

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLORIDA**

MANUEL P. ASENSIO,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.: _____

RANDY FINE, individually and as a
candidate for United States Representative
for Florida's Sixth Congressional District,

Defendant.

_____/

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

Plaintiff Manuel P. Asensio sues Defendant Randy Fine for declaratory relief under Chapter 86, Florida Statutes, and states:

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is an action for declaratory judgment arising from an actual, present, and continuing controversy concerning the delivery, receipt, notice, and legal effect of Plaintiff Manuel P. Asensio's July 19, 2026 Investigative Report ("July 19 Report") during the 2026 Republican primary election for United States Representative for Florida's Sixth Congressional District.
2. Plaintiff Manuel P. Asensio and Defendant Randy Fine are opposing candidates seeking the Republican nomination for United States Representative for Florida's Sixth Congressional District.
3. Defendant Fine presently serves as the incumbent United States Representative for Florida's Sixth Congressional District.
4. On July 19, 2026, Plaintiff completed and verified an extensive investigative report concerning a structural constitutional issue central to the faithfulness or faithlessness of the administration of the federal judicial power of the United States, at the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, and Federal Judicial Center by Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., related federal judicial administration of the Freedom of Information Act, the Ethics in Government Act, the Rules Enabling Act, and the Judicial Conduct Act of October 15,

1980, and litigation addressing those matters in this court and the United States District Court, Middle District Of Florida, Jacksonville Division.

5. The July 19 Report also contains Plaintiff's investigation, evidence, judgments, and conclusions concerning litigation undertaken by President Donald J. Trump against Chief Justice Roberts and other federal judges who control in the administrative structure of the US courts and the laws created by Congress to govern them.
6. Plaintiff concludes in the July 19 Report that lawyers acting on behalf of President Trump in those matters acted under the Plaintiff's earlier action but narrowed and weakened actions against Chief Justice Roberts undertaken on President Trump's behalf and ultimately abandoned them after they were dismissed litigation after the Plaintiff's action to intervene was concealed and without adjudication of the larger structural constitutional matters documented by Plaintiff.
7. Plaintiff has made the July 19 Report and its evidentiary and constitutional record a central issue of his candidacy for Congress.
8. Plaintiff has repeatedly delivered that report directly to Defendant Fine and through persons authorized to receive communications for Defendant Fine, the chairpersons and officials of each of the counties that constitute Florida's Sixth Congressional District, and the Chairwoman of the Republican Congressional Caucus for Florida's Sixth Congressional District, Sharon Demers.
9. Plaintiff states that the July 19 Report was transmitted to Defendant Fine, Jason Fisher, Fine's Chief of Staff, and Marie Rogerson, Fine's former Deputy Chief of Staff, Fine's former Campaign Manager and former Deputy Chief of Staff, and close friend who is in regular contact with Fine.
10. The controversy concerning notice did not end there.
11. Plaintiff thereafter participated on August 8, 2026 in an approximately forty-minute telephone conversation with Rogerson, and Brandon Wolfe who is Plaintiff's the Chief of Staff, Legal Coordinator, and Campaign Manager, concerning the July 19 Report, its prior delivery to Fine, Fisher, the related litigation, the constitutional controversy, and Plaintiff's demand that Fine confront the report publicly.
12. Rogerson thereafter continued the conversation separately with Wolf and provided Wolf with Fisher's telephone number so that Wolf could communicate directly with Fine's Chief of Staff concerning the same matter.
13. Fisher thereafter denied receiving the report and stated: **"I never received the Investigator report."**

15. That statement presents a direct factual controversy with Plaintiff's evidence concerning the prior transmission and confirmation of delivery of the report to Fisher.
16. Plaintiff thereafter continued efforts to eliminate any possible uncertainty concerning notice.
17. On August 9, 2026, the day following the August 8, 2026 Rogerson communication, Plaintiff repeatedly telephoned and left messages for Demers, Fine, Fisher, and Rogerson, and repeatedly transmitted or caused to be transmitted by email and text message links through which they could immediately obtain the July 19 Report.
18. Fine, Fisher, and Rogerson did not respond to those communications from Plaintiff.
19. On August 9th, Plaintiff also left messages concerning the July 19 Report with Fine's campaign.
20. Plaintiff separately left messages concerning the report with Fine's Washington, D.C. congressional office.
21. Plaintiff further submitted or instructed to be submitted a request for a meeting with Fine and included within that request a direct link through which the July 19 Report could be accessed.
22. The July 19 Report has continuously been publicly available on the **official Republican Party website of the St. Johns Republican Presidential Executive Committee, StJohnsGOP.org**, separate and distinct from Plaintiff's congressional campaign websites and other issue-specific websites. The Report has also been continuously available through Plaintiff's websites, including TruthToTrump.com, AsensioForCongress.com, and Asensio4Congress. The St. Johns Republican Presidential Executive Committee and its official website are identified separately because they constitute a Republican political organization and Republican communications platform independent of Plaintiff's congressional campaign websites.
23. Plaintiff does not contend that Internet publication by itself necessarily establishes legal receipt by Defendant Fine.
24. Rather, the public availability of the report is part of a cumulative notice record that includes direct transmission, confirmation of transmission, communications with present and former senior Fine staff, direct telephone and text communications to Fine's Chief of Staff, messages to Fine's campaign, messages to Fine's Washington office, presentations at meeting of Republican clubs, emails and conversations with leaders of the Republican Executive Committees in the Sixth Congressional District,

and multiple meeting requests containing a direct link to the report, and extensive conversation in person and by telephone with Demers.

25. Plaintiff has continuously communicated concerning the July 19 Report, the matters it presents, and Plaintiff's demand that those matters be addressed in the congressional election with Aaron Baker who is also running against Fine and has agreed to debate the issues raised in the July 19 Report and communicated Baker's agreement with Republican county chairmen and persons participating in or associated with Demers and the Republican Congressional Caucus.
26. Notwithstanding those repeated communications, Fine's Chief of Staff has expressly denied receiving the report.
27. Plaintiff therefore seeks judicial determination of the concrete questions whether the July 19 Report was delivered to and received by Fisher and whether delivery and receipt through Fine's Chief of Staff constituted legally imputable notice to Fine.

II. RELATED JUDICIAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROCEEDINGS

28. This action arises within a continuing factual, political, judicial, and constitutional record and is related to *Asensio v. Power*, Case No. CA-26-0993, Division 55, pending in the Circuit Court of the Seventh Judicial Circuit in and for St. Johns County, Florida.
29. In *Asensio v. Power*, Plaintiff brought claims against Evan Power individually and Denver Cook individually arising from conduct involving Republican Party authority, political organization, Plaintiff's participation in the Republican primary for Florida's Sixth Congressional District, Republican federal-judiciary policy, and related political and organizational conduct.
30. The history pleaded in *Asensio v. Power* predates the present congressional primary. On June 21, 2024, Plaintiff and Robert A. Harris, acting as co-chairmen of the St. Johns Presidential Executive Committee, submitted a written Request for Hearing to the Republican Party of Florida concerning the Committee's charter application, the www.stjohnsgop.org domain, use of GOP identifiers, Republican federal-judiciary policy, political conduct concerning Plaintiff, litigation with US Congresswoman Kat Cammack, and statements made concerning Plaintiff's prior litigation.
31. *Asensio v. Power* therefore forms part of the factual and political record from which the present controversy concerning Fine and the 2026 Sixth Congressional District Republican primary arose.

32. This action is also related factually and constitutionally to the 2026 *Asensio v. Roberts* action filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Florida, Jacksonville Division.
33. In that action, Plaintiff Manuel P. Asensio and Citizens United Against Judicial Supremacy, LLC seek declaratory and injunctive relief against John G. Roberts, Jr., in his administrative capacity as Presiding Officer of the Judicial Conference of the United States; Robert J. Conrad, Jr., Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts; and Trevor N. McFadden, in his administrative capacity as a member of the Judicial Conference Committee on Court Administration and Case Management.
34. The 2026 *Asensio v. Roberts* action concerns, among other things, access to the courts, the right to a neutral tribunal, First Amendment organizational speech, the Judicial Conference, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, the Federal Judicial Center, and Plaintiff's challenge to the administration of federal judicial authority to govern the laws regulating that administration without direct independent congressional oversight and specific approvals. This is most important in the case of the Plaintiff's pending Consideration before Roberts and President Trump's actions under the Plaintiff's record.
35. The federal action incorporates and arises from a longer judicial and administrative history that includes *Asensio v. DiFiore*, No. 1:18-cv-10933-RA (S.D.N.Y.); *Asensio v. Roberts*, No. 1:19-cv-03384-KPF (S.D.N.Y.); Judicial Conduct Act complaints; proceedings presented to the Judicial Conference beginning in 2019; Plaintiff's June 25, 2021 Demand for Consideration, Resolution, and Reporting; the December 31, 2025 Consideration concerning Judge Trevor N. McFadden; *America First Legal Foundation v. Roberts*, No. 1:25-cv-01232 (D.D.C.); and related judicial-conduct and administrative proceedings.
36. Those proceedings constitute substantial portions of the historical and evidentiary record addressed in the July 19 Report and President Trump.
37. The July 19 Report expressly connects that continuing President Trump and his legal advisors with that federal judicial and administrative record, including the pending *Asensio v. Power* state proceeding, the 2026 *Asensio v. Roberts* federal action, Plaintiff's participation in the Republican primary election for Florida's Sixth Congressional District.

III. PARTIES

38. Plaintiff Manuel P. Asensio is a citizen of the United States and resident of St. Johns County, Florida.
39. Plaintiff is a qualified Republican candidate for United States Representative for Florida's Sixth Congressional District in the 2026 Republican primary election.
40. Plaintiff is the investigator, evidentiary source, and author responsible for the July 19 Report.
41. Plaintiff verified the July 19 Report under penalty of perjury on July 19, 2026 and its subsequent improvement solely to extract from the Conclusion and incorporate into a new Section XII the report's discussion of President Donald J. Trump's personal and presidential experience with disputed, unauthorized, unconstitutional, and otherwise questionable governmental and judicial proceedings, including matters arising from the January 6, 2021 constitutional events. No other substantive portion of the report was changed by this modification.
42. Defendant Randy Fine is the incumbent United States Representative for Florida's Sixth Congressional District and an opposing candidate seeking the Republican nomination for that office in the 2026 primary.
43. Fine conducts his governmental, political, electoral, and other activities through employees, staff, representatives, and agents who receive and transmit communications intended for him in Florida and Washington, D.C.
44. Jason Fisher serves as Fine's Chief of Staff.
45. Upon information presently available to Plaintiff, Fisher performs or has performed senior responsibilities concerning communications and matters directed to Fine.
46. Marie Rogerson formerly served as Fine's Campaign Manager and Deputy Chief of Staff.

IV. JURISDICTION, VENUE, AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

47. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to Chapter 86, Florida Statutes.
48. Section 86.011, Florida Statutes, authorizes Florida trial courts to declare rights, status, and other equitable or legal relations whether or not further relief is or could be claimed.

49. Section 86.011 further authorizes declaratory adjudication concerning the existence or nonexistence of facts upon which an immunity, power, privilege, right, status, or other legal relation does or may depend.
50. Plaintiff seeks adjudication of presently existing and ascertainable facts rather than an advisory opinion concerning hypothetical future conduct.
51. The controversy is concrete.
52. Plaintiff maintains that the July 19 Report was transmitted to and received by Fine's Chief of Staff.
53. Fine's Chief of Staff has expressly stated: **"I never received the Investigator report."**
54. Plaintiff possesses and identifies evidence, witnesses, communications, transmissions, and subsequent events inconsistent with that denial.
55. Whether the report was received and whether receipt through Fisher constitutes notice to Fine are therefore existing and adverse factual and legal positions capable of determination through judicial process.
56. Plaintiff resides in St. Johns County, Florida.
57. Plaintiff's July 19 Report was created and completed, and verified, in St. Johns County.
58. Plaintiff's congressional campaign is conducted in Florida's Sixth Congressional District, which includes St. Johns County.
59. Material communications and events giving rise to this action occurred in, originated from, or directly affected Plaintiff in St. Johns County.
60. Venue is proper in this Court.

V. THE JULY 19, 2026 INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

61. On July 19, 2026, Plaintiff completed and verified the July 19 Report.
62. The report contains Plaintiff's investigative findings, evidence, factual statements, judgments, and conclusions concerning structural questions involving federal judicial authority and administration, and President Trump's legal actions related thereto.
63. The report addresses the Judicial Conference of the United States, Chief Justice John G. Roberts, Jr., federal judicial administration, related Judicial Conduct Act conduct

and structural proceedings, and state and federal litigation concerning those institutions and officials.

64. The report also addresses Plaintiff's findings concerning litigation undertaken in connection with President Trump's publicly stated objections to judicial weaponization and the conduct of federal judicial actors.
65. Plaintiff concludes that important legal actions undertaken in President Trump's interests under the Plaintiff's record were narrowed, weakened, and abandoned without presenting or adjudicating the larger structural record documented in Plaintiff's investigation.
66. Plaintiff verified that factual statements in the report based upon his personal knowledge were true; that those statements derived from documents, records, communications, and identified sources accurately reflected those materials to the best of his knowledge and belief; and that the judgments and conclusions in the report represented his good-faith conclusions drawn from the evidence presented.
67. Plaintiff has placed that investigative record before Fine, the Republican Party, and the voters of Florida's Sixth Congressional District.
68. Plaintiff has requested that Fine review the report and publicly accept, reject, dispute, explain, or otherwise address the material constitutional issue in the report and its conclusions.

VI. INITIAL TRANSMISSION TO JASON FISHER

69. Plaintiff and Robert A. Harris caused the July 19 Report to be transmitted to Fine and to Jason Fisher for delivery to and consideration by Fine.
70. Fisher was selected as the recipient because Fisher was Fine's Chief of Staff and occupied a senior position through which a substantial communication directed to Fine could reasonably be presented.
71. The transmission was deliberate and specifically directed to Fine through Fisher.
72. Robert A. Harris possesses personal knowledge concerning these transmissions and delivery of the report.
73. Plaintiff subsequently received information through Demers confirming that the report had been delivered to Fisher.
74. Plaintiff also received communications through Demers concerning whether Fine would participate in a debate with Plaintiff.

75. A date, time, and place for the debate were organized and scheduled, and this information was delivered to Fine, Demers, and Baker.
76. Those communications reinforced Plaintiff's understanding that Fine's organization had received the July 19 Report through Fisher.

VII. AUGUST 8, 2026 COMMUNICATION WITH MARIE ROGERSON

76. On August 8, 2026, Plaintiff Manuel P. Asensio and Brandon Wolf participated in an approximately forty-minute telephone conversation with Marie Rogerson.
77. Rogerson formerly served as Fine's Deputy Chief of Staff.
78. The approximately forty-minute conversation concerned the July 19 Report, its factual and constitutional subject matter, the related litigation, the prior delivery of the report to Fisher, and Plaintiff's request that Fine publicly address the matters contained in the report.
79. Plaintiff personally participated in and possesses personal knowledge of that conversation.
80. Brandon Wolfe participated in and possessed personal knowledge of that conversation.
81. Plaintiff explained that the report had been delivered to Fisher.
82. Plaintiff explained the related state and federal litigation.
83. Plaintiff explained the constitutional controversy documented in the report.
84. Plaintiff explained his demand that Fine publicly confront the report and its contents.
85. Rogerson communicated her position concerning whether Fine would participate in such a debate.
86. After Plaintiff ceased participating in the call, Rogerson continued the conversation separately with Wolf concerning the same matter.
87. During that continuing communication, Rogerson provided Wolf with Fisher's telephone number.
88. The telephone number was provided so that Wolf could communicate directly with Fine's Chief of Staff concerning the report and the matters that had just been discussed.

89. Rogerson's direct referral of Wolf to Fisher further corroborated Plaintiff's understanding that Fisher was a senior Fine representative through whom the matter was appropriately presented.

VIII. DIRECT COMMUNICATION WITH FISHER AND HIS EXPRESS DENIAL

90. Following the communications described above, Wolf communicated with Fisher concerning the July 19 Report.

91. Fisher thereafter stated that he had not received the report.

92. Fisher specifically stated: **"I never received the Investigator report."**

93. Plaintiff pleads that statement as Fisher's statement concerning receipt of the July 19 Report.

94. Fisher's statement directly conflicts with Plaintiff's evidence concerning the earlier transmission of the report to Fisher and confirmation concerning its delivery.

95. Fisher's denial transformed what otherwise might have remained a question of communication into an express and ascertainable factual controversy concerning receipt.

96. Plaintiff disputes Fisher's statement.

97. Plaintiff states that Fisher had previously been transmitted the July 19 Report.

98. Plaintiff further states that the surrounding communications and subsequent events provide additional evidence from which receipt and notice may be determined.

IX. PLAINTIFF'S SUBSEQUENT DIRECT NOTICE TO FISHER

99. Plaintiff did not rely exclusively upon the prior transmission once he learned that Fisher denied receiving the report.

100. On the following day, Plaintiff personally undertook repeated additional efforts to place the July 19 Report directly before Fisher.

101. Plaintiff repeatedly telephoned Fisher.

102. Plaintiff left messages for Fisher concerning the matter.

103. Plaintiff repeatedly sent or caused to be sent text messages to Fisher.

104. Those text messages included a direct link through which Fisher could access the July 19 Report.

105. Plaintiff's purpose in sending those communications was to eliminate any possible uncertainty concerning Fisher's access to the report and Fine's notice of it.

106. Fisher did not respond to Plaintiff's telephone messages and text communications.

107. Plaintiff therefore states that, regardless of the dispute concerning the original transmission, Fisher was thereafter repeatedly provided direct communications identifying the report and direct electronic means of accessing it.

X. ADDITIONAL DIRECT NOTICE TO FINE'S CAMPAIGN AND WASHINGTON OFFICE

108. Plaintiff also communicated or attempted to communicate directly through additional channels maintained for Fine.

109. Plaintiff left messages concerning the July 19 Report with Fine's campaign.

110. Plaintiff separately left messages concerning the report with Fine's Washington, D.C. office.

111. Plaintiff identified the report and the controversy concerning it in those communications.

112. Plaintiff further submitted or caused to be submitted a request for a meeting with Fine.

113. Plaintiff included with the meeting request a direct link to the July 19 Report.

114. The meeting request therefore did not merely ask for unspecified access to Fine.

115. It affirmatively identified and provided electronic access to the investigative material that Plaintiff sought to discuss.

116. Those direct communications constitute additional evidence of Plaintiff's continuing efforts to place the report before Fine and persons responsible for receiving communications intended for him.

XI. PUBLICATION AND CONTINUING PUBLIC AVAILABILITY

117. The July 19 Report has also been continuously available to Fine, his staff, Republican officials, the electorate, and the public through multiple Internet locations.

118. Those locations include TruthToTrump.com.

- 119. They include StJohnsGOP.org.
- 120. They include AsensioForCongress.com.
- 121. They also include Asensio4Congress.
- 122. Those publications identify the July 19 Report with Plaintiff, the constitutional controversy, and Fine's congressional race.
- 123. Plaintiff has publicly directed the report and requests concerning the report to Fine.
- 124. Plaintiff does not contend that public Internet publication, standing alone, necessarily establishes personal receipt by Fine.
- 125. Public availability instead corroborates the broader notice record and establishes that the document at issue was continuously accessible through the links transmitted and communications made to Fisher, Fine's campaign, Fine's Washington office, and others.

XII. CONTINUING COMMUNICATION WITH REPUBLICAN COUNTY LEADERSHIP

- 126. Plaintiff and persons working with him have also continuously communicated concerning the July 19 Report with Republican Party leadership relevant to Florida's Sixth Congressional District.
- 127. Plaintiff has been communicating concerning the report with county Republican chairmen and persons associated with the chairmen's caucus.
- 128. Those communications concern the report, the litigation and constitutional record underlying it, Fine's notice, and Plaintiff's demand that the subject be publicly addressed.
- 129. These communications demonstrate that the report and controversy have not been hidden, private, abandoned, or confined to a single attempted delivery.
- 130. They are part of an ongoing political and evidentiary record in which Plaintiff has repeatedly sought to place the same identified report before Fine and the persons participating in the congressional primary process.

XIII. THE CUMULATIVE NOTICE RECORD

- 131. The issue before the Court is not dependent upon any single communication considered in isolation.
- 132. Plaintiff's evidence concerning delivery and notice is cumulative.

133. The record includes the original transmission of the July 19 Report to Fisher.
134. It includes Robert A. Harris's personal knowledge concerning that transmission.
135. It includes communications involving Demers the highest-ranking official of the Republican Party in the Sixth Congressional District that has been deeply and constantly involved in written and verbal communications concerning the delivery of the July 19 Report and who is directly connected to Power and Cook who are the Defendants in *Asensio v. Power*.
136. It includes the August 8, 2026 approximately forty-minute discussion among Plaintiff, Brandon Wolf, and Marie Rogerson.
137. It includes Rogerson's subsequent continuation of the conversation with Wolf.
138. It includes Rogerson's referral of Wolf directly to Fisher and provision of Fisher's telephone number.
139. It includes Wolf's communication with Fisher.
140. It includes Fisher's express statement: **"I never received the Investigator report."**
141. It includes Plaintiff's subsequent repeated telephone messages to Fisher.
142. It includes Plaintiff's subsequent repeated text communications to Fisher containing a link to the report.
143. It includes Plaintiff's messages to Fine's campaign.
144. It includes Plaintiff's messages to Fine's Washington office.
145. It includes Plaintiff's meeting request containing a link to the report.
146. It includes continuous public availability of the report through TruthToTrump.com, StJohnsGOP.org, AsensioForCongress.com, and Asensio4Congress.
147. It includes Plaintiff's continuing communications with Republican county chairmen and persons associated with the chairmen's caucus.
148. These facts create a present dispute capable of determination from witnesses, telephone records, text messages, electronic communications, website records, transmission records, testimony, admissions, and other competent evidence.

XIV. AGENCY, AUTHORITY, AND IMPUTED NOTICE

149. Fisher served as Fine's Chief of Staff during the communications material to this action.
150. Plaintiff states that a chief of staff occupies a senior representative position through which communications intended for the principal may, according to the actual facts of the relationship, be received, transmitted, evaluated, or acted upon.
151. Plaintiff does not rely solely upon Fisher's title to establish the full scope of Fisher's authority.
152. Plaintiff relies upon the facts and conduct surrounding the communications, including the initial transmission to Fisher, prior confirmation concerning delivery, Rogerson's direct referral of Wolf to Fisher concerning the report, Fisher's own communication concerning whether he had received it, and the communications directed thereafter to Fine's campaign and office.
153. Plaintiff states that those circumstances support determination of whether Fisher possessed actual or apparent authority to receive the July 19 Report or communications concerning it on Fine's behalf.
154. Under Florida agency principles, knowledge or notice obtained by an agent or employee while acting within the scope of the agent's authority concerning a matter material to that authority may be imputed to the principal.
155. Delivery to an authorized representative may therefore have legal effect as notice to the principal notwithstanding the absence of personal hand-delivery to the principal.
156. Plaintiff seeks determination of that agency relationship and its legal consequence as applied to the facts proved in this action.

XV. ACTUAL AND PRESENT CONTROVERSY AND THE LEGAL RELATIONSHIP CREATED BY NOTICE

157. A concrete, present, and adverse controversy exists between Plaintiff and Defendant concerning not merely the historical delivery of the July 19 Report, but the legal status and consequences of Defendant's actual or imputed notice of a defined structural constitutional controversy during an active congressional election.
158. Plaintiff and Defendant are opposing candidates for the same office of United States Representative for Florida's Sixth Congressional District.

159. Defendant is also the incumbent holder of that office and presently exercises the powers and responsibilities of a Member of the United States House of Representatives.
160. The July 19 Report concerns structural constitutional questions involving the administration of federal judicial power, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the relationship between federal judicial administration and Congress, and matters that Plaintiff maintains require congressional examination, accountability, legislation, oversight, or other constitutionally authorized congressional action.
161. The July 19 Report therefore does not concern an unrelated private dispute. It concerns the structure and administration of the federal government and governmental responsibilities that Plaintiff maintains bear directly upon the office presently held by Defendant and sought by both parties.
162. Plaintiff has affirmatively placed that constitutional controversy before Defendant and before the electorate and has demanded that Defendant accept, reject, dispute, explain, or otherwise publicly state his position concerning the report and its conclusions.
163. Whether Defendant received actual or legally imputed notice of that report determines whether Defendant can properly maintain, as a factual or legal position in the ongoing electoral controversy, that the report and constitutional issues were never presented to him or to persons authorized to receive communications for him.
164. Plaintiff maintains that Defendant, through Fisher and the cumulative channels of notice pleaded above, has been placed on actual or legally imputable notice of the July 19 Report and of Plaintiff's demand that its constitutional issues be confronted in the election.
165. Fisher's express statement, **"I never received the Investigator report,"** creates a present adverse position concerning that notice, while Plaintiff's evidence of transmission, confirmation, subsequent communications, repeated links, campaign contacts, congressional-office contacts, and meeting request establishes a competing position susceptible to adjudication.
166. Resolution of receipt and notice will therefore determine an existing legal relationship between the parties: whether Fine, through an authorized representative, has legally received notice of the specific constitutional controversy that Asensio has placed before him as an incumbent Representative and opposing congressional candidate.

167. Plaintiff seeks a declaration that will eliminate the present uncertainty concerning whether the July 19 Report was received, whether Fisher's receipt or knowledge is imputable to Fine, and whether Fine is legally chargeable with notice of the report and the constitutional controversy notwithstanding Fisher's denial and notwithstanding the absence of proof that Fine personally opened or read the document.

168. Plaintiff does not ask this Court in this action to determine the ultimate merits of every constitutional judgment stated in the July 19 Report or to decide the federal constitutional obligations that may arise from Defendant's notice. Plaintiff seeks determination of the predicate state-law questions of delivery, agency, receipt, imputed knowledge, and notice, and of the legal status created by those facts between the parties.

XVI. COUNT I: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT — DELIVERY AND RECEIPT

169. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 168.

170. Plaintiff states that the July 19 Report was transmitted to Fisher for Fine.

171. Fisher has expressly denied receiving it.

172. Fisher stated: **"I never received the Investigator report."**

173. Plaintiff disputes that statement.

174. Plaintiff possesses witnesses and evidence from which the fact of transmission and receipt may be adjudicated.

175. The issue is a present, ascertainable factual controversy.

176. Plaintiff requests a declaration determining whether the July 19 Report was transmitted to and received by Fisher.

XVII. COUNT II: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT — AUTHORITY AND IMPUTED NOTICE

177. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 176.

178. At the times material to this controversy, Fisher served as Fine's Chief of Staff.

179. The July 19 Report was expressly intended for Fine.

180. Plaintiff directed or caused the report to be directed through Fisher because of Fisher's senior representative position.

181. Subsequent conduct, including Rogerson's referral of Wolf directly to Fisher concerning the same report, provides additional evidence relevant to Fisher's authority and role.

182. Plaintiff requests a declaration determining whether Fisher possessed actual or apparent authority to receive the July 19 Report or communications concerning that report on Fine's behalf.

183. Plaintiff further requests a declaration that, if Fisher received the report while acting within the scope of such authority, Fisher's receipt constituted legally imputable notice to Fine.

XVIII. COUNT III: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT — LEGAL STATUS AND CONSEQUENCES OF ACTUAL OR IMPUTED NOTICE

184. Plaintiff incorporates paragraphs 1 through 183.

185. The dispute concerning delivery and notice affects an existing legal relationship between Plaintiff and Defendant arising from their status as opposing candidates for the same federal office, Defendant's status as the incumbent officeholder, and Plaintiff's presentation to Defendant of a specific structural constitutional controversy concerning the powers and responsibilities of that office.

186. Plaintiff has expressly presented the July 19 Report to Defendant as a matter requiring Defendant to accept, reject, dispute, explain, or otherwise address its constitutional premises, factual findings, evidence, judgments, and conclusions.

187. Defendant's actual or imputed notice is therefore legally material to whether Defendant may maintain that the report and constitutional controversy were never presented to him or to an authorized representative acting on his behalf.

188. Plaintiff states that delivery to and receipt by Fisher, if established, placed Defendant Fine on legally imputable notice of the July 19 Report and the controversy it presents.

189. Plaintiff further states that the subsequent direct communications to Fisher, repeated transmission of links to the report, messages to Fine's campaign and congressional office, and the meeting request containing a direct link constitute additional facts relevant to actual or imputed notice.

190. Plaintiff seeks a declaration determining whether the cumulative notice record established at trial legally charges Defendant Fine with notice of the July 19 Report and the structural constitutional controversy presented therein.

191. Plaintiff further seeks a declaration that, if the Court finds legally sufficient receipt or notice through an authorized representative, Defendant Fine may not deny the legal fact of notice solely on the ground that the report was not personally hand-delivered to, opened by, or read by Fine.
192. Plaintiff does not in this Count ask the Court to adjudicate the ultimate federal constitutional merits of the July 19 Report or to determine whether federal law compels Defendant to participate in a political debate.
193. Plaintiff seeks a declaration limited to the parties' present legal status and relations under Florida law concerning delivery, agency, actual or imputed receipt, knowledge, and notice of the identified constitutional controversy.

XIX. REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION

194. The controversy arises during an active Republican primary election for United States Representative for Florida's Sixth Congressional District.
195. Plaintiff and Fine are opposing candidates for that nomination.
196. The underlying report and controversy are presently being communicated to Republican Party officials and voters.
197. The value and practical effect of declaratory relief will be substantially reduced if adjudication occurs only after the electoral controversy has concluded.
198. Section 86.111, Florida Statutes, permits the Court to order a speedy hearing of an action for declaratory judgment and to advance the matter on the calendar.
199. Plaintiff therefore requests expedited consideration consistent with due process and the Court's authority.

XX. PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Manuel P. Asensio respectfully requests that this Court:

- A. Declare whether Plaintiff's July 19, 2026 Investigative Report was transmitted to Jason Fisher;
- B. Declare whether Fisher received the July 19 Report;
- C. Adjudicate the factual controversy created by Fisher's statement, **"I never received the Investigator report"**;
- D. Declare whether Fisher possessed actual or apparent authority to receive the July 19 Report or communications concerning it on behalf of Defendant Fine;

E. Declare that, if Fisher received the July 19 Report within the scope of such authority, Fisher's receipt and knowledge constituted legally imputable notice to Defendant Fine;

F. Determine whether Plaintiff's subsequent telephone messages to Fisher, text communications containing direct links to the report, communications with Fine's campaign, communications with Fine's Washington, D.C. congressional office, and meeting request containing a direct link to the report constitute additional facts establishing actual or legally imputable notice;

G. Declare whether, based upon the cumulative evidence established at trial, Defendant Fine is legally chargeable with notice of the July 19 Report and the structural constitutional controversy presented therein;

H. Declare that, upon proof of legally sufficient receipt through an authorized representative, the legal fact of notice is not defeated solely because the July 19 Report was not personally hand-delivered to, opened by, or read by Defendant Fine;

I. Declare the present legal status and relations of Plaintiff and Defendant under Florida law arising from delivery, receipt, agency, imputed knowledge, and notice of the July 19 Report, without adjudicating in this action the ultimate merits of the federal constitutional issues presented in the report;

J. Advance this action and order a speedy hearing pursuant to section 86.111, Florida Statutes;

K. Award Plaintiff taxable costs to the extent permitted by Florida law;

L. Grant any supplemental relief authorized by Chapter 86 necessary or proper to effectuate the Court's declaration; and

M. Grant such other relief as the Court determines lawful and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

MANUEL P. ASENSIO

Plaintiff, pro se

5122 A1A South

St. Augustine, Fl. 32080

(561) 946-1000

info@stjohnsgop.org

Dated: August 10, 2026

VERIFICATION

I, Manuel P. Asensio, declare that I have read the foregoing Complaint for Declaratory Judgment; that the factual statements based upon my personal knowledge are true; and that factual statements based upon communications, documents, records, and information supplied by identified witnesses accurately state those matters to the best of my knowledge and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this on the 10th day of August 2026, in St. Johns County, Florida.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M P Asensio', written over a horizontal line.

MANUEL P. ASENSIO