



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on June 19, 2012

“Righteous Mutiny” of Paul Pres. Campaign by Group “Lawyers for Ron Paul”

The Republican National Committee is describing a pending legal challenge mounted by supporters of Ron Paul as “frivolous” [according to a document](#) obtained by CNN. Reportedly, although the memo dismisses the lawsuit, it outlines a “joint defense effort” to answer the allegations contained in the complaint.



The group that filed the suit is called “[Lawyers for Ron Paul](#),” and in what is breaking news and perhaps shocking to many enlisted in the fight for liberty, they have claimed to have wrested control of the national Ron Paul presidential campaign from those in that effort’s official leadership that “[had raised the white flag](#)” and were “[never playing to win](#)” in the first place.

This unofficial takeover is being described as a “righteous mutiny” with organizers of the coup calling the lawsuit filed in the Ninth Circuit Court the “tip of the spear” of the continuing campaign to get Ron Paul elected president.

[The lawsuit](#), described as “revolt against Romney,” was filed by the law firm of Gilbert & Marlowe in Santa Ana, California and requests that the court determine:

... whether Plaintiffs are free to vote their conscience on the first and all ballots at the Federal Election known as the Republican National Convention or whether Plaintiffs are bound to vote for a particular candidate as instructed by Defendants’ State Party Bylaws, or State Laws, or the preference of political operatives....

Named as defendants in the lawsuit are the chairmen of every state’s Republican Party, as well as the state party itself.

In all a total of over 143 delegates (presumably national delegates, otherwise the federal court would have no jurisdiction) have joined or asked to join as plaintiffs in the suit.

Among other complaints, the lawsuit alleges that the RNC violated its own rules and applicable federal voting statutes by:

Certifying “unlawful slates of Delegates that were not elected in accordance with the US Statues and US Supreme Court Decisions cited, nor in accordance with the proper Bylaws of Defendants;”

Engaging “in a scheme to intimidate and harass Delegates who were supporting a Candidate that Defendants did not approve of;”

Forcing delegates to “sign affidavits under penalty of perjury with the threat of criminal



Written by [Joe Wolverton, II, J.D.](#) on June 19, 2012

prosecution for perjury as well as financial penalties and fines if the Delegate fails to vote as instructed by Defendants rather than vote the Delegate's conscience as mandated by the US Statutes and US Supreme Court;"

Denying "a quorum or to manipulate Delegates supporting a particular Candidate to be deprived of a fair election as a Delegate;"

Using "threats of violence including dressing security type people in dark clothing searching out supporters of a Candidate Defendants do not approve of to harass and intimidate said Delegates from voting their conscience;"

Unlawfully using "State Bylaws and in some cases State Laws to harass and intimidate Delegates from voting their conscience;" and

Altering "the voting ballot results to fraudulently reflect an outcome that is inconsistent with the actual voting ballot results for the purpose of certifying a fraudulently selected slate of Delegates to support the Candidate of Defendants' choice rather than the Delegates properly elected."

If the court does not issue an immediate injunction blocking these actions, the plaintiffs argue, they will suffer irreparable harm.

In [an interview with Courthouse News](#), the plaintiffs' lead attorney Richard Gilbert explained his clients' motivation:

When nominating someone for a federal office, all delegates must be free to vote their conscience. They don't want to be bound to any candidate, or even be forced to vote for the nominee. To have a real convention, the delegates must have free will so that when they meet, they can persuade each other and then decide who to vote for.

This notion of "binding" delegates to vote for one candidate despite the dictates of their conscience is one of the many bones of contention being fought over by those loyal to Ron Paul and those who accept Mitt Romney as the "presumptive nominee."

The RNC argues that the winner of the popular vote (Mitt Romney in most cases) should also received at least a corresponding percentage of that state's delegates elected at the state conventions, while the plaintiffs in this lawsuit (and the Paul campaign itself) insist that delegates are empowered by RNC Rule 38 to vote their consciences and cannot be forced to vote for the winner of the state primaries.

Promising to "carry on the fight," the executive committee of the Lawyers for Ron Paul is actively seeking new plaintiffs to add to the lawsuit and they continue to promote the message that the war is not over and that despite the fact (as they see it) that Ron Paul's national campaign staff has "thrown in the towel," the grassroots supporters around the country still have the power to get their man into the White House.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

[Subscribe](#)