January 27, 2024

From: Dean Wiley, currently resident and "citizen" of North Carolina

To:
Jason Murray, Counsel of Record, *
Isabel Broer, *
(* = OLSON GRIMSLEY KAWANABE HINCHCLIFF & MURRAY LLC; via direct email)
North Carolina Senator Thom Tillis, via online 'contact form' submission
https://www.tillis.senate.gov/email-me
The Supreme Court of the United States of America (SCOTUS), and everyone else on planet Earth via online publication in "open letter" format

RE: No. 23-719, Donald J. Trump, *Petitioner* v. Norma Anderson, Et Al., *Respondents*

+ + +

SCOTUS has erred in "hearing" this petition. SCOTUS has no jurisdiction in this matter.

+ + +

All of the *Petitioner(s)*, *Respondents* and "amici curiae" filers have erred in their filings.

+ + + Summary + + +

SCOTUS "should" close this matter and "remand" (or instruct) *Petitioner(s)* to "write to your congress person(s)." See "Discussion" below. SCOTUS is "usurping" the power and duty of the United States Congress.

Thom Tillis and the many other signatories – all members of congress - to the "brief" at https://www.tillis.senate.gov/2024/1/tillis-colleagues-file-supreme-court-amicus-brief-in-support-of-former-president-donald-trump-s-appeal-of-colorado-ballot-disqualification "should" be ordered to take a class in "governance" and bring this matter before both Houses of Congress for a vote to "remove the disability (or not)." You are hereby "ordered" My Senator.

+ + + Discussion + + +

Colorado is a member-state of the Union of "Sovereign Nation-States" collectively "The USA." The Supreme Court of that state has ruled – and opined for and in descent – as to the "validity" of another – co-equal – branch of Colorado's government doing its "duty" to "uphold, defend, support and enforce" the Constitutions of The USA and Colorado and all of the laws, rules and ordinances promulgated and allowed under both. The Supreme Court of Colorado found no reason to "stop" the Executive/Administrative branch from "doing their duty." Two of three branches of a member-state's government have – using the "language of the 14th Amendment" – placed a "disability" upon Donald J. Trump and all that would vote for him.

If SCOTUS "continues" and were to "reverse or nullify" the Colorado (Highest) Court's ruling, they (SCOTUS) would in fact "nullify" the entire Colorado court. All cases would have to be "called up for review" as SCOTUS (in its own incompetence for not 'not hearing' this) would thereby have declared Colorado's Supreme Court "incompetent." The Colorado "ruling" – in the ruling itself or in the opinion(s), I don't recall – makes "mention" of the "remedy, by vote in congress" afforded to Donald J. Trump (and his followers/voters).

In order that the exact – plain – language of the "law" (14th Amendment) be "followed": The "petition" to remove this disability must be made to, or by, the Congress. "But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability." (14th Amendment, Section 3)

The disability is the "lawful" removal of his "name" from a "primary" ballot that is paid for by the People of Colorado and The USA. Removal from the primary and the "upholding of that removal/disability" have been well discussed as to the removal (or non-inclusion) of his name from a "general election ballot."

As quoted above, to "exhaust the [administrative] process" as clearly defined in that last sentence of Section 3 (14th Amendment) – in fact to "follow" the administrative process at all – the Congress must vote in both houses.

None of the "petition" itself, the "responses" or the "briefs", address this "technical (legal) requirement." None of the documents or filings discuss or "acknowledge" that the "removal (or dis-allowance) of [any persons] name or 'disqualifying [a person] from office of any kind'" based on – or under – the language of the 14th Amendment ***is the disability*** that is mentioned in the last sentence. All of the "filings" go (ad nauseam) over the events surrounding January 6, 2021, with the rearrangement of the words (a different order of words does not make them different words) and a completely embarrassing, frustrating, and intelligence offending set of "arguments" over the definition of the word "office."

All of the other (bloviating) discussions and arguments (see Tillis link above, "self-aggrandizing, self-cancelling, and 'abdicating' the duty/power of the US Congress to SCOTUS) as to the congress having the power to "enforce" all of the 14th via legislation are mute. "If" the Congress "wanted" legislation then they should have passed it before now. Also in the Tillis link above is "promotion" for his attempt to "introduce" legislation to address this "disability" in another state. Tillis, and anyone else thinking along those lines, study "ex post facto."

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." (10th Amendment) [We] The People, of Colorado, have "used" their powers, lawfully and completely, through their State (democratically elected, yet republican in essence/nature) government. The "power" to remedy you (anyone that does not like "the disability" placed on Donald J. Trump) is "delegated and clearly delineated" to the US Congress.

(intentional blank line bottom of page 2/3)

+ + + Conclusion + + +

SCOTUS has erred in "hearing" a petition. SCOTUS "usurps" the delineated and clearly defined power and duty of the United States Congress. SCOTUS has no "jurisdiction" in a "Congressional" formal vote "meeting."

Petitioner(s) do not "challenge" the constitutionality and/or verbiage of the 14th Amendment or Colorado's "use" of it. They attempt only to "redefine words" and "(re)litigate and re-argue the 'perspective' of events." Petitioners "incompetence" is evidenced by their filings and public statements. None – including members of "both Houses" - have "inquired" of Congress to remove "this disability." Their "knowledge" that they can not – and will not – receive a "two-thirds vote" is why they cast themselves about to SCOTUS and the "media." Loud wrong is still wrong. Everyone that "signed on" to the many briefs that is a member of Congress "should be" removed from that office for failure to perform their Oath Sworn Duty and "abdicating" their offices (of any/all definitions of "office" in every language in the history of offices and languages).

Respondent(s) are not "faulted" for being over-worked, overwhelmed, and having to consider their personal safety for being on the (wrong) right side of history. They "missed it" because (Former) Judge J. Michael Luttig that started all of this has never mentioned it. They have been too "busied" (and frustrated) by all of this "word mincing" and "proper citing with emphasis/quotes added or omitted" and margin measuring.

/s/ Dean Wiley, NC