RECEIVED

To: The Ballot Law Commission c/o Secretary of State Capitol Bldg., 2nd fl. Concord, N.H. 03301

SEP 1 3 2002

NEW HAMPSHIRE SECRETARY OF STATE

RE: R.S.A. Chapter 665:4 Objection.

Please register my objection to the fact that the \$100 assessment, as required by RSA Ch. 655:19-c,I(a) was NOT "pa"id "At the time of filing declaration"s (655:19,I) by the following candidates who obtained more votes than myself in the Primary Election on Tuesday 9/10 but which votes must NOT count since the nominee had NOT filed in "conformity with law"; see the Declarations of Candidacy for: Craig Benson, Bruce Keough, Gordon Humphrey, and Robert Kingsbury wherein they either tendered currency, in the form of Federal Reserve Notes (that are mere promises to pay), or checks = other commercial instruments being orders to pay, neither sufficient to satisfy the requirement that they "shall pay the administrative assessment" of \$100 "At the time of filing" creating no 59-second debt window as remarked by Kingsbury to pay within the minute of filing the papers because it was to have been done simultaneously! See Article 5, Part the First, New Hampshire Constitution & Bill of Rights to the Religious Freedom to not have to owe anybody anything in accordance with the Bible, book of Romans, Chapter 13, verse 8 to "Owe no one anything, Likewise to exclude both Mark Fernald and Beverly Hollingworth in their Democratic race for the same reasons in that they too failed to "pay" the assessment fee in accordance with the Coinage Act of 1792 that is still the law! See the annotation for Article 97, Part 2, N.H. Constitution for the Value of Money, how computed from shillings and pence under the old English system to today's United States monetary system of dollars and cents, the dollar defined as being metal, at least, but certainly not paper in any form but perhaps the (temporary?) use as by the printing of United States Notes that are SPENT into circulation rather than those F.R.N.'s (Federal Reserve Notes) that are LOANed into circulation, causing an increase to the national debt!

The bankers termed banksters by some people, knowing this, and so with Commission member Hugh Gregg having been an officer of the Indian Head Bank and now either an officer or at least a stock-holder of its successor, the Fleet Bank, to be disqualified as will be indicated in the attached Motion to Disqualify.

Now therefore the above and herein is a "concise statement of the facts" per Rule 205.01(a)(3) of the who, what, when, where, why and how of: (1) the Republicans, Benson, Keough, Humphrey and Kingsbury, plus (2) Fernald and Hollingworth who ALL did NOT "pay the assessment fee in accordance with the LAW "At the TIME of filing" (emphasis ADDed) in the Office of Secretary of State, for whatever reason of theirs (like maybe thinking there is a "payment by intervention" statute allowing this, but there being NONE; see Appeal #2002-0447 with reference back to Appeal #99-808), by their tender of currency, (checks #____, #____, #____; + # $\#_$ respectfully (photocopies of their Declarations of Candidacy to file as Rule #206.09(a) evidence at the hoped-for 4th Friday of September meeting (9/27) @ __:__ o'clock a.m./p.m. where in Room # ___ L.O.B. it'll be argued that this is a new case, like a 2nd bite of the apple, since by then the Supreme Court is hoped to have a ruling decision by then, so as to either kill two birds with one stone, plus now against the Democrats anyway to see WHO be the RSA Ch. 659:88 "Write-In" candidate, if any, but if such appeal be adverse to this Petitioner, then to proceed here IF such decision was based upon the fact that Sundays are IN-cluded in the 5-day time period, the 3-day time limit here ending on either Saturday or Sunday, Sept. 14 or 15, so to file this by 4:30 p.m. Friday the Thirteenth to be safe, and that should allow any amendments. See Article 14, Part First, N.H. Const. & Bill of Rights to "complete" legal remedies. Plus to where and when to argue that in all these cases here there be NO "certified check, cashier's check,

or teller's check" by R.S.A. Ch. 382-A:3-310(a) to discharge an "obligation" to "the same extent discharge would result if an amount of money equal to the amount of the instrument were taken in payment of the obligation." and so section (b) WAS given as the reason in Year 1999 for the Appeal #2002-0447 in. volving the Presidential candidates, and that this B.L.C. did ask of HOW they might have mis-interpreted / mis-applied this statute to the situation back then and might be so corrected with the proper highlighting, now. So since section (b) applies to both "a note or an uncertified check" likewise "taken for an obligation" then "the obligation is suspended to the same extent the obligation would be discharged if an amount of money equal to the amount of the instrument were taken" BUT under the rules (1)+ (2) therein page 379 of the 1994 book, with nothing added for same at page 53 of the 2001 Supplement. BUT before looking into the rules, please pay attention to the words: dis-charge, and suspended above, to thus ask: WHEN was this \$100 first "charge"d? as in to fix or ask (a sum) as a fee or payment (W3-p.327, #5b(1)) Answer: at the TIME of filing, BUT more importantly to my argument: WHEN was it dis-charged? If it was a certified check, etc. (but NOT in ANY of these cases here complained against), then to "the same extents...(as) money" BUT that in both fules (1) + (2) for uncertified checks and notes, there be a mere "suspension" of any "obligation" (or what is "owe"d) (again NOT the case here, as indicated above, with the reference to the Bible)) "until dishonor of the" check or note, "or until it is paid!! thus PROVING that PAYment is NOT at the TIME of filing by this note and these checks! + !!!!!

WHEREFORE, the "action which the petitioner wishes the commission to take" by Rule 205.01(a)(4) is described above and summarized here to disqualify all four Republicans, (in a sence telling the top three millionaires that this race is NOT about how much QUANTITY of money one has, BUT of the QUALITY!), and likewise to also disqualify the two Democrats, to then find out WHO, if anybody, to replace them by RSA 659:88 to compete with myself in the General Election, and the Libertarian candidate, John Babiarz IF such amending be allowed.

CERTIFICATION

I, Joseph S. Haas, the signor have read this document, and am so authorized to file it, plus to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, there are good grounds to support it and the factual allegations contained therein are truthful; and "The document has not been filed for the purpose of delay or harassment."

huisday, September 12, 2002 @ 8:15 o'clock a.m./ p.m.

Joseph S. Haas 64 Centre Street Concord, N.H. 03301

cc: Craig Benson

814 Ely 24reut, Sufte 407 Manchester, N.H. 03101 603: 625-4884

&

Mark Fernald Spring Hill Rong Shavon, Nob. 03458 603: 924-3440

MOTION TO DISQUALIFY

For the reasons as already indicated in the related case(s) of complaint(s), and summarized here, both Gregg and Rice must disqualify themselves as having NOT taken the oath of office in the proper form as outlined in Article 84, Part 2, N.H. Constitution, in that their RSA Ch. 92:2 oaths are missing two letter "s"'s, first in bearing faith and true allegiance to some United State of America (v.s. the United States of America, in the plural), AND the state of New Hampshire, but then refering to only ONE constitution, missing the letter "s" for constitutions also in the plural, presuming to be in some league with the state Constitution but for some unknown areason, or mistake, NOT with any allegiance to the Union of fifty states, either way the oath being in-complete and in violation of Article 14, Part First, N.H. Constitution and Bill of Rights, because "Every subject of this state is entitled to a certain remedy" AND (after the ";" simi-colon = "to obtain right and justice" so labeled "Legal Remedies" in the caption but really MORE than that, in a free, COMPLETE, prompt PLUS comformable manner! THUS withOUT the CORRECT oath, "No person... appointed to any public office...shall exercise such office ...until he shall make and subscribe the oath...." These documents that Gregg and Rice signed being clearly NOT any thing that they did "make" on their own, being mere photocopies, and with no "subscription" by Chairman Richardson found anywhere! The office being thus "vacant" with de-factos in some position therein, and as a military flag was last seen there, what they said was the B.L.C. was in fact NOT! and so to likewise enforce RSA Ch. 3-E:1 for the correct law of the flag, furthermore disqualifying Gregg for his interest in the bank(s) whose financial A formal hearing is specifically interests must disqualify him from this B.L.C. requested according to Rule 205.03(e). CERTIFICATION: (by Rule 204(b)(174)), I Joseph S. Haas, the signor have read this document, and am so authorized to file it; plus to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief, there are good grounds to support it and the factual

allegations contained therein are truthful; and "The document, has not been filed

for the purpose of delay or harassment."

Joseph S. Haas / 64 Centre St. Concord, New Hampshire 03301