

1 Emily Craiger (Bar No. 021728)  
2 [emily@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:emily@theburgesslawgroup.com)  
3 THE BURGESS LAW GROUP  
4 3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
6 Telephone: (602) 806-2100

7 RACHEL H. MITCHELL  
8 MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

9 By: Thomas P. Liddy (019384)  
10 Joseph J. Branco (031474)  
11 Joseph E. LaRue (031348)  
12 Karen J. Hartman-Tellez (021121)  
13 Deputy County Attorneys  
14 MCAO Firm No. 0003200

15 CIVIL SERVICES DIVISION  
16 225 West Madison St.  
17 Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
18 Telephone (602) 506-8541  
19 Facsimile (602) 506-8567  
20 [liddy@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:liddy@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
21 [brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
22 [laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
23 [hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
24 [ca-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:ca-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov)

25 *Attorneys for the Defendant*  
26 *Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*

27 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
28 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

29 Kari Lake and Mark Finchem,

30 Plaintiffs,

31 vs.

32 Kathleen Hobbs, et al.,

33 Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00677-JJT

**MARICOPA COUNTY DEFENDANTS'**  
**RULE 11 AND 28 U.S.C. § 1927**  
**MOTION FOR SANCTIONS**

(Honorable John J. Tuchi)

1 Defendants Bill Gates, Clint Hickman, Jack Sellers, Thomas Galvin, and Steve  
2 Gallardo in their official capacities as members of the Maricopa County Board of  
3 Supervisors (“the County”) respectfully move for sanctions against Plaintiffs’ counsel and  
4 Plaintiffs under Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and 28 U.S.C. § 1927.  
5 Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint (“FAC”) and Motion for Preliminary Injunction  
6 (“MPI”) publicly assert and represent to the Court allegations against the County that are  
7 unfounded, asserted without a reasonable inquiry, and asserted for an improper purpose.  
8 Most blatant are Plaintiffs’ repeated assertions that Arizonans do not vote on paper ballots.  
9 This is false. Arizona law requires paper ballots. Either Plaintiffs’ counsel failed to do the  
10 bare minimum factual investigation required by Rule 11 - speaking to their own clients  
11 who have each voted on paper ballots for nearly 20 years - or they knowingly alleged the  
12 fact anyway and pursued these frivolous claims anyway. Under either scenario, Plaintiffs  
13 and their counsel violated Rule 11.

14 Moreover, the entire foundation of Plaintiffs’ case – the alleged need for court  
15 intervention to implement their preferred method of ballot tabulation because they fear  
16 possible, invisible, undetectable invaders into Arizona counties’ ballot tabulation  
17 equipment that will allegedly improperly manipulate the vote count – is based purely on  
18 speculation, conjecture, and unwarranted suspicion. Because no actual facts or evidence  
19 exist to support Plaintiffs’ assertion that tabulation equipment ever has or will incorrectly  
20 count ballots in Arizona, to support their claims Plaintiffs’ FAC instead sets forth  
21 demonstrably false allegations made without any basis or reasonable factual inquiry in  
22 violation of Rule 11. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b). Likewise, Plaintiffs’ counsel violated both Rule  
23 11 and 28 U.S.C. § 1927 by unreasonably multiplying the proceedings with their untimely  
24 and unsupported MPI filed months after filing their initial Complaint and after the County  
25 filed its MTD.

26 Plaintiffs’ and their counsels’ use of the Court to further a disinformation campaign  
27 and false narrative concerning the integrity of the election process in Arizona by asserting  
28 demonstrably false allegations is repugnant. This improper use of the courts is

1 unacceptable, detrimental to the entire election process, subjects election officials and  
2 workers to threatening and harassing conduct, and violates Rule 11. Accordingly, this court  
3 should issue sanctions against Plaintiffs and their counsel to deter future filings of similarly  
4 frivolous lawsuits.

5 **I. Notice to Plaintiffs**

6 On May 20, 2022, by written correspondence, County counsel alerted Plaintiffs'  
7 counsel of its intention to file a Motion to Dismiss and seek Rule 11 sanctions. (*See Ex.*  
8 *1, May 20, 2022 Correspondence.*) On May 27, 2022, County Counsel, having received  
9 no response, sent e-mail correspondence to Plaintiffs' counsel requesting a meet and  
10 confer. (*See Ex. 2, May 27, 2022 Correspondence.*) On May 31, 2022, counsel for the  
11 Parties participated in a telephonic meet and confer. At that time, Plaintiffs' counsel stated  
12 it had not considered whether amending the FAC could remedy the issues raised in the  
13 County's May 20, 2022, correspondence. Accordingly, the Parties filed a stipulated request  
14 for extension of Defendants' responsive pleading deadline, so Plaintiffs could consider the  
15 issues raised by County counsel nearly two weeks prior. (Doc. 24) On June 6, 2022, the  
16 Parties participated in a second meet and confer in which Plaintiffs' counsel stated that it  
17 "disagreed" with the County's position and would not amend or dismiss the FAC, except  
18 they would no longer pursue Plaintiffs' claims based on A.R.S. § 11-251. The following  
19 day, on June 7, 2022, the County filed its MTD. (Doc. 27). One day later, on June 8, 2022,  
20 Plaintiffs filed their MPI. (Doc. 33) On July 18, 2022, County counsel served the instant  
21 motion on Plaintiffs' counsel.

22 **II. Plaintiffs' false allegations and misleading "evidence".**

23 Plaintiffs' FAC is premised on three broad allegations that are demonstrably false,  
24 which any reasonable factual investigation would have revealed. First: that Arizona voters  
25 do not vote by hand on paper ballots. (FAC, ¶¶ 7, 58-60, 153). *They do.* Second: that  
26 Arizona's election equipment is not independently tested by experts. (FAC, ¶¶ 20, 57, 69).  
27 *It is.* Third: that Arizona's tabulation results are not subject to vote-verifying audits. (FAC,  
28 ¶¶ 23, 72, 144-52.) *They are.* The County's MTD addressed each of these provably false

1 allegations in detail, using publicly available and widely circulated information. (County's  
2 MTD at 1-6)

3 In addition, the allegations in the FAC relating specifically to Maricopa County  
4 elections are demonstrably false. For example, the allegation that "[t]he recent hand count  
5 in Maricopa County, the second largest voting jurisdiction in the United States, offers  
6 Defendant Hobbs a proof-of-concept and a superior alternative to relying on corruptible  
7 electronic voting systems" is untrue. (FAC, ¶ 155.) As set forth in detail in the MTD, the  
8 Cyber Ninjas counted only two contests (of more than 60 on each ballot), it took them more  
9 than three months, it cost millions of dollars, they claim that they went bankrupt as a result,  
10 and the hand count results were so problematic the Arizona Senate was forced to purchase  
11 paper-counting machines in an attempt to reconcile the hand counts' botched numbers.  
12 (MTD at 13-14) Moreover, the baseless "findings" of the Cyber Ninja's "reports," including  
13 those in paragraphs 70, 132, and 164 of the FAC, have been debunked. For instance,  
14 Plaintiffs' assertion that the Final Voted file (VM55) contained significant discrepancies is  
15 blatantly false, (*see* FAC, ¶ 70); among other things, the Cyber Ninjas did not understand  
16 that there are protected voters who are prohibited by state law from being included in any  
17 public voter file. (County's MTD, Ex. 13 at 65) Plaintiffs repeatedly assert that election  
18 files were "missing," "cleared," or "deleted." (FAC, ¶¶ 70, 132, 164) However, all the hard  
19 drives and corresponding data files from the November 2020 General Election were  
20 maintained and safely secured by Maricopa County; the files the Cyber Ninjas claimed were  
21 missing were either not subpoenaed and so not provided, or were not located because of the  
22 Cyber Ninjas' ineptitude. (County's MTD, Ex. 13 at 5)

23 In spite of being clearly alerted to these factual misrepresentations both in the  
24 County's May 20, 2022, correspondence and the County's subsequently-filed MTD,  
25 Plaintiffs doubled-down by filing their untimely MPI. In it, in addition to relying on the  
26 false allegations previously asserted in the FAC, they asserted, among other things, that  
27 "[e]xperience has now shown the move to computerized voting in Arizona was a mistake."  
28 (MPI at 2); and that, "[a] return to the tried-and-true paper ballots of the past – and of the

1 present, in countries like France, Taiwan, and Israel – is necessary.” (MPI at 2) But Arizona  
2 does not use computerized voting, and never has. Arizona law requires paper ballots.<sup>1</sup> See  
3 Ariz. Rev. Stat. (“A.R.S.”) §§ 16-462 (primary election ballots “shall be printed”), 16-  
4 468(2) (“Ballots shall be printed in plain clear type in black ink, and for a general election,  
5 on clear white materials”), 16-502 (general election ballots “shall be printed with black ink  
6 on white paper”). A fact that would have been easily learned by doing the most *de minimis*  
7 factual investigation required by Rule 11(b), namely talking to their own clients who have  
8 each voted on paper ballots for nearly 20 years.

9 In addition to the repeated factual misrepresentations, both the FAC and MPI were  
10 riddled with testimony and allegations that are entirely unrelated to elections in Arizona and  
11 seem designed to muddy the waters in an attempt to mislead the Court. For instance, FAC  
12 ¶¶ 73-89, 125-131, 133 and 134 contain allegations concerning elections in Alabama, North  
13 Carolina, Nebraska, Texas, Georgia, Wisconsin, Michigan, and Colorado conducted with  
14 equipment that is not used in Arizona and so have nothing to do with Arizona and its  
15 certified tabulation equipment. Plaintiffs’ blanket allegations concerning alleged foreign  
16 manufacturing of components by hostile nations is similarly inapposite; the allegations do  
17 not identify specific machines or parts. (FAC, ¶¶ 90-92) Likewise, Plaintiffs’ discussion of  
18 their beliefs regarding “open source” technology has nothing to do with the claims asserted  
19 or relief requested. (*Id.*, ¶¶ 108-24)

20 Likewise, Plaintiffs heavily rely on a Georgia case addressing voting systems that  
21 do not use paper ballots or lack appropriate paper back up, unlike the systems used in  
22 Arizona. (Response to MPI, 3-4) Plaintiffs also repeatedly use out-of-context quotes from  
23 testimony in unrelated cases and proceedings to sow doubt about the integrity of elections  
24 in Arizona. (*Id.* at 4-5) Further, Plaintiffs rely on a statement from the U.S. Cybersecurity  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> The only exception is voters who are visually impaired may vote on accessible voting  
27 devices. § 16-442.01. But accessible voting devices must produce a paper ballot or voter  
28 verifiable paper audit trail, which the voter can review to confirm that the machine correctly  
marked the voter’s choices and which can be used to audit the election. § 16-446(B)(7);  
(Elections Procedures Manual (2019) at 80.

1 and Infrastructure Agency (“CISA”) to assert that vulnerabilities exist concerning Maricopa  
2 County’s voting system, even though the system addressed in the report is different than  
3 the system used by Maricopa County (or any other county in Arizona). (*Id.* at 5-6)

4 Finally, the entire FAC is premised on the erroneous theory that machine counting  
5 of ballots is unreliable because the machines used are “potentially susceptible to malicious  
6 manipulation that can cause incorrect counting of votes” and these alleged vulnerabilities  
7 stem from the possibility that the machines “can be connected to the internet.” (FAC, ¶¶ 26,  
8 33.) Maricopa County’s vote tabulation system is not, never has been, and cannot be  
9 connected to the Internet. The Arizona Senate’s Special Master confirmed that Maricopa  
10 County uses an air-gapped system that “provides the necessary isolation from the public  
11 Internet, and in fact is in a self-contained environment” with “no wired or wireless  
12 connections in or out of the Ballot Tabulation Center” so that “the election network and  
13 election devices cannot connect to the public Internet.” (County’s MTD Ex. 12 at 8, 10–11)  
14 The Special Master’s report discredits all of the Cyber Ninjas’ speculative findings—relied  
15 on by the FAC—concerning alleged “unauthorized access, malware present or internet  
16 access to these systems” that “basic cyber security best practices and guidelines were not  
17 followed” or that in the past Maricopa County failed to ensure that “election management  
18 servers were not connected to the internet.” (FAC, ¶¶ 70, 132, 164)

### 19 **III. LEGAL ARGUMENT**

#### 20 **A. Applicable Legal Standards**

21 Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and 28 U.S.C. § 1927, represent  
22 independent sources of authority for the imposition of sanctions by a federal court.  
23 *Truesdell v. S. Cal. Permanente Med. Grp.*, 209 F.R.D. 169, 173 (C.D. Cal. 2002). Rule 11  
24 is designed to deter attorneys and unrepresented parties from violating their certification  
25 that any pleading, motion or other paper presented to the court is supported by an objectively  
26 reasonable legal and factual basis. *Id.* Section 1927 is designed to deter attorney  
27 misconduct. *Id.* at 174. In the instant action, sanctions are warranted under both bases.

28

1 Rule 11 states, in pertinent part, that when an attorney presents a signed paper to a  
2 court, that person is certifying that to the best of his or her “knowledge, information, and  
3 belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances,—”

4 (1) it is not being presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause  
5 unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation;

6 (2) the claims, defenses, and other legal contentions therein are warranted  
7 by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for the extension,  
8 modification, or reversal of existing law or the establishment of new law;  
9 [and]

10 (3) the allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support  
11 or, if specifically so identified, are likely to have evidentiary support after a  
12 reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery ...

13 Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(b).

14 Rule 11 permits a court to impose a sanction for any violation of these certification  
15 requirements, either upon the attorney or the party responsible for the violation. Fed. R.  
16 Civ. P. 11(c)(1). It is governed by an objective standard of reasonableness. *See, e.g., Conn*  
17 *v. CSO Borjorquez*, 967 F.2d 1418, 1421 (9th Cir. 1992). The court considering a request  
18 for Rule 11 sanctions should consider whether a position taken was “frivolous,” “legally  
19 unreasonable,” or “without factual foundation, even if not filed in subjective bad faith.”  
20 *Zaldivar v. City of Los Angeles*, 780 F.2d 823, 831 (9th Cir. 1986); *see also Townsend v.*  
21 *Holman Consulting Corp.*, 929 F.2d 1358, 1362–65 (9th Cir. 1990) (en banc).

22 Further, a sanction should be “what suffices to deter repetition of such conduct or  
23 comparable conduct ...” Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(c)(4). Indeed, “the central purpose of Rule 11  
24 is to deter baseless filings in district court.” *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmarx Corp.*, 496 U.S.  
25 384, 393 (1990). Thus, “[e]ven if the careless litigant quickly dismisses the action, the  
26 harm triggering Rule 11’s concerns has already occurred[,]” and “the imposition of such  
27 sanctions on abusive litigants is useful to deter such misconduct.” *Id.* at 398.

28 A federal court may also base an order of sanctions on authority granted by 28  
U.S.C. § 1927, which states, in pertinent part, that:

1 Any attorney ... who so multiplies the proceedings in any case unreasonably and  
2 vexatiously may be required by the court to satisfy personally the excess costs,  
expenses, and attorneys' fees reasonably incurred because of such conduct.

3 28 U.S.C. § 1927.

4 Thus, "Section 1927 authorizes the imposition of sanctions against any lawyer who  
5 wrongfully proliferates litigation proceedings once a case has commenced." *Pacific*  
6 *Harbor Capital, Inc. v. Carnival Air Lines, Inc.*, 210 F.3d 1112, 1117 (9th Cir. 2000).  
7 Because Section 1927 requires that an attorney's multiplication of proceedings be both  
8 "unreasonabl[e]" and "vexatious[ ]," the conduct of the attorney in question must have  
9 been somehow wrongful. *Truesdell*, 209 F.R.D. at 175. Unlike Rule 11, "[t]he imposition  
10 of sanctions under § 1927 requires a finding of bad faith." *Pacific Harbor*, 210 F. 3d at  
11 1117. "We assess an attorney's bad faith under a subjective standard. Knowing or reckless  
12 conduct meets this standard." *MGIC Indem. Corp. v. Moore*, 952 F.2d 1120, 1122 (9th Cir.  
13 1991); see *In re Keegan Mgmt. Co., Securities Litig.*, 78 F.3d 431, 435–36 (9th Cir. 1996).  
14 Thus, "counsel must have a culpable state of mind but its conduct need not be intentional:  
15 [a court] may only award sanctions where it finds that counsel acted with 'intent,  
16 recklessly, or in bad faith.' " *Baneth v. Planned Parenthood*, 1994 WL 224382, \*3 (N.D.  
17 Cal. May 12, 1994) (citations omitted). As is true for Rule 11, Section 1927 sanctions may  
18 be an award of reasonable attorneys' fees. See *Salstrom v. Citicorp Credit Servs., Inc.*, 74  
19 F.3d 183, 185 (9th Cir.1996).

20 **B. Plaintiffs and their counsel violated Rule 11.**

21 "Rule 11 imposes a duty on attorneys to certify by their signature that (1) they have  
22 read the pleadings or motions they file and (2) the pleading or motion is 'well-grounded in  
23 fact,' has a colorable basis in law, and is not filed for an improper purpose." *Smith v. Ricks*,  
24 31 F.3d 1478, 1488 (9th Cir. 1994). "The issue in determining whether to impose sanctions  
25 under Rule 11 is whether a reasonable attorney, having conducted an objectively  
26 reasonable inquiry into the facts and law, would have concluded that the offending paper  
27 was well-founded." *Schutts v. Bentley Nevada Corp.*, 966 F. Supp. 1549, 1562 (D. Nev.  
28 1997) (citation omitted). Where such a violation is found, Rule 11 authorizes sanctions



1 against persons—attorneys, law firms, or parties—responsible. *See Pavelic & LeFlore v.*  
2 *Marvel Entertainment Group*, 493 U.S. 120, 120 (1989). Here Plaintiffs’ counsel has  
3 repeatedly violated the certification requirements of Rule 11. Worse, both counsel and  
4 Plaintiffs have pursued this matter for an improper purpose – namely to sow doubts about  
5 the reliability and trustworthiness of elections for their own financial and political benefit.

6 As an initial matter, Plaintiffs repeatedly made false allegations that Arizona does  
7 not use paper ballots, test its tabulation machines, and audit election results. They also  
8 made numerous factual misstatements concerning Maricopa County, its tabulation  
9 machines’ internet connections and the Cyber Ninjas’ audit findings. These false  
10 allegations and statements are sufficient alone, under Rule 11(b)(3), to support imposition  
11 of sanctions. Indeed, for the reasons set forth above and at length in Defendant’s MTD and  
12 Response to MPI, these allegations are untrue and any reasonable inquiry using publicly-  
13 available information would have shown the falsity of these assertions. Yet, Plaintiffs and  
14 their attorneys made these false statements anyway.

15 Further, Plaintiffs violated Rule 11(b)(2) and (b)(3) because their constitutional  
16 claims are entirely untenable. Specifically, these claims fail because they are based on the  
17 complete fiction that “Arizona’s use of electronic election equipment permits unauthorized  
18 persons to manipulate vote totals without detection, thereby infringing Plaintiffs’ right to  
19 vote and have the vote counted accurately.” (Response to Defendant’s MTD at 12.)  
20 Plaintiffs bombard the Court with unnecessarily-voluminous filings and irrelevant  
21 averments, but, as set forth in detail above, fail to allege a single factual allegation that any  
22 Arizona ballot tabulation equipment has ever been hacked or manipulated or has  
23 improperly counted votes, or that any Arizona voters’ ballot, including Plaintiffs’, has ever  
24 been improperly counted by an electronic tabulation machine – because no such evidence  
25 exists. Plaintiffs’ claims are based on mere speculation and conjecture but, as the court  
26 rightly stated in *King v. Whitmer*, in awarding sanctions for a factually deficient election-  
27 related challenge, “[w]hile there are many arenas—including print, television, and social  
28 media—where protestations, conjecture, and speculation may be advanced, such

1 expressions are neither permitted nor welcomed in a court of law.” *King v. Whitmer*, 556  
2 F. Supp. 3d 680, 689 (E.D. Mich. 2021).

3 Furthermore, Plaintiffs and their counsel merely asserting an alleged good faith  
4 belief in the merits of their claim is insufficient to prevent sanctions. Indeed, an “empty-  
5 head” but “pure-heart” does not justify pursuing Section 1983, Equal Protection Clause  
6 and Due Process Clause claims where the factual contentions asserted to support those  
7 claims lack any evidentiary support. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 Advisory Committee Notes  
8 (1993 Amendment) (noting that Rule 11’s objective standard is “intended to eliminate any  
9 ‘empty-head pure-heart’ justification for patently frivolous arguments”); *Tahfs v Proctor*,  
10 316 F.3d 584, 594 (6th Cir. 2003)(“A good faith belief in the merits of a case is insufficient  
11 to avoid sanctions.”).

12 Finally, Plaintiffs and their counsel violated Rule 11(b)(1) by pursuing this frivolous  
13 lawsuit that has no factual or legal basis for the improper purpose of undermining  
14 confidence in elections and to further their political campaigns. Both Plaintiffs Lake and  
15 Finchem have voted on paper ballots for nearly 20 years; thus, their claims that Arizona  
16 does not use paper ballots are the very definition of “frivolous.” (*See* Cnty. MTD, Ex. 15.)  
17 And, during the entire time that Plaintiffs have voted in Arizona, their votes were tabulated  
18 by machines. Yet, they did not challenge machine tabulation in the early 2000s, nor did they  
19 challenge it when the County began using Dominion equipment in 2019. (*See, e.g.,* FAC,  
20 ¶¶ 18, 137). Instead, they waited until they were running for statewide political office, when  
21 a significant portion of their likely voters had become erroneously convinced that the 2020  
22 election was “stolen.” Only then did they raise concerns about tabulation equipment, after  
23 having determined that promoting distrust in elections was politically profitable. Indeed,  
24 both Plaintiffs are actively stating their intentions “not to concede” and require a 100% hand  
25 recount of all ballots. Specifically, on June 28, 2020, Plaintiff Finchem publicly stated,  
26 “[a]in’t gonna be no concession speech coming from this guy. I’m going to demand a 100%  
27 hand count if there’s the slightest hint that there’s an impropriety. And I will urge the next  
28 governor [referring to Lake] to do the same.”

1 [https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/arizona/2022/07/13/arizona-gov-doug-](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/arizona/2022/07/13/arizona-gov-doug-ducey-endorses-beau-lane-secretary-state/10053166002/)  
2 [ducey-endorses-beau-lane-secretary-state/10053166002/](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/arizona/2022/07/13/arizona-gov-doug-ducey-endorses-beau-lane-secretary-state/10053166002/). Lake responded, stating she  
3 would “absolutely” do the same, noting that former president Trump never conceded his  
4 2020 loss and stating “that was really smart.” *Id.*

5 This Court should not countenance candidates filing a meritless lawsuit for political  
6 purposes, which asserts fictional violations of constitutional rights and is completely  
7 devoid of any factual basis, but furthers a false narrative that election results cannot be  
8 trusted. As was the case in *King v. Whitmer*,

9 This lawsuit represents a historic and profound abuse of the judicial process.  
10 It is one thing to take on the charge of vindicating rights associated with an  
11 allegedly fraudulent election. It is another to take on the charge of deceiving  
12 a federal court and the American people into believing that rights were  
13 infringed, without regard to whether any laws or rights were in fact violated.

14 *King*, 556 F. Supp.3d at 688 (E.D. Mich. 2021).

### 15 **C. Plaintiffs’ counsel violated Section 1927.**

16 “Section 1927 authorizes the imposition of sanctions against any lawyer who  
17 wrongfully proliferates litigation proceedings once a case has commenced.” *Pacific*  
18 *Harbor Capital, Inc. v. Carnival Air Lines, Inc.*, 210 F.3d 1112, 1117 (9th Cir. 2000).  
19 Sanctions imposed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927 must be supported by a finding of bad  
20 faith. *See Blixseth v. Yellowstone Mountain Club, LLC*, 796 F.3d 1004, 1007 (9th Cir.  
21 2015). “[A] finding that the attorney recklessly or intentionally misled the court” or “a  
22 finding that the attorney[ ] recklessly raised a frivolous argument which resulted in the  
23 multiplication of the proceedings” amounts to the requisite level of bad faith. *Franco v.*  
24 *Dow Chem. Co. (In re Girardi)*, 611 F.3d 1027, 1061 (9th Cir. 2010) (citations omitted).  
25 In addition, “recklessly or intentionally misrepresenting facts constitutes the requisite bad  
26 faith” to warrant sanctions, as does “recklessly making frivolous filings.” *Id.* at 1061–62  
(internal quotations and citations omitted).

27 Here Plaintiffs’ counsels’ numerous false allegations and misrepresentations of  
28 evidence, as well as their continued pursuit of baseless claims, especially after Defendants

1 repeatedly alerted them to these misrepresentations, are sufficient to justify sanctions  
2 pursuant to Section 1927.

3 Plaintiffs' improper conduct is further evidenced by their inexplicable years-long  
4 delay in seeking injunctive relief. Plaintiffs challenge a statutory scheme that has authorized  
5 counties to use vote tabulation machines to "automatically" count votes since at least 1966.  
6 (*See* Cnty. MTD, Ex. 14.) Plaintiffs allege problems with vote tabulation machines have  
7 occurred since 2002. (*See, e.g.*, FAC, ¶¶ 71–82.) Plaintiffs seek to invalidate a voting system  
8 certified by the Secretary on November 5, 2019. (*See id.*, ¶¶ 18, 137.) And Plaintiffs' voter  
9 files indicate they each have voted in elections in which vote tabulation machines were used  
10 for more than a decade. (*See* Cnty. MTD, Ex. 15.) Yet, despite the fact that Plaintiffs should  
11 have brought their lawsuit years earlier (if they really believed that their constitutional rights  
12 were being infringed by tabulation machines), they waited until a distrust of tabulation  
13 machines had become commonplace among some of their political party's base and they  
14 judged that a lawsuit such as this one would garner them political favor. Plaintiffs' counsel  
15 should have questioned why their clients only *now* decided to file this lawsuit, and should  
16 have recognized that something smelled funny. And even if they did not, Plaintiffs' counsel  
17 should have declined to continue prosecuting this matter after counsel for the County clearly  
18 explained that Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the applicable Section 1983 Statute of  
19 Limitations, Laches and the *Purcell* principle. (*See* Ex. 1 and Cnty. MTD)

20 By filing the request for injunctive relief, after the County alerted them to the utter  
21 lack of legal and factual support for Plaintiffs' claims, Plaintiffs' counsel violated Section  
22 1927. Pursuing injunctive relief under these circumstances, with the resulting additional  
23 unnecessary briefing and an evidentiary hearing, is reckless and vexatious. Plaintiffs'  
24 counsel has acted in bad faith by completely disregarding the futility of their claims, taxing  
25 judicial resources, wasting the time of election employees on the eve of the August 2022  
26 Primary election and forcing the unnecessary expenditure of taxpayer resources.

27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons addressed above, the County asks the Court to award its reasonable attorneys’ fees incurred, pursuant to Rule 11 and Sections 1927, from the date that Plaintiffs filed the First Amended Complaint up until the Court’s ruling on the present motion, or in an amount the Court deems sufficient “to deter repetition of such conduct or comparable conduct by others similarly situated.” Fed R. Civ. P. 11(c)(4).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 10<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2022.

THE BURGESS LAW GROUP

BY: /s/ Emily Craiger  
Emily Craiger

RACHEL H. MITCHELL  
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

BY: Thomas P. Liddy  
Joseph J. Branco  
Joseph E. La Rue  
Karen J. Hartman-Tellez  
Deputy County Attorneys

*Attorneys for the Defendant*  
*Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 10, 2022, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the following:

Alan M Dershowitz  
Harvard Law School  
1575 Massachusetts Ave.  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
[dersh@law.harvard.edu](mailto:dersh@law.harvard.edu)  
[alandersh@gmail.com](mailto:alandersh@gmail.com)

1 Andrew D Parker  
2 Jesse Hersch Kibort  
3 Parker Daniels Kibort LLC  
4 123 N 3rd St., Ste. 888  
5 Minneapolis, MN 55401  
6 [parker@parkerdk.com](mailto:parker@parkerdk.com)  
7 [kibort@parkerdk.com](mailto:kibort@parkerdk.com)

8 Kurt B Olsen  
9 Olsen Law PC  
10 1250 Connecticut Ave. NW, Ste. 200  
11 Washington, DC 20036  
12 [ko@olsenlawpc.com](mailto:ko@olsenlawpc.com)

13 Christine Bass  
14 States United Democracy Center - Los Angeles, CA  
15 506 S Spring St., Ste. 13308  
16 Los Angeles, CA 90013  
17 [christinebass@statesuniteddemocracy.org](mailto:christinebass@statesuniteddemocracy.org)

18 David Andrew Gaona  
19 Kristen Michelle Yost  
20 Roonali H Desai  
21 Connersmith Brockelman PLC  
22 2800 N Central Ave., Ste. 1900  
23 Phoenix, AZ 85004  
24 [Agaona@cblawvers.com](mailto:Agaona@cblawvers.com)  
25 [kvost@cblawvers.com](mailto:kvost@cblawvers.com)  
26 [rdesai@cblawyers.com](mailto:rdesai@cblawyers.com)

27 Sambo Dul  
28 States United Democracy Center  
8205 South Priest Dr., Ste. #10312  
Tempe, AZ 85284  
480-253-9651  
[bo@statesuniteddemocracy.org](mailto:bo@statesuniteddemocracy.org)

Daniel S Jurkowitz  
Pima County Attorneys Office  
32 N Stone Ave., Ste. 2100  
Tucson, AZ 85701  
[Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov](mailto:Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov)

Michael Kielsky  
Davillier Law Group LLC  
4105 N 20th St., Ste. 110  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
[MK@USazLaw.com](mailto:MK@USazLaw.com)

/s/ Dana N. Troy

EXHIBIT “1”



**The Burgess Law Group**  
3131 E. Camelback Road, Suite 224  
Phoenix, AZ 85016

Emily Craiger  
602-806-2104  
[Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com)

May 20, 2022

**Sent Via Email and Regular Mail**

Andrew D. Parker, Esq.  
Parker Daniels Kibort  
888 Colwell Building  
123 Third Street North  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401  
[Parker@parkerdk.com](mailto:Parker@parkerdk.com)

Kurt Olsen, Esq.  
Olsen Law, P.C.  
1250 Connecticut Ave., NW Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
[ko@olsenlawpc.com](mailto:ko@olsenlawpc.com)

Alan Dershowitz  
1575 Massachusetts Avenue  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
[alandersh@gmail.com](mailto:alandersh@gmail.com)

RE: *Lake, et al. v. Hobbs., et al, 22-cv-00677-DMF*  
12(b)(6) Motion to Dismiss Meet and Confer & Rule 11 Notice

Dear Messrs. Parker, Olsen and Dershowitz,

This firm represents the members of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors, in their official capacities, (the "County") with respect to the above-referenced lawsuit. Pursuant to the court's May 12, 2022, Order, this letter serves as notice of the County's intention to file a 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss. In addition, this letter provides notice that you and your law firms are in violation of Rule 11(b)(2) & (3), Fed. R. Civ. P. As detailed below, this case is frivolous. It is devoid of any factual or legal bases and the court is precluded from granting the relief requested. Although we are willing to discuss this matter with you, because of the nature and magnitude of the Amended Complaint's defects, it is our position that they cannot be cured by amendment. As such, the County requests your clients voluntarily dismiss this suit immediately. Absent immediate dismissal, in addition to filing a motion to dismiss, our client will seek Rule 11 sanctions, including attorneys' fees and costs.

The Amended Complaint seeks an injunction requiring two things prior to the November 8, 2022, midterm general election: (1) votes to be "cast by hand on verifiable paper ballots that maintains (sic) voter anonymity" and (2) that votes "be counted by human beings, not by machines" with "transparency" and "observable by the public". (Am. Cmplt ¶7). With respect to your clients' request for an injunction requiring paper ballots or as stated in Paragraph 153, "an election conducted by paper ballots, as an alternative to the current framework," it is difficult for one to



May 20, 2022

Page 2

imagine a larger waste of judicial resources and taxpayer money or a more egregious violation of Rule 11(b).

All votes tabulated in Maricopa County and every other County in Arizona are cast on paper ballots - Arizona has always used paper ballots. *See*, A.R.S. § 16-462 (primary election ballots “shall be printed”); A.R.S. § 16-468(2) (“Ballots shall be printed in plain clear type in black ink, and for a general election, on clear white materials”); A.R.S. § 16-502 (general election ballots “shall be printed with black ink on white paper”)<sup>1</sup>. It is inconceivable that your clients are not aware of this fact because both have voted on paper ballots for nearly 20 years. *See* Ex. A, Finchem and Lake voting history, respectively. In fact, both Mr. Finchem and Ms. Lake have received a paper ballot in the mail and voted early by mail in numerous elections since 2004. *Id.* Moreover, Mr. Finchem has been elected to office by voters using paper ballots that were tabulated by machines four times since 2014. Whether you failed to speak to your clients before filing this action or failed to do the minimum reasonable inquiry required, the point remains the same – your inclusion of this request for injunctive relief violates Rule 11 and we intend to seek sanctions if you do not withdraw it immediately.

Plaintiffs’ remaining request for injunctive relief fares no better. The law is well-settled, Federal courts will not enjoin a state’s election laws in the period close to an election. *Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U. S. 1 (2006) (*per curiam*). Indeed, “the *Purcell* principle—reflects a bedrock tenet of election law: When an election is close at hand, the rules of the road must be clear and settled. Late judicial tinkering with election laws can lead to disruption and to unanticipated and unfair consequences for candidates, political parties, and voters, among others.” *Merrill v. Milligan*, 595 U.S. \_\_\_, 142 S. Ct. 879, 880 (2022) (Kavanaugh, J., concurring).

With fewer than six months before the general election and fewer than three months before the August primary, your clients seek an injunction completely replacing the entire ballot tabulation process authorized by Arizona law since at least 1979. *See* Laws 1979, ch. 209 (34th Leg., 1st Reg. Sess.). An injunction forcing the County to count all the ballots by hand in the midterm election would disrupt the County’s ability to conduct the election properly and consistent with federal and state law. Moreover, the County has already released its election plan on which the citizens of Maricopa County rely for voting and related information. <https://recorder.maricopa.gov/site/pdf/FINAL%20-%202022%20Elections%20Plan.pdf>. And, among other things, it already has leased and contracted for polling location space, ballots are being printed, poll workers are being hired and trained and costs have been budgeted. Under these circumstances, the *Purcell* principle precludes the court from granting the requested injunctive relief.

Further, the allegation that, “[t]he recent hand count in Maricopa County, the second largest voting jurisdiction in the United States, offers Defendant Hobbs a proof-of-concept and a superior alternative to relying on corruptible electronic voting systems,” is demonstrably false. (Am.Cmplt.

---

<sup>1</sup> The only exception to the paper ballot requirement in Arizona is the exception made for voters who are blind or visually impaired. A.R.S. § 16-442.01. Those voters may use accessible voting devices. A.R.S. § 16-442.01. Notwithstanding, Arizona law requires that every accessible voting device must produce a paper ballot or voter verifiable paper audit trail. Elections Procedures Manual (2019) at 80.

May 20, 2022

Page 3

¶ 155). The Cyber Ninjas counted only two contests (of more than 60 on each ballot)<sup>2</sup>, it took them more than three months<sup>3</sup>, it cost millions of dollars<sup>4</sup>, they claim that they went bankrupt as a result<sup>5</sup>, and the hand count results were so problematic, the Arizona Senate was forced to purchase paper-counting machines in an attempt to reconcile the hand counts' botched numbers<sup>6</sup>. The Cyber Ninjas' bungled hand count demonstrates exactly why the court cannot, at any time, but especially six months before the midterm general election, grant your clients' request to preclude machine counting of ballots in Maricopa County.

Because the relief you request is neither necessary (Maricopa County uses paper ballots) nor legally possible (the midterm general election is too close), there is no good faith basis for your clients to continue pursuing their requests for injunctive relief. For these reasons alone, they must dismiss this case.

Even if the requested relief were needed or possible, Plaintiffs' underlying legal claims fail as a matter of law. The constitutional claims are barred by Section 1983's two-year statute of limitations and the doctrine of laches<sup>7</sup>. As addressed above, for more than 40 years the Arizona legislature has authorized the use of machines to count Arizonan's paper ballots. In addition, it is clear that your clients' alleged distrust of the machine counting process began many years ago, although they've never mentioned it before. Page after page of the Amended Complaint alleges it has been widely known for nearly 20 years that machine counting of ballots is allegedly unreliable and prone to hacking and manipulation. Specifically, Paragraph 73 alleges, "credible allegations of electronic machine 'glitches' that materially impacted races began to emerge in 2002". The County disputes these unfounded assertions regarding the unreliability of machine counting and that the Amended Complaint contains a single plausible factual allegation that supports the existence of these vulnerabilities<sup>8</sup> in Maricopa County. Nevertheless, the fact remains that your

---

<sup>2</sup> Cyber Ninjas' Report, Vol. III (September 24, 2021) at 2-3, *available at* <https://www.azsenaterepublicans.com/cyber-ninjas-report>.

<sup>3</sup> Cyber Ninjas' Report, Vol. II (September 24, 2021) at 4, *available at* <https://www.azsenaterepublicans.com/cyber-ninjas-report>.

<sup>4</sup> Jerod MacDonald-Evoy, "'Audit' records show Cyber Ninjas went deep into debt, despite pro-Trump donations," *AZMirror* (May 11, 2022), *available at* <https://www.azmirror.com/blog/audit-records-show-cyber-ninjas-went-deep-into-debt-despite-pro-trump-donations/>.

<sup>5</sup> Erin Brady, "Cyber Ninjas to File for Bankruptcy, CEO Plans to Start New Firm with Same Employees," *Newsweek* (January 7, 2022), *available at* <https://www.newsweek.com/cyber-ninjas-file-bankruptcy-ceo-plans-start-new-firm-same-employees-1667113>.

<sup>6</sup> See Randy Pullen Report (August 13, 2021), *available at* <https://www.azsenaterepublicans.com/pullen-report> (explaining that the Arizona Senate acquired tabulation machines to count the paper ballots in an attempt to 'check' the results of the hand-count performed by Cyber Ninjas).

<sup>7</sup> "In the context of election matters, the laches doctrine seeks to prevent dilatory conduct and will bar a claim if a party's unreasonable delay prejudices the opposing party or the administration of justice." *Arizona Libertarian Party v. Reagan*, 189 F. Supp. 3d 920, 922–23 (D. Ariz. 2016).

<sup>8</sup> Indeed, the Special Master hired by the Arizona Senate and Maricopa County confirmed that Maricopa County uses an air-gapped system that "provides the necessary isolation from the public Internet, and in fact is in a self-contained environment" with "no wired or wireless connections in or out of the Ballot Tabulation Center" so that "the election network and election devices cannot connect to the public Internet." John Shadegg, Answers to Senate Questions Regarding Maricopa County Election Network: Arizona 2020

May 20, 2022

Page 4

clients unreasonably delayed bringing these claims for years and this delay clearly prejudices the County given the injunctive relief requested and the proximity to the general election, so the claims are time-barred.

Further, the constitutional claims and declaratory action fail because the relief requested would violate the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution. (U.S. Const., art I, 4). This clause gives state legislatures the authority to determine how congressional elections are to be administered, absent Congressional action. There is no federal regulation requiring votes be counted by hand. Arizona's legislature has, consistent with its Constitutional obligations and authority, legislated the manner in which votes are counted in Arizona - by electronic tabulation machines, followed by a 2% hand count audit. A.R.S. §§ 16-441 – 450 (providing the statutory framework and authorization for the use of tabulation machines for Arizona's elections); -602(B) (mandating the 2% hand count audit following every primary, special, or general election). Finally, there is no private right of action pursuant to A.R.S. § 11-251. It simply does not exist.

In violation of your Rule 11 obligations, the Amended Complaint is riddled with objectively-provable false and misleading misstatements of fact about substantive matters – most, if not all, are disproven by public documents of which the court may take judicial notice. In addition to those addressed above, and just by way of example, Paragraph 2 alleges that “untested and unverified electronic voting machines” are used in Maricopa County and Arizona. Not so. The tabulation machines used in Arizona elections were subjected to testing and verification prior to being certified for use, as required by federal and state law. A.R.S. § 16-442; 52 U.S.C. § 20971. Both the independent, bipartisan Election Assistance Commission and the Arizona Secretary of State's Equipment Certification Committee certified them. These machines are tested again, both before and after elections, to verify that they accurately read paper ballots. A.R.S. § 16-449 (pre-election logic and accuracy test); Elections Procedures Manual (109) at 235 (post-election logic and accuracy test). Further, the accuracy of the tabulation machines is verified via the required 2% hand-count audit conducted by representatives of the political parties after elections. A.R.S. § 16-602(B). The allegation that the tabulation machines used in Arizona elections are untested and unverified is patently false.

In summary, the Amended Complaint asks the Court to order Maricopa County and Arizona to allow people to vote by paper ballot when that is already the law in Arizona. It seeks an order requiring ballots to be counted according to the Plaintiffs' preferences, despite the fact that the United States Constitution authorizes the Arizona legislature to determine how Arizona ballots are counted. It also asks for injunctive relief that is barred by the well-established *Purcell* principle. As if that were not enough, it is premised on a statutory hook for which the statute of limitations has expired and it is barred by laches; and it seeks relief pursuant to a statute that provides no private right of action. Finally, the bulk of the allegations in the Amended Complaint are either demonstrably false or have nothing to do with the way elections are conducted in the State of Arizona. As such, the Amended Complaint fails as a matter of law. The County therefore requests that you discuss this with your clients, and further requests that your clients voluntarily dismiss this action immediately, but certainly no later than June 1, 2022 (the responsive pleading deadline

May 20, 2022

Page 5

in this matter). If they do not do so, we will file a motion to dismiss and the County will seek its attorney's fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988, which provides that the court may award fees to "the prevailing party" in cases brought pursuant to Section 1983. Additionally, the County will seek sanctions, including attorney's fees, pursuant to Rule 11.

Because your clients are candidates for the party nomination in the August 2, 2022 elections for the offices of governor and secretary of state in Arizona, we assume they will carefully consider the facts and legal analysis provided and reconsider pursuing this matter. As indicated, feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss this further.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Emily Craiger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "E" and "C".

Emily Craiger, Esq.  
For the Firm

EXHIBIT “A”

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 1

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>	
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1383	<b>House Number:</b>	5225	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>		<b>Precinct:</b>	0048
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/02/2021	<b>Street Direction:</b>	N	<b>CPC:</b>	6793
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b>	31ST	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b>	PL	<b>School District:</b>	038
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>		<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>		<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/22/2021
		<b>City:</b>	PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b>	85016	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1377	<b>House Number:</b>	5225	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>		<b>Precinct:</b>	0048
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/03/2020	<b>Street Direction:</b>	N	<b>CPC:</b>	0048
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b>	31ST	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b>	PL	<b>School District:</b>	038
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>		<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	P
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>		<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b>	PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b>	85016	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1376	<b>House Number:</b>	5225	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>		<b>Precinct:</b>	0048
<b>Election Date:</b>	08/04/2020	<b>Street Direction:</b>	N	<b>CPC:</b>	0048
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b>	31ST	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b>	PL	<b>School District:</b>	038
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>		<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>		<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	07/16/2020
		<b>City:</b>	PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	REP
		<b>Zip Code:</b>	85016	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1349	<b>House Number:</b>	5225	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>		<b>Precinct:</b>	6581
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/05/2019	<b>Street Direction:</b>	N	<b>CPC:</b>	6581
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b>	31ST	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b>	PL	<b>School District:</b>	038
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>		<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>		<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/22/2019
		<b>City:</b>	PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b>	85016	<b>Provisional:</b>	

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 2

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	1341	<b>House Number:</b> 5225	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0048
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/06/2018	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0048
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 31ST	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> PL	<b>School District:</b>	038
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/25/2018
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85016	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1339	<b>House Number:</b> 5225	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0048
<b>Election Date:</b>	08/28/2018	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0048
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 31ST	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> PL	<b>School District:</b>	038
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	08/17/2018
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	REP
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85016	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1326	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	6462
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/07/2017	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	6462
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	014
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/20/2017
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1301	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0379
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/08/2016	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0379
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	014
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/28/2016
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 3

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	1300	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0379
<b>Election Date:</b>	08/30/2016	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0379
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	014
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	08/24/2016
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	REP
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1299	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	6389
<b>Election Date:</b>	05/17/2016	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	6389
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	014
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	04/29/2016
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1290	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	C	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	7900
<b>Election Date:</b>	03/22/2016	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	7900
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	014
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	03/02/2016
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1280	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	6134
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/03/2015	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	6134
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	014
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/27/2015
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	



Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 4

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	1256	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0379
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/04/2014	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0379
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/29/2014
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1255	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0379
<b>Election Date:</b>	08/26/2014	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0379
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	08/11/2014
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	REP
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1246	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	5761
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/05/2013	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	5761
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/17/2013
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1221	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0379
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/06/2012	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0379
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/23/2012
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 5

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	1220	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0379
<b>Election Date:</b>	08/28/2012	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0379
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	08/23/2012
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	REP
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1193	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	5061
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/08/2011	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	5061
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/21/2011
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1167	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/02/2010	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/27/2010
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1166	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	08/24/2010	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	08/19/2010
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	DEM
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 6

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	1163	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	6495
<b>Election Date:</b>	05/18/2010	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	6495
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	04/29/2010
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1154	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	5961
<b>Election Date:</b>	03/09/2010	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	5961
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	03/01/2010
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1139	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	J	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	5671
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/03/2009	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	5671
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	S
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1098	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/04/2008	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	10/22/2008
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 7

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	1097	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	09/02/2008	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	09/01/2008
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	DEM
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1077	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	DEM
<b>Election Type:</b>	C	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	7368
<b>Election Date:</b>	02/05/2008	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	7368
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	LAKE	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 430-6278	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	01/25/2008
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	1007	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/07/2006	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	11/01/2006
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	892	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/02/2004	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 8

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	891	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	09/07/2004	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P6
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	779	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/05/2002	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P3
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	769	<b>House Number:</b> 6602	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0409
<b>Election Date:</b>	09/10/2002	<b>Street Direction:</b> N	<b>CPC:</b>	0409
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> 36TH	<b>City District:</b>	P3
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> ST	<b>School District:</b>	314
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	R
<b>Telephone:</b>	(602) 257-1234	<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85018	<b>Provisional:</b>	
<b>Election Number:</b>	669	<b>House Number:</b> 515	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	G	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0361
<b>Election Date:</b>	11/07/2000	<b>Street Direction:</b> W	<b>CPC:</b>	0361
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> PALO VERDE	<b>City District:</b>	P4
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> DR	<b>School District:</b>	438
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	P
<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85013	<b>Provisional:</b>	

Report: Production

Maricopa County

Page: 9

Date: 5/17/22

Recorder's Office Information Systems Center

Time: 3:39:51 PM

**Voted File Report**  
**For Voter ID: 2002542**

<u>Voter ID</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>Date of Registration</u>
2002542	LAKE, KARI ANN	5225 N 31ST PL 85016	A	07/18/2000
<b>Election Number:</b>	666	<b>House Number:</b> 515	<b>Party:</b>	REP
<b>Election Type:</b>	P	<b>House Number Suffix:</b>	<b>Precinct:</b>	0361
<b>Election Date:</b>	09/12/2000	<b>Street Direction:</b> W	<b>CPC:</b>	0361
<b>First Name:</b>	KARI	<b>Street Name:</b> PALO VERDE	<b>City District:</b>	P4
<b>Middle Name:</b>	L	<b>Street Type:</b> DR	<b>School District:</b>	438
<b>Last Name:</b>	HALPERIN	<b>Street Suffix:</b>	<b>Early Voter Status:</b>	P
<b>Telephone:</b>		<b>Unit Number:</b>	<b>Ballot Rcv from USPS:</b>	
		<b>City:</b> PHOENIX	<b>Primary Ballot:</b>	
		<b>Zip Code:</b> 85013	<b>Provisional:</b>	

## Voting History

### 1740143 - FINCHEM, MARK W

#	Election Name	Voted Early?
126	2002 GENERAL ELECTION	
147	2004 PRIMARY ELECTION	
148	2004 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
172	2006 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
189	2007 CITY OF TUCSON GENERAL	
193	2008 PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
194	2008 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
208	NOVEMBER 2009 CONSOLIDATED ELECTIONS	Yes
209	2010 ORO VALLEY PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
213	2010 SPECIAL STATE SALES TAX ELECTION	Yes
214	2010 PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
215	2010 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
232	2012 PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE ELECTION	Yes
233	2012 ORO VALLEY PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
234	2012 SPECIAL CONGRESSIONAL PRIMARY	Yes
236	2012 SPECIAL CONGRESSIONAL GENERAL	Yes
237	2012 PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
238	2012 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
252	2014 PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
253	2014 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
257	2015 PIMA COUNTY BOND ELECTION	Yes
258	2016 PRESIDENTIAL PREFERENCE ELECTION	Yes
259	2016 SCHOOL FUNDING ELECTION	Yes
260	2016 PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
261	2016 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
265	2017 TOWN OF ORO VALLEY SPECIAL ELECTION	Yes
269	2018 PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
270	2018 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes
274	2019 CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL/FIRE ELECTION	Yes
276	2020 PRIMARY ELECTION	Yes
277	2020 GENERAL ELECTION	Yes

EXHIBIT “2”



**From:** [Emily Craiger](#)  
**To:** [Dana Troy](#); [parker@parkerdk.com](#); [ko@olsenlawpc.com](#); [alandersh@gmail.com](#)  
**Cc:** [Joseph La Rue](#); [Karen Hartman-Tellez](#); [Thomas Liddy](#); [Joseph Branco](#); [Roopali Desai](#); [Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov](#); [bo@statesuniteddemocracy.org](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Lake, et al. v. Hobbs., et al. 22-cv-00677-DMF - Scheduling a Meet and Confer  
**Date:** Friday, May 27, 2022 9:07:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Lake v Hobbs Rule 11 MTD letter Maricopa County.pdf](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

Counsel:

I received no response to the attached correspondence sent to you last Friday. Consistent with the Court's May 17, 2022, Order, we request a brief telephonic conference to discuss your position. Counsel for the other Defendants are copied. Please let us know times you are available next Tuesday, May 31, 2022, before 1:00 PM and I will circulate a dial-in for a call with all parties.

Regards, Emily Craiger

Emily Craiger  
The Burgess Law Group  
3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
Tel: 602.806.2104  
Mobile: 602.318-0197  
Email: [Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com)  
Web: [www.theburgesslawgroup.com](http://www.theburgesslawgroup.com)



---

**From:** Dana Troy <[Dana@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:Dana@theburgesslawgroup.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 20, 2022 4:17 PM  
**To:** [parker@parkerdk.com](#); [ko@olsenlawpc.com](#); [alandersh@gmail.com](#)  
**Cc:** Emily Craiger <[emily@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:emily@theburgesslawgroup.com)>  
**Subject:** Lake, et al. v. Hobbs., et al. 22-cv-00677-DMF

Attached is Rule 11 Notice dated May 20, 2022 re the above referenced matter. Please contact Emily Craiger with questions. Thank you.

Dana N. Troy

Office Manager  
The Burgess Law Group  
3131 E. Camelback Rd., Suite 224  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
Tel: 602.806.2100  
Email: [Dana@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:Dana@theburgesslawgroup.com)  
Web: [www.theburgesslawgroup.com](http://www.theburgesslawgroup.com)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Kari Lake and Mark Finchem,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Kathleen Hobbs, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:22-cv-00677-JJT

**PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANT MARICOPA COUNTY'S  
REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS PURSUANT  
TO RULE 11 AND 28 U.S.C. § 1927**

(Honorable John J. Tuchi)

Defendants Bill Gates, Clint Hickman, Jack Sellers, Thomas Galvin and Steve Gallardo in their official capacities as members of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors (the “County”) filed a Motion for Sanctions pursuant to Rule 11 and 28 U.S.C. § 1927. The Court, having reviewed the Motion, and good cause appearing therefore,

**ORDERS:**

The County’s request for sanctions is GRANTED, and attorneys for the County shall submit a petition for attorneys’ fees on or before \_\_\_\_\_ for fees incurred from the date of Plaintiffs filing of the Amended Complaint through entry of this Order.

Dated this \_\_\_\_ day of August, 2022.