

**JUDICIAL COMMITTEE APPEAL
TO VOID THE ADOPTION OF THE SPECIAL INVESTIGATORY
COMMITTEE REPORT
AND ALL ACTIONS TAKEN THEREUPON BY THE LIBERTARIAN
NATIONAL COMMITTEE
AT ITS JUNE 9, 2025 SPECIAL MEETING**

Filed by:

Hector Roos, sustaining member

On behalf of Petitioners

Date: October 1, 2025

Reply to Jake Porter Amicus Brief

In re: Roos et al. v. LNC (2025 JC Appeal)

Petitioner respectfully replies as follows:

For the past year, Mr. Porter has operated a watchdog blog demanding transparency of the LNC. His effort is commendable. However, Mr. Porter suffers from a preconceived belief that Angela McArdle is an enemy that must be stopped at all costs. This is why when I first challenged Mr. Porter and his report for evidence, his first response was to cast my concerns as bad faith [Exhibit 9-The LNC's SIC Report - Deregulation Corner, Page 2]. He never answers: Why should the public including the SIC trust reporting that relies on anonymous sources? Why did the SIC or the LNC attorney not seek out the Delaware corporation paperwork independent of Mr. Porter? Instead of correcting these ethical lapses, the SIC relied on Mr. Porter's anonymous sources, exaggerations, knowingly false statements and straw man arguments to attack Angela McArdle and her supporters.

For instance, Mr. Porter claims he worked alone, stating "I am doing these investigations independently and there are expenses that have been incurred. This specific investigation cost \$70 alone" [Exhibit 11 - Jake Porter Report, Page 6]. Now thanks to John Ponty who exclaimed that he was a part of Mr. Porter's effort, we know Mr. Porter "independent" effort was untrue [Ponty Amicus, Page 2 ("...both Porter and I were involved in finding the original documents...")].

As part of Mr. Porter's efforts, he claimed incorrectly that Mr. Padgett was paid by the Kennedy Victory Fund through Swing Vote Strategist [Exhibit 11 - Jake Porter Report, Page 2]. We know instead that that these payments were paid to Angela McArdle [Roos Appeal, Page 15, 28-29, Exhibit 4-Special Investigatory Committee Report, Page 60]. These payments were not related to her LNC duties or the LNC itself and not subject to LNC oversight.

In the reporting about Freedom Calls, Mr. Porter jumps to same conclusion as before when he titled his report the "Libertarian Party is Paying Chair's Domestic Partner Through Unidisclosed

(sic) Hidden Delaware LLC” [Exhibit 11 - Jake Porter Report, Page 1]. It is clear to everyone then as it is now that a call center was operating through Freedom Calls. Mr. Porter does not mention this fact in his report.

Reply to Claims in Mr. Porter’s Amicus:

No. 1: The LNC knew and approved (without a vote) Ms. McArdle’s appointment to Executive Director. The point that Mr. Porter avoids is that the LNC permitted Ms. McArdle the authority with which she acted. He is simply critical of her actions using that authority.

No. 2: The excerpt of a likely lengthy text message exchange included in the SIC report was too limited to confirm the context or to understand intent behind Ms. McArdle’s response.

No. 3: If the LNC was “never communicated” to about the purpose of Freedom Calls, why did the LNC after a year, approve an additional year of funding for it? Instead of answering this question, Mr. Porter presents the straw man claims about embezzlement.

No. 4: If Mr. Padgett lost his own money, how is this a conflict of interest? Losing money does not trigger Policy Manual requirements for disclosure. Again, Mr. Porter with another straw man argument claiming that Ms. McArdle cannot be taken “at her word.”

No. 5: Mr. Porter makes conjectures about Mr. Padgett’s financial situation and his intentions in supporting the Libertarian Party through his volunteer efforts with Freedom Calls. Is it a “big claim” when the budget for Freedom Calls was modest and brought in more revenue than staff fundraising activities as Ms. McArdle explained?

No. 6: Mr. Porter makes a contradictory claim that the “LNC was never accused of wrongdoing” yet alludes to the reality that if his claims were true then the LNC “didn’t do their due diligence in questioning the financials or operations of the party.” More importantly, Mr. Porter agrees with the Petitioner that the SIC was not a “truly independent investigation.”

No. 7: Mr. Porter claiming that Ms. Hays and Ms. McArdle did not have an attorney-client relationship because it was described as “quasi” in a text message exchange is more of Mr. Porter’s straw man argument.

In the conclusion of his amicus brief, Mr. Porter makes a bold claim that the Petitioner has seen published repeatedly elsewhere: “the appeal attempt[s] to confuse the judicial committee by continuing to question who incorporated and operated Freedom Calls, LLC.” This is not true. The petition points out consistently that the SIC did not independently verify the Delaware incorporation documents while claiming they did and that these documents are used to indicate Mr. Padgett’s ownership when they do not support such a conclusion. Mr. Porter ends his amicus brief like he starts criticizing Ms. McArdle’s actions but refusing to recognize the LNC granting her the authority to take such actions.