



Mathew Tyler

Response to Your Request

LegalSupport <legalsupport@sos.ca.gov>

Fri, Jul 26, 2024 at 10:42 AM

To: [REDACTED]

Mr. Tyler,

We are in receipt of your January and July 2024 requests for reasonable accommodations and/or modifications for ballot access as an independent presidential candidate and to the signature requirements related to having a measure placed on the ballot, among other things. Both of your requests were forwarded to our Elections Division and legal staff for review.

The Secretary of State's office has no legal authority to unilaterally waive or otherwise set aside signature requirements related to the independent presidential candidacy process or for the ballot measure process.

You may be interested in the write-in candidacy process for presidential candidates. The write-in candidacy process does not require nominations signatures: <https://elections.cdn.sos.ca.gov/statewide-elections/2024-general/president-elector-write-in.pdf>.

Legal Affairs Office

California Secretary of State

T: 916-695-1242

E: legalsupport@sos.ca.gov



SHIRLEY N. WEBER, Ph.D.
CALIFORNIA SECRETARY OF STATE

WWW.SOS.CA.GOV



Confidentiality Notice: This email message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.



Mathew Tyler [REDACTED]

Response to Your Request

Mathew Tyler [REDACTED]

Fri, Jul 26, 2024 at 10:20 PM

To: LegalSupport <legalsupport@sos.ca.gov>

Cc: contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov, accommodations@calcivilrights.ca.gov

Dr. Weber,

I am not interested in being a "write-in," I am interested in being allowed to participate in an election that my taxes help fund.

In addition to the my requests which California Secretary of State is in receipt of, under what authority are these signature requirements even permitted? U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1 does not include setting criteria; times, places, and manner, not qualifications or criteria.

Doctor's note attached.

29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(j)(iii), "The **primary object** of attention in cases brought under the ADA should be **whether covered entities** have **complied with their obligations** and whether discrimination has occurred, **not** whether an individual's impairment substantially limits a major life activity. Accordingly, the threshold issue of whether an impairment "substantially limits" a major life activity should not demand extensive analysis." (emphasis added)

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 certains 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 are being denied, 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. "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](#).

Prohibition of discrimination when federal financial assistance is involved--

Prohibition of discrimination in any program or activity by recipients or applicants of Federal financial assistance pursuant to basically all federal policy; i.e., 42 U.S.C. § 12132; 42 U.S.C. § 12133; 42 U.S. Code § 2000a(a), (d); 42 U.S. Code § 2000a-1; 42 U.S. Code § 2000a-2(a); 42 U.S. Code § 2000d; 28 CFR § 42.503, 28 C.F.R. § 42.108

Cal. Gov't Code § 11136-11139 prohibits State of California monies being used for disability discrimination.

Disability discrimination, "Subject to the provisions of this subchapter, no qualified individual with a disability shall, by reason of such 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

"It shall be discriminatory to subject an individual or class of individuals on the basis of a disability or disabilities of such individual or class, directly, or through contractual, licensing, or other arrangements, to a denial of the opportunity of the individual or class to participate in or benefit from the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity." 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(i)

"the imposition or application of eligibility criteria that screen out or tend to screen out an individual with a **disability** or any class of individuals with disabilities from fully and equally enjoying any goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations, unless such criteria can be shown to be necessary for the provision of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations being offered;" 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(i)

"a failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations;" 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii)

"a failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a **disability** is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of **auxiliary aids and services**, unless the entity can demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden;" 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii)

Article VI, clause 2 of the US Constitution (the "Supremacy Clause") establishes that the US Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Followed by federal laws. Followed then by state laws. e.g. and i.e., although some states have legalized/decriminalized marijuana, marijuana is still federally illegal in those states and as such the federal government can choose to enforce the law in those states. A state can't pass a law that would exempt its residents from IRS/federal taxes because the state lacks the authority to supersede federal law. If a person, like a bureaucrat and their family are put on the federal do not fly list, the state can do nothing about that. In accordance with the US Constitution, in case of conflict, federal law supersedes state law thus the SOS would not be violating state law as state law is precluded.

"...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)

"A public entity shall administer services, programs, and activities in the most integrated setting appropriate to the needs of qualified individuals with disabilities.," 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(d)

"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-upon_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)

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,

Herschaft v. New York Bd. of Elections, No. 00 CV 2748 (CBA), 2001 WL 940923, at *6 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 13, 2001), aff'd sub nom. *Herschaft v. NY Bd. of Elections*, 37 F. App'x 17 (2d Cir. 2002) is not applicable. Not only does it not deal with an ADA request for reasonable accommodations, it predates the "ADA Amendments Act of 2008" which Congress enacted to restore and strengthen the ADA from court decisions weakening it; i.e., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ADA_Amendments_Act_of_2008#Reasons_for_enactment

Preemption / preclusion of conflicting state laws--

Preemption of inconsistent state law when necessary to effectuate a required "reasonable modification" is established by the "Supremacy Clause" (Article 6, clause 2 of the US Constitution) and is affirmed by, *Mary Jo C. v. New York State and Local Retirement Sys.*, No. 11-2215, 35 at 6 - 36 at 2, 37 at 7 - 39 at 9 (2d Cir. 2013).

' The "natural effect" of Title II's "reasonable modification" requirement, *Crosby*, 530 U.S. at 373, in light of the foregoing observations, requires preemption of inconsistent state law when necessary to effectuate a required "reasonable modification." Congress clearly meant Title II to sweep broadly. If all state laws were insulated from Title II's reasonable modification requirement solely because they were state laws, "state law [would serve as] an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress" in enacting Title II. *Marsh*, 499 F.3d at 177. Far from "provid[ing] a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities," 42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1), the ADA would be powerless to work any reasonable modification in any

requirement imposed by state law, no matter how trivial the requirement and no matter how minimal the costs of doing so. We conclude that the ADA's reasonable modification requirement contemplates modification to state laws, thereby permitting preemption of inconsistent state laws, when necessary to effectuate Title II's reasonable modification provision.^[8] (*Mary Jo C. v. New York State and Local Retirement Sys., No. 11-2215 [2d Cir. 2013]*)

'...the ADA preempts inconsistent state law when appropriate and necessary to effectuate a reasonable accommodation under Title II is also consistent with decisions from our sister Circuits. See, e.g., *Barber v. Colorado Dep't of Revenue*, 562 F.3d 1222, 1232-33 (10th Cir. 2009) (ultimately concluding that there was no conflict between state law and the ADA in the case before it, but observing that the court "in no way affirm[ed] the district court's conclusion that '[a]n accommodation that would have required defendants to willfully ignore or violate the law is per se not reasonable.'" (citation omitted)); *Quinones v. City of Evanston, Ill.*, 58 F.3d 275, 277 (7th Cir. 1995) ("[The defendant] believes that it is 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." (emphasis in original)); *Williams v. Gen. Foods Corp.*, 492 F.2d 399, 404 (7th Cir. 1974) (similar). As the Ninth Circuit explained:

The court's obligation under the ADA . . . is to ensure that the decision reached by the state authority is appropriate under the law and in light of proposed alternatives. Otherwise, any state could adopt requirements imposing unreasonable obstacles to the disabled, and when haled into court could evade the antidiscrimination mandate of the ADA merely by explaining that the state authority considered possible modifications and rejected them...

The NYSLRS argues that "Title II . . . requires reasonable modification only of 'rules, policies, or practices' — not state statutes," NYSLRS Br. 19, and seeks to distinguish *Crowder*, which contemplated the modification of a mandatory Hawaii State administrative regulation rather than a state statute, see *Crowder*, 81 F.3d at 1481-85, on this ground, NYSLRS Br. 21 n.6. But as a general rule, duly promulgated state regulations have the force of law for these purposes as do statutes. See, e.g., *State v. Kotis*, 91 Hawai'i 319, 331, 984 P.2d 78, 90 (1999) (Under Hawaii law, "[a]dministrative rules, like statutes, have the force and effect of law."); *Allstate Ins. Co. v. Rivera*, 12 N.Y.3d 602, 608, 911 N.E.2d 817, 820, 883 N.Y.S.2d 755, 758 (2009) (under New York law, "[a] duly promulgated regulation . . . has the force of law." (internal quotation marks omitted)). From the standpoint of the ADA's preemptive force, we can discern no reason to distinguish between the preemption of state statutes and state regulations. Cf. *Crosby*, 530 U.S. at 372 n.6 (noting that "a variety of state laws and regulations may conflict with a federal statute" and be preempted). And for the reasons discussed above, we do not read the ADA to prohibit reasonable modifications to state statutes when appropriate.' (*Mary Jo C. v. New York State and Local Retirement Sys., No. 11-2215 [2d Cir. 2013]*)

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*)

"...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*)

Constitutionally--

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 devoid of reality I have heard in my entire life.

U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1 does not include setting criteria; times, places, and manner, not qualifications or criteria.

If states lack the power to impose criteria for the House and the Senate⁽³⁾⁽⁴⁾⁽⁵⁾, 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)

A state's presidential eligibility requirements (e.g., requiring candidates to get X amount of signatures of eligible voters from that state, PER state) are plainly unconstitutional, an illegal and illegitimate government overreach. Violating the tenth amendment to the US Constitution, by the state attempting to defraud or thievingly conniving "the people" of the right to establish qualifications for the Presidency as explicitly conferred to the US Constitution pursuant to Article II, section 1, clause 5 of the US Constitution, as an original intention of forethought by our founding fathers, not an afterthought implemented by Congress amending the US Constitution. Violating my due process and equal protection rights. In accordance with the "Supremacy Clause" (Article 6, clause 2 of the US Constitution), the US Constitution is the supreme law of the land, superseding/preempting conflicting state laws, in this case inferior subordinate state laws conflict with all Presidency eligibility requirements as vested in the supreme law of the land; i.e., it is established, "Qualifications for the Presidency," not "Qualifications for the Presidency and inferior subordinate state requirements" Promulgated by *Trump v. Anderson*, No. 23-719, 601 U.S. (2024), "It would be incongruous to read this particular Amendment as granting the States the power — silently no less — to disqualify a candidate for federal office," establishes: (1) States lack the power to disqualify a candidate for federal office and, (2) that not including a candidate on the ballot, even for a primary would be disqualifying the candidate. Constituting violations of: 18 U.S.C. § 595, 18 U.S.C. § 241, 18 U.S.C. § 242, and of Article 1, section 1 to the US Constitution; "All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

In accordance with Article II, section 1, clause 5 of the US Constitution, as a legitimate 2024-2084 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 or "renditioned" to the latest unknown/unnamed gitmo? ●

-Mathew Tyler, US Presidential candidate (I), 2016-2084. ●

(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

(2b) California law wise, Cal. Gov't Code § 11135

(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]



scanned-0139.png

7552K

Feather River Health Center
5125 Skyway
Paradise, CA 95969
Phone: 530.872.2000

PHYSICIAN'S EXCUSE


9/26/2013

To Butte County Superior Court:

This is to certify that Mathew L Tyler is under my professional care. In order to avoid any aggravation or injury to his condition, I recommend that he be excused from Jury service indefinitely. He has a congenital condition which renders the patient with muscle weakness (congenital myopathy) and he is permanently disabled since childhood. His condition will not improve and he requires frequent reclining, making sitting / standing difficult if needed for longer periods of time.

If you have any question, please feel free to contact me at the above referenced number.

Sincerely,


Steve Gawthrop, PA
Steve Gawthrop, PA
Feather River Health Center

9/26/13

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the USA that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and abilities. (28 U.S.C. § 1746)

Mathew Tyler
222 Lawrence St # 3171
Quincy, CA 95971

January 28, 2024

Re: ADA Request for reasonable accommodations
US Presidential candidate FEC# P60005600

Secretary of State
1500 11th St., Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

Attention: Secretary of State

Dear Secretary of State

ADA Request for reasonable accommodations

Independent presidential candidate, Petition for ballot inclusion

1. AUTHORITY

- a) Pursuant to Article 6, Clause 2 to the US Constitution (herein the “SUPREMACY CLAUSE”), in accordance with the 1st amendment to the US Constitution to petition the Government for a redress of grievances via the 14th amendment to the US Constitution as/if/ when necessary; 18 U.S.C. § 3771, 42 U.S.C. § 12202, California: CON Article 1 § 3(a), California: CON Article 1 et seq., California: CIV § 51, “*Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973*,” 29 U.S.C. § 794 (herein “Section 504”), and the “*Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*,” 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. (herein “ADA”); collectively herein “AUTHORITY.”

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the USA that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and abilities. (28 U.S.C. §1746)

2. ADA REQUEST FOR REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS

- a) Pursuant to the aforementioned AUTHORITY, as a disabled US citizen, Mathew L. Tyler (herein “Mr. Tyler” and “REQUESTOR”) hereby requests the following reasonable accommodations in: policies, practices, and procedures;
 - (1) that an exception be made for any and all physical requirements for ballot access in the 2024 general election as an independent presidential candidate. Physical requirements including without limitation to: collecting, providing, and submitting signatures, and any other requirements imposed by the State (“REQUESTEE”) for ballot access in the 2024 general election.
 - (2) Or pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq. that the State show cause how honoring Mr. Tyler’s Section 504 and/or ADA request for reasonable accommodations “*...would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations.*”
 - i. 18 U.S.C. § 241; 18 U.S.C. § 242

3. FEES

- a) In accordance with the SUPREMACY CLAUSE, pursuant to the Equal protection clause of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, I hereby request a waiver to any and all fees that political party nominated candidates do not have to pay.

4. QUALIFICATIONS FOR OFFICE

- a) I affirm that I am:
 - (1) at least 35 years old; and,
 - (2) a natural-born U.S. citizen; and,
 - (3) a U.S. resident for at least 14 years; and,
 - (4) in compliance with the U.S. Constitution; and,
 - (5) eligible with Section 3 of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution

5. CANDIDATE INFORMATION

- a) Full legal name: Mathew Lee Tyler
- b) Name as it will appear on the write-in list: Mathew Tyler
- c) Mailing Address:

222 Lawrence St # 3171
Quincy, CA 95971

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the USA that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and abilities. (28 U.S.C. §1746)

- d) Telephone: +1-262-757-8802
- e) Email: hi@tylerpresident.com
- f) Website: <https://www.TylerPresident.com>

6. RUNNING-MATE

- a)
U.S. Congresswoman Lauren Boebert
1713 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the USA that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and abilities. (28 U.S.C. §1746)

APPLICANT'S AFFIRMATION

I hereby intend to run for the office stated above and solemnly affirm that I meet all qualifications for the office prescribed by law. I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the U.S. that the aforementioned is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and abilities. (28 U.S.C. §1746).



Mathew Tyler

Signature of Candidate

02/07/2024

Executed on (date)



Mathew Tyler, US Presidential candidate (I)
M.L.T.

TylerPresident.com, “Strength and honor”

“The world will not be destroyed by those who do evil but by those who watch them without doing anything.”
– Albert Einstein

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (28
U.S.C. §1746)

Mathew Tyler
222 Lawrence St # 3171
Quincy, CA 95971

July 10, 2024

Secretary of State
1500 11th St., Suite 400
Sacramento, CA 95814

—
Re: ADA Request for reasonable modifications
US Presidential candidate FEC# P60005600

Attention: **LEGAL**
ADA Coordinator

Dear ADA Coordinator,

ADA Title I and Title II / Section 504 Accessibility/Request for Modifications

Unaffiliated independent presidential candidate, Petition for ballot inclusion

1. AUTHORITY

- a) Pursuant to Article 6, Clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution (herein the “SUPREMACY CLAUSE”), in accordance with the 1st amendment to the U.S. Constitution to petition the Government for a redress of grievances via the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution as/if/when necessary; 18 U.S.C. § 3771, 42 U.S.C. § 12202, “*Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973*,” 29 U.S.C. § 794 (herein “Section 504”), the “*Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990*,” 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. (herein “ADA”); California CON Article 1 § 3(a), California CIV § 51, and the 1990 Copenhagen Commitment sections 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 6, 7.1, 7.3, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8; collectively herein “AUTHORITY.”

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (28 U.S.C. §1746)

- b) Preemption of inconsistent state law when necessary to effectuate a required "reasonable modification" is affirmed by, *Mary Jo C. v. New York State and Local Retirement Sys.*, No. 11-2215, 35 at 6 - 36 at 2, 37 at 7 - 39 at 9 (2d Cir. 2013)
 - (1) 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-7

2. REQUEST FOR REASONABLE MODIFICATIONS

- a) Pursuant to the aforementioned AUTHORITY, as a U.S. citizen and qualified individual with a disability¹ (42 U.S.C. § 12131[2]), Mathew L. Tyler (herein "Mr. Tyler" and "REQUESTOR") hereby requests the following reasonable modifications in: policies, practices, and procedures;
 - (1) that an exception be made for any and all physical requirements for ballot access as an unaffiliated (independent) presidential candidate in the 2024 general election. Physical requirements including without limitation to: collecting, providing, and submitting signatures²³⁴⁵⁶, and any other requirements⁷⁸ imposed by the State (herein "REQUESTEE") for ballot access as an unaffiliated (independent) presidential candidate in the 2024 general election; and,
 - (2) that an exception be made for any and all time related requirements for ballot access as an unaffiliated (independent) presidential candidate in the 2024 general election; and,
 - (3) that an exception be made for any and all physical requirements for having a measure added to the ballot. Physical requirements including without limitation to: collecting, providing, and submitting signatures, and any other requirements imposed by REQUESTEE; and,
 - i. Ballot measure is the preclusion / removal / elimination / repeal of the collection and submission of signatures required for candidates and ballot measures alike.
 - ii. Please let me know if there are any other requirements aside from the now precluded signature requirement to have a ballot measure appear on the ballot.
 - (4) that the State provide written confirmation under penalty of perjury that Mr. Tyler's ADA request will be honored and that Mr. Tyler will appear on the 2024 general election ballot as an unaffiliated (independent) presidential candidate.

1 Afflicted with Central core disease and ADHD; major life activities affected by Central core disease: performing manual tasks, walking, standing, lifting, bending, breathing, and stamina; ADHD: learning, reading, concentrating, thinking, communicating, time/appointments, and working

2 52 U.S.C. § 10501(b)(4)

3 52 U.S.C. § 10502(a), (b)

4 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(B)

5 42 U.S.C. § 12112(b)(6)

6 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(D)

7 [Arbitrary and capricious] candidate requirements are not in line with founding, quintessential principles of America, historical traditions, or the rights enshrined by the U.S. Constitution; "[t]he very enumeration of the right takes out of the hands of government—even the Third Branch of Government—the power to decide on a case-by-case basis whether the right is really worth insisting upon." *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association, Inc. v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1

8 "It would be incongruous to read this particular Amendment as granting the States the power — silently no less — to disqualify a candidate for federal office," *Trump v. Anderson*, No. 23-719, 601 U.S. (2024)

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (28 U.S.C. §1746)

3. NOTICE

- a) The state is required to operate in the most integrated setting for the individual; 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; and,
- b) The state cannot impose eligibility criteria that screens out or tends to screen out an individual with a disability; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(3), (6), (8); 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A) (i), (2)(A)(iii); and,
- c) The state is required to make reasonable modifications; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130(b)(1)(i)-(iii), (iv)-(vii), (2), (7); 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii); and,
 - (1) The lawful way for a head of department with budget decisions to deny an ADA request are stipulated in 28 C.F.R. § 35.164; and,
 - i. The state must "...**demonstrate**..." **not purport**. And, "...must be made by the head of the public entity or his or her designee after considering all resources available for use in the funding and operation of the service, program, or activity and must be accompanied by a written statement of the reasons for reaching that conclusion. If an action required to comply with this subpart would result in such an alteration or such burdens, a public entity shall take any other action that would not result in such an alteration or such burdens but would nevertheless ensure that, to the maximum extent possible, individuals with disabilities receive the benefits or services provided by the public entity."
 - ii. It is important to note that even if the state is able to demonstrate that honoring my request would cause an undue burden or fundamentally alter anything, the state is still required to provide inclusive access (28 CFR § 35.130(d), (g)) to the services to me, a qualified individual with a disability (42 U.S.C. § 12131[2]) which will be on the state to determine eligibility requirements that do not discriminate against me. The state is required to provide reasonable accommodations (28 C.F.R. § 35.130[d]; 28 C.F.R. § 35.149; 28 C.F.R. § 35.160[b], [c]; 28 C.F.R. § 35.130[b][1]-[3], [6]-[8]; 42 U.S.C. § 12182[b][1][A][i]-[iii], [B]-[E]; 42 U.S.C. § 12182[b][2][A][i]-[iii]) unless the state can demonstrate and providing reasonable accommodations would cause undue hardship to the state or that honoring them would fundamentally alter the nature of the services (42 U.S.C. § 12182[b][2][A][ii], [iii]).
 - iii. "undue hardship" means an action requiring significant difficulty or expense, when considered in light of the factors set forth in subparagraph (B)." 42 U.S.C. § 12111(10)(A)
 - d) If the State does not honor my request for reasonable accommodations and the State does not satisfy the aforementioned demonstration requirement, how honoring my request would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (28 U.S.C. § 1746)

accommodations, you and the State⁹¹⁰¹¹ will be discriminating against me for my disability¹²¹³ in my participation and enjoyment of **federally protected activities (18 U.S.C. § 245)** which will also **violate my civil rights (18 U.S.C. § 241 and 18 U.S.C. § 242)**¹⁴

- (1) 18 U.S.C. § 245(b)(1)(A) Interfering with my ability to qualify or campaign as a candidate for elective office in any primary, special, or general election; and,
- (2) 18 U.S.C. § 245(b)(1)(B) Interfering with my participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States; and,
- (3) 18 U.S.C. § 245(b)(1)(E) Interfering with my participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance

4. FEES (if applicable)

- a) In accordance with the SUPREMACY CLAUSE, pursuant to the Equal protection clause¹⁵ of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, I hereby request a waiver to any and all fees¹⁶ that political party nominated candidates do not have to pay. Pursuant to the 24th amendment¹⁷ to the U.S. Constitution, I request a waiver to any and all fees regardless of who has to pay them.

5. SEPARABILITY

- a) If any provision herein is judicially determined to be invalid, the remainder shall not be affected by such determination

6. ELIGIBILITY / CRITERIONS FOR OFFICE

- a) I affirm that I am:
 - (1) a registered voter in California; and,
 - (2) at least 35 years old; and,
 - (3) a natural-born U.S. citizen; and,
 - (4) a U.S. resident for at least 14 years; and,
 - (5) in compliance with the U.S. Constitution; and,
 - (6) eligible with Section 3 of the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution; and,
 - (7) indigent

9 42 U.S.C. § 1983

10 42 U.S.C. § 1986

11 42 U.S.C. § 1987

12 42 U.S.C. § 2000a(d)

13 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)

14 United States v. Price, 383 U.S. 787 (1966)

15 Williams v. Rhodes, 393 U.S. 23 (1968)

16 52 U.S.C. § 10306(b)

17 Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections, 383 U.S. 663 (1966)

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (28
U.S.C. §1746)

7. CANDIDATE INFORMATION

- a) Full legal name: Mathew Lee Tyler
- b) Name as it should appear on the ballot: Mathew Tyler
- c) Mailing Address:

222 Lawrence St # 3171
Quincy, CA 95971

- d) Telephone: +1-262-757-8802
- e) Email: hi@tylerpresident.com
- f) Website: <https://www.TylerPresident.com>

8. RUNNING-MATE

- a) U.S. Congresswoman Lauren Boebert
1713 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. (28 U.S.C. §1746)

APPLICANT'S AFFIRMATION

I hereby intend to run for the office stated above and solemnly affirm that I meet all qualifications for the office prescribed by law. I, MATHEW L. TYLER declare under penalty of perjury that the aforementioned is true and correct. (28 U.S.C. §1746).





Signature of Candidate

July 10, 2024
Executed on (date)



Mathew Tyler, US Presidential candidate (I)
M.L.T.

TylerPresident.com, "Strength and honor"

"The world will not be destroyed by those who do evil but by those who watch them without doing anything."
– Albert Einstein



Mathew Tyler

Response to Your Request

Mathew Tyler [REDACTED]

Wed, Jul 31, 2024 at 8:30 AM

To: Mathew Tyler [REDACTED]

Cc: LegalSupport <legalsupport@sos.ca.gov>, contact.center@calcivilrights.ca.gov, accommodations@calcivilrights.ca.gov

Dr. Weber,

As I hope you people are trying to include me rather than trying exclude me as required by federal and California anti-disability discriminations laws, I trust that you people have had sufficient time to confirm that I am correct:

1. that the State of California is acting unconstitutionally and as such unlawfully by attempting to impose eligibility criteria that conflicts with the US Constitution; and,
2. Even if the State of California has the ability to impose criteria, that my Section 504 / ADA Title I and Title II request for reasonable accommodations supersede the discriminatory criteria;
 1. required to operate in the most integrated setting for the individual; [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](#); and,
 2. California Government Code § 11136-11139; and,
 3. prohibited from eligibility criteria that screens out or tends to screen out an individual with a disability; [28 C.F.R. § 35.130\(b\)\(3\), \(6\), \(8\)](#); [42 U.S.C. § 12182\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)\(i\), \(2\)\(A\)\(iii\)](#); and,
 4. required to make reasonable modifications; [28 C.F.R. § 35.130\(b\)\(1\)\(i\)-\(iii\), \(iv\)-\(vii\), \(2\), \(7\)](#); [42 U.S.C. § 12182\(b\)\(2\)\(A\)\(ii\)](#); and,
 5. Interfering with my ability to qualify and campaign as a candidate for elective office in any primary, special, or general election; [18 U.S.C. § 245\(b\)\(1\)\(A\)](#); and,
 6. Interfering with my participating in or enjoying any benefit, service, privilege, program, facility, or activity provided or administered by the United States; [18 U.S.C. § 245\(b\)\(1\)\(B\)](#); and,
 7. Interfering with my participating in or enjoying the benefits of any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance; [18 U.S.C. § 245\(b\)\(1\)\(E\)](#); and,
 8. Violating at least one international law, the [1990 Copenhagen Commitment](#); specifically sections: [5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 6, 7.1, 7.3, 7.5, 7.6, 7.7, 7.8](#)
3. The State of California acting unconstitutionally and as such unlawfully, and/or being required by superseding federal law to make reasonable accommodations, there is no need for the California Secretary of State to "...unilaterally waive or otherwise set aside signature requirements..." as they are precluded pursuant to the US Constitution and superseding federal law, which is affirmed in the State of California with California's anti-discrimination laws such as the California Unruh Civil Rights Act.

I look forward to a timely confirmation that I will be included on the 2024 general election ballot.

-Mathew Tyler, US Presidential candidate (I), 2016-2084. ●

[Quoted text hidden]