violating my Constitutional Rights, my Civil rights, my safety and my standing as an American.

4 MI) Michigan's then-Secretary of State, Jocelyn Benson, without legislative approval, unilaterally abrogated Michigan election statutes related to absentee ballot applications and signature verification. Michigan's legislature has not ratified these changes, and its election laws do not include a severability clause.

Example a) The Michigan Constitution provides all registered voters the right to request and vote by an absentee ballot without giving a reason. MICH. CONST. art. 2, § 4. On May 19, 2020, however, Secretary Benson announced that her office would send unsolicited absentee-voter ballot applications by mail to all 7.7 million registered Michigan voters prior to the primary and general elections. M.C.L. § 168.759(3). This statute limits the procedures for requesting an absentee ballot to three specific ways. The Michigan Legislature declined to include the Secretary of State as a means for distributing absentee ballot applications. Id. § 168.759(3)(b). Under the statute's plain language, the Legislature explicitly gave only local clerks the power to distribute absentee voter ballot applications. Because the Legislature declined to explicitly include the Secretary of State as a vehicle for distributing absentee ballots applications, Secretary Benson lacked authority to distribute even a single absentee voter ballot application. Regardless of the number of votes that were affected by the unconstitutional modification of Michigan's election rules, the non-legislative changes to the election rules violated the Electors Clause establishes culpability and establishes maladministration.

Michigan's past Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson violated not only MI law but the Constitution resulting in unlawful MI elections of 2020. Resulting in unlawful actors and Intruders occupying Offices of Trust with no authority to do the business of the People. I, Steven A. Colon give you Notice that I am filing a formal complaint against the State of Michigan for certifying the 2020 Michigan elections which allowed Intruders to fill Offices of Public Trust, Honor and Profit with no authority and allowing the government of the United States to be unlawfully changed; causing injury to me violating my Constitutional Rights, my Civil rights, my safety and my standing as an American.

5 PA) Pennsylvania's final results show 49,141 more votes than voters and the Secretary of State unlawfully certified the Pennsylvania election results. Secretary Boockvar certified the election results on November 24, 2020. However, the SURE system, the official registrar of votes pursuant to 25 PA. STAT. § 1222, reflected that there were 784,752 more votes than voters.

Honorable Attorney Generals, Really? Totally a fact, 100% true. Sirs, this makes the entire United States look like idiots to the People of the World and God.

Pennsylvania law expressly prohibits certifying until after the investigation of an over-vote: PA. STAT. § 3154 (emphasis added). No investigation of the 784,752 votes before certification, as required under 25 PA. STAT. § 3154, was undertaken. After some sort of number magic, as of February 1, 2021, all Pennsylvania counties closed out their elections in the SURE system—meaning all counties had completed updating the voter information for the November 2020 election. The SURE system reflects that there are still 49,141 more ballots cast included in the certified vote tally, then there were voters in the November 2020 election. No explanation for this gross discrepancy has ever been given by the State. Boockvar's certification of the vote for 2020 violated 25 PA. STAT. § 3154, and is therefore void. I give Notice this fact alone establishes culpability and establishes maladministration.

Pennsylvania misled this Court (establishing culpability) and continued to illegally count tens of thousands of ballots received after November 3, 2020. On September 17, 2020, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court voted 4-3 that all mail in ballots postmarked by 8:00 on Election Day, and received by 5:00 p.m. November 6, 2020, even those lacking a postmark or bearing an illegible postmark, would be counted. *Pennsylvania Democratic Party v. Boockvar*, 238 A.3d 345 (Pa. 2020).

On October 19, 2020, this Court split 4-4 on whether to stay that decision by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court leaving that unconstitutional decision to stand. After Justice Barrett's confirmation, the Republican Party sought expedited relief to resolve this issue before the November 2020 election. On October 28, 2020, in a classic bait and switch, Pennsylvania used guidance from its Secretary of State that Pennsylvania would segregate potentially unlawful ballots to argue that this Court should not expedite review. See *Republican Party of Pa. v. Boockvar*, 141 S. Ct. 1, 2 (2020) ("we have been informed by the Pennsylvania Attorney General that the Secretary of the Commonwealth issued guidance today directing county boards of elections to segregate [late-arriving] ballots") (Alito, J., concurring). The Court would reasonably rely on such a representation. Before the ink was dry on that decision, however, Pennsylvania changed that guidance, breaking the State's promise to this Court. On November 6, 2020, Justice

Alito ordered all county boards of election to comply with the guidance “that all ballots received by mail after 8:00 p.m. on November 3 be segregated and . . . if counted, be counted separately.” *Republican Party v. Boockvar*, 208 L.Ed.2d 293, 294 (U.S. 2020) (“The application received today also informs the Court that neither the applicant nor the Secretary has been able to verify that all boards are complying with the Secretary’s guidance, which, it is alleged, is not legally binding on them.”) (Alito, Circuit Justice). Before Justice Alito’s order dated November 6, 2020, Pennsylvania illegally counted at least 61,855 illegal ballots which were received after the statutory 8:00 pm November 3, 2020, deadline by virtue of the fact that Pennsylvania did not segregate those ballots. The Department of State’s records reflect that: 50,285 ballots were received between November 4 through November 6, 2020; 11,570 ballots were received between November 7 through November 11, 2020; and 10,038 were received after November 11, 2020. Pennsylvania was still counting ballots after November 17, 2020. Secretary Boockvar claimed that only about 10,000 ballots were counted after 8 p.m. on November 3, thereby admitting ballots were illegally counted, but she offered no proof that only 10,000 ballots were illegally counted. The Pennsylvania Secretary of State unconstitutionally threw out state election integrity laws governing mail-in ballots establishing culpability. In 2016, Pennsylvania received 266,208 mail-in ballots; 2,534 of them were rejected (.95%).<sup>16</sup> However, in 2020, Pennsylvania received 2,623,867 mail-in ballots—nearly 10 times the number of mail-in ballots compared to 2016. Despite this flood of ballots, the reported rejection rate was just 1.3% with just 34,171 ballots rejected.<sup>17</sup> As explained below, this vastly larger volume of mail-in ballots was treated in an unconstitutionally modified manner that included: (1) doing away with the Pennsylvania’s signature verification requirements; and (2) blocking poll watchers in Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties in violation of State law. The blatant disregard of statutory law renders all mail-in ballots constitutionally tainted and should not have formed the basis for appointing or certifying Pennsylvania’s presidential electors to the Electoral College. Specifically, Pennsylvania’s then Secretary of State, Kathy Boockvar, without legislative approval, unilaterally abrogated several Pennsylvania statutes requiring signature verification for absentee or mail-in ballots. Pennsylvania’s legislature has not ratified these changes, and the legislation did not include a severability clause. In 2019, Pennsylvania’s legislature enacted bipartisan election reforms, 2019 Pa. Legis. Serv. Act 2019-77, that set a deadline of 8:00 p.m. on election day for a county board of elections to receive a mail-in ballot. 25 PA. STAT. §§ 3146.6(c), 3150.16(c). Acting under a generally worded clause that “Elections shall be free and equal,” PA. CONST. art. I, § 5, cl. 1, a 4-3 majority of Pennsylvania’s Supreme Court in *Pa. Democratic Party v. Boockvar*, 238 A.3d 345 (Pa. 2020), extended that deadline to three days after Election Day and adopted a presumption that even non-postmarked ballots were presumed timely. Absentee and mail-in ballots in Pennsylvania were thus evaluated under an unlawful standard regarding signature verification. On August 7, 2020, the League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania and others filed a complaint against Secretary Boockvar and other local election officials, seeking “a declaratory judgment that Pennsylvania existing signature verification procedures for mail-in voting” were unlawful for a number of reasons. *League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania v. Boockvar*, No. 2:20-cv-03850-PBT, (E.D. Pa. Aug. 7, 2020). I give Notice this is the second time I found documents where an unlawful act settled a lawsuit.

The Pennsylvania Department of State quickly settled with the plaintiffs, issuing revised guidance on September 11, 2020, stating in relevant part: “The Pennsylvania Election Code does not authorize the county board of elections to set aside returned absentee or mail-in ballots based solely on signature analysis by the county board of elections.” The Pennsylvania Department of State’s guidance directly contradicted Pennsylvania law. First, Pennsylvania Election Code mandates that, for non-disabled and non-military voters, all applications for an absentee or mail-in ballot “shall be signed by the applicant.” 25 PA. STAT. §§ 3146.2(d) & 3150.12(c). Second, Pennsylvania’s voter signature verification requirements are expressly set forth at 25 PA. STAT. 350(a.3)(1)-(2) and § 3146.8(g)(3)-(7). The Pennsylvania Department of State’s guidance unconstitutionally did away with Pennsylvania’s statutory signature verification requirements establishing culpability and maladministration. I, Steven A. Colon give you Notice that I am filing a formal complaint against the State of Pennsylvania for certifying the 2020 Pennsylvania elections which allowed intruders to fill Offices of Public Trust, Honor and Profit with no authority and allowing the government of the United States to be unlawfully changed; causing injury to me violating my Constitutional Rights, my Civil rights, my safety and my standing as an American.

I give Notice large sums of money may have influenced the 2020 elections in other States of the Union and demand this Court to order an investigation into the Alleged Zuckerberg connection.



I give Notice that more and more shenanigans of nefarious Intruders and public servants Obstructing Justice are happening still.

I give Notice that this Court is to issue a Writ of Mandamus to the US Department of Justice and instruct them to either resign or prosecute by acting public servants, their bad acting family members and the Intruders even if it includes themselves.

The Electors Clause of Article II, Section 1, Clause 2 and Article 1 section 4 of the Constitution makes clear that only the legislatures of the States are permitted to determine the rules for appointing presidential electors. The pertinent rules here are the state election statutes, specifically those relevant to the presidential election. Non-legislative actors lack authority to amend or nullify election statutes. Bush II, 531 U.S. at 104 (quoted supra). Under Heckler v. Chaney, 470 U.S. 821, 833 n.4 (1985), conscious and express executive policies—even if unwritten—to nullify statutes or to abdicate statutory responsibilities are reviewable to the same extent as if the policies had been written or adopted. Thus, conscious and express actions by State or local election officials to nullify or ignore requirements of election statutes violate the Electors Clause to the same extent as formal modifications by judicial officers or State executive officers. The foregoing actions constitute non legislative changes to State election law by executive branch State election officials, or by judicial officials, in the five States of Pennsylvania, Georgia, Michigan, Wisconsin, and Arizona in violation of the Article 1 section 4 and Article 2 section 1, clause 2 resulting in unlawful actors filling Offices of Trust doing unlawful acts.

Whereas Treason is defined as the crime of betraying one's country, especially by attempting to kill the sovereign or overthrow the government. Further defined by the Constitution specifically identifies what constitutes treason against the United States and, importantly, limits the offense of treason to only two types of conduct: (1) "levying war" against the United States; or (2) "adhering to [the] enemies [of the United States], giving them aid and comfort." Although there have not been many treason prosecutions in American history—indeed, only one person has been indicted for treason since 1954—the Supreme Court has had occasion to further define what each type of treason entails.

I give Notice that the threshold for culpability of Treason has been established by the actions of the Executive Branch and the Pentagon by supplying known enemies of the United States with \$85 Billion dollars worth of United States Military Equipment. I give Notice that upon conviction of Treason; I demand the DEATH PENALTY for remedy.

Whereas whoever, having devised or intending to devise any scheme or artifice to defraud, or for obtaining money( Public Job) or property( Office of Trust) by means of false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises, or to sell, dispose of, loan, exchange, alter, give away, distribute, supply, or furnish or procure for unlawful use any counterfeit or spurious coin, obligation, security, or other article, or anything represented to be or intimidated( Intimidation took place) or held out to be such counterfeit or spurious article, for the purpose of executing such scheme or artifice or attempting so to do, places in any US Post Office or authorized depository for mail matter, any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by the Postal Service, or deposits or causes to be deposited any matter or thing whatever to be sent or delivered by any private or commercial interstate carrier, or takes or receives therefrom, any such matter or thing, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail or such carrier according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, any such matter or thing, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both. If the violation occurs in relation to, or involving any benefit authorized, transported, transmitted, transferred, disbursed, or paid in connection with, a presidentially declared major disaster or emergency (as those terms are defined in section 102 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122)), or affects a financial institution, such person shall be fined not more than \$1,000,000 or imprisoned not more than 30 years, or both. Mail fraud occurs when the U.S. Mail is used in furtherance of a criminal act. In order for a defendant to be convicted under

18 U.S.C. 1341 for committing mail fraud, the follow elements must be satisfied: (1) the defendant must have been engaged in a scheme to defraud; (2) the scheme must have involved material misstatements or omissions; (3) the scheme resulted, or would have resulted upon completion, in the loss of money, property, or honest services; (4) the defendant must have used the U.S. mail in furtherance of scheme to defraud; and (5) the defendant used or caused the use of U.S. mail.

Not only unlawfully changing Wisconsin's 2020 election manners but the WIC used the US Mail in their scheme as did the other States. The *Federal Prosecution of Election Offenses Eighth Edition of December 2017* and Mail Fraud laws have their criteria for a case satisfied.

I give further Notice that Elder abuse may have taken place in Wisconsin nursing homes to get the Elderly people to vote the way they were told to vote. A Writ of Mandamus to investigate this occurrence because it is a documented fact is Justified.

The general misconception is that any statute passed by legislators bearing the appearance of law constitutes the law of the land. The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land, and any statute, to be valid, must be in agreement. It is impossible for both the Constitution and a law violating it to be valid; one must prevail. This is a summary as follows: The General rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law is in reality no law, but is wholly void, and ineffective for any purpose; since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment and *not merely from the date of the decision so branding it*. An unconstitutional law, in legal contemplation, is as inoperative as if it had never been passed. Such a statute leaves the question that it purports to settle just as it would have had the statute not been enacted. Since an unconstitutional law is void, the general principles follow that it imposes no duties, confers no rights, creates no office, bestows no power or authority on anyone, affords no protection and justifies no acts performed under it. A void act cannot be legally consistent with a valid one. An unconstitutional law cannot operate to supersede any existing valid law. Indeed, insofar as a statute runs counter to the fundamental law of the land, it is superseded thereby. No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it.

"Comes now Steven A. Colon being first duly sworn, under oath, and states as follows:" I give testimony that the Constitution's first three words- " We the People " - affirm that the government of the United States exists to serve its citizens. I give further testimony that the Constitution guarantees a Republican form of government for the United States and protects the People from government overreach.

I give testimony that these five States of the Union, Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin set into place unlawful state election manners for the 2020 November 3rd Elections and the State of Georgia used the same unlawful manners for Georgia's US Senate Elections of January 2021. I give further testimony that the five States of the Union, Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin ran unlawful state elections on November 3rd 2020, certified the unlawful 2020 November Elections, then sent unlawful State Electors to the US Congress to vote for the President of the United States, picking an unlawful President of the United States; While avoiding the lawful alternative(3 US Code, section 2), choosing unlawful State Electors over lawful State Electors, violating the Oath of Office and committing High Crimes and Misdemeanors and sending unlawful actors into Offices of Trust acting with no authority. I give testimony that the aforementioned five States used the US Mail for norovirus schemes. The Constitution of the United States, Court Precedent, Common law, various statute law and other black and white documents and prove High Crimes and Misdemeanors took place in Wisconsin 2020 Elections and the 2020 elections in general.

Whereas 28 US Code section 1651- Writs gives authority to The Supreme Court and all courts established by Act of Congress may issue all writs necessary or appropriate in aid of their respective jurisdictions and agreeable to the usages and principles of law. With an alternative writ or rule nisi may be issued by a justice or judge of a court which has jurisdiction. I may request Writs from this Court in this case to clarify and enforce the law. Two examples of Writs are: a Writ of Mandamus and a Writ of Quo Warranto.

I give Notice that the remedy at this time is; this Court must issue as many Writs of Mandamus and Writs of Quo Warranto as it deems necessary to have the 2020 Wisconsin Elections

decertified and the rule of Law upheld; A Writ of Mandamus issued to the Wisconsin Attorney General and a Grand Jury to press all criminal charges possible to the Intruders, the public servants and any other nefarious people who committed crimes of Mail Fraud, Elder Abuse, Voter Fraud, Destruction of Election Materials, Obstruction of Justice, minor Maladministration or any other criminal act and Civil Rights violations to re-establish fair elections with integrity. A Writ of Mandamus issued to a grand jury to investigate if large sums of money influenced the 2020 elections in any of the other States.

I give Notice I reserve my Right to sue for Monetary Damages pertaining to the blatant Maladministration and crimes carried out by public servants and nefarious individuals; with inflation I am not ruling out a future court remedy of \$ Billions of dollars.

I give further Notice to this Court should recommend the Death Penalty as remedy for any crime where it is applicable.

I give further Notice that as part of the remedy this Court should recommend the highest fines possible where they are applicable.

I give Notice to this Court to demand each petitioner of this case to give a financial report and a deposition of any connection to the previously mentioned Prima Facie cases I have presented as a remedy.

I give Notice to this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus instructing all public servants in the Courts Jurisdiction to read all fifty one Constitutions and study all laws and ethics rules.  
I give Notice to this Court to make a suggestion to all public servants to read all fifty one Constitutions and study all laws and ethics.

I give Notice to this Court to issue a Writ of Mandamus to the scientists, universities and Doctors in the Court's Jurisdiction to provide factual proof that there are more than two human genders.

I give Notice to this Court to issue a suggestion that all public servants must be capable mentally, morally and physically able to perform their duties.

I give Notice to this Court to issue a suggestion that Term Limits be instituted to every public servant job to avoid abusing the system, this will instill public service integrity.

I, Steven A. Colon, give testimony that I went to Washington DC on January 6th 2021 because I can read and write. I understand the Constitution of the United States and the fifty State Constitutions. I understand US Court precedent. I understand what a Republican form of government is. I can reason for myself and I do not need to rely on a black robed public servant to tell me what is lawful and what is not lawful. I am damn proud I went to Washington DC on January 6th 2021 to show my support for those public servants who were brave enough to stand on their Honor and Duty to their Oath of Office. Those on record who stood for the Constitution are defending their Duty and their Honor the Defendants in this lawsuit, case no.# 2:22-cv-00305-LA Filed 03/10/22; RONALD H. JOHNSON, THOMAS P. TIFFANY, AND SCOTT L. FITZGERALD. I, Steven A. Colon, stand to defend them.

*Steven A Colon*  
*Steven A. Colon*

State of New York  
County of Orleans

On the 28 day of March, 2022,  
Before me personally appeared Steven A. Colon  
Personally known to me or proved on the basis of  
satisfactory evidence to be the individual described  
in the above, and who executed the foregoing document.

*Michele L Harling*  
Notary

MICHELE L. HARLING  
NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF NEW YORK  
No. 01HA6111937

Qualified in Orleans County  
My Commission Expires June 28, 2024

I, Steven A. Colon, give black and white, open and obvious testimony that there was mass Voter Fraud and mass Maladministration and mass Obstruction of Justice in the Wisconsin 2020 Elections and at least four other States of the Union camouflaged in the color of law; resulting in Intruders occupying Offices of Honor, Trust and Profit changing the very form of the government of the United States. Putting in place hurtful policies unconstitutional in nature and destructive to the People of the United States. The actions of the Intruders are set into Congressional record, Executive Orders and US Court records showing their culpability of High Crimes and Misdemeanors. One only has to compare the actions of the Intruders to the actions of just and honorable public servants that use the Constitution as their guide. The Constitution is a Make the United States Great document. The actions of the Intruders all are designed to oppress the People and destroy the United States from within.

Jurat in Notary law: I, Steven A. Colon swears that the evidence that I stated and gave "unequivocal and present act" and "consciously take upon myself the obligation of an Oath," the Truth, the Whole Truth, and nothing but the Truth, so help me God.

*Steven A Colon*  
*Steven A Colon*

State of New York  
County of Orleans

On the 28 day of March, 2022,  
Before me personally appeared Steven A. Colon  
Personally known to me or proved on the basis of  
satisfactory evidence to be the individual described  
in the above, and who executed the foregoing document.

*Michele L Harling*  
Notary

MICHELE L. HARLING  
NOTARY PUBLIC-STATE OF NEW YORK  
No. 01HA6111937  
Qualified in Orleans County  
My Commission Expires June 28, 2024