1	IN THE IOWA DISTRICT COURT FOR POLK COUNTY
2	DRAKE ALDEN SHELTON, * Case No. EQCE086503
3	Petitioner, *
4	* TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
5	*
6	KIMBERLY KAY REYNOLDS, * Friday, May 21, 2021 *
7	Respondent. *
8	
9	THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER came on for a Motion to
10	Dismiss before the Honorable Michael Huppert, District Court Judge, at 10:06 a.m., on Friday, May 21, 2021, at
11	the Polk County Courthouse in the City of Des Moines, Iowa.
12	
13	APPEARANCES
14	For the Petitioner:
15	Pro se
	Pro se
16	Pro se  For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law
16 17	Pro se  For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law  ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  Department of Justice
16 17 18	Pro se  For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law  ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
16 17 18	For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law  ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  Department of Justice  Hoover State Office Building
16 17 18 19 20	For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law  ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  Department of Justice  Hoover State Office Building
16 17 18 19 20 21	For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law  ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  Department of Justice  Hoover State Office Building
16 17 18 19 20 21	For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law  ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL  Department of Justice  Hoover State Office Building
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL Department of Justice Hoover State Office Building Des Moines, IA 50319
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	For the Respondent:  SAMUEL LANGHOLZ, Attorney at Law ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL Department of Justice Hoover State Office Building Des Moines, IA 50319  LINDSAY M. BENI, CSR, RPR Official Court Reporter

1	<u>I N D E X</u>
2	WITNESSES Page
3	No testimony taken.
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	<u>E X H I B I T S</u>
10	Exhibits Offered/Received
11	No exhibits admitted.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

## PROCEEDINGS

(Proceedings commenced at 10:06 a.m. on the 21st day of May, 2021, via GoToMeeting.)

2.0

THE COURT: This is in the matter of Drake Alden Shelton versus Kimberly Kay Reynolds, Case

No. EQCE086503. This is the date and time previously set for hearing on the respondent's motion to dismiss. The record should reflect that the parties and counsel are appearing for this hearing either by video conference or telephonically as previously directed.

Mr. Langholz, it's your motion. Can't hear you.

MR. LANGHOLZ: Good morning, Your Honor. My name is Sam Langholz. I'm with the Attorney General's Office. I'm sorry. Am I coming through?

THE COURT: Yeah. There's a delay that I didn't pick up on. You're fine.

MR. LANGHOLZ: Okay. Thank you. I represent Governor Reynolds in this matter. Our motion to dismiss argues that this case should be dismissed for two reasons, that it fails to state a claim because the proclamations were validly issued and also because Mr. Shelton lacks standing to challenge this claim.

It appears that Mr. Shelton's petition seeks to challenge both the current proclamations as well as

speculative future proclamations to declare that the proclamations do not apply to him or any future orders would not apply to him.

However, Mr. Shelton has not identified in the petition any actual injury that he's currently suffering from the proclamations currently in effect.

In fact, if one were to review the current proclamations, there essentially are no directives that affect any members of the public, even if being a general member of the public would be sufficient injury to challenge the proclamation. But in any event, both being the general public and not identifying anything in the proclamation that injures Mr. Shelton, he lacks any standing to challenge the current proclamations.

To the extent he's challenging a future order, he specifically identifies an order regarding vaccination, you know, no -- any such challenge is speculative and is insufficient as a matter of law to be sufficient injury in order to proceed with this lawsuit. With that, I will rest on our brief for the remainder unless Your Honor has any questions.

THE COURT: No, thank you. Mr. Shelton, go ahead.

MR. SHELTON: Okay. I, Drake Alden Shelton, by way of special and material visitation with the Court

and not a general appearance or in public and I, the living man, Drake Alden Shelton, personally appears a member of the Shelton Family Society. I am happy to address the judge with a term of respect such as Your Honor as long as it is understood that when I use that term of respect, we are still speaking man to man.

I require this Court to issue an order acknowledging my exclusion, exemption, and immunity from every present and future order, requirement, direction, limitation, prohibition or restriction proceeding from the alleged Novel Coronavirus 2019 disaster emergency, especially any future orders of vaccination that would discriminate against me or threaten my ability or right to contract the employed or do business with any other manner entities in the State of Iowa and the response given it to it by the State of Iowa, Governor Kim Reynolds, and every other agent or principal involved in the Iowa governor's disaster proclamations.

Stating in support I, Drake Alden Shelton, move this honorable Court for a default judgment against defendant Kimberly Kay Reynolds, though there are many matters I could bring up to this hearing, the fact that the judge has confined our time to one hour, I believe the following brief facts which would take me approximately five minutes and 30 seconds to read are

1 sufficient to enter a default judgment in my favor. 2 THE REPORTER: Mr. Shelton, this is the reporter. I know you're reading, and that's fine, but 3 4 could you slow down a tad bit? I want to make sure I get it all down perfect. 5 MR. SHELTON: All right. 6 7 THE REPORTER: Thank you. MR. SHELTON: Do you need me to repeat 8 anything or is it okay if I continue? 9 No, after the default 10 THE REPORTER: 11 judgement sentence you can start there but slow it down 12 a tad. Thank you. 13 MR. SHELTON: Okay. It's around five minutes and 30 seconds of reading. Is that concise 14 enough for the hearing? 15 16 THE COURT: That's up to you to decide how 17 you want to make your record, Mr. Shelton. I've got the 18 If you're just repeating what's been filed, filings. 19 what's somewhat redundant, but I'll leave it to you. 2.0 MR. SHELTON: All right. Number one, I have 21 done my due diligence to settle this matter privately. I've fulfilled all requirements for administrative 22 23 remedy and my conditional acceptance of contract and 24 lawful notice to comply COVID-19 restrictions and 25 requirements. There are three defaults which I filed

with my original petition for declaratory judgment.

This Fifth Amendment process and due process requirement of administrative remedy is explained in Myers versus Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation at 4252 in the year 1938. Kim Reynolds has failed to meet her contractual obligations that she acquiesced to her by silence. She has breached our contract by failing to sign to acknowledge my immunity. This is the cause of action. I require the Court to enforce these contractual obligations by entering a default judgment against the defendant, Kimberly K. Reynolds.

Number 2, Kim Reynolds has not appeared to this case as of yet. The statements of her attorneys are not facts of this Court's consideration, as I pointed out in my reply to affirmative defenses on May 9th of 2021. First, the Sixth Amendment refers to assistance of counsel, not representation. Second, the Federal Rules of Evidence 602 repeated in Iowa Rule 5.602 requires witnesses to have firsthand knowledge of a matter. Thomas J. Miller, Jeffrey C. Peterzalek or any other of her attorneys have no firsthand knowledge of the case and are therefore not lawful witnesses relevant to anything in this case. Their statements are mere hearsay and lack competence.

Thirdly, Trinsey versus Pagliaro, 1964 civil

case reads quote, Statements of counsel and their briefs or argument, while enlightening to the Court, are not sufficient for purposes of granting a motion to dismiss or summary judgment, unquote. Supreme Court case Holt versus United States, 1910 at 250 reads, quote, No instruction was asked. As we have said, the judge told the jury that they were to regard only the evidence admitted by him, not statements of counsel etc., unquote. Fifthly, a maxim of equity reads, "Equity acts on the person." Notice that maxim does not say equity acts on a representative of a person.

Main argument Number 3. In this case, I am not directly challenging Kim Reynolds' claims to emergency powers. I am challenging the existence of a disaster that is the condition for her to claim her emergency powers. According to her code that she joined herself to in her proclamations, she must first put an effort to verify that there's a disaster before she can declare her claimed emergency powers. Her code reads at 29C.6, Proclamation of Disaster Emergency by Governor, quote, in exercising the governor's powers and duties under this chapter and to the effect of policy and purpose, the governor may, one, after finding a disaster exists or is threatened, proclaim a state of disaster or emergency, unquote.

Kim Reynolds has put nothing into evidence to prove the existence of any COVID-19 pandemic disaster. There is no admissible evidence that Kim Reynolds put in any effort to find any disaster or test a single theory or claim being promoted by the World Health Organization, the CDC, or any other government or media outlet promoting this alleged Novel Coronavirus 2019 disaster emergency.

In Kim Reynolds' January 2021 proclamation, Clauses 1, 2, 4 and 5, she cites hearsay from the World Health Organization, the United States Department of Health and Human Services, and Donald Trump. In Clause 3 and 7 she baselessly claims that a viral outbreak disaster existed. And here's the key. She claimed the existence of transmission of COVID-19. Thus in doing so, she openly espoused the baseless and speculative germ theory of disease and cited no admissible evidence whatsoever for her claims. I filed many citations from learned treatises that agree with my analysis and made many reputations of the germ theory as it applies to the alleged COVID-19 pandemic in my filings.

But for sake of brevity, I simply put this question to the Court. Is there a man or woman coming forward with firsthand knowledge making a claim of the transmission of COVID-19? Yes or no? If the answer is

no, I Drake Alden Shelton, the living man, move this 1 2 honorable court to enter a default judgment against defendant Kimberly Kay Reynolds. Thank you. 3 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Shelton. 4 Mr. Langholz, anything else from the 5 6 respondent? 7 MR. LANGHOLZ: Just briefly, Your Honor. Initially I'd like to clarify -- you know, 8 we agree with Mr. Shelton that the Court should not take 9 10 any of my statements as evidence. We are merely representing the governor and recognize that this is a 11 motion to dismiss. You know, the Court doesn't need to 12 13 reach the question of whether there is a proper disaster proclamation if the Court finds that Mr. Shelton doesn't 14 have standing because he's not alleged any particular 15 injury. But even if the Court does reach it, the Court 16 may properly take notice of the full text of the 17 18 proclamation, the many government actions that have been 19 taken around the world, and could also properly conclude 20 that there is a public health disaster emergency going on and dismiss this case on that basis as well. 21 Thank you, Your Honor. 22 23 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Shelton, I'll 24 give you the last word. 25 MR. SHELTON: Right. So I addressed what he

said directly from *Trinsey versus Pagliaro*. It stated, "Statements of counsel and their briefs or argument, while enlightening to the Court, are not sufficient for purposes of granting a motion to dismiss." I directly address what you said.

And secondly, again, he has offered -- first of all, the man is not Kim Reynolds. Kim Reynolds has not appeared to this case. There is absolutely no basis for representation in American law whatsoever. And all he did was cite hearsay, speculations, conjectures. He has no firsthand knowledge. I asked a direct question: Is there a man coming -- man or woman coming forward with firsthand knowledge making claim of a transmission of COVID-19? Yes or no. He had no answer. I motion for default judgment.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, sir. Let me take a look at what's been filed. As soon as I'm in a position to do so, I will enter a ruling on the motion. And if the motion is granted, that will take care of the case at this level. If it's denied, we'll schedule further proceedings consistent with the filings, and we're off the record.

(Proceedings concluded at 10:19 a.m. on the 21st day of May, 2021.)

## <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u>

I, LINDSAY M. BENI, Certified Shorthand
Reporter and Official Reporter for the Fifth Judicial
District of Iowa, do hereby certify that I was present
during the foregoing proceedings and took down in
shorthand the testimony and other proceedings held; that
said shorthand notes were transcribed by me by way of
computer-aided transcription; and that the foregoing
pages of transcript contain a true, complete, and
correct transcript of said shorthand notes so taken.

DATED this 2nd day of June, 2021.

\_\_\_\_/s/Lindsay M. Beni\_\_\_\_\_ LINDSAY M. BENI, CSR, RPR Official Shorthand Reporter Polk County Courthouse Des Moines, IA 50309 (515) 286-3231 lindsay.beni@iowacourts.gov License No. 1355

19 TRANSCRIPT ORDERED: 5/21/2021 TRANSCRIPT COMPLETED: 6/2/2021