

CARY LEE PETERSON  
REGID: 23401111  
SENATE LOBBY ID: 401103650  
FCI SHERIDAN CAMP  
P.O. BOX 6000  
SHERIDAN, OR 97378

AUGUST 19, 2019

ATTENTION TO:

CHAIRMAN SEN. JOHNNY ISAKSON  
SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

CC:

CHAIRMAN SEN. GRAHAM  
SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

; AND

CLERK OF COURT C/O  
CHIEF JUDGE HON. D. BROOKS SMITH; AND  
THIRD CIRCUIT JUSTICE HON. SAMUEL ALITO  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS IN THE THIRD CIRCUIT  
21400 U.S. COURTHOUSE  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19106

[In re: USA v. Peterson, Appeal No. 19-1093; related cases in U.S. district courts of The Third Circuit with "Cary Lee Peterson" as a party; New Jersey (Case No(s). 3:18-CV-14649-BRM and 3:16-CR-00230-AET in Trenton and C.A. No. 2:16-CV-01428 in Newark) and Delaware (C.A. No. 1:18-CV-00704-LPS)

; AND

CHIEF JUDGE HON. FREDA WOLFSON  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN THE NEW JERSEY DISTRICT (TRENTON, NJ)

[In USA v. Peterson (16-CR-00230-AET-1); SEC v. RVPlus, Inc. (C.A. No. 16-CV-01428), et al., and Cary Lee Peterson v. Garvey (and Doe) (C.A. No. 18-CV-14649)]

; AND

CHIEF JUDGE HON. MICHAEL MOSSMAN  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT IN THE OREGON DISTRICT (PORTLAND, OR)  
[In Peterson v. Federal, Reilly, Reilly, Deutsch, Garvey, and Doe, C.A. No. 19-CV-00436-MC]

; AND

NEW JERSEY ATTORNEY GENERAL GREWAL  
STATE OF NEW JERSEY - LEGAL DIVISION (TRENTON, NJ),  
[In re: Violation of N.J.S. 2C:5-2, 2C:2-2, and 2C:13-2; and N.J.S.C. RPC 3.4, 3.4(g), 4.2, 5.5, and 8.4]

; AND

U.S. ATTORNEY GENERAL WILLIAM BARR  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (WASHINGTON, D.C.),  
[In re: 42 USCS 1997f; Garvey-Peterson Ordeal]

; AND

CLERK OF COURT C/O  
NINTH CIRCUIT JUSTICE HON. ELANA KEGAN; AND  
CHIEF JUDGE HON. SIDNEY THOMAS  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT  
BROWNING U.S. COURTHOUSE  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103  
[In USA v. Peterson, CR-16-MJ-70311; Judicial Disability Complaint filed by Cary Lee Peterson (June/July 2019); Peterson v. Federal, C.A. No. 19-CV-00436-MC (Oregon)]

; AND

CHAIRMAN TOM PEREZ;  
SEN. CHUCK SCHUMER (DEMOCRATIC SENATE LEADER);  
VICE CHAIR (C.E./V.P.) SEN. KAREN CARTER-PETERSON; AND  
ASSOCIATE CHAIR/SENIOR COUNSEL JAIME HARRISON  
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

430 S. CAPITOL STREET SE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20003

[In FEC Form 2 filed by Sen. Bernard Sanders on 2/19/2019 and 3/4/2019; 2016 and 2020 Democratic Party Loyalty Pledge(s) from Sen. Bernard Sanders]

[NOTE: ALL COPIED RECIPIENTS SET FORTH ABOVE HEREINAFTER SHALL BE REFERRED "TRIBUNALS" WITH PERTINENT INTERESTS PURSUANT TO GARVEY-PETERSON ORDEAL]

---

**IN RE: CERTIFICATION OF MOTION FOR RE-EXAMINATION OF PETITION FOR CENSURE-  
IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY ON SENATOR BERNARD SANDERS OF VERMONT PURSUANT TO  
TITLE 2 (THE CONGRESS), CHAPTER 6 (CONGRESSIONAL AND COMMITTEE PROCEDURE;  
INVESTIGATIONS**

---

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I, Cary Lee Peterson ["Petitioner", a lobbying registrant for U.S. Senate and House (under registrant name "Cary Peterson"). who is currently a prisoner at FCI Sheridan, Oregon, hereby certify and submit this "Letter Brief" in lieu of a formal legal petition ["Petition"], and in lieu of oath, to Senate Select Committee on Ethics ["COMMITTEE"], understanding the penalty of perjury for making false statements to the Government and Congress, and declare all foregoing statements as factual and true to the best of my knowledge.

1. THEREBY, Petitioner files this Petition, in efforts to assert public interest and respectfully move Committee on MOTION FOR RE-EXAMINATION OF PETITION FOR CENSURE-IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY ON SENATOR BERNARD SANDERS OF VERMONT, whereby shall incorporate all disclosure statement(s) made in the former Petition of 7/16/2019 ["FORMER BRIEF"] (i.e., Points One, Two, and Three; and quoted legal definition(s) or term(s) "REGULATIONS", "SUBJECT MEMBER" [see Section 1 of Former Brief], and "ALLEGATIONS" [see Section 2 of Former Brief].

2. IN ADDITION, Petitioner would like to incorporate hereto, legal definitions and terms, as follows:

(1) "Garvey-Peterson Ordeal"- an series of issue(s) of controversy held in the U.S. district and circuit courts of the Third and Ninth Circuits (New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Oregon,

Guam, Arizona, and California), derived from a non-political dispute with a mutual business associates and interests [Garvey clients BAS Broadcasting Ohio and Sen. Bernard Sanders] of Garvey Schubert Barer (law firm owned by Brad C. Deutsch) and Petitioner, whom are both lobbying registrants for Congress and campaign solicitors or advisers for Federal campaign committees regulated by the Federal Election Commission.

(2) "Garvey Schubert Barer"- a law firm headquartered in Seattle (WA), with branches in Portland (OR), Washington (D.C.), New York (NY), and the Member State of China; owner and managing director Braden ("Brad") Christopher Deutsch; formerly a governmental attorney for the Federal Election Commission and Federal Communication Commission. Portland branch principal John Rothermich was formerly Clerk of Court at U.S. Court of Appeals in The Third Circuit, where Petitioner's appeal case is held in the present; also, Rothermich has a relationship in the first or second degree with U.S.D.J. Michael McShane of Oregon District (i.e., nongovernmental organization 'Outside-In' in Portland, Oregon).

(3) "Gotcha Evidence"- A collection of court records ["factum probans"], filed in SEC v. RVPlus, Inc., C.A. No. 2:16-cv-01428 (3rd Cir. U.S., N.J. 2016), ECF Doc. No. 32, 32-1, 32-2, and 32-3; and supporting self-authenticating evidence (i.e., legal papers and court documents pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. P. 902) published in the public domain at '[www.gotchaevidence.com](http://www.gotchaevidence.com)'. Thus, "Gotcha" legal documents "res cips," and illustrates a clear and convincing [inference] preponderance of evidence (pursuant to SEC v. RVPlus, ECF Doc. 32-1, 'Exhibit A'), that Garvey Schubert Barer, Garvey owner Brad Deutsch, and/or one or more associates of Garvey Schubert Barer commissioned or solicited a pretextual and private prosecution, and arbitrary arrest on Petitioner as an exparte alternative dispute resolution [see legal definition on 'alternative liability'], opposed to filing civil or administrative complaints against Petitioner's political action committee, Americans Socially United.

**In Example [In respect to Points Two & Three of Former Brief]:**

(a) SEC v. RVPlus, ECF Doc No. 32-1 provides showing of how Garvey-Peterson issue in controversy started "ab initio." The email from Garvey client Thomas ("T.K.") Klein, stating that "Garvey Shubert filed the Federal charges against Cary" speak for itself. "Ad hoc," Petitioner Peterson had no criminal history, criminal action, or pending civil litigation prior to the Federal criminal complaint and arrest warrant filed by U.S. Attorney Fishman in New Jersey, and the SEC in New York, in March 2016 or prior.

(Thus, the SEC v. RVPlus case (Gotcha Evidence, ECF Doc No. 32-2 and 32-3) and "Rollcall Article" of 3/18/2016 (published by Rollcall.com writer on behalf of Bernie 2016, Inc.) provide several "factum probans" derived and alluded by Brad Deutsch's comments made to the news media about Petitioner Peterson's arrest and "Federal charges," that Sanders'presidential

campaign committee counsel Brad Deutsch of Garvey Schubert provided ironic and true remarks, that he was 'not at all surprised' to hear about Peterson's arrest, and that filing a civil court or FEC complaint against Petitioner Peterson's super PAC, Americans Socially United was 'not worthwhile.' (Hence, Klein's attestation in Gotcha Exhibit A email dialogue corroborate the ironic lucidity of Deutsch's comments made to Center for Public Integrity and 'Rollcall.com', which infer that he was 'not at all surprised about hearing about Peterson's arrest because he was the perpetrator or accomplice of whom had solicited or commissioned an ex-parte alternative dispute resolution by privies or virtual representatives on his behalf around or about the time his quoted statements were published by particular news media representative whom.were in contact with DOJ (New Jersey) public relations representative Matthew Reilly, who published and false information about an arrest of Petitioner Peterson securities fraud charges, a month before the actual date of arrest pursuant to the court docket records [see SEC v. RVPlus, ECF Doc. No. 32-2 and 32-3].

Thus, the government had been ordered by the trial judge to present all Brady and Jencks evidence, which did not include any reference to a third-party complaint filed by any associate or principals at Garvey Schubert Barer, Bernie 2016, Inc., or any prosecuting witness or whistleblower (i.e., quasi-criminal, qui-tam). Additionally, in or about January 2018, Petitioner's defense counsel requested the evidential mark of the Garvey law firm associate that 'filed the federal charges' against Petitioner Peterson pursuant to Klein's attestation in email dialogue [see Gotcha Evidence, Exhibit A of SEC Case hereunto].

Notwithstanding, the compilation of Garvey and his (governmental and news media privies' attempts to inextricably sabotage Petitioner's limited public figure reputation by libel and defamatory media content, and interpolating or compromising search engine results in Google Web Search and News (i.e., manipulating Google search engine results to raise manufactured and fabricated news content to the top of search results to give the appearance that Petitioner was charged for scamming Daniel "James Bond" Craig and Subject Member Sen. Sanders (in conjunction with securities fraud charges), there is no conundrum to conceal the clear and convincing evidence, of which "res cips," even among the substantial amount of "ad hominem" collusion and tortious interference (from hired media) allowed by the U.S. District Court; whereby had been solicited or commissioned in the midst of presidential primary elections in 2016. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 528, Judge Thompson, a member of Delaware Democratic Convention since 1974, and someone had a relationship in the first or second degree with Subject Member Sanders should have not been allowed to hold Petitioner's criminal case "ab initio" due to significant conflicts of interest that would disqualify her under 28 U.S.C. 455.

**(b) In the nonce**, the Garvey-Peterson Ordeal induced by Subject Member has resulted in an unsound and preposterous exhaustion of judicial and public resources for a totalitarian (RICO Act styled witchhunt), that is estimated at \$3 million for a criminal prosecution that the trial

judge admitted at sentencing, beared absolutely no evidence on court records showing that Petitioner Peterson came into **any proceeds** from any kind of fraud [**\$0 in damages or losses to the public**]. [A showing of abuse of public trust, ultrahazardous activity, unreasonable risk taken for an alternative dispute resolution, and lack of consideration or acknowledgment of federal campaign compliance and Rules of Congress (i.e., not including private sector expenses incurred by Petitioner, or special attorneys' other retainer fees for relative issues at private law firms; whereas, including but not limited to salaries of special AUSAs and special attorneys under 28 USC 543 hired by USA Fishman in December 2016; travel and *per diem* for 14 government trial witnesses (seven whom were international travelers); CJA attorney fees, and 32 months of pretrial detention and pretrial supervision; investigators and inspectors at FEC, FBI, and SEC; and cross-action in 12 Federal judicial and administrative tribunals among multiple Federal departments, agencies, jurisdictions, and circuits.]

(Hence, if every Member of Senate used unsound totalitarianistic activity at the same or similar unreasonable risk to solve their quasi-campaign or personal legal disputes, it would cost the United States around \$300 million of unnecessary spending taxpayers' money for an ultrahazardous activity that is not within the color of law whatsoever.)

**ADDITIONALLY**, the aforementioned unethical acts in faith, in conjunction with 'Gotcha Evidence' hereunto (as defined hereinbefore), illustrate a clear and convincing preponderance of evidence (far beyond a scintilla of "pima facie") that Subject Member had pursued a campaign-related litigation with use of Federal campaign or Senate administration funds pursuant to "Regulations" (defined hereinbefore performer in Former Brief).

(c) **(And, more importantly:** Where is the Senate approval, expense receipts, or public disclosure from Subject Member pursuant to Regulations on the Federal [donor] campaign funds used to compensate Garvey Schubert Barer, Brad Deutsch, or any of the non-lawyer privies in concert and participation with Garvey law firm or Deutsch, whom were hired to conduct data research or private investigations on Petitioner Peterson, pursuant to Klein's attestation in email dialogue of Gotcha Exhibit A? THE INQUIRY IN LAYMAN'S BREVITY: How was Subject Member's Federal campaign committee general counsel Brad Deutsch of Garvey Schubert Barer compensated to carry out the aforementioned alternative dispute resolution, including, but not limited to pre- and post- dispute communication with Petitioner Peterson; in addition to BAS Broadcasting Ohio's legal and executive personnel, news media representatives, FEC Chairman, FEC Attorney Pena-Wallace, SEC Attorneys Megan Genet and Adam Grace, Paul J. Fishman and Ari Fontecchio (in an individual capacity as private attorneys at Arnold & Porter LLP), attorney and ARTCO co-owner Richard Day, Daniel Craig, Stephen Fox, Edward Deutsch, Vanessa Tijerina (an individual whom was a federal election candidate client of Petitioner), Lourdes Aflague Leon Guerrero (as an individual whom was an officer at Bank of Guam), Vicente Gonzalez (as an individual whom was a federal election candidate), Pohnpei Gov.

Marcelo Peterson, [U.S.] DOI attorney "Savage" of FSM, attorney Steven Finnen, Murphy Panuelo, and Bill Jaynes pursuant to Gotcha Exhibit A and H, SEC v. RVPlus, ECF Doc. No(s). 32-1 and 32-3).

**(d) In addition [in respect to Point One of Former Brief]**, Exhibits of this Petition will show that Subject Member Sanders filed with the FEC sworn statements that all information was factual and true to the best of his knowledge. Whereas pursuant to DNC policy, a Democratic loyalty pledge does not grant a political official or candidate the right to enjoy quasi or bipartisan political spectrum privileges. Hence, Subject Member's FEC papers submitted on 3/4/2019 as an independent party incumbent was willfully or negligently submitted to the secretary of state in Vermont (state elections office) (pursuant to 2 USCS 1a, and 1b) and the Federal Election Commission in bad faith, and in violation of **13 V.S.A. § 2904 (false swearing)**.

**In addition, the cumulative evidence [exhibits] of Petition (hereunto) include news media content from NPR News, Yahoo News, and USA Today, whereby should be acknowledged by Committee pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. P. 902 (evidence that is self-authenticating)**

3. FURTHERMORE: Petitioner makes notice to the Committee and Tribunals of pertinent Federal Procedures and local provisions under the Supreme Court of New Jersey, whereby shall be incorporated with Petition, in conjunction with Former Brief, as follows:

(a) 18 USCS Appx 2X1.1 (Conspiracies, Attempts, Solicitations)

(b) Title 2 - The Congress (Chapter 6...Congressional and Committee Procedure; Investigations)

(c) 28 U.S. Code§ 528 (**Disqualification of officers and employees of the Department of Justice**)...The Attorney General shall promulgate rules and regulations which require the disqualification of any officer or employee of the Department of Justice, including a United States attorney or a member of such attorney's staff, from participation in a particular investigation or prosecution if such participation may result in a personal, financial, or political conflict of interest, or the appearance thereof. Such rules and regulations may provide that a willful violation of any provision thereof shall result in removal from office.

(d) (Pursuant to 2 USCS 72a(b), reports to from the U.S. Attorney General and The [Senate] Counsel to Senate and House of Representatives shall submit, not later than 1/2/2021, a report on the activities of Committee.)

(e) 2 USCS 190I (Private claims pending before Congress, taking testimony)

(f) 2 USCS 190m (Subpoenas for taking testimony; compensation of officers and witnesses return of depositions)

(g) 2 USCS (Oath to witnesses in an case under examination)

(h) 2 USCS 192 (Refusal of witness to testify or produce papers)

(i) 2 USCS 193 (Privilege of witnesses)

(j) 2 USCS 194a (Request by Congressional committees to officers or employees of Federal departments, agencies, etc., concerned with foreign countries or multilateral organization for expression of views and opinions)

(k) 2 USCS 1b (Countersignature of certificate of election) The certificate mentioned in the preceding section [2 USCS 1a] shall be countersigned by the secretary of state of the state.

(l) 2 USCS 1a (Election to be certified by governor) It shall be the duty of the executive of the State from which any Senator has been chosen to certify his election, under the seal of the State, to the President of the Senate of the United States. (R.S. §18.)

(m) 2 USCS 288e (Intervention or appearance)

(n) 2 USCS 288e(b) (Notification; publication) The Counsel shall notify the Joint Leadership Group of any legal action or proceeding in which the Counsel is of the opinion that intervention or appearance as amicus curiae under subsection (a) is in the interest of the Senate. Such notification shall contain a description of the legal action or proceeding together with the reasons that the Counsel is of the opinion that intervention or appearance as amicus curiae is in the interest of the Senate. The Joint Leadership Group shall cause said notification to be published in the Congressional Record for the Senate.

(o) 2 USCS 288e(c) (Powers and responsibilities of Congress) The Counsel shall limit any intervention or appearance as amicus curiae in an action or proceeding to issues relating to the powers and responsibilities of Congress. ( Pub. L. 95-521, title VII, §706, Oct. 26, 1978, 92 Stat. 1880 .)

(p) 2 USCS 288c (Defending the Senate,committee,subcommittee,member, officer, oremployee of Senate)

(q) 2 USCS 288g (Advisory and other functions)...(a)Cooperation with persons, committees, subcommittees, and offices Counsel shall advise, consult, and cooperate with—



(1) the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia with respect to any criminal proceeding for contempt of Congress certified by the President pro tempore of the Senate pursuant to section 194 of this title;

(2) the committee of the Senate with the responsibility to identify any court proceeding or action which is of vital interest to the Senate;

(3) the Comptroller General, the Government Accountability Office, the Office of Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and the Congressional Research Service, except that none of the responsibilities and authority assigned by this chapter to the Counsel shall be construed to affect or infringe upon any functions, powers, or duties of the aforementioned;

(4) any Member, officer, or employee of the Senate not represented under section 288c of this title with regard to obtaining private legal counsel for such Member, officer, or employee;

(5) the President *pro tempore* of the Senate, the Secretary of [1]Senate, the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, and the Parliamentarian of the Senate, regarding any subpoena, order, or request for withdrawal of papers presented to the Senate which raises a question of the privileges of the Senate; and

(6) any committee or subcommittee of the Senate in promulgating and revising their rules and procedures for the use of congressional investigative powers and with respect to questions which may arise in the course of any investigation.

**(b) Legal research files- The Counsel shall compile and maintain legal research files of materials from court proceedings which have involved Congress, a House of Congress, an office or agency of Congress, or any committee, subcommittee, Member, officer, or employee of Congress. Public court papers and other research memoranda which do not contain information of a confidential or privileged nature shall be made available to the public consistent with any applicable procedures set forth in such rules of the Senate as may apply and the interests of the Senate.**

**(c) Miscellaneous duties- The Counsel shall perform such other duties consistent with the purposes and limitations of this chapter as the Senate may direct.**

(r) New Jersey Statute(s)-

**(1) N.J.S. 2C:5-2 (Conspiracy)**...[a.] Definition of conspiracy. A person is guilty of conspiracy with another person or persons to commit a crime if with the purpose of promoting or

facilitating its commission he: (1) Agrees with such other person or persons that they or one or more of them will engage in conduct which constitutes such crime or an attempt or solicitation to commit such crime; or (2) Agrees to aid such other person or persons in the planning or commission of such crime or of an attempt or solicitation to commit such crime...[b.]Scope of conspiratorial relationship. If a person guilty of conspiracy, as defined by subsection a. of this section, knows that a person with whom he conspires to commit a crime has conspired with another person or persons to commit the same crime, he is guilty of conspiring with such other person or persons, whether or not he knows their identity, to commit such crime...[c.] Conspiracy with multiple objectives. If a person conspires to commit a number of crimes, he is guilty of only one conspiracy so long as such multiple crimes are the object of the same agreement or continuous conspiratorial relationship. It shall not be a defense to a charge under this section that one or more of the objectives of the conspiracy was not criminal; provided that one or more of its objectives or the means of promoting or facilitating an objective of the conspiracy is criminal.

(2) **N.J.S. 2C:2-2 (Culpability; criminal negligence)**...General requirements of culpability... [a.] Minimum requirements of culpability. Except as provided in subsection c.(3) of this section, a person is not guilty of an offense unless he acted purposely, knowingly, recklessly or negligently, as the law may require, with respect to each material element of the offense. [b.] Kinds of culpability defined. (1) Purposely. A person acts purposely with respect to the nature of his conduct or a result thereof if it is his conscious object to engage in conduct of that nature or to cause such a result. A person acts purposely with respect to attendant circumstances if he is aware of the existence of such circumstances or he believes or hopes that they exist. "With purpose," "designed," "with design" or equivalent terms have the same meaning. (2) Knowingly. A person acts knowingly with respect to the nature of his conduct or the attendant circumstances if he is aware that his conduct is of that nature, or that such circumstances exist, or he is aware of a high probability of their existence. A person acts knowingly with respect to a result of his conduct if he is aware that it is practically certain that his conduct will cause such a result. "Knowing," "with knowledge" or equivalent terms have the same meaning. (3) Recklessly. A person acts recklessly with respect to a material element of an offense when he consciously disregards a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the material element exists or will result from his conduct. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that, considering the nature and purpose of the actor's conduct and the circumstances known to him, its disregard involves a gross deviation from the standard of conduct that a reasonable person would observe in the actor's situation. "Recklessness," "with recklessness" or equivalent terms have the same meaning. (4) Negligently. A person acts negligently with respect to a material element of an offense when he should be aware of a substantial and unjustifiable risk that the material element exists or will result from his conduct. The risk must be of such a nature and degree that the actor's failure to perceive it, considering the nature and purpose of his conduct and the circumstances known to him, involves a gross deviation from the standard of care that a

reasonable person would observe in the actor's situation. "Negligently" or "negligence" when used in this code, shall refer to the standard set forth in this section and not to the standards applied in civil cases...[c.] Construction of statutes with respect to culpability requirements. (1) Prescribed culpability requirement applies to all material elements. When the law defining an offense prescribes the kind of culpability that is sufficient for the commission of an offense, without distinguishing among the material elements thereof, such provision shall apply to all the material elements of the offense, unless a contrary purpose plainly appears. (2) Substitutes for kinds of culpability. When the law provides that a particular kind of culpability suffices to establish an element of an offense such element is also established if a person acts with higher kind of culpability. (3) Construction of statutes not stating culpability requirement. Although no culpable mental state is expressly designated in a statute defining an offense, a culpable mental state may nevertheless be required for the commission of such offense, or with respect to some or all of the material elements thereof, if the proscribed conduct necessarily involves such culpable mental state. A statute defining a crime, unless clearly indicating a legislative intent to impose strict liability, should be construed as defining a crime with the culpability defined in paragraph b.(2) of this section. This provision applies to offenses defined both within and outside of this code...[d.] Culpability as to illegality of conduct. Neither knowledge nor recklessness nor negligence as to whether conduct constitutes an offense or as to the existence, meaning or application of the law determining the elements of an offense is an element of such offense, unless the definition of the offense or the code so provides...[e.] Culpability as determinant of grade of offense. When the grade or degree of an offense depends on whether the offense is committed purposely, knowingly, recklessly or criminally negligently, its grade or degree shall be the lowest for which the determinative kind of culpability is established with respect to any material element of the offense.

(s) 52 USCS 30145 (Federal Election Campaigns General Provisions)

(t) 2 USCS 4721

(u) 2 USCS 4725 (Gifts and travel)

(v) **13 V.S.A. § 2904. False swearing (Vermont Statute)**...A person of whom an oath is required by law, who willfully swears falsely in regard to any matter or thing respecting which such oath is required, shall be guilty of perjury and punished as provided in section 2901 of this title.

(w) 13 V.S.A. § 2901. Punishment for perjury (Vermont Statute)...A person who, being lawfully required to depose the truth in a proceeding in a court of justice or in a contested case before a State agency pursuant to 3 V.S.A. chapter 25, commits perjury shall be imprisoned not more than 15 years and fined not more than \$10,000.00, or both.

(x) 18 U.S.C. 245(b) (Federally protected acts)...Whoever, whether or not acting under color of law, by force or threat of force willfully injures, intimidates or interferes with, or attempts to injure, intimidate or interfere with— (1 )any person because he is or has been, or in order to intimidate such person or any other person or any class of persons from— (A) voting or qualifying to vote, **qualifying or campaigning as a candidate for elective office**, or qualifying or acting as a pollwatcher, or any legally authorized election official, in any primary, special, or general election; **(B) participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States**; (C) applying for or enjoying employment, or any perquisite thereof, by any agency of the United States; (D) serving, or attending upon any court in connection with possible service, as a grand or petit juror in any court of the United States; **(E) participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance...**(2) any person because of his race, color, religion or national origin and because he is or has been— (A) enrolling in or attending any public school or public college; **(B) participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility or activity provided or administered by any State or subdivision thereof...**

(y) 42 U.S. Code § 2000aa. (Searches and seizures by government officers and employees in connection with investigation or prosecution of criminal offenses) (a) Work product materials notwithstanding any other law, **it shall be unlawful for a government officer or employee, in connection with the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense, to search for or seize any work product materials possessed by a person reasonably believed to have a purpose to disseminate to the public a newspaper, book, broadcast, or other similar form of public communication, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce...**

4. FURTHERMORE, in respect to Former Brief, Petition shall submit the following exhibits hereunto, to meet the burden to show a preponderance of Evidence of **Allegations [in respect to Former Brief]** (far-beyond a scintilla), as follows [self-authenticating evidence pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. P. 902]:

(a) All legal papers (on public record) and court documents at [www.gotchaevidence.com](http://www.gotchaevidence.com), whereby are pursuant to 2 USCS 288g(b).

[NOTE: See Gotcha Evidence folder directory at **[www.gotchaevidence.com](http://www.gotchaevidence.com)**]

(1) See Gotcha Evidence Context Summary (news release from ABC-8 local network affiliate website, at <https://bit.ly/2MtMghz>)

IN CONCLUSION:

THEREBY, PETITIONER DECLARES THAT ALL STATEMENTS OF THIS PETITION HEREINABOVE ARE FACTUAL AND TRUE TO THE BEST OF HIS KNOWLEDGE.

Respectfully submitted,

*s/ Cary Lee Peterson.* \_\_\_\_\_ Date: *August 19, 2019*

CARY LEE PETERSON, LL.D.

[PETITIONER]

By: Amanda Liu, Authorized POA Agent