

## 1960-64 Birth Index Includes Sealed and Legally Invalid Records

The 1960-64 birth index includes the following birth records:

ASING, NATHAN C  
ASING, NORMAN

M  
M

I have a copy of the divorce records for the parents of these 2 children. They were both adopted by their step-father after their birth father signed off on allowing them to be adopted. I will not post the divorce record or say what their adoptive name is, out of respect for their privacy. What is important for us to know is that the names in the birth index are their BIRTH NAMES. They now use their stepfather's last name.

After an adoption, a new birth certificate is created under the adoptive name, listing the adoptive father as the father. That new certificate "takes the place of" the original birth certificate; the original birth certificate is no longer legally valid because the person with that name and father no longer legally exists.

The original birth records are legally required to be sealed. See 338-17.7 at [http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol06\\_Ch0321-0344/HRS0338/HRS\\_0338-0017\\_0007.htm](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol06_Ch0321-0344/HRS0338/HRS_0338-0017_0007.htm) and HRS 338-20 at [http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol06\\_Ch0321-0344/HRS0338/HRS\\_0338-0020.htm](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/hrscurrent/Vol06_Ch0321-0344/HRS0338/HRS_0338-0020.htm). The original birth certificate can be reinstated if an adoption is set aside, and I believe the original birth certificate can be accessed by the adoptee for personal reasons, but the certificate itself is only LEGALLY valid if the adoption is set aside and the legal status is once again reflected by that original birth certificate – at which time it is restored "to its original place in the files".

The birth index is a printout of records from a database. Sealed records have a flag noting them as sealed. There are also other classifications flagged in the database that are alluded to in the "For Office Use Only" section of the request for a birth certificate. Office workers have to search the different types of records and mark off which type of index they have searched because it requires a different search parameter to be able to see those records. The distinctions/flags are meant to keep legally valid records separate from legally-invalid records such as late, altered, incomplete, or sealed records.

The "place in the files" referred to in HRS 338-20 is the flag status of the record. After an adoption the original birth record in the database is marked with a "sealed" flag that is supposed to prevent any public disclosure of that record's existence. If the adoption is set aside the "sealed" flag is removed, thus restoring the record to the status of a legally-valid, disclosable record.

In order for sealed records (such as the birth records for Nathan and Norman Asing) to be displayed in a birth index printout one of three things has to occur: either the individual records need to have their "sealed" flag removed, the parameter of the printout has to be changed to include sealed records, or the printout has to include the normal parameters PLUS those specific names.

I have tried to get more information which would reveal which of those 3 things happened in order to allow these birth names to appear, but the HDOH is refusing to respond to my requests for simple index data. The last I heard, the HDOH was saying it would take 6 months for them to get to my request because they are so short-staffed and because my request is such a low priority. I am not to contact them about my request until that timeframe is up and then we can start the process of me giving them

10 days to respond, they can ask for more time or say my request isn't clear enough, and then I can appeal to the OIP who won't do anything about it as long as the HDOH has ever e-mailed me back. So they are not about to let me scrutinize their birth index.

Nobody in Hawaii that I have access to is willing to stick their neck out by actually looking at the public records at the HDOH office for me – possibly because the HDOH now makes a person sign in on a public list so everybody can see who has looked at the 1960-64 birth index. I understand the hesitancy. It is a sad, sad state of affairs when people have to be afraid that somebody knows they looked at public records. That underscores why this lawlessness is not just a distraction but downright DANGEROUS. It is undermining the whole foundation of this country and turning it into a thugocracy.

I can't afford to hire a PI to check for me. So this is as far as I can go until the 6 months are up.

Though I don't know which one is reality, I can say that all 3 scenarios create legal problems for the HDOH.

If they have removed the "sealed" flag from these records they are in contempt of the court which sealed the records.

If they have changed the parameter of the birth index then there is no way to know which of the records in the birth index are legally-valid and which are not, and the presence of Obama's name in the birth index means nothing because it could be legally-invalid and still appear in the birth index.

If they added just these 2 names to the birth index of legally-valid records that shows that they will manipulate and misrepresent particular names at will, and the birth index STILL means nothing because any name on the list could have received special treatment to get there.

The fact that the HDOH would engage in any of these 3 scenarios raises the obvious question of why. Why can they not simply store and disclose records according to the laws? This is just about the basic issue of whether they even have legally-valid records for people. Why does that question have to be so clouded in law-breaking?

At this point, the HDOH is a criminal venture and regardless of any issue with Obama, they need to be criminally investigated. The only records that can be trusted from the HDOH are those which have been subjected to an audit of the computer transaction logs and are found to have been unmanipulated.