

Amicus Curiae Brief in Support of Appellants in the Matter of Hector Roos et al. v. Libertarian National Committee

Interest of Amicus Curiae

As a concerned member of the Libertarian Party, and a member of the LNC, representing Region 1, and as the state chair of the Libertarian Party of Hawaii, as a person directly affected by the herein alleged misconduct associated with the underlying subject matter, with a vested interest in upholding the party's bylaws and fiduciary responsibilities, I, Austin Martin submit this amicus curiae brief in support of the appellants, Hector Roos and co-petitioners to void the LNC's adoption of the SIC report and related resolutions from meetings on June 9, 2025.

Summary

This brief draws on documented evidence from LNC proceedings, emails, and public reports to highlight procedural and substantive flaws in the adoption of the Special Investigatory Committee (SIC) report. No party has requested this brief, and no compensation has been provided for its preparation. The appellants seek to void the LNC's adoption of the SIC report and related resolutions from meetings on June 9, 2025, and August 24, 2025, due to procedural irregularities, fiduciary breaches, and misconduct. This brief supports the appellants' position by addressing key themes: procedural rush, retaliations against dissenters, conflicts of interest, impacts on the Beth Vest v. LNC lawsuit, concealment of evidence, and collusion among SIC members. Evidence from LNC minutes, emails, and other correspondence demonstrate a pattern of bias, obstructions, and violations that warrant granting the appeal. The Judicial Committee should invalidate these actions to restore integrity to LNC governance.

Argument

1. An Unbroken Pattern of Procedural Rush Preventing Informed Decisions

The LNC's adoption of the SIC report was (in the opinion of one who was required to make an informed decision) improperly noticed. Our decision was needlessly rushed, making it impossible for members to exercise proper care and due diligence, which requires adequate notice for informed decision-making [1]. This pattern originated in early 2025 and has effectively prevented LNC members' ability to meaningfully deliberate on a variety of issues [7 (p.8), 17, 19]. The Roos petition explicitly argues that the June 9, 2025, adoption lacked proper notice, leading to misrepresentation in the process [1]. The February 2, 2025, LNC special meeting was a rushed dismissal of a prior investigatory committee and hasty appointments for a new one, with closed nominations for chair and vice-chair without full conflict disclosures or meaningful deliberations [3]. The dismissal of the prior Investigatory Committee and immediate

elections, sets an appearance of a biased foundation for the SIC. Questions have since been steamrolled.

Demonstrating this pattern, the August 29, 2025, ethics complaint summary [21] highlighted ignored concerns about SIC independence, with counsel Oliver Hall dismissing scrutiny as "reckless" without addressing the haste [17]. Chair Steven Nekhaila and his like-minded cohorts consistently insisted on executive sessions to evade open debate [6,13]. When a Point of Parliamentary Inquiry was raised with respect to the effect and intent of the SIC-recommended resolutions, the POPI was ignored and I was mocked for raising the question [15].

Recent correspondence further illustrates this ubiquitous pattern of obstruction, with Chair Nekhaila initiating needlessly hasty email motions on September 19, 2025, restricting debate despite an upcoming meeting and contrary to the LNC Operations Review emphasizing open discussion. On September 23, votes were cast amid unanswered concerns about legal strategy and SIC conflicts [16, 21]. The Roos petition details that the SIC report adoption violated Policy Manual Rule 1.02-1 by providing no more than 36 hours for review of its extensive content, far short of the five-day advance notice required for motions [1]. The pattern of rushing the LNC to judgement is unbroken and plain to see. The SIC also exceeded its scope by introducing material far beyond its original mandate to investigate alleged conflicts of interest, rendering the adoption out of order under RONR (12th ed., 10:26-1, 23:6-b) which supports voiding for procedural misconduct [1]. These violations alone should render the actions invalid, but the troubling patterns do not end here.

2. Retaliations Against Members for Questioning Details

I have witnessed a chilling pattern of public and private retaliation against appellant supporters, including threats and censures, violations of members' rights under party bylaws, and suppressing legitimate inquiry.

Chair Nekhaila's emails repeatedly threatened to revoke my list privileges for questioning the SIC and the active Beth Vest V. LNC lawsuit [7, 8, 9, 13, 17, 21], and repeatedly allowed the secretaries to abuse the "mute" power in meetings to stifle dissent. On August 26, 2025, he stated: "further indecorous or harassing communications will subject you to a motion to revoke your list privileges." Within the hour, he blocked my access to lp.org emails, without me taking any further actions, only relenting amid public backlash [8]. I offered to forgive him if he apologized and restored access immediately; instead Nekhaila attempted to use coercion by leveraging my access to official systems and force me to consent to email monitoring and pre-approval. He explicitly rejected the offer of forgiveness, and asked me to bring this up to the JC, despite restoring access. I do so now to demonstrate the pattern. Nekhaila also announced a censure motion against me at the September 7, 2025, meeting for his ethics complaints against my publicly questioning the honesty of the SIC report, while completely ignoring ethics

complaints from critical members [9]. This echoes prior incidents. Nekhaila's control over LNC members' access to counsel was leveraged to silence critics amid coup allegations, which emerged as early as late January 2025 [3, 7]. My involvement in multiple appeals also reveals the targeted nature of these actions [10].

Recent LNC correspondence from September 24-27, 2025 [7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19] further supports the appellants' claims of procedural misconduct and fiduciary breaches in the SIC process. Even ignoring his role as LP Treasurer during the events in question, SIC member Bill Redpath explicitly confessed to the receipt of previously undisclosed payments from Kennedy for overlapping work while being paid by the LP for ballot access work in New Mexico in 2024, directly mirroring (and exceeding) SVS allegations against former Chair Angela McArdle [4]. The SIC report asserts this violates DC code § 29–411.05(f). While the legal conclusions in the SIC seem shaky (at best), this conflict directly overlaps with subject matters investigated and would single-handedly eviscerate any claim of “independence” falsely asserted by the SIC. The same is true for Kathy Yeniscavich's inadequate disclosure of her own conflicts. Similarly, evidence emerged in June that Oliver Hall had a conflicting attorney-client relationship with Angela McArdle [14]. After initially and firmly denying such a relationship in writing [14], Oliver Hall later acknowledged “informal advisements” with McArdle along with evidence of the existence of such a relationship during the September call with the LNC, contrary to his prior written claim. Mr. Hall further acknowledged that he did not disclose this fact to involved parties, nor seek to obtain her consent prior to advising the SIC on how to levy charges against her. His apparent relationship and ongoing communications with outside parties (i.e.: secret settlement negotiations with Nicholas Sarwark [6, 13]) raises additional, distinct appearances of impropriety.

Despite this, Chair Nekhaila and counsel Oliver Hall dismissed inquiries from Andrew Chadderdon and myself as “bad faith” and “harassment”, preventing our ability to complete our due diligence [17]. Hall and Nekhaila's most recent (unfounded) claim to prevent further inquiry was that counsel had already “exhausted billable hours”, and therefore could (seemingly indefinitely) delay critical legal guidance on this pressing matter. Chadderdon rightly noted that no such limit exists, while Hall's refusal to engage further unless directed by the board stifles oversight and directly violates the terms of his contract and LNC policies. This is a persistent pattern of evading transparency and obstructing informed decision-making. [8, 9, 16, 17].

The pattern escalated with direct interference in the August 30, 2025, LPHI state convention, which was bombarded with over 100 last-minute out-of-state participants (with many directly citing intent to alter the composition of the LNC, with apparent support from “Factionless” LNC members) in an apparent coordinated effort to unseat me as the Hawaii state chair, and disrupt region 1. This mega swell of non-residents who just signed up in the final 48 hours, delayed proceedings and overwhelmed credentialing volunteers. The influx tied into broader LNC

disputes, with pre & post-convention reports and discussions clarifying the invasion as retaliation for challenges to SIC biases and misconduct. [5, 25, 26] Kyle Davis and other members of the LP allies made specific public statements clarifying their intent in coordinating the invasion of the Hawaii affiliate on their LPAllies live stream and in the LPAllies discord server. They framed their actions ostensibly as a “defensive invasion” to “replace the Chair”, and “put a check on the Region”, due to my “activities on the LNC” [5, 25, 26]. In short, this collaboration between Davis, Harlos, and mainland networks was a coordinated attempt to undermine my whistleblowing activities. They even tried a frame-up for my very own false “embezzlement” claims, which current and former members of the LNC distributed just before the convention.

Building on this, post-convention developments reinforced the retaliatory intent: On September 6, 2025, Nekhaila blocked access to LP.org emails amid ongoing disputes [8, 9], relenting only after backlash, as documented in LNC correspondence. By September 8, 2025, the LNC voted down censures of Nekhaila and myself, but tensions persisted, with critics directly referencing disputes exposed in ethics complaints against them. The pattern culminated in the LNC's October 1, 2025, special meeting, where I was censured for "threatening" remarks and “violent rhetoric”, (an exercise in performative outrage ostensibly because of my calls to remove socialism from the LP). The retaliations extend to evasive tactics involving whistleblower inquiries. Nekhaila barred Chadderdon and I access to counsel outside "formal party business" on August 26, 2025, and Hall refused engagement unless board-directed, citing "harassment" and seeking compensation for responses [8, 19]. This created and inflamed a hostile work environment [17]. The nature and character of the many post-report resignations of SIC-involved individuals, including Secretary Caryn Ann Harlos, Adrian Malagon (who conducted the Kixie audit), and Kathy Yeniscavich, as highlighted in the Roos petition [1], hints at troubling inferences. Such intimidating obstruction diminishes the integrity of our party's governance and leads to unexpected resignations and behind-the-scenes maneuvering. These are more reasons to question the legitimacy of the disputed actions.

3. Conflicts of Interest Involving SIC Members and Contributors

Undisclosed conflicts among SIC members and counsel compromised the report's impartiality, breaching fiduciary duties under DC nonprofit law and LNC policies. As noted previously, Oliver Hall, on June 9-10, 2025, denied having an attorney-client relationship with Angela McArdle but admitted on September 10 to providing “informal” advice on overlapping Vest suit issues without her permission to advise the SIC, creating an appearance of impropriety [6, 11, 17, 20]. An August 29, 2025, ethics complaint thread [7] cites Meredith Hays' extensive set of troubling, sometimes sardonic statements, including: “Yes me and Adrian created this whole situation to remove Angela and Heise...” [7 (p.14-18)] with Nekhaila's response acknowledging “political realities,” evidencing premeditated bias. Nekhaila confirmed secret settlement meetings with Nicholas Sarwark without full LNC disclosure, further undermining impartiality.

It was also revealed that Meredith Hays had explicitly formed a “quasi-attorney client relationship” with Angela McArdle that “not even Adrian has to know about” [7, 12].

On September 18, 2025, I submitted an ethics complaint reporting SIC member Bill Redpath’s undisclosed 2024 Kennedy campaign payments for ballot access work [4]. The complaint was ignored, and additional retaliatory behavior was directed at me. Similarly, I raised concerns about Kathy Yeniscavich’s Kennedy Victory Fund volunteer role, which was (inadequately) disclosed, where payment was offered but declined, was dismissed without scrutiny, unlike McArdle’s conflicts [18]. During that time, Yeniscavich allegedly attempted to induce McArdle to accept improper payment, giving rise to the reasonable belief that there was intention.

The Roos petition notes additional biases, including Doug Knebel’s prior accusations against McArdle and Adrian Malagon’s chair ambitions. This violates D.C. code by creating material interests [1, 18]. “Pursuant to D.C. Code § 29-411.05(f), a person is independent if they lack a material interest...” (statute apparently misrepresented at one point [allegedly by Oliver Hall] in the SIC report, pg. 2), “in the matters investigated” or the “outcome of the proceedings” which reasonably could affect a person’s judgement in the decision [7, 20].

4. Potential Impacts on Beth Vest vs. LNC

The SIC adoption risks prejudicing the ongoing Beth Vest derivative lawsuit, where unauthorized strategies overlapped with party actions. Sarwark's August 16, 2025, email proposed settlements to "hold McArdle legally accountable," with Nekhaila confirming: "We all felt the goals of the Vest suit had been achieved..." [6, 13]. My August 26, 2025, email accused ultra vires actions [21]: the board apparently had not authorized any of the actions... per Policy Manual Section 1.02, in reference to unvoted strategies that directly link SIC and Vest — until another recently rushed email ballot, while egregiously denying access to counsel to members of the LNC, where they continued the pattern of ratifying their own misconduct. Vest denied Sarwark's representation [13]. Chair Nekhaila persisted in claiming that Nick Sarwark properly was involved and represented Vest [7, p.2]. Since then, the LNC has attempted to ratify the misconduct and cover up the fact that the entire legal strategy was unauthorized and unsupervised, while suppressing my ability to make legal inquiries or engage in any meaningful discussion about the issues [7].

LNC discussions on September 5, 2025, debated adopting the case [2, 11]. The Vest suit alleges McArdle's self-dealing, and features claims which could be amended with the introduction of the flawed SIC report; a JC ruling voiding the SIC could expose conflicts beneficial to Vest, while upholding it might validate disputed claims in DC Superior Court. However, the flawed SIC report cannot provide any meaningful defense in court – it would only prove governance flaws as an obvious coverup by involved parties; even if no wrongdoing was committed, the SIC report in its current form ensures total legal failure will be the most likely long-term outcome in the Vest

case, regardless of the actual merits [18 p.1-4]. The LNC was not advised meaningfully of these issues, such as the overwhelming likelihood that the SIC report, if publicly released, could be introduced to the Vest suit, and Oliver Hall, even when pressed, still refuses to provide meaningful guidance, even after tacitly indicating he should have done so previously.

Whistleblower complaints document unanswered questions on Vest strategy changes, coinciding with confirmed secret Sarwark negotiations, potentially influencing the pivot to a second (fatally flawed) dismissal motion without full LNC input [7, 19, 21]. An ethics complaint on September 19, 2025, accuses Nekhaila and McGee of misrepresentation in the JC brief by claiming the SoP does not bind the LNC, contrary to LNC bylaws [23]. (This, notably, appears to align with a larger, coordinated effort to eliminate the NAP and fundamentally transform the LP). The SIC report's recommendations against using general funds for litigation like the Vest suit, while suggesting reconsideration with dedicated donations or pro bono counsel, signaling internal concessions without full LNC authorization [13, 17, 18].

5. Concealment and Destruction of Evidence

My ethics complaint notes Nekhaila's failure to report the Sarwark meetings to the LNC [4]. My questions probed Hall's external discussions: "Have you had any discussions with external attorneys... regarding the SIC, the Vest suit...?" [7, 13, 14]. Nekhaila barred me from addressing Oliver Hall, despite the fact that he formally represents me and Region 1: "I am barring you from addressing Oliver Hall outside of formal party business," further cementing the accusation of withheld responses [13]. Oliver Hall was repeatedly asked questions of a fiduciary nature, and some of these questions and statements were avoided with the appearance of intention; while some incomplete statements purporting to be answers were provided by Oliver Hall [24], these were insufficient and incomplete, with many answers directly contradicting previous statements or facts established in the record. Further questions have since been prohibited.

The Roos petition accuses conflict concealment and leaked emails reveal hidden strategies and evasive tactics that signify bad faith [1]. The Roos petition alleges SIC concealment through omissions, including the failure to release full Kixie audit data and inadequate pursuit of evidence from declined interviewees like McArdle and Padgett, creating gaps that violate diligent investigation standards, amounting to spoliation [1, 18]. "The Committee was unable to determine the profitability of the RTR Rally or whether McArdle personally profited from the event, due to lack of access to relevant financial records" (SIC report, pg. 3). They simultaneously admit gaps in records while implying misconduct, about matters seemingly beyond their scope.

Which Principles Apply to the LNC?

The September 19, 2025, ethics complaint [23] highlights misrepresentation in the JC brief like the fact that the SoP does not bind the LNC, concealing its foundational role, possibly itself amounting to misrepresentation [21]. The LNC's September 23-26, 2025 email ballot to rescind the Judicial Committee brief in Roos et al. v. LNC, which falsely claimed the Statement of Principles does not bind the LNC, failed with implicated members Jonathan McGee (brief author), Meredith Hays (admitted pre-plotting against McArdle/Heise), Paul Darr (SIC Vice Chair), and others voting No [21, 22]. This entrenches a misrepresentation violating Bylaws Articles 2 and 3, evidencing systemic fraud and bias by shielding misconduct and prioritizing "factionless" interests over Party principles. The vote underscores collusion among conflicted members, justifying voiding the SIC report to uphold integrity [4, 21].

6. Pre-Plotting and Colluding by SIC Members

Screenshots and minutes indicate coordinated efforts to undermine leadership, breaching fiduciary duties [7 (p.14-18), 12], as highlighted in the Roos petition [1]. Meredith Hays is accused of making covert contributions to the SIC work-product. Ms. Hays', who also had an attorney-client relationship with Angela McArdle [12], publicly and repeatedly disavowed any participation in the SIC when first confronted about her suspected involvement. Evidence would emerge showing that Ms. Hays made an apparent statement of intent (on or about January 27th, 2025 [7 (p.14-18), 12]) saying "I want to write up a report, even if it's ghost written", continuing in a separate message, "Too many cooks, tbh". When confronted with this evidence, she maintained denial, even while confirming the statements' authenticity [7 (p.7), 12(p.5)]. The Roos Petition highlights evidence that indicates Ms. Hays did indeed covertly contribute to the SIC's work product.

Screenshots from the January LNC Discord Chat [7 (p.14-18), 12] provide compelling evidence of members conspiring on pre-planned removals. Ms. Hays sardonically admits she "created this whole situation to remove Angela and Heise", and Nekhaila immediately afterward acknowledges that "political realities need to be considered" [7, 12]. February 2025 special meeting involved collusive dismissals and appointments amid leadership shifts [3]. I have personally been targeted with retaliatory behavior by those apparently responsible as a direct result of my exercise of my duty of diligence — and in fact, this has so far characterized my entire experience in the LNC since I was elected in May.

The settlement emails appear to confirm pre-SIC plotting. Sarwark referenced meetings from earlier in the year for a "positive outcome" against McArdle, Nekhaila characterized and leveraged outcomes of the SIC well in advance of its June passage in the LNC [10, 13, 15, 21]. The importance of this fact is hard to overstate.

This portrays systemic breaches. My ethics complaint progressively exposes that Hall was apparently concealing Redpath's undisclosed Kennedy conflicts, which eventually were

explicitly acknowledged in September, after initially being properly raised (and suppressed) in the June 9th session [4, 14]. The double standard is tangible: Hall & Nekhaila have embraced "inverted" good/bad faith definitions, where accountability questions are "harassment" and breaches like secret Sarwark settlements are regarded as "good faith" [17]. One supposes this is now to be expected, given the SoP misrepresentation in the JC brief. The new norm is systemic collusion to defend misconduct [8, 9, 13, 21]. These are dangerous precedents to permit – these members clearly appear to have been working in concert, giving rise to the reasonable belief that collusion would exist (even apart from the direct evidence) and that there was intention.

The SIC report is full of unsubstantiated claims. It implies McArdle's personal profit from RTR without evidence (admitting no determination due to missing documents) and alleging concealment of Freedom Calls ownership based on inference alone, lacking cited proof of intent and aligning with the petition's arguments for material misrepresentation [1, 18]. For example: *"McArdle gave misleading or false statements to LNC members, instructed removal of Padgett from her conflict disclosures"* (SIC report, pg. 2). This substantial accusation relies entirely on inference rather than conclusive evidence. As it sits, there are more individuals than just Padgett and McArdle who would have a claim against the LP for defamation, *even if key elements in the report turned out to be true after all* – due to evidence of a rush to judgement, malice, conflicts, collusion, and since the scope so greatly exceeds the mandate.

Conclusion

The moral hazard is obvious when confronted with the false claim that the SoP's prohibition on fraud does not bind the LNC, seemingly a deliberate misrepresentation to shield misconduct. It's evident in the hypocritical concealment of SIC member Bill Redpath's 2024 Kennedy campaign payments, allegedly violating DC Code § 29-406.30 [4, 20, 21]. Systemic bias and collusion are on brazen display through the SIC's dismissal of Kathy Yeniscavich's Kennedy Victory Fund ties while targeting Angela McArdle, driven by Meredith Hays' admitted plot to remove McArdle and Heise, and unsubstantiated RTR profit claims despite evidence gaps [1, 4, 7 (esp. p. 14-18), 17, 18, 19, 21]. Pre-SIC plotting is confirmed by direct evidence: the settlement emails can leave no doubt that the investigators were justifying a foregone conclusion, rather than fact-finding in a fair and objective investigation [6, 13, 15]. Allowing vague double standards and prejudices to persist risks reducing the Libertarian Party to just another compromised political option. The Judicial Committee must void the SIC report and resolutions to uphold our principled governance and restore trust.

At the hearing, I will be available to answer questions and to present any additional evidence requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Austin Martin, October 21, 2025

Appendix

- [1] Hector Roos et al., “*LNC Judicial Committee Appeal*”, September 8, 2025. (<https://mywikis-wiki-media.s3.us-central-1.wasabisys.com/lpedia/Petition-for-appeal-roos-et-al-2025-09-08.pdf>).
- [2] Libertarian National Committee, “*Libertarian National Committee, Respondent Brief*”, June 9, 2025, (<https://mywikis-wiki-media.s3.us-central-1.wasabisys.com/lpedia/LNC-respondent-brief-roos-v-LNC-2025-09-16.pdf>).
- [3] Libertarian National Committee, “*Special Meeting Minutes*”, February 2, 2025. (https://15962047324151071424.googlegroups.com/attach/8b42423eaeedf/LNC-Meeting_2025-02-02_FI_NAL.pdf?part=0.1&view=1&vt=ANaJVrGRwy3zM_kGo36hMXFPxwj4Hdu-krDK_s5zsrttpIS_2_fLFDuHhARCa4ZDbIIZYStUEvY90aaK3HmPi5oIUuysyYCRYA7rOKxeeV63hwkzPY5K5dE)
- [4] Austin Martin, “*FW: Ethics Complaint Against LNC Treasurer Bill Redpath for Undisclosed Conflicts*”, September 18, 2025. (https://drive.google.com/file/d/10dfbz4N5ZrtFpyfDuHBC1k-76gcnqFpt/view?usp=share_link), and (<https://groups.google.com/g/lnc-public/c/Ahe3rOBHts/m/88pbvD5iGAAJ>).
- [5] Libertarian Party of Hawaii, “*2025 Convention of the Libertarian Party of Hawaii*”, September 5, 2025. (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OFUWhfWratM&t=130s>)
- [6] Third Party Watch, “*A Remarkable Email Thread: Sarwark and LNC*”, August 16, 2025 (<https://thirdpartywatch.com/2025/08/16/a-remarkable-email-thread-sarwark-and-lnc/>).
- [7] Austin Martin, “*Urgent: Ethics Complaint Follow Up*”, August 24-September 3, 2025 (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1lslBTB6GYNXSpfjVfwzUgi8dKGGahY3d/view?usp=drivesdk>).
- [8] Steven Nekhaila, “*FW: Restoration of Mr. Martins Email Privileges*”, September 6, 2025. (<https://groups.google.com/g/lnc-public/c/PnqgrR-8I9Y/m/9H53tS4YAwAJ>)
- [9] Third Party Watch, “*LNC Dispute Continues — Nekhaila Will Seek Censure of Martin*”, August 14, 2025 (<https://thirdpartywatch.com/2025/08/13/the-lnc-dispute-continues/>).
- [10] Third Party Watch, “*Three Judicial Committee Appeals Have Enough Signatures*”, July 31, 2025 (<https://thirdpartywatch.com/2025/07/28/three-judicial-committee-appeals-have-enough-signatures/>).
- [11] Third Party Watch, “*Vest on Sarwark*,” August 19, 2025 (<https://thirdpartywatch.com/2025/08/19/vest-on-sarwark/>).
- [12] Austin Martin, “*Fw: Hays’ Involvement with the SIC*”, September 8-10, 2025 (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/131VSgfMAPz69U2YM38SeA6ZC1yTbbH32/view?usp=drivesdk>).
- [13] Steven Nekhaila, “*Fw: Resuming Settlement Discussion re Vest v. McArdle*”, August 16-26, 2025, <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1EwqoPp1ccAM86g3y8OwAtXVE0EVjyv3q/view?usp=sharing>
- [14] Austin Martin, “*Fw: A question about privilege and propriety*”, June 9-10, 2025 (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Sv7IWlmEtbcjyi7EDf3Zu9ElkZnCa6b4/view?usp=drivesdk>)

[15] Adrian Malagon, “*FW: Point of Parliamentary Inquiry*” (about the effect of the “McArdle Ban” resolution) , June 18-August 12, 2025
(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1k17st34oJjsugmbNXa7LKHxUjUhxWZ59/view?usp=drivesdk>).

[16] Andrew Chadderdon to Steven Nekhaila et al., “*Urgent Situation Developing: Fw: My State is Being Held Hostage!*”, September 24-25, 2025
(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1xx2QjeqIWY-mkNWPFU97e9gvpCO3q2XG/view?usp=drivesdk>).

[17] Austin Martin to Oliver Hall et al., “*Fw: Legal Subterfuge and Sabotage against the LNC*”, September 26-27, 2025
(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1C0YhX5aSuN7e50p1b4kC0Nb16pJd-8s-/view?usp=drivesdk>).

[18] Libertarian National Committee, “*Special Investigatory Committee Report*”, June 9, 2025
(https://mywikis-wiki-media.s3.us-central-1.wasabisys.com/lpedia/Special_Investigatory_Committee_Report.pdf).

[19] Andrew Chadderdon et. al., “*Notification of concerns, Whistleblower Complaint*”, September 2-26, 2025
(https://drive.google.com/file/d/1tUXby2S2YDDTaKJYifhpPwvPO_tpmTI/view?usp=drivesdk), and
(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sOo-IagffNrOIWHQBbV1rGt72yb72p-p/view?usp=drivesdk>).

[20] Austin Martin, “*Memorandum On Conflicts of Interest Between Members Overlapping the SIC and the LNC*”, August 23, 2025
(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/12udOla9gvXPbPB3u9kS8DRF7VxCM76ey/view?usp=drivesdk>)

[21] Austin Martin, “*Fwd: Fw: Breach of Ethics & Fiduciary Duty — Public Statements Regarding SIC Report*”, August 12-September 21, 2025
(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zqMIGLyPKkawIn2BJPOMtL9APkVvePL8/view?usp=drivesdk>);

and Andrew Chadderdon, “*2025.08.29 - Ethics Complaint - Legal Concerns Summary*”, August 29, 2025,
(<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1G8OOwhhhU76hx0Psvh5C2151nLAVDcb-/view?usp=drivesdk>)

[22] Libertarian National Committee, “*2025 Motions and Ballots https://tinyurl.com/LNCvotes25*”, September 23, 2025, (<https://tinyurl.com/092325JC>).

[23] Austin Martin, “*Ethics complaint against Steven Nekhaila and Jonathan McGee for Misrepresentation*”, September 26, 2025,
https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QYVGfMTiFPCavfLz0pA-RO0y_MCybGBd/view?usp=drivesdk

[24] Oliver Hall to LNC: “*response to Mr Martin and Mr Chadderdon’s questions*”, September 18th 2025
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1Mcu0LAQw3BkojytjRV6ic4lsTo9PEXgn/view?usp=drivesdk>

[25] LPAllies Livestream of Hawaii Convention, August 2025:

https://www.youtube.com/live/rJIMRhjWvHI?si=YeulJ_rU7LUqZS-w

[26] LP Allies Hawaii Convention Recap Video:

https://www.youtube.com/live/rJIMRhjWvHI?si=CQI55lrL_P6WlO9J