

4. Defendant (NYSBOE) is the accountable government bureau for any and all actions committed by the sixty-two (62) county BOE's across New York State.
5. The breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, negligence, constructive fraud and conspiracy against the plaintiffs has occurred in counties throughout New York.
6. Each of the plaintiffs are natural born New York State constitutional citizens, (not statutory citizens under USC 8 §1452, §1101(a)(21)), electors living in different counties during all the time of the allegations herein.
7. Each of the plaintiffs have an inalienable right to be heard and complaint measured under common law.

DEFENDANTS OBLIGATIONS

8. Defendant is a government bureau whose main purpose is to facilitate a consistent and uniform election process for the People of New York, in all sixty-two (62) county boards of election across the state.
9. Defendants in its mission statement posted on their web stated it is responsible for administration and enforcement for all sixty-two (62) county BOE's; Exhibit 101.

"The State Board of Elections was established in the Executive Department June 1, 1974 as a bipartisan agency vested with the responsibility for administration and enforcement of all laws relating to elections in New York State... The Board is also responsible for regulating disclosure and limitations of a Fair Campaign Code intended to govern campaign practices. In conducting these wide-ranging responsibilities, the Board offers assistance to local election boards and investigates complaints of possible statutory violations. In addition to the regulatory and enforcement responsibilities the board is charged with the preservation of citizen confidence in the democratic process and enhancement in voter participation in elections".

10. Pursuant to Election Law §3-102, §3-104, and §3-105 defendant's general powers and duties are to (a) issue instructions (b) promulgate rules and regulations, (c) visit local boards of

election, (d) examine BOE procedures and records, (e) conduct investigation, (f) conduct private or public hearings, (g) administer oaths, affirmations, (h) subpoena witnesses, (i) monitor the adequacy and effectiveness of the election laws; and, (j) report thereon.

11. The New York Comptroller, Report 2007-S-65 clearly states that NYSBOE "*is responsible for administrating and enforcing all election laws and reported that NYSBOE "does visit county boards to review operations and issues reports"*". Exhibit 102

12. The consistent uniform behavior and attitude amongst the sixty-two (62) boards, towards the people that are pursuing elective office outside of the blessings of the two major masked political association's (aka republican and democratic parties) corporate (top down) type control are not possible without an orchestrator and co-conspirator, namely the defendant.

13. This case is state-wide and alleges violations in virtually all sixty-two (62) county Boards of Election.

14. Defendant is the state agency responsible for the collusion between the sixty-two (62) boards and the two major masked political association's

15. Such blatantly open massive conspiracy is impossible to have occurred without a state wide orchestrator.

16. Such blatantly open massive conspiracy is impossible to have occurred outside of defendants knowledge.

17. It would be absurd to conclude that all sixty-two (62) boards would need to be served and represented by sixty-two (62) plus lawyers, turning the court into a circus. There is only one New York state government and the good People of New York should not be paying for sixty-two (62) plus lawyers to defend one agency against the people.

18. Logic dictates, all those lawyers, commissioners, and media would leave no room in the court for the people.

**"MEMBERS OF THE COUNTY COMMITTEE"
ARE NOMINATED AT THE PRIMARY ELECTION.**

19. In a recent Dutchess County Supreme Court case (2011) Martino -v- Town of Hyde Park Republican Committee (case attached, not yet recorded) Exhibit 103 the applicants challenged the existence of the Town of Hyde Park Republican Committee. Whereas, it was found that

"a town committee was a creature of statute that owes its existence to the Dutchess County Republican Committee, Pursuant to New York State Election Law 2-104".

20. The court found that the Dutchess county Republican County Committee recognized and authorized the existence of the Town Committee. The Court referenced Francisco v. Borden, 545 N.Y.S.2d 401, 153 A.D.2d 786 (N.Y.A.D. 3 Dept., 1989) that ruled

"County Committee had duly authorized the creation of such a town party committee or had conferred rule-making powers upon it. The creation of a town party committee, its powers, authority and procedures are solely the province of a county committee"...

21. Therefore the fact that the Town Committee is "solely" created by statute, if, and only if, implemented by the will of the County Committee, is well established in case law.

22. Nominations of candidates for town offices shall be made at the primary preceding the election as the rules of the county committee shall provide. The designating title "members of the county committee" from a town is therefore "Nominated at the Primary Election" or caucus

§6-108.1 candidates for town offices shall be made by caucus or primary election as the rules of the county committee shall provide

23. These candidates are not elected at the annual primary election, but nominated if challenged at the primary election then, **unlike elected offices**, "**authorized**" by the county committee at a private association party meeting after the readjustment of the units. Exhibit 117

**COMMITTEEMEN
ARE ELECTED AT THE PRIMARY ELECTION**

24. Committeemen are "**nominated by designating petition**" and "**elected at the Primary Election**" as prescribed by statute and is an independent freely elected committeeman who answers "**solely**" to the people of their election district and not a "private" association.

§6–118 Except as otherwise provided by this article, the designation of a candidate for party nomination at a primary election and the nomination of a candidate for election to a party position to be elected at a primary election shall be by designating petition.

EXISTING CONTRACT

25. A contract, at least a constructive one, was made between plaintiffs and the defendant through the purported constitutional oath's taken by defendant, along with the other 124 New York county commissioners, acting as custodians of the contract.

26. Those two contracts are the Constitution for these United States of America and the constitution for New York, hereinafter contracts.

27. By their ostensible oaths defendant owed a legal duty to plaintiffs to obey the Rule of Law to the highest standard of care.

28. The oaths created a legal duty to faithfully uphold, serve and honor the constitutions between government actors such as defendant and the People of New York.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS OF FACTS

29. Plaintiffs had rested their trust in defendant custodian as the People exercised their right to participate in the choosing of their representatives during the 2010 and 2011 elections.

30. Defendant intentionally misused or expanded said trust and breached its duty to honor the contracts.

31. Defendant intentionally conspired with the leadership of the two major masked political private associations at both the state and county level, to defraud the plaintiffs by shutting them out of the election or franchise process through deception and unlawful acts during the 2010 and 2011 annual primary elections.

32. Defendant colluded with permission both private political associations and misused or expanded election law Article 2, to take and maintain control via §2-106 of the New York state election law, to oscillate the control of power among a few individuals in each county, thereby disenfranchising the plaintiffs and the People of New York.

33. Some of the misinformation and unlawful actions perpetrated by defendant during the 2010 and 2011 annual primary elections against plaintiffs and others will now be stated, none of which were successful in their endeavor to become elected committeeman as documented during the 2010 primary election. Exhibit 118

34. BOE's said that they are not the receiver of designating petitions.

35. BOE's said that there are no vacancies, when there were.

36. BOE's said that committeeman elections are on the odd years only.

37. BOE's said that the filling of vacancies for the office of Committeeman is by party rules alone.

38. BOE's said that that county party rules are not available.

39. BOE's said that party positions are not elected at the primary election.
40. BOE's ignored petitions given to them.
41. BOE's refused to receive petitions.
42. BOE's challenged petitions filed with them as being insufficient.
43. BOE's have placed on the ballot the elected title "Committeemen" running against the nominate title "Members of the County Committee".
44. At the 2011 Primary Election in Dutchess County the BOE has reported that two (2) "nominated" Town Committeemen has defeated an "elected" Committeeman.
45. Defendant has unlawfully expunged and hidden from the view of the people the free elected committeeman.
46. Defendant behaves like an arm of the two major masked political private associations.
47. Defendant is compliant to all the above non-constitutional activities with the two major masked political associations, which said associations could not implement acting alone.
48. Defendant injured the plaintiffs and the People by the disenfranchisement of their right to truly choose their elected representatives.
49. Defendant benefited from the plaintiffs injury with political favors.
50. Defendant benefited from the plaintiffs injury with political powers.
51. Defendant have acted in collusion with private associations over the decades to expunge the free elected committeeman.
52. As a result of the aforementioned compliance, plaintiffs and the People have been disenfranchised of their most basic and unalienable right to participate in the selection of their elected representatives.

53. Plaintiffs and the People have been, disenfranchised of the right to truly choose their elected representatives.

54. Plaintiffs and the People, in final effect of defendants' actions [taken as a whole], have been disenfranchised of the right to freely choose their elected representatives.

REASONABLE EXPECTATIONS

55. As eloquently expressed by George Washington in his "Farewell Address" our founders logically intended that the representative process be by people rule, not party rule under the control of a few individuals Exhibit 104

56. Our Founders logically intended a bottom up organization for the people to control their representatives by having the power to choose for themselves.

57. Each political party in New York has 16,300 election districts (ED). Natural law dictates a free people are "entitled" to have a "FREE" "elected" representative (Committeeman) to fill all vacancies on their behalf.

58. **"In order to fulfill their Constitutional duties"** each of these committeemen, must have a seat and one vote on the "general committee" (aka county committee), town committee, assembly committee, congressional committee and senatorial committee.

59. Each general committee, by open popular vote is to choose a chairman, treasurer, secretary and any other officer the general committee might determine necessary.

60. Each general committee, by open popular vote may at will challenge and replace leadership.

61. The chairman of each of New York's sixty-two (62) general committees make up the state committee.

62. Natural law dictates that legislators cannot legislate away the unalienable rights of the sovereign or "free People", or their "free elected committeemen", for we the people created them and they did not create the people.

**THE GRIM REALITY SUFFERED UPON THE PEOPLE
BY ABETTED DEFENDANT**

63. Empowered by the defendant both "private associations" act and perform as the face of the political parties.

64. Empowered by the defendant both "private associations" operate on a day to day basis exercising a kind of corporate rule, little different than the communist model. As forewarned by George Washington these associations have become;

*"potent engines by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men have subverted the power of the people and have usurped for themselves the reins of government, and, thereby have destroyed the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion".
Exhibit 104, line 165-168*

65. Empowered by the BOE both "private associations" have expunged the free elected committeemen.

66. If defendant acknowledged the designating petitions lawfully and duly filed by many people across New York, "FREE" elected Committeeman would rise to their rightful positions of power; and, truly free elections would return to New York State.

67. These private associations empowered by progressive forces in our legislative body, could not have achieved their liberty destroying goals without the past and continuous cooperation of defendant. Together they betrayed the good people of New York by destroying the bottom up organization of the committeemen process (grassroots control of elections).

68. Presently town committeemen are "masked as county committeemen", and to fill the seats belonging to the "FREE" elected Committeeman. These "town" committeemen are straw-men holding only a straw vote, puppets under the iron fists of their masters.

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

69. Plaintiffs are entitled and demands declaratory judgment under NY CVP Law 3001 demand for the relief and re-allege and restate the foregoing jurisdictional allegations and general factual allegations.

70. The need for a declaratory judgment is both urgent and necessary because the present state of voter confidence is rapidly deteriorating because of past and present actions by the defendant.

71. The need for a declaratory judgment is both urgent and necessary because this present controversy was initiated by corrupt men, empowered by the defendant, who have succeeded in subverting the power of the people by expunging the elected committeeman and thereby shutting out the plaintiffs and the People from the election process.

72. The need for a declaratory judgment is both urgent and necessary because the plaintiffs and the People of New York have been, and continue to be disfranchised by these actions as per Article 1 Section 1 of the New York State Constitution.

73. The plaintiffs have properly filed designating petitions for vacant seats as committeemen in their election district for "election" at the 2010 and 2011 primary election as prescribed by election law §6-118, §6-130-136 and §6-144, which were not challenged but have been unlawfully rejected, and or re-designated by the defendant into a nominated town positions at the primary election therefore plaintiffs have suffered injury. Exhibit 105,108 & 111

74. The defendant had a duty to protect voter confidence and secure the rights of the plaintiffs to choose political representation and to exercise their right as elected committeemen to fill political office vacancies on behalf of the People of New York but, instead has violated that obligation of duty.

WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the good People of New York demand:

(A) Judgment order that the town position entitled "Member of the County Committee", which were created by the county committee through and under color of election law Article 2 serves at the pleasure of the freely elected committeeman, as is already well established case law: and,

(B) Judgment order deeming all candidates (1) duly filed prima-fascia designating petitions titled "Committeeman" and that (2) went un-contested at the 2010 and 2011 annual primary election as lawfully elected committeemen as per New York State Constitution Article 1, Section 1; and Election law §6-118 and acknowledged as such by the BOE's and,

(C) Order for immediate enforcement of the aforementioned (A) and (B) by warrants delivered to sheriffs in each county; and for service upon State and all County Boards of Elections, and

(D) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred to bring this action, including court costs, together with such other and further relief as the Court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.

COUNT ONE - BREACH OF CONTACT

75. Plaintiffs re-allege and restate the foregoing jurisdictional allegations, general factual allegations, and declaratory judgment demand under NY CVP Law 3001.

76. The Constitution for these United States and the Constitution for New York are enforceable contracts between the defendant, the plaintiffs and the People of New York.

77. Plaintiffs properly filed designating petitions for the office of Committeeman as per election law §6-118

78. NYSBOE and County BOE commissioners swore or should have sworn the oath to support said Constitutions.

79. Said commissioners breached said oaths when they worked and enabled the mechanisms by which the two private party ASSOCIATIONS derailed the true committeeman process; and, thereby breached said contracts.

80. The results of the breach of contracts suffered by the plaintiffs are disenfranchisement of the right to run for public office by the defendant.

81. The results of the breach of contracts suffered by the plaintiffs are denial of the right to choose political representation and to exercise the right as elected committeemen to fill political office vacancies on behalf of the People of New York as we have already been elected at the primary elections in 2010 & 2011, but continue to be obstructed by defendant, as per the NYS Constitution, Bill of Rights, Article 1, Section 1 where we read;

No member of this state shall be disfranchised, or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizen thereof, ... except that the legislature may provide [and they have] that there shall be no primary election held to nominate candidates for public office or to elect persons to party positions for any political party or parties in any unit of representation of the state from which such candidates or persons are nominated or elected whenever there is no contest or contests for such nominations or election as may be prescribed by general law.

82. The results of the breach of contracts suffered by the plaintiffs and the People is the lost of personal and economic freedom associated with the political transference to private associations.

83. In the case *Sun Gold Corp. v. Stillman*, 2010 NY Slip Op 31896 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., 2010) the required elements for breach of contract stated and met herein are:

... plaintiff must establish each of the following four elements: (1) existence of a valid contract; (2) plaintiff's performance of the contract; (3) defendant's material breach of the contract; and (4) damages (Noise In The Attic Productions, Inc. v London Records, 10 AD3d 303 [1st Dept 2004] [referencing NY PJI 4:1-elements of breach of contract]; and Furia v Furia, 116 AD2d 694 [2d Dept 1986]).

WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the good People of New York demand:

(A) Judgment order that the town position entitled "Member of the County Committee", which were created by the county committee through and under color of election law Article 2 serves at the pleasure of the freely elected committeeman, as is already well established case law: and,

(B) Judgment order deeming all candidates (1) duly filed prima-fascia designating petitions titled "Committeeman" and that (2) went un-contested at the 2010 and 2011 annual primary election as lawfully elected committeemen as per New York State Constitution Article 1, Section 1; and Election law §6-118 and acknowledged as such by the BOE's and,

(C) Order for immediate enforcement of the aforementioned (A) and (B) by warrants delivered to sheriffs in each county; and for service upon State and all County Boards of Elections, and

(D) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred to bring this action, including court costs, together with such other and further relief as the Court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.

COUNT TWO - BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

84. Plaintiffs re-allege and restate the foregoing jurisdictional allegations, general factual allegations, and declaratory judgment demand under NY CVP Law 3001.

85. Plaintiffs in good faith trusted defendant, who had a fiduciary duty to protect the plaintiff's constitutional rights to run for public office and choose their representatives and to guard elections.

86. Defendant knowingly breached said trust when they conspired with the two private party ASSOCIATIONS to maintain the control of the committeeman process in the hands of a select few and prevent access by plaintiffs and the People.

87. The damages suffered by the plaintiffs because of said breach of trust by defendant was the denial of plaintiffs right to run for public office, to select political representatives, and to exercise committeemen rights to fill political vacancies on behalf of the good People of New York, as we have already been elected at the primary elections in 2010 & 2011, but continue to be obstructed by defendant, as per the NYS Constitution, Bill of Rights, Article 1, Section 1 where we read;

No member of this state shall be disfranchised, or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizen thereof, ... except that the legislature may provide [and they have] that there shall be no primary election held to nominate candidates for public office or to elect persons to party positions for any political party or parties in any unit of representation of the state from which such candidates or persons are nominated or elected whenever there is no contest or contests for such nominations or election as may be prescribed by general law.

88. In the case of Shaw Creations Inc v. Galleria Enter.s Inc, 2010 NY Slip Op 32938 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., 2010) the required elements for breach of fiduciary duty stated and met herein are:

...breach of fiduciary duty has three elements: (1) a breach of fiduciary duty, (2) defendant knowingly induced or participated in the breach, and (3) damage resulting from the breach. Kaufman v Cohen, 307 AD2d 113, 125 (1st Dept 2003).

WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the good People of New York demand:

(A) Judgment order that the town position entitled "Member of the County Committee", which were created by the county committee through and under color of election law Article 2 serves at the pleasure of the freely elected committeeman, as is already well established case law: and,

(B) Judgment order deeming all candidates (1) duly filed prima-fascia designating petitions titled "Committeeman" and that (2) went un-contested at the 2010 and 2011 annual primary election as lawfully elected committeemen as per New York State Constitution Article 1, Section 1; and Election law §6-118 and acknowledged as such by the BOE's and,

(C) Order for immediate enforcement of the aforementioned (A) and (B) by warrants delivered to sheriffs in each county; and for service upon State and all County Boards of Elections, and

(D) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred to bring this action, including court costs, together with such other and further relief as the Court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.

COUNT THREE – NEGLIGENCE

89. Plaintiffs re-allege and restate the foregoing jurisdictional allegations, general factual allegations, and declaratory judgment demand under NY CVP Law 3001.

90. Plaintiffs and the People of New York entrusted, to a high standard of care, defendant with the sacred duty to protect the election process, George Washington's "engine of freedom".
Exhibit 104, line 164-168

91. Defendant were negligent in their duty when they permitted and conspired with the two private ASSOCIATIONS to transfer, over time, the control of the committeeman process to private ASSOCIATIONS.

92. The damages suffered by the plaintiffs negligence was the denial of plaintiffs right to run for public office, to select political representatives, and to exercise committeemen rights to fill political vacancies on behalf of the good People of New York, as we have already been elected at the primary elections in 2010 & 2011, but continue to be obstructed by defendant, as per the NYS Constitution, Bill of Rights, Article 1, Section 1 where we read;

No member of this state shall be disfranchised, or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizen thereof, ... except that the legislature may provide [and they have] that there shall be no primary election held to nominate candidates for public office or to elect persons to party positions for any political party or parties in any unit of representation of the state from which such candidates or persons are nominated or elected whenever there is no contest or contests for such nominations or election as may be prescribed by general law.

93. In the case of Nowak v. County of Wayne, 2007 NY Slip Op 30881(U) (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 4/9/2007), 2007 NY Slip Op 30881 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., 2007) the required elements for negligence stated and met herein are:

... "The elements of negligence are a duty the defendant owes to the plaintiff, a breach of that duty by the defendant, a causal connection between the breach and the plaintiff's injury, and actual injury. In the absence of any one of these elements, no cause for negligence will lie" (57A Am Jur2d Negligence §71).

WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the good People of New York demand:

(A) Judgment order that the town position entitled "Member of the County Committee", which were created by the county committee through and under color of election law Article 2 serves at the pleasure of the freely elected committeeman, as is already well established case law: and,

(B) Judgment order deeming all candidates (1) duly filed prima-fascia designating petitions titled "Committeeman" and that (2) went un-contested at the 2010 and 2011 annual primary election as

lawfully elected committeemen as per New York State Constitution Article 1, Section 1; and Election law §6-118 and acknowledged as such by the BOE's and,

(C) Order for immediate enforcement of the aforementioned (A) and (B) by warrants delivered to sheriffs in each county; and for service upon State and all County Boards of Elections, and

(D) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred to bring this action, including court costs, together with such other and further relief as the Court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.

COUNT FOUR - CONSTRUCTIVE FRAUD

94. Plaintiffs re-allege and restate the foregoing jurisdictional allegations, general factual allegations, and declaratory judgment demand under NY CVP Law 3001.

95. Plaintiffs and the People of New York entrusted defendant with the expectation of a high standard of care in its duty to protect the election process, “the engine of freedom” [committeeman process].

96. Defendant misused or expanded said trust by having elaborate and masked systems working directly and/or indirectly with private ASSOCIATIONS that in the last analysis did deceive and defraud plaintiffs and the People.

97. In their betrayal, defendants acquired or obtained political power and favors through control of the election process.

98. The damages suffered by the plaintiffs fraudulent actions was the denial of plaintiffs right to run for public office, to select political representatives, and to exercise committeemen rights to fill political vacancies on behalf of the good People of New York, as we have already been

elected at the primary elections in 2010 & 2011, but continue to be obstructed by defendant, as per the NYS Constitution, Bill of Rights, Article 1, Section 1 where we read;

No member of this state shall be disfranchised, or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizen thereof, ... except that the legislature may provide [and they have] that there shall be no primary election held to nominate candidates for public office or to elect persons to party positions for any political party or parties in any unit of representation of the state from which such candidates or persons are nominated or elected whenever there is no contest or contests for such nominations or election as may be prescribed by general law.

99. In the case of *Kopelowitz & Co., Inc. v. Mann*, 2009 NY Slip Op 50712(U) (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 4/17/2009), 2009 NY Slip Op 50712 (N.Y. Sup. Ct., 2009) the required elements for construction fraud stated and met herein are:

*... to establish a prima facie case of fraud, the plaintiff must establish (1) that the defendant made material representations that were false, (2) that the defendant knew the representations were false and made them with the intent to deceive the plaintiff, (3) that the plaintiff justifiably relied on the defendant's representations, and (4) that the plaintiff was injured as a result of the defendant's representation. (See *Kerusa Co., LLC v W10Z/515 Real Estate Ltd. Partnership*, NY3d, 2009 NY Slip Op 02482 [April 2, 2009]; *Small v Lorillard Tobacco Co., Inc.* 94 NY2d 43 [1999]; *Channel Master Corp. v Aluminum Limited Sales, Inc.*, 4 NY2d 403 [1958]; *Smith v Ameriquest Mortg. Corp.*, AD3d, 2009 NY Slip Op 02586 [2d Dept March 31, 2009]; *Cash v Titan Financial Services, Inc.* 58 AD3d 785 [2d Dept 2009]; *Shovak v Long Island Commercial Bank*, 50 AD3d 1118 [2d Dept 2008]; *Sellinger Enterprises, Inc. v Cassuto*, 50 AD3d 766 [2d Dept 2008]; *Williams v Eason*, 49 AD3d 866 [2d Dept 2008]; *McMorrow v Dime Sav. Bank of Williamsburg*, 48 AD3d 646, [2d Dept 2008].*

WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the good People of New York demand:

(A) Judgment order that the town position entitled "Member of the County Committee", which were created by the county committee through and under color of election law Article 2 serves at the pleasure of the freely elected committeeman, as is already well established case law: and,

(B) Judgment order deeming all candidates (1) duly filed prima-fascia designating petitions titled “Committeeman” and that (2) went un-contested at the 2010 and 2011 annual primary election as lawfully elected committeemen as per New York State Constitution Article 1, Section 1; and Election law §6-118 and acknowledged as such by the BOE's and,

(C) Order for immediate enforcement of the aforementioned (A) and (B) by warrants delivered to sheriffs in each county; and for service upon State and all County Boards of Elections, and

(D) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred to bring this action, including court costs, together with such other and further relief as the Court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.

COUNT FIVE - CONSPIRACY

100. Plaintiffs re-allege and restate the foregoing jurisdictional allegations, general factual allegations, and declaratory judgment demand under NY CVP Law 3001.

101. Defendant and the two private ASSOCIATIONS, each and together, intentionally overtly and covertly solicited and committed acts that were in violation of election law.

102. Defendant and the two private ASSOCIATIONS openly and jointly committed acts that worked to disenfranchise the plaintiffs and the People.

103. Defendant breached the public trust when they conspired with the two private ASSOCIATIONS to maintain the control of the committeeman process in the hands of a few and prevent access by the People.

104. The end result of the actions committed by defendant was the denial of plaintiffs and the People’s right to select political representatives for voting purposes and to exercise committeeman rights to fill political office vacancies on behalf of the People of New York, as we

have already been elected at the primary elections in 2010 & 2011, but continue to be obstructed by defendant, as per the NYS Constitution, Bill of Rights, Article 1, Section 1 where we read;

No member of this state shall be disfranchised, or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizen thereof, ... except that the legislature may provide [and they have] that there shall be no primary election held to nominate candidates for public office or to elect persons to party positions for any political party or parties in any unit of representation of the state from which such candidates or persons are nominated or elected whenever there is no contest or contests for such nominations or election as may be prescribed by general law.

105. In the case of *Cresser v. American Tobacco Co.*, 662 N.Y.S.2d 374, 174 Misc.2d 1 (N.Y.Sup., 1997) the required elements for conspiracy stated and met herein are:

The elements of conspiracy are: (1) an agreement to participate in an unlawful act; (2) an injury caused by an unlawful overt act performed by one of the parties to the agreement; (3) " 'which overt act was done pursuant to and in furtherance of the common scheme.' " Lindsay v. Lockwood, 163 Misc.2d 228, 234, 625 N.Y.S.2d 393 (Sup.Court, Monroe County, 1994) citing Halberstam v. Welch, 705 F.2d 472, 477 (D.C.Cir., 1983).

WHEREFORE, the plaintiffs for themselves and on behalf of the good People of New York demand:

(A) Judgment order that the town position entitled "Member of the County Committee", which were created by the county committee through and under color of election law Article 2 serves at the pleasure of the freely elected committeeman, as is already well established case law: and,

(B) Judgment order deeming all candidates (1) duly filed prima-fascia designating petitions titled "Committeeman" and that (2) went un-contested at the 2010 and 2011 annual primary election as lawfully elected committeemen as per New York State Constitution Article 1, Section 1; and Election law §6-118 and acknowledged as such by the BOE's and,

(C) Order for immediate enforcement of the aforementioned (A) and (B) by warrants delivered to sheriffs in each county; and for service upon State and all County Boards of Elections, and

(D) Reimbursement for all expenses incurred to bring this action, including court costs, together with such other and further relief as the Court may deem reasonable and just under the circumstances.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED.

All rights reserved,

DATE: The 16th Day of the Eleventh month of the Year of Our Lord two thousand eleven and the two hundred thirty-fifth Year of Our Independence.

John Vidurek, Sui Juris, unrepresented
Lead Plaintiff
Fax (888) 891-8977
600 Violet Ave, Suite 107
Hyde Park, New York

Gerard Aprea, Sui Juris, unrepresented