

Date: July 10, 2024

To: RNC Credentials Committee

From: Contested Delegates and Alternates of Missouri

After a close analysis of the affidavits submitted by the contestants and a close analysis of the video evidence from the respondents. The respondents offer the following summary of evidence failures.

#### I. False Evidence

1. The contestants provided 24 affidavits that substantially contained false information, blatant lies, speculation and hearsay. All of these should be deemed inadmissible!
  1. When the contestants originally submitted their contest and affidavits, they did not know that one of the delegates had filmed the vast majority of the state convention. The delegate filmed over 3 hours of the events relevant to this contest. That's a HUGE problem for the contestants because that video (which you can watch) actually proves the contestants wrong! Here are some specifics. The video is linked in our appeal and at the end of this document.
  2. Many of the affidavits by the contestants actually support the respondents claims that the credentialing process of the state convention included an intentional process to address minor credentialing issues AND eight affidavits agree that their credentialing experience was ultimately resolved. This was a lengthy, but normal credentialing process and it functioned as intended at the state convention.
    1. Lee Greenberg – Badge issue RESOLVED thru customary process.
    2. Anthony Artman – A process was in place to resolve minor issues.
    3. Rene Artman – People stood in line to get issues resolved and were able to obtain credentials after verification.
  3. Three of the affidavits by the contestants only contained speculation and they blatantly offer no proof.
    1. Edward Engler – Accusations were mere speculation “Somehow the crowd thought...” “Unknown period of time..” “Seemed to be...”
    2. Christine Hessel – Accusations of motives were only speculation.
    3. Kay Hoflander – Stated “It appeared, and I cannot prove that...” and “It didn't make sense and smelled “fishy.”
  4. Many of the affidavits contained hearsay rather than first hand experiences.
    1. Elizabeth Grutnick – Affidavit was mostly hearsay.
    2. Gary Grutnick – Affidavit was mostly hearsay.
  5. Several affidavits contain provably false information. These statements are proven to be false by the video evidence submitted by the respondents.
    1. Christine Hessel – Stated there was not a 2/3 majority but in fact several of the recorded votes do indicate a 2/3 majority of the voting delegates.
    2. Kay Hofflander – Stated that the winning slate names were never read aloud. Clearly a false statement because the video proves they were actually read twice.
  6. A majority of the affidavits present no proof whatsoever, only opinions and non-factual statements.
    1. June Schmidt – No personal witness to ANYTHING
    2. Kenneth Venezia – No personal witness to ANYTHING
    3. Jack Howard – No personal witness to ANYTHING

4. Ralph Schmidt – No personal witness to ANYTHING
  5. Thomas Wilsdon – No personal witness to ANYTHING
  6. Daniel Hyatt – No personal witness to ANYTHING
  7. Matthew Chellis – No personal witness to ANYTHING
  8. Theresa Douglas – No personal witness to ANYTHING
  9. James Rowe – No personal witness to ANYTHING
  10. Andrew Barnhart – No personal witness to ANYTHING
  11. Penne Henke – No witness statement to ANYTHING
2. Due to the overwhelming inadmissible or false evidence presented by the contestants, these affidavits should not be relied upon as reliable evidence and therefore removed from consideration.
  3. After the removal of these affidavits, there is no remaining evidence to support the contestants case and as the burden of proof lies with the contestants, their contest should be denied and the respondents appeal should be approved.

## II. Absence of Evidence

1. The contestants have the burden of proof. They speculate but they lack the required evidence on the following key points:
  1. NO ONE submitted an affidavit stating that any of the credentialing remained unresolved at the time of the credentialing vote. The evidence actually shows that the credentialing was resolved through a lengthy standard process and the credentials were unanimously approved by the entire state convention.
  2. NO ONE submitted an affidavit stating that they were an excluded state delegate.
  3. NO ONE submitted an affidavit stating that they were aware of a delegate that lacked credentials.
2. If these alleged credentialing irregularities had actually occurred, then the contestants were ALL present and could have raised objections or voted against the credentials report. However, the TRUTH is that the credentials report was UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED! Watch the video as proof!

## III. Preponderance of Evidence is the Decision Criteria

1. The contest procedures clearly outline that the burden of proof lies with the contestants. In this case the contestants clearly have a LACK of evidence.
2. However, the respondents in this case (the grassroots) have over 350 notarized affidavits, a 3 hour video, the official minutes and other supporting documents.
3. Clearly, the respondents have the preponderance of evidence in this case.

Google Drive Link Containing Video of Missouri Republican State Convention:  
<https://bit.ly/3xUKa3H>