

Libertarian National Judicial Committee

Petitioner: Jonathan M. Jacobs

vs.

Respondent: Libertarian National Committee

**Re: JUDICIAL COMMITTEE APPEAL TO VOID CERTAIN
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE JUNE 9, 2025 SPECIAL MEETING
OF THE LIBERTARIAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE**

Petitioner Response to John Ponty's Amicus Brief of 8/8/25

August 9, 2025

Response to Part 1

In his filing of August 8, John Ponty claimed that the motions, previously designated Resolutions 1 and 2, are somehow incidental main motions and therefore not subject to Section 1.02 of the Policy Manual. The LNC, through Mr. McGee, concedes the point that these resolutions are original main motions.

Further, a main motion referred to a committee by a subsidiary motion does not need special instructions to report back to the assembly, though they may be given. See RONR 36:8

The requirement for a motion to be an incidental main motion is because the assembly has not taken any action on the subject, i.e. they have yet to instruct the committee. Saying, effectively, "We appoint a committee," even if done by a main motion, is not a "substantive matter," under 10:4 2). Basically, the assembly has yet to deal with the matter.

Response to Part 2

Mr. Ponty claims, in regard to Resolution 1," Appellants claim that it is ridiculous to expect the Judicial Committee to determine the intent of the National Committee in adopting the motion." No, we do not claim that.

The appellants do claim that the scope of this motion is much broader than the LNC. It will involve any convention delegates, who select officers and at-large LNC members, state affiliate chairs, and finally members of affiliated parties. It is ridiculous to posit that the LNC did not really mean it when they "deem" someone "unfit" for office at the national, regional, or affiliate level. This is especially true when there no public record of their deliberation in this

matter and when, to date, one third of the LNC members voting for this resolution have left the LNC.