



STATE OF CALIFORNIA
LEGAL DIVISION MS A-260
FRANCHISE TAX BOARD
PO BOX 1720
SACRAMENTO CA 95741-1720

September 22, 2023

VIA EMAIL ONLY

CHRISTINE GRAB
[REDACTED]

Re: California Public Records Act

Dear Ms. Grab:

This letter is in response to your email correspondence dated September 13, 2023 and September 18, 2023 (copies enclosed) and received by FTB's Disclosure Office regarding FTB's September 12, 2023 production of three redacted Oaths of Allegiance records.

The handwritten signatures of the individual subjects of the three requested Oaths of Allegiance records were redacted to protect the privacy of these individuals under the California Public Records Act (PRA), specifically, California Government Code sections 7927.700 and 7927.705, as well as under California Constitution, article I, section 1, and the Information Practices Act (California Civil Code section 1798, et seq.).

After further review of the applicable legal authority, FTB has determined it is authorized to redact signatures on certain records requested under the PRA, including the requested Oaths of Allegiance records. Accordingly, please find a revised production of the three Oaths of Allegiance records and destroy the prior ones provided to you.

Sincerely,

Ray Rouse
Deputy Chief Counsel of Settlement and Litigation

Enclosures

Tel [REDACTED]
Fax [REDACTED]
ftb.ca.gov

Reiser, Jarrod@FTB

From: Christi Grab [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2023 9:08 AM
To: FTB Disclosure Office@FTB; Smith, Lilly@FTB
Subject: Improper Redactions

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments or reply unless you recognize the sender's email and trust the content.

Hello Disclosure Department and Ms. Smith:

On Tuesday, September 12, 2023, Lilly Smith sent me three Oaths of Allegiance in response to a records request that I'd made. The signatures of the person swearing the oaths were redacted on all three documents.

All State of California employees are required to sign an Oath of Allegiance before beginning the duties of their employment. My understanding is that anyone who is working unlawfully without a properly 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, including prison.

As you're probably already aware of, I am currently drafting a Federal Criminal Complaint (FCC) against assorted FTB staff for running eight *bona fide* criminal schemes to overcharge taxpayers. I can prove via my own records that at least some of the unlawful schemes were in place as far back as 2005. This means that the executives in office now inherited these unlawful schemes from their predecessors. I am adding the predecessors to the list of Accused in the FCC.

Some of said predecessors are the people whose oaths were redacted. There is no way for me to know if the oath was taken if the signature (or lack thereof) of the person swearing the oath is hidden. FTB has not previously redacted signatures on oaths that have been provided in response to records requests. Given that these three people were actively perpetrating *bona fide* criminal schemes, and given FTB's proven track record of improperly redacting documents to hide evidence, my assumption is that Ms. Smith is trying to hide that the oaths were not sworn by these three people and that all three of them were working unlawfully during their tenure with FTB.

Why are these particular signatures redacted?

Ms Smith, I hope you have a really good reason beyond “My boss told me to.” If you don’t, please know that “My boss told me to” does not hold up in court. Jozel Brunett, the person who most likely ordered the redactions, has been working unlawfully for many years without a fully executed oath. Ms. Brunett had not properly sworn to uphold state and federal laws, and she has a proven track record of ordering her subordinates to violate state and federal laws — and the employees are the ones held liable, not her.

You may consider talking to an attorney not affiliated with FTB (FTB is only looking out for what’s best for FTB, not what is best for you) to discuss what potential consequences could be faced if you are pinned as the patsy for covering up evidence. So that the attorney you consult is fully aware of the magnitude of the criminal activities that you are covering up, you should probably download and bring the document titled “*Plaintiffs Statement of Undisputed Facts*” and supporting evidence from the San Diego Superior Court Case *Grab v FTB*. You can get it from the court’s website at: <https://roa.sdcourt.ca.gov>. The case year is 2020 and the case number is 00005100. It is item #84.

Also, please always remember that you are employed by the People of California as a public servant. You signed an Oath of Allegiance to uphold state and federal laws. You are required to do the right thing for the People of California, even if it means defying your boss.

I am confident that, after seeing the evidence documented in court records, any attorney you speak with will tell you to defy Ms. Brunett and send the unredacted oaths. I look forward to receiving the unredacted oaths no later than close of business on Tuesday, September 19, 2023.

Regards,

Christine Grab

Reiser, Jarrod@FTB

From: Christi Grab <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, September 18, 2023 9:56 AM
To: Malone, Candie@FTB; Williams, Carol D@FTB
Cc: Stanislaus, Selvi@FTB; Brunett, Jozel@FTB; [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Smith, Lilly@FTB; FTB Disclosure
Office@FTB
Subject: Fwd: Improper Redactions

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization! Do not click links, open attachments or reply unless you recognize the sender's email and trust the content.

Dear FTB HR:

Hopefully, Ms. Smith has already reached out to you directly about this situation. I am forwarding you this email in case she didn't. I want to make sure that you are aware that the Legal department has ordered her to violate CPRA laws by improperly redacting documents to hide evidence.

I want you to know that I view FTB's culture of throwing one another under the bus to protect yourselves as despicable. The person who ordered the redactions should have been the one to sign that letter. I am disgusted that Legal has set Ms. Smith up as a patsy.

I would hope that you would stand up for Ms. Smith and not allow the Legal department to set her up as a patsy the way that they set up Keith Swank, Chelsea Hubbard, Grace LeBleu, Christopher Calhoun, Angelia Goff, the Taxpayer Advocates, and many others.

Regards,

Christine Grab

Begin forwarded message:

From: Christi Grab <[REDACTED]>

Subject: Improper Redactions

Date: September 13, 2023 at 9:07:31 AM PDT

To: "FTB Disclosure Office@FTB" <FTBDisclosureOffice@ftb.ca.gov>, [REDACTED]

Hello Disclosure Department and Ms. Smith:

On Tuesday, September 12, 2023, Lilly Smith sent me three Oaths of Allegiance in response to a records request that I'd made. The signatures of the person swearing the oaths were redacted on all three documents.

All State of California employees are required to sign an Oath of Allegiance before beginning the duties of their employment. My understanding is that anyone who is working unlawfully without a properly 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, including prison.

As you're probably already aware of, I am currently drafting a Federal Criminal Complaint (FCC) against assorted FTB staff for running eight *bona fide* criminal schemes to overcharge taxpayers. I can prove via my own records that at least some of the unlawful schemes were in place as far back as 2005. This means that the executives in office now inherited these unlawful schemes from their predecessors. I am adding the predecessors to the list of Accused in the FCC.

Some of said predecessors are the people whose oaths were redacted. There is no way for me to know if the oath was taken if the signature (or lack thereof) of the person swearing the oath is hidden. FTB has not previously redacted signatures on oaths that have been provided in response to records requests. Given that these three people were actively perpetrating *bona fide* criminal schemes, and given FTB's proven track record of improperly redacting documents to hide evidence, my assumption is that Ms. Smith is trying to hide that the oaths were not sworn by these three people and that all three of them were working unlawfully during their tenure with FTB.

Why are these particular signatures redacted?

Ms Smith, I hope you have a really good reason beyond "My boss told me to." If you don't, please know that "My boss told me to" does not hold up in court. Jozel Brunett, the person who most likely ordered the redactions, has been working unlawfully for many years without a fully executed oath. Ms. Brunett had not properly sworn to uphold state and federal laws, and she has a proven track record of ordering her subordinates to violate state and federal laws — and the employees are the ones held liable, not her.

You may consider talking to an attorney not affiliated with FTB (FTB is only looking out for what's best for FTB, not what is best for you) to discuss what potential consequences could be faced if you are pinned as the patsy for covering up evidence. So that the attorney you consult is fully aware of the magnitude of the criminal activities that you are covering up, you should probably download and bring the document titled "*Plaintiffs Statement of Undisputed Facts*" and supporting evidence from the San Diego Superior Court Case *Grab v FTB*. You can get it from the court's website at: <https://roa.sdcourt.ca.gov>. The case year is 2020 and the case number is 00005100. It is item #84.

Also, please always remember that you are employed by the People of California as a public servant. You signed an Oath of Allegiance to uphold state and federal laws. You are required to do the right thing for the People of California, even if it means defying your boss.

I am confident that, after seeing the evidence documented in court records, any attorney you speak with will tell you to defy Ms. Brunett and send the unredacted oaths. I look forward to receiving the unredacted oaths no later than close of business on Tuesday, September 19, 2023.

Regards,

Christine Grab