

April 16, 2021

Dear Senator McBroom,

First of all, I wish to formally thank you and Rep. Hall for your efforts to issue subpoenas for election data in Detroit and my hometown of Livonia. I am particularly grateful for your rapid response to my request for expedited access to that data prior to the critical proceedings of January 6th. Despite the Livonia Clerk's refusal to abide by your extension of access to the subpoena data, your effort was appreciated and has been acknowledged in several forums since that time.

On March 23, I was at another such forum. I was invited to speak about election fraud at the first in-person meeting of Calhoun County Tea Party in almost a year due to COVID restrictions. Senator Bizon was also in attendance at the meeting. When he addressed the audience, he chose to publicly challenge me to testify once more before the Senate Oversight Committee...this time under oath. This was a polite way of calling me a liar. I may press discussion of topics no one wishes to address, but I do not lie. I accepted his "invitation" without reservation. Upon following up with Senator Bizon, he advised me that I would need to coordinate with you to arrange a mutually acceptable time for my testimony. Upon hearing this, I reached out to you to do just that. After several rounds of informal communications, I received your formal April 9 letter. Upon review of your letter, it appears that there are several matters beyond scheduling which need to be addressed.

If you were under the impression that it was I who sought another audience with your committee, as my remarks above would attest, you were misinformed. Having said that, as you are well aware, I am always eager to have the opportunity to share the evidence of election fraud to which I am privy. There is extreme bias and rampant censorship of this topic in our media. Therefore, it is critical for me to leverage whatever channels are available to inform our citizens on this critical topic despite the enhanced personal exposure to baseless attacks by those who are complicit with the suppression of election fraud information.

You have made it clear that you plan to conduct the pending hearing as a trial with you serving as both prosecutor and judge while I sit as the defendant. So be it. As for the specific claims that you make in your letter, please refer to the exhibits attached to this letter.

Let me be clear. There were no preconditions cited in the challenge issued by Senator Bizon except that I would agree to testify under oath. I am willing to do so despite the threatening assertions in your letter because the truth about the 2020 election fraud deserves to have its day in court.

I am committed to providing you and your committee with compelling evidence of election fraud that the citizens of Michigan not only deserve to hear, but which many of our citizens have shared at significant personal risk.

Per my previous communications, the proposed content for my testimony is as follows:

- Review election processes [15 Min]
- Identify potential fraud mechanisms for subverting election processes [15 Min]
- Provide evidence of these fraud mechanisms pertinent to the 2020 election [30 Min]

If you seek additional information prior to the committee, please recall the words of a dedicated public servant who once said, "We have abandoned the beauty of an unpredictable process. Because it is too chancy. Too messy."

"If we do not stoop to follow the mundane when it is apparently irrelevant, we will only diminish the constitutional protections from abuse when the issues are paramount."

"I recommend that we do not allow fear of the uncertainty of the process to manipulate us into acquiescing to abusing power. I recommend that we do not forget the people who give the power to the legislature to serve them. I recommend that we approach these issues like flint with commitment.... I recommend that we grow some courage."

To be frank, I am not looking forward to testifying before your committee. Please do not construe this as fear of your committee or fear of testifying to the truth. My reluctance is based upon my observation of the political environment in Lansing that comes from eight years of public service. Politics seems to bring out the worst in people who would otherwise seek to do what is right. No matter what I say or what evidence I provide, I am confident that many of the usual suspects in the media will use the opportunity posed by the hearing to continue their defamatory narratives of the past. Sadly, that is the price of courage.

I have paid that price before.

I was denied committee chairmanships during my second term for being too vocal in my opposition to Obamacare expansion and Common Core.

I had my legislation blacklisted and committee hearings on election fraud obstructed.

I was removed from committee assignments the day after advising Senate Majority Leader Arlan Meekhof that I did not work for him, I worked for the people of Michigan.

I was even the target of firearm brandishing in caucus by Senator Meekhof and subsequently challenged to a duel in front of members of the MI Senate Republican Caucus for the grievous sin of disagreeing with him on policy direction (ironically, I was in opposition to his gun control proposals).

Silence on matters of great import, however, have their price as well.

In the wake of the 2020 elections, America has been fundamentally transformed. Free speech is dead. Freedom of assembly and our right to petition the government for redress of grievances are significantly infringed. Religious liberty, personal privacy and our gun rights are in the crosshairs.

I am willing to pay the price of courage yet again. The stakes for our nation are simply too high to ignore.

Please advise as to your committee availability regarding times and dates so that we can arrive at a mutually agreeable schedule for a hearing.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patrick Colbeck", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Patrick Colbeck

BACKGROUND

I have done my best to breakdown and organize the claims you make in you April 9th letter. If I missed any of your salient points, please advise. Before I address each of these claims specifically, I believe it is important to provide a general overview of our communications to date. My records indicate that I have reached out to you via email with the following messages:

- 11/6 Key Information
- 11/27 Process Flows
- 12/1 MI Testimony
- 12/7 Ramsland Affidavit
- 12/9 Dominion Wayne County Training Audio
- 12/12 Committee Questions
- 12/15 Critical Subpoena Data
- 1/3 FW: Livonia Subpoena Data
- 1/3 UPDATE: Livonia Subpoena Data
- 3/24 Senate Testimony Under Oath
- 4/12 FW: Response Request

To date, I have no record of a single email responses from you to any of these email communications. You have been on occasions much more responsive to text messages, but at no time prior to the submittal of your April 9 letter do I have records of any requests for information by you related to the claims which you cite in this letter.

In addition to these communication channels, you also have my phone number. You could have called me and asked me to provide this information or you could have simply responded to previous emails. If the information is within my ability to provide it, I have been extremely responsive in providing that information. Instead, you chose to make claims in your letter which, together with your choice to share your letter with the media before reaching out to me, seem to indicate that you are much more interested in continuing your public disparagement of me than pursuing the truth. Only you know your true motivations in this regard.

CLAIM 1: I have asked you to prove that internet connectivity had resulted in some changing or manipulation of votes but you did not have the material.

The only inquiry of that nature from you of which I am aware was when you asked the following question during my December 1 testimony before your committee. "How do we move from what's possible to what's actually happened?"

You may recall that I already provided you with an answer. "By getting access to the actual data...particularly the flash cards" to which you accurately added "and the chain of custody issues".

We need access to the data that has been requested not only of Antrim County in the current lawsuit by plaintiff Bill Bailey, but also the data in other counties such as Wayne County. Instead, citizens have been treated to an endless barrage of obfuscation, delays, threats and attempts to erase information pertinent to either demonstrating that we indeed had fair elections or that our current indications of fraud should lead to criminal convictions. In Antrim County alone, Clerk Sheryl Guy has demonstrated a pursuit of cover-up not transparency. The much-maligned ASOG report correctly noted evidence of

attempts to modify and delete security logs. Later, Sheryl Guy admitted to being responsible for these attempts during a County Commissioner meeting. She then attempted to dismiss the lawsuit in which she is a material witness. Lastly, she attempted to “reinstall” the election software on the same machines subject to investigation in that lawsuit and subject to federal records retention statute.

Couple this behavior with the continued obfuscation in Wayne County from the City of Livonia and the City of Detroit in response to your subpoenas and we have a serious issue with access to the electronic information that supports the observed evidence of election fraud. Furthermore, I have been told that any legislator wishing to examine the information provided to date by these clerks must first sign an NDA. Why would legislators be subject to NDA’s as a condition for looking at the data provided by clerks in Wayne County? Suffice it to say, such behavior does not improve public confidence in the integrity of the 2020 election.

CLAIM 2: I asked for specific source for the page showing fractional voting but did not receive a sourcing of this slide for you to review yourself.

During the hearing, the slide citing evidence of fractional voting referenced a sworn affidavit made by Russ Ramsland as filed in the Michigan lawsuit filed by Attorney Sidney Powell in Michigan. Since this lawsuit and its associated affidavits are a matter of public record, one would assume that you or your staff would know how to access it. For your convenience, I have included a copy of that affidavit with this letter.

CLAIM 3: You privately messaged that (John Poulus, Dominion CEO) was lying to us. Yet, no legal action has been taken by yourself or anyone else related to his statements before the committee.

First, let’s examine John Poulus’ factually incorrect statements:

- Poulus said, “Michigan does not use Ranked Choice Voting. A simple review of Antrim’s ballots confirms this.”
 - Two affidavits contradict this assertion (ASOG Report and Halderman Report) plus a third cyber security expert (CyberNinjas) who examined Antrim County data observed the installation of Ranked Choice Voting module yet failed to mention it in his report. Two out of three asserted that they could find no evidence it was active, but the unredacted ASOG report would likely provide additional insights on this matter. I encourage you to seek access to the unredacted ASOG report especially since it was redacted on the basis of a false assertion by the AG representative relating to source code. The CyberNinja report clearly states that there was no source code among the data obtained from the available Antrim County hard drives. Furthermore, evidence of fractional votes supporting the implementation of Ranked Choice Voting module was evident in the results feed from Dominion Servers to media outlets as revealed in Russ Ramsland’s sworn affidavit.
 - A simple review of ballots is insufficient to determine whether or not Ranked Choice Voting module was active. One requires the demonstration that the chain of custody pertaining to all ballots has been maintained prior to reviewing the ballots including validation of the security of upstream links in the chain of custody such as the poll books and qualified voter file as well as the downstream link to the vote tally. If one can be assured that the ballots to be counted have been cast by real voters on real ballots, then one can validate the tabulator accuracy at the time

a recount is performed. This recount can then be compared against reports generated by the tabulators on election day. To date, there have been four separate tabulations of the results in Antrim County. Not one of them has the same count.

Date	Registered Voters	Total Votes Cast	Biden	Trump	Third Party	Write-In	TOTAL VOTES for President
Nov 3	22,082	16,047	7,769	4,509	145	14	12,423
Nov 5	22,082	18,059	7,289	9,783	255	20	17,327
Nov 21	22,082	16,044	5,960	9,748	241	23	15,949
Dec 17	22,082		5,959	9,759	244	20	15,962

- Poulus said, “None of Antrim’s tabulators were connected to the internet. Antrim county does not have modems. They do not use modems.”
 - Dominion provided Antrim County with a quote for 17 modems ostensibly for precincts and another five for the transmission of the results. While I was not present in Antrim County to investigate any physical evidence of internet connectivity, it would be logical to assume that the modems were procured to connect Dominion voting systems to the internet or whatever euphemism they are using for a “secure remote connection”. This quote has been included for your reference.

NOTE: What the CEO of Dominion dismisses as “human error” regarding Error #2 in Antrim County (“Election officials forgot to conduct public accuracy test on new election project”) is actually a violation of MCL 168.798 and should be grounds for decertification of the election.

Second, regarding failure to file lawsuits, please note that I am not a lawyer nor am I a prosecutor nor do I work for the Attorney General’s office. These are the officials who should be filing lawsuits on behalf of the citizens of Michigan. Also, contrary to the malicious, defamatory statements of Dominion and their accomplices in the media, I do not have the financial resources to do so. Sadly, today’s justice system appears to be reserved for those with significant financial resources. You are an elected representative. You have access to such resources. When the Governor posed a threat to your legislative authority, the legislature filed a lawsuit. When the Secretary of State or other parties abuse the rights of the people you represent, you are silent. The fact remains that you have the means of filing lawsuits on behalf of the people if you so choose plus you also have the power of the purse to enact reforms should there be a will to do so.

CLAIM 4: Your slides do not present a rebuttal to his testimony regarding the origins of Dominion.

To what slides are you referring? I did not present any slides specific to the origins of Dominion during my presentation on December 1.

CLAIM 5: Questions about your financial gain and personal credibility are entirely relevant and admissible

My response to Dominion's maliciously defamatory statements is a matter of public record. I have attached a copy of my response for your reference. Can I assume that the financial gain and personal credibility of any Senator wishing to make such inquiries are subject to such inquiry as well? Would they be required to testify under oath? Would they waive their legislative immunity?

CLAIM 6: Willingness to persist with failed arguments and associate with known liars

Specifically which arguments that I have made are "failed"? Who has determined they are "failed" and by what reasoning?

Since my service in the Michigan Legislature has come to an end, I am hard pressed to identify any association with known liars. To whom specifically are you referring?

CLAIM 7: You tear down all others

It is very true that I have been disappointed with the response to evidence of significant election fraud by the majority of those who are supposed to serve us in the legislature not to mention their tepid response to the Governor's infringement of civil liberties in response to COVID.

It is very frustrating that I, with my "former" prefix in front of "Senator", seem to be the one leading the charge for the rectification of election fraud during the 2020 election. As a consequence, I often get asked by people during public forums "why don't our elected officials do anything about it?". My one word response is "fear". Those who have attempted to take a stand in contradiction to statements made by leadership have been penalized and marginalized...not simply by the usual suspects in the media but by prominent members of their own party. The authority of those in "leadership" positions has definitely been abused as you noted so eloquently during your farewell speech on the House floor.

What would you prefer that I say in response to questions such as "why aren't our elected officials doing anything to address the 2020 election fraud?"