

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ELECTIONS**

In the Matter of)	
Mattan (aka John) Johnson)	Administrative
)	Order #25-001

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Introduction

This matter came before the District of Columbia Board of Elections (“the Board”) on January 15, 2025. It concerns a recommendation by the Board’s General Counsel that the Board take enforcement action against Mattan Johnson (“Johnson”) based on evidence that he submitted multiple fraudulent voter registration applications and fraudulently cast a ballot. Chairman Gary Thompson and Board member Karyn Greenfield presided over the hearing. The Board’s General Counsel was also present.

Background

It is undisputed that, between October 2022 and November 2024, Johnson submitted five voter registration applications that contained false information and that he cast a ballot in the 2024 General Election.¹ It is also undisputed that at all times relevant to this matter, Johnson was ineligible to vote for reasons of his age.² The following identifies the specific false information provided by date of application submitted:

¹ As explained below, Johnson attended a prehearing conference before the Board’s Office of General Counsel (“OGC”) during which he admitted to each item of false information he had included in these applications. One of his applications was submitted via the registration form that was pre-printed on the special ballot envelope used to hold his 2024 General Election ballot. As further explained below, that ballot was not counted.

² As Johnson was still a minor at time of these proceedings, OGC consulted with the Office of Attorney General for D.C. as to the requirements for juvenile proceedings and the Board of Ethics and Government Accountability as to the requirements for open meetings to ascertain whether the agency proceedings in this matter should be treated as confidential. Both authorities affirmed that there was no confidentiality requirement based on Johnson’s status as a minor.

October 19, 2022 (new registration box on form checked)

False year of birth
False last four digits of Social Security Number (“SSN”)

May 30, 2023 (name change box on form checked)

False first name of John
False year of birth

October 7, 2024 (new registration box on form checked)

False first name of John
Partially false middle name
False year of birth
False last four digits of SSN

November 2, 2024 (same-day registration on special ballot envelope)

False first name of John
Partially false middle name
False year of birth
False last four digits of SSN
False address

November 6, 2024 (address change box on form checked)

False first name of John
Partially false middle name
False year of birth
False last four digits of SSN
False address

On each voter application, Johnson provided an earlier year of birth than the year in which he was actually born so that he would appear to be eligible to register.

Each voter application included the following language immediately over the signature line:

WARNING: If you sign this statement even though you know it is untrue, you can be convicted and fined up to \$10,000 and/or jailed for up to five years.

On each voter application, Johnson signed his name immediately under this warning.³ Four of the applications were submitted by Johnson through the Board’s on-line portal. The forms he completed instructed that first-time registrants may be required to “provide identification that

³ The November 5, application was set forth on the special ballot envelope and this warning language was particularly emphasized in all capital bolded font.

shows your name *and* current address the first time you vote[.]” (emphasis added) and that applicants could also register “with valid proof of residence” at the polls when voting.

Johnson’s fraud and the need for enforcement action was brought to the attention of the Board’s General Counsel as a result of his attempt to update his registration and cast a ballot during early voting on November 2, 2024. On that early voting date, Johnson went to a vote center and provided, for the first time (and again, falsely), a 16th Street address that differed from a previously provided and unconfirmed address on a registration application submitted by Johnson on October 7, 2024. He had no documentation showing that he lived at that new address and so was given a special ballot that would be counted only if he timely submitted an acceptable form of documentation (such as a current government-issued identification card (“ID”) or utility bill or bank statement that was not more than 90-days old) that associated his name with the address that he claimed.

The deadline for submission of the address cure documentation was 5:00 p.m. on November 12, 2024. Two minutes prior to that deadline, Johnson emailed his documentation with the following forwarding note: “I am submitting a proof of residency document and I ask that my provisional ballot, which was cast on 02 November, will be counted.” In identifying himself in the forwarding note, Johnson again provided a false first name, the false 16th Street address and a false date of birth. Board records indicate that this message was received at 5:01 p.m. (after the deadline).⁴

Johnson determined that his special ballot had not been accepted and the following morning emailed the Board’s Office of General Counsel stating:

⁴ Johnson included two addresses in the send line of his email. One of those addresses was not a valid email for the Board and the message bounced back. The message was delivered to the other valid Board email.

My ballot was not counted because I emailed my proof of residency document approximately 30 minutes late. I initially emailed it right before 5:00, but for some reason, it bounced back multiple times.

Voting is a constitutional right and I do not believe that a technical error should stop my vote from being counted.

Johnson sought the intervention of the Board's General Counsel knowing that, notwithstanding whatever proof of residency he provided, he was ineligible to vote because of his age. Moreover, he continued his deception by again including in his email to the General Counsel a false year of birth in addition to a false name and address.

This led the General Counsel to review the documentation that Johnson had submitted and for her to email him back the list of acceptable documents along with an explanation that, because that documentation he had provided was more than 90 days old, it was unacceptable. After seeing the list of acceptable documentation, Johnson responded via email that, at the vote center, he had provided IDs and he questioned why the IDs that he had shown when trying to cast his ballot were not accepted. The General Counsel asked Johnson to email her images of those IDs. Johnson responded by sending two photo IDs, a community college ID and a Library of Congress user card that was prominently marked "minor". He stated in his email that he got the Library of Congress card "a few days before my birthday, which is why it says 'minor.'" As neither ID card showed any residential D.C. address for Johnson, the General Counsel informed him, on November 14, that those IDs were also insufficient and that his ballot was not counted.

Johnson persisted and emailed the General Counsel asking her how she could be sure that his ballot was not counted. When the General Counsel confirmed that his ballot was not accepted, he went further and asked how he could appeal. The General Counsel advised Johnson that he could appeal to the Board. Johnson requested a hearing before the Board during the last few minutes for doing so on Friday, November 15, 2024. A virtual hearing was quickly organized at

which the General Counsel, the Board's Registrar of Voters, and Johnson appeared on the evening of November 15, 2024 before Board member Karyn Greenfield. Knowing all the while that he was ineligible to vote and withholding that information, Johnson continued to protest the disposition of his documentation as to residency. The presiding Board member, however, ruled that he had failed to provide the required documentation.

On Monday morning, November 18, 2024, the General Counsel followed-up on the Board hearing proceedings by emailing Johnson information on his right to further appeal the Board decision to the D.C. Superior Court and by sending him a six-page formal written Board order that upheld the rejection of his special ballot. At approximately noon that same day, Johnson emailed the General Counsel letting her know that he had filed an appeal with the D.C. Superior Court and asking her how long it would take the court to act. The General Counsel emailed him a reply stating that, as the matter was now in litigation, it would be handled by OGC's litigation attorney ("OGC attorney"), who was copied on the General Counsel's email, and advising him to direct any questions to her.

The OGC attorney then engaged Johnson by emailing him and letting him know that he would have to address his questions about court processing times to the court. That said, she explained that she had conducted a search for Johnson's Superior Court case and could not find it.

The OGC attorney further stated as follows in her email to Johnson:

In addition and as this case has been referred to me due to your appeal, I have undertaken my due diligence and independently investigated this matter. My investigation has produced credible evidence that ... you were ... ineligible to cast a ballot in the 2024 General Election for reasons of your age. Should your appeal be perfected and your ... date of birth be confirmed through evidence presented in such litigation, I will be asking the court to affirm the Board's decision on that ground as well.

Knowing full well that he was ineligible to vote based on his age, Johnson nevertheless responded:

“What ‘credible evidence’ did you find?”

The OGC attorney advised:

I have an email communication from your mother (which also stated that John is not your name). I believe that the information is highly credible given that (1) your mother would be expected to know your date of birth; (2) the signature of the voter application that lead to this email is consistent with other signatures on file for you; and (3) you have persistently avoided providing an identification card that might actually document your date of birth. Of course, your DOB (and name) can/will be verified through a court proceeding.

She also requested that Johnson confirm whether he filed an appeal and, if so, that he provide the case number.

Johnson emailed back:

The allegations are not appreciated.

I did indeed file an appeal which was rejected due to an administrative error (*you know how DC works*).^[5]

He went on to explain, however, that he was not pursuing his appeal because he could not meet the deadline for doing so and he had since learned that the votes on his ballot would not have been of any consequence.

Given the clear evidence of voter fraud related to Johnson, the Board’s Office of General Counsel initiated enforcement proceedings and sent a formal notice to him on November 21, 2024 requesting that he appear at a December 3, 2024 pre-hearing conference. The OGC attorney checked the Board’s data files for active voters living at the two addresses that Johnson had provided in attempting to register and also sent requests, copied to Johnson, to a voter at each

⁵ Emphasis added.

address (these two voters were later confirmed to be Johnson's parents) requesting that those persons appear as witnesses at the pre-hearing conference.

The next day, Johnson sent the OGC attorney the following email regarding the December 3 pre-hearing conference: "I will not be available at that time. If I am to attend, this conference will need to be rescheduled, hopefully for after the new year." Although informed that the presence of his parents at the pre-hearing conference had been requested, he did not copy his parents on his email in which he stated he would not be at the conference.

The OGC attorney promptly responded by noting that the evidence was strong enough that she was prepared to move forward without speaking to Johnson and that, in any event, his mere statement that he was not available was not enough, given the seriousness of the matter, and she denied Johnson's request for continuance.

Subsequently, attorney Gansler contacted the OGC attorney and advised that he would be representing Johnson. Just prior to the pre-hearing conference, the OGC attorney sent attorney Gansler and Johnson images of the five registration applications that were attributed to Johnson.

At the December 3, 2024, pre-hearing conference, Johnson and attorney Gansler appeared and Johnson's mother made herself available. Attorney Gansler discussed with Johnson his Fifth Amendment right and Johnson agreed to waive that right. He was then placed under oath. The OGC attorney proceeded by confirming on the record Johnson's actual name, date of birth, last four numbers of his SSN, and his address. The OGC attorney went through each of the five registration applications and the information on those forms that appeared to be false. Johnson admitted to each of the false entries identified above.

With respect to his choice of the alias "John," the OGC attorney sought an explanation of how Johnson came to select that particular false name. In doing so, she noted that John Johnson

was an extremely common name and that there were eighty-three (83) John Johnsons in the Board's records, and she asked Johnson if he selected the name "John" because it would likely make it more difficult for the Board to detect his fraud. Johnson responded by explaining why he did not care for his given name (*e.g.*, "Mattan," according to Johnson, was often mispronounced by others) but he provided no credible exculpatory explanation as to why he had opted for the substitute name of "John."

The OGC attorney then went through the email communications between Johnson and OGC. Among other things, she asked Johnson what he meant when he responded to proof of his fraud by saying that the "allegations are not appreciated." Johnson's response was along the lines of people in general do not appreciate being accused of deception.

The OGC attorney noted that, during the arguably busiest election cycle on record, Johnson had, based on entirely false pretenses, caused the General Counsel, the Registrar of Voters, and a member of the Board to appear at a hearing convened essentially on an emergency basis. She expressed concern that Johnson was not exhibiting the slightest remorse for the disruption and resource misuse he had caused. Attorney Gansler commented then and later that his client does not wear his emotions on his sleeve but did regret his actions.

After speaking with the OGC attorney, Johnson left the video proceeding and his mother entered. The OGC attorney asked her if she could shed any light on Johnson's adoption of the alias "John." Johnson's mother volunteered that she had commented to Johnson at one point that her distinctive name enabled third parties to ascertain her background and she speculated that Johnson stopped using his somewhat distinctive given name for similar reasons. She essentially acknowledged that Johnson had concealed from her his use of the name "John," stating that she found out about that when school personnel referred to him as "John." While in 2023 she came

into possession of Board mail sent to Johnson regarding a then-pending effort on his part to register illegally and she notified the Board that he should not be registered, she was otherwise unaware of Johnson's continuous efforts to illegally register to vote.

During the pre-hearing conference proceedings, the OGC attorney explained that the Board could take enforcement action upon the recommendation of the General Counsel and that the General Counsel would be formulating her recommendation based on record and evidence. She stated that the matter was likely to go before the Board at its regular meeting on January 8, 2024.⁶

After the pre-hearing conference, the OGC attorney sent a formal notice to Attorney Gansler advising him that the matter was set for the Board's January 8, 2024, meeting. Among other things, the notice advised that if Gansler had evidence that he wished to present to the Board, he should provide that to the OGC attorney by close of business on December 20, 2024, so that she could forward it to the Board. To the extent that Johnson or his counsel believed that some remedial action on Johnson's part might mitigate any punishment that might be imposed, the OGC attorney recommended that Johnson take that action promptly so that evidence of his actions could be presented to the Board. The deadlines for submitting evidence and appearing before the Board were subsequently re-scheduled for January 10, 2025 and January 15, 2025, respectively. No submissions were made.

On January 15, 2024, the parties appeared before the Board at a regular meeting. The OGC attorney presented to the Board the history of the matter as described above. The registration applications, email exchanges between Board staff and Johnson, and the recording of the pre-hearing conference were entered into the record without objection. The General Counsel then

⁶ There was some communication during and after the pre-hearing conference of an enforcement recommendation that was mutually agreed to between the General Counsel and Johnson. Given the differences between the parties, however, as to the scope of such recommendation, that option was not pursued.

reviewed the criminal statutory provisions that were implicated by Johnson's conduct, the total number of offenses that could be found based on treating each false entry as a separate offense, and the Board's authority to impose civil fines of up to \$2,000 for each violation of the election laws.

The Board then heard from Attorney Gansler who suggested that the seriousness of the matter should be diminished because: (1) Johnson was not successful in having his illegal ballot counted; (2) had Johnson's ballot been counted, his write-in votes for persons who had not declared their candidacy were not meaningful; (3) Johnson's desire to vote was laudable; (4) the extent of Johnson's deception was limited to using a few false claims (e.g., the one false first name of "John"); and (5) Johnson is a minor. He also indicated that, as Johnson will soon be old enough to vote legally, a punishment will serve little deterrent purpose. He proposed a penalty with three components: (1) counseling for Johnson; (2) a civil penalty at a level that Johnson (as opposed to his parents) could personally pay of no more than \$2,000; and (3) a third party investigation of Johnson's electronic devices. He argued that the matter was not appropriate for referral to prosecutorial authorities.

Advising of the risks of self-incrimination, the Chair then offered Johnson an opportunity to express his "remorse" or offer any other comments to the Board. Johnson only briefly stated: "I did this out of conviction but, at the same time, I didn't want to cause anyone too much trouble and it's unfortunate that I did."

The Chair then sought the General Counsel's recommendation on the matter. Before offering that recommendation, the General Counsel noted that the fact that the Board did its part to prevent fraud should not be a reason for discounting the seriousness of the offense. With respect to whether it would be appropriate to refer the matter to prosecutorial authorities, she pointed out

that the Board's mission is to insure the integrity of electoral process. She then recommended referral to the Attorney General for the District of Columbia and to the United States Attorney for criminal investigation and that Johnson be fined \$12,000. She opined on the reasonableness of her recommendation by explaining that counting one offense for each of the five false applications and one offense for the casting of the ballot equated to six violations that would support a civil fine of \$12,000.

The Board passed the matter to consider the remainder of the agenda and then went into executive session to discuss the disposition of Johnson's case. When the Board reconvened, it announced its unanimous decision to refer Mr. Johnson's conduct to the Attorney General for the District of Columbia and to order that, within 60 days from the date of the hearing, Johnson pay a \$6,000 civil fine; subject to possible downward adjustment upon a motion supported by (1) demonstration of therapy/mental health counseling and (2) an independent forensic examination of Johnson's electronic devices.

Discussion

Under D.C. law, it is a criminal offense to register, attempt to register, vote, or attempt to vote while making false representation as to qualifications to register and vote.⁷ At a minimum, with respect to this offense, Johnson falsely represented that he met the age qualification for voting on five voter applications and attempted to vote once based on such false representation. It is also a separate criminal offense under D.C. law to give false information as to name and address for the purpose of establishing eligibility to register or vote.⁸ There are nine instances of false first

⁷ D.C. Official Code §1-1001.14(a). False qualifications to vote arguably includes a providing an address in a D.C. election jurisdiction that is not the election jurisdiction where the individual resides.

⁸ D.C. Official Code §1-1001.14(a-1)(1)(B).

and middle names and addresses on Johnson’s voter applications. D.C. law further and separately criminalizes submitting false voter registration applications.⁹ Johnson submitted five false registration applications. Finally, it is a criminal violation of the D.C. election laws to cast a false ballot.¹⁰ Johnson submitted a false ballot.

As also noted by the General Counsel at the hearing in this matter, federal law criminalizes providing false information when registering or voting.¹¹ Federal law also criminalizes concealing material facts from election hearing examiners.¹²

The penalty for a conviction for each violation of the D.C. criminal election laws and of the Federal laws is a fine of up to \$10,000 and/or imprisonment for up to five years.¹³ The Board has authority, upon recommendation of the General Counsel, to refer criminal election law violations to prosecutorial authorities.¹⁴ In addition, the Board, again upon recommendation of the General Counsel, can impose civil fines of up to \$2,000 for each violation of “any provision” of the D.C. elections laws.¹⁵ In other words, civil fines are not limited to violations of the criminal D.C. election laws. That said, as the General Counsel pointed out, there are at least twenty (21)

⁹ D.C. Official Code §1-1001.14(a-1)(1)(C).

¹⁰ D.C. Official Code §1-1001.14(a-1)(1)(D). Although D.C. Official Code §1-1001.14(a-1)(1)(A)-(D) and (E) are connected by the word “or”, the offenses are not alternative punishments. *See* Council of the District of Columbia Legislative Drafting Manual, 2019 Ed., at p. 87 (explaining that “or” means “and”).

¹¹ 52 U.S. Code §10307(c). Because this provision applies to the nomination and election of federal officials, including D.C.’s Delegate to Congress, it reasonably covers any registration activity in the District.

¹² 52 U.S. Code §10307(e).

¹³ D.C. Official Code §§1-1001.14(a) and (a-1)(2); 52 U.S. Code §10307(c) and (e).

¹⁴ D.C. Official Code §1-1001.18(a). While we have focused on election law violations, Johnson’s conduct could also implicate criminal laws against, for example, making false statements to government agencies, or against abuse of process. Should prosecutorial authorities decide to act on a referral, they would have discretion to expand the violations charged.

¹⁵ D.C. Official Code §1-1001.18(b).

separate criminal violations of D.C. election laws, meaning Johnson faces a maximum of \$42,000 in civil fines.

In the instant matter, there is no dispute as to the violations of law. The issue for us is the level of enforcement action to be taken.

Notwithstanding that Johnson's crimes are the most egregious example of voter fraud witnessed in the District of Columbia, the General Counsel has proposed a reduced fine based on the number of fraudulent applications and the casting of a fraudulent ballot as opposed to each violation of law and then half of the maximum fine allowed for these six violations. She also recommended referral to both the U.S. Attorney and the Attorney General for the District of Columbia for criminal investigation.

Attorney Gansler has requested a substantially reduced fine that could be paid over many months, no criminal referral, counseling, and a forensic review of Johnson's devices. Attorney Gansler argues that this level of enforcement action is appropriate based on a number of arguably mitigating circumstances.

With respect to Attorney Gansler's arguments, we disagree that Johnson's conduct should not be punished because he was unsuccessful and because the votes on his ballot, even if accepted, would not have been counted. While Johnson's ballot was not ultimately counted, he successfully diverted the General Counsel from other highly important duties for multiple hours as she fielded his constant challenges to the rejection of his fraudulent ballot, organized and attended an emergency hearing, and prepared a six-page order on his baseless claims. He successfully caused a member of this Board to convene a Friday evening hearing on his fraudulent claims and then carried on before her pursuing his ruse. He successfully pulled the Registrar of Voters away from her job managing the thousands of calls and inquiries that her office fielded during the 2024

General Election. The level to which Johnson disrupted, for no legitimate purpose whatsoever, the business of senior Board officials and staff during a time when the Board's resources were stretched to the maximum cannot be understated.

Moreover, as noted above, the law punishes the act of casting a fraudulent ballot and attempts to register and vote fraudulently. The crimes are proven notwithstanding that the culprit was unsuccessful in causing a fraudulent ballot to be counted or, whether had the ballot been accepted, it would have been inconsequential. Accordingly, we are not comfortable with the notion that the law contemplates punishing a failed or meaningless attempt any less than a successful one.

With respect to the point that Johnson's motivations were not ideological, we understand counsel to mean that there was no evil or malicious end to Johnson's desire to vote illegally. This point, however, suffers from the same defect as counsel's claim that Johnson is remorseful and recognizes the disruption he caused, namely, the evidence of motive and intent is entirely dependent on Johnson's say-so as relayed by his counsel. No character witnesses who could have provided insight into his state of mind or intentions were produced. His mother was not asked to explain her son's behavior. All we have is Johnson's allegations as to his motive and intent, passed through counsel, and no credibility can be accorded his post hoc, self-serving claims.

Nor are we persuaded that Johnson's limiting the scope of the false information he provided to, for example, the same alias somehow proves a lesser level of deception. On the contrary, Johnson's consistent use of the same false identifying information may simply reflect the fact that he could produce some documentation to support such false identifying information. Likewise, as we remain unsure of Johnson's motives, we cannot say that a punishment would not deter him from perhaps attempting to vote more than once in a future election.

Indeed, Johnson's own words and demeanor reveal a different story than the one painted by his counsel. For example, at the January 15 hearing, when provided with an opportunity to speak with respect his remorse or otherwise, Johnson stated that he did not intend to cause "too much trouble and it's unfortunate that I did." That strikes us as falling short of an expression of remorse. Likewise, when confronted via email by the OGC attorney with his fraud, Johnson's response was the antithesis of regretful. Instead, as if he is beyond reproach, he stated that "[t]he allegations [of fraud] are not appreciated." With respect to his failed attempt to engage the Superior Court, his comment - "you know how DC works" - suggests contempt for the District's courts and government. When notified of the pre-hearing conference, he replied in a dictatorial tone essentially instructing the agency to reschedule the hearing. We are troubled by what we perceive to be Johnson's disregard for our local government, including this Board.

Further, with respect to Johnson's supposed intent of merely exercising a right he believed was wrongly (in a moral, as opposed to legal, sense) denied him, his claims as to that ultimate objective do not square with the facts. Based on his communications, Johnson presents as an intelligent young man who was willing to make serious misrepresentations and go to great lengths to cause the Board to register him and allow him to vote. At the same time, however, he raised red flags with respect to his ineligibility and came right up to the bar of perfecting his applications and then somewhat inexplicably failed to get over it. For example, although he had submitted multiple applications that warned him that he might need an ID that showed his name and address, the IDs that he produced had only his name and one conspicuously indicated that he was a minor, as if to see if the Board would notice his deception. One possible motive for this would be to determine whether the Board would in fact register a person based on a faulty ID or would in fact fail to look into an applicant's age despite evidence that the applicant was underage. Despite his

many efforts to register, he sent in his residency documentation at exactly the 5:00 pm deadline and then urged the Board to essentially ignore the deadline and allow him to register illegally. The other Postal Service documentation he provided also fell just short of being an acceptable current (less than 90-day) form of proof of residency and, had our staff been less diligent and not carefully looked at its slightly insufficient date, could have been accepted. All of this arguably reads, particularly in the current environment of false narratives about election administrators allowing ineligible persons to register and vote, as an effort to “test the system” to ascertain the Board’s competency to administer elections because “you know how DC works.” Unfortunately, because Johnson is not credible and there is no one who can independently corroborate some sincerely held belief regarding the right to vote, we simply cannot say what Johnson’s true motives were.

Finally, given the prevalence of unfounded attacks on the integrity of election administration organizations and the threats to our democratic institutions created by those attacks, we cannot treat lightly such a brazen effort to vote fraudulently. Accordingly, we agree with the General Counsel that the assessment of a \$12,000 civil fine would be reasonable and fair under the circumstances, although we reduced the fine to \$6,000 as stated below. Similarly, given the clear evidence of multiple election crimes, it would arguably be a dereliction of our duty to protect the integrity of our elections and an abuse of our discretion to refrain from referring this matter to prosecutorial authorities.

Conclusion

For the reasons indicated above, it is hereby:

ORDERED that the recommendation of the General Counsel is **ACCEPTED IN PART**. The Office of General Counsel shall forthwith refer this matter to the Office of Attorney General for the District of Columbia. It is further

ORDERED that Mattan Johnson shall pay a \$6,000 civil fine by sixty days from January 15, 2025,¹⁶ provided however that, upon the submission of a motion for reconsideration supported by: (1) a demonstration that Mr. Johnson is receiving therapy/mental health counseling and (2) a report discussing a forensic examination of Johnson's electronic/digital devices conducted by an independent third party forensic examiner that provides a finding that there has been no evidence uncovered pursuant to such examination of any tendencies towards violence on Mr. Johnson's part, the Board would take such factors under advisement and entertain a modification to the amount of the civil fine.

Date: January 22, 2025



Gary Thompson
Chairman
Board of Elections

¹⁶ Payments must be by check or money order made out to the **D.C. Treasurer** and sent to the attention of the Board's Office of General Counsel.