

US Supreme Court Backs “Grand Theft” Election 2020

By [Stephen Lendman](#)

Global Research, December 13, 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#)

In-depth Report: [U.S. Elections](#)

On Friday, the Supreme Court declined to hear arguments in what may be remembered one day as the most significant political dispute in US history.

Texas et al v. Pennsylvania et al was the judicial equivalent of Hollywood’s Godzilla v. (King) Kong.

The 1962 horror film was bad fiction. Friday’s Supreme Court action was real life horror, stating the following:

“The State of Texas’s motion for leave to file a bill of complaint is denied for lack of standing under Article III of the Constitution.”

“Texas has not demonstrated a judicially cognizable interest in the manner in which another State conducts its elections.”

“All other pending motions are dismissed as moot.”

The US Constitution’s Article III defines judicial branch and Supreme Court powers.

There’s no ambiguity about brazen election theft for Biden/Harris over Trump.

Arguments presented by Texas AG Ken Paxton were powerful and convincing — supported by constitutional law.

Instead of correcting what he called “a dark shadow of doubt over the outcome of the entire election,” an egregious’ affront to the rule of law, the High Court let it stand — permitting election grand theft instead of reversing it.

Election 2020 was defined by brazen fraud. Yet the Court legitimized what’s illegitimate.

Its nonruling/ruling set a precedent.

Henceforth, US elections decided by brazen fraud will be deemed acceptable as long its ruling class wants their results to stand.

By declining to hear the case, Election 2020 is virtually decided. Injustice triumphed over the rule of law.

On January 20, losers Biden/Harris will be inaugurated.

Trump will move on to other endeavors, his tenure over on that date.

What's coming next is unclear. A statement by the Texas GOP said the following:

"The Supreme Court, in tossing the Texas lawsuit that was joined by seventeen states and 106 US congressmen, has decreed that a state can take unconstitutional actions and violate its own election law."

"Resulting in damaging effects on other states that abide by the law, while the guilty state suffers no consequences."

"This decision establishes a precedent that says states can violate the US constitution and not be held accountable."

"This decision will have far-reaching ramifications for the future of our constitutional republic."

"Perhaps law-abiding states should bond together and form a Union of states that will abide by the constitution."

Trump's legal advisors Rudy Giuliani and Jenna Ellis said they may file new lawsuits in US district courts following the Friday SCOTUS decision not to hear Texas v. Pennsylvania arguments.

Calling its move a "terrible mistake," Giuliani added:

"Basically the courts are saying they want to stay out of this."

"They don't want to give us a hearing."

"They don't want the American people to hear the facts."

"These facts will remain an open sore in our history unless they get resolved."

"They need to be heard. They need to be aired, and somebody needs to make a decision on whether they're true or false."

"And some courts are going to have to have the courage to make that decision."

"The case wasn't rejected on the merits the case. (It) was rejected on standing."

"The answer to that is to bring the case now to the district court by the president, by some of electors alleging the same facts where there would be standing and therefore get a hearing."

According to Ellis, a "line of attack" going forward remains.

Trump's legal team can continue challenging Election 2020 results until Congress affirms Electoral College votes on January 6.

That's the line in the sand after which no further challenges may be legally made.

Ellis slammed the High Court's decision for failing to uphold constitutional law on what one

day may be remembered by historians and jurists as inaction at a time when it was vitally needed.

Hearing, seeing, and speaking no evil, 7 of its 9 justices buried their heads in the sand by ignoring brazen election fraud. See below.

Letting it stand affirmed its triumph over an open, free, and fair process — judicially gone by Friday's coup de gras.

A Final Comment

Justices Alito and Thomas disagreed with Friday's decision, Alito saying:

"In my view, we do not have the discretion to deny the filing of a bill of complaint in a case that falls within our original jurisdiction," adding:

He would have denied the Texas request to halt election certification.

"In my view, we do not have the discretion to deny the filing of a bill of complaint in a case that falls within our original jurisdiction."

Trump's three appointed High Court justices — Gorsuch, Kavanaugh and Barrett — failed to stand with him on this monumental issue.

Regardless of what steps Trump's legal team pursues ahead, it's virtually over. The postmortems alone remain.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Award-winning author Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG)

His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html>

Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Stephen Lendman](#), Global Research, 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Stephen Lendman](#)

About the author:

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III."

<http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca