$$
\begin{gathered}
\text { GOVERNMENT } \\
\text { OF } \\
\text { THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA } \\
+++++ \\
\text { BOARD OF ELECTIONS } \\
+++++ \\
\text { SPECIAL BOARD MEETING } \\
+++++
\end{gathered}
$$

FRIDAY
APRIL 22, 2022
$+\boldsymbol{+}+\boldsymbol{+}$
The District of Columbia Board of Elections convened a Special Board Meeting via Videoconference, pursuant to notice at 10:30 a.m. EDT, Gary Thompson, Chair, presiding.

BOARD OF ELECTIONS MEMBERS PRESENT:
GARY THOMPSON, Chair
MIKE GILL, Member
KARYN GREENFIELD, Member

BOARD OF ELECTIONS STAFF PRESENT:

TERRI STROUD, General Counsel
KAREN F. BROOKS, Registrar of Voters
MILLICENT GREEN WRIGHT, Election Services
MYISHA THOMPSON, Election Services

## CONTENTS

Call to Order. ..... 3
Ascertainment of Quorum. ..... 3
Nominating Petition Challenges
b. James Harnett v. Corren Brown,Candidate for Mayor of theDistrict of Columbia10
c. Lisa Gore v. Leniqua'dominique Jenkins, Candidate for At-Large Member of the Council of the District of Columbia ..... 21
d. James Harnett v. Leniqua'dominique Jenkins, Candidate for At-Large Member of the District of Columbia. ..... 37
e. Sirraya Gant v. Dorothy Douglas, Candidate for Ward 7 Committeewoman of the Democratic State Committee. ..... 64
f. Jimmie Williams v. Tyrell Holcomb,Candidate for Ward 7 Committeeman ofthe Democratic State Party76
g. Denise Reed v. Mary Candon, Candidate for Democratic National Committeewoman ..... 97
h. David Meadows v. Anthony Muhammad, et al., Candidates for Ward 8 Committeewoman and Committeemen of the Democratic State Committee on the "Fight the Power 8" Slate. ..... 116
i. Dennis Jaffe v. Bradley Thomas, Candidate for At-Large Member of the Council of the District of Columbia. ..... 128
j. Nathan Fleming v. Bradley Thomas, Candidate for At-Large Member of the Council of the District of Columbia. ..... 130
k. Luz Martinez-Munoz v. Trayon White,Candidate for Mayor of the Districtof Columbia.174
Adjournment. ..... 242
P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Well good morning, everybody. My name is Gary Thompson. I'm the Chair of this 3-member Board. With me is Karyn Greenfield and Mike Gill who I see present. And that means we have a quorum. I also want to check on the record, is the Court Reporter present? I need the Court Reporter to raise their hand so we can unmute them. Now we got it. COURT REPORTER: Hello. This is Mr. Crawley.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Mr. Crawley, thank you so much for being here. So we have a quorum. We have a Court Reporter present. Good morning, everybody -- everybody that's here in the hearing room. Everybody that's on by Zoom.

Today is the purpose of our hearing, which was duly noticed, is to hear challenges to petitions, specifically with respect to whether the candidates' challenges have the requisite
number of signatures to run for their respective offices. This is my first time chairing a series of challenges like this. I'm told this is more than usual. There are a lot of challenges. We have ten challenges that were not resolved by pre-hearing conference and that require us to go through the tasks of hearing from both the challenger and the candidate or their respective counsel one at a time. So we've got our work cut out for us.

Begin we dive in, I want to say on the record, a thank you to the Voter Services Division in particular for a lot of hard work in reviewing a lot of signatures. So just to set the stage a little bit for many people who I can see are observing, when you're running for mayor, you need 2,000 signatures or 1 percent of your party, whichever is less. And different numbers are needed, depending on the office, whether it's an at-large member of the council or a ward council member, ANC Commissioner, et cetera. It ranges from 2,000, I believe, down to 25 for the

ANC.
I used to be an ANC Commissioner, so I know what it's like to try to get 25 signatures. So I mean I haven't -- didn't have to go through the chore of getting more than 25 and it was not easy, $I$ can tell you. And of course, this is all driven by statute and regulation.
And just to sort of explain to
everybody, we don't have much discretion in that regard. When you look at the relevant regulations, the word "shall" appears many times. In 1607 of the Title 3 of the regs for example, it says, "A signature shall not be counted as valid in any of the following circumstances:" And then it goes from the "A" down to "N". So there's a lot of circumstances where a signature shall not be counted such as it's a duplicate signature or it's not a registered voter and you know, so on and so forth. There's a lot of detail to this. And these are the regulations that we are required to apply.

So yeah, before we dive into the context of any particular challenge, I just hope everybody understands that whatever views you might have about whether these should be requirements, we don't have the discretion today to set them aside. When I read all through this, I have a lot of sort of personal sort of reactions to some of it, which is wow, this is onerous. It should be easier. Maybe the Council should do something to make this easier. That's not really relevant. You know, I may think that on the one hand. But on the other hand, I recognize that the regulations and the governing statutes, they are what they are. They're in place and we have to follow them.

That said, sometimes we do have discretion. There's some room with respect to certain issues for us to decide what to do. And I guess I speak only for myself when I say, when there is room -- when there is discretion, I want to do everything I can to allow a candidate to be on the ballot. That's the starting point is to
try everything that we can try to see a candidate through to appearing on the ballot so the voters can decide. Sometimes we won't be able to get there because there's just a short fall. Sometimes we will be able to get there.

With that opening set of comments, before we dive in, Karyn or Mike, any opening comments on your end?

MEMBER GILL: Nope. For me at least, ready to dive in. Ditto your remarks on, you know, when it's grey, we tend to air on the side of getting folks on ballots and letting people -letting the voters decide.

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yeah. And I don't have anything, Gary. I concur with you all that there is some discretion we have and we do look at that.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Well thank you so much. We've got ten matters as I said. Nine of them we must address today.

MS. STROUD: Well one, but we're --
CHAIR THOMPSON: Go ahead.

MS. STROUD: So one of the -- the first matter was filed such that it has to be resolved today. The others are not necessarily required to be resolved today, but we do hope to resolve as many as we can today. The matters that were filed on April 3rd must be resolved today. The matters that were filed -- the challenges that were filed on April 4th need not be resolved until the 25th. But you know, we are holding all these hearings today. And we hope to resolve them for several reasons, the main one being that we are required to mail out ballots to military and overseas voters.

And so you know, doing -- resolving challenges today would allow us extra time in case of litigation to resolve our ballots. If you could remove -- Excuse me. We are hoping to resolve all of the matters that we can resolve today. And then will in any event, be resolved no later than Monday, except for the first matter, which must be resolved today. But we're going to -- with that, I'll let you know how
we're going to proceed today.
For each matter, we're going to have the parties introduce themselves by stating their name and address for the record. Then we are going to have a representative from the Voter Services Division provide their report with respect to their findings. Then if necessary, we'll hear from representatives of the Office of the General Council. The challenger will have five minutes to respond to the Voter Services presentation. And then the candidate will have similarly, five minutes to respond. And so that's how we will proceed.

My understanding is that the Board will vote to enter into executive session to deliberate on the matters -- on each of the matters after we've heard them all. So we will not be stopping after every matter to go and deliberate and then come back and then come back and hear from the next matter. So there will be the Voter Services report, responses to the reports by the challenger and the candidate, and
then we will move on to the next matter. And again, each side will have five minutes. So that should give everyone present a sense of how much time it will take to resolve or to hear each matter.

CHAIR THOMPSON: And can you just read real quick for people following the order. We're going to do ten of these. Can you just read the order that they're going to go in. So if you're tenth, you know --

MS. STROUD: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: -- you've got an hour or more, maybe two or more --

MS. STROUD: Sure.
CHAIR THOMPSON: -- just to give a sense of timing.

MS. STROUD: The first matter is James Harnett versus Corren Brown or Corren Brown, Candidate for Mayor of the District of Columbia. And excuse me if I mispronounce, you know, anyone's name. Lisa Gore versus Leniqua'dominique Jenkins, Candidate for At-Large Member of the

Council of the District of Columbia. James Harnett versus Leniqua Jenkins, Candidate for AtLarge Member of the Council for the District of Columbia. Sirraya Gant versus Dorothy Douglas, Candidate for Ward 7 Committeewoman of the Democratic State Committee. Jimmie Williams versus Tyrell Holcomb, Candidate for Ward 7 Committeeman of the Democratic State Committee. Denise Reed versus Mary Candon, Candidate for Democratic National Committeewoman. David Meadows versus the Candidates for Ward 8 Committeewoman and Committeeman of the Democratic State Committee on the "Fight the Power 8" Slate, represented by Anthony Muhammad as the Slate Manager. Dennis Jaffe versus Bradley Thomas, Candidate for At-Large Member of the Council of the District of Columbia. Nathan Fleming versus Bradley Thomas, Candidate for At-Large Member of the Council of the District of Columbia. And finally Luz Martinez-Munoz versus Trayon White, Candidate for Mayor of the District of Columbia. CHAIR THOMPSON: All right, so thank
you. With that, we'll call the matter of James Harnett versus Corren Brown, Candidate for Mayor of the District of Columbia. Can we hear first from Voter Services?

MS. STROUD: We will hear from Voter Services and we have Millicent Green Wright from Voter Services who will read the registrar's report in that matter.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Good morning. On March 23rd, 2022, Corren Brown submitted a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as Candidate --

MEMBER GILL: Hey, Gary. It's tough to hear her.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Thank you. Good morning. Can everyone hear now?

MEMBER GILL: Yep, all good.
MS. GREEN WRIGHT: On March 23rd, 2022, Corren Brown submitted a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21, 2022 primary election for the Office of Mayor of the District of Columbia. The
minimum requirement to obtain ballot access for this office is 40 signatures of District voters who are dully registered in the same party as the candidate. The petition contained 48 signatures. The petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law.

The petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022 by James Harnett, a registered voter in the District of Columbia. Mr. Harnett filed a challenge to 12 of the 48 signatures submitted enumerated by line and page number on the individual challenge sheets filed for each petition page. The signatures were challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR, Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations.

The review of the challenges indicates that nine of the twelve challenges are valid. One is valid because the signer was not registered at the time the petition was signed. And eight are valid because the signers are not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the petition was signed.

This leaves the candidate's nominating petition with 39 signatures, one signature below the number required for ballot access.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Just for the record, what party is this?

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Statehood Green.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Statehood Green.
MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: So that's why it's 40 because 1 percent gets you a much lower number than 2,000.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
MS. STROUD: Okay. Is Mr. Harnett present? James Harnett?

MR. HARNETT: Yes, I'm present.
MS. STROUD: Okay. And if you could state your name and address for the record.

MR. HARNETT: Sure thing. My name is James Harnett. I reside at 2221 Eye Street Northwest, Apartment 321, Washington DC 20037.

MS. STROUD: Okay. And you have five
minutes to respond to the Registrar Voters findings.

MR. HARNETT: Great. Well, I'll keep this short and brief. I agree with the findings of the registrar. The candidate submitted valid signatures to appear on the ballot in the race where the candidate would need 40 signatures to appear on the ballot. Looking at or sort of coming from the conversation we had in the prehearing conference, it was clear that the candidate did not sign their own nominating petition. If the candidate had signed their own nominating petition, it is likely they would have had 40 valid signatures to appear to the ballots. I went through the case record in previous Board decisions to see how the Board has determined in races where a candidate's own signature on their nominating petition was the determining factor in whether or not to grant ballot access. And the only case file that $I$ could find was a situation the Board unanimously dealt with in 2020 where a candidate in the -- Let's see, it was Jamal

Burton v Jillian Woolin's case regarding the candidate's ANC nominating petitions. They submitted ten signatures. And the candidate had submitted the signatures did not date his own nominating -- his own signature on his nominating petition. And that signature was ruled as not being valid. So the candidate was one signature below the threshold to make it onto the ballot.

I see similar parallels to this
situation. And I think the Board should find similarly to how it did in 2020, that this candidate did not file enough valid signatures to make it onto the ballot. But that's all I've got. Thank you very much.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Harnett. Is Ms. Brown present?

MS. BROWN: Good morning. Yes, I'm present.

MS. STROUD: Okay. And if you could just state your name and address for the record.

MS. BROWN: Corren Brown. My address is 5885 Colorado Avenue Northwest, Apartment 108,
zip code 20011.
MS. STROUD: Okay. And you have five minutes, Ms. Brown to respond.

MS. BROWN: I just wanted to state that at the bottom of the nominating petitions, it has a statement that says, "We the undersigned being duly registered voters in the District of Columbia who are registered in the same party as the candidate request that the District of Columbia Board of Elections place the name of the individual nominated by this petition on the June 21st, 2022 primary election ballot."

In my ignorance of not knowing that I was able to sign my own petition, $I$ did not sign it. And I'm just asking that my signing of the petitions that I circulated around would be considered me signing my own petition to count as the one missing signature on my nominating petition. Thank you.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you, Ms.
Brown. Do any of the Board members have any questions for either party?

CHAIR THOMPSON: I'm trying to find the actual circulating petition to see where the signature is placed. There's a PDF with 17 pages. Probably towards the back somewhere. MS. STROUD: So I don't think that the file contains --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. MS. STROUD: -- the petition sheet. CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. So thank you so much, Ms. Brown. Just describe a little bit more when you were circulating the petition, you signed as a circulator on the same date, it just was in a different spot on the -- it's not signed as a petition signer, but it's signed as a circulator of capacity. Is that right?

MS. BROWN: Yes, sir. It's signed in the circulator's signage at the bottom of the petition.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. We'll take a close look at that, we promise. And you know, when we go into executive session, you know, I think my question is certainly going to be do we
have the discretion to recognize that and count it as a petition signature for purposes of getting you from 39 to 40 signatures. And that's what we'll talk about in executive session. But I think we understand the issue pretty well. It's heartbreakingly close and we're going to look at it carefully.

MS. BROWN: Thank you.
MEMBER GILL: Hey, Gary. I noticed some folks are raising hands. Just in terms of procedure here, challengers and candidates are speaking, but we're not doing public matters?

MS. STROUD: Well, just for the record, I do see that Mr. David Schwartzman has his hand raised. And I believe that in the prehearing conference, Mr. Schwartzman spoke on behalf of Ms. Brown at her request. And so if the Board will allow -- would you want to --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: We can limit comments to less than a minute. Yeah, I think it would be
appropriate.
MS. STROUD: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: We've got a long day.
MR. SCHWARTZMAN: Thank you so much. I guess I'm a witness. I collected a lot of the signatures. Now I just want to point out that the nomination petition, which everyone signed, you know, 39 says, "We the undersigned duly registered voters in DC are registered in the same party, request that the DC Board of Elections place the name of the individual nominated by this petition on the June 21st primary election ballot."

I would submit that not only did she sign the bottom of two submitted petitions as circulator, but she -- it's obvious that she is not only registered in the same party as her candidate, but given her filing for candidacy and circulation of a nomination petition, she is requesting that she be nominated for these petitions.

I would submit that, that in itself is
equivalent to signing the petition herself. In other words, it's fulfilling the criteria which the 39 valid signatures fulfilled. And I'm just going by the criteria what the signers of the petition who are registered members of the Statehood Green party signed this petition. And she basically fulfilled the same criteria as they did. And so I would humbly submit to the Board that this equivalency be considered in granting her ballot status for the primary. Thank you very much for this opportunity.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr.
Schwartzman.
MS. STROUD: Okay. If there are no more questions, we'll move on to the next matter. The next matter is Lisa Gore versus Leniqua'dominque Jenkins, Candidate for At-Large Member of the Council of the District of Columbia. Is Ms. Gore present? I just want to make sure both parties are present before we hear from the registrar voters.

MS. GORE: Yes, I'm present.

MS. STROUD: Ms. Jenkins, are you present?

MS. JENKINS: Yes, I'm present. Can you hear me?

MS. STROUD: Yes. Now we'll hear from Voter Services representative, Ms. Myisha Thomson.

MEMBER GILL: Karyn is her mic on? I can't hear anything. I don't know if others can.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Thank you, Mike. Take it from the top.

MS. THOMPSON: Good morning. On March 23rd, 2022, Leniqua'dominque Jenkins submitted a nominated petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate on the June 2st, 2022 primary election for the Office of the At-Large Member of the Council. The minimum requirement to obtain ballot access for this office is 2,000 signatures of District voters who are duly registered in the same party as the candidate.

The petition contained 2,049
signatures. The petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law. The petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022 by Lisa Gore, a registered voter in the District of Columbia. In the initial findings, it was determined that Ms. Gore filed challenges to 185 of the 2,049 signatures submitted. Enumerated by a line and page number on the individual challenge sheets filed for each petition page.

However, upon additional review following supplemental materials presented at the pre-hearing, it was determined that Ms. Gore's supplemental materials presented at the -- I'm sorry, I read the same line. It was determined that Ms. Gore filed challenges to (audio interference) of the 2,049 signatures submitted. The signatures were challenged pursuant to the Title 3 DCMR, Section 1607.1 of the (audio interference).

The initial review of challenges indicated -- The initial review of challenges indicated that 145 were valid. With the
additional review, it has now been determined that 235 of the challenges are valid. Three are valid as the signer is not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed. Two are valid because the petition does include the address of the signer. Five are valid because the signature is not dated.

One is valid because the signer is not
a registered voter -- is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the petition was signed. And 224 are valid because the circulator of the petition failed to complete all required information in their circulator's affidavit. This left the candidate's nominated petition with 1,814 signatures. One hundred and eighty-six signatures below the number required for ballot access.

At the pre-hearing conference, Ms. Jenkins admitted circulating affidavits attesting to various pages addressed in Ms. Gore's
challenge. In total, they addressed 214 signatures. Accepting circulating affidavits is a matter for the Board to determine. As such, the candidate's nominated petitions remain at 1,814 signatures. One hundred and eighty-six signatures below the number required for ballot access.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Thompson. We will now hear from Ms. Gore. Ms. Gore, you have five minutes to address the registrar's findings.

MS. GORE: Good morning. Again, my name is Lisa Gore and I just want to quickly -Yes?

MS. STROUD: If you could state your name and address.

MS. GORE: Oh, yeah. It's Lisa Gore, 7045 31st Street Northwest, Washington DC and the zip code is 20015.

MS. STROUD: Okay. And you have five minutes.

MS. GORE: Okay. I agree with the
original registrar's decision. One of the things that $I$ would like to just spend a little bit of time to address is the issue that this is a clerical error as indicated on the affidavit. I think the Board should highly take into consideration just the meaning of what a clerical error is. And in terms of this particular challenge, $I$ think we have some differences in the sheer volume of errors in completely like, you know, complaining of the affidavit involved in this particular case.

It is definitely beyond something
clerical when you have several challengers that have consistent mistakes. It's a systemic problem with the administration of the campaign and in turn, integrity of the ballot circulation process which is the ultimate goal in this case. If you look closely at some of the signature challenger sheets, there are definitely issues where some of the dates don't appear to be the date of the signer. One I would like you to look at is Sheet 95 for Ronald Harris, Lines 1,
$5,6,8,9$, and 10. Compare the three on that affidavit to the three in the sworn affidavit that he completed. So I think when you talk about this, you have to look and ask yourself, are these really errors and if that is a sufficient defense. I would say that these are not errors, that it's indicative of other issues in the campaign, particularly with who is actually signing these affidavits. And if the circulator is in fact the person that is reported to sign, you know, the affidavit.

Also in terms of the affidavit itself, some of them are notarized, some of them are not. Very few of the affidavits actually confirm the date. In certain instances, that's really important because there are certain sheets where the dates are mixed. There is one sheet -- and I'm trying to find the information really quickly where it was pre-dated, but the last signer actually had a timestamp on the sheet. Let me see if $I$ can find that real quick for you. Let me get that. I'm looking through my notes to see
if I can find that one for you. It's actually Sheet 78 by Willie Camper.

If you look at that sheet, the first signature was done on February 28th, 1st through the 4th. Fifth signature was done on February 27th. The sixth through the 7 th was on the 29 th. And then the eights and the tenth was on the 19th. And the timestamp on that last line was 10-11. So I'm not sure if that's a.m. or p.m. But I think there's enough issues within the overall universe of all these affidavits to really call into question whether this was a mere clerical error. And in terms of what the spirit that the Board's regulation takes that into account.

And I would say that this is not a mere clerical error. We have some petition signatures that submitted numerous sheets and didn't date any of them. So it really calls into question who circulated what, who completed what, and the integrity of that entire process.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you, Ms.

Gore. Ms. Jenkins, if you could state your name and address for the record and then you have five minutes.

MS. GORE: Hi. Can everyone hear me? Give me a thumbs up please. Thank you. My name is Leniqua'dominque Jenkins. Leniqua'dominique is one first name. I live at 901 46th Street Northeast Washington DC 20019. And I am requesting access to the ballot.

I'd like to start by saying that I'm super affirmed by the information that I've collected with circulating the affidavits. I'd like to state that there isn't a code that sets parameter on what that language should look like specifically. So this represents the interest of the democratic process. I'm not a lawyer. The language does not reflect a lawyer. I'm a citizen. The people that signed and circulated are citizens. And the language represents that.

The affidavits state that they are responsible for the circulating petitions and that they were in their sole care and that
they're not compromised. And that they were in the care of the circulators during the circulation period that's in question and the dates that are in question.

I'd also like the Board to consider that there are court cases that parallel my exact situation where circulators have excluded the dates or used a different date within a one or two day margin that should be considered and you guys ruled favorably. That was in the David Grusso versus Brown case in 2012. Anyone that has circulated petitions knows that this is a simple clerical error. And the Board has agreed and affirmed that in the past. And as submitted, affidavits, some have notaries, some don't because of the economic burden and the volume to maneuver and get around. So that was me exercising academic muscle to present the strongest information possible.

So I'm requesting access to the ballot. If we would like to go side by -- like line by line, $I$ would like to request a sidebar
to do that. I don't have each petition in front of me, but I would love the opportunity to address them individually if the Board has questions. And did I get an indicator for like two minutes? I'm sorry, I couldn't see that.

MS. STROUD: Three minutes.
MS. JENKINS: Three minutes, yes. So again, I successfully secured more than the amount required to access the ballot. And I'm requesting the Board to accept my circulator updated affidavits affirming that they were in their care on the dates in question and allow me access to the ballot. Thank you.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Do the Board members have questions for either party?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. I mean obviously there's some small defects that don't control the outcome. This really comes down to whether the circulator affidavit can be cured. The pertinent regulation recites that a signature shall not be counted as valid in a circumstance where the circulator of the petition failed to
complete all required information in the circulator's affidavit.

So I guess the issue that we have to talk about is, is that curable after the notice date. Obviously some of these things aren't curable. If you're not a member of the political party or you're not a registered voter, that's never curable. But this is one that is potentially curable. So we'll have to talk about that legal issue.

But I guess maybe my question is when I get into the details of the report, it looks like there's a shortage of 186 signatures if these affidavits are, you know, defective and can't be accepted. However if the affidavits cure them and I appreciate that some were notarized and some couldn't be of course. I don't know that they have to be. But in any event, they address 200 --

MS. JENKINS: And 27, I believe.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Two hundred and twenty-four challenges succeeded because the
circulator of the petition failed to complete all required information. And the circulator affidavits that were submitted addressed 214 signatures. So is there some -- is there some question about whether they in fact -- assuming that we can accept the cured affidavits, is there some question about the number 214? Is it maybe 213 or 112? Because if that's, you know, it could hinge on that as well.

MS. STROUD: Yeah. I mean depending on what the Board decides with respect to the different classes of defects on the circulator affidavit, it could be outcome determinative.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Some of these
affidavits might cure and some might not cure. Correct?

> MS. STROUD: Yes, correct.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: Go ahead, please.
MS. JENKINS: I'm sorry. I wanted to say that the language speaks to the intent in
that the circulators are responsible for the circulation in its entirety. And I think just because of the volume, if you notice, there were just a handful of circulators. And it represents the intent of being within those time parameters. So I think that the language really represents that considering that these are citizens and I'm a citizen. It really represents, like I said, the precedent that's been set with the Grusso case of being curable. And that the circulators are responsible and had the petitions in their care on the dates in questions and on the dates that are being challenged.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay and thank you.
And since I put a question out there, Ms. Gore, would you like to comment further?

MS. GORE: Yes. I think as I stated before, the Board has to look at whether or not that is in fact the case. And I think there's so many irregularities in these petitions as a whole that, that is called into question. One of the things that was brought up in terms of the
timeframe that these signatures reported to be, Sheet 184 and Sheet 187 --

MS. JENKINS: I don't think it's fair to cite sheets unless we're going to go line by line because I don't have the sheets directly in front of me to respond appropriately.

MS. GORE: Okay. Let me say --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: Well, let her finish.
MS. GORE: Let me finish my comment please. Please, no interrupting. I'm not going to interrupt you. Sheet 184 and 187 were predated February 19th. The signatures beginning with the first through the last is almost over a month, 30 days. So we're not talking in some of these situations, one, two, three, four, five, even ten days. So I think all of that, the entirety of the issues with these -- and I highlighted some of that, including you know, dates, times, it has to call into question just who did what on these affidavits -- on these petition sheets. And I think that's something
that the Board has to consider when it's talking about a mere clerical error versus, you know, systemic issues within the collection of these sheets. And that is evidence by some of the issues that I talked about.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Thank you, Ms. Gore. Ms. Jenkins, a brief rebuttal? Please go ahead.

MS. JENKINS: Again, I'm not confident about the lines that she's referencing. And I would love a sidebar to go line by line. I think that anyone that has had five circulators or six circulators circulating petitions, it's not uncommon to get a date and have a blank space on a date and to circle back. These are natural occurrences that have been affirmed and that you guys have granted petition access -- I mean ballot access in the past.

Again, I'd just like to echo that there's been a precedent set by the Board in the Grusso case versus Brown where these situations were identical and parallel to my own experience
in circulating the petition. I don't think it's systemic. It's real. It's practical. And if we go line by line and if we even look at the affidavits, they're attesting and giving sworn testimony that they are responsible, this is their experience by citizens that are circulating these petitions. So I hope that the Board votes favorably and grants me access to the ballot like you've done in past cases.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. We will
now move on to the next matter. And the candidate is the same, but the challenger is different. And so we are now moving on to James Harnett versus Leniqua'dominique Jenkins. And so Mr. Harnett, we heard from you earlier. So are you still present? Can you go on and find a participant?

CHAIR THOMPSON: And when we call on someone, you can raise your hand. It makes it easier because we have to -- in Zoom, we have to scroll, you know, 69 participants. Oh, there we
go. There he is.
MR. HARNETT: Thank you. Yes, I'm here.

MS. STROUD: You stated your name and address for the record. Well, we'll hear the registrars report first -- the Voter Services report with respect to this matter.

MS. THOMPSON: On March 23rd, 2022, Leniqua'dominque Jenkins submitted a nominated petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21st, 2022 primary election for the Office of the At-Large Member of the Council. The minimum requirement to obtain ballot access for this office is 2,000 signatures of District voters who are duly registered in the same party as the candidate.

The petition contained 2,049
signatures. The petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law. The petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022 by James Harnett, a registered voter in the District of Columbia. Mr. Harnett filed challenges to 183
of the 2,049 signatures submitted. Enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each petition page. The signatures were challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR, Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations. And the review of challenges indicated that 183 of the 183 challenges are valid. One hundred and eighty-three are valid because the circulator of the petition failed to complete all required information in this circulator's affidavit. This left the candidates nominated petition with 1,866 with 134 signatures below the required -- the number required for ballot access.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. Are you done?

MS. THOMPSON: No, $I$ have some more.
MS. STROUD: Oh, sorry.
MS. THOMPSON: At the pre-hearing conference on April 19th, 2022, Ms. Jenkins submitted documentation that addressed 29 individual voters and then also circulator affidavits attesting to various pages that Mr.

Harnett challenged that addressed 103 signatures. A second circulator affidavit is a matter for the Board to determine. As such, the candidate's nominated petition remained at 1,866 with 134 signatures below the number required for ballot access.

MS. STROUD: Okay. So I would note that with respect to this matter, the Registrar Voter's determination was the same. And I would also note that there was some overlap with respect to the challenge filed by Mr. Harnett, both Ms. Gore and Mr. Harnett challenged in common 18 pages. And so there is a significant amount of overlap with respect to the challenge. There was one page of the pages in common that Mr. Harnett did not challenge and that's 193. But I just wanted to say for the record that there's a significant amount of overlap in terms of the challenges filed by both Ms. Gore and Ms. Harnett. And so we will hear from Mr. Harnett in response to the Voter Services report.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Can I ask a question
real quick?
MS. STROUD: Sure.
CHAIR THOMPSON: It says at the end of the report, "The candidate, Ms. Jenkins is 134 signatures below the threshold." And at the prehearing conference, she submitted documentation addressing 29 individual voters. And that also circulator affidavits curing the issues in a balance of 103 signatures. So if I'm doing my math correctly. I'm a lawyer. $103+29$ is 132. So does that -- even if that's all accepted --

MS. JENKINS: We cured 105 in total of varied challenges. Again, I don't have it in front of me line by line. But the bulk of them were the affidavits with the updated sworn testimony. And also I think that my campaign manager that has spoken for me, she's prepared to go line by line with some of these challenges. She spoke at the pre-hearing as well.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Well, let's do it this way. Now that I threw that question out, why don't we hear from the
challenger first for five minutes. And then Ms. Jenkins, we'll come back to you and we'll certainly recognize your campaign manager as well.

MS. JENKINS: Thank you.
CHAIR THOMPSON: So Mr. Harnett, why don't you go ahead.

MR. HARNETT: Thank you. Should I repeat my name and address?

MS. STROUD: No. We've already got your address for the record with respect to the previous challenge.

MR. HARNETT: Okay. All right, then I'll just get started. Well thank you, everyone. I agree with the registrar's findings that out of 183 challenges, 183 are valid. From my reading of the Board's regulations and of the regulations in the statute -- sorry -- the rules in the statute, any cures to individual signatures or to any individual voters must have been received within ten days of the filing of the challenge, which was on April 4th, 2022 resulting in an

April 14th, 2022 deadline, which is enumerated in Title 3 DCMR, 1607.1, Section B. These cures were not received before that deadline. And thus, are not curable.

Only change of addresses can be cured as part of the post-challenge cure process, which is a requirement stipulated by DCMR 1607.1(b). Signers of a nominating petition must be registered voters at the time of the petition, otherwise the signature cannot be counted. The same is true of individuals that are not registered in the same party as the candidate who is seeking nomination. And while my challenge was only to the incomplete circulator affidavit of 183 signatures, by the candidate's own admission, a number of signatures are further invalid because they are individuals who are not registered to vote or not registered to vote in the party of the candidate who seeks nomination or are not dated.

> And is outlined in Board challenge
regulations, "If a signature is challenged on a
particular ground and in the course of investigating the challenge, Board staff discovers an unrelated fatal defect, either on the face of the petition or pursuant to a record search concerning the specific allegation or challenge, the Board may on its own motion declare the signatures invalid, notwithstanding the defect that was not alleged or challenged." And now the candidate has submitted as they noted, 29 voter registration, voter change forms. All of those were received after the deadline, as well as the circulation affidavit forms. And those were inclusive of individuals that were not registered to vote at the time they signed the petition, were not a member of the same party as the candidate, which again on the reading of -- claim reading of the statute says that those signatures "shall not be accepted". Just as it says for incomplete circulator affidavits that those "shall not be accepted if not completed in full." And again, all those were received after the deadline.

So while, you know, there were a number -- there were a few -- a handful, $I$ don't have the exact number, but I'm sure the registrar does, of forms that were submitted of individuals who were changing their address from addresses they listed on the nominating petition and the address that they are registered with, with the Board of Elections. There were a small number of them that would not have overcome the deficit that the candidate is facing in terms of the signatures they need to reach 2,000. But in addition to that, none were received before the 10-day deadline.

So all of them while being accepted by the Board for the purposes of newly registered voters and changes of addresses, are not acceptable to the statute in terms of what can be accepted at this Board meeting for the purposes of this nominating petition. So I appreciate the registrar's work and would be happy to answer any questions.

MS. STROUD: So just for
clarification, Mr. Harnett, you're saying that changes of address were submitted that could cure defects in the signatures submitted, but they were not timely submitted. And even if they were timely submitted, some of them were not strict changes of address, but actual registrations because these individuals were not registered. Is that the case, Mr. Harnett.

MEMBER GILL: I think he's on mute.
MS. STROUD: Okay. If you could unmute.

MR. HARNETT: Yes, sorry. I wasn't able to unmute. Yes, that is correct.

MS. STROUD: Okay.
CHAIR THOMPSON: This has to do with the 29. Right? Within the 29.

MR. HARNETT: That's correct. So of the 29 under the statute as I've read it, the only admissible change for the purposes of this nominating petition are changes of address. And there were -- while there were a few, you know, three, four, five changes of address forms that
were submitted for existing voters that would have been accepted if they'd been submitted within the 10-day window; they were not. Further on the question of whether or not, because that's not determinative to the whole number of signatures that the candidate is short to receive ballot access.

As the Chair noted at the start of the window and as is spelled out in the statute, it is not up -- There is no statute that allows the Board to interpret or to modify the "shall" requirements of what is listed in Title 3 DCMR 1607, which says, You must be registered to vote at the time signing the petition. You must be living -- You must be, you know, a member of the same party. And the circulator must complete all requirements of the circular affidavit, which the registrar has noted in the individual challenge sheets that $I$ challenged is not the case. And thus, those challenge sheets under the statute and my reading of it and certainly what at least initially the registrar's reading of it was as
well, that those would not be curable issues. CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. Ms. Jenkins, please go ahead.

MS. STROUD: If you --
MS. JENKINS: Thank you. I was having challenges with the host unmuting me. So again, I would like to circle back a little back and allow my campaign manager, De Andra Judge to go through the evidence that we've provided because there's 150 pieces of evidence that we provided to the registrar and the Board. Can she please be unmuted?

MS. JUDGE: Good afternoon. Thank you. This is De Andra.

MS. STROUD: Could you provide your name and address for the record.

MS. JUDGE: Absolutely. So De Andra Judge and it's a space in there. So D-E A-N-D-R-A, Judge as in Judge Judy. One of the things I want to point out first is just a little bit of the math. As Mr. Harnett pointed out, there are 183 challenges that he provided that were
strictly pertaining to a missing date by the circulator when they signed their affidavit. For the purpose of his concern, those are the only ones we are addressing with him. He is not really pertinent to the discussion regarding any of the challenges that the registrar may have found, which we can address separately.

So looking at Mr. Harnett's
challenges in particular, we were able to provide affidavits for all of our circulators to cure 183. Where the number 105 comes from is just our due diligence to make sure that we segmented out all of the challenges that the registrar provided above and beyond the 183. So for Mr. Harnett, all of his challenges are cured with our affidavit.

As we stated before, the previous ruling by the Board with the Grusso versus Brown case has ruled favorably in terms of the candidate. But even beyond that, one of the things -- I know we've been stating statutes all day. And so one of the statutes that $I$ want to
bring the attention for the Board to look at is Statute 1606.5, which says, "The Board shall receive evidence in support of and in opposition to the challenge and shall rule on the validity of the challenge no more than 20 days", not ten, 20 days "after the challenge has been filed. The Board shall consider any evidence as may be submitted including, but not limited to documentary evidence, affidavits, and oral testimony."

So Mr. Harnett has been talking about address changes. He didn't submit any challenges on that basis. He submitted challenges based on a date being missing from the circulator affidavit. And according to DCMR 1606.5, there's a 20-day window to be able to post any opposition to those challenges that was provided. And we were well within that 20-day window.

Separate from Mr. Harnett with the Registrar Office, we had a remaining 29 that we wanted to address. They were not all address changes. Many of the names that were identified
were in defect by registered voters. We specifically identified nine individuals whose name had been misread on the circulator's petition. And they were indeed found in the voter registration file that we have provided by the Board. Two were actually registered and there was no misreading of the names to be had. And then there was one individual whose address was misread. And they too are also in the voter file. There were 12 residents who were provided -- who will be provided a voter register form or address change.

I would like to be very clear that if a voter registration wasn't curable, then why were we provided with a form? It really implied that the Board actually wants people to be registered. And so we agree with that. We want people to be registered as well. And so this is the standard and we've met that standard. So just looking at Harnett in particular, all of his challenges were cured with the affidavit. They were all submitted within the 20 -day window as
referenced by 1606.5.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. So just to clarify, there was a challenge to 183 signatures based on alleged defects in the circulator affidavit. And you're saying that all 183 were cured?

MS. JUDGE: Correct.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Sorry. I just
got confused because our notes say at the prehearing conference there was evidence that, that reported to cure 103 signatures.

MS. JUDGE: So that's a mistake. It was --

MS. STROUD: When you're saying that you cured them, you are saying -- you're referring to the fact that you submitted statements from the circulators that you intend to ask the Board to accept so that the defects can be cured. Correct?

MS. JUDGE: Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. CHAIR THOMPSON: That's (audio interference). Got you. Okay. But among that,
within that universe of 183, there's additional challenges to 29 signatures in particular that you're now saying were duly challenged within -duly cured within that 20-day window.

MS. JUDGE: Yes, sir. So to be very clear, Mr. Harnett had 183 challenges that were all about the date from the circulator's affidavit being missing. Our affidavit that we submitted as evidence for these to be cured covers his 183. The number needed for Leniqua'dominique Jenkins to be on ballot was 134. What we did was identified of that 134 , the number that were cured with the updated affidavits from our circulators. That addresses Mr. Harnett's challenges.

That was 105 that were cured alone that the registrar found no additional defects. That took our number down to 29 remaining needing to be cured in order to meet the minimum 134 for her to receive ballot access. With that remaining 29, we focused on those that were also being addressed and resolved by the affidavit as
well. In that 29, we broke down in a table that we provided in the pre-hearing conference, line by line, those who weren't a registered voter, those who needed a change of address, those who their names were marked by the registrar as not registered because the name was misread or the address was misread. And addressed all of the remaining 25 people.

MS. STROUD: So when you say that you submitted documents to cure -- for example, the signatures that were declared invalid because they had a change of address, you're saying that you submitted change of address forms or voter registration forms indicating that the addresses should be updated. And if you did that, did you do it within the ten days after the challenges were filed?

MS. JENKINS: Yes.
MS. JUDGE: Yes. And we were notified April 6th that we actually had challenges. We were not notified on the 4 th. And so the ten days actually would have ended on a weekend,
which would have given us until the 18th. And all of our affidavits are signed on or before the 18th of April, which is a Monday.

MS. STROUD: (Audio interference) filed on the 4th, then that meant that you had until the 14th (audio interference) address.

MS. JUDGE: We had communication from the Board of Elections on the 6th, so ten days from that would be the 16th, which is a weekend. Friday, Government agencies were closed in observation of Emancipation Day. And our last affidavit signature is on the 18th, which is a Monday. So we are still within that parameter of the 10-day window that he's referencing paired with the DCR Code that we mentioned as well.

MS. STROUD: When you received notice -- So you received notice of the challenge, you're saying on the 6th.

MS. JUDGE: Correct.
MS. STROUD: And that notice indicated that you had to file -- it indicated the date where you had to file changes of address under
the statute.
MS. JUDGE: Yes.
MS. STROUD: And did you turn in the changes of address by the date indicated in the notice you got? Because the statute -- I just want to, you know, be clear on this point -- the statute provides that the changes of address must be submitted within ten days after the challenge is filed, not within 10 days after your receipt of notice of the challenge.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MS. JUDGE: Thank you for asking that. I'm sorry if I cut you off. There is a delay on my end, so just forgive me in advance. Yes, I did do the change of address within that window. All of the changes of address are before the 14th. And we submitted evidence to support that as well during the preliminary conference. We have the folks standing with their picture with their changeable voter registration. And we submitted all of that in a PDF.

MS. STROUD: On or before the 14th?

I just want clarification on that.
MS. JENKINS: Yes.
MS. JUDGE: That's correct.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
MR. HARNETT: So if I may --
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, please. Go
ahead. Take a few minutes.
MR. HARNETT: Sure thing. So just to touch on a few items. As the registrar noted, I received the same correspondence that the candidate did in terms of the qualifications. I'm happy to share the email -- share my screen and show you -- the date that the candidate needed to submit to the Board any changes of address was April 14th. And I received -- and I have the timestamp for when the registrar and myself both received the spreadsheet of potential cures that the candidate submitted. And that was on April 20th.

And so there wasn't any submissions that I received, that the registrar received as the registrar would have forwarded those to me,
before April 14th. Our pre-hearing conference was on the 19th -- I'm sorry, it was submitted on the 19th. The 19th was the first day that I saw any documentation submitted by the candidate. There's really two buckets here. There's the first being, you know, for changes of address, those must be submitted within ten days of the challenge. That's what the statute says. And so the deadline for that is April 14th because the challenge was submitted on April 4th.

There's a separate question about, you know, documentation before the Board before this conversation about you know, whether or not the candidate has potential, you know, forms that circulators have completed that attest to the fact that they would have dated the form had they known to or had they read, you know, what it says at the bottom of the petition page. Those can be accepted within 20 days, which we are within and which is, you know, the Board -- the registrar accepted and what is, you know, I imagine going to be a topic of conversation when
you all go into executive session. And so that's a separate bucket.

That is the focus of what my challenge was as I noted in my introduction. The Board may on its motion declare invalid signatures that are not qualifiable under a different part of the statute be it that they were not registered to vote at the time they signed the petition. That they were not a member of the same party. While there were a few of the 29 that were changes of addresses that obviously have since been processed by the Board, for the purposes of this conversation, those were submitted on April 19th, five days after the deadline for -- you know, whether or not it's dated by April 14th, that's sort of irrelevant because the statute says the Board must have received those changes within, you know, the 10-day deadline. So you know, the candidate submitted documentation to the Board that the first documentation that $I$ received was on April 19th.

Separately, the question of whether or
not things are curable, under the statute there is only one item that is curable. And that's changes of address. Even if, you know, let's just say for the purpose of this conversation, they were received within the 10 -day window. Circulator, you know, changes to the nominating petition saying the circulator did actually date or would have dated, you know, that is not a curable issue. If someone was not a registered voter at the time that they signed the petition, that is not a curable issue.

There's a list of noncurable issues in the statute. Only one is curable. And again, that wasn't received as the registrar was hinting at. That was not received before the pre-hearing conference. It was not received before or on April 14th. And I'm sure the registrar would attest to that being the case, but you know, I don't want to speak for anybody else.

MS. JUDGE: Can we respond? CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, please. Yeah, please go ahead.

MS. JUDGE: So I want to just make it clear that while the statute may say that there is this 10-day window from when the challenge is filed, as the Board perfectly stated in their opening that they do have discretion. And because this is a democracy and we believe in fairness and equity and justice, it is impossible to uphold some statute that is disenfranchising. If we cannot find out about when a challenge is made until we are notified by the Board and then that eats into a 10-day window, we have to ask ourselves where is justice? Where is equity? And so we respect every statute that is there and we are definitely wanting to uphold everything, but we also have to be mindful that we have to wait to be told that there's a challenge. And with that, we moved and we acted. And there's also very limited information provided to candidates on how to cure things. And so we just want to make sure that the Board understands that every rule that is out there, we will also adhere to and we have. And so thank you.

MS. JENKINS: Also I would like to elongate that comment by saying that all of the change of addresses are within the parameters. Folks signed out a paper change of address and put them in the mail. And we have the photo of the folks that changed their address and it dated. So we are within those parameters. So it may not have been communicated, I'm not sure, to Mr. Harnett, but once we got communication from the Board of Elections that change of addresses needed to be made, we actually received that on the 13th, a day before the actual window closed. And we still were able to meet that expectation and provide evidence that we actually did it in time for the preliminary hearing.

So I feel like in both cases, but particularly this one, we have gone above and beyond in terms of curing and providing hard tangible evidence. We provided over 64 images that we took and notaries and evidence to cure and have access to the ballot. So I just want to echo cases that have set precedence for
situations similar to my own. And also the academic liberties that $I$ was forced to take because there are not any codes that give guidance on how to cure. So we had to be creative to show that we want access to ballot and that we have met the expectations of the Board and we represent the interest of the over 2,000 people that desire to have me as a candidate, but most importantly desire democracy and enfranchisement.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Thank you so much, everybody. Any other Board members have any questions before we move to the next matter? We've got a lot to sort through on this one. And some (audio interference) with respect to the prior challenge. Just thank you everybody for making your points and helping us understand the issues and frame them well. I promise you, we're going to sort through it thoroughly and you know, apply the laws as written. But to the extent we have discretion, respect the ballot access preference if we can. Thank you so much.

MS. STROUD: The next matter before the Board is Sirraya Gant versus Dorothy Douglas. And before we hear from the Voter Services representative, I'd like to ascertain whether the parties are present on the platform. Sirraya Gant and Dorothy Douglas. And this matter is Sirraya Gant versus Dorothy Douglas, Candidate for Ward 7 Committeewoman of the Democratic State Committee.

MS. GANT: I'm present. Thank you. MS. STROUD: Yes.

MS. DOUGLAS: And I'm present as well.
Thank you.
MS. STROUD: Thank you. And now we'll hear from the Voter Services representative.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Greetings. On March 21st, 2022, Dorothy Douglas submitted a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21, 2022 primary election for the Office of Ward 7 Committeewoman of the Democratic State Committee. The minimum requirement to obtain (audio interference) is 100
signatures of District voters who are duly registered in the same ward (audio interference). The petition contains 100 of the 56 signatures. (Audio interference) public inspection for today as required by law. The petition was (audio interference) by Sirraya Gant, a registered voter in the District of Columbia. Ms. Gant filed challenges to 80 of the 156 signatures submitted. Enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each petition page. The signatures were challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR, Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations. Our review of the challenges indicates that 39 of the 80 challenges are valid. Five are valid because the signer is not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed. Two are valid because the petition does not include the address of the signer. Four are valid because the signers are not dated. Nine are valid because the signers were not registered at the time the
petition was signed.
Six are valid because the signer is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time that the petition was signed. Three are valid because the petition does not include the name of the signer where the signature is not sufficiently legible for identification. And ten are valid because the signer is not registered -- is not a registered voter in the ward from which the candidate seeks nomination at the time the petition was signed.

This leaves the candidate's nominating petition was 117 signatures. Seventeen signatures over the number required for ballot access.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you, Mrs. Green Wright. So we will now hear from Ms. Gant. And if you could state your name and address for the record and you have five minutes.

MS. GANT: Hello. Good morning. I'm Sirraya Gant, 116 56th Street Southeast and 219. And so I agree with the 39 that were invalid, but

I also raise the question about Ms. Dorothy Douglas affidavit -- circulator affidavit and her signing her affidavit. It was raised during the hearing and we spoke about it. And (audio interference) petitions; one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight of the 13 that she changed her dated and compromised the dates on signing her circulators. And too, you couldn't recognize what the dates were. And from my understanding during training for circulators is that you're never supposed to pre-sign your circulators or change the date. It compromises the process and it comprises the signatures on the petition.

During the hearing, Dorothy Douglas
also talked about how she did change it. And she said she changed it based off of the fact that she wanted them to match because they're supposed to match the signatures of the signers. And so I ask that those should be thrown out. And after speaking about that (audio interference), it came back that she initially, I think -- Let me say
what she did. She didn't initial. She crossed them out and she didn't initial 20 of her signatures of 20 of her dates that she put on there.

So one of the things that I'm asking is that they -- that the Board reconsiders the fact of the petitions whose dates were compromised during the time of her turning in her petitions. And like I said again, it was maybe about four sheets.

MS. STROUD: Okay. So just to get clarity or provide clarity because there were some instances in which we really couldn't hear you. But I'm familiar with your challenge. And the issue we've got on some petition sheets that were circulated in the circulator affidavit, some of the dates were crossed out and updated on the sheets.

MS. GANT: Yes.
MS. STROUD: So as a result of that, you think that those sheets should be disregarded and not counted towards meeting the signature
requirements. The signatures on those sheets should not be counted towards the minimum number of signatures required for ballot access because of that issue with scratching out and marking up and updating the dates on the circulator affidavits.

MS. GANT: Exactly, yes. In my training with the circulators is that the dates cannot be compromised. The dates should not be crossed out because you cannot tell -- it's hard to tell afterwards if for whatever reason the circulator changed the date. Because the fact that other people started signing it and then they had to change it, so that's the compromising of it. And so that's why I'm asking that they do not be considered.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. And now we'll hear from you, Ms. Douglas. And if you could state your name and address for the record and then you have five minutes.

MS. DOUGLAS: Can you hear me?
MS. STROUD: Yes, thank you.

MS. DOUGLAS: Okay, I'm sorry. My name is Dorothy Douglas. My address is 4401 Minnesota Avenue. And I want to say Happy belated Easter, everybody. And thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak.

I want to say that the registrar had already approved 117 that qualified me for the ballot. There's nowhere on here that says that I crossed out anything on my petitions. She said look, the only thing that was done, which it was overwritten -- written over so you could see what I had signed. And this was me and I initialed it to say that I signed those dates. And I hear Ms. Gant saying beforehand that I didn't (audio interference) to make that accusation. And I wanted to also say that (audio interference). MR. GURLEY: (Audio interference) talking.

MS. DOUGLAS: Yes, ma'am. Hello?
Okay, can I continue? I also wanted to say that the key code for nomination petition does not say anything that is not allowed to change -- change
or correct or overlap anything. I was present at the time on the date that was corrected in front of the registrar at the date when I submitted my records to them in-person who asked me to correct my petitions in which I did in their presence.

And then they brought back my petition saying things were done -- they were stamped and approved and it was submitted on time.

And I also want to say that I did submit those signatures on time. And now I'm up to 117.

MR. GURLEY: Cell phone. Reserve the time you have left.

MS. DOUGLAS: Can you reserve my time that I have left? So I just wanted to say according to the key code, nomination petition, it doesn't say anything (audio interference) in reference to what you're saying. The only thing that it referenced to is that the nomination means that the register is not dated. That's all that's mentioned.

MR. GURLEY: Reserve your time.

MS. DOUGLAS: Reserve my time please. MS. GANT: Can I say something?
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MR. GURLEY: Can you reserve the time that's remaining of the five minutes?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Absolutely, yes. MR. GURLEY: Okay, thank you. CHAIR THOMPSON: I think Ms. Gant wants to speak again.

MS. GANT: Yes. So I understand what Ms. Douglas is saying. But what wasn't -- if you look at my petitions, I clearly -- that was a challenge that was not -- it was not acknowledged during the preliminary hearing from the report. And I brought it up and I also asked for the recording because it was not -- they ignored it. And then when I brought it up, we talked about it. We talked about -- and Ms. Dorothy did talk about changing the dates on it. And from my understanding, even for her to get there and the registrar is asking her or telling her to change the dates on it, I've never seen that to be done.

Or according to the regulations that you all have that the dates of the circulator should be accurate. It also speaks to her integrity because you should know for sure after all these times being able to sign dates. In Allen versus Silverman, making mistakes tells the integrity of the candidate. For me, in looking at this and understanding what the rules are for the Board of Elections, once a person comes -- because the affidavit -- So once it's compromised several times -- it's not like it's one mistake. It was on six different ones. And if I specifically look at some of them, you can tell the dates said one thing and she changed it to another date. So the accuracy of the circulator should be voided because you don't know -- we don't know. And we don't have any registrar here to say that's accurate what she's saying. Because when I -when I (audio interference), all of my signatures were signed. And so for even a registrar to tell someone to change a date on the circulator affidavit, that shouldn't be allowed.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. MS. GANT: And also --

CHAIR THOMPSON: I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. Ms. Gant were you finished?

MS. GANT: Yes. That's my final thing.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. And Ms. Douglas, you wanted to speak again? MS. DOUGLAS: And also -MR. GURLEY: That's okay, You don't -My name is Calvin Gurley. I'm here not representing, but adding to some of Mrs. Douglas' testimony. And from what $I$ understand here is that this new allegation was not brought up during the pre-hearing. It seems that it is being brought up now. So I don't know if the Board has any kind of concern with that because bringing up issues after the pre-hearing perhaps, I don't know if it's in accord with the proceedings -- the pre-hearing and the actual hearing here. So I need for you to consider
that.
But from Mrs. Dorothy Douglas, when she signed the petition as the person who circulated the petition and the date she used to put down there, that should be here at her discretion up to the point where she finalizes that page and submitted it to the Board of Elections. If she crossed out that particular signature or updated it or corrected, as long as it was done before she submitted it, it was all her arbitration to put the date in which she qualified that particular page.

> And she is the person that's certifying or testifying that she was in front of the voter at that particular time that the voter signed the petition. And she was the one that collected that signature from that particular registered voter. And the registered voter did put their date on there. At the time that she uses that space, that is that circulator's -- her affidavit. The Board never had any problem with a person signing it and that particular date does
not conflict with the signatures of the registered voters. And this is not the case here. I don't see the purpose of why this kind of opposition would be even made or I believe that the Board of Elections has taken out time to address this.

But Mrs. Douglas does have the 117
votes to put her on the ballot. So I think that she clarified and answered any opposition clearly. But with her 117, she's clearly 17 signatures above the 100 that's needed.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Gurley. We appreciate that. I think we've got a handle on this one. And we'll take all that under advisement and talk about it in our executive session.

I think what we'll do if this works for everybody is we'll hear one more challenge, Williams versus Holcomb and then break for half an hour for a sort of quick lunch. Does that sound okay? That seems to be okay. So why don't we proceed now with Williams versus Holcomb.

MS. STROUD: Okay. The next item on the agenda is Jimmie Williams versus Tyrell Holcomb, Candidate for Ward 7 Committeeman of the Democratic State Committee. I would first like to determine whether or not both parties are present in this matter.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. Jimmie Williams, I'm here.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you.
MR. HOLCOMB: Yes. Tyrell Holcomb, I'm here.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. And we'll now hear from the Registrar of Voters or Voter Services representative. Thank you.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: On March 23rd, 2022, Tyrell Holcomb submitted a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as the candidate in the June 21, 2022 primary election for the Office of Ward 7 Committeeman of the Democratic State Committee. The minimum requirement to obtain ballot access for this office is 100 signatures of the District voters who are duly
registered in the same ward and party as the candidate.

The petition contained 120 signatures.
The petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law. The District petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022 by Jimmie Williams, a registered voter in the District of Columbia. Mr. Williams filed challenges to 42 of the 120 signatures submitted, enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each petition page. The signatures were challenged based on the signature's date preceding the signature gathering. And also pursuant to Title 3 DCMR, Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations.

Based on the review of the challenges indicates that 29 of the 42 challenges are valid. Eleven are valid because the signer is not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed. Eight are valid because the signers were not registered at the time that the petition was
signed. Three are valid because the signer is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the same time the petition was signed. And seven are valid because the signatures are pre-dated. This leaves the candidates nominating petition with 91 signatures, nine signatures below the number required for the ballot access.

The Registrar of Voters timely
received seven change of address forms from Tyrell Holcomb on Thursday, April 14th, 2022.

Two of these forms could be accepted and five of the forms were from voters who were not registered. Accordingly, Candidate Holcomb was credited with two signatures that initially been determined to be invalid. This left the candidate's nominating petition with 93 signatures, seven signatures below the number required for ballot access.

After additional review of the challenge, the Registrar of Voters determined that two signatures that had been initially --
that had been initially determined to be invalid were in fact valid. Therefore Mr. Holcomb was credited with two additional signatures. This leaves the candidate's nominating petitions with 95 signatures. Five signatures below the number of required for ballot access.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Quick question. What's the nature of the challenge where a signature is pre-dated? What does that mean?

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: It means that it's not a petition -- I'm sorry. It means that the petition was -- they circulated the petition before they actually collected signatures. So if you sign on -- Say they dated the petition before collecting signatures.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And that affects seven signatures.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: And those are still

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Yes.

CHAIR THOMPSON: There's a part of the

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: The overall challenge, yes.

CHAIR THOMPSON: -- accepted challenges.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
MS. STROUD: Okay. So we'll first hear from Mr. Williams. If you could state your name and address for the record.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. My name is Jimmie Williams. I live at 3605 Highwood Drive Southeast, zip code 20020.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. And you have five minutes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes. I challenged the signatures. And as you've heard in the previous one and the lesson in the trainings, they tell you do not sign the affidavit because the affidavit does state what, five things including that you witness those signatures that you
circulated. And so that's a serious process to ensure integrity of the signatures and that you follow the process, which we all do. However, I'm asserting that they weren't followed because the difference in the dates. It appears that it was signed prior to that date. The dates do predate the dates of the actual signatures, which means the petition looks like it has been presigned.

Secondly, I also say that while the Board does allow sufficient time to clear in most cases; however, the difference is after it's been submitted. So there is ample time to review your petitions to make sure the dates are corrected. And in certain cases, I've seen where petitions have corrected the dates, signed them, and submitted it before submitting to make sure that they are correct. In this particular case, that's not what happened, which is why I assert that those signatures should be thrown in because they're invalid, did not follow the practice. And despite the ample time allowed to correct
prior to submission, that did not happen.
So I'm a strong believer in democratic process and the process with the Board of Elections, but I don't think those were followed here. So given the ample time, as they said, you're not supposed to pre-sign, opportunity to correct -- opportunity to correct before submission. And I think that is really the bright line here is were they correct when they submitted? Was there ample opportunity to correct before they were submitted? There was, but that didn't happen. So as a result, I'm asking that those signatures on Page 11 -- or I do believe, it's Page 11, that they are invalidated. Thank you. With three minutes left, I reserve my time.

MS. STROUD: Thank you. Mr. Holcomb, if you could state your name and address for the record. And then you have five minutes.

MR. HOLCOMB: Yes. Tyrell Holcomb 4020 Minnesota Avenue Northeast 20019 is my zip code.

MS. STROUD: Thank you.
MR. HOLCOMB: So I would say in
response to Mr. Williams firstly that our prehearing was on April the 19th. Mr. Williams did not show up to our pre-hearing. And so we didn't have the opportunity to try to work this out in the pre-hearing. Thus we are where we are today. I certainly do believe that this is an attack on democracy when you look at all three of the candidates who are not running as part of a slate, other candidates who have been challenged by a particular slate. And I believe that, that is essentially -- it is the right of every individual to be able to run.

But furthermore, an attack on
democracy as it relates to the individual who circulated this particular petition page, Mr. Shirley Thompson Wright who is on today's call and who also has submitted an affidavit that has been notarized indicating that she circulated that petition page on the 22nd of March and the 23rd of March. She herself signed the very first
line of that page on the 22nd. There was another person who signed on the second page. The remaining pages were signed on the 23rd when she signed at the very bottom as the circulator, she signed the date in which she signed the petition herself as a voter to endorse me as a person to be on the ballot.

Furthermore, she as a circulator is not one who's been trained on what the process is as it relates to circulating the petition. And so I believe that it is unfair to look at holding her to a process -- holding her to a standard as it relates to knowing all of the ins and outs and the intricacies as it relates to having to sign and date in other matters as it relates to the circulating petitions. Therefore I do believe that the Board should consider this matter and should reinstate the eight, not seven petition signatures -- eight petition signatures that have been challenged and brought into question. And with that, $I$ yield my time to -- With that, I ask the remainder of my time to be held.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Holcomb.

CHAIR THOMPSON: I understand that the circulator pre-signed on March 22nd. The signatures were dated March 23rd and she has since attested to the fact that she personally witnessed the signatures on March 23rd, recognized her clerical error and (audio interference) secure her affidavit in that regard?

MS. STROUD: Well her -- I'll read into the record her statement that she submitted to the Board with respect to the particular petition sheet. "To whom it may concern, I circulated a petition page on behalf of Tyrell M. Holcomb, candidate for Ward 7 Committeeman for the Democratic State Committee on March 22nd, 2022 and March 23rd, 2022. When I signed after circulating the petition, I mistakenly thought the date was March 22nd, 2022."

CHAIR THOMPSON: Oh, it's that simple. She wrote the wrong date down?

MS. STROUD: Well, I understand that Mr. Holcomb, you're saying that she's on the call today. Maybe we could talk to her directly about the circumstances around the signing of the circulator's affidavit?

MR. HOLCOMB: Yes, she is on the call.
MS. STROUD: Okay.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, we'd love to hear from you, Ms. Thompson Wright.

MS. STROUD: Shirley Thompson Wright. Is she under a number of a particular name?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Also if you could raise your hand --

MS. STROUD: Yeah, that would be helpful.

CHAIR THOMPSON: -- Ms. Thompson Wright, if you could just raise the hand, we'll spot you right away. You might be under a different name. There she is. Galaxy.

MS. THOMPSON WRIGHT: Good morning -afternoon, I'm sorry.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Ms. Wright, just one
second. I guess since you're a fact witness, we're just going to swear you in as best we can if that's okay. Go ahead, Terri.

MS. STROUD: Hi, Ms. Thompson Wright.
If you could affirm that what you are about to state in the record is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Would you raise your hand and affirm that statement? MS. THOMPSON WRIGHT: I do affirm that.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. And now we'll hear from you with respect to the circumstances around the signing of the circulator affidavit for Sheet 11.

MS. THOMPSON WRIGHT: Yes. So I
circulated a petition for Tyrell Holcomb. On the 22nd, I received it. And then I circulated it the 22nd and the 23rd. When $I$ went to sign at the bottom, I did mistakenly put the 22nd date because it was just moving so fast and it was my mistake. And I put the 22nd and not the 23rd as the date that $I$ gave him the actual petitions
from the signatures that $I$ received for him. MS. STROUD: Okay. So you were circulating the petition on March 22nd and March 23rd.

MS. THOMPSON WRIGHT: Correct. MS. STROUD: And you signed the
affidavit -- the portion of the affidavit where you're supposed to fill in the date, you signed that on the 22nd.

MS. THOMPSON WRIGHT: No, I signed it once I gave it back to Tyrell, but I signed it as the 22nd date just mistakenly. I should have put the 23rd on there when I gave it back to him the next following day. I think it was about 2 o'clock in the afternoon. I was really hustling and bustling when I got those last signatures. And I was on my way back to work and I just -the date just went past me. I put the $22 n d$ and not the 23 rd.

CHAIR THOMPSON: You signed it on the 23rd, but you mistakenly wrote the 22nd?

MS. THOMPSON WRIGHT: Yes, sir.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Got it.
MS. THOMPSON WRIGHT: I initially signed by signature on the 22nd, but when I gave it back to Tyrell, it was the 23rd. And I signed the 22nd and it should have been the 23rd. It was just an oversight. And I did fill out an affidavit and we had it notarized. So I was just hoping that this mistake could be overlooked -not overlooked, but it wouldn't, you know, harm his chance to run in this election primary.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Well thank you so much. I think we have everything we need on this matter.

MR. WILLIAMS: I do have a response and I think I have time reserved, 3 minutes? CHAIR THOMPSON: Go ahead, sir. Yeah. MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. I think my concern is understanding. So when I submitted petitions, I reviewed all the petitions I received to make sure they are compliant to the DC Board of Education law. I reviewed the dates. I reviewed the signatures to make sure that I am
in compliance. And I do understand people make errors, but at the same time, I think the rules exist for a reason, including disagreements such as this. That's why there are rules.

Regardless if there is a clerical error, before you submit those petitions, you have the opportunity to review them and correct. In one instance, $I$ did see where a petition that I reviewed corrected the petition, initialed them, and signed them correctly before they submitted it to the Board of Education, which is the process. I think it makes it able to ensure there's democracy and to ensure that these are done correctly. This minimizes a correct -- a such thing as saying a clerical error, because it's my name and I want to make sure that it's done in process. So regardless of intent and asking for exceptions, $I$ think it's pretty much, the rules exist for a reason.

So if you submitted an incorrect date and it's your election, you have every attempt before submitting to make sure that you submit
correct and valid signatures that are dated and corrected before you submit it. So I've heard signature arguments already before. And several people have caught that, they recognized them, and they corrected them before they submitted. Once it's submitted, $I$ think it's a different case.

Clerical errors are errors, but when you go by really was it correctly submitted? Then I think that is the fault of the person who is campaigning. It should be correctly submitted and the Board of Elections allows ample time to make that correction. So that is where I still stand and I concur with the Registrar's findings and that's why I raised the difference. I did have an emergency where $I$ was not able to attend the previous hearing, but again, it moved forward because I filed the challenge and I think exactly it still stands regardless. And that's why I'm here today. Thank you.

MS. STROUD: I think Mr. Holcomb reserved time if you want --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah. Mr. Holcomb, I think you reserved time. Did you want to have the final word?

MR. HOLCOMB: Yes. So certainly thank you for the opportunity to respond as the challenger asked. I hear the point that's been raised as it relates to the opportunity to correct. But in this regard as a candidate who did not circulate this particular petition page, if I were to be the one to correct it, I would have been forging either her initial or her signature on that particular page, which is I believe to my knowledge, a federal crime.

And with that furthermore, $I$ do not believe it is encompassed upon any of us to disenfranchise voters. This is exactly what would have happened in this instance if these eight petition signatures are to be thrown out because Ms. Thompson Wright as she has so eloquently put today, put the incorrect date by mistake. And also to the fact that she signed the date -- the date she signed is the date that
she signed at the very bottom. Obviously this is an honest mistake.

Furthermore, the working class individuals who signed by petition, the working class individuals who circulated this petition are of the same class of people who just like my mom and my grandmother were that got me in this process in the very beginning as a young man. Furthermore, citing the federal law that this is not punitive. This particular rule is no punitive. And certainly we should protect the rights to access the ballot for minority candidates in any particular election. And so with that said, $I$ ask the Board to consider what has been said today by myself and Ms. Thompson Wright and ensure that these eight petition signatures are credited so that I can run and make the ballot as a candidate. Thank you.

MS. STROUD: Yeah. I just want to -Mr. Holcomb, you know, I just want to make a statement. I think this is for the benefit of anyone who wants to get involved in this process.

You had stated -- and this is, you know, just to state for the record because I think it's important because this is such an important process and you had indicated that your circulator was not trained. But you picked up documents at the beginning of the process, the documents titled "circulating and filing nominating petitions".
And all candidates when they get
ballot access materials, they sign to acknowledge that they have received these document. And one of the things that, that document says at the onset is that as a candidate seeking elected office in the District of Columbia, you are responsible for ensuring that each individual who circulates nominating petitions on your behalf complies with all pertinent rules and regulations regarding petition circulation. So when you enlist individuals to circulate on your behalf, it's incumbent upon you as the candidate to make sure that they know and are aware of and follow the rules governing petition circulation.

And I just wanted to state that for the benefit of you know, anyone out there who's engaging in this process. And so that's just, you know, not necessarily in reference to your particular, you know, situation. But it is incumbent on individuals who are, you know, enlisting others to circulate on their behalf to ensure that they are familiar with and are following. And we do provide training sessions where individuals are made aware of the rules and regulations surrounding the petition circulation process. And so I just think it's important to state that for the record with respect to these matters.

MR. HOLCOMB: Mr. Chair, may I respond?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yeah, briefly.
MR. HOLCOMB: Thank you. I just want to say that I wasn't in any way trying to circumvent that aspect of the process. But what I would say is that in refuting what you said, what I was alluding to was formalized training.

I do know that there is formalized training and I assume that based on what my challenger was saying and his comments as it related to training as a person who himself has ran campaigns and hired individuals to be a part of his campaigns, I assume that he was relating to formalized training. And that's why $I$ made the comment $I$ made about it.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Well thank you so much and complements on your background for those. So with that, we're going to take a break. I said half an hour. It's 12:25, so why don't we say 1:00 p.m. And we'll resume with Reed versus Candon, then go to Meadows versus Muhammad. Then Jaffe versus Bradley. Then Fleming versus Bradley. And finally, MartinezMunoz versus White.

The final matter, I'm just going to say, we won't start it before 2:00 p.m. If anyone's listening and waiting for that matter, when we resume at 1:00, 1 think it will take us at least an hour to get through four of those.

So you can rest assured, we won't start that one before 2:00 p.m. We'll see if we can finish up the next five in another two hour block of time. And thank you so much, everybody for participating so far in the hearing.

So we are temporarily -- Oh, I guess
I should make a motion to temporarily adjourn for lunch and resume at 1:00 p.m. Do I have a second? Oh, the Zoom link will be the same everybody. All right. Well hearing no objection, we'll take a break until 1:00 p.m. Thanks.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at $12: 27 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. and resumed at 1:06 p.m.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay well, good afternoon everybody. I made the mistake of walking outside for a bit. Wow. What a beautiful one.

MEMBER GILL: I think we blame Terri

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.

MEMBER GILL: -- for choosing the best spring day of 2022. It's not your fault, Terri.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Oh, goodness. Well here we are stuck inside at least two more hours. And I see that Mike Gill and Karyn Greenfield are here so we are resumed on the record.

And we're going to pick up now with the sixth case, Denise Reed vs. Mary Candon. And I guess first if each can confirm that they're here for starters.

MR. GILL: Denise Reed.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Denise Reed?
MS. REED: I'm here.
MS. CANDON: MaryEva Candon is here. And I need to really point out my name. My first name is MaryEva, M-A-R-Y-E-V-A and my last name is Candon.

And I did put on my signature of candidacy that I would have, my name would be spelled out as capital M-A-R-Y, no space, capital E-V-A, space Candon so.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Got you. Now

MaryEva, thank you so much.
MS. CANDON: Yes.
MS. STROUD: Did you say that the E was capitalized, MaryEva?

MS. CANDON: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. With that we'll hear from Voter Services.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: On March 23rd, 2022, MaryEva Candon submitted a nominating Petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21, 2022, primary election for the Office of National Committeewoman of the Democratic State Committee.

The minimum requirement to obtain ballot access for this office is 500 signatures of district voters who are duly registered in the same party as the candidate.

The Petition contains 523 signatures. The Petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law. The Petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022, by Denise Reed, a registered voter in the District of Columbia.

Ms. Reed filed challenges to 111 of the 523 signatures submitted enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each Petition page.

The signatures were challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations. Per the review of the challenges, it indicates that 90 of the 111 challenges are valid.

Four are valid because the signor is not registered to vote at the address listed on the Petition at the time the Petition was signed. Two are valid because the signors were not registered at this time the Petition was signed.

One is valid because the Petition does not include the address of the signor. Three are valid because the Petition does not include the name of the signor where the signature is not sufficiently legible for identification.

One is valid because the signor's voter registration was designated as inactive on the voter role at the time the Petition was
signed. Three are valid because the signature is not dated.

One is valid because the signor is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the Petition was signed. Seventy are valid because the circulator of the Petition sheet was not a qualified Petition circulator at the time the Petition was signed. And five are valid because the signatures are predated. This leaves the candidate's nominating Petition with 433 signatures, 67 signatures below the number required for ballot access.

At the Prehearing Conference, Ms. Candon requested that the Registrar of Voters review several challenges that had been initially determined to be valid.

After another review by the Registrar of Voters, one signature challenge that was initially determined to be valid has now been determined to be invalid.

In addition, upon this review, it was
determined Sheet No. 29 also had double circulated signatures which removes 10 additional signatures.

This leaves a candidate's Nominating Petition with 424 signatures, 76 below the number required for ballot access.

MS. STROUD: Okay. Thank you. At this time we will hear from Ms. Reed. And Ms. Reed, if you could state your name and address for the record, and then you can commence with your position and you have five minutes.

MS. REED: Good morning. My name is
Denise L. Reed. I reside at 1711 40th Street Southeast, Washington, D.C. 20020.

MS. STROUD: Okay.
MS. REED: May I proceed?
MS. STROUD: You may proceed.
MS. REED: Good morning Board Members, Counsel, Madame Registrar, Ms. Candon, Representatives and our viewing public and participating citizens.

My name is Denise L. Reed, a citizen
and registered voter of Washington, D.C. I have introduced and filed a challenge to the Petition of MaryEva Candon.

As a citizen of Washington, D.C., I take great interest in protecting the integrity of our election process for our beloved city. It is in that interest that we all adhere to rules and procedures established in the best interest of a fair and transparent process.

With this aim, we are presented with a candidate who has grossly maligned the process with multiple egregious abnormalities of policy established by the Board of Elections.

As witness hereto and the Board of Elections, Registrar Report, it has been carefully highlighted the various deficiencies in attempting to qualify for ballot process.

I'm sorry, ballot access, excuse me. I take no relation in not being able to allow the citizens to have an opportunity to engage and to express their reasonable interest in selecting the candidate of their choice.

However, this process deserves integrity and equitable application to all involved. Therefore, it is my request that the Board and its members, based on the Registrar's Report and the Petition challenge previously submitted regarding this candidate's access to the ballot be preliminary denied and/or withdrawal accepted. Thank you for your time today.

CHAIRMAN THOMPSON: Okay.
MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you, Ms. Reed. And now we will hear from Ms. Candon.

MS. CANDON: Hi, hello Commissioners and this wonderful public servants at the Board of Elections. I am MaryEva Candon. I live at 2122 California Street Northwest, D.C., of course, 20008.

And I am registered Democrat and at the address I listed on my form. I want to first of all, submit five statements for the record just to make sure that the Board has seen them and I'll just read, I'm not going to read them
all.
I'm just going to say four of them are to address the eight signatures not dated. And one of the submissions is a letter from attorney, Johnny Barnes in reference to the challenge.

Okay so, I want to say that I have submitted affidavits that affect eight signatures that have been challenged and I don't believe the, well anyway, so I think they can be allowed. But more importantly, the, how many I think, well anyway, I think it's 80 --. I'm sorry, let me go back. I want to also put on the record that the Board of Elections Registrars have said there are 523 signatures submitted and I contest that, but I'm not going to argue that today.

$$
\text { I believe } 528 \text { signatures were }
$$

submitted. And among that in the challenge, in the sheets of the challenge, four of the challenged signatures were counted twice as challenges.

So that would make that rather than

111 challenges, it's actually 107 and those four are in the category of the unqualified circulator 80 challenges.

So I want to put that on the record that the numbers are slightly different. But predominately, $I$ want to address the 80 challenges that are for one proposed violation and that is that the circulators of those sheets were unqualified.

So I am here to try to explain that, in fact, they are qualified and I want to provide you a sample because what actually happened is that the circulators on those sheets that have been disqualified because of two circulators signing the one sheet, that's because the circulator got back, the initial circulator got this sheet back to me with say, with fewer than ten signatures.

So I circulated it after they gave it to me to get the remaining signatures and then I signed my qualified information just under the initial circulators so that what can do is see
when the initial circulators signed, you go up to that date and see how far down the signatures come to be within that date.

Those were circulated by the initial signature and the last three say my date is, it includes the signatures within that. So I think that once it's understood that the signatures had qualified circulators circulating them, I mean and observing them, then our interest in having valid signatures that a circulator a qualified circulator gathered is clear.

If you understand the two dates and come down the signature lines. So I don't think they're unqualified circulators at all. What I mean is --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Right.
MS. CANDON: -- I'm a little confused at the --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Right.
MS. CANDON: -- that being a violation because it --

CHAIR THOMPSON: It's just that we
can't tell which circulator is attesting to which signatures. There's not like a --

MS. CANDON: Yes, that's -- I'm sorry. Let me try to explain that again. I really apologize that this seems difficult. I had one that I wanted to show you.

Let's look at Sheet 29. At least I'll use this as an example, Sheet 29. That has ten voters' signatures on it including the first circulator at the bottom.

She collected all of the signatures up until 3-20 which she wrote under her circulating signature. So it happens that $I$ was out gathering signatures, she handed this to me so I had the next voter $I$ ran into sign ten and you see that date is 3-21.

And I signed below 3-21 that I had
observed that person signing that signature. So Laura Lee Nesters (phonetic) who dated a circulator of line 3-20, she gathered the signatures from 3-11 to 3-19.

And then I had another voter fill in
and I observed them and so that's why I carefully signed the exact information in the exact order. So you just have to look at the date --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. CANDON: -- and the circulators.
And see --
CHAIR THOMPSON: Well, thank you so much for that. I was looking at Sheet 29 as you walked us through that and it's crystal clear to me so thank you.

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes.
MS. CANDON: Okay so it, anyway well that's basically my point of and I think that the having two, my effort to and I am the only second circular of these 80 challenged signatures which by the way is four more than, it's really 76 because of the double challenged on one sheet.

Would you like me to identify that sheet?

CHAIR THOMPSON: No.
MS. CANDON: No.
CHAIR THOMPSON: I think we're good.

One question I have for Voter Services is I see a comment in her notes that should the Board accept the "double circulator sheet signatures as valid, the remaining challenges are insufficient to deny ballot access" so this is --

MS. CANDON: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: -- in other words, this is the outcome determinative?

MS. CANDON: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Is that true as well, Voter Services?

MS. STROUD: Yes.
MEMBER GILL: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. All right well thank you so much. Any other questions out there?

MEMBER GILL: No. MS. CANDON: My only question would be if you have further questions than we've discussed, you know, would you get in touch with the challenger and the challengee or the challenged?

In other words, if you have any further questions, will you get back to us or --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Probably not. We're going to go into Executive session in a little bit and we're going to decide the outcome. This is one where we can take until Monday if we would like to --

MS. STROUD: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: -- so we may decide during session that we do have questions and we will certainly let you know, but it's possible we'll decide this afternoon. So if there's anything else you want to add to the record, please go ahead.

MS. CANDON: No, well I mean, no.
CHAIR THOMPSON: And --
MS. CANDON: That's --
CHAIR THOMPSON: And also for the record, we do have and I've read carefully your April 14th letter that has five attachments to it, various statements and affidavits and a letter from attorney Johnny Barnes. So I want
you to know we've read those as well.
MS. CANDON: Right. I do have a
question. I was wondering well, oh yes, on the pre-dated I think I have five that Ms. Reed has claimed are pre-dated.

I was wondering where it's located that, where in the statute or in the regulations does it say that the ten signatures, the circulator's date has to be after the ten signatures because, in fact, $I$ think that the one way to read it is that the circulators should sign it so that the person -- and date it, so that the person signing the sheet realizes it's an official sheet and it's a valid circulator? You understand what I mean there?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, but I think it's an attestation by the circulator that they witnessed the signature so logically it would come on or after the date of the signatures of the --

MS. CANDON: But if it's logical, but I don't think it's, you know, I don't -- it's not
a requirement. It's not a rule or a-MS. STROUD: Well you can't, Ms.

Candon, you can't swear or affirm that you've done something and attest to having done something if you haven't done it yet.

MS. CANDON: Well no, but that's where our attesting to the Board before you submit it. It doesn't mean that the -- you know, some circulators might think and sharp circulators, you know, circulators who have done it before, they might think that the minute they get the sheet they should sign it and date it so that it's their sheet and it's all official. It's not clear to me that it --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, your point is well taken. I understand. We'll take that into advisement to the extent that that's even an issue here that we have to decide. We may not need to drill down on that one, but --

MS. CANDON: Right. Okay.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much and you've taken some time so let me give the
challenger, Ms. Reed, any final comments from you?

MS. REED: Yes, thank you very much. I just wanted to further state that as an attorney, Ms. Candon should understand the importance of not compromising an affidavit.

When we present ourselves as candidates and the Board of Elections gives us the blank Petitions to take out to the public, we are given more than a sufficient amount to do that where it's not necessary to add an additional circulator to any of our pages.

And also, on the day that $I$ came on April 4th to review Ms. Candon's Petitions, when I saw the egregiousness and the number of pages that had been double signed as an additional circulator, $I$ questioned an official there about it because $I$ just couldn't believe that somebody would do that multiple times on multiple pages.

And at that time $I$ was told, no it is not allowed. And so therefore I proceeded to complete the challenge sheets in the manner that

I did for the I believe it was eight pages that were double signed.

So you know, we have rules and we need to be consistent or why should we have rules at all and so it's very obvious that Ms. Candon sought to skirt those rules and now she's trying to explain it away when rules are rules.

I ask that you uphold the findings of the Registrar. Thank you very much.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay well thank you so much. And we will address this in Executive Session later. And with that, we'll turn next to the challenge of David Meadows regarding Anthony Muhammad. And let's just first confirm that they're both here.

MS. STROUD: Yes and actually so Mr. Muhammad is the Slate Representative, but there are other individuals who are the actual members of the three member slate, the Fight the Power 8 slate and so $I$ just want to confirm that let's see David Meadows is first. Yes, I see you here, Mr. Meadows. And Anthony Muhammad are you --

MR. MUHAMMAD: I'm here.
MS. STROUD: -- here, sir? Okay. And then the other two slate members are --

MR. JOHNSON: Joseph Johnson and -MS. STROUD: Joseph Johnson and Ms. Williams.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Sandra Williams.
MS. STROUD: Sandra Williams, yes. Are you all present or Mr. Muhammad, will you be representing the slate in this matter?

MR. MUHAMMAD: Joseph Johnson is present.

MS. STROUD: Okay.
MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Johnson will.
MS. STROUD: Okay. So we will first hear the report of the Registrar of Voters in this matter.

MS. GREEN WRIGHT: On March 7th, 2022, Anthony Muhammad submitted a Nominating Petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21, 2022, primary election with the Office of Ward 8 Committeeman of the Democratic State

Committee.
The minimum requirement to obtain valid access for this office is 100 signatures of district voters who are duly registered in the same ward and party as the candidate.

The Petition contained 158 signatures.
The Petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law. The Petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022, by David Meadows, a registered voter in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Meadows filed challenges to 79 of the 158 signatures submitted enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each Petition page.

The signatures were challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations. After reviewing, after the reviewing of the challenges in the case that 65 of the 79 challenges are valid.

Twenty-nine are valid because the signor is not registered to vote at the address listed on the Petition at the time that the

Petition was signed.
Eighteen are valid because the signers were not registered at the time the Petition was signed. Two are valid because the Petition does not include the address of the signor.

Five are valid because the Petition does not include the name of the signor where the signature is not sufficiently legible for identification.

Two are valid because the signor's voter registration was designated as inactive on the voter roll at the time the Petition was signed. Two are valid because the signature is not made by the person whose signature it purports to be.

And seven are valid because the signature is not registered to vote in the same party as a candidate at the time the Petition was signed.

This left the candidate's Nominating Petition with 93 signatures, seven signatures below the number required for valid access. At
the prehearing conference, Mr. Meadows requested that the Registrar of Voters reduce several challenges that had been initially determined to be invalid.

After another review by the Registrar of Voters, nine of the signature challenges that were initially determined to be invalid are valid.

Two are valid because the signer is not a registered voter in the Ward from which the candidate seeks nomination at the time the Petition was signed and seven are valid because the date on the Petition was dated after the Nominating Petition was filed with the Board.

This leaves the candidates Nominating Petition with 84 signatures, 16 signatures below the number required for ballet access.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. And Mr. Meadows, if you could state your name and address for the record, we'll hear from you now in response to the Registrar of Voters or the Voter Services report with respect to your challenge.

MR. MEADOWS: Yes, good afternoon. My name is David Meadows, I live at 305 the letter K Street Southeast, Washington, D.C. 20003 in Ward 8.

I want to thank the Board for your time on this matter and to the Registrar and the staff for your attention. This challenge was filed in good faith without animosity in a timely manner as pursuant to statutory code.

The Fight the Power Slate failed to cure the deficiencies within the allotted timeframe and we believe that the Board has no option but to accept the Registrar's findings that show that the Slate is 16 signatures short of the 100 required signatures needed.

I must point out that this is roughly one-fifth of one percent of the current 46,923 registered Democrats within Ward 8. And I will reserve my time as needed.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. And Mr. Johnson, will you be representing the slate in terms of the response to the Registrar's report?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Good afternoon. MS. STROUD: If you could state your name and address for the record.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Joseph Johnson, 2431 Alabama Avenue Southeast, Washington, D.C. zip code 20020, Apartment 202.

MS. STROUD: Thank you. And you have five minutes.

MR. JOHNSON: And I'll free here and we did discuss the challenges, the determination that they made the four finding, the seven below the required signatures to gain ballot access.

Our concerns in the prehearing was not addressed as the registering attorney for the Board overlooked our concerns, but did pay clear attention to David's concerns so I'll go over some of the initial concerns that we had in the prehearing.

On Page 1 of 20, signature 1, line 1, signature 6, lines 6, 8 and 10, the Board said that those signatures was originally okay. Or they said that they needed a change of address.

On Page 3 of 20, 7, 8 and 10 the Board said that they were all in Ward 8. Page 4 of 20, 1, 4 and 8 and 9, the Board said that they needed a change of address.

A lot of these changes happened where we did not have time. This was after the prehearing. A lot of changes have been after so we did not have time to basically reach out to the residents that signed our Petitions to obtain those corrections.

Page 5 of 20, 3, 8 and 9, the same exact same. Page 6 of 20, 2 and 6, the same exact same. Page 4, Page 7 of 20, 4 and 8, same exact same. Page 10 of 20, number 2, Page 12 of 20, number 3 and on to Page 17 of 20, I have some of these, these are my family members that is on the call to testify.

One, two, four, six, nine and ten, those were challenged as the date and forged signatures so they are on a call to corroborate and verify their signatures, but when it comes to the date, the dates was not put there.

We are and still in the midst of a pandemic. People have moved, addresses have not been updated or changed over and so I am asking the Board to look into this to grant us access on the ballot as there is a lot of discrepancies in their report and when it comes to Page 17 of 20, number 2, they have my father as a Republican when he's a Democrat when it pulls up in the Board of Election system.

And so we made these concerns known. None of these are new concerns. The Board and the email that they sent, they did not address our concerns, but they did address David's concerns and so none of these are new.

I said that in our prehearing from Page 1 through 20 these were concerns of ours on every page, but those concerns was not addressed and like I said, some of my family members and other residents is on the call to address their signature and as it says for the dates, not too long ago, the Board granted Regina Pixley access on the ballot with no dates at all.

And so there is a date there and so I would ask the Board to grant us access. And any remaining time I would like to hold. Thank you. CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. Do any of the, Ms. Greenfield or Mr. Gill, do you have any questions for either party?

MR. GILL: No questions, Terri. MS. STROUD: Okay.

CHAIR THOMPSON: I'll just say that, you know, this is one where it doesn't look like there's sort of like a big sort of a legal issue like can you cure a circulator's affidavit, that sort of thing.

This is about the detail, signature by signature. And it looks like the finding is for 16 short, but I want to promise you that we're going to look and re-examine the details on all 20 of those sheets that you just walked us through.

And really double our efforts to make sure we get it right and we'll take that under
advisement in our executive session.
MS. STROUD: So just for
clarification, Mr. Johnson, you're saying that you understood that you had signatures that could be cured pursuant to changes of address, but are you saying that you submitted the changes of address or were not able to?

MR. JOHNSON: Both. Thank you. Some of these just came up. Right? So during the prehearing we just received this, the new up to date that was added and a lot of these were on Page 17 of 20 was not there.

So basically these are not new challenges, they were challenged, but they were not challenged in terms of -- the Board basically said that they were okay and so that when they re-looked and they came back and they said that for the signature, for instance, if we look at minus the ten, they challenged me and I'm the candidate, but they saying my signature is forged.

So the problem here is if I'm a
candidate and I'm attesting to my signature and I'm saying that my signature is not forged, I don't understand the disconnect there and so I had this conversation with the attorney of the Board and as well as Ms. Karen Brooks, the Registrar of the Board, and I'm just, like I said, I listened to everyone and their arguments today and I'm just concerned that the democracy and everything that everybody is so concerned about is at risk here because there's a possibility we are using outdated information or an outdated system to verify these signatures. The card that the Registrar sent Ms. Karen Brooks, some of these were from 2013 and 2014. If that's in between of 7 to 8 years or even 10 years, signatures change over time.

Even if it's just the slightest, you know, you taking the $J$ up or whatever the case may be, over time these things do change and, you know, the idea of it is a lot of these things was not addressed in our prehearing and so I'm hoping that the Board look into this and grant us access
on the Board, on the ballet.
MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you.
MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, thank you everybody. With that, we'll turn to the eighth case.

MR. GILL: Yes.
MS. STROUD: Yes.
CHAIR THOMPSON: The case of Dennis Jaffe vs. Bradley Thomas.

MS. STROUD: Yes, and then I just want to ascertain that the parties are here. Mr. Jaffee and Mr. Thomas?

MR. THOMAS: Yes, I am present. As a preliminary matter, however, I have authorized attorney Robert Bell pursuant to 3 DCMR of 403.2 and 403.3 to represent me in this matter. And Mr. Bell is on board as well.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you. So first of all, we'll hear from Voter Services and then Mr. Jaffe and then Mr. Bell on behalf of Bradley Thomas. And as always, each party will
have five minutes to state their position.
MR. BELL: Thank you. There is a preliminary matter that I wish to address if I could so that we can save time. The preliminary matter is that there are two hearings involving Mr. Bradley Thomas.

This one and the second one involving Nathan Fleming vs. Bradley Thomas. The issues are the same from a legal perspective and we think for administrative convenience and economy, if these two were combined, the arguments that would be made in opposition by Mr. Thomas would I think save the court -- I mean this panel from having to go through two hearings involving this exact same issue.

The major issue is that there that we argue is there is a lack of jurisdiction on the part of the Board to move forward with untimely challenges.

And on the fact of both of the documents filed by both of these challenges, there are untimely as a matter of fact by looking
at the face of them.
Both of them have been filed at a time that the office was closed. And so that's a legal position that we think that the Board does not have authority to proceed with and adjudicate.

And if you combine them, then you can make that argument without you having to hear the same thing twice.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, --
MR. BELL: So we hereby move to consolidate.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Well, I thank you for that. I think what we'll do is we'll hear from Voter Services on Mr. Jaffe's challenge, then also hear from Voter Services on Mr. Fleming's challenge.

Then we'll hear from Mr. Jaffee and then from Mr. Fleming and then, Mr. Bell, that will give you a chance to consolidate all of your comments including your threshold abduction to the Board having jurisdiction at all.

MR. BELL: That's fine. I understand. Another preliminary matter is that we move to dismiss either this matter because of lack of jurisdiction by the Board to hear it.

And I'd be prepared to address both of those at the conclusion.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, we'll hear that when we come to you and I, you know, appreciate that, the importance of that issue. So we're going to make sure, is Mr. Fleming here?

MR. FLEMING: I am here, but I am not prepared. I was not informed that I would need to be prepared for this particular hearing, so that's my position.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right.
MR. BELL: And we hereby move to
dismiss his challenge because he's not prepared to go forward.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, I tell you what, let's go back to Jaffe vs. Thomas. Let's hear from Voter Services and then we'll turn to Mr. Jaffee.

MS. THOMPSON: Good afternoon. On March 23rd, 2022, Bradley Thomas submitted a Nominating Petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21, 2022, primary election for the Office of At Large Member of the Council. The minimum requirements of obtain ballot access for this office is 2,000 signatures of District voters who are duly registered in the party as the candidate.

The Petition contained 2,443
signatures. The Petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law. The Petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022, by Dennis Jaffe, a registered voter in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Jaffee filed challenges to 865 of the 2,443 signatures submitted enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each Petition page.

This was challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations. In reviewing of the challenges indicated that 789
of the 865 challenges are filed, are valid. I'm sorry.

One hundred seventy-four are valid because the signor is not a registered voter, is not registered to vote, the address listed on the Petition at the time the Petition was signed.

Two hundred sixty-three are valid because the signors are not registered. Twentythree are valid because the signors' voter registration was designated as inactive on the voter roll at the time the Petition was signed.

Ten are valid because the Petition does not include the address of the signor. Twenty-seven are valid because the signature is not dated. Thirteen are valid because the signature is a duplicate of a valid signature.

Sixty-three are valid because the Petition does not include the name of the signor, the signor is not especially legible for identification.

Seven are valid because the signature is not made by the person whose signature it
purports to be. One hundred and forty are valid because the signor is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the Petition was signed.

And 69 that are valid because the circulator of the Petition failed to complete all required information in the circulator's affidavit.

This left the circulated, I'm sorry, the candidate's Nominated Petition with 1,654 signatures. Three hundred and forty-six signatures below the number required for ballot access.

Following this review, the Registrar of Voters timely received 12 change of address forms from Mr. Thomas on Thursday, April 14th, 2022. Six of these forms could be accepted as address changes.

The remaining were not accepted in regards to this challenge because two of the forms were from the voters who were not registered. One of the forms was a voter found
to be inactive and three of the forms were no changes to their voter record.

Accordingly, Mr. Thomas was credited with six signatures that had initially been determined to be invalid. This leaves the candidates Nominating Petition with 1,660 signatures, 340 signatures below the number required for ballot access.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, Mr. Jaffe.
MS. STROUD: Yes, Mr. Jaffe, if you could state your name and address for the record and we'll have five minutes to present your response to the Voter Services report.

MR. JAFFE: Thank you. My name is
Dennis Jaffe. I reside at 1629 Columbia Road Northwest, Apartment 726, Washington, D.C. 20009. When I reviewed various Petitions for the candidates, I started out with the expectation that maybe it was nasve on my part after all these years I don't know, that each candidate in each campaign took with the utmost seriousness the expectation that rules be complied with and
that the Petitions filed be done so competently.
I ran two Petition signature efforts in 2010 and 2011. I ran another one four years ago in 2018. All of which exceeded the required number of signatures by many, many, many signatures.

When in January before I was even thinking about supporting Ms. Gore for Council, I wrote a letter to the D.C. Council urging them to consider lowering the number of signatures on, that would be required all around because of the pandemic.

There was no action on that and at the same time I received a response from Ms. Gore that said that she appreciated the notion of what I was saying and she was committed in her response to powering through as she wrote to doing the best as the campaign could to comply with the law.

$$
\text { I didn't know at that time that } I
$$ would be running the effort for Ms. Gore. There was not one other candidate who responded for at-

large Council.
To the letter that I shared with the other candidates, Mr. Thomas did not respond at all. I would have welcomed that. And I welcome his belated notion that it was too many signatures, but $I$ don't see the purpose of contesting a rule long after it went into effect.

You just can't do that. And that's something that Mr. Thomas had raised during the prehearing. You just can't change the rules after the rules are completely implemented.

And while I respect Mr. Thomas, with respect to his leadership on Statehood and on the ANC and having resided in D.C. for generations in his own family, in my having looked at the Petitions that he filed, when we filed the 865 challenges to the Petitions, it was because, to my surprise, someone with the amount of experience that he had apparently had circulators who just let him down.

They did not rise to the occasion of doing the kind of job that any candidate
deserves. But that doesn't give an attorney or a candidate, even the candidate who's an attorney, the right to challenge what the rule is with respect to the 2,000 long after it's been done.

In fact, it's kind of odd I would think that Mr. Thomas filed 12 change of address forms although only six were legitimate. If he was contesting the 2,000 being legitimate in the first place which is not something the Board of Elections can do anything about.

It was the Council many months ago. I don't know why he bothered even responding to the challenge at all if he thinks in his mind that for some make-believe reason that it was not timely.

We were there well before 5 o'clock or before 5 o'clock, a little after 4:00 I'd say. And it's odd that he bothered to legitimize the process and the challenge that we filed, that I filed with respect to attempting to get change of address forms.

Why bother if the challenge is
illegitimate in his mind? Why bother if the 2,000 was illegitimate and he exceeded to, well he got more than 1,600 signatures.

Why bother contesting the challenge if it was based upon the notion that 2,000 is required? It just doesn't make sense to me. You know, the time that he mentioned, $I$ was there at 4:30 and filed.

As I stated during the prehearing, I looked at my cell phone and saw 4:59 when the Clerk came up to me to accept what we had already prepared and they said, put down 5 o'clock. I said, okay. Put down 5 o'clock. I did that.

But it's just frightening that Mr.
Thomas kind of has a cafeteria style of complying with the rules. Oh, I'm going to make up something about this time that they were there even though he wasn't there to see it.

Other people were there when I was there. And their office was not closed. So it's odd that he pays attention to a rule of the time that he makes up that we were not in compliance
with, but then there's a rule about 2,000 signatures and that rule does not have to apply.

It, that just doesn't make sense to me. It is odd that to me he's challenging or that he makes the argument especially with the 2,000 only after failing to file enough cures to bring him up to the 2,000.

And if there weren't enough curable defects to allow him to do that to begin with. So I take the process very seriously. I respect the process. Some things are easier than others to comply with.

That's why I asked questions and I cannot possibly, I cannot say enough how incredibly accessible and responsive Ms. Brooks has been, the Registrar.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, thank you so much.

MR. JAFFE: And Ms. Echols (phonetic) as well. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Appreciate that. With that, I tell you what, Mr. Bell, it's your
option. Do you want to go next and we'll cap off this challenge or do you want to let Mr. Fleming speak and then you can do both of them together?

MR. BELL: I think so. That's the best approach we would definitely have at the beginning would apply so we think moving with Mr. Fleming so for that.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. So let's hear then from Voter Registration.

MR. FLEMING: I object to that request. There are two separate matters and they should be resolved separately. I was not called for the Jaffe to this hearing which is occurring now.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Fair enough.
MR. FLEMING: From this hearing.
CHAIR THOMPSON: That's your right, Mr. Fleming. Thank you. Well we'll go back and thank you, Mr. Bell, for your offer, but why don't we go ahead and hear from you and as Mr. Fleming has requested we'll conclude Mr. Jaffe's challenge first and then even though it might be
somewhat repetitive, we'll hear from Mr. Fleming so Mr. Bell, if you could go ahead.

MR. BELL: Thank you very much. Again I have a motion to strike not only the testimony and the evidence that were offered from the Voter Services, but also Mr. Jaffe's challenge.

Both of them are untimely and cannot be considered or adjudicated by this Board because the Board does not have authority to deal with untimely challenges.

The Board has made and I'm relying upon the records from the Board, and I ask the Board to take judicial notice of those so that they would be a part of the record.

And also we rely upon data and information on the Board's website and to the extent that we relied upon that, we ask the panel to take judicial notice of it.

We are prepared to submit documents that reflect those public records along with the website entries. The key issue here is, can an untimely challenge be used as a way to deny a
property right to access to a ballot to a candidate such as Mr. Bradley Thomas?

This body, after Mr. Thomas filed his Petition, Nomination Petition, made the preliminary determination and they sent Mr. Thomas a letter dated March 28th telling him that based on his submission they met sufficiency for filing a Petition and as a result of that his Petition gave him the right to be on the ballot.

They said that they would open up a challenge period and they specifically gave the timeframe for that challenge period and they said that challenge period would close or end on April the 4th, 2022 at 5:00 p.m. Not a continuation at 5:00 p.m., but it ended at 5:00.

And if you look at the face of the Nominating Petition receipt filed by Mr. Jaffe, it has on it, 5:00 p.m. at the close of business. This Board has no jurisdiction to deal with depriving a person with a property constitutional right to be on the ballot.

And this is protected by the law from
the D.C. Court of Appeals as well as the Supreme Court. And I draw your attention particularly to the Supreme Court decision of Anderson vs. Celebrezze, and also the decision from the D.C. Court of Appeals called Vincent Orange vs. the D.C. Board of Election and Ethics.

And particularly the footnote 4 in 1993 decision. And the Court recognized the property right not only of Mr. Bradley, but it recognized the property right of the voters and the signatures who have signed those Petitions.

Because there was a preliminary determination that he was entitled to meet forward, that property right can only be taken away if there were timely filed challenges.

And the rules of this Board are very clear on that. That this office closed and I direct this Board's attention to in particular Third D.C. Municipal Regulation at 9900.1.

And it says specifically in no uncertain terms that the close of business is at 4:45. If you look at the letter that sent to Mr.

Bradley Thomas on March the 28th, 2022, it said that it's closed. The period ends at 5:00 p.m.

So what we have here now is a very loose, sloppy process whereby the panel and the Board are allowing people to come in and take, sabotage attacks and ambushes on legitimate candidates solely because they wait until the last minute to run in there and file these socalled challenges.

But Mr. Bradley serves and stands in the same position as any candidate who had no challenged time to file against them because Mr. Jaffe's challenge is untimely.

It cannot be considered, it cannot be adjudicated and Mr. Bradley Thomas' property right and the right that he has under the Constitution and the First Amendment cannot be deprived because he has, he's on pontification about, you know, COVID.

COVID was real. There was concerns with COVID, but we're not relying upon COVID. We're relying on the fact that with all the
experience that he articulated, he couldn't get to the Board in time at 4:44, 4:45 before the office closed.

This Board cannot continue to allow these sabotage ambush tactics on innocent people who are trying to engage the Democratic process by people who wait until the last minute to run in there and file these kind of complaints.

This is what is going on with respect to Mr. Jaffe. He's a professional at it. He's now bragging about it and we think that this needs to be looked at very carefully, but you also need to look at what authority based on your own regulation that says if a person who is otherwise earned the right to be on the ballot has a property interest in it and has First Amendment protection can be deprived of that just because somebody do not want him on the ballet.

That's something that this Board cannot do. I'm prepared at this point in time to offer additional authority and I direct your attention to the case called, Harvey vs. the D.C.

Board of Election, 581 Atlantic 2d, at 757 (1990) where the D.C. Court of Appeals reversed this Board because the Board allowed a process to try to deny access to the ballot to a candidate who had otherwise satisfied the minimum targeted amount and the Board was reversed and told to put that person's name on the ballot.

The Board took an appeal or asked for a request for rehearing to the full Panel and the full Panel rejected the Board. So requests can allow the decision to remain so the decision of Harvey vs. the Board tells this Board that you got to be a little bit more careful and the court warned this Board of that in Pree vs. the D.C. Board when they said you have no process in place to deal with these challenges.

You are bootlegging and you are bootstrapping the Petition process as a way of saying this has given notice of people how to do the challenge process.

And what we're saying here is that the challenge process ended at 5 o'clock. It did not
continue at 5 o'clock, and there was absolutely no authority on the part of this Board to allow those challenges to go forth.

And Mr. Bradley standing in the same position as any other unchallenged candidate has the right to go forward and have access to that ballot.

Not only based on law, but based on the Constitution. For those reasons, we ask that this challenge be rejected.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Bell. I certainly understand your argument referencing the definition and the 3 DCMR 9900.1.

We'll take this under advisement in Executive session and obviously talk about it carefully with our counsel. I would note for the record, 5:00 p.m. is clearly listed in the, elsewhere as the time by which challenges can be submitted. It's on the --

MS. STROUD: The Board's calendar.
CHIARMAN THOMPSON: Yes, the actual

Board calendar. Doesn't mean that's controlling, but it's on the Board's calendar and it's what's been advertised which everyone, it's the rule that under which everyone's been operating.

But I do want to take a careful look at what does it mean in 9900.1 when it references 4:30? So we'll look at that.

MR. BELL: 4:45.
MR. GILL: Let the Chairman of the Board finish.

MR. THOMPSON: We'll take your, we'll obviously take your point seriously. I mean, I certainly understand that if something's not submitted timely then it, you know, it may not be acceptable. So thank you.

MR. BELL: Can I make a final comment?
CHAIR THOMPSON: Go ahead.
MR. BELL: You're giving me a chance to make a final comment?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, please, yes.
MR. BELL: Yes, I appreciate your offer of consideration and I appreciate the fact
that you're going to look at that, but I also would ask that you look very carefully at the case law and I ask you to look very carefully at the interpretation of the Constitution by the D.C. Department of Appeals as well as the Supreme Court and realize that this Board's authority does not continue after 5 o'clock as it relates to the challenge posting period.

The challenge posting period ends at
5 o'clock and the Board has absolutely no authority to be accepting these erroneous burdensome challenges and taught, and waste the resources of the city trying to process stuff that just straight up ambush on candidates who are otherwise legitimate and qualified as determined by the Board. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. Before we turn to Mr. Fleming, Mr. Jaffee, any final, do you just very briefly have a comment? I see your hand's up.

MR. JAFFEE: Yes, yes, yes. Thank
you. First, I want to note that when I hear
ambush and I think of a last minute request to have another representative of the challenge be prepared to speak prior to the time that they're scheduled to speak, that sounds more like an ambush to me number one.

Number two, I've taken over and I have to apologize if anything I said came across as bragging. Wow. Bragging would be if I made note that we submitted 4,102 signatures. That's perhaps what bragging would be. I think -CHAIR THOMPSON: Wrap it up in just one minute if you could please.

MR. JAFFE: I took an Uber to the Board of Elections and the Uber let me off at 4:40 p.m. and I assure you that with everything that $I$ had prepared to be submitted, it didn't take me all that long to get out of the Uber and up to the Board of Elections to be late there so that's one thing.
And the other thing is I did neglect to mention previously I would like to recognize if I may, the candidate Lisa Gore with respect to
assisting and collaborating on the challenge. She has her hand raised.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. And that's enough to satisfy all. Ms. Gore, please go ahead.

MS. GORE: Thank you and I'll definitely be brief. I just want to add a little context to the time that the campaign was in the Board of Election and I actually had a portion of the documents for the Bradley Thomas challenge.

As you know, we were speaking to the Board earlier this morning on another challenge. That challenge sheet is time stamped at 4:25. So the campaign was at the Board of Election way before the 5:00 p.m. deadline.

As you know, it was incredibly busy, but I can just attest under the record that our sheets were filled out, we got the information to the Board on time, we were there way prior to the 5:00 p.m. deadline.

We saw many campaigns go in and out and we did not, you know, show up at the last
minute trying to push documents through. The campaign was there in a timely fashion and submitted the challenge in a timely fashion. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. I really appreciate or appreciate that. You're right, that's very helpful context. Okay with that, why don't we turn to Mr. Fleming's challenge, the ninth challenge and we'll hear from Voter Services and then Mr. Fleming and then back to Mr. Bradley's attorney, Mr. Bell.

MS. THOMPSON: On March 23rd, 2022, Bradley Thomas submitted a Nominating Petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21, 2022, primary election for the Office of At Large Member of the Council.

The minimum requirement to obtain ballot access for this office is 2,000 signatures of district voters who are duly registered and the same party as the candidate.

The Petition contained 2,443
signatures. The Petition was posted for public
inspection for ten days as required by law. The Petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022, by Nathan Fleming, a registered voter in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Fleming filed challenges to 1,238 of the 2,443 signatures submitted enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each Petition page.

The signatures were challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations. A review of the challenges indicates that 1,600 of the 1,238 challenges are valid.

Two hundred sixty-eight are valid because the signor is not registered to vote at the address listed on the Petition at the time the Petition was signed.

Three hundred twenty-seven are valid because the signors are not registered. Fortytwo are valid because the signors' voter registration was designated as inactive on the voter roll at the time the Petition was signed.

Nine are valid because the Petition does not include the address of the signor. Thirty-three are valid because the signature is not dated.

Seven are valid because the signature is a duplicate of a valid signature. Eightythree are valid because the Petition does not include the name of the signor is not sufficiently legible for identification.

One is valid because the signature is not made by the person whose signature it purports to be. One hundred seventy-seven are valid because the signor is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the Petition is signed.

And 59 are valid because the circulator of the Petition failed to complete all required information in the circulator's affidavit. This left the candidates Nominating Petition with 1,437 signatures, 563 signatures below the number required for ballot access.

Following this review, the Registrar
of Voters timely received 12 changes of address forms from Mr. Thomas on Thursday, April 14, 2022.

Six of these forms could be accepted as address changes. The remainder were not accepted in regards to this challenge because two of the form were from voters who were not registered.

One of the forms was a register found to be inactive and three of the forms were no changes to the voter record. Accordingly, Mr. Thomas was credited six signatures that had initially been determined to be invalid.

This leaves the candidates nominating Petition with 1,443 signatures, 557 signatures below the number required for ballot access.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, thank you so much.

MS. STROUD: So now we will hear from Mr. Fleming. Mr. Fleming, if you could state your name and address for the record.

MR. FLEMING: Good afternoon. My name
is Nathan Fleming. I reside at 5047 Sheriff Road NE, Washington, D.C. I am a duly registered voter of the District of Columbia who believes in ensuring the integrity of the process.

Voters, as you know, are responsible for ensuring the residents of the District are responsible for ensuring the integrity of the process through the challenge period.

I exercised that right and the Registrar has indicated that Mr. Thomas fails to meet the mandatory signatures required for ballot access. I encourage the Board to accept the Registrar's Report.

I will respond to the allegation that the report was not, the challenge was not timely filed. The Registrar's Report notes that the challenge was timely filed.

I filed the challenge before 5:00 p.m. in the Office of the Board of Elections and I note that there was no evidence provided by Mr. Thomas or will be provided by Mr. Thomas contrary to that fact.

I reserve the remainder of my time. Can you please let me know how much time I have remaining?

MS. STROUD: Three minutes. Just under four minutes actually 3 minutes and 57 seconds.

MR. FLEMING: Okay. Thank you. The majority of that time $I$ would like to respond, use to respond to Mr. Thomas' attorney's argument.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Mr. Bell, go ahead and we certainly heard, I felt like you meant to say on the timing issue, we certainly heard you previously so you don't necessarily have to repeat what you've said, but please go ahead.

MR. BELL: Okay, thank you very much. And I appreciate this opportunity and I would incorporate by reference all of the earlier statements I made with respect to the untimeliness of the Petition in the Jaffe matter.

But we think that in this matter, the
same issue. If you look at the face of the Nominating Petition challenge receipt that was submitted in the Jaffee matter and the same thing with respect to the Fleming matter, it doesn't say $4: 45$, 46 or $4: 59$, it says 5 o'clock.

The office and the authority of the Board to operate dealing with a challenge is over at 5 o'clock. It doesn't continue at 5 and you start the process anew.

If you look at the Petition receipt challenge of Mr. Fleming, now you're talking about an individual who came in with this sanctimonious approach about how he's trying to do all of this for fairness, he's running for the same office.

But look at these Petition receipt and the sloppiness in it. Take a moment and take judicial notice, it says 04052020 and it got slashed out, it look like 23, very sloppy work.

He saying he filed it on the 5th. If you file it on the 5th clearly, that was late and this was on the face of the document and if you
look right across to the right hand side of the same receipt, it says 5:00 p.m.

That's an admission that the Office was closed therefore not closing, not continuing to work a processing and trying to take away the constitutional right for a person who has otherwise earned that right, not trying to shut down the First Amendment rights of those who have supported this candidate in a fair and competitive process with votes.

Here we are with the same ambush approach again and they're trying to use and are using the Board as the cover to allow them to do this dirty work.

The Board they said let them come in and file it at 5:00, the Board got regulations there that the Office is closed at 5:00. They got statements all over the internet saying that 5 o'clock you know is over.

And they got in this regulation particular the DCMR that 4:45 is the piece. If you go to the Court of Appeals in the pre-case
and say what we do is let those in the office at 4:45 do certain things and the Court of Appeals has warned that's not the approach.

Do something about your approach in handling these challenges. Mr. Fleming is just like Mr. Jaffe. He's late, he's out of time, and he has shown nothing that contradict the presumption of going forward with ballot access to Mr. Bradley Thomas.

He can't show anything because on the face of his receipt, just like on the face of Mr . Jaffe's receipt, it says 5 o'clock. What kind of office can operate when 5 o'clock is close of business the way the Board has allowing its office to operate, 5 o'clock is a continuation of business?

You can't take away constitutional and statutory rights allowing things to go on the way you have allowed things to go on as the Board. This needs to be looked at, it needs to be stopped, it needs to be corrected and Mr. Bradley Thomas' case is the idea case to put a stop to
these 5 o'clock filings.
Sitting around waiting until the last minute to just dump all of this into the office and so now you the Board, you go deal with it. We are dealing in a pandemic.

Mr. Bradley Thomas made the decision because we're in a pandemic not to challenge any of the others because of the difficulties of collecting these signatures. That's a lot of work.

The Constitution as well as the Supreme Court has made it very clear that a campaign is a serious idea of getting diverse ideas into the marketplace so that the voters can decide.

But what we've got going on now is this ambush process where this Board is allowing folks to just run in and Mr. Jaffe as well as Mr. Fleming, Mr. Jaffe said, somebody at the Board told him don't put 4:49 on it, put 5 o'clock. How ridiculous.

How, if somebody at the Board did
that, that person needs to be fired because what they have done is told him to do something that's a misrepresentation and he put it into his document. And now he's already testified to it. Lisa Gore testified too that I was coming into the office, $I$ was in the office and Mr. Jaffe come running in with new so called challenges. This is not the way this process is supposed to work.

Mr. Fleming, Mr. Jaffe if you look at both of them in the totality of the circumstances, shows that something needs to be done by the Board to correct this or the Court's going to have to correct it because too many legitimate candidates are being harmed.

The office was closed, close of business is recognized throughout the whole United States, 5 o'clock is what is recognized. Your regulations say 4:45, but yet still you allow this to go forward.

It needs to be stopped and presumption in favor of Mr. Bradley that he is qualified,
that he is got a ballot access. That's a property right that's protected by the Constitution, it's consistent with the regulations that you have in place. It's consistent with the Statute and what you do about allowing these challenges under these circumstances, you are violating the governing statute and you are violating the Constitution and you're violating the case law from the District of Columbia, the Court of Appeals.

We ask you to correct that. And I reserve one minute for Mr. Bradley if I have it to say whatever he'd like because he is the candidate. Thank you.

> CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, thank you so
much. We appreciate you raising this issue again. I promise we'll take a close look at it. You certainly have made it clear.

With that, I think it would be appropriate for Mr. Fleming to have any, he reserved some time for any rebuttal comments.

MR. FLEMING: Yes, can I get a report on how much time Mr. Bell took with his remarks? CHAIR THOMPSON: He took the full five minutes and I think --

MR. FLEMING: Did you say over five minutes?

CHAIR THOMPSON: He took five, he took one so you can speak for us to four minutes please.

MR. FLEMING: Also, I would like to speak for nine minutes because he incorporated his remarks from the previous hearing or those remarks should not be allowed in this proceeding. CHAIR THOMPSON: They really were part of the separate, we kept the two things completely separate procedurally at your requests so, you know --

MR. FLEMING: Okay.
CHAIR THOMPSON: -- I decline the request and would ask you to please -- I mean, we don't have a strict time limit, but we --

MR. FLEMING: Okay. Please. Okay, thank you --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
MR. FLEMING: -- for allowing me the time to speak given that I am also the candidate. So I want to begin by making it clear that Mr. Bell did not assert any arguments disputing any of the facts found in the Registrar's report regarding Mr. Thomas' signature.

We found he has less than 1,700 signatures. He's well under the number that he needs for ballot access and there's been several issues with the report with the quality of the challenge where there's been signatures, Petitions where none of the people listed on the sheet are even residents of the District of Columbia which speaks to circulator fraud.

Which this Board has ruled and the Court has ruled in Brizill v. Williams and in Allen v. Silverman that circulator fraud should lead to all of those Petitions being thrown out, but none of those facts were rebutted by Mr. Bell.

I would like to think that the Statute does not require a receipt of the time of the challenge to be filed. It simply requires a challenge that specifically alleges the lines and the defects according to the code and the DCMR when that was properly held here.

I am, no evidence was offered that the challenge was filed before, was not filed before 5:00 p.m. I am offering evidence that I filed the challenge before 5:00 p.m. I'm entering that into the record currently that I filed the challenge before 5:00 p.m.

But in the alternative, $I$ don't think that there's a distinction between at/or 5:00 p.m. And the Board should not outweigh my duly filed challenge, my right as a citizen to file the challenge for and the Board has a standard of form or fashion.

Not form or fashion, but I'm sorry, I can't think of the exact term, but the form should not outweigh the substantiveness of my challenge. In the matter that he articulated

Harvey v. Board of Elections, it does not favor his candidate's position.

Actually, in that particular matter, the Board was admonished for not following the statutory language of the District Counsel and so he's asking you to do exactly what the board was admonished for by going outside of what the Statute states. The Statute states at 5:00.

Also, it's the job of the Registrar's, the job of Voter Services, the job of Board of Elections to determine whether things were timely filed. That's why my Petition was accepted.

By coming on the backend and saying that it was not timely filed, that calls into a question every determination made by the Board of Elections and that would lead to a result that is extremely unfavorable.

Also I would like to make the point that the character of this challenge speaks to an attack at the entire body of law related to signatures and Mr. Bell's point about the DCMR was not raised at the prehearing conference.

Therefore, I had no opportunity to look it up and the Board's regulations and the law states that matters that were not spoken on in the prehearing conference cannot be addressed here so anything in the LMR should be made moot based upon that point.

And I will, in general, I would believe that characteristic of Mr. Thomas' Petition rises to the level of the Petitions in the matters of Brizill v. Williams and in the matters of Allen v. Silverman where this Board noted that the defects of particular circulator defects, the circulator is the person that is responsible for upholding the law and making sure that the signatures are valid.

Not the Board of Elections, by law, by statute and we must make sure that we uphold the rules that we have. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay, Mr. Fleming, thank you so much. So Mr. Fleming, Mr. Bell, you both have plenty of time and I know Mr. Bell requested Bradley Thomas to have a word and so
we'll permit a minute for Mr. Thomas.
I believe you're present if you'd like to have the final word on this?

MR. THOMAS: All right. Thank you. I thank the Board for your time and attention to this matter. I think you've done a very fair job of hearing these issues.

I agree with my counsel that we do have an issue of timeliness here that the prima facie evidence is that these challenges were filed at 5 o'clock.

We find that mysterious that both of them were filed at exactly 5 o'clock and suggest that the Board might want to consider whether or not the challenges have adequately proven that their submissions were timely.

But beyond that, I just want to again thank you all for taking the time to consider our response to the challenge here and for the overall way that you've been handling these matters today.

I thank you for your time again and I
trust the Board will reach the proper conclusion. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Thank you so much, Mr. Thomas and everybody. That concludes that matter. We have one more matter. Before we turn to it, I think maybe we could use a five-minute break just to clear our heads, use the restroom and such.

So why don't we take that five-minute break and then I think we'll resume and take up the final matter.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 2:26 p.m. and resumed at 2:35 p.m.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: Before we proceed I see Mr. Jaffe has his hand and up I assume from previously, it's inadvertently left up.

MR. JAFFE: No, thank you. It was not inadvertent.

CHAIR THOMPSON: If I could just quickly say, I mean, we did close that matter but please go ahead for about like half a minute.

MR. JAFFE: I don't even need a half a minute.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
MR. JAFFE: I'm responding to several comments that were made and I wish to simply note that Mr. Thomas ought to consider his attorney's characterization of my challenge in dirty work as being beneath the dignity with which Mr. Thomas has sought to conduct his campaign.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. I see somebody else with a hand raised. It came to the former matter, for the next matter.

So, okay, so let me just pause there before we proceed. I was going to make a remark relatedly or incidentally. We've heard nine challenges so far today. You know, in each case the candidate has done a great job, the challenger has done a great job and I don't assign any ill motives to anybody. You're a candidate. I appreciate that there's some detailed work to do when you pick up these petitions and have to get them filled out,
frequently relying on circulators. I know it's not easy. Some of the petition forms are not in great shape. Some of them have mistakes in them. Things wrong with different signatures, maybe with the circulator affidavits. I don't infer from that, $I$ don't think anybody on the board at the BOE infers from that but anyone involved is disrespecting the rules or, you know, not taking democracy seriously or some, whatever phrases have been used in that regard. And likewise with respect to the challengers, every citizen has a right to challenge a petition. If they make a challenge, you know, that's their prerogative. Then in one vain I don't assign to any challenger any ill will or ill motives. Nobody in my mind is trying to ambush or anything like or subvert democracy or anything like that. People can use, you know, adjectives or phrases of that nature, it's fine. That's the words you want to use but, you know, for me, those kind of adjectives just go right past me. We're just looking at the facts and the regulations here. And we're going
to get the answer right in each case. So, I just thought I'd add that after the, three or four of these have gotten a little heated in that regard. So, I went back. It's been a long day and we will turn last but certainly not least to the matter of Luz Martinez-Munoz versus Trayon White, candidate for mayor in the district. And the way we're going to do this is we're going to hear from Voter Services first and then from the challenger and then from the candidate or the respective representatives. And before Voter Services goes I just want to confirm that there is somebody here for the challenger of Luz Martinez-Munoz?

MS. MARTINEZ-MUNOZ: Yes, I'm present.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay.
MS. MARTINEZ-MUNOZ: And I have my counsel with me who will need to be unmuted as well, Christy White.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much, and welcome, Mrs. White.

MRS. WHITE: Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: And also, Trayon White, are you present or is your counsel present?

MR. WHITE: Yes.
MS. MARTINEZ-MUNOZ: Is Ari Theresa there?

MR. WHITE: Yes, if needed but I'm here and my counsel, Ari Theresa, is here as well.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Thank you so much for being here. So, with that Voting Services, please proceed.

MS. THOMPSON: On March 23, 2022, Trayon White met a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the June 21st, 2022, primary election for the office of Mayor of the district of Columbia.

The minimum requirement to obtain ballot access for this office is 2,000 signatures of voters who are duly registered in the same party as the candidate. The petition contains 4,391 signatures. The petition was posted for public inspection for 10 days as required by law.

The petition was challenged on April 4th, 2022, by Luz Martinez-Munoz, sorry, if I pronounced your last name wrong.

MS. MARTINEZ-MUNOZ: Munoz.
MS. THOMPSON: Munoz. Sorry if I pronounced it wrong. He raised the vote in the District of Columbia. Ms. Martinez-Munoz, filed challenges to 2,768 of the 4,391 signatures submitted, enumerated by line and page number on individual challenge sheets filed for each petition page. These signatures were challenged pursuant to Title III, DCMR Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations.

In review of the challenges in the case that 2,192 of the 2,768 challenges are valid. Eight hundred and sixty are invalid because the signer is not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition signed. Four hundred and ninety eight are invalid because the signer is not registered. Seventy four are invalid because the signer's voter registration was designated as
inactive on the voter roll at the time the petition was signed. Nineteen are invalid because the signature is a duplicate of a valid signature. Forty six are invalid because the signature was not dated. Eighty three are invalid because the petition does not include the address of the signer. Two Hundred four are invalid because the petition does not include the name of the signer with a signature is not sufficiently legible for identification. Fifty three are invalid because the circular of the petition fails to complete all required information in the circular's affidavit. Nine are invalid because the signature was not made by the person whose signature it purports to be. Three hundred forty six are invalid because the signer was not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the petition was signed. This left the candidate's nominated petition with 2,199, 199 signature above the number required for ballot access.

At the pre-hearing conference on April

19, 2022, Ms. Martinez-Munoz asks for an additional review of the preliminary findings. The second review indicates that there are an additional 61 invalid challenges. As a result 2,253 of the 2,768 challengers are valid. The new valid is as follows. Eight hundred seventy eight are invalid because the signer is not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed. Five hundred nine are invalid because the signer is not registered. Eight three are invalid because the signer's voter registration was designated as inactive on the voter roll at the time the petition was signed. Twenty four are invalid because the signature is a duplicate of a valid signature. Twenty six are invalid because the signature was outdated. Eighty are invalid because the petition does not include the address of the signer. Two hundred five are invalid because the petition does not include the name of the signer with the signature is not specifically legible for identification. Fifty two are
invalid because the circular of the petition failed to complete all required information in the circular's affidavit. Eighteen are invalid because the signature was not made by the person whose signature it purports to be and 358 are invalid because the signer was not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the petition was signed. This means the candidate's nominating petition with 2,138, 138 signature above the number required for ballot access.

MS. STROUD: Thank you,. And now we'll be hearing from the parties in the matter. So, Ms. Martinez-Munoz, are you going to be speaking on your own behalf or will you be represented by Mrs. White in this matter?

MS. MARTINEZ-MUNOZ: I'll be represented by Mrs. White.

MS. STROUD: Excuse me?
MS. MARTINEZ-MUNOZ: I'll be represented by Mrs. White.

MS. STROUD: Okay, thank you.

Mrs. White, if you could state your name and address for the record.

MRS. WHITE: Good afternoon, thank you. My name is Christy White. My address is 1601 Holly Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C. 20012.

MS. STROUD: Thank you and you have five minutes.

MRS. WHITE: Thank you.
The registrar undertook a preliminary review to determine the sufficiency of the challenge against Trayon White's petition. Although the resulting reports not finding this review resulted in the invalidation of more than 2,000 signatures, approximately half of the signature submitted by Trayon White.

After the pre-hearing conference another review invalidated 61 more signature bringing Tray White's signature total down to 2,138. In essence, every other signature provided by Trayon White has been found to be invalid and each time an official has reviewed the signatures submitted by Trayon White it finds
more signatures to invalidate. The challenger's position is that enough additional signatures remain and that are invalid so as to deny Trayon White access to the ballot.

The challenger has presented detailed evidence that provides a good faith basis for approximately 400 additional signatures to be invalidated and a synopsis of this is also provided prior to this hearing to the parties.

To date, a majority of these challenges have not been reviewed or disputed. In order to insure integrity in the ballot access process, the law requires that the petition signatures accepted on behalf of the candidate meet certain requirements. Against the back drop of a clear case of a campaign that failed to meet the legal requirements for collecting valid signatures and failed to perform adequate due diligence prior to submitting these signatures to the Board of Elections it is imperative to set a precedent that when it comes to ballot access the law will be followed. Not only is there enough
evidence to invalidate more than 138 signatures, the Trayon White campaign has failed to present any reliable evidence that would dispute the allegations of the challenger. The alleged evidence submitted by his counsel is questionable at best and it was provided to the Board of Elections after the pre-hearing conference and we'd like that to be reviewed as well. It gives the appearance of photo shop signatures and other deficiencies. Trayon White's campaign has also objected to our request to subpoena witnesses to testify at today's hearing leaving us little to no other options for getting this information to the panel to decide. Therefore, the challenger requests a detailed review of the challenges identified during the pre-hearing conference as finding as evidence by the spreadsheet provided to Board of Elections and the condensed synopsis provided today and to make a finding that Trayon White's ballot signature count is less than 2,000 signatures for ballot access.

The challenger has gone through pain-
seeking detail to make a prima facie case that Trayon White did not collect enough valid signatures. The challenger vote has specifically identified the invalid signatures and unqualified circulators in filing the challenge and when requesting reconsideration after the preliminary review was done. And it should be noted that to date it appears that there has been no review of the circulator challenges in this matter.

It has been incumbent upon Trayon White to defend against the challenge. However, the record is void of any reliable evidentiary showing from him. On the other hand, again, we have submitted detailed information for the additional invalid signatures and unqualified circulators.

We ask the panel or the appropriate designees to apply the law to the outstanding challenges submitted by the challenger and render a determination based on the record and evidence in this case. We are not dealing with a political novice with no experience with the
petition signature process and the laws that govern them. We are dealing with a sitting council members who has gone through this process twice before and was elected in part to draft, pass and review the District's laws. I would think that we should hold him to a higher standard than the average person under these circumstances but at the very least he should be held to uphold the bare minimum requirements of the law. We request a thorough review of the remaining challenges on the challenger spreadsheet, memorandum and testimony of any arguments offered today before making a final determination. To do so would be to create a dangerous precedent to not do so I should say would to create a dangerous precedent that incomplete or unintentional of intentional indifference to the laws if sufficient override the very law is to insure fairness and protect the integrity of our city's elections. I use my time and reserve to continue in the future.

CHAIR THOMPSON: I just have a question or two. I think initially you all filed challenges to 2,768 specific signatures among the 4,391 collected which is in keeping with the regulations that you to specifically challenge signatures. But then you referenced another spreadsheet that I think you put together after the pre-hearing conference highlighting issues you think exist with respect to 405 of the signatures. Are those 405 within the 2,768 you previously identified or is this something new that's come up since the pre-hearing conference? MRS. WHITE: These are one and the same of the initial challenges submitted to the Board of Elections. This is nothing new.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. With respect to those 405 did you have a chance to discuss that and vetted that with the BOE including at the pre-hearing conference?

MRS. WHITE: Unfortunately, we did not. We submitted the spreadsheet after the prehearing conference. We were prepared to discuss
in detail the various challenges that we would l9ike to have reconsidered and determined. But there was no time to do so so we submit that spreadsheet to the panel to review in addition to the rest of the testimony.

CHAIR THOMPSON: And you're essentially asking the BOE to reconsider its determination to date with respect to those 405 signatures?

MRS. WHITE: In essence, yes. We would like the Board of Elections to apply the law to the remaining outstanding challenges. Again, it appears that the circulator challenges have not been reviewed, only the signature challenges have been reviewed and the circulator challenges constitute approximately 238 of our challenges so they have not been reviewed. There are an additional approximately 80 challenges that based on the law should have been invalidated and since only 61 have been invalidated since the prehearing conference there are still a lot of challenges that we believe deserve attention.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And those 405
that, those examples in it, that's the spreadsheet that you submitted yesterday, is that right?

MRS. WHITE: That was -- well, they submitted it Tuesday but the spreadsheet has been updated by Voter Services to respond to each of the challenges that the challenger wants to be reviewed by Voter Services. And so within the spreadsheet the Voter services Division indicated the responses to the signatures that the challenger wanted to raise in the case. So, they have reviewed.

CHAIR THOMPSON: That was my next question. So, Voter services has had a chance to study the detail on those 405 signatures that were further specific on the spreadsheet?

MS. THOMPSON: Yes, we did.
CHAIR THOMPSON: And that's been --
MS. THOMPSON: That doesn't include --
CHAIR THOMPSON: That was included by the time of your presentation today?

MS. THOMPSON: That's correct, yes.

MS. STROUD: And so as a basis of that review your final determination is that the petition still maintains 2,138 valid signatures? MS. THOMPSON: That's correct.

MS. STROUD: Okay.
MRS. WHITE: I would like to note that we did not get any of this information regarding the additional update made to the spreadsheet and, again, to reiterate that we have information from Board of Elections that the circulator challenges have not been counted or reviewed determined at this time.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Do you have a response to that?

MS. BROOKS: Despite --
MS. STROUD: If you could speak into the mic.

MS. BROOKS: Okay. As I explained to you in the pre-hearing conference your challenge is based on the fact that you cannot confirm that there would be evidence. That is totally the responsibility of the challenger to confirm the
actually residents. But the law doesn't say -the law just states you have to be a resident of the District or a resident of another jurisdiction that files an application with us prior to circulating the petition. So, those challenges that you filed against the circulators, yes, we did look at them and on particular pages we did identify those as far as the circulators we are not obligated to go and check to see if they're actually residents in the District of Columbia. That is the challenger's responsibility.

MRS. WHITE: May I respond?
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, please.
MRS. WHITE: Thank you. And so as I indicated we undertook a systemic review of the petition submitted by Trayon White's campaign. There are 25 circulators that circulated petitions on his behalf. Twenty of them we were able to confirm that they are D.C. residents at the time of circulating the petition. The five that we have noted on the spreadsheet and through
the challenge, we were unable to confirm their residency. They are not listed as a resident or on the voter rolls or anywhere else that we find at the address that they provided on their circulator affidavit. That to me raises a question and proves that there is a question that they are not D.C. residents.

We have not been able to subpoena these circulators to inquire as to whether they are residents and find any additional proof. We have been stonewalled on that aspect and so we require some additional information. There are, for example, one of the circulators there are 12 of them that live in D.C. but none of them reside at the address that the circulator attested to on the affidavit. It seems as though this is a case where we would need to get more information through this process so that we can confirm whether or not this is a D.C. resident because all of the searches that we have performed have not pulled up this particular person at this address. And that's in five cases.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. So, you don't -- you don't know whether they are or are not a D.C. resident. But you're continuing to raise the question as to whether they are or not and all these five, petitioned by these five circulators how many signatures are contained on their sheets?

MRS. WHITE: There's a combined total of about 238 signatures.

CHAIR THOMPSON: By those five circulators?

MRS. WHITE: By those five circulators and there are documents that were provided by counsel for Trayon White's campaign that purport to I guess cure the address or something along those lines for some of the circulators and there's no supporting information provided that show that these circulators indeed reside at the address that they indicated and also their signatures are not in person signatures. They appear to be photo shopped from other documents including one where it has a date of February and
these were supposed to be submitted in April. CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Ms. White, please, we'll come back for more comments that you may have. And at this time let's hear from Trayon White or his counsel.

MR. WHITE: Yes. Thank you.
First of all, I want to thank everyone joining in this process. And the people, the residents of the District of Columbia went out day and night at the local grocery stores and the community to help us to get 4,390 signatures which, in fact, was more than any other candidate in all races in Washington, D.C.

It is a fact that we met the
threshold. The threshold was 2,000 valid signatures. And after tedious review the D.C. Board of Elections verified that we qualified. The challengers than challenged that again and after tedious review again of 4,391 signatures D.C. Board of Elections came back and said, again we qualify again to be on the ballot. And so this seems to me like a witch hunt. We knew
going into this that we had to deal with a lot of residents who were in D.C. who had a lot of housing insecurities, had changed residencies during the Pandemic and as a result we went above and beyond to make sure we had enough signatures to qualify.

It was said that I, I'm not new to this. In fact, I'm not. This is my sixth time doing this. In fact, I served on Ronald White's petition signature when he first ran and lost and even the second one I got a call to served again. And so there is no implied fraud here. In fact, some of the statements made by the contester was that we did not "Did not submit any evidence". That is not true.

As you will note by the evidence submitted again on April the 5th, 2022, I myself along with other people came down to the Board of Elections and got proof that these were D.C. residents. And the burden of proof again is on the contester. The contester said "Twelve of them do not live in D.C." Where is the evidence
that they do not live in D.C.? This is an assault of democracy and every day residents and, in fact, voter suppression. When we talk about making sure everyone is able to exercise the democratic voting rights. And I even heard (audio interference) this is a privilege. No, it's called voting rights because everyone in D.C. has the right to sign a petition and to participate in the democratic process for an election. And so I'm appalled at this contester and the leadership and what's happened so far.

We have done our due diligence. And, in fact, even after the number got scrubbed down to 2,199, they did context it again another 405 and we, again, sustained the challenge. This seems to me like a witch hunt for fear that, fear of the outcome, but the reality is that we, the Trayon White campaign for mayor has qualified to be on the ballot in 2002 to run for mayor in Washington, D.C. And so we're here -allegations or hurtful language about what we did or didn't do or what was the word that was said?

I think she said it was photo shopped or was implied fraud. I'm not sure where she's getting that from. But, indeed, we submitted above and beyond the required amount of signatures. And to note in closing that the D.C. Board of Elections after scrubbing through this stuff over and over again has declared that we have 2,138 valid signatures. One hundred and thirty eight over the required amount. Therefore, Trayon White for Mayor is by law, by law, to be on the ballot and this is a democracy so we must exercise the laws to its fullest extent to insure we create equity and opportunity for everybody to participate in the democratic process.

> I'm joined today by my lawyer, Ari

Theresa, who is here to answer any questions. But it is plain and simple where we are, where we should land. So, let's not waste a whole lot of time on this. Let's get to this -- get to this election and win and bring equity and resolutions to D.C.

Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Council Member White, thank you so much for taking the time to turn out today and talk about your petition process.

I just have one question. It's a question that's been raised obviously with respect to five or maybe as many as 12 of your circulators, maybe not being D.C. residents. To your knowledge are all your circulators residents of D.C. or otherwise be registered, no resident circulators?

MR. WHITE: To my knowledge all
circulators with the exception of one we could not verify if that person was a D.C. resident or not. But to my knowledge all of them with the exception of one we were unable to verify if they was or was not. But that's not even in question. The question is from them, they're saying that they're not, 12 of them are not and you have to prove that today in want to hear the evidence.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And thank you so much for that, again. You mentioned your
attorney. I'd like to know if she would like to speak or him, I'm sorry.

MS. MARTINEZ-MUNOZ: It seems to be unmuted.

CHAIR THOMPSON: What is the name again?

MS. STROUD: Ari Theresa. Theresa, T-H-E-R-E-S-A.

MR. THERESA: Thank you. My name is Aristotle Theresa. And I'm going to respond to some of the allegations from opposing counsel here.

One of them and this has been discussed a little bit but I'd like to go through the timeline.

April 6th we received the challenge which was line by line challenge. April 19th, D.C. BOD provided a response to those. April 19th the opposing counsel in the campaign filed a review of their voided challenges and then April 21st we had a preliminary hearing where we heard the voided challenges and the response and the
initial challenge. April 21 D.C. BOE provided a second response and then April 21 they filed a post=hearing response and here we are now complaining about there not being ample opportunity to present their case. And they raise some other issues about errors and I'd like to just go over the standard for that because it seems that opposing counsel has placed a higher standard than is required by law.

$$
\text { So, Title III, Section } 1605(b) \text { states }
$$

that an affidavit is executed by the person filing the petition, attesting to that the best of his or her knowledge the petition is complete and contains the legally required number of valid signatures. It doesn't say that to the best of their knowledge that there are no errors, that there are no blank spots in the petition. It says that they testify that it's complete and that it has the sufficient number of signatures. And after three reviews now D.C. BOE has agreed. Further, there's this issue, you know, one of the biggest issues they had and this was mentioned by
the council member was this idea of wrong addresses. So, there are 878 wrong address challenges. And I'd just like to share some information from the deputy mayor for economic and planning and development from their D.C. Housing Survey Report. And it states that residents in Ward 8 have -- 28 percent of residents in Ward 8 have housing instability. But if you go through 1 through 4 you see that they have about half the rate of housing instability.

If you go through 5 and 6 it's about
5 to 7 percent less the rate of housing instability. So, it's not 5 to 7 percent but, you know, it's about 60 or 70 percent of the rate at Ward 8. And so if you go through that and you look at these challenges if the council man was a council man and his base was somewhere else in the city it's possible he may be 500 over the limit. But we're neither here nor there. Our council man did his due diligence. He gather 4,400 signatures almost. And the fact that there
is this discrepancy in house insecurity in the District of Columbia should not be used against him to allege some kind of malfeasance in the collecting of signatures which I think is completely unfair to the council man who I know has done a very good job running his campaign and collecting signatures.

And as a part of that good faith and the effort that he's taken I want to speak to these five -- five circulators that were at issue that we supposedly forged, right? So, they're right here. We've shared them. These are not even cures actually. This is directly from the D.C. Board of Elections. So, on April 5th, Councilman White, along with others came and they in good faith to prove that these people were residents, they went and got the proof from D.C. BOE and they printed these out for us. So, if anything appears as fraud or whatever, D.C. BOE could print these sheets out today and they would be identical to the ones that we have. This is why they're challenges have failed is because in
their due diligence they were unable to find these people in the system even though they were there. These people have been registered to vote since 2004, 2007. This is directly from the D.C. Board of Elections.

So, I mean, and beyond that, beyond the most, you know, this issue of fraud. Something that's more representative of our campaign and the cleanness with which it's been run, out of 4,400 signatures D.C. BOE who probably has years and years of experience looking at these signatures found nine signatures did not match. That's less an one percent, . 05 percent. I don't know if my math is right but it's really low. Nine out of 4,400 signatures apparently did not match and they're alleging fraud. And I just don't see it.

We are happy with the findings of D.C.
BOE. We don't believe that this is an appropriate use of public money to keep contesting public findings. If you accept public funding, accept public findings. This is a
fishing expedition. And perhaps opposing counsel is a bit too close to this case.

I'll let it rest there.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All right.
MRS. WHITE: May I respond?
CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes, absolutely, hold on a second.

MS. STROUD: I just wanted to ask Mr. Theresa a question.

The document that you pointed to that you said came from the BOE they are in reference to Vincent Brown, Burnell Smith, +Brian Boyd, Danielle Simmons and Irving Harris?

MR. THERESA: Yes.
MS. STROUD: Okay. And so those printouts and I'm going to ask, you know, the Registrar of Voters to speak to that as well. You provided a -- Voter Services provided those printouts with respect to the five individuals that I just named, Mr. --

MR. THERESA: And in good faith we share them with the opposing side and instead
were assaulted with claims of fraud.
CHAIR THOMPSON: And those are the same five circulators we were talking about before that contained 238 signatures?

MS. STROUD: Let me confirm that with Mrs. White. Mrs. White, those individuals that you were referring to as the five circulators that you could not identify as D.C. residents they were Vincent Brown, Burnell Smith, Brian Boyd, Danielle Simmons and Irving Harris?

MRS. WHITE: That's correct.
MS. STROUD: Okay. And, Ms. Brooks, do you have the print-outs that you provided to the campaign with respect to those individuals?

MS. BROOKS: Yes.
MS. STROUD: Okay. Could you -- the five individuals Vincent Brown, Burnell Smith, Brian Boyd, Danielle Simmons and Irving Harris. MS. BROOKS: We have -- well, we have Ronald Hughes, Danielle Simmons, Andrea Whittle, I'm not sure if she was on the list. Vincent Brown and Irving Harris.

MS. STROUD: Okay. What about Burnell Smith and Brian Boyd?

MS. BROOKS: Those weren't submitted to US, no.

MS. STROUD: Those were not, excuse me, I'm sorry.

MS. BROOKS: No. Unless they are (audio interference).

CHAIR THOMPSON: So, is that three out of five that are --

MS. STROUD: We do. I would just say for the record that the other two names were Burnell Smith and Brian Boyd.

MS. BROOKS: Okay. They gave us their driver's license of Burnell Smith. We have that.

MS. STROUD: Okay.
MS. BROOKS: And what was the other name?

MS. STROUD: Brian Boyd.
MS. BROOKS: they gave me -- I guess this came from --

MS. STROUD: Can you identify what that
document is for the record?
MS. BROOKS: It must have come from our website.

MS. STROUD: Okay. This appears to be with respect to Brian Boyd, a print-out from the Board's website that indicates the name Brian Anthony Boyd, party affiliation, Democrat and it provides also the address for the voter. But I would just also state for the record that in order to circulate petitions in D.C. you have to be an individual who is 18 years of age or older and a District resident, not necessarily a registered voter. But you do have to be a D.C. resident. But we do have registration records for Vincent Brown, Danielle Simmons and Irving Harris.

> MS. BROOKS: Yes.

CHAIR THOMPSON: For the record, they all indicate D.C. addresses.

MS. STROUD: They all indicate D.C. addresses, yes.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Ms. White,
thank you for your patience. We certainly allowed ample presentation by the candidate. Please take as much additional time as you need to rebut or address anything that's come up.

MRS. WHITE: Thank you so much.
So, for the record when we had our pre-hearing conference the Board of Elections had no record of receiving the supposed print-outs that attest to the residency of certain circulators. I would like to know whether the document that you were just provided were provided from counsel for Trayon White or from their own files as being part of the challenge involving Trayon white or if it's just part of their records generally. The circulators, the issue with the circulators is that so Vincent Brown, for example, who we have a print-out for. There are 12 Vincent Browns on the voter roll and none of them match the registered address -- the address that was used on the circulator form. The Vincent Brown print-out that you have that address still does not match the address that was
on the circulator affidavit. There's no way for us to understand or know definitively that the Vincent Brown's print-out that you have is the Vincent Brown that circulated the petition. And our due diligence in searching on line, the voter rolls and whatever we had access to has not provided us proof that he is a D.C. resident. The same thing from Burnell Smith. We did not receive the driver's licenses that you just received so I'm not sure when they were provided or received or put into the file but that's something that we still have not seen to date. And the same for Brian Boyd.

For Danielle Simmons there are four other Danielle Simmons in the voter roll none of which have an address that match the address she used on her circulator petition. And there are four Irving Harris' in the voter roll but none at the address that was put on the petition. And, in fact, the address that was put on the petition was invalid because it was an intersection and not an address. And so just to respond to, you
know, allegations of disenfranchisement, the onus is on the campaign to cure these issues. And the campaign did not cure these issues. The challenger has submitted detailed and verified information that there are issues and invalidities in what was submitted in Trayon White's petition. And he has provided very little, if any, evidence to counter these assertions. And while, yes, we did have the burden of proof for presenting these challenges and we made them in good faith, there should be and is some responsibility or obligation on behalf of Trayon White's campaign to dispute this information and provide information. But when we requested access to witnesses and things of that nature we were denied emphatically. And we were unable to get a determination as to whether or not we could subpoena witnesses to date quite frankly. So, there's a limited amount of information $I$ can give you because $I$ cannot subpoena Mr. Brown, for example. Have him come before you and testify to the fact that this
signature is his and the address is his and he was a D.C. resident at the time the petition was circulated.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much.
Well, here's what I can promise you. We will continue to drill down on the details of those five circulators and confirm what we can within the BOE. This is necessarily an accelerated process. There isn't much time between when petitions are filed, challenges are made and decisions like this one have to be made so that the ballot can be confirmed. It's necessarily super fast-paced and just not time to drill down on every questions. But I can assure you that hundreds and hundreds of aggregate hours have been spent by the registrar and Voter Services Division reviewing each challenge. In this case, 2,768. So, this has been an excruciatingly busy time here and I want to continue to thank everybody involved in this herculean effort.

But, you know, that said, we'll keep
drilling down on the details, especially on these five circulators and make sure we get it right or as right as we can possibly get it in the time that we're permitted. But I just gave --

MRS. WHITE: Thank you.
CHAIR THOMPSON: i just gave a short speech. I see Council Member White has hand raised. Let me recognize him.

MRS. WHITE: I do have a question.
MR. WHITE: Thank you. I want to thank you for that even in listening to counsel I still have not heard proof in the allegations 12 of my circulations were not D.C. residents. And based on the law once you sign the affidavit you're good. Like, so if they make that assertion and based this whole witch hunt on that you have to prove that. And still to now we have not heard it. So, I'm still waiting to get it from counsel which I haven't heard yet and we just belonging the process of this hearing with nothing. So, I wanted to rebuttal with that because I don't see any proof even after all them words that meant
nothing.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you for that.
MRS. WHITE: I do have a question.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Ms. White, you had a question. Please go ahead.

MRS. WHITE: Yes, thank you. I'm not sure if I'm allowed to directly address anyone but I would like to know the name of the circulator that's not a D.C. resident because that is new information for the Board to consider and invalidate those signatures pursuant to the law.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Well, that's entirely up to, I'd say the council members counsel more appropriately to field. You don't have to answer it but please, Mr. Theresa, go ahead. We got to unmute you, sorry.

MR. THERESA: Okay. Yeah, basically, opposing counsel admitted that they don't know the address and that they don't have evidence that they do not live at that address. Even in their post-preliminary hearing brief they vaguely
state that they heard something. So, this is based on hearsay. This continued fish hunt. And they don't have evidence and as the councilman stated the burden is theirs. And our circulator stated for the record that they swore under oath that they're D.C. residents. The councilman is speaking under oath. He said only one was not. There needs to be no further inquiry on this matter. The Board has the ability to quash subpoenas. We don't have all the time in the world to deal with this. We don't have all the resources in the world to deal with this. And, frankly, I think it's an inappropriate use of public funding to continue this, you know, this inquiry in this way. I hope it ends today, this afternoon preferably.

Thank you. MRS. WHITE: I'd like the record to reflect that the question remains unanswered as to who -- which circulator was not a resident of D.C. that Mr. Trayon White has already attested to the fact that there was one circulator who was
not a resident of D.C.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Well, thank you for that. I think we've heard from everybody on this issue. We appreciate how much time this took for everybody to organize and deal with for the last week or so. There's been a lot of detail exchange so thank you, everybody, for being here. And that concludes this matter and all 10 of the challenges we've dealt with here and after a long day.

I see a couple of hands up. I'm not meaning to cut anybody off. I know MaryEva, I see your hand up. Did you want to say something real quick?

MS. CANDON: Yes, quickly. I know you're going into executive session. This is for all of us. I'm just wondering what form of the communication with us will take about the resolution.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much.
MS. STROUD: Yes, orders will be issued with respect to the first matter that we heard
today. The matter must be resolved today under the law. And the Board will go into Execution Session. They will deliberate with respect to all of the matters that we heard today.

And with respect to the resolution, orders will timely be issued within each -- each ruling will be issued within the time allotted by law which is 20 days for each matter. And we will do our best to issue written orders.

The Board will issue oral rulings today and then we will issue written orders as soon as possible thereafter.

MS. CANDON: So, that means if not today it means Monday?

CHAIR THOMPSON: Yes.
MS. STROUD: Yes. No later than Monday.

MS. CANDON: And will it be by email or mail?

MS. STROUD: We'll mail to the parties and we'll also post the orders on our website.

MS. CANDON: Okay. Will you post --

I'm sorry. I think everybody would want to know this. Will you post the orders that are determined this evening on the website this evening or not? I'm just asking, not demanding.

MS. STROUD: We will issue as many orders as we can tonight and the orders -- any challenges that were filed on the 4 th will be issued today or by no later than Monday.

MS. CANDON: Okay. And on the website Monday?

MS. STROUD: Yes.
MS. CANDON: Okay. Just, you know, some of us might be anxious.

Thank you very much for all your hard work.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you. I see the Council Member has his hand raised again. Council Member white. MR. WHITE: Yes. I hate to beat a dead horse but for the record I've never said that the one person was not a D.C. resident. I heard people say that were quoted. I said we cannot
verify if one out of all the 20 plus persons were D.C. residents. So, we don't know if they were D.C. or not. So, please don't say I say they were not D.C. residents. It's on the record. CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you much. That's an important distinction. I see the hand raised by Sandra Williams.

MS. STROUD: And I believe that Sandra Williams is a member of the Fight the Power 8. Please correct me if I'm wrong.

MS. WILLIAMS: Yes, it is. Meadows vs. Muhammad.

I just wanted to go on record that I felt that our part of the hearing was like just brushed off the shoulder. Just like, okay, you had a chance to say, let's move on. You didn't question anything. You didn't review anything and you didn't allow the other person who had their hand up to say anything. And if it goes down the way I think it will, you have not heard the last from us. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much.
There is a hand raised by Nathan Leon, and I can't see the --
(Simultaneous speaking.)
MS. STROUD: -- he was one of the parties in the Thomas matter.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Bennett-Fleming.
MS. STROUD: Uh-huh.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Thanks for bearing with us on this hand-raising thing. If we just leave it open we get zoombaed. So, we have really carefully control who speaks and when.

Okay. While we're waiting for Mr. Bennett-Fleming, I see James Harnett has his hand up.

MR. HARNETT: Yes, thank you. To respect -- I understand the first -- order that needs to be written and published today was the matter of James Harnett v. Corren Brown. If we were to stay on the zoom meeting here will you all come out of Executive session and announce the oral orders for that case as well as all of
the others that you make a determination on this afternoon or is there going to be another process by which people are notified earlier than that? MS. STROUD: Well, the Board will vote to go into Executive Session. They will deliberate and then they will appear back on the record after they have deliberated. And --

CHAIR THOMPSON: Can we come back on at 5. That's probably enough time.

MS. STROUD: Mm-hmm.
CHAIR THOMPSON: I'll tell you what. Well, I mean, this is just a rough plan. I think we'll go into executive session and we'll come back at 5 and announce the rulings that we've been able to reach. Most certainly, we will reach a determination in Harnett $v$. Brown by that point.

MR. HARNETT: Okay, thank you. CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Looks like we have one hand raised. It's Council Member White and you get the last word today. Or, Mr. Bennett-Fleming, did you have
-- okay, Council Member White. Council Member White, did you want to say anything? I see your hand raised.

MR. WHITE: No, sir. $I$ think $I$ did not take it down.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much. Well, that concludes everything from the time that I started with the comment that a lot of these petition signature requirements I recognize are not easy. As a private citizen I can see all kinds of ways to make them clear or easier for candidates to deal with but that's a discussion for another time and certainly something that only the Council can address. Meanwhile, we certainly must follow the letter and the spirit of the statute and the regulations that are on the books with respect to the requirements for valid signatures and apply those to the facts of each one of these 10 cases. So, that's what we'll do.

And with that and we also want to thank everybody for being here.

MR. FLEMING: Hello. Can you hear me? CHAIR THOMPSON: I'll go ahead and move to go into Executive Session under D.C. Code --

MR. FLEMING: Can you hear me?
CHAIR THOMPSON: 575(B)(13) --
MR. FLEMING: Can you hear me?
CHAIR THOMPSON: Let me get my motion out. But we got one more comment it looks like. Oh, there he is, Mr. Nate Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: Yes. Thank you. Thank you so much.

I just wanted to note that there were two separate matters. In my matter statements that were seem to be incorporated from the previous matter which is not properly alleging those facts. He has to allege misstatements in my hearing so I ask that they not be incorporated because it will be improper to do so.

And then secondly, matters related -and I tried to say it at the end of my hearing but $I$ was not able to get off of mute. And, then secondly, matters related to a proprietary
interest or property interest in a right to the ballot were not alleged in the pre-hearing conference. As you know, the pre-hearing conference is the opportunity to state what issues will be argued at this hearing and matters that are not alleged at the hearing are not ripe for discussion here (audio interference). So, any allegation in the cases that he cited, Orange v. Board of Elections and other cases related to the Supreme Court case related to proprietary interests were not asserted during the prehearing conference and they should not be in consideration during the Executive Session.

Thank you.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much.
So, with my motion pending to go into Executive Session, do I have a second?

Looks like you have to unmute our own Board Members.

MEMBER GILL: Yes, so for whatever reason we get muted.

So, second.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And, Karyn, are you --

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes, I'm here.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. So, all in favor of going into Executive Session? (Chorus of aye.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: So, that's three and that's what we'll do.

Thank you everybody for bearing with us and like we said, we'll come back on the record at 5:00 and we'll announce what we can. At least the very first case and take it from there.
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 3:33 p.m. and resumed at 5:07 p.m.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: Thank you so much for hanging with us. Thank you to everybody for staying past 5:00 now on a beautiful day.

I move that we go back on the record. MEMBER GILL: Second. CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor?
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. We are back to continue and conclude our adjudication of 10 challenges. We've been in Executive Session. We have exhaustively discussed the challenges. They have reached determinations in all 10 cases. Our plan is to go through all 10 of them and this is just for us Board Members to conduct. There will be motions made and possibly seconded, possibly passed or not passed. It's not a time for any further argument or public comment. So, everybody is muted and thank you so much for your patience in that regard.

So, having said that I will start and go back to the same order that we've been through them today.

The first case is a challenge by James Harnett v. Corren Brown, candidate for mayor of the District of Columbia. The motion is a motion to uphold the challenge and deny access to candidate Brown. I guess the way we'll do this is I'll tee up each motion, maybe make a comment,
whoever wants to second can second and make comment and then the three of us can make comment and then we'll hold the vote.

So, I just have a brief comment which is really heartbreaking to accept the challenge where there's 39 out of 40 necessary signatures. I really wanted to let go but there's just not enough signatures to clear the threshold. And the additional signature as a circulator is on a different part of the form that doesn't count in that regard. So, I'm sad to make the motion and I'm sad to have to vote for it.

MEMBER GILL: So, following on that, $I$ second it but it really -- it comes down to the form itself. I know there was comments about at the top of the form it says, we the undersigned. But you can be a circulator and not be -- and not fit the parameters of being a District resident or able to vote. You have to file a separate form. But when it says, we the undersigned, it does not refer to the circulator because it wouldn't apply to the circulator in all cases.

And so we have to distinguish between those places where there are signatures and then a separate section for the circulator. We just couldn't see our way past the four corners of the letter.

And, Gary, I think you want to note, well, we'll safe it to the end.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Karyn, any
comment?
MEMBER GREENFIELD: No, I don't have any comment. We talked about this and, yeah, the one but we did have a conversation and the form doesn't draw in the circulators signature is part of that so --

CHAIR THOMPSON: So, the motion having been made and seconded, all in favor?
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: Unanimous.
The second challenge we've heard is Lisa Gore v. Leniqua'dominque Jenkins, candidate for at-large member of the Council of the District of Columbia.

The motion that I'm making is also a motion to uphold the challenge and deny access to candidate Jenkins. Reason is, she has 186 signatures short of the requirement and there are circulator defects that either have not been cured or cannot be cured and that would bar the statute is -- the regulation, I should say, is quite specific, 1607, that we shall not accept signatures if the circulator of the petition has failed to complete all required information in the circulator's affidavit which is not the case here in many respects. And this is not the kind of formal error that we can weigh with respect to dates on the circulator's affidavit and some of the other particulars that we supplemented out of the fact so, it's not any fun to make this motion to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access t2Ms. Jenkins. But, nevertheless I make the motion.

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Second.
MEMBER GILL: So, I second. As Gary said it's no fun after all the work to get
signatures but everyone has to have the same rules.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Karyn, anything from you?

MEMBER GREENFIELD: No, I don't anything.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. The motion having been made and seconded, all in favor? (Chorus of aye.) CHAIR THOMPSON: It carries unanimously.

You know even though it's somewhat moot I think we should go ahead and consider and rule upon the next challenge, Harnett v. Jenkins. James Harnett v. Dominque Jenkins, candidate for at-large member of the council of the District of Columbia. It's a closely related challenge where in that case the shortfall is 134 and once again, we cannot see it our way allow the defects with the circulator affidavits to be remedied so on that particular matter I regretfully again move to uphold the challenge and denied ballot access.

MEMBER GILL: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor?
MEMBER GREENFIELD: Aye.
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: It's unanimous.
Okay. Moving on to the fourth
challenge of the day, Sirraya Gant v. Dorothy Douglas, candidate for Ward 7 committee woman of the Democratic State Committee. In this case, the motion is to reject the challenge and allow ballot access. Ms. Douglas was 17 signatures over of the required threshold and without belaboring the details because this one was mostly about some details. We found that the registrar's work in this regard and the recommendation made was advisable and, therefore, I move to reject the challenge and allow ballot access to Ms. Douglas.

MEMBER GILL: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor?
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: The motion carries
unanimously.
On to the fifth challenge of the day. Jimmie Williams v. Tyrell Holcomb, candidate for Ward 7 Democratic State Committee. This is one where the motion once again is to reject the challenge and allow ballot access. And that's the motion I'm making. This was the one where there was a shortfall but there was testimony in the record that a circulator mistakenly dated her affidavit March 22nd when in fact she signed it on March 23rd just put down the wrong date. And her testimony was in the record in that regard and I found it acceptable so that's why I'm making the motion in this case to reject the challenge and allow ballot access.

MEMBER GILL: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. All in favor? (Chorus of aye.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: Next is the sixth one of the day or next on our agenda. Denise Reed v. MaryEva Candon.

This is one where once again
regretfully $I$ must make the motion to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access. The candidate was 76 signatures short. This was largely because of the fact that on eight sheets each with 10 signatures there were double signature by circulators, although the sheet was clearly intended to be completed and signed by one circulator with two signatures that it's not possible to tell which corresponds to which. In any event it's not in compliance with the important requirement of there being circulator affirmation of signatures so regrettably it's a motion to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access.

MEMBER GILL: I second that.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Any comments out there, Mike or Karyn?

MEMBER GILL: Well, 1 mean, I guess for the record, you know, this is one where, you know, we never infer any fraud, you know, we want challengers to prove their case essentially. But in this case no one even remotely is saying
there's anything untoward here. But the problem is, that by double signing it neither signature is actually true to what they're affirming. And while we believe that it was done with the best intentions, almost belts and suspenders, what it does and what we're worried about in terms of precedent is that we would essentially say the language on the form doesn't matter and we just can't do that. And so that's unfortunately why we have to accept the challenge.

CHAIR THOMPSON: So, having made the motion and the second is made, all in favor? (Chorus of aye.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: Three to nothing. The seventh challenge of the day, David Meadows v. Anthony Muhammad, among others. Candidate for Ward 8, committee woman and committee men of the Democratic State Committee on the Fight the Power 8 slate.

On this one the motion is to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access. This is one where the requisite number of signatures were

16 short. It required some re-examination of the particulars which we did and, nevertheless, the number of valid signatures continues to fall short so I have to regretfully make this motion to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access. MEMBER GILL: And I second it. Same thing. I know it's so hard to go and get these signatures and when you end up only a couple short it's even doubly heartbreaking. But as I said everyone has the same bar so we got to uphold the challenge. And I second. MEMBER GREENFIELD: And I definitely agree with Mike and we did look at it and looked at all of the signatures and why and we cannot get to the 100.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. With that the motion and seconded, all in favor?
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: The motion passes.
The eighth matter of today is Denis Jaffee v. Bradley Thomas, candidate for at-large member of the council of the District of

Columbia. On this matter I must regretfully move to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access.

This is the case where after many challenges were upheld the candidate nevertheless fell 340 ballot signature short. There wasn't much discussion about the particulars but rather there was discussion about whether the challenge was filed on a timely basis having been filed -stamped at 5:00 p.m. on the day in question with the challenger obviously present in the office before 5:00 p.m. and we discussed this including with counsel and come to the conclusion that it does constitute timely filing. And so for that matter, I make a motion to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access.

MEMBER GILL: Second. I think during the discussion we sort of referenced, you know, when you're in the line at the polls, you know, voting ends at 7:00 or 8:00 but if you're in line we stay open until everyone has voted. The day that these filings are due, you know, if you're there before the close of business then, you
know, it's not the -- it's not the person who brings it in fault, if there's a crush and staff can't stamp it. But if you're there in a timely manner that's what gets recognized just like if you're there to vote we keep the polls open until the line is done. We don't reopen them the next day but we keep them open until the line is done so I second it.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. The motion having been made and seconded all in favor? (Chorus of aye.) Chair THOMPSON: Motion carries. Nine is the matter of Nathan Fleming v. Bradley Thomas, candidate for at-large member of the council of the District of Columbia. Once again I regretfully move to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access. This involves the same candidate, Bradley Thomas. In this count with respect to these signatures challenge the candidate was 557 signatures short. There wasn't any discussion with regard to those particulars but rather counsel for Mr. Thomas raised the
timing issue again, same issue that was argued separately or recorded separately. And we looked into it and found that as we just explained that the challenge was filed on a timely basis and, therefore, I make the motion to uphold the challenge and deny ballot access.

MEMBER GILL: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor? (Chorus of aye.)

CHAIR THOMPSON: Three in favor of that motion.

And, finally, Luz Martinez Munoz versus Trayon White, candidate for mayor of the District of Columbia. In this matter I am moving to reject the challenge and allow ballot access. This is the case where the candidate collected 4,391 signatures. Many of them were invalid. However, the candidate ended up with 138 more than needed. After several rounds of examination of the details, the 138 number stands. We reexamined the spreadsheet, 405, that was submitted earlier in the week and really drilled down on
those details including with regard to the five circulators that were discussed. And the staff worked exhaustively on this, all these petitions but there were a lot of signatures to get through on this one and a lot of details to review and everything that was submitted was very carefully and thoroughly considered responsibly and mutually and after the dust has settled on all of that the 138 overage number remains and for that reason I move to reject the challenge and allow ballot access.

MEMBER GILL: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And comments on this one from anybody else?

MEMBER GILL: No, I mean you got to meet the bar. You don't have to clear the bar more than the bar.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Right. Okay, with that. The motion having been made and seconded, all in favor?
(Chorus of aye.)
CHAIR THOMPSON: Three to nothing. So,

Mike, you had some comments you wanted to make with respect to some of the candidates that are not going to make it onto the ballot in the primary.

MEMBER GILL: Well, so, just in the first instance, it's for a candidate for, you know, one of the non-majority party. One of the non-majority parties and so we were always trying to find a way to say, you know, let the people decided if there's a missing date or we can figure those types of things out. We want people on the ballot. So, in the first one where it came down to one signature, it's doubly hard. That was the only candidate in that primary. And so we just wanted to mention that, you know, a write-in vote and attestation of your candidacy within two days after a write-in vote, you know, gets you the same result. So, that was, you know, one of the -- one of the difficulties was it was a challenge to a primary slot where there's no -- now there's no candidate for that party. And so that's just, you know, we hate to
see that. But we wanted to just make sure everyone was aware of, it's still a primary. There's still a small number or it's, you know, it's a limited to the voters in that party and so a write-in candidacy is not completely out of the question in that respect.

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Actually, just a correction.

MEMBER GILL: Did I mangle the two day

MEMBER GREENFIELD: No. This is quoting Section 8 of the statute R2, to be eligible to receive a nomination of a party for public office a write-in candidate shall be a duly registered member of the party nominated and shall meet all the other qualifications required for election to the office as long as they state your candidacy by no later than the third day immediately following the day of the election. So, with the election being on June 21st if anyone wanted to seek to be a write-in or you can, mount a write-in campaign and if you get any
votes whether or not you announced before the election you can submit an affirmation of writein candidacy by the third day after the election.

CHAIR THOMPSON: And I think it was there for Anthony Williams.

MS. STROUD: Anthony Williams was removed from the ballot in his re-election campaign and launched a write-in candidate that was successful.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. And there's always the general election, too. It might apply to some of these.

Well, thank you, everybody, for bearing with us. I have learned a lot about petition challenges. There's a lot of detail to this and I have a new appreciation for just how difficult it is when you're a candidate to submit all this and get all this in the door and I have a new found overwhelming appreciation for the staff of the BOE who really drills down on every detail and, you know, as we've said several times, thank you for the challengers. In some
cases successful and in some cases not. But what you've done is helped keep our democracy strong by making sure that these requirements are administered properly and correctly. So, you know, the whole process as a whole is incredibly valuable and hopefully all contributes to a successful and enriching campaign season.

So, with that, I --
MS. STROUD: I would just, sorry, Mr.
Chair. I would just note for the record that the Board is hereby announcing, with respect to all of these matters, their announcement of a determination of the matters on the record but written orders will follow.

CHAIR THOMPSON: All right. Thank you for adding that. And I think in the case of Harnett v. Brown, the written order will definitely --

MS. STROUD: We'll get that out
tonight.
CHAIR THOMPSON: -- be issued tonight.
MS. STROUD: Yes.

CHAIR THOMPSON: Because of the date deadline. The other nine probably will come out on Monday.

MS. STROUD: Some may come out tonight. So, we'll be here.

CHAIR THOMPSON: I'll be here.
MS. STROUD: Yes.
MEMBER GREENFIELD: We'll be here.
CHAIR THOMPSON: It's 5:30.
MS. STROUD: Let's just say Monday.
CHAIR THOMPSON: Okay. Monday, but, no, I'm joking. I mean, this is it. This is the accelerated part of the campaign season for $B O E$ so, you know, we work evenings, we work weekends. You know, we do whatever it takes to keep everything running towards the deadlines that we know are in front of us to have the ballot finalized and the ballot mailed, you know. We're sticking to the calendar. It's on our BOE website. And it's the first thing I looked at when I was nominated. I said, wow, what does the schedule look like. It's tight but we're hitting
every date, one after another and next week there's another slew of dates so, you know, so it's relentless right now. But we are keeping up and keeping pace. And it's impressive. So, everyone so, with that $I$ move to adjourn.

MEMBER GILL: Second.
CHAIR THOMPSON: All in favor?
(Chorus of aye.)
(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 5:31 p.m.)
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