

FIGHTING LAWFARE

Democrats Alleged Votes Changed by Secret Code in
Machines(<https://defendingtherepublic.org/democrats-alleged-votes-changed-by-secret-code-in-machines/>)

MI Sanction Litigation(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/king-v-whitmer/>)

Counterclaim Against

Dominion(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/dominioncounterclaim/>)

Democrats Alleged Votes Changed by Secret Code in Machines

PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN GLASS HOUSES SHOULD NOT THROW ROCKS

Democrats alleged votes changed by a secret code and electronic access to voting machines from anywhere in the world!

By **Sidney Powell**(<http://sidneypowell.com/>)

Wait, what?!!

It was the Democrats who first claimed vote tallies were manipulated, flipped, and instructed by secret code in voting machines and that the presidential election should be overturned.

The double-standard in play here has reached a whole new level.

As you know, the 2021 Democrat-controlled Congress has interviewed more than 1000 people(<https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/who-are-the-key-players-in-the-jan-6-committee-hearings-so-far>), spent months, taken hundreds of depositions, held professionally produced-for-television “hearings,” and spent untold millions of tax dollars—impugning or harassing anyone who had the audacity to allege the 2020 election was stolen by fraud—some even blaming lawyers who filed lawsuits—for fomenting the violence that occurred in the Capitol on January 6, 2021.

Substantial digging has uncovered that it was the Democrats, including Democrats still in key roles on the January 6 Committee *who first ever made*—or supported lawyers who made—the very same allegations for which they attack us now.

The election of George W. Bush in Ohio in 2004 was a microcosm of 2020. The Democrats screamed about computer fraud, and based primarily on the difference in *exit polls* versus the votes counted, their lawyers filed a [lawsuit](https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-VERIFIED-ELECTION-CONTEST-PETITION.pdf)(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-VERIFIED-ELECTION-CONTEST-PETITION.pdf>) which alleged, *inter alia*:

- George W. Bush, Dick Cheney, Karl Rove, Ken Blackwell and others "participated personally and/or substantially 'in devising and/or implementing [a] pattern of vote fraud and discrimination * * * which operated to deprive numerous Ohio citizens of their constitutional and statutory rights.' They had a "plan to steal the election." Petition at 15, 28.
- The legitimate result was changed to a fraudulent result by "gaining physical or electronic access to the tabulating machines and systems" such as by modem," *Id.* at 30.
- The "confederate of [the Republicans] who was actually changing the vote totals did not need access to the computer. Electronic access can be obtained from almost anywhere in the world. . ." *Id.* at 30-31.
- Fraudulent acts included "erasing or falsifying the electronic audit trail which could show access to the computer and the spreadsheet." *Id.* at 31.
- A second means of changing the result included "**by inserting unauthorized and so far undetected operating instructions into the software" used in connection with voting machines,**" and,
- "[S]ome or all of the unauthorized operating instructions were pre-set to delete themselves a given amount of time after the election." 1 *Id.* at 31.
- "**[A]t least 130,613 votes were taken from Kerry- Edwards and given to Bush-Cheney.**" at 33-35.

Then they requested votes be added to Kerry-Edwards and that the electors for Kerry-Edwards be certified instead of those for Bush, as seen in the screenshot below. *Id.* at 35.

actually cast for the Bush-Cheney ticket, the true result was that the Kerry-Edwards ticket won Ohio by at least 142,537 votes. Accordingly, contestants seek an order directing the Secretary of State to:

- a. **Add at least 130,656 votes to the official total reported in the Certified Results for the Kerry-Edwards ticket,**
- b. **Deduct at least 130,656 votes from the official total reported in the Certified Results for the Bush-Cheney ticket, and**
- c. **Issue certificates of election to the Electoral College electors representing the Kerry-Edwards ticket.**

Republicans seemed to have managed a media blackout. Quoting a thorough article (<https://people.csail.mit.edu/rivest/voting/press/WasThe2004ElectionStolen.pdf>) by Robert F. Kennedy Jr.:

Republicans derided anyone who expressed doubts about Bush's victory as nut cases in "tinfoil hats," while the national media, with few exceptions, did little to question the validity of the election. The Washington Post immediately dismissed allegations of fraud as "conspiracy theories," . . . and The New York Times declared that "there is no evidence of vote theft or errors on a large scale."

Those mantras sound familiar, don't they?

Guess who filed a brief **in support of the lawyers** who filed this election fraud petition? Who argued vehemently (and correctly) that those lawyers who challenged the 2004 election should **not** be sanctioned?

None other than January 6 Committee members Zoe Lofgren and Adam Schiff, plus Democrats Maxine Waters, and former Congressmen John Conyers, Jerry Nadler, and many others.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

MOSS, ET AL.,	:	
CONTESTORS,	:	CASE NO. 04-2088
-v-	:	ORIGINAL ACTION TO CONTEST ELECTION
BUSH, ET AL.,	:	
CONTESTEES.	:	

MOTION ON BEHALF OF UNITED STATES SENATOR RUSSELL FEINGOLD (WISCONSIN) AND UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES WILLIAM LACY CLAY (MISSOURI), BARNEY FRANK (MASSACHUSETTS), DENNIS KUCINICH (OHIO), **SHEILA JACKSON LEE (TEXAS)**, **ZOE LOFGREN (CALIFORNIA)**, **JIM McDERMOTT (WASHINGTON)**, MARTY MEEHAN (MASSACHUSETTS), **JERROLD NADLER (NEW YORK)**, JAMES OBERSTAR (MINNESOTA), DONALD PAYNE (NEW JERSEY), LINDA SANCHEZ (CALIFORNIA), **ADAM SCHIFF (CALIFORNIA)**, ROBERT SCOTT (VIRGINIA), CHRIS VAN HOLLEN (MARYLAND), **MAXINE WATERS (CALIFORNIA)**, ROBERT WEXLER (FLORIDA), AND LYNN WOOLSEY (CALIFORNIA) FOR LEAVE TO JOIN AS *AMICI CURIAE* IN THE MEMORANDUM OF UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE **JOHN CONYERS, JR.**, AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF SECRETARY OF STATE BLACKWELL AND OHIO'S TWENTY ELECTORS FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO CIV. R. 11 AND S. CT. PRAC. R. XIV, §5

BENSON A. WOLMAN (0040123)
COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR AMICUS CURIAE
JOHN CONYERS, JR., AND PROPOSED AMICI

FILED
 FEB 14 2005

The Congressmen(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-MOTION-ON-BEHALF-OF-PROPOSED-AMICI-CURIAE-FOR-LEAVE.pdf>) strongly urged protection of the Democrats' lawyers from sanctions for their stunning election challenge(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-VERIFIED-ELECTION-CONTEST-PETITION.pdf>) which included vigorous allegations of machine fraud, vote flipping, a third party changing the vote/outcome, secret instructions in the machines, erased audit trails, vote "hopping," fake ballots—all as part of their massive conspiracy allegedly orchestrated by George Bush, Dick Cheney, Karl Rove, Ken Blackwell, and others.

The Democrats joined John Conyers brief(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-AMICUS-CURIAE-IN-OPPOSITION-TO-MOTION.pdf>), making these

arguments—and the same arguments they now vilify and seek to disbar many of us for making:


UN COMPUTER - HCG

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

MOSS, ETAL.,	:	
	:	
CONTESTORS,	:	CASE NO. 04-2088
	:	
-v-	:	ORIGINAL ACTION TO CONTEST ELECTION
	:	
BUSH, ETAL.,	:	
	:	
CONTESTEES.	:	

**MEMORANDUM OF UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE JOHN CONYERS,
JR. AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION OF SECRETARY OF
STATE BLACKWELL AND OHIO'S TWENTY PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS FOR
SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO CIV. R. 11 AND S. CT. PRAC. R. XIV, §5**

BENSON A. WOLMAN (0040123)
COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR AMICUS CURIAE
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN CONYERS, JR.
 SUSAN B. GELLMAN (0034375)
WOLMAN & ASSOCIATES
 341 S. THIRD STREET, SUITE 301
 COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215-5463
 TEL: 614-280-1000/FAX: 614-280-9000
COUNSEL FOR AMICUS CURIAE CONYERS



CLIFFORD O. ARNEBECK, JR. (0033391)
COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR CONTESTORS
 341 SOUTH 3RD STREET SUITE 10

litigating important questions concerning the public's vote." *In re Election of Nov. 6, 1990 for the Office of Attorney Gen.* (1991), 62 Ohio St. 3d 1, 5, 577 N.E.2d 343, 346; *see also Bradley v. Perrodin* (2nd Dist. 2003), 106 Cal. App. 4th 1153, 1165, 131 Cal. Rptr. 2d 402, 411 (observing that "the fundamental right of self-determination for the citizens" of a given jurisdiction is implicated "in each and every election contest.").

Indeed, the nation's Founders recognized the importance of ensuring the availability of robust election contests to the legitimacy of electoral results. In 1798, Congress first enacted legislation allowing parties to election contests to obtain subpoenas for evidence discovery. 9 ANNALS OF CONGRESS 3704-05 (1799). Throughout the over-two hundred year history of election contests since then, the "vast majority of election contests have been initiated by private parties." *Dornan v. Sanchez* (C.D. Cal. 1997), 978 F. Supp. 1315, 1319.

Conyers Memorandum at 2-3(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-AMICUS-CURIAE-IN-OPPOSITION-TO-MOTION.pdf>).

They also wrote: "**For over two hundred years, one of the strengths of our democracy has been that citizens may question the results of an election.**" *Id.* at 2. **They argued it was strongly in the public interest to allow election contests and discovery in them.** *Id.* at 2-3. Indeed, election challenges are crucial.

As the Democrats urged(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-AMICUS-CURIAE-IN-OPPOSITION-TO-MOTION.pdf>), citizens who bring election challenges "vindicate more than their private rights. They protect the broader public interest." [Election challenges] "involve the right of the people to have the fact as to who has been duly elected to be judicially determined. The inquiry must be in as to whether in a given instance the popular will has been or is about to be thwarted by mistake or fraud. The public interest imperatively requires that the ultimate determination of the contest shall reach the right result." [citations omitted]. *Id.* at 3.

They also recognized—when it was their candidates who lost—that "the Verified Petition was filed for the entirely proper purpose of challenging an election that seemed deeply flawed and suspicious." *Id.* at 16. They even accepted defects in the pleadings as understandable, "[u]nder the incredibly truncated time-frame of an election context, procedural error—even in situations where the requirements are beyond question—occurs." *Id.* at 16, 17; *see id.* at 5, 10.

Against cries of "mind-boggling" claims of "conspiracy theories," "theory, conjecture, hypothesis, and invective" rather than evidence, harassment; and, a challenge filed "only for partisan political purposes," *id.*

at 16, the Democrats closed their strong brief with this:

Under these circumstances, a finding of bad faith and imposition of sanctions would be highly inappropriate and would serve to chill advocacy of important interests that are implicated by election contests. **One of the strengths of our democracy is that citizens are free to question the results of an election.** Those who in good faith attempt to complain through legally provided channels about the deficiencies of an election are protected by law from retaliatory sanction motions. (emphasis added). *Id.* at 17.

With the urging of these Democrat members of Congress, and in a correct application of the law, the Ohio Supreme Court (<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/MOSS-vs-BUSH-DECISION.pdf>) did not sanction the attorneys who filed the election challenges. The same should be true today.

The Congressional Democrats went on to challenge the seating of the Ohio electors—the first such challenge in our history—and produced a lengthy report(<https://defendingtherpublic.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/ANALYSIS-OHIO-REPORT.pdf>).

As you can see, the hypocrisy and duplicity of the January 6 Committee and the Democrats know no bounds. The more we learn, the more it appears there has long been only one political machine running “the matrix,” creating an illusion we were making the choices, and as Mr.(<https://rumble.com/vt2tzq-undeniable-proof-that-democrats-are-hypocrites-when-it-comes-to-election-fr.html>) Obama himself (<https://rumble.com/vt2tzq-undeniable-proof-that-democrats-are-hypocrites-when-it-comes-to-election-fr.html>) noted, each “side” has cheated in elections.

How long has computerized voting and vote counting to defraud Americans of their sacred votes and install whomever the puppet masters prefer as President of the greatest power on earth? Who are the oligarchs making these decisions?

Our elections simply cannot be about who cheats the best. What if the Democrats were right about Ohio in 2004?

Was Bush elected in Ohio by tactics that have now been perfected and used in multiple states? Who else was?

How long has it been since the American people really elected their president—or other officials?

How deeply and widely has the machine fraud infected elections at every level of our Republic and the states?

Until we get paper ballots, hand-counted, and citizen voter identification, we delude ourselves by thinking we have a Republic or that “we the people” are electing our leaders.

And, given the information above, it is duplicitous and ridiculous to attack those of us who made what we now know to be the same allegations the Democrats made in 2004. The 65Project—whose sole purpose is to demonize and destroy (<https://wwwaxios.com/2022/03/07/trump-election-lawyers-disbar>) the lawyers who challenged the 2020 election—to “shame them and make them toxic in their communities and in their firms”—should never have received charitable non-profit status, and it should be terminated for sheer hypocrisy or estopped by law from filing anything.

We can fix this if we unite immediately to demand this simple and far less expensive means of electing our government. No one should be opposed to an honest and transparent election process. Americans are entitled to it, and our elected officials who live in glass houses should not be throwing rocks.

MOSS vs BUSH	MOSS vs BUSH	MOSS vs BUSH	MOSS vs BUSH	CISA Report
VERIFIED	MOTION FOR	MOTION ON	AMICUS	
ELECTION	LEAVE TO FILE	BEHALF OF	CURIAE IN	
CONTEST	BRIEF	PROPOSED	OPPOSITION	
PETITION		AMICI CURIAE	TO MOTION	
		FOR LEAVE TO FILE ON COMPUTER - HCG		

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF OHIO

IN THE SUPREME COURT		IN THE SUPREME COURT		IN THE SUPREME COURT	
Moss, et al.,	Contestors,	Moss, et al.,	Contestors,	Moss, et al.,	Contestors,
: v.	:	: v.	:	: v.	:
Bush, et al.,	Contestors,	Bush, et al.,	Contestors,	Bush, et al.,	Contestors,
: v.	:	: v.	:	: v.	:
Case		Case		Case	
Rev. Bill Moss 1640 Franklin Ave. Columbus, OH 43205		MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF OF JOH CONGRESS AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORTI		MOTION ON BEHALF OF UNITED STATES IN (MISSOURI) BARNEY FRANK (MASSACHUSETTS) SHEILA JACKSON LEWIS (TEXAS), ZOE LOFGREN (CALIFORNIA) JEFF DELLUM (WISCONSIN), JEFF YORK, JAMES OBERSTAR (MINNESOTA), D LINDA SANCHEZ (CALIFORNIA), ADAM SCHIFF (NEW YORK), ELIJAH CUMMINGS (MARYLAND), ROBERT WEXLER (FLORIDA) AND LYNN WOO	
(R. C)		Cliff Colu Tele Fax: amend		Cliff Colu Tele Fax: amend	
Ruth Carol Moss 1640 Franklin Ave. Columbus, OH 43205		30 East Broad Street, 17th Floor Columbus, Ohio 43215 Telephone: (614)466-2872 Fax: (614) 466-7592		30 East Broad Street, 17th Floor COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215 Telephone: (614) 466-7592	
VERI		Rob Colu Tele Fax: amend		Rob Colu Tele Fax: amend	
Ronnie L. Avan 4484 Willowbrook Road Columbus, Ohio 43220		Kurtis A. Bricker Bricker & Eckler 100 South 3rd Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215 Tel: 614-223-3337 Fax: 614-223-3390 Kunnen@bricker.com		Kurtis A. Bricker Bricker & Eckler 100 South 3rd Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215 Tel: 614-223-3337 Fax: 614-223-3390 Kunnen@bricker.com	
Mohammed S. Avan 4484 Willowbrook Road Columbus, Ohio 43220		Peter Cour Tele Fax: susse		Peter Cour Tele Fax: susse	
Eugene Beer 105 W. Kenworth Columbus, Ohio 43214		BENSON A. WOLMAN (0040123) COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR AMICUS CURIAE JOHN CONVERS, JR., AND PROPOSED AMIC CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF THE OTHER NON-OHIO CONTEST SUSAN B. GILLMAN (0034375) WOLMAN & ASSOCIATES		BENSON A. WOLMAN (0040123) COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR AMICUS CURIAE JOHN CONVERS, JR., AND PROPOSED AMIC CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF THE OTHER NON-OHIO CONTEST SUSAN B. GILLMAN (0034375) WOLMAN & ASSOCIATES	
Dr. Marilyn Blackwell 6408 Busch Blvd apt. 483 Columbus, Ohio 43229		341 S Colu Tele Fax: susse		341 S Colu Tele Fax: susse	
Linda Bykert 2657 Brandon Rd. Upper Arlington, Ohio 43227		PETER COUR TELE FAX: SUSSE		PETER COUR TELE FAX: SUSSE	
Frank C. Cleveland, Jr. 1445 Venice Drive Columbus, Ohio 43207		CLIFFORD O. ANNEBECK, JR. (0033391) COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR CONTESTORS ROBERT J. FITRACK (007796) SUSAN B. GILLMAN (0034375) PETER PICKARSKY (Pro Hac Vice) 341 SOUTH 3RD STREET, SUITE 100 COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215 TEL: 614-223-8771/FAX: 614-224-8082		CLIFFORD O. ANNEBECK, JR. (0033391) COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR CONTESTORS ROBERT J. FITRACK (007796) SUSAN B. GILLMAN (0034375) PETER PICKARSKY (Pro Hac Vice) 341 SOUTH 3RD STREET, SUITE 100 COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215 TEL: 614-223-8771/FAX: 614-224-8082	
Brian Conway 1327 King Avenue Columbus, Ohio 43212		COUNSEL FOR CONTESTORS		COUNSEL FOR CONTESTORS	

Exh. A

Case 1:20-cv-04809-TCB Document 5-3 Filed 11/

**Joint Cybersecurity Ac
Iranian Advanced Persistent
Identified Obtaining Voter Re**

() Loading...

() () () ()

