Twitter Thread by Vickie Harrell



Vickie Harrell
@vharrelle71



Somebody needs to tell a few people that, a general “policy” argument, telling a court that it has no right to decide an issue when the matter falls squarely within the case and controversy requirements of Art 3, and the Constitution specifically provides for jurisdiction of the=

parties; additionally, the court has federal question jurisdiction, is not a good take, and is not persuasive. Next, an argument of disenfranchisement of voters (a) is weak in countering the Bush v Gore equal protection opinion; (b) is beside the point, when the issues is the=

issue is not issues is

constitutional validity of votes cast by state appointed electors, especially in context of serious allegations that State officials unconstitutionally nullified provisions of statutes passed pursuant to the plenary power of the legislatures and thereby threw into chaos by=

dilution or nullification of their own citizens votes. More on this later-I am studying briefs because someone said “their brief is weak.” The person could not have referred to the TX brief. IMO, Tx did a fine, outstanding job in a case of first=

impression. To my followers, don’t despair if some of the amici are not granted leave to file brief. Court is inundated, does not need to be told what it already knows. Also, time is of the essence. More importantly, the formalities are not everything.

BTW: I don’t know how one arrives to a state “sovereignty” argument that was not reserved to states by express dictates of the federal constitution. TX took care of that in anticipation of such argument in its brief, almost as a shrug. TX was right, sovereignty in context=

Of this case is a shrug. TX- great job. Lots of hooks in your brief to hang more than a few hates on. Kudos.

Not to say TX and its coalition of states will prevail. The Court is under enormous competing political pressures here, bu I am saying, no matter how much some may wish it were so, the case TX brings is by no means frivolous. There are a lot of serious allegations that original=

jurisdiction cannot avoid. We are talking 4 states, wherein the conduct of an election is not about the voters casting votes, but about the conduct of state officials in managing state responsibilities to a national election that is at the outermost limit of unseemly.

I have to say it, arguing unclean hands in context is frightfully ironic! Also, really folks, the SCOTUS is not twitter: the list of horribles such as official threats against, and incitement of the public, riot, recited by you folks has already happened, we have had a summer, no

a few years of it all; so soon as Biden was elected, out came @AOC with her threat of public “enemies” list. The Court will not be so easily dissuaded of its authority by recitation of horribles that have happened mainly at your instigation and could just as well be argued the=

other way. Really?! https://t.co/UDgEzI0v16

Opening paragraph my followers. Reading is believing.

Also, “never in all our history” has so and so asked or requested a court to do thus and such is called a case of “first impression.” I think our SCOTUS is up to it.