

From: Christi Grab [REDACTED]
Subject: Excerpt from the Complaint I filed with multiple state and federal regulators
Date: October 19, 2023 at 5:26 PM
To: [REDACTED]

CG

On July 17, 2023, I made a request for copies of Oaths of Office for State Senator President *Pro Tempore* Toni Atkins and one of her staff, Jason Weisz. Per 5 US Code 3331 and California Gov Code section 1360, all elected officers and appointees are required to take an Oath of Office. Per Government Code sections 1360, 1362-1369 and Section 3 of Article XX of the Constitution of California, all employees of the State of California are required to take an Oath of Office or Oath of Allegiance prior to beginning employment with a government agency.

I made this request via the "Contact Us" form on Senator Atkins website. On July 18, 2023, the Senate Rules Committee sent a confirmation that they had received the request, which had been forwarded from Senator Atkins office (exhibit 1).

Over the last few years, I have made over 80 oath requests from seven different California State agencies. Up until now, I have gotten responsive documents in two weeks or less (with the exception of one request which was apparently lost in the USPS mail). On August 5, 2023, I sent a follow up request asking when I should expect the documents since they had already exceeded the normal two-week response time (exhibit 2). The Senate Operations responded on August 8, 2023, that the request was being processed and gave no time frame to expect to receive the documents (exhibit 2).

On August 18, 2023, Erika Contreras violated my rights under the Legislative Open Records Act, Gov code 9070 *et seq.*, by responding with improperly redacted documents (exhibit 3). In doing so, Ms. Contreras has 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.

The documents provided hid the signatures of the person swearing the oath and the witness. The way to tell if an oath is properly executed is to see if it is properly signed by the person swearing that oath, properly signed by the person witnessing the oath being administered, and that the document is properly dated. 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.

By hiding the signatures, it is impossible to determine whether the oaths were properly executed. As stated above, I have now received over 80 oaths in response to public records requests; this is the first time I have received a redacted oath.

On August 31, 2021, I sent an email demanding unredacted documents. I gave a deadline to respond of 09:00 am on Tuesday, September 5, 2023 (exhibit 4). On September 5, 2023, at 10:36 am, I called Ms. Contreras to ask if she intended to send over unredacted documents. I left a message for her.

At 10:40 am, John Nam returned my call on Ms. Contreras's behalf. Mr. Nam stated that the LORA request had already been fulfilled. I stated at least a half-dozen times that the documents had been unlawfully redacted and asked him 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 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

Exhibit 21 - 2 of 11

deny the allegations that the documents were unlawfully redacted, he has tacitly admitted that he was aware that Ms. Contreras had violated the law. This makes him a co-conspirator in violating my rights under the Legislative Open Records Act, Gov code 9070 *et seq.* and 18 US Code 242.

On September 5, 2023, at 1:01 pm, I sent Ms. Contreras and Mr. Nam an email letting them know the charges I was Accusing them of and asking them to provide a legal statute to justify the lack of disclosure. As of this writing, neither have responded (exhibit 5). If either of them respind, I will send a supplement to this Claim.

Despite the redactions, it appears both oaths have already expired, which means that both Toni Atkins and Jason Weisz are both working unlawfully without a current, fully executed oath (exhibit 3). 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, which includes fines and/or imprisonment.

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. At the top, it says the oath 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 is dated December 5, 2016. It 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 he never signed an oath when the new session started in 2021 and is currently working unlawfully without an oath.