
Civil Rights Email Submission

3 messages

USAWAW-Civil-Rights <USAWAW.Civil-Rights@usdoj.gov>

Mon, Apr 22, 2024 at 9:17 AM

To: "*****" <*****>

Morning,

We received your email on April 11, 2024. I want to follow up with you and see if we can chat this week.

What is a good time I can contact you? May you provide the best phone number to reach out to.

Thank you,

Civil Rights Program

U.S. Attorney's Office, WDWA

U.S. Department of Justice

[700 Stewart Street, Suite 5220](#)

[Seattle, WA 98101](#)

Tel: (206)-553-7970

Fax: (206)-553-0082

Civil Rights Info Line: (202)-514-3847

USAWAW.Civil-Rights@usdoj.gov



CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION: E-mails from the United States Attorney's Office normally contain confidential and privileged material and are for the sole use of the intended recipient. Use or distribution by an unintended recipient is prohibited and may be a violation of law. If you believe that you received this e-mail in error, please do not read this e-mail or any attached items. Please delete the e-mail and all attachments, including any copies thereof, and inform the sender that you have deleted the e-mail, all attachments, and any copies thereof. Thank you

Mathew Tyler <*****>

Mon, Apr 22, 2024 at 9:04 PM

To: USAWAW-Civil-Rights <USAWAW.Civil-Rights@usdoj.gov>

In an effort to avoid any confusion or ambiguity, and in order to accurately hold those who violate the law against me accountable when I publish everything (including what you're privy and not privy to) about

state and federal government disability discrimination all over the Internet; please communicate with me solely in writing and sign communications or specify who is communicating.

Are you writing on behalf of the US Attorney's Office? 42 U.S.C. § 1987. Are you writing about the Department of Justice's own disability discrimination? 28 C.F.R. § 35.171? 28 C.F.R. § 35.172? And violation of civil rights; i.e., due process and equal protection?

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.

In your opinion, do you think the federal government suspending or terminating or refusing to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance applies to the entire state or just the election(s) that the state is discriminating against me in? 42 U.S.C. § 12132 -> 42 U.S.C. § 12133 -> 29 U.S.C. § 794a(a)(2) -> 42 U.S.C. § 2000d -> 42 U.S.C. § 2000d-1 and 29 U.S.C. § 794

The 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, and 18 U.S.C. § 242

-
- "...we hold that a state amendment is unconstitutional when it has the likely effect of handicapping a class of candidates and has the sole purpose of creating additional qualifications indirectly." *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 836 (1995)
- "Representatives and Senators are as much officers of the entire union as is the President. States thus "have just as much right, and no more, to prescribe new qualifications for a representative, as they have for a president. . . . It is no original prerogative of state power to appoint a representative, a senator, or president for the union." *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 803 (1995)
- "...Constitution's treatment of Presidential elections actively contradicts the majority's position. While the individual States have no "reserved" power to set qualifications for the office of President, we have long understood that they do have the power (as far as the Federal Constitution is concerned) to set qualifications for their Presidential electors — the delegates that each State selects to represent it in the electoral college that actually chooses the Nation's chief executive. Even respondents do not dispute that the States may establish qualifications for their delegates to the electoral college, as long as those qualifications pass muster under other constitutional provisions (primarily the First and Fourteenth Amendments). See *Williams v. Rhodes*, 393 U.S. 23, 29 (1968); *McPherson v. Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1, 27-36 (1892). As the majority cannot argue that the Constitution affirmatively grants this power, the power must be one that is "reserved" to the States. It necessarily follows that the majority's understanding of the Tenth Amendment is incorrect, for the position of Presidential elector surely "'spring[s] out of the existence of the national government.'" See *ante*, at 802. *U.S. Term Limits, Inc. v. Thornton*, 514 U.S. 779, 861-62 (1995)

-Mathew Tyler

[Quoted text hidden]

1/27/25, 9:20 PM

Gmail - Civil Rights Email Submission

Tue, May 7, 2024 at 4:04 PM

Mathew Tyler <*****>

To: Mathew Tyler <*****>

Cc: USAWAW-Civil-Rights <USAWAW.Civil-Rights@usdoj.gov>

I thought someone from Washington's US Attorney's Office and/or Department of Justice Office wanted to chat with me? Did you people not want to commit the crime in writing or something? What did you want to chat about? Accommodate me by putting it in writing. Something the state of Washington has refused to do.

-Mathew Tyler

<https://www.FraudFires.com>

[Quoted text hidden]