

Christine Grab

September 5, 2023

Office of Inspector General/MAILSTOP 0305
Department of Homeland Security
245 Murray Lane SW
Washington, DC 20528-0305

Dear Regulators:

My understanding is that, per 5 U.S. Code § 3331, every elected or appointed government official must sign an Oath of Office. Per California Government Code sections 1360, 1362-1369 and Section 3 of Article XX of the Constitution of California, all State of California employees are required to sign an Oath of Office (if elected or appointed) or an Oath of Allegiance (everyone else) before beginning the duties of their employment. My understanding is that anyone who is working unlawfully without an executed Oath is considered to be a *foreign agent posing as a government agent* and subject to prosecution under Title 18 U.S.C. § 912.

Over the past two months, I have sent you seven letters notifying you of twelve State of California employees who do not have fully executed Oaths. The purpose of today's letter is to notify you of two people who have Oaths of Office that are of questionable validity. Both are in the California State Senate.

In the first letter, dated June 27, 2023, I explained that I am in the process of drafting a Federal Criminal Complaint (FCC) against several people who conspired together in order to cover up criminal activities being perpetrated by employees of the California Franchise Tax Board (FTB) against the peoples of California. I am working on procuring the Oaths for everyone who I intend to charge in the FCC so that I can add *Treason of Oath* to the charges.

Two of the people who have been active in the cover-up are State Senate President *Pro Tempore*, Toni Atkins (who is the elected representative for the district that I live in) and her Deputy District Manager, Jason Weisz.

The first and most obvious problem with the oaths is the fact that the oaths have been improperly redacted to hide the signatures of both the person swearing the oath and the witness. Without the signatures exposed, there is no way to know if the oaths were properly executed or not (exhibit 1).

On Thursday, August 31, 2023, I sent the Senate Committee an email stating that they had violated the Legislative Open Records Act, Gov code 9070 *et seq* disclosure law by sending

improperly redacted documents. In doing so, they also violated 18 US Code 242 by not allowing me full and free access of information in accordance with my rights, which is a Class A misdemeanor. I demanded unredacted copies to be sent within 48-business hours. I copied the Secretary of the Senate Operations Erika Contreras -- the person who sent the documents -- as well.

On September 5, 2023, I called and spoke with Deputy Secretary of the Senate Operations John Nam. In our conversation, I stated at least a half-dozen times that the documents had been unlawfully redacted and asked Mr. Nam at least a half-dozen times if he would send unredacted documents. Mr. Nam never denied the allegation that the documents were improperly redacted, he simply repeated over and over again that the LORA request had been already been fulfilled. Per CCP § 431.20(a), failure to deny constitutes admission: Any material allegation in the complaint that is not effectively denied is deemed admitted. [see *Hennefer v. Butcher* (1986) 182 CA3d 492, 504, 227 CR 318, 325]. By failing to deny the allegations that the documents were unlawfully redacted, he has tacitly admitted that he was aware that Ms. Contreras had violated the law.

I believe that Erika Contreras improperly redacted the documents to hide that they were not properly executed, and that Mr. Nam was conspiring in the cover-up.

There are more problems with Ms. Atkins and Mr. Weisz oaths beyond the redactions.

While Oaths of Allegiance do not have an expiration date, Oaths of Office do have an expiration date listed on them. For elected officials, the expiration date is usually listed as end of that person's elected term.

Toni Atkins is an elected official. Her first term ran from January 2017 through December 2020. She was re-elected in the November 2020 election. Her second term began in January 2021 and ends in December 2024. Ms. Atkins oath is dated December 7, 2020 and doesn't have an expiration date listed like it should. However, at the top, it says the oath only covers the 2021 – 2022 Regular Session. I believe that this means that the oath is currently expired because we are now in 2023.

Jason Weisz's oath has two more problems. Like Ms. Atkins, it appears that his oath has already expired. Jason Weisz's oath is dated December 5, 2016 and didn't have an expiration date on it as it should have. However, we know this oath expired in December 2020 when Ms. Atkins's term ended. It appears Mr. Weisz never signed an oath when the new session started in 2021 and is currently working unlawfully without an oath.

The second problem with Mr. Weisz's oath is that it is written in all capital letters. My understanding is that when the words UNITED STATES or CALIFORNIA are in all capital letters, that refers to a private corporation which is utilizing the same name as our country/state in order to masquerade as the legitimate government. This means that in 2016, Mr. Weisz swore allegiance to a private corporation, not to the constituents, and is therefore considered a foreign agent posing as a government agent in violation of Title 18 U.S.C § 912.

It has been seven years since I first notified Senator Atkins office of "strange" activity that appeared to be unlawful – that my estimated tax payments had vanished from FTB's books, FTB was unable to locate the money no matter how many times I sent cancelled checks, and FTB was

demanding monies that would not be owed once the “lost” monies were “found.” Mr. Weisz was the person I spoke to about it back then.

It has been five years since I first met with Mr. Weisz in person and exposed that I had been a victim of *bona fide* embezzlement and racketeering schemes. In that meeting, Mr. Weisz said he thought it was great the FTB had found more revenue sources for the state and did not care that constituents were being exploited.

Over the last five years, I have been consistently sending Senator Atkins harder and harder proof that these were indeed *bona fide* criminal activities. I also sent Ms. Atkins office proof of additional schemes to overcharge interest that were exposed via the *Christine N. Grab v The California Franchise Tax Board* court case that was heard in San Diego Superior Court.

Every time I have asked Ms. Atkins office to do intervene to halt these crimes, Mr. Weisz has stated that Ms. Atkins was too busy working on other matters.

The court case has concluded now, and FTB never denied any of the allegations that I’d made of accounting fraud utilized to perpetrate criminal schemes. Per CCP § 431.20(a), failure to deny constitutes admission: Any material allegation in the complaint that is not effectively denied is deemed admitted. [see *Hennefer v. Butcher* (1986) 182 CA3d 492, 504, 227 CR 318, 325].

The documents confirming the allegations made against FTB can be procured from the San Diego Superior Court’s website at: <https://roa.sdcourt.ca.gov>. The case year is 2020 and the case number is 00005100. Items #39, #84 and #86 on the court website each contain detailed information, including FTB’s own records where I highlighted the accounting fraud, showed how FTB “cooked the books,” and documented when the employees committed perjury, improperly redacted documents to hide evidence, and posted my and my husband’s social security numbers online in order to retaliate for notifying TIGTA and the FBI of the accounting fraud that was exposed through the court case.

It appears that all of the schemes to overcharge taxpayers are still in place. It seems that no one in the other State of California agencies with the power of oversight are willing to hold FTB accountable, including Ms. Atkins and Mr. Weisz.

I request the immediate prosecution of Senator Toni Atkins and her deputy, Jason Weisz, for working unlawfully without executed oaths.

Regards,



Christine Grab

OATH

for the Office of State Senator

Thirty-Ninth Senate District

2021 - 22 Regular Session

I, Toni G. Atkins, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of California; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties upon which I am about to enter.

[Redacted Signature]

Toni G. Atkins

Subscribed and sworn to before me,

This 7th Day of December

A.D. 2020

[Redacted Notary Name]

The [Redacted] Martin J. [Redacted] Justice, [Redacted] of California



Exhibit B - 1 of 1

OATH

FOR THE OFFICE OF Senator Teri Atkins

I, Jason Weiss, DO SOLEMNLY SWEAR (OR AFFIRM) THAT I WILL SUPPORT AND DEFEND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AGAINST ALL ENEMIES, FOREIGN AND DOMESTIC; THAT I WILL BEAR TRUE FAITH AND ALLEGIANCE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA; THAT I TAKE THIS OBLIGATION FREELY, WITHOUT ANY MENTAL RESERVATION OR PURPOSE OF EVASION; AND THAT I WILL WELL AND FAITHFULLY DISCHARGE THE DUTIES UPON WHICH I AM ABOUT TO ENTER.

[REDACTED]
(EMPLOYEE)

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME,
THIS 5th DAY OF December
A.D. 2016
[REDACTED]
Deputy legislative Counsel

From: Christi Grab christi@gwsandiego.net
Subject: Fwd: LORA Request
Date: August 31, 2023 at 10:28 AM
To: [REDACTED]



Begin forwarded message:

From: Christi Grab <[REDACTED]>
Subject: LORA Request
Date: August 31, 2023 at 8:06:06 AM PDT
To: Senate Rules <Senate.Rules@sen.ca.gov>

Dear Senate Committee:

On July 18, 2023 I made a request for copies of Oaths of Office for State Senator Toni Atkins and one of her staff, Jason Weisz. After an unreasonably long wait, on August 14, 2023, Erika Contreras responded to my request with improperly redacted documents.

The documents that Ms. Contreras sent had all signatures were redacted. The way to tell if an oath is properly executed is to see if it is properly signed by the person swearing that oath and by the person witnessing the oath being administered.

By hiding the signatures, it is impossible to determine whether the oaths were properly executed. Since you failed to provide an intact copy, you have violated the disclosure law.

The reason that I asked for copies of the oath is because I am filing a Criminal Complaint against them, and *Treason of Oath* is one of the charges being filed against Ms. Atkins and Mr. Weisz. Since Ms. Atkins and Mr. Weisz have been committing the crimes conspiring to cover up criminal activities, my default assumption is that Ms. Atkins and Mr. Weisz have not properly sworn oaths to uphold the state and federal laws. Not signing an oath means they have *falsely posed as a government agent* and are subject to prison under Title 18 U.S.C. § 912.

It appears that you have redacted the documents to hide that the oaths were not properly executed. This makes you a co-conspirator in covering up criminal activities.

I demand unreacted copies within 48-business hours, or else I will add Erika Contreras to the Criminal Complaint as a co-conspirator.

Regards,

Christine Grab

Exhibit 2 - 1 of 1