

---

**State of Rhode Island questionnaire and statement**

3 messages

---

**Cote, Allison (RICHR)** <Allison.Cote@richr.ri.gov>  
To: "hi@tylerpresident.com" <hi@tylerpresident.com>

Mon, Jul 1, 2024 at 6:57 PM

Mr. Tyler:

Please read the attached letter.

Sincerely,

**Allison G Côté**

**EEOC Project Director**

**RI Commission For Human Rights**

**180 Westminster Street**

**Providence, RI 02903**

**401.222.6812 (phone)**

**401.222.2616 (fax)**

**Voice Relay 7-1-1**

**[allison.cote@richr.ri.gov](mailto:allison.cote@richr.ri.gov)**



**Nonjurisdictional letter.docx**  
364K

---

**Mathew Tyler** <\*\*\*\*\*>  
To: "Cote, Allison (RICHR)" <Allison.Cote@richr.ri.gov>

Tue, Jul 2, 2024 at 3:50 AM

Ms. Côté,

Are you joking with me or are you violating my 14th amendment equal protection rights without first affording me due process whilst committing honest services fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1346)?(1) 42 U.S.C. § 1986

In accordance with 42 U.S. Code § 12131(1)(A), (B), the state ***is*** a public entity and as a qualified individual with a disability ([42 US Code § 12131\[2\]](#)), I am seeking a [section 504](#)/ADA Title II reasonable accommodation; which the state is required by superior federal law(2) and case law to provide. Not only

is the state a public entity and public accommodation, the issue at hand deals specifically with employment and the eligibility criteria that's being imposed which means that Title I of the ADA also applies.

According to your 07/01/2024 email, as this deals with employment, this is in your jurisdiction.

"...compelled to follow the directive from the state, but the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution requires a different order of priority. A **discriminatory state law** is **not a defense** to liability under federal law; **it is a source of liability under federal law**. *Williams v. General Foods Corp.*, 492 F.2d 399, 404 (7th Cir. 1974)"; (emphasis added) *Quinones v. City of Evanston*, 58 F.3d 275, 277 (7th Cir. 1995)

If I spoke a different language than what the material the state provides, would I be disqualified from participating or would the state be required to provide translated materials? Even if not required, would the state be so unChristian that it would be unwilling to help a person asking for help?

Can the state deny some citizens from using its roads or certain lanes of the road whilst allowing others to use it? No. Why not? Because it's all paid for with the public purse. Some people being able to utilize public resources whilst others aren't, who haven't first been afforded due process, violates people's equal protection rights afforded by the 14th amendment to the US Constitution...

Why would I, a qualified individual with a disability, be excluded from participating solely from my legitimate medical inability to acquire the signatures? 42 U.S. Code § 12132; 42 U.S. Code § 12182(a); 42 U.S. Code § 12112(a)

What kind of people commit crimes (42 U.S.C. § 2000a[d]) against disabled people? Despite being required(2) to include me, you people are literally trying to exclude me; i.e., what alternatives to my request has the state proposed? Requiring me to provide people to facilitate communication is not lawful. "Discrimination or segregation by an establishment is supported by State action within the meaning of this subchapter if such discrimination or segregation (1) is carried on under color of any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation; or (2) is carried on under color of any custom or usage required or enforced by officials of the State or political subdivision thereof; or (3) is required by action of the State or political subdivision thereof." 42 U.S.C. § 2000a(d)

"A public entity shall not rely on an adult accompanying an individual with a disability to interpret or facilitate communication..." 28 C.F.R. § 35.160(c)(2)

"Although [plaintiffs] were ultimately able to cast their vote with the fortuitous assistance of others, the purpose of the Rehabilitation Act is 'to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize employment, economic self-sufficiency, independence, and inclusion and integration into society'.... The right to vote should not be contingent on the happenstance that others are available to help." *Nat'l Fed'n of the Blind v. Lamone*, 813 F.3d 494, 506-7 (4th Cir. 2016)

The world will know your names; [the perpetuity of the Internet](#).

"Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, this part **applies to all services, programs, and activities provided or made available by public entities**." 28 C.F.R. § 35.102(a)

"Under Title II of the ADA, **no qualified individual with a disability shall, on the basis of disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity**. 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(a). This means that the County must give individuals with disabilities an equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from any service provided to others. 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(1). These legal requirements include providing equal access to the County's website and the public content posted there." (*letter\_of\_findings-upton\_county\_tx\_election\_website\_accessibility\_1.pdf*)

"The ADA is meant to ensure that people with disabilities can fully participate in all aspects of civic life. Under Title II, all state/local governments must follow the ADA regardless of their size." via <https://www.ada.gov/topics/title-ii/> (An official Department of Justice .gov website)

"The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal civil rights law that provides protections to people with disabilities to **ensure that they are treated equally in all aspects of life. Title II of the ADA requires state and local governments ("public entities") to ensure that people with disabilities**

have a full and equal opportunity to vote. **The ADA's provisions apply to all aspects of voting,**" <https://www.ada.gov/resources/polling-places-checklist/>

Again for any Dunning–Kruger effect imbeciles and/or ignoramuses alike,

"...**all aspects of voting.**"

"The primary purpose of the ADA Amendments Act is to **make it easier** for people with **disabilities** to obtain **protection** under the ADA. Consistent with the ADA Amendments Act's purpose of reinstating a broad scope of protection under the ADA, the definition of "disability" in this part shall be **construed broadly in favor of expansive coverage to the maximum extent permitted by the terms of the ADA**. The primary object of attention in cases brought under the ADA should be **whether entities covered under the ADA** have complied with **their obligations and whether discrimination has occurred**, not whether the individual meets the definition of "disability." The question of whether an individual meets the definition of "disability" under this part should not demand extensive analysis. " 28 C.F.R. § 35.101(b)

The state does not even have the authority to require criteria for federal level jobs; the entire notion is probably the most absurdly preposterous, delusional lunacy ideas I have heard in my entire life. If states lack the power to impose criteria for the House(1) and the Senate(2), why would states have the power to impose criteria for the highest job of the land? In accordance with the supreme law of the land, specifically the "[Supremacy Clause](#)" (Article 6, clause 2 of the US Constitution), the state would have to be above the US Constitution to supersede the Constitutional requirements as established by Article II, section 1, clause 5 of the US Constitution. Which would also contradict the Founding fathers original intention. Absent a US Constitutional amendment establishing otherwise, the power for states to require criteria has never been allocated to the states. This is the literal letter of the law; which has never even been disproven or even refuted by the state.

"...until the late 1800's, all ballots cast in this country were write-in ballots. The system of state-prepared ballots, also known as the Australian ballot system, was introduced in this country in 1888. See L.E. Fredman, *The Australian Ballot: The Story of an American Reform* ix (1968). Prior to this, voters prepared their own ballots or used preprinted tickets offered by political parties. Since there were no state-imposed restrictions on whose name could appear on a ballot, individuals could always vote for the candidates of their choice." [Burdick v. Takushi, 504 U.S. 428, 446 \(1992\)](#)

**No state immunity;** "A **State** shall **not** be **immune** under the **eleventh amendment** to the Constitution of the United States ... in **Federal** or State court ... **violation** of this chapter. In any action against a State for a violation of the requirements of this chapter, remedies (including remedies both at law and in equity) are available for such a violation to the same extent as such remedies are available for such a violation in an action against any public or private entity other than a State." (emphasis added) 42 U.S. Code § 12202


It is also worth pointing out that I am not the one poised to be **criminally charged** with disability discrimination supported by state action, deprivation of civil rights, deprivation of federally protected activities (18 U.S.C. § 245(b)(1)(A), (B), (E)), **you and your colleagues are;** 42 U.S. Code § 12202, 42 U.S.C. § 1986, 18 U.S.C. § 595, 42 U.S.C. § 1983, 18 U.S.C. § 241, 18 U.S.C. § 242,

Qualification standards and selection criteria that screen out people based on their disabilities that are not job-related or consistent with business necessity violate the ADA ([complaint\\_-\\_united\\_states\\_v\\_alabama\\_department\\_of\\_transportation.pdf](#))

"Under Title II of the ADA, no qualified individual with a disability shall, on the basis of disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity. 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(a). This means that the County must give individuals with disabilities an equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from any service provided to others. 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(1). These legal requirements include providing equal access to the County's website and the public content posted there." ([letter\\_of\\_findings-upton\\_county\\_tx\\_election\\_website\\_accessibility\\_1.pdf](#))

"...to avoid discrimination, a public entity must reasonably modify its policies, procedures, or practices when necessary to avoid disability discrimination, unless it can show that the modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of the service, program, or activity." (statement\_of\_interest-in\_re\_georgia\_sb\_202.pdf)

In accordance with Article II, section 1, clause 5 of the US Constitution, as a legitimate 2024 US Presidential candidate; in your opinion and something I'm wondering is, with a ~~reasonable accommodation~~ amendment stripping any applicable statute of limitation protections or maybe just blatantly violating it, if found guilty, should those, especially in government that violate the US Constitution be hanged for high treason? 🤔

-Mathew Tyler, US Presidential candidate (I), 2024-2084. 

- (1) *United States v. Price*, 383 U.S. 787 (1966) aka "'Mississippi Burning' Trial."
- (2) 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(a), (d); 28 C.F.R. § 35.160(b)(1); 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(B), (2)(A)(iii); 42 U.S.C. § 2000a(a), (d); 42 U.S.C. § 2000d
- (3) *Powell v. McCormack*, 395 U.S. 486, 550 (1969) (invalidating House's decision not to seat a Member accused of misuse of funds) ("[I]n judging the qualifications of its members Congress is limited to the standing qualifications prescribed in the Constitution.")
- (4) *Exon v. Tiemann*, 279 F. Supp. 609, 613 (D. Neb. 1968) ("There being no such requirement in the Constitution itself, a state cannot require that a Representative live in the District from which he was nominated."); *State ex rel. Chavez v. Evans*, 446 P.2d 445, 448 (N.M. 1968) ("[The New Mexico statute,] by requiring that each candidate for representative in Congress be a resident of and a qualified elector of the district in which he seeks office, adds additional qualifications to becoming a candidate for that office.... [W]e must hold the provisions of the Federal Constitution prevail and that this statute unconstitutionally adds additional qualifications."); *Hellman v. Collier*, 141 A.2d 908, 912 (Md. 1958) (same); cf. *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779 (1995) (state may not impose term limits on its congressional delegation)
- (5) *Cook v. Gralike*, 531 U.S. 510 (2001), was a United States Supreme Court case in which the Court held that an attempt by the state of Missouri to influence Congressional elections in favor of candidates who supported term limits was unconstitutional. The Court held that the powers delegated to the states by the Elections Clause related only to the power over the procedural mechanisms of elections. Because this amendment sought to influence the outcome of elections, it exceeded state powers over national elections.

[Quoted text hidden]

**Cote, Allison (RICHR)** <Allison.Cote@richr.ri.gov>  
To: Mathew Tyler <\*\*\*\*\*>

Fri, Jul 5, 2024 at 12:25 PM

Good afternoon:

I understand that you are frustrated with the Commission's decision.

In the alternative, you may draft a charge of discrimination yourself and submit it with your notarized signature. In that case, we must accept it as a filed charge. However, it is likely the charge would be administratively closed for lack of jurisdiction.

If you file a charge you may request the right to sue in superior court once it has been at least 120 days from the filing date.

You may also wish to speak to the U.S. Department of Justice.

Sincerely,

**Allison G Côté**

**EEOC Project Director**

**RI Commission For Human Rights**

**180 Westminster Street**

**Providence, RI 02903**

**401.222.6812 (phone)**

**401.222.2616 (fax)**

**Voice Relay 7-1-1**

**[allison.cote@richr.ri.gov](mailto:allison.cote@richr.ri.gov)**

---

**From:** Mathew Tyler <\*\*\*\*\*>

**Sent:** Tuesday, July 2, 2024 6:50 AM

**To:** Cote, Allison (RICHR) <[Allison.Cote@richr.ri.gov](mailto:Allison.Cote@richr.ri.gov)>

**Subject:** Re: State of Rhode Island questionnaire and statement

Ms. Côté,

Are you joking with me or are you violating my 14th amendment equal protection rights without first affording me due process whilst committing honest services fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1346)?(1) 42 U.S.C. § 1986

In accordance with 42 U.S. Code § 12131(1)(A), (B), the state is a public entity and as a qualified individual with a disability ([42 US Code § 12131\[2\]](#) [[law.cornell.edu](http://law.cornell.edu)]), I am seeking a [section 504](#) [[en.wikipedia.org](http://en.wikipedia.org)]/ADA Title II reasonable accommodation; which the state is required by superior federal law(2) and case law to provide. Not only is the state a public entity and public accommodation, the issue at hand deals specifically with employment and the eligibility criteria that's being imposed which means that Title I of the ADA also applies.

According to your 07/01/2024 email, as this deals with employment, this is in your jurisdiction.

"...compelled to follow the directive from the state, but the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution requires a different order of priority. A **discriminatory state law** is **not a defense** to liability under federal law; **it is a source of liability under federal law**. *Williams v. General Foods Corp.*, 492 F.2d 399, 404 [casetext.com] (7th Cir. 1974)"; (*emphasis added*) *Quinones v. City of Evanston*, 58 F.3d 275, 277 (7th Cir. 1995)

If I spoke a different language than what the material the state provides, would I be disqualified from participating or would the state be required to provide translated materials? Even if not required, would the state be so unChristian that it would be unwilling to help a person asking for help?

Can the state deny some citizens from using its roads or certain lanes of the road whilst allowing others to use it? No. Why not? Because it's all paid for with the public purse. Some people being able to utilize public resources whilst others aren't, who haven't first been afforded due process, violates people's equal protection rights afforded by the 14th amendment to the US Constitution...

Why would I, a qualified individual with a disability, be excluded from participating solely from my legitimate medical inability to acquire the signatures? 42 U.S. Code § 12132; 42 U.S. Code § 12182(a); 42 U.S. Code § 12112(a)

What kind of people commit crimes (42 U.S.C. § 2000a[d]) against disabled people? Despite being required(2) to include me, you people are literally trying to exclude me; i.e., what alternatives to my request has the state proposed? Requiring me to provide people to facilitate communication is not lawful. "Discrimination or segregation by an establishment is supported by State action within the meaning of this subchapter if such discrimination or segregation (1) is carried on under color of any law, statute, ordinance, or regulation; or (2) is carried on under color of any custom or usage required or enforced by officials of the State or political subdivision thereof; or (3) is required by action of the State or political subdivision thereof." 42 U.S.C. § 2000a(d)

"A public entity shall not rely on an adult accompanying an individual with a disability to interpret or facilitate communication..." 28 C.F.R. § 35.160(c)(2)

"Although [plaintiffs] were ultimately able to cast their vote with the fortuitous assistance of others, the purpose of the Rehabilitation Act is 'to empower individuals with disabilities to maximize employment, economic self-sufficiency, independence, and inclusion and integration into society'.... The right to vote should not be contingent on the happenstance that others are available to help." *Nat'l Fed'n of the Blind v. Lamone*, 813 F.3d 494, 506-7 (4th Cir. 2016)

The world will know your names; [the perpetuity of the Internet \[tylerpresident.com\]](https://tylerpresident.com).

"Except as provided in paragraph (b) of this section, this part **applies to all services, programs, and activities provided or made available by public entities**." 28 C.F.R. § 35.102(a)



"Under Title II of the ADA, **no qualified individual with a disability shall, on the basis of disability, be excluded from participation in or be denied the benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity, or be subjected to discrimination by any such entity.** 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(a). This means that the County must give individuals with disabilities an equal opportunity to participate in and benefit from any service provided to others. 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(1). These legal requirements include providing equal access to the County's website and the public content posted there." (*letter\_of\_findings-upton\_county\_tx\_election\_website\_accessibility\_1.pdf*)

"The ADA is meant to ensure that people with disabilities can fully participate in all aspects of civic life. Under Title II, all state/local governments must follow the ADA regardless of their size." via <https://www.ada.gov/topics/title-ii/> [ada.gov] (An official Department of Justice .gov website)

"The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal civil rights law that provides protections to people with disabilities to **ensure that they are treated equally in all aspects of life. Title II of the ADA requires state and local governments ("public entities") to ensure that people with disabilities have a full and equal opportunity to vote. The ADA's provisions apply to all aspects of voting.**" <https://www.ada.gov/resources/polling-places-checklist/> [ada.gov]

Again for any Dunning–Kruger effect imbeciles and/or ignoramuses alike,

**"...all aspects of voting."**

"The primary purpose of the ADA Amendments Act is to **make it easier** for people with **disabilities** to obtain **protection** under the ADA. Consistent with the ADA Amendments Act's purpose of reinstating a broad scope of protection under the ADA, the definition of "disability" in this part shall be **construed broadly in favor of expansive coverage to the maximum extent permitted by the terms of the ADA.** The primary object of attention in cases brought under the ADA should be **whether entities covered under the ADA** have complied with **their obligations and whether discrimination has occurred**, not whether the individual meets the definition of "disability." The question of whether an individual meets the definition of "disability" under this part should not demand extensive analysis. " 28 C.F.R. § 35.101(b)

The state does not even have the authority to require criteria for federal level jobs; the entire notion is probably the most absurdly preposterous, delusional lunacy ideas I have heard in my entire life. If states lack the power to impose criteria for the House(1) and the Senate(2), why would states have the power to impose criteria for the highest job of the land? In accordance with the supreme law of the land, specifically the "[Supremacy Clause \[en.wikipedia.org\]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supremacy_Clause)" (Article 6, clause 2 of the US Constitution), the state would have to be above the US Constitution to supersede the Constitutional requirements as established by Article II, section 1, clause 5 of the US Constitution. Which would also contradict the Founding fathers original intention. Absent a US Constitutional amendment establishing otherwise, the power for states to require criteria has never been allocated to the states. This is the literal letter of the law; which has never even been disproven or even refuted by the state.

"...until the late 1800's, all ballots cast in this country were write-in ballots. The system of state-prepared ballots, also known as the Australian ballot system, was introduced in this country in 1888. See L.E. Fredman, *The Australian Ballot: The Story of an American Reform* ix (1968). Prior to this, voters prepared their own ballots or used preprinted tickets offered by political parties. Since there were no state-imposed restrictions on whose name could appear on a ballot, individuals could always vote for the candidates of their choice." *Burdick v. Takushi*, 504 U.S. 428, 446 (1992) [casetext.com]

1/27/25, 9:32 PM

Gmail - State of Rhode Island questionnaire and statement

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]