

1 D. Andrew Gaona (028414)
2 **COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**
3 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
5 T: (602) 381-5486
6 agaona@cblawyers.com

7 Sambo (Bo) Dul (030313)
8 **STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER**
9 8205 South Priest Drive, #10312
10 Tempe, Arizona 85284
11 T: (480) 253-9651
12 bo@statesuniteddemocracy.org

13 *Attorneys for Defendant*
14 *Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs*

15 **ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT**
16 **MOHAVE COUNTY**

17 JEANNE KENTCH, an individual; TED
18 BOYD, and individual; ABRAHAM
19 HAMADEH, an individual; and
20 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE, a
21 federal political party committee,

22 Plaintiffs/Contestants,

23 v.

24 KRIS MAYES,

25 Defendant/Contestee,

26 and

KATIE HOBBS, in her official capacity as the
Secretary of State; et al.,

Defendants.

No. S8015CV2022-01468

**ARIZONA SECRETARY OF STATE
KATIE HOBBS' MOTION TO
DISMISS STATEMENT OF
ELECTION CONTEST**

(Oral Argument Requested)

(Assigned to Hon. Lee F. Jantzen)

1 **Introduction & Background**

2 In this “election contest,” Plaintiffs/Contestants ask this Court to overturn the results of
3 the 2022 General Election. In that election, based on the official statewide canvass, the people
4 of Arizona chose Kris Mayes as their next Attorney General by a narrow margin of 511 votes.
5 As required by Arizona law, that race is currently the subject of an automatic statewide recount,
6 with a hearing to announce the recount results set for December 22. Plaintiffs now ask this Court
7 to halt that process and declare Plaintiff Abraham Hamadeh the winner of that race. But that
8 relief is extreme, unfounded, and unavailable. An election contest must rest on facts known to
9 Plaintiffs when a contest is filed, not wild speculation aimed at undermining the work of
10 Arizona’s election officials.

11 State and county election officials should be commended for their hard work, diligence,
12 and integrity in administering the 2022 General Election. However, like all elections that came
13 before it and all elections that will follow it, this election was not perfect – after all, elections are
14 administered by humans. But that is emphatically not a reason for this Court to thwart the will
15 of the people as expressed at the ballot box, which is precisely what Plaintiffs ask this Court to
16 do. Arizona courts apply “all reasonable presumptions” in “favor [of] the validity of an election,”
17 *Moore v. City of Page*, 148 Ariz. 151, 159 (App. 1986), presumptions that Plaintiffs’ threadbare
18 allegations cannot overcome.

19 **First**, this entire lawsuit should be dismissed under the equitable doctrine of laches.
20 Plaintiffs Hamadeh and the Republican National Committee originally filed this lawsuit in
21 Maricopa on November 22, and it was dismissed without prejudice because it was premature.
22 Yet they waited until just hours before the statutory deadline to re-file essentially the same
23 lawsuit (but in a different county), and in so doing, injected unnecessary delay into the process
24 when they clearly knew their intentions all along. This alone is reason to dismiss their Statement.

25 **Second**, Plaintiffs’ allegations related to election day issues in Maricopa County (Count
26 I) fail from the get-go because they do not establish “misconduct” or an “erroneous count of

1 votes” and because they allege that the maximum universe of potentially affected voters is 395,
2 which cannot change the outcome of the election.

3 **Third**, Plaintiffs’ claims about Maricopa County’s alleged failure to issue provisional
4 ballots (Count II) and inaccurate ballot duplications and electronic adjudications (Counts III and
5 IV, respectively) across all counties are based entirely on speculation and therefore fail as a
6 matter of law. Beyond that, Plaintiffs’ requested relief – that an unknown number of voters be
7 allowed to cast provisional ballots weeks after election day – is not authorized by law.

8 **Fourth**, Plaintiffs’ claim that an unidentified and unknowable number of early ballots
9 constituted “illegal votes” because of an alleged conflict between A.R.S. § 16-550(A) and the
10 2019 Election Procedures Manual (“EPM”) fails because it was brought far too late, it fails as a
11 matter of law, and, like Counts II-IV, it’s based on pure speculation.

12 **Finally**, the Court should not defer ruling on these fundamental legal deficiencies to
13 permit Plaintiffs to do any discovery. They filed this litigation to try and find proof to support
14 their claims, and that’s simply not how election contests work. The Court shouldn’t reward
15 Plaintiffs’ attempted fishing expedition or tolerate their scattershot approach to this litigation.

16 **Argument**

17 Plaintiffs’ election contest fails, and the Court should quickly dismiss it. But the Secretary
18 recognizes that election contests are rare, and first provides the Court with some background and
19 fundamental principles underlying this dispute.

20 To survive a motion to dismiss, an election contest must be based on well-pleaded facts,
21 rather than on legal conclusions. *See Hancock v. Bisnar*, 212 Ariz. 344, 348 ¶ 17 (2006)
22 (assessing election contest under Rule 8(a) notice pleading requirements); *Griffin v. Buzard*, 86
23 Ariz. 166, 169-70 (1959) (election contest subject to dismissal if it fails to state a claim upon
24 which relief can be granted). “A complaint that states only legal conclusions, without any
25 supporting factual allegations, does not satisfy Arizona’s notice pleading standard under Rule
26 8,” *Cullen v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.*, 218 Ariz. 417. 419 ¶ 7 (2008), and the Court may not accept

1 as true “inferences or deductions that are not necessarily implied by well-pleaded facts,
2 unreasonable inferences or unsupported conclusions from such facts, or legal conclusions
3 alleged as facts.” implied by well-pleaded facts” and “unreasonable inferences or unsupported
4 conclusions,” *Jeter v. Mayo Clinic Ariz.*, 211 Ariz. 386, 389 ¶ 4 (App. 2005).

5 “[E]lection contests are purely statutory, unknown to the common law, and are neither
6 actions at law nor suits in equity, but are special proceedings.” *Griffin*, 86 Ariz. at 168. They are
7 thus the subject of deliberate legislative restriction because of a “strong public policy favoring
8 stability and finality of election results.” *Ariz. City Sanitary Dist. v. Olson*, 224 Ariz. 330, 334 ¶
9 12 (App. 2010) (cleaned up). And A.R.S. § 16-672(A) carefully circumscribes the valid grounds
10 of a contest: (1) “misconduct” by election boards and canvassers; (2) the elected official was
11 ineligible for the contested office; (3) the contested official gave a “bribe or reward” or
12 “committed any other offense against the elective franchise”; (4) “illegal votes”; or (5) because
13 of an “erroneous count of votes,” the elected official didn’t “receive the highest number of
14 votes.” The Legislature also provided that the exclusive remedies in election contests are (1)
15 judgment confirming the election; (2) judgment annulling and setting aside the election for the
16 contested race; (3) a declaration that the certificate of election of the person whose office is
17 contested is of no further legal force or effect and that a different person secured the highest
18 number of legal votes and is elected. A.R.S. § 16-676(B), (C). The Court lacks jurisdiction to
19 grant any other form of relief.

20 Plaintiffs also must prove their entitlement to the extraordinary remedy of overturning
21 election results against several important backstops:

- 22 • Arizona courts apply “all reasonable presumptions” in “favor [of] the validity of an
23 election,” *Moore*, 148 Ariz. at 159;
- 24 • the “returns of the election officers are prima facie correct,” *Hunt v. Campbell*, 19 Ariz.
25 254, 268 (1917); and

- 1 • courts apply a presumption of “good faith and honesty of the members of the election
2 board” that must control unless there is “clear and satisfactory proof” to the contrary, *id.*

3 All told, to obtain relief in this case, Plaintiffs must overcome all these presumptions and
4 make either “a showing of fraud or . . . a showing that had proper procedures been used, the
5 result would have been different.” *Moore*, 148 Ariz. at 159. Because Plaintiffs “are not . . .
6 alleging any fraud” [Stmt. ¶ 1], to state a valid election contest, Plaintiffs must allege facts
7 sufficient to show “the result would have been different.”

8 With this background in mind, we turn to each of Plaintiffs’ deficient claims.

9 **I. Plaintiffs’ Entire Case is Barred by Laches.**

10 This is not the first go-around with these precise claims in an election contest – Plaintiffs
11 Hamadeh and the RNC filed a near-identical complaint in Maricopa County on November 22
12 [*see Exhibit 1*], which was dismissed several days later because it was premature under the
13 election contest statutes, *Hamadeh v. Mayes*, No. CV2022-015455 (Maricopa Cnty. Super. Ct.,
14 Nov. 29, 2022 Order) [attached as **Exhibit 2**]. Plaintiffs could have re-filed this action as early
15 as 11:00 AM on December 5 once the statewide canvass was certified, yet laid in wait until just
16 before the courthouse closed on December 9 to do so. These facts cry out for the application of
17 the equitable doctrine of laches, as Plaintiffs clearly knew of their cause of action well before its
18 filing and have prejudiced all involved by waiting. And as Plaintiffs themselves noted in the
19 Maricopa County action, “[b]ecause finality in elections is paramount to an orderly transfer of
20 power, election contests must be initiated, litigated and concluded with all deliberate speed,”
21 Plaintiffs who tarry risk discovering that their claims have dissipated in the passage of time, and
22 unnecessary delay “would perversely penalize the Contestants for acting promptly, undermine
23 the expedited statutory timetables for bringing and resolving election contests, and jeopardize a
24 timely transfer of power in January.” [**Exhibit 3** (excerpt from Plaintiffs’ 11/28/22 Response to
25 Motion to Dismiss, p. 4)]

1 Laches “seeks to prevent dilatory conduct and will bar a claim if a party’s unreasonable
2 delay prejudices the opposing party or the administration of justice.” *Lubin v. Thomas*, 213 Ariz.
3 496, 497 ¶ 10 (2006). And it can be applied even if a case is technically filed within a statute of
4 limitations set by the Legislature for an election challenge. *See, e.g., Lubin v. Thomas*, 213 Ariz.
5 496, 498 ¶¶ 9-11 (2006) (noting that “merely complying with the time limits . . . for filing a
6 notice of appeal may be insufficient if the appellant does not also promptly prosecute the
7 appeal”).

8 In deciding whether a plaintiff’s delay is unreasonable, a court should consider “the
9 justification for the delay, the extent of the plaintiff’s advance knowledge of the basis for the
10 challenge, and whether the plaintiff exercised diligence[.]” *Arizona Libertarian Party v. Reagan*,
11 189 F. Supp. 3d 920, 923 (D. Ariz. 2016). Plaintiff’s delay here is completely unreasonable; they
12 filed a near-identical complaint weeks ago, but didn’t re-file until the last possible moment. And
13 the result of their delay will cause prejudice to all parties by likely delaying the announcement
14 of the results of the recount, pushing a potential evidentiary hearing to just before or just after a
15 state holiday, further delaying the issuance of a certificate of election for this race, and
16 threatening the ability of the newly elected official to take office on January 2, 2023 as required
17 by the Arizona Constitution. The Court should dismiss their Statement.

18 **II. Plaintiffs Do Not Allege a Viable Election Contest Based on Election Day Issues in**
19 **Maricopa County.**

20 Even if not barred entirely by laches, Plaintiffs’ contest fails. Plaintiffs first contend
21 (Count I) that there was either an erroneous count of votes or election board misconduct because
22 “[u]pon information and belief,” “various poll workers across Maricopa County refused or failed
23 to ‘check out’ some or all . . . voters” who checked in at vote centers with printer problems on
24 election day but did not cast their ballots there, thereby allegedly preventing provisional or early
25 ballots those voters submitted elsewhere from being tallied. [Stmt. ¶¶ 68-71] They allege that
26 “at least 126 of those voters” submitted provisional ballots that weren’t counted, that at least 269

1 other voters who tried to cast their early ballots did not have their ballots counted, and that poll
2 workers who did not “check out” these voters engaged in “misconduct.” [*Id.* ¶¶ 69-72] According
3 to Plaintiffs – again, only “upon information and belief” – votes that Maricopa County
4 “improperly failed to tabulate are material to, and potentially dispositive of, the outcome of the
5 election for . . . Arizona Attorney General.” [*Id.* ¶ 73]

6 Plaintiffs go out of their way to state that they “are not, by this lawsuit, alleging any fraud,
7 manipulation or other intentional wrongdoing.” [Stmt. ¶ 1] Further, and fatal to their claims, the
8 election day issues they identify are also not “misconduct” under the election contest statutes.¹
9 Here again, the “returns of the election officers are prima facie correct,” and courts apply a
10 presumption of “good faith and honesty of the members of the election board” that must control
11 unless there is “clear and satisfactory proof.” *Hunt*, 19 Ariz. at 268. But more importantly,
12 “honest mistakes or mere omissions on the part of the election officers” are not enough to
13 establish “misconduct.” *Findley v. Sorenson*, 35 Ariz. 265, 269 (1929). That there were
14 unintentional errors with printer settings and that poll workers may have unintentionally made
15 errors with voter “check ins” and “check outs” is simply not “misconduct” as a matter of law.
16 *See Aguilera v. Fontes*, No. CV 2020-014562, 2020 WL 11273092, at *4 (Ariz. Super. Ct. Nov.
17 30, 2020) (“A flawless election process is not a legal entitlement under any statute, EPM rule,
18 or other authority[.] Rather, a perfect process is an illusion.”).

19 Even if Plaintiffs could prove that the election day errors in Maricopa County amount to
20 “misconduct” or led to an “erroneous count” (which they did not and cannot do), those errors
21 could not have changed the outcome of the election. The maximum number of voters implicated
22 by Plaintiffs’ allegations is 395, which is insufficient to show that the “result would have been
23 different.” This is true even if the Court assumes that all 395 of these unidentified and unknown
24 voters would have cast a ballot for Hamadeh. And the Court simply cannot make such a sweeping
25

26 ¹ Plaintiffs allege no facts supporting an “erroneous count,” or miscount of votes, as to Count I.

1 and dangerous assumption, nor should the Court indulge any speculation from Plaintiffs about
2 how allegedly impacted voters would have voted.² The Court should dismiss this Count.

3 **III. Plaintiffs’ Counts II-IV Are Speculative and Should Be Dismissed.**

4 Next, Counts II-IV should all be dismissed because they rest on speculation, and there is
5 no plausible allegation that the errors complained of would have any effect on the outcome of
6 this race.

7 Plaintiffs fail to support Counts II-IV with “well-pleaded facts,” instead relying on the
8 following conclusory allegations:

- 9 • In Count II, Plaintiffs allege that “[u]pon information and belief, a material number of
10 voters” were “required to vote a provisional ballot” after being “told by election workers
11 that they were not registered to vote,” that Maricopa County denied “certain voters” their
12 right to cast a provisional ballot at all, and that “[u]pon information and belief,” this error
13 was “material to, and potentially dispositive of, the outcome of the election for the office
14 of Arizona Attorney General.” [Stmt. ¶¶ 77, 80-82]
- 15 • In Count III, Plaintiffs allege that “the counties’ Ballot Duplication Boards have
16 incorrectly transcribed a material number of voters selections in the race for Arizona
17 Attorney General.” [*Id.* ¶ 85] The only alleged fact anywhere in Plaintiffs’ Statement that
18 could even remotely relate to this claim is that in the 2020 presidential race, a small
19 sampling of Maricopa County ballots had an apparent error rate of 0.41% in duplication.
20 [*Id.* ¶ 41]
- 21 • In Count IV, Plaintiffs allege that “[u]pon information and belief, the counties’ Electronic
22 Adjudication Boards have incorrectly recorded a material number of voters selections in
23

24 ² When, as here, a plaintiff claims that certain voters were deprived of an opportunity to cast a
25 ballot, courts cannot rely on evidence that a voter would have voted for a particular candidate
26 because “it would be an uncertain and dangerous experiment to attempt the task of ascertaining
and giving effect to their intentions, as ballots actually cast and returned.” *Babnew v. Linneman*,
154 Ariz. 90, 93 (App. 1987) (quotation omitted).

1 the race for Arizona Attorney General,” including by erroneously tabulating over-votes
2 and designating certain votes as undervotes. [*Id.* ¶¶ 91-93] The only alleged facts
3 anywhere in Plaintiffs’ Statement that could even remotely relate to this claim are that (1)
4 the statutory hand count audit of the Governor’s race in Maricopa County revealed a
5 single electronic adjudication error [*Id.* ¶ 49], (2) an unidentified “observer” of the
6 adjudication process in an unidentified county “reported” issues with “electronic
7 adjudication equipment” capturing certain voters’ marks [*id.* ¶ 51], (3) that two ballots re-
8 tabulated in Navajo County were identified that “should have been sent to adjudication [¶
9 52], and (4) unidentified counties counted “undervotes” if “an unclear mark fills less than
10 14% of the oval.” From these reed-thin facts, Plaintiffs allege that “[u]pon information
11 and belief, votes included on improperly adjudicated ballots are material to, and
12 potentially dispositive of” the race for Attorney General [*id.* ¶ 94].

13 All three of these claims turn on Plaintiffs’ rank speculation both that these alleged errors
14 occurred, and that they occurred in numbers sufficient to affect the outcome of the Attorney
15 General’s race. This cannot satisfy Plaintiffs’ burden. Plaintiffs, quite literally, have no idea that
16 any of these errors occurred at all with votes cast for Attorney General, and they certainly have
17 no idea how many votes were affected. There isn’t a shred of credible factual support for any of
18 these claims, and this Court cannot credit Plaintiffs’ wild “inferences or deductions that are not
19 necessarily implied by well-pleaded facts” and “unreasonable inferences or unsupported
20 conclusions.” *Jeter*, 211 Ariz. at 389 ¶ 4.

21 Applied here, it is unreasonable to simply presume, with no support, that a “material
22 number” of voters in Maricopa County were denied provisional ballots (Count II). It is
23 unreasonable to presume that a “material number” of ballots across all fifteen counties suffer
24 from ballot duplication errors affecting the race for Attorney General in 2022 because two years
25 ago, there were some errors found in a single race in a single county (Count III). And it is
26 unreasonable to presume that a “material number” of ballots across all fifteen counties suffer

1 from electronic adjudication errors affecting the race for Attorney General because of isolated
2 instances of alleged adjudication issues in a different race altogether and unidentified other races,
3 or because of alleged tabulator settings that are within the county’s administrative discretion.
4 (Count IV). If fanciful allegations of this sort could support an election contest claim, every
5 election would be subject to challenge by anyone unhappy with the result. But they don’t;
6 instead, election contests must rest on facts, not “mere suspicion and conjecture,” *Hunt*, 19 Ariz.
7 at 264, which could never be enough to overcome the presumptive validity of the election
8 returns, *Moore*, 148 Ariz. at 159. As a result, the Court should also dismiss Counts II-IV.

9 **IV. Plaintiffs’ Requested Relief as to Count II Is Legally Unsupported**

10 As to Count II, Plaintiffs also seek extraordinary relief – allowing some unidentified and
11 unknown number of voters to cast provisional ballots weeks after election day. Such relief falls
12 well outside the Court’s jurisdiction in an election contest.

13 To begin, there is no statutory basis for the requested relief, which does not appear among
14 the remedies listed in A.R.S. § 16-676. By enumerating the relief a court may grant, A.R.S. §
15 16-676 also serves to limit a court’s discretion to fashion other remedies. *See McNamara v.*
16 *Citizens Protecting Tax Payers*, 236 Ariz. 192, 196 ¶ 13 (App. 2014) (noting that where “a statute
17 expressly provides a particular remedy or remedies, a court must be [wary] of reading others into
18 it”) (cleaned up). And it is no answer for Plaintiffs to claim that they are entitled to a writ of
19 mandamus in the alternative; the election contest statutes provide the exclusive list of remedies
20 in such an action, and the Court lacks jurisdiction to go beyond that statute. *See, e.g., Donaghey*
21 *v. Attorney General*, 120 Ariz. 93 (1978).

22 The requested relief would also require the Court to invent, from whole cloth, an election
23 schedule and process different from the ones established by Title 16, which no court is
24 empowered to do (or has ever done). Plaintiffs’ proposed remedy also implicates the concerns
25 that animated the Arizona Supreme Court’s decision in *Babnew*, discussed above. Allowing a
26 self-identified subset of the electorate an opportunity to essentially cast their votes after the

1 fact—once the gap between the candidates is known—would be a “dangerous experiment” that
2 would amplify the potential and incentives for dishonesty and manipulation. *Babnew*, 154 Ariz.
3 at 93. Indeed, Arizona’s law setting strict timelines for the release of election results – and
4 imposing criminal penalties for any premature release of results – was crafted to avoid this
5 precise scenario where election results are known to the public, and could influence voter
6 behavior, before the close of voting. *See* A.R.S. § 16-551(C); 2019 EPM, Ch. 12(I).

7 **V. Plaintiffs’ Claims About Early Ballot Signature Verification Are Barred by Laches**
8 **and Legally Baseless.**

9 Finally, Plaintiffs contend (Count V) – again, based solely “on information and belief” –
10 that there were an unidentified number of “illegal votes” cast because “a material number of
11 early ballots” were improperly validated by county recorders across the state based on a signature
12 match from “an election-related document that was not the voter’s ‘registration record,’ such as
13 a prior early ballot affidavit of early ballot request form.” [Stmt. ¶ 98] This claim rests on
14 Plaintiffs’ presumption that a voter’s “registration record” is narrowly limited to a voter’s
15 registration form, and further on the idea that any provision of the EPM that authorizes early
16 ballot validation based on other “specimen[s]” is invalid and unenforceable. [*Id.* ¶¶ 98-99]
17 Again, Plaintiffs say on “information and belief” that these ballots – a number they do not
18 identify – “is material to, and potentially dispositive of, the outcome of the election for the office
19 of Arizona Attorney General.” [*Id.* ¶ 101] And they ask for an order “proportionally reducing
20 the tabulated returns of early ballots to exclude early ballots” validated in alleged violation of
21 the law. [*Id.* ¶ 102] Count V fails for multiple, independent reasons.³

22
23 ³ The Secretary notes that this claim was raised in the Maricopa County case (*see Exhibit 1,*
24 *Count V*), and that Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed it without prejudice after reviewing
25 arguments essentially identical to that which follows. During a hearing held on November 28,
26 Plaintiffs’ former counsel indicated that it was being dismissed so that it could be brought
seeking only “prospective” relief (*i.e.*, for future elections). Why it’s brought again here thus
defies all explanation.

1 **A. Laches.**

2 To begin, the equitable doctrine of laches bars Count V. Plaintiffs waited years to
3 challenge this practice and provision of the EPM, their delay is unreasonable, and that delay
4 causes significant prejudice to our elections system, the Courts, and above all, voters whom
5 Plaintiffs ask this Court to disenfranchise.

6 Here, Plaintiffs knew or should have known of this practice since at least 2019, when the
7 EPM was approved by the Secretary, Governor, and Attorney General and thus obtained the
8 force and effect of law. In fact, the Secretary’s office put out a summary document describing
9 the updates in the 2019 EPM that called out this provision.⁴ Courts uniformly reject challenges
10 to election procedures like this brought only after an election.

11 Indeed, “[c]hallenges concerning alleged procedural violations of the election process
12 must be brought prior to the actual election.” *Sherman v. City of Tempe*, 202 Ariz. 339, 342 ¶ 9
13 (2002) (citation omitted). Here, rather than seeking relief as to this alleged conflict between the
14 statute and EPM years or even months ago, Plaintiffs waited until after the election (and after
15 Hamadeh lost his race) to sue. But “by filing their complaint after the completed election,”
16 Plaintiffs “essentially ask [the Court] to overturn the will of the people, as expressed in the
17 election.” *Sherman*, 202 Ariz. at 342 ¶ 11. The Court should thus reject Plaintiffs’ attempt to
18 “subvert the election process by intentionally delaying a request for remedial action to see first
19 whether they will be successful at the polls.” *McComb v. Superior Court In & For Cty. Of*
20 *Maricopa*, 189 Ariz. 518, 526 (App. 1997) (quotation omitted).

21 Plaintiffs’ belated claim – brought after all votes have been counted – also causes
22 significant prejudice to voters. Many Arizonans’ early ballots were validated and tabulated based
23 on the challenged EPM provision, and throwing their votes out after-the-fact in service of
24 Plaintiffs’ speculative claim would disenfranchise those voters. And while Arizona law generally

25 _____
26 ⁴https://azsos.gov/sites/default/files/Summary_Updates_to_Draft_2019_Elections_Procedures_Manual.pdf (at p. 5).

1 requires early voters whose signatures cannot be verified receive notice and an opportunity to
2 “cure” those signatures, A.R.S. § 16-550(A), the unidentified voters implicated by Plaintiffs’
3 arguments here would have no such opportunity. *Sotomayor v. Burns*, 199 Ariz. 81, 83 ¶ 9 (2000)
4 (finding claims barred by laches and considering fairness to the parties, the court, “election
5 officials, and the voters of Arizona”).⁵ This would treat similarly situated voters differently and
6 violate both the equal protection and due process rights of voters who would not receive the
7 benefit of the statutory cure period. *See Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98, 104-05 (2000) (“Having once
8 granted the right to vote on equal terms, the State may not, by later arbitrary and disparate
9 treatment, value one person’s vote over that of another.”).

10 Beyond that, “[t]he real prejudice caused by delay in election cases is to the quality of
11 decision making in matters of great public importance,” and “[t]he effects of such delay extend
12 far beyond the interests of the parties. Waiting until the last minute to file an election challenge
13 ‘places the court in a position of having to steamroll through the delicate legal issues in order to
14 meet the [applicable] deadline[s].’” *Sotomayor*, 199 Ariz at 83 ¶ 9. (citation omitted). Late
15 filings, such as Plaintiffs’, “deprive judges of the ability to fairly and reasonably process and
16 consider the issues . . . leaving little time for . . . wise decision making.” *Id.*

20 ⁵ Count V, which seeks to invalidate an unspecified number of early ballots is also little more
21 than a belated and improper attempt to challenge early ballots in violation of Arizona’s early
22 ballot challenge laws. Under Arizona law, efforts to challenge – and, thereby, invalidate – early
23 ballots must be brought by designated political party challengers before the affidavit envelope is
24 opened and the ballot removed from the envelope for tabulation. *See* A.R.S. § 16-552(D). In any
25 event, a challenger’s allegation that the affidavit signature does not match the voter’s signature in
26 the registration record – despite the county recorder’s determination that the signatures do match
– is not a valid basis for an early ballot challenge. A.R.S. §§ 16-552(D) & 16-591; *McEwen v.*
Sainz, No. CV-22-163 (Santa Cruz Cty. Sup Ct.), Aug. 22, 2022 Minute Entry Order (“Signature
verification is a function and responsibility of the County Recorder’s office and not the bas[i]s
for an early ballot challenge”) (attached as **Exhibit 4**).

1 **B. Merits.**

2 Even if not barred by laches, Plaintiffs' Count V claims and their challenge to the EPM
3 provision about early ballot signature verification are legally baseless. "A party attacking the
4 validity of an administrative regulation has a heavy burden." *Watahomigie v. Ariz. Bd. of Water*
5 *Quality Appeals*, 181 Ariz. 20, 24 (App. 1994). An agency's rulemaking powers "are measured
6 and limited by the statute creating them," *Caldwell v. Arizona State Bd. of Dental Examiners*,
7 137 Ariz. 396, 398 (App. 1983), and courts will not invalidate a regulation "unless its provisions
8 cannot, by any reasonable construction, be interpreted in harmony with the legislative
9 mandate." *Watahomigie*, 181 Ariz. at 25. Plaintiffs fail to carry their heavy burden here.

10 **1. Plaintiffs' interpretation of A.R.S. § 16-550 contradicts the statute's**
11 **text and legislative history.**

12 A.R.S. § 16-550(A) requires the county recorder to compare the signature on early ballot
13 affidavits with the signature in the voter's "registration record." Consistent with this
14 requirement, the 2019 EPM, at page 68, specifies that, besides the voter's registration form, the
15 county recorder "should also consult additional known signatures from other official election
16 documents in the voter's registration record, such as signature rosters or early ballot/PEVL
17 request forms," when conducting early ballot signature verification. Plaintiffs' erroneous
18 argument [Stmt. ¶ 91] that this EPM provision conflicts with A.R.S. § 16-550(A) assumes that
19 the statutory reference to a voter's "registration record" is narrowly limited to the registration
20 form or some other singular document. But that assumption is contrary to both the plain text and
21 legislative history of A.R.S. § 16-550(A).

22 Nothing in the plain text of A.R.S. § 16-550(A) limits the county recorder's review to the
23 voter registration form; nor does A.R.S. § 16-550(A) or any other law prohibit county recorders
24 from consulting other official documents in the voter's registration record when verifying early
25 ballot affidavit signatures. Indeed, if, as Plaintiffs insist, the Legislature wanted to restrict the
26 county recorder's review to the registration form alone, it knows how to do so because that's

1 exactly what the law said before the Legislature explicitly amended it. Before 2019, A.R.S. §
2 16-550(A) required the county recorder to compare the signature on early ballot affidavits to
3 “the signature of the elector on his registration form.” But in 2019, the Legislature amended
4 A.R.S. § 16-550(A) to replace the reference to “the signature of the elector on his registration
5 form” with today’s construction referencing “the elector’s registration record.” S.B. 1054, 54th
6 Leg., 1st Reg. Sess. (Ariz. 2019). When interpreting a statute, “each word, phrase, clause, and
7 sentence must be given meaning so that no part . . . will be void, inert, redundant, or trivial.” *Ariz.*
8 *Dep’t of Revenue v. S. Point Energy Ctr., LLC*, 228 Ariz. 436, 441 ¶ 18 (App. 2011) (citation
9 omitted). Here, the Legislature acted to expressly expand the county recorder’s review from just
10 the “registration form” to documents in the “registration record.” The Court should reject
11 Plaintiffs’ baseless effort to undo or render this legislative amendment meaningless.

12 **2. Plaintiffs’ interpretation would lead to absurd results.**

13 As the state’s Chief Election Officer, the Secretary must maintain the statewide voter
14 registration database, which contains the voter registration record of all Arizona voters. *See*
15 A.R.S. § 16-142; EPM, Ch. 1(IV)(A). These registration records in the voter registration
16 database often include not just the voter’s registration form, but also other – more recent –
17 documents associated with the voter’s registration and voting activity, such as the signature
18 roster or electronic poll book signatures, early ballot request forms, active early voting list
19 request forms, and early ballot affidavits from prior elections. That a voter’s registration record
20 includes other documents beyond the registration form is apparent from the Legislature’s usage
21 of the term “registration record” in other parts of Title 16. *See, e.g.*, A.R.S. § 16-153(A) (allowing
22 certain voters to protect from public disclosure their personal identifying information, “including
23 any of that person’s documents and voting precinct number contained in that person’s voter
24 registration record” (emphasis added)); A.R.S. § 16-168(F) (protecting “the records containing
25 a voter’s signature” within a voter’s registration record (emphasis added)).

1 Indeed, for long-time registered voters, the registration form in the voter’s record may be
2 decades old, and their signature may degrade or change over time, as reflected in more recent
3 official documents in the registration record. Plaintiffs’ insistence that officials may only consult
4 the registration form – and not any other official documents in the voter’s registration record –
5 both defies the plain text and legislative history of A.R.S. § 16-550(A) and would lead to absurd
6 results. Counties would have to reject early ballots based on signature comparison to an outdated
7 exemplar while ignoring more recent signatures available in the voter’s registration record.
8 Further, Plaintiffs’ argument would absurdly lead to some voters being required to cure their
9 signature for every early ballot they cast or face disenfranchisement because the county,
10 according to Plaintiffs, must always compare the voter’s early ballot affidavit signature to their
11 decades-old registration form, despite knowing that the voter’s signature has changed based on
12 recent documents in the registration record. The Court should reject Plaintiffs’ erroneous and
13 nonsensical reading of the law. *Green Cross Med., Inc. v. Gally*, 242 Ariz. 293, 297 ¶ 11 (App.
14 2017) (courts “will not interpret a statute in a manner that would lead to an absurd result.”).

15 **C. Speculation.**

16 Count V also fails because it is based entirely on speculation. As with “misconduct” and
17 “erroneous count of votes,” a contest based on “illegal votes” requires the contestant to prove
18 (1) that illegal votes were cast and (2) that those illegal votes “were sufficient to change the
19 outcome of the election.” *Moore*, 148 Ariz. at 156. Plaintiffs don’t – and obviously can’t – allege
20 a single fact to support this claim. This fundamental failure independently dooms these claims.
21 *Cullen*, 218 Ariz. at 419 ¶ 7.

22 Beyond that, however, Plaintiffs provide no principled way for the Court to even consider
23 this claim and the remedy Plaintiffs seek. Plaintiffs cavalierly ask this Court to “proportionally
24 reduc[e] the tabulated returns of early ballots to exclude early ballots” validated in alleged
25 violation of the law. [Stmt. ¶ 101] But they don’t allege how many early ballots were validated
26 using a signature exemplar on something other than a voter registration form, and they could

1 never prove what that number is because the counties have no data that could ever show which
2 signature exemplar was used to verify a particular ballot. And this should go without saying, but
3 it would be impracticable for counties to re-do early ballot signature verification at this stage.
4 Granting Plaintiffs' request would therefore require the Court to: (1) speculate how many early
5 ballots would have been rejected had counties applied Plaintiffs' absurd interpretation of A.R.S.
6 § 16-550(A); and then (2) speculate how these voters would have voted in the Attorney General's
7 race to "proportionally reduce" the vote totals. The Court should reject Plaintiffs' request to
8 apply conjecture upon conjecture to overturn the election result.

9 **VI. The Election Contest Statutes Do Not Give Contestants Carte Blanche to Conduct**
10 **Discovery or Inspect Ballots.**

11 As the Secretary notes throughout the Motion, Plaintiffs' election contest is little more
12 than a claim in search of a factual basis. Plaintiffs may attempt to evade dismissal by arguing
13 that they should be afforded an opportunity to conduct discovery before the motions are heard.
14 A plaintiff may not, however, use an invalid pleading as a springboard for discovery. *See*
15 *Lakewood Cmty. Ass'n v. Orozco*, No. 1 CA-CV 19-0194, 2020 WL 950225, at *1 (Ariz. Ct.
16 App. Feb. 27, 2020) (holding that "[a] motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) tests the allegations
17 of a pleading by assuming the truth of the well-pleaded facts in the complaint before the parties
18 engage in discovery" and "[t]hus, no discovery was necessary or appropriate" before a trial court
19 rules on such a motion) (emphasis added).

20 At bottom, this case should proceed no further and be immediately dismissed. Plaintiffs
21 may seek an opportunity to inspect ballots pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-677 in hopes of securing
22 evidence to support their wishful thinking and speculation. This statute, however, should not be
23 read to allow such discovery if the election contest itself is not cognizable. Although no Arizona
24 appellate court has addressed the issue, courts have elsewhere held that election contests must
25 pass the pleading threshold to justify discovery. For instance, the Minnesota Supreme Court
26 recently denied a candidate the opportunity to inspect ballots under a similar law because of

1 deficiencies in the candidate’s election contest allegations. *Bergstrom v. McEwen*, 960 N.W.2d
2 556 (Minn. 2021). The court held the candidate’s pleading included only speculative allegations
3 unsupported by facts or evidence, and also held that the complaint must first meet the pleading
4 requirements before ballot inspection was permitted. *Id.* at 565–66.

5 Minnesota is not alone – the highest courts of many other states agree. *See, e.g., Zahray*
6 *v. Emricson*, 182 N.E.2d 756, 757-58 (Ill. 1962) (election contest “cannot be employed to allow
7 a party, on mere suspicion, to have the ballots opened and subjected to scrutiny to find evidence
8 upon which to make a tangible charge”); *McClendon v. McKeown*, 323 S.W.2d 542, 545 (Ark.
9 1959) (court shouldn’t allow ballot inspection and a recount based on the mere allegation ““that
10 after said cancellation and retabulation, the Petitioner verily believes that he will have received
11 more votes[.]””); *Cruse v. Richards*, 37 P.2d 382, 383–84 (Colo. 1934) (“In a contest proceeding
12 it is always necessary to allege facts which will enable the court to determine that a different
13 result would follow in the vote by reason of such alleged facts. . . . Courts cannot properly embark
14 on a mere fishing expedition by opening up ballot boxes when there is an utter lack of specific
15 allegations as to the distribution of the votes.”); *Gollmar’s Election, Case of*, 175 A. 510, 513
16 (Pa. 1934) (“The pleadings before us would seem only an effort to place the situation in such a
17 light as to justify a voyage of exploration into a large number of ballot boxes, in the hope of an
18 ultimate discovery. Such is not province of a contest[.]”).

19 **Conclusion**

20 Arizona has a “strong public policy favoring stability and finality of election results,”
21 *Ariz. City Sanitary Dist*, 224 Ariz. at 334 ¶ 12, which means that the judiciary must be wary of
22 interfering with presumptively valid election results. The burden on an election contestant is thus
23 exceedingly high, and here, is a burden that Plaintiffs failed to meet. For all the reasons discussed
24 above, the Court should dismiss Plaintiffs’ “election contest” with prejudice, and without leave
25 to amend. The Secretary further reserves her right to seek an award of fees against Plaintiffs and
26 their counsel under Rule 11, Ariz. R. Civ. P., and A.R.S. § 12-349.

1
2 Respectfully submitted this 13th day of December, 2022.

3 **COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**

4 By /s/ D. Andrew Gaona

5 D. Andrew Gaona

6 **STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER**

7 Sambo (Bo) Dul

8 *Attorneys for Defendant Arizona Secretary of State*
9 *Katie Hobbs*

10 ORIGINAL efiled and served via electronic
11 means this 13th day of December, 2022, upon:

12 Honorable Lee F. Jantzen
13 Mohave County Superior Court
14 c/o Danielle Lecher
15 division4@mohavecourts.com

16 David A. Warrington
17 Gary Lawkowski
18 Dhillon Law Group, Inc.
19 2121 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 608
20 Alexandria, Virginia 22314
21 DWarrington@dhillonlaw.com
22 GLawkowski@dhillonlaw.com

23 Timothy A. La Sota
24 Timothy A. La Sota, PLC
25 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305
26 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
tim@timlasota.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants

23 Daniel C. Barr
24 Alexis E. Danneman
25 Austin Yost
26 Samantha J. Burke
Perkins Coie LLP
2901 North Central Avenue
Suite 2000

1 Phoenix, AZ 85012
2 dbarr@perkinscoie.com
3 adanneman@perkinscoie.com
4 ayost@perkinscoie.com
5 sburke@perkinscoie.com
6 *Attorneys for Kris Mayes*

7 Joseph La Rue
8 Joe Branco
9 Karen Hartman-Tellez
10 Maricopa County Attorney's Office
11 225 West Madison St.
12 Phoenix, AZ 85003
13 laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov
14 brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov
15 hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov
16 c-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov
17 *Attorneys for Maricopa County*

18 Celeste Robertson
19 Joseph Young
20 Apache County Attorney's Office
21 245 West 1st South
22 St. Johns, AZ 85936
23 crobertson@apachelaw.net
24 jyoung@apachelaw.net
25 *Attorneys for Defendant, Larry Noble, Apache County Recorder,*
26 *and Apache County Board of Supervisors*

1 Christine J. Roberts
2 Paul Correa
3 Cochise County Attorney's Office
4 P.O. Drawer CA
5 Bisbee, AZ 85603
6 croberts@cochise.az.gov
7 pcorrea@cochise.az.gov
8 *Attorneys for Defendant, David W. Stevens, Cochise County Recorder,*
9 *and Cochise County Board of Supervisors*

10 Bill Ring
11 Coconino County Attorney's Office
12 110 East Cherry Avenue
13 Flagstaff, AZ 86001
14 wring@coconino.az.gov
15 *Attorney for Defendant, Patty Hansen, Coconino County Recorder,*
16 *and Coconino County Board of Supervisors*

17 Jeff Dalton
18 Gila County Attorney's Office
19 1400 East Ash Street
20 Globe, AZ 85501

1 jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov
2 *Attorney for Defendant, Sadie Jo Bingham, Gila County Recorder,*
3 *and Gila County Board of Supervisors*

3 Jean Roof
4 Graham County Attorney's Office
5 800 West Main Street
6 Safford, AZ 85546
7 jroof@graham.az.gov
8 *Attorneys for Defendant, Wendy John, Graham County Recorder,*
9 *and Graham County Board of Supervisors*

7 Scott Adams
8 Greenlee County Attorney's Office
9 P.O. Box 1717
10 Clifton, AZ 85533
11 sadams@greenlee.az.gov
12 *Attorney for Defendant, Sharie Milheiro, Greenlee County Recorder,*
13 *and Greenlee County Board of Supervisors*

11 Ryan N. Dooley
12 La Paz County Attorney's Office
13 1320 Kofa Avenue
14 Parker, AZ 85344
15 rdooley@lapazcountyaz.org
16 *Attorney for Defendant, Richard Garcia, La Paz County Recorder,*
17 *and La Paz County Board of Supervisors*

15 Ryan Esplin
16 Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division
17 P.O. Box 7000
18 Kingman, AZ 86402-7000
19 EspliR@mohave.gov
20 *Attorney for Defendant, Kristi Blair, Mohave County Recorder,*
21 *and Mohave County Board of Supervisors*

19 Jason Moore
20 Navajo County Attorney's Office
21 P.O. Box 668
22 Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668
23 jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov
24 *Attorney for Defendant, Michael Sample, Navajo County Recorder,*
25 *and Navajo County Board of Supervisors*

23 Daniel Jurkowitz
24 Ellen Brown
25 Javier Gherna
26 Pima County Attorney's Office
32 N. Stone #2100
Tucson, AZ 85701
Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov
Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov

1 Javier.Ghera@pcao.pima.gov
2 *Attorney for Defendant Gabriella Cázares-Kelley, Pima County Recorder, and Pima
County Board of Supervisors*

3 Craig Cameron
4 Scott Johnson
5 Allen Quist
6 Jim Mitchell
7 Pinal County Attorney's Office
8 30 North Florence Street
9 Florence, AZ 85132
10 craig.cameron@pinal.gov
11 scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov
12 allen.quist@pinal.gov
13 james.mitchell@pinal.gov
14 *Attorneys for Defendant, Dana Lewis, Pinal County Recorder,
and Pinal County Board of Supervisors*

15 Kimberly Hunley
16 Laura Roubicek
17 Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office
18 2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201
19 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090
20 khunley@santacruzcountyaz.gov
21 lroubicek@santacruzcountyaz.gov
22 *Attorneys for Defendant, Suzanne Sainz, Santa Cruz County Recorder,
and Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors*

23 Colleen Connor
24 Thomas Stoxen
25 Yavapai County Attorney's Office
26 255 East Gurley Street, 3rd Floor
Prescott, AZ 86301
27 Colleen.Connor@yavapaiaz.gov
28 Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov
29 *Attorney for Defendant, Michelle M. Burchill, Yavapai County Recorder,
and Yavapai County Board of Supervisors*

30 Bill Kerekes
31 Yuma County Attorney's Office
32 198 South Main Street
33 Yuma, AZ 85364
34 bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov
35 *Attorney for Defendant, Richard Colwell, Yuma County Recorder,
and Yuma County Board of Supervisors*

36 /s/ Diana Hanson

Exhibit 1


Exhibit 1



649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor
 Phoenix, Arizona 85003
 (602) 382-4078
 Kory Langhofer, Ariz. Bar No. 024722
kory@statecraftlaw.com
 Thomas Basile, Ariz. Bar. No. 031150
tom@statecraftlaw.com

Timothy A La Sota, Ariz. Bar No. 020539
TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC
 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305
 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
 (602) 515-2649
tim@timlasota.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants

COPY
 NOV 22 2022
 CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
 S. MYERS
 DEPUTY CLERK



IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

ABRAHAM HAMADEH, an individual; and
 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
 a federal political party committee,

Plaintiffs/Contestants,

v.

KRIS MAYES,

Defendant/Contestee,

and

KATIE HOBBS, in her official capacity as the
 Secretary of State; LARRY NOBLE, in his
 official capacity as the Apache County
 Recorder; APACHE COUNTY BOARD OF
 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
 DAVID W. STEVENS, in his official capacity
 as Cochise County Recorder; COCHISE
 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in
 their official capacity; PATTY HANSEN, in
 her official capacity as the Coconino County

No. CV 2022-015455

**STATEMENT OF ELECTION
 CONTEST**

*(Expedited Election Proceeding
 Pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 16-672, et seq.)*

1 Recorder; COCONINO COUNTY BOARD
2 OF SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
3 SADIE JO BINGHAM, in her official
4 capacity as Gila County Recorder; GILA
5 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in
6 their official capacity; WENDY JOHN, in her
7 official capacity as Graham County Recorder;
8 GRAHAM COUNTY BOARD OF
9 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
10 SHARIE MILHEIRO, in her official capacity
11 as Greenlee County Recorder; GREENLEE
12 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in
13 their official capacity; RICHARD GARCIA,
14 in his capacity as the La Paz County Recorder;
15 LA PAZ COUNTY BOARD OF
16 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
17 STEPHEN RICHER, in his official capacity as
18 the Maricopa County Recorder; MARICOPA
19 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in
20 their official capacity; KRISTI BLAIR, in her
21 official capacity as the Mohave County
22 Recorder; MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF
23 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
24 MICHAEL SAMPLE, in his official capacity
25 as Navajo County Recorder; NAVAJO
26 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in
27 their official capacity; GABRIELLA
28 CAZARES-KELLY, in her official capacity
as the Pima County Recorder; PIMA
COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in
their official capacity; DANA LEWIS, in her
official capacity as the Pinal County Recorder;
PINAL COUNTY BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
SUZANNE SAINZ, in her official capacity as
the Santa Cruz County Recorder; SANTA
CRUZ COUNTY BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
MICHELLE M. BURCHILL, in her official
capacity as the Yavapai County Recorder;
YAVAPAI COUNTY BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;
RICHARD COLWELL, in his official
capacity as the Yuma County Recorder; and

1 YUMA COUNTY BOARD OF
2 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity,
3 Defendants.
4

5 Plaintiffs hereby state and allege as follows:

6 **SUMMARY OF THE CASE**

7 1. The Plaintiffs are not, by this lawsuit, alleging any fraud, manipulation or
8 other intentional wrongdoing that would impugn the outcomes of the November 8, 2022
9 general election.

10 2. The election was, however, afflicted with certain errors and inaccuracies in
11 the management of some polling place operations, and in the processing and tabulation of
12 some ballots. The cumulative effect of these mistakes is material to the race for Arizona
13 Attorney General, where the candidates are separated by just 510 votes out of more than 2.5
14 million ballots cast—a margin of two one-hundredths of one percent (0.02%).

15 3. When, as here, an accretion of erroneous ballot processing or tallying
16 determinations is potentially dispositive of an election for public office, Arizona law
17 permits any elector to initiate a contest proceeding to ensure that inaccuracies or illegalities
18 in the canvassed returns are judicially remedied, and the declared result conforms to the will
19 of the electorate. *See* A.R.S. §§ 16-672, *et seq.*

20 4. The Recorders and Boards of Supervisors of the fifteen counties (collectively,
21 the “County Defendants”) have, in at least five respects, caused the unlawful denial of the
22 franchise to certain qualified electors, erroneously tallied certain ballots, and included for
23 tabulation in the canvass certain illegal votes in connection with the election for the office
24 of Arizona Attorney General. Specifically:

25 a. The Maricopa County Defendants have improperly disqualified
26 provisional ballots and early ballots submitted by individuals who, as a
27 direct and proximate result of poll worker error, were incorrectly
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

designated in electronic pollbooks as having previously voted in the same election;

- b. Upon information and belief, the Maricopa County Defendants have improperly and unconstitutionally deprived individuals whose eligibility could not be confirmed of an opportunity to cast a provisional ballot;
- c. Upon information and belief, the County Defendants have erroneously transposed and improperly tabulated voters' indicated candidate selections when duplicating certain ballots that could not be electronically tabulated; and
- d. Upon information and belief, the County Defendants have erroneously determined and improperly tabulated voters' indicated candidate selections when adjudicating certain ballots that could not be electronically tabulated.
- e. Upon information and belief, the County Defendants improperly accepted for processing and tabulation certain early ballots that were accompanied by affidavits presenting a signature that did not match the signature on file in the putative voter's "registration record." A.R.S. § 16-550(A).

5. Immediate judicial intervention is necessary to secure the accuracy of the results of the November 8, 2022 general election, and to ensure that candidate who received the highest number of lawful votes is declared the next Arizona Attorney General.

JURISDICTION

6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article 6, § 14 of the Arizona Constitution, A.R.S. § 16-672(A)-(B), and Arizona Rule of Special Action Procedure 3.

7. Venue lies in Maricopa County pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-672(B).

PARTIES

8. Plaintiff/Contestant Abraham Hamadeh is a qualified elector of the State of

1 Arizona and of Maricopa County, and resides in Scottsdale, Maricopa County, Arizona.¹
 2 Mr. Hamadeh is the Republican Party’s nominee for the office of Arizona Attorney General
 3 in the November 8, 2022 general election.

4 9. Plaintiff Republican National Committee is a national political party
 5 committee that is responsible for the strategic and day-to-day operation of the Republican
 6 Party at the national level and for promoting the election of Republican candidates for office
 7 in Arizona and across the United States.

8 10. Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes is the Democratic Party’s nominee for the
 9 office of Arizona Attorney General in the November 8, 2022 general election.

10 11. Defendant Katie Hobbs is the Secretary of State of Arizona, and is named in
 11 this action in her official capacity only. The Secretary of State is the public officer charged
 12 by law with conducting the canvass of the returns for statewide offices and with declaring
 13 the persons elected to such offices. *See* A.R.S. §§ 16-648, 16-650.

14 12. The county recorders in each of Apache County, Cochise County, Coconino
 15 County, Gila County, Graham County, Greenlee County, La Paz County, Maricopa County,
 16 Mohave County, Navajo County, Pima County, Pinal County, Santa Cruz County, Yavapai
 17 County, and Yuma County are named in this action in their respective official capacities
 18 only. The County Recorder is the principal elections officer of his or her county and is
 19 responsible for overseeing and directing numerous components of election administration
 20 within the jurisdiction, to include the processing, verification and tabulation of early ballots,
 21 and the appointment and oversight of Ballot Duplication Boards and Electronic
 22 Adjudication Boards. *See* A.R.S. §§ 16-541, -542, -543, -544, -550, -602, -621.

23 13. The boards of supervisors in each of Apache County, Cochise County,
 24 Coconino County, Gila County, Graham County, Greenlee County, La Paz County,
 25 Maricopa County, Mohave County, Navajo County, Pima County, Pinal County, Santa
 26 Cruz County, Yavapai County, and Yuma County are named in this action in their

27 _____
 28 ¹ Mr. Hamadeh’s full residential address location is protected from disclosure pursuant to
 A.R.S. § 16-153.

1 respective official capacities only. Each Board of Supervisors is charged by law with
2 conducting elections within its jurisdictional boundaries, to include appointing polling
3 location election boards, overseeing the operations of polling locations on Election Day,
4 and canvassing the returns of elections in the county. *See* A.R.S. §§ 11-251(3), 16-446, -
5 447(A), -511, -531, -642, -645, -646.

6 14. Upon information and belief, the fifteen Boards of Supervisors will, on or
7 before November 28, 2022, canvass the returns of the November 8, 2022 general election
8 in their respective counties, and deliver the canvass results to the Secretary of State.

9 15. Upon information and belief, the Secretary of State will, on or before
10 December 5, 2022, canvass the returns of the November 8, 2022 general election and
11 declare the Contestee elected to the office of Arizona Attorney General.

12 16. For the reasons set forth herein, the canvass upon which such declaration will
13 be premised is afflicted by election board misconduct, the tallying of unlawful ballots, and
14 the erroneous counting of votes, within the meaning of A.R.S. § 16-672(A)(1), (A)(4), and
15 (A)(5). Upon information and belief, a complete and correct tabulation of all lawful ballots
16 will establish that Contestant Hamadeh received the highest number of votes for the office
17 of Arizona Attorney General in the November 8, 2022 general election.

18 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

19 **Erroneous Vote Counts Due to Pervasive Poll Worker Error in Maricopa County**

20 17. Broadly speaking, the voting process in Arizona is bifurcated; qualified
21 electors may cast either an “early ballot” or an Election Day ballot.

22 18. A qualified elector may cast an “early ballot” at any time during the 27 days
23 preceding the election. Early ballots may be obtained and returned via mail. Alternatively,
24 early ballots may be cast in-person at designated early voting locations, dropped off at
25 official drop box locations during the early voting period, or dropped off at polling locations
26 on Election Day. In-person early voting concludes on the Friday preceding the election,
27 although voters confronting unforeseen exigencies that would prevent them from voting in-
28

1 person on Election Day may cast a ballot at an “emergency” early voting location during
2 the ensuing three-day period. *See* A.R.S. § 16-542.

3 19. As an alternative to early voting, voters may obtain and cast a ballot in-person
4 at a polling location on Election Day.

5 20. Every polling location is staffed by an election board consisting of an
6 inspector, marshal, and two judges. The inspector is the chairman of the election board.
7 *See* A.R.S. §§ 16-531, -534(A).

8 21. Maricopa County utilized a “voting center” model in the November 8, 2022
9 general election. Under this framework, a qualified elector of Maricopa County may appear
10 at any designated voting center site within the county, regardless of whether the voting
11 center is located within the precinct in which the voter resides. Once the voter’s identity is
12 verified and s/he “checks in” by signing the electronic pollbook (e-pollbook), the poll
13 workers print a customized ballot that includes all candidate races and ballot propositions
14 for which the elector is eligible to vote. E-pollbooks reflect in real-time an elector’s status
15 as having voted or not voted, and are electronically synchronized across all polling locations
16 countywide.

17 22. After marking their ballots at the voting center, voters feed them into the
18 tabulation machine, which instantaneously processes and tabulates all properly indicated
19 selections on the ballot.

20 23. Shortly after voting hours commenced at 6:00 a.m. on Election Day, the ballot
21 tabulation devices stationed at approximately 70 voting centers in Maricopa County (*i.e.*,
22 roughly one third of all voting centers in Maricopa County) began to malfunction.
23 Specifically, the tabulators regularly rejected or otherwise failed to process ballots that, on
24 their face, had been properly and sufficiently completed.

25 24. These extensive and significant disruptions to Election Day operations in
26 Maricopa County have been widely reported by national and local news media outlets. *See*,
27 *e.g.*, Caitlin McFall, “Maricopa County, Arizona, Officials Say 20% of Voting Locations
28 Experiencing ‘Hiccups’ with Tabulators,” FOX NEWS, Nov. 8, 2022, *available at*

1 [https://www.foxnews.com/politics/maricopa-county-arizona-officials-say-20-voting-](https://www.foxnews.com/politics/maricopa-county-arizona-officials-say-20-voting-locations-experiencing-hiccups-tabulators)
 2 [locations-experiencing-hiccups-tabulators](https://www.foxnews.com/politics/maricopa-county-arizona-officials-say-20-voting-locations-experiencing-hiccups-tabulators); Sasha Hupka, “Early Glitches with Maricopa
 3 County Election Machines Frustrate Voters,” ARIZ. REPUBLIC, Nov. 9, 2022, *available at*
 4 [https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2022/11/08/arizona-election-](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2022/11/08/arizona-election-problems-maricopa-county-tabulator-issues/8302133001/)
 5 [problems-maricopa-county-tabulator-issues/8302133001/](https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/politics/elections/2022/11/08/arizona-election-problems-maricopa-county-tabulator-issues/8302133001/); Tweet of Brahm Resnick, Nov.
 6 8, 2022 at 1:37 p.m., *available at*
 7 <https://twitter.com/brahmresnik/status/1590081166295859200> (reporting that “about 60
 8 voting centers were hit with tabulator problems”).

9 25. Voters whose ballots could not be read by a malfunctioning tabulator were
 10 confronted with five possible options.

- 11 a. First, the voter could choose simply to wait until the tabulator was
 12 restored to working order—an uncertain contingency that could take
 13 hours.
- 14 b. Second, the voter could deposit the voted ballot into a separate receptacle
 15 (known as “Door 3”) for later tabulation at the Central Counting Center,
 16 although the voters selecting this option would be unable to visually and
 17 personally confirm the tabulation of their ballots.
- 18 c. Third, the voter could request to utilize an accessible voting device
 19 (which is designed primarily for persons with disabilities), upon which
 20 they could complete and cast a ballot electronically. *See* A.R.S. § 16-
 21 447. Upon information and belief, however, most or all voting centers in
 22 Maricopa County maintained only one accessible voting device on site
 23 and many locations lacked supplies necessary for the proper operation of
 24 such devices. Maricopa County did not instruct voters of this option.
- 25 d. Fourth, the voter could spoil his or her initial ballot, “check out” of the
 26 voting center, and present at another voting center, where s/he could
 27 check-in and vote a full regular ballot.

1 e. Fifth, if the voter had previously obtained an early ballot, he or she could
2 “check out” of the voting center, vote that early ballot, execute the
3 accompanying early ballot affidavit, and deposit it at the voting center for
4 later processing and tabulation at the Central Counting Center. *See*
5 A.R.S. §§ 16-547, -548.

6 26. Importantly, however, the fourth and fifth options required poll workers at the
7 initial polling location to “check out” the voter—*i.e.*, indicate in the e-pollbook that the
8 voter left the polling location without casting a ballot. If the voter is not checked out, he or
9 she is recorded in the e-pollbook as having already voted. Consequently, if the voter
10 subsequently presents at a different polling location, she or he will be permitted to cast only
11 a provisional ballot, which Maricopa County will **not** tabulate. *See* A.R.S. § 16-584(D).
12 Similarly, if the voter is not “checked out” and then deposits a completed early ballot, that
13 early ballot will be voided.

14 27. Poll workers at some polling locations were unaware of the process for
15 checking a voter out of the polling location. Upon information and belief, Maricopa County
16 poll workers received no training (or, alternatively, inadequate training) on the process for
17 checking voters out of a polling place.

18 28. Across Maricopa County, numerous qualified electors “checked in” at a
19 voting center but did not either “check out” or cast a ballot.

20 29. Upon information and belief, poll workers failed to properly “check out”
21 numerous Maricopa County voters who chose to spoil their ballots and vote by alternative
22 means. This pervasive and systematic error directly and proximately resulted in three
23 recurring scenarios in which qualified electors were unlawfully and unconstitutionally
24 disenfranchised.

25 a. Upon information and belief, at least 146 voters who were not properly
26 “checked out” at their initial polling location and who later presented at
27 a different polling location were required to vote using provisional
28

1 ballots, which will not be counted because the elector was erroneously
2 recorded in the e-pollbook as having already voted.

3 b. Upon information and belief, at least 273 voters who were not properly
4 “checked out” at their initial polling location and who later deposited a
5 completed early ballot at the same or a different voting center had their
6 early ballots voided and not tabulated because the elector was
7 erroneously recorded in the e-pollbook as having already voted.

8 c. Upon information and belief, a material number of voters who were not
9 properly “checked out” at their initial polling location and who later
10 presented at a different polling location were denied an opportunity to
11 cast a provisional ballot at all, in violation of Arizona law. A.R.S. § 16-
12 584.

13 30. At 8:01 a.m. on Election Day, as the disorder in Maricopa County voting
14 centers was escalating quickly, Bill Gates, the Chairman of the Maricopa County Board of
15 Supervisors, tweeted the following statement:

16 If you’re at a polling place experiencing an issue with a
17 tabulator, you have three options & your vote will be counted
18 in each. 1) stay where you are and wait for tabulator to come
19 online 2) drop your ballot in the secure slot (door 3) on tabulator
20 3) go to a nearby voting center.

21 *See Exhibit A.*

22 31. Chairman Gates’s tweet was incomplete because it omitted two of the
23 solutions available to affected voters (namely, using the accessible voting device, and
24 dropping off a mail-in ballot). It was materially misleading because it stated that the voters
25 could simply “go to a nearby voting center” without specifying that voters must check out
26 of a polling location before traveling to a second location. And it was objectively false in
27 assuring voters that their “vote will be counted in each” contingency when, as described
28 above, Chairman Gates’s instructions foreseeably resulted in the disenfranchisement of a
significant number of qualified electors who followed his instructions.

1 erroneously transposed, thereby resulting in the unlawful mistabulation of a ballot lawfully
2 cast by a qualified elector.

3 **Electronic Adjudication Errors**

4 38. Voters sometime mark their ballots in a manner that precludes an accurate
5 electronic tabulation. Two frequent causes of impeded electronic tabulation are (a) apparent
6 “over-votes,” in which the tabulator detects that a voter may have marked more than the
7 permissible number of selections for a given office or ballot measure, and (b) ballots that
8 the tabulator has identified as either blank or containing unclear markings. When one or
9 both of these circumstances is present, the ballot is referred for electronic adjudication.

10 39. Electronic adjudications are carried out on a secure computer application and
11 are conducted by an Electronic Adjudication Board that is appointed by the County
12 Recorder and consists of one inspector and two judges who are members of different
13 political parties. *See* A.R.S. § 16-621(B)(2).

14 40. The Electronic Adjudication Board examines a digital image of the ballot and
15 assesses voter selections that the tabulator was unable to definitively ascertain. If the voter’s
16 intent is “clear,” the Electronic Adjudication Board ensures that the voter’s intended
17 selections are properly indicated and tabulated. If the voter’s intent cannot be sufficiently
18 verified, the ambiguous selections are not tabulated. *See id.*; Ariz. Sec’y of State,
19 ELECTRONIC ADJUDICATION ADDENDUM TO THE 2019 ELECTIONS PROCEDURES MANUAL
20 (Feb. 2020) at pp. 2–3, available at
21 [https://azsos.gov/sites/default/files/Electronic_Adjudication_Addendum_to_the_2019_Ele](https://azsos.gov/sites/default/files/Electronic_Adjudication_Addendum_to_the_2019_Elections_Procedures_Manual.pdf)
22 [ctions_Procedures_Manual.pdf](https://azsos.gov/sites/default/files/Electronic_Adjudication_Addendum_to_the_2019_Elections_Procedures_Manual.pdf).

23 41. Actual “over-votes” are invalid and may not be counted. *See* A.R.S. § 16-
24 610.

25 42. Upon information and belief, one or more selections in up to 15% of all ballots
26 cast in the November 8, 2022 general election in Maricopa County have been referred to
27 electronic adjudication in connection with at least one candidate contest, judicial retention
28 or ballot proposition appearing on the ballot.

1 43. By statute, the County Recorder must conduct a hand count audit of selected
2 candidate races across a randomly generated sample of (a) 5,000 of early ballots and (b)
3 ballots cast at 2% of voting centers in the county. *See* A.R.S. § 16-602(B), (F). The purpose
4 of the hand count is to verify the accuracy of tallies generated by tabulator devices and
5 determinations by various ballot processing boards.

6 44. The hand count audit following the November 8, 2022 general election has
7 revealed at least one instance in which the Maricopa County Electronic Adjudication Board
8 incorrectly characterized the voter's ostensible intent. Specifically, the Electronic
9 Adjudication Board had tabulated the disputed ballot as a vote for gubernatorial candidate
10 Katie Hobbs. As the hand count audit found, however, the ballot contained both an
11 indicated preference for Hobbs and an accompanying write-in vote for a different candidate,
12 Kari Lake. The Electronic Adjudication Board was required by law to designate the
13 gubernatorial contest as over-voted and not to tabulate a vote for any candidate in that race.
14 *See* Exhibit B p. 32.

15 45. The Attorney General contest was not among the races randomly selected for
16 inclusion in Maricopa County's hand count audit but, upon information and belief, a similar
17 and proportionate rate of erroneous determinations afflict the broader corpus of all ballots
18 that underwent electronic adjudication, thereby resulting in the unlawful mistabulation of
19 certain votes cast in connection with the election for Arizona Attorney General.

20 46. Additionally, an observer of the ballot adjudication process has reported that
21 tabulation and electronic adjudication equipment has been unable to clearly capture the
22 ballot markings made by some voters who did not use the writing implements recommended
23 by elections officials. Although it is likely that such markings can be assessed and correctly
24 tabulated by a manual inspection of the affected ballots, elections officials have not
25 undertaken a manual inspection of such ballots and therefore have failed to correctly
26 tabulate the votes marked on such ballots.

27
28

Unverified Early Ballot Affidavit Signatures

1
2 47. An elector who chooses to cast an early ballot must enclose the ballot in an
3 envelope containing a sworn affidavit, signed by the voter, that certifies the voter’s
4 qualifications and personal signature affixation, and affirms his or her understanding of the
5 criminal prohibition against casting multiple ballots in the same election. *See* A.R.S. § 16-
6 547(A).

7 48. Upon receipt of a returned early ballot envelope, the County Recorder or the
8 Recorder’s designee must “compare the signatures thereon with the signature of the elector
9 on the elector’s registration record.” A.R.S. § 16-550(A). If “the signatures correspond,”
10 the early ballot is processed and tabulated. *Id.* If “the signature is inconsistent with the
11 elector’s signature on the elector’s registration record,” then the early ballot is invalid and
12 cannot be tabulated, unless the putative voter cures the signature discrepancy within five
13 business days of an election or federal office (or the third business day after any other
14 election). *Id.*

15 49. Upon information and belief, a material number of early ballots were
16 accompanied by an affidavit containing a signature that the County Recorder or his/her
17 designee concluded was inconsistent with the signature presented on the voter’s
18 “registration record.” These early ballots were processed and accepted for tabulation,
19 however, because the County Recorder or Recorder’s designee determined that the affidavit
20 signature matched a signature on a *different* document that was *not* the voter’s “registration
21 record”—such as an early ballot affidavit submitted in connection with a previous election
22 or a pollbook signature roster. *See* EPM at p. 68.

23 50. To the extent the EPM purports to authorize the County Recorder to use for
24 the verification of early ballot affidavits signature specimens that are not contained in a
25 voter’s “registration record,” it is unlawful and unenforceable. *See Leach v. Hobbs*, 250
26 Ariz. 572, 576, ¶ 21 (2021) (“[A]n EPM regulation that exceeds the scope of its statutory
27 authorization or contravenes an election statute’s purpose does not have the force of law.”).

1 59. Under Arizona law and Maricopa County’s official policies, poll workers
2 were required to “check out” these voters, which would enable them to obtain and cast a
3 regular ballot at a different polling location elsewhere in Maricopa County or to cast a
4 previously issued early ballot.

5 60. Upon information and belief, various poll workers across Maricopa County
6 refused or failed to “check out” some or all of these voters. As a result of that systematic
7 error, the e-pollbooks inaccurately designated these individuals as having previously voted
8 in this election.

9 61. When subsequently presenting at a different voting center, at least 146 of
10 these voters were incorrectly informed that they had already voted and were permitted to
11 complete and submit only a provisional ballot. Upon information and belief, the Maricopa
12 County Defendants failed to tabulate these valid provisional ballots for inclusion in the
13 canvass.

14 62. In addition, at least 273 voters whom poll workers failed to properly “check
15 out” instead chose to complete and submit a previously issued early ballot. Upon
16 information and belief, because these individuals are inaccurately recorded in the e-
17 pollbook as having previously voted, however, the Maricopa County Defendants failed to
18 tabulate these valid early ballots for inclusion in the canvass.

19 63. These pervasive poll worker errors have denied numerous qualified electors
20 of Maricopa County, including supporters of the Contestant, their right to vote under
21 Arizona law.

22 64. By failing to properly “check out” these voters and restore their ability to vote
23 a regular ballot for tabulation, the Maricopa County Defendants (through their election
24 boards) engaged in “misconduct” within the meaning of A.R.S. § 16-672(A)(1), acted in
25 excess of their legal authority, failed to discharge a non-discretionary duty prescribed by
26 law, and caused an erroneous count of votes in the election for Arizona Attorney General.

27 65. Upon information and belief, votes included on provisional and early ballots
28 that the Maricopa County Defendants improperly failed to tabulate are material to, and

1 potentially dispositive of, the outcome of the election for the office of Arizona Attorney
2 General.

3 66. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs are entitled to an order (including, if necessary, a
4 writ of mandamus) requiring the Maricopa County Defendants to tabulate for inclusion in
5 the canvass all provisional ballots and early ballots submitted by qualified electors who had
6 “checked in” at a voting center but did not cast a regular ballot in the November 8, 2022
7 general election.

8 COUNT II

9 [Maricopa County Only]

10 **Erroneous Count of Votes and Election Board Misconduct: Wrongful Exclusion of 11 Provisional Voters**

12 (A.R.S. §§ 16-584, 12-2021, 16-672(A)(1), (A)(5))

13 67. The Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set
14 forth herein.

15 68. If poll workers are unable to verify a putative voter’s identity or eligibility to
16 vote, but the individual affirms that he or she is eligible to vote, he or she is entitled to
17 receive, complete and submit a provisional ballot. *See* A.R.S. § 16-584.

18 69. Upon information and belief, certain poll workers at various polling locations
19 across Maricopa County refused to furnish provisional ballots to certain voters, on the
20 grounds that they had previously cast a ballot at another polling location earlier in the day.

21 70. Upon information and belief, in many instances the affected voters had, in
22 fact, *not* cast a ballot at another polling location, but rather had voluntarily spoiled their
23 ballot and left the first polling location without obtaining or casting a replacement ballot.

24 71. In any event, any individual whom the e-pollbook has recorded as having
25 already voted is entitled to receive, complete and submit a provisional ballot upon affirming
26 his or her eligibility. *See* A.R.S. § 16-584.

27 72. By denying these individuals a provisional ballot and failing to tabulate any
28 such valid provisional ballots in the canvass, the Maricopa County Defendants (through
their election boards) engaged in “misconduct” within the meaning of A.R.S. § 16-

1 672(A)(1), acted in excess of their legal authority, failed to discharge a non-discretionary
 2 duty prescribed by law, and caused an erroneous count of votes in the election for Arizona
 3 Attorney General.

4 73. Upon information and belief, the Maricopa County Defendants' unlawful
 5 denial of certain electors' right to cast a provisional ballot was material to, and potentially
 6 dispositive of, the outcome of the election for the office of Arizona Attorney General.

7 74. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs are entitled to an order (including, if necessary, a
 8 writ of mandamus) requiring the Maricopa County Defendants to afford to all individuals
 9 who were refused a provisional ballot a reasonable opportunity to cast in the November 8,
 10 2022 general election a provisional ballot, which must be duly processed and included in
 11 the canvass in conformance with applicable law.

12 **COUNT III**
 13 **Erroneous Count of Votes: Inaccurate Ballot Duplications**
 14 **(A.R.S. §§ 16-621, 16-672(A)(5))**

15 75. The Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set
 16 forth herein.

17 76. When a submitted ballot is damaged or defective such that it cannot be read
 18 by an electronic tabulator, the ballot is transmitted to a Ballot Duplication Board that
 19 operates under the auspices of the County Recorder and that transposes the voter's indicated
 20 selections to a duplicate ballot, which in turn is electronically tabulated. *See* A.R.S. § 16-
 21 621(A); EPM at p. 201.

22 77. Upon information and belief, the counties' Ballot Duplication Boards have
 23 incorrectly transcribed a material number of voter selections in the race for Arizona
 24 Attorney General in the November 8, 2022 general election, thereby resulting in the
 25 unlawful mistabulation of a ballot lawfully cast by a qualified elector.

26 78. Upon information and belief, by not correctly duplicating certain ballots, the
 27 County Defendants (through their Ballot Duplication Boards) have caused an erroneous
 28 count of votes for the office of Arizona Attorney General. *See* A.R.S. § 16-672(A)(5).

1 Defendants (through their agents) have caused an erroneous count of votes for the office of
2 Arizona Attorney General. *See* A.R.S. § 16-672(A)(5).

3 86. Upon information and belief, votes included on improperly adjudicated
4 ballots are material to, and potentially dispositive of, the outcome of the election for the
5 office of Arizona Attorney General.

6 87. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs are entitled to an order (including, if necessary, a
7 writ of mandamus) requiring the County Defendants to amend the canvass results for the
8 office of Arizona Attorney General to correct erroneous tabulations associated with the
9 inaccurate adjudication of ballots.

10 **COUNT V**
11 **Illegal Votes: Unverified Early Ballots**
12 **(A.R.S. §§ 16-550(A), 16-672(A)(4))**

13 88. The Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set
14 forth herein.

15 89. An early ballot is lawful and eligible for tabulation if—and only if—the
16 signature on the affidavit accompanying the ballot matches the signature featured on the
17 elector’s “registration record.” A.R.S. § 16-550(A).

18 90. Upon information and belief, a material number of early ballots cast in the
19 November 8, 2022 general election were transmitted in envelopes containing an affidavit
20 signature that the County Recorder or the Recorder’s designee determined did not
21 correspond to the signature in the putative voter’s “registration record.” The County
22 Recorder, however, nevertheless accepted the early ballot for processing and tabulation
23 because the affidavit signature ostensibly matched a signature on an election-related
24 document that was **not** the voter’s “registration record,” such as a prior early ballot affidavit
25 or early ballot request form.


26 91. To the extent the Elections Procedures Manual purports to authorize the
27 validation of early ballot affidavit signatures by reference to a signature specimen that is
28 not found in the voter’s “registration record,” it is contrary to the plain language of A.R.S.
§ 16-550(A), and hence unenforceable.

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

- d. An order requiring the County Defendants to amend the canvass results for the office of Arizona Attorney General to correct erroneous tabulations associated with the inaccurate adjudication of ballots.
- e. An order proportionately reducing the tabulated returns of early ballots to exclude early ballots that were accompanied by an uncured affidavit signature that is inconsistent with the signature on file in the putative voter's registration record.
- f. An order requiring the Secretary of State to amend the canvass of statewide returns to reflect amendments to county-level canvass results made by one or more of the County Defendants.
- g. An injunction or other order pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 16-650 and 16-676(C) prohibiting the Secretary of State from declaring the Contestee elected to the office of Arizona Attorney General or from issuing to Contestee a certificate of election.
- h. An injunction or other order pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-676(C) nullifying and setting aside any certificate of election issued by the Secretary of State to the Contestee for the office of Arizona Attorney General.
- i. An injunction or other order pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 16-650 and 16-676(C) requiring the Secretary of State to declare Contestant Abraham Hamadeh elected to the office of Arizona Attorney General and to issue to Contestant a certificate of election.
- j. Such other relief as the Court deems necessary, equitable, proper, and just.

DATED this 22nd day of November, 2022.

STATECRAFT PLLC

By: 
Kory Langhofer
Thomas Basile
649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Timothy A La Sota, SBN # 020539
TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC
2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants



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

Exhibit A



Tweet



Bill Gates



@billgatesaz



If you're at a polling place experiencing an issue with a tabulator, you have three options & your vote will be counted in each. 1) stay where you are and wait for tabulator to come online 2) drop your ballot in the secure slot (door 3) on tabulator 3) go to a nearby vote center

8:01 AM · Nov 8, 2022 · Twitter for iPhone

443 Retweets

193 Quote Tweets

867 Likes



Exhibit B



MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Hand Count / Audit Report



Election: **GENERAL ELECTION – NOVEMBER 8, 2022**

Synopsis:

Pursuant to A.R.S. §16-602(B), Maricopa County conducted the hand count/early ballot audit for the **November 8, 2022 General Election**. 2% of the vote centers (polling places) were counted as required by statute, which amounted to 5 vote centers (polling places) out of 223 total vote centers (polling places).

The hand count began on **Wednesday, November 9, 2022** at **6:08 p.m.** when the Maricopa County Chairs of the **Democratic, Libertarian, and Republican** Party met to select the vote centers (polling places), races, and early ballot batches to be audited. All ballots were accounted for in the central counting location before the selection process started. The selection order was chosen by lot, and the **Democratic** Party was selected to go first, followed by the **Libertarian** Party and then the **Republican** Party.

With the draw order established, the specific vote centers (polling places) to be audited were selected with the participating County Party Chairs alternating the various selections. Once the allotted vote centers (polling places) were chosen, the percentage of early ballot audit batches to be audited were drawn (1% of early ballots or 5,000, whichever is less). A total of **26 batches** were selected to be audited to reach the required audit total.

Four (4) contested races were chosen as required by law: 1 Federal race, 1 Statewide race, 1 Legislative race and 1 Statewide Ballot Measure were counted. Specifically, the following list display's the contested races that were audited:

- Federal Race – **U.S. Representative**
- Statewide Race – **Governor**
- Statewide Legislative Race – **State Representative**
- Statewide Ballot Measure – **Proposition 129**

The master precinct and race selection lists are attached for review. The physical hand count started at **9:15 a.m.** on **Saturday, November 12, 2022** and was concluded at **6:22 p.m.** on **Saturday, November 12, 2022**. The tabulation method used was the stacking method. The audit was conducted by 24 boards made up of 3 members, of which not more than 2 members were from the same political party. This hand count included votes cast on both the scan and accessible marking devices from the selected vote centers (polling places).

Early Ballot Audit:

The required number of early ballots were audited as per Arizona State Law (1% of early ballots or 5,000, whichever is less). The early ballot audit consisted of 26 batches with at least 1 batch from every machine used for tabulation. Each batch contained approximately 200 early ballots. There was a over **1.3 million** early ballots cast in Maricopa County for the **November 8, 2022 General Election**.

Comments:

Attached are the summary reports which depict the results of the hand count audit for each selected race/measure. The outcome confirmed the accuracy of the tabulation results and was within the variance and designated margin as defined by the Vote Count Verification Committee established by the Secretary of State.

Stephen Richer
Maricopa County Recorder

Reynaldo Valenzuela Jr.
Director of Mail-In Voting & Election Services
Office of Maricopa County Recorder, Stephen Richer

Scott Jarrett
Director of In-Person Voting & Tabulation
Maricopa County Elections Department



MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Hand Count / Audit Report



Election: GENERAL ELECTION – NOVEMBER 8, 2022

Party Selected to: Draw 1ST DEM Draw 2ND LBT Draw 3RD REP

SECTION A SELECTED VOTE CENTERS - LISTED IN ORDER SELECTED – 5 TOTAL

0082	0116	0075	0134	0179	Facility Information: 0075 = Estrella Foothills High School #201 (Fac# 14506) 0082 = Flite Goodyear (Fac# 15705) 0116 = Journey Church (Fac# 15731) 0134 = Maryvale Bridge Methodist Church (Fac# 10074) 0179 = Sevilla Elementary School (Fac# 10432)
------	------	------	------	------	--

SECTION A (Continued) SELECTED EV BATCHES (LISTED IN ORDER SELECTED - 26 TOTAL)

49	51	38	20	10	27	8	34	21	25
44	35	28	2	33	12	47	5	19	11
48	29	4	14	36	13				

SECTION B. NUMBER OF RACES TO COUNT PER CATEGORY

RACE CATEGORY	TICK MARK TALLY	NUMBER OF RACES PER CATEGORY	RECEIVED PRECINCT HAND COUNT MARGIN WORKSHEET
1. President	0	0	
2. Statewide Candidate			
3. Statewide Ballot Measure			
4. Federal Candidate			
5. State Legislative			
Additional Races Needed	0	0	

SECTION C. RACES TO BE COUNTED

	Race To Be Counted	Category of Race
1.	N/A	1. President
2.	GOVERNOR	2. Statewide Candidate
3.	PROPOSITION 129	3. Statewide Ballot Measure
4.	US REPRESENTATIVE	4. Federal Candidate
5.	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	5. State Legislative



MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

Hand Count / Audit Report



Election: **GENERAL ELECTION – NOVEMBER 8, 2022**

SELECTED RACES

OFFICE TYPE	OFFICE NAME	DRAWN
FEDERAL	US SENATOR	
FEDERAL	US REPRESENTATIVE	X
STATEWIDE	GOVERNOR	X
STATE LEGISLATIVE	STATE SENATOR	
STATE LEGISLATIVE	STATE REPRESENTATIVE	X
STATEWIDE	SECRETARY OF STATE	
STATEWIDE	ATTORNEY GENERAL	
STATEWIDE	STATE TREASURER	
STATEWIDE	SUP. OF PUBLIC INSTR.	
STATEWIDE	CORP COMMISSIONER	
PROPOSITION	PROPOSITION 129	X

MARICOPA COUNTY ELECTIONS DEPARTMENT

AGGREGATE - **VOTE CENTER** HAND COUNT REPORT - TOTAL FROM ALL PRECINCTS

Total Vote Centers Counted (2%): **5** Total Ballots Cast: **3,269** Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE			Race: US REPRESENTATIVE
Precinct # - Precinct Name	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
0075 ESTRELLA FOOTHILLS HIGH SCH	10	10	0
0082 FLITE GOODYEAR	125	125	0
0116 JOURNEY CHURCH	13	13	0
0134 MARYVALE BRIDGE METHODIST CH.	309	309	0
0179 SEVILLA ELEMENTARY SCH.	352	352	0
TOTAL	809	809	0
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
0	809	100	0.000%

*Designated Margin for PRECINCT ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE			Race: GOVERNOR
Precinct # - Precinct Name	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
0075 ESTRELLA FOOTHILLS HIGH SCH	1,081	1,081	0
0082 FLITE GOODYEAR	246	246	0
0116 JOURNEY CHURCH	1,139	1,139	0
0134 MARYVALE BRIDGE METHODIST CH.	366	365	1
0179 SEVILLA ELEMENTARY SCH.	423	423	0
TOTAL	3,255	3,254	1
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
1	3,254	100	0.031%

*Designated Margin for PRECINCT ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE			Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE
Precinct # - Precinct Name	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
0075 ESTRELLA FOOTHILLS HIGH SCH	1,168	1,168	0
0082 FLITE GOODYEAR	111	111	0
0116 JOURNEY CHURCH	1,867	1,867	0
0134 MARYVALE BRIDGE METHODIST CH.	28	28	0
0179 SEVILLA ELEMENTARY SCH.	38	38	0
TOTAL	3,212	3,212	0
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
0	3,212	100	0.000%

*Designated Margin for PRECINCT ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE			Race: PROPOSITION 129
Precinct # - Precinct Name	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
0075 ESTRELLA FOOTHILLS HIGH SCH	952	952	0
0082 FLITE GOODYEAR	210	210	0
0116 JOURNEY CHURCH	1,044	1,044	0
0134 MARYVALE BRIDGE METHODIST CH.	319	319	0
0179 SEVILLA ELEMENTARY SCH.	346	346	0
TOTAL	2,871	2,871	0
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
0	2,871	100	0.000%

*Designated Margin for PRECINCT ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

MARICOPA COUNTY ELECTIONS DEPARTMENT

AGGREGATE - EARLY BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - TOTAL FROM ALL BATCHES

Total # of Batches: **26** # of Ballots from ALL Batches: **5,170** Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE			Race: US REPRESENTATIVE
Early Voting Batch #	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
49	190	190	0
51	158	158	0
38	170	170	0
20	145	145	0
10	138	138	0
27	26	26	0
8	168	168	0
34	88	88	0
21	169	169	0
25	78	78	0
44	142	142	0
35	80	80	0
28	192	192	0
2	116	116	0
33	163	163	0
12	157	157	0
47	156	156	0
5	137	137	0
19	108	108	0
11	171	171	0
48	139	139	0
29	121	121	0
4	95	95	0
14	132	132	0
36	101	101	0
13	172	172	0
TOTAL	3,512	3,512	0
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
0	3,512	100	0.000%

*Designated Margin for EARLY VOTING ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

AGGREGATE - EARLY BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - TOTAL FROM ALL BATCHES

Total # of Batches: **26** # of Ballots from ALL Batches: **5,170** Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE			Race: GOVERNOR
Early Voting Batch #	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
49	193	193	0
51	196	196	0
38	197	197	0
20	199	199	0
10	198	198	0
27	198	198	0
8	198	198	0
34	198	198	0
21	195	195	0
25	200	200	0
44	195	195	0
35	195	195	0
28	197	197	0
2	197	197	0
33	200	200	0
12	192	192	0
47	193	193	0
5	196	196	0
19	197	197	0
11	199	199	0
48	194	194	0
29	198	198	0
4	197	198	1
14	195	195	0
36	191	191	0
13	192	192	0
TOTAL	5,100	5,101	1
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
1	5,101	100	0.020%

*Designated Margin for EARLY VOTING ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

MARICOPA COUNTY ELECTIONS DEPARTMENT

AGGREGATE - EARLY BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - TOTAL FROM ALL BATCHES

Total # of Batches: **26** # of Ballots from ALL Batches: **5,170** Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE			Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE
Early Voting Batch #	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
49	196	196	0
51	178	178	0
38	216	216	0
20	220	220	0
10	269	269	0
27	260	260	0
8	180	180	0
34	286	286	0
21	224	224	0
25	227	227	0
44	271	271	0
35	262	262	0
28	137	137	0
2	238	238	0
33	245	245	0
12	223	223	0
47	236	236	0
5	177	177	0
19	283	283	0
11	173	173	0
48	278	278	0
29	192	192	0
4	256	256	0
14	289	289	0
36	248	248	0
13	272	272	0
TOTAL	6,036	6,036	0
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
0			0.000%

*Designated Margin for EARLY VOTING ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

AGGREGATE - EARLY BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - TOTAL FROM ALL BATCHES

Total # of Batches: **26** # of Ballots from ALL Batches: **5,170** Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE			Race: PROPOSITION 129
Early Voting Batch #	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference
49	171	171	0
51	169	169	0
38	176	176	0
20	176	176	0
10	185	185	0
27	181	181	0
8	185	185	0
34	187	187	0
21	183	183	0
25	181	181	0
44	181	181	0
35	195	195	0
28	184	184	0
2	180	180	0
33	185	185	0
12	176	176	0
47	175	175	0
5	175	175	0
19	188	188	0
11	176	176	0
48	176	176	0
29	185	185	0
4	188	188	0
14	183	183	0
36	185	185	0
13	185	185	0
TOTAL	4,711	4,711	0
Aggregated Margin = Absolute Difference ÷ Machine Count X 100			Aggregated Margin
0			0.000%

*Designated Margin for EARLY VOTING ballots, in accordance with A.R.S. § 16-602(K)(4): 1.000%

Comments: If a discrepancy occurred, the reason will be notated and described in each of the detailed Precinct and/or EV Batch reports for the given race or measure.

CUMULATIVE AGGREGATED MARGINS - BY TYPE				
	Hand Count Total	Machine Count	Absolute Difference	Aggregated Margin
VOTE CENTERS	10,147	10,146	1	0.010%
EV'S	19,359	19,360	1	0.005%
Aggregated Margin	$= \text{Absolute Difference} \div \text{Machine Count} \times 100$			

THE "VOTE CENTER SPECIFIC" HAND COUNT REPORTS
AND
"EARLY BALLOT BATCH SPECIFIC" HAND COUNT REPORTS
FOLLOW THIS SUMMARY

THE FOLLOWING WORKSHEETS ARE THE SUPPORTING AND DETAILED COUNTS THAT WERE USED TO DERIVE THE ABOVE SUMMARIES AND DESIGNATED MARGIN PERCENTAGES.

If any variances occur, the specific Vote Center or Early Ballot Hand Count Reports that follow would indicate the reasons for these variances in the "Comments" section for the affected "Race Category". Those variances are noted as part of the designated margin calculation when "**Intent**" or "**Machine Error**" is deemed to have occurred based on the Board's audit.

For those variances noted as "Intent" errors, those reflect votes that were unreadable by the machine but were determined by the boards to be votes for a given candidate or issue based on the board determining the "intent" of the voter. As an example, ballots where the voter circled the candidate's name instead of filling in the oval for the given candidate (as instructed) OR where the voter marked the oval but did not fill in the oval sufficiently enough such as placing an "X" or using a checkmark instead of filling in the oval. The machine is faulted for this as an error despite it not actually being a machine read error. This "intent" occurrence is included as a machine error variance and is part of the designated margin calculation.

For any marks not read by the machine because they were too light or the board upon their review deemed the machine count to be in error, those would be listed as "machine errors" and those totals would be part of the designated margin calculations, if existing. All variances, if any, are noted in the final result reports that follow.

VOTE CENTER HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

Site: **0075 ESTRELLA FOOTHILLS HIGH SCH** Ballots Cast: **1,086** Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	2	2	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	0	0	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	0	0	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	3	3	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	0	0	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	0	0	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	0	0	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	2	2	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	3	3	0	
TOTAL	10	10	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	888	888	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	193	193	0	
TOTAL	1,081	1,081	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	0	0	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	0	0	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	0	0	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	0	0	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	0	0	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	1	1	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	1	1	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	855	855	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	129	129	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	171	171	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	0	0	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	1	1	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	0	0	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	1	1	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	3	3	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	2	2	0	
TOTAL	1,168	1,168	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	669	669	0	
PROP 129 - NO	283	283	0	
TOTAL	952	952	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

VOTE CENTER HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

Site: 0082 FLITE GOODYEAR

Ballots Cast: 249

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: **FEDERAL CANDIDATE**

Race: **US REPRESENTATIVE**

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	2	2	0
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	1	1	0
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	6	6	0
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	4	4	0
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	0	0	0
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	1	1	0
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	1	1	0
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	0	0	0
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	59	59	0
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	51	51	0
TOTAL	125	125	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: **STATEWIDE CANDIDATE**

Race: **GOVERNOR**

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAKE, KARI	159	159	0
HOBBS, KATIE	87	87	0
TOTAL	246	246	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: **STATE LEGISLATIVE**

Race: **STATE REPRESENTATIVE**

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	0	0	0
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	0	0	0
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	0	0	0
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	1	1	0
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	0	0	0
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	1	1	0
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	0	0	0
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	0	0	0
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	1	1	0
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	1	1	0
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	1	1	0
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	1	1	0
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	48	48	0
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	21	21	0
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	19	19	0
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	0	0	0
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	0	0	0
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	1	1	0
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	1	1	0
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	6	6	0
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	6	6	0
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	1	1	0
TOTAL	111	111	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: **STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE**

Race: **PROPOSITION 129**

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
PROP 129 - YES	120	120	0
PROP 129 - NO	90	90	0
TOTAL	210	210	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

VOTE CENTER HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

Site: 0116 JOURNEY CHURCH

Ballots Cast: 1,142

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE

Race: US REPRESENTATIVE

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	4	4	0
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	1	1	0
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	1	1	0
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	2	2	0
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	0	0	0
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	0	0	0
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	2	2	0
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	2	2	0
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0
TOTAL	13	13	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE

Race: GOVERNOR

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAKE, KARI	994	994	0
HOBBS, KATIE	145	145	0
TOTAL	1,139	1,139	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE

Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	4	4	0
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	1	1	0
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	2	2	0
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	2	2	0
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	0	0	0
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	0	0	0
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	1	1	0
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	1	1	0
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	1	1	0
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	2	2	0
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	38	38	0
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	36	36	0
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	3	3	0
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	822	822	0
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	809	809	0
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	128	128	0
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	7	7	0
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	9	9	0
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	0	0	0
TOTAL	1,867	1,867	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE

Race: PROPOSITION 129

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
PROP 129 - YES	878	878	0
PROP 129 - NO	166	166	0
TOTAL	1,044	1,044	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

VOTE CENTER HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

Site: 0134 MARYVALE BRIDGE METHODIST CH. Ballots Cast:

367

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE

Race: US REPRESENTATIVE

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	1	1	0
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	5	5	0
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	128	128	0
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	169	169	0
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	1	1	0
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	0	0	0
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	0	0	0
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	0	0	0
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	2	2	0
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	3	3	0
TOTAL	309	309	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE

Race: GOVERNOR

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAKE, KARI	162	162	0
HOBBS, KATIE	204	203	1
TOTAL	366	365	1

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred: One ballot more per hand count board and deemed as an unread vote for HOBBS

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE

Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	0	0	0
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	0	0	0
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	1	1	0
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	0	0	0
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	0	0	0
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	1	1	0
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	4	4	0
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	5	5	0
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	1	1	0
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	1	1	0
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	3	3	0
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	2	2	0
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	1	1	0
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	1	1	0
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	0	0	0
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	1	1	0
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	1	1	0
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	2	2	0
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	1	1	0
TOTAL	28	28	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE

Race: PROPOSITION 129

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
PROP 129 - YES	163	163	0
PROP 129 - NO	156	156	0
TOTAL	319	319	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

VOTE CENTER HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

Site: 0179 SEVILLA ELEMENTARY SCH

Ballots Cast: 425

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE

Race: US REPRESENTATIVE

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	4	4	0
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	3	3	0
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	161	161	0
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	180	180	0
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	0	0	0
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	0	0	0
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	3	3	0
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	0	0	0
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0
TOTAL	352	352	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE

Race: GOVERNOR

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAKE, KARI	217	217	0
HOBBS, KATIE	206	206	0
TOTAL	423	423	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE

Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	3	3	0
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	2	2	0
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	2	2	0
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	1	1	0
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	1	1	0
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	1	1	0
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	2	2	0
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	2	2	0
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	1	1	0
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	1	1	0
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	2	2	0
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	2	2	0
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	2	2	0
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	2	2	0
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	0	0	0
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	5	5	0
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	5	5	0
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	1	1	0
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	0	0	0
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	1	1	0
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	0	0	0
TOTAL	38	38	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE

Race: PROPOSITION 129

Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference
PROP 129 - YES	185	185	0
PROP 129 - NO	161	161	0
TOTAL	346	346	0

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **49** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	30	30	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	30	30	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	0	0	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	5	5	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	7	7	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	3	3	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	48	48	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	53	53	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	14	14	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	190	190	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	85	85	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	108	108	0	
TOTAL	193	193	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	0	0	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	5	5	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	5	5	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	6	6	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	2	2	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	2	2	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	1	1	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	3	3	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	4	4	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	3	3	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	31	31	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	26	26	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	33	33	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	24	24	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	18	18	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	25	25	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	1	1	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	0	0	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	0	0	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	0	0	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	0	0	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	0	0	0	
TOTAL	196	196	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	98	98	0	
PROP 129 - NO	73	73	0	
TOTAL	171	171	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **51** #per Batch: **198**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	41	41	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	33	33	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	5	5	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	12	12	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	13	13	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	34	34	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	14	14	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	3	3	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	1	1	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	158	158	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	105	105	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	91	91	0	
TOTAL	196	196	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	0	0	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	16	16	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	14	14	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	12	12	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	3	3	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	9	9	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	7	7	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	3	3	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	5	5	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	4	4	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	2	2	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	16	16	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	13	13	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	9	9	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	2	2	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	4	4	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	4	4	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	2	2	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	3	3	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	5	5	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	3	3	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	3	3	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	1	1	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	1	1	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	3	3	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	2	2	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	8	8	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	8	8	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	4	4	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	3	3	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	3	3	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	1	1	0	
TOTAL	178	178	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	104	104	0	
PROP 129 - NO	65	65	0	
TOTAL	169	169	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **38**

#per Batch: **197**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	32	32	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	52	52	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	5	5	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	7	7	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	15	15	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	24	24	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	17	17	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	18	18	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	170	170	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	74	74	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	123	123	0	
TOTAL	197	197	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	2	2	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	2	2	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	1	1	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	16	16	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	10	10	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	23	23	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	6	6	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	4	4	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	3	3	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	1	1	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	1	1	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	5	5	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	5	5	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	4	4	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	4	4	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	3	3	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	3	3	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	5	5	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	4	4	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	6	6	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	2	2	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	6	6	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	6	6	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	9	9	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	8	8	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	14	14	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	12	12	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	4	4	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	4	4	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	7	7	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	6	6	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	6	6	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	4	4	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	1	1	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	1	1	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	0	0	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	12	12	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	1	1	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	1	1	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	2	2	0	
TOTAL	216	216	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	92	92	0	
PROP 129 - NO	84	84	0	
TOTAL	176	176	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# 20 #per Batch: 200

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	26	26	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	31	31	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	5	5	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	26	26	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	11	11	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	16	16	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	17	17	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	12	12	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	145	145	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	82	82	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	117	117	0	
TOTAL	199	199	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	7	7	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	9	9	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	9	9	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	8	8	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	13	13	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	13	13	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	4	4	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	4	4	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	1	1	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	1	1	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	2	2	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	2	2	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	5	5	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	5	5	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	9	9	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	9	9	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	2	2	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	8	8	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	8	8	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	1	1	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	9	9	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	9	9	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	7	7	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	7	7	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	8	8	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	3	3	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	3	3	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	3	3	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	4	4	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	2	2	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	1	1	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	4	4	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	7	7	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	4	4	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	5	5	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	5	5	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	3	3	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	2	2	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	2	2	0	
TOTAL	220	220	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	82	82	0	
PROP 129 - NO	94	94	0	
TOTAL	176	176	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# 10 #per Batch: 199

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	46	46	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	57	57	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	4	4	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	14	14	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	1	1	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	13	13	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	2	2	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	1	1	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	138	138	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	66	66	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	132	132	0	
TOTAL	198	198	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	26	26	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	29	29	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	37	37	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	15	15	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	11	11	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	20	20	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	8	8	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	13	13	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	12	12	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	12	12	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	12	12	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	1	1	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	1	1	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	1	1	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	1	1	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	1	1	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	6	6	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	5	5	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	2	2	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	4	4	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	1	1	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	1	1	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	10	10	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	13	13	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	15	15	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	5	5	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	3	3	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	3	3	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	0	0	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	0	0	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	0	0	0	
TOTAL	269	269	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	88	88	0	
PROP 129 - NO	97	97	0	
TOTAL	185	185	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **27** #per Batch: **198**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	8	8	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	9	9	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	2	2	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	0	0	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	2	2	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	0	0	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	1	1	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	1	1	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	1	1	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	26	26	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	95	95	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	103	103	0	
TOTAL	198	198	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	5	5	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	6	6	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	8	8	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	1	1	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	2	2	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	1	1	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	1	1	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	2	2	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	2	2	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	2	2	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	2	2	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	1	1	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	31	31	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	34	34	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	38	38	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	26	26	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	28	28	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	21	21	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	18	18	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	16	16	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	11	11	0	
TOTAL	260	260	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	91	91	0	
PROP 129 - NO	90	90	0	
TOTAL	181	181	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **8** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	73	73	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	67	67	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	0	0	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	0	0	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	1	1	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	1	1	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	10	10	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	15	15	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	168	168	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	97	97	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	101	101	0	
TOTAL	198	198	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	11	11	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	14	14	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	7	7	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	20	20	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	15	15	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	22	22	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	3	3	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	3	3	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	2	2	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	2	2	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	2	2	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	3	3	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	3	3	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	1	1	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	6	6	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	7	7	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	10	10	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	5	5	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	4	4	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	5	5	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	1	1	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	3	3	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	7	7	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	5	5	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	7	7	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	4	4	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	3	3	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	2	2	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	2	2	0	
TOTAL	180	180	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	91	91	0	
PROP 129 - NO	94	94	0	
TOTAL	185	185	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **34** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	11	11	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	5	5	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	2	2	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	8	8	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	10	10	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	45	45	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	3	3	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	2	2	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	1	1	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	88	88	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	77	77	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	121	121	0	
TOTAL	198	198	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	3	3	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	1	1	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	1	1	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	1	1	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	0	0	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	1	1	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	2	2	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	24	24	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	26	26	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	3	3	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	3	3	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	3	3	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	2	2	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	2	2	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	6	6	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	6	6	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	6	6	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	6	6	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	15	15	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	14	14	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	1	1	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	1	1	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	2	2	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	48	48	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	46	46	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	47	47	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	6	6	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	6	6	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	0	0	0	
TOTAL	286	286	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	97	97	0	
PROP 129 - NO	90	90	0	
TOTAL	187	187	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **21** #per Batch: **198**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	18	18	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	44	44	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	2	2	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	9	9	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	11	11	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	21	21	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	32	32	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	27	27	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	2	2	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	3	3	0	
TOTAL	169	169	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	72	72	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	123	123	0	
TOTAL	195	195	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	6	6	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	11	11	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	16	16	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	28	28	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	3	3	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	7	7	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	8	8	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	3	3	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	3	3	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	1	1	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	1	1	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	1	1	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	1	1	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	3	3	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	1	1	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	4	4	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	4	4	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	8	8	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	8	8	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	17	17	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	17	17	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	7	7	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	8	8	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	15	15	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	8	8	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	9	9	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	4	4	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	3	3	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	1	1	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	1	1	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	0	0	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	0	0	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	0	0	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	4	4	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	3	3	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	6	6	0	
TOTAL	224	224	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	82	82	0	
PROP 129 - NO	101	101	0	
TOTAL	183	183	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **25** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	28	28	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	19	19	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	9	9	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	4	4	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	16	16	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	1	1	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	78	78	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	87	87	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	113	113	0	
TOTAL	200	200	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	2	2	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	3	3	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	3	3	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	4	4	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	7	7	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	7	7	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	2	2	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	2	2	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	4	4	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	9	9	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	9	9	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	2	2	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	2	2	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	4	4	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	15	15	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	13	13	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	29	29	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	25	25	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	27	27	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	14	14	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	12	12	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	11	11	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	15	15	0	
TOTAL	227	227	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	103	103	0	
PROP 129 - NO	78	78	0	
TOTAL	181	181	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **44** #per Batch: **199**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	28	28	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	50	50	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	2	2	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	6	6	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	15	15	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	34	34	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	5	5	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	2	2	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	142	142	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	68	68	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	127	127	0	
TOTAL	195	195	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	2	2	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	11	11	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	12	12	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	21	21	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	1	1	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	0	0	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	16	16	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	13	13	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	20	20	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	23	23	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	8	8	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	8	8	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	14	14	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	14	14	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	1	1	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	2	2	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	2	2	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	7	7	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	7	7	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	14	14	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	14	14	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	3	3	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	3	3	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	1	1	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	2	2	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	1	1	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	1	1	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	7	7	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	8	8	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	9	9	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	2	2	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	1	1	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	5	5	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	5	5	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	6	6	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	6	6	0	
TOTAL	271	271	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	92	92	0	
PROP 129 - NO	89	89	0	
TOTAL	181	181	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **35** #per Batch: **198**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	10	10	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	23	23	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	11	11	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	30	30	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	1	1	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	4	4	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	0	0	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	1	1	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	80	80	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	84	84	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	111	111	0	
TOTAL	195	195	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	8	8	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	11	11	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	19	19	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	3	3	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	5	5	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	11	11	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	5	5	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	4	4	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	3	3	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	3	3	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	4	4	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	5	5	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	12	12	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	18	18	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	22	22	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	1	1	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	2	2	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	44	44	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	42	42	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	19	19	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	5	5	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	7	7	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	6	6	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	0	0	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	0	0	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	0	0	0	
TOTAL	262	262	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	95	95	0	
PROP 129 - NO	100	100	0	
TOTAL	195	195	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **28** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	55	55	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	74	74	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	3	3	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	4	4	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	4	4	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	7	7	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	20	20	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	21	21	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	4	4	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	192	192	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	84	84	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	113	113	0	
TOTAL	197	197	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	3	3	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	12	12	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	11	11	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	21	21	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	3	3	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	6	6	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	7	7	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	1	1	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	1	1	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	5	5	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	5	5	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	1	1	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	1	1	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	7	7	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	7	7	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	10	10	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	3	3	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	2	2	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	2	2	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	4	4	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	4	4	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	4	4	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	4	4	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	7	7	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	0	0	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	0	0	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	0	0	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	0	0	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	0	0	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	0	0	0	
TOTAL	137	137	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	93	93	0	
PROP 129 - NO	91	91	0	
TOTAL	184	184	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# 2 #per Batch: 198

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	23	23	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	36	36	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	4	4	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	6	6	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	11	11	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	17	17	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	2	2	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	9	9	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	2	2	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	6	6	0	
TOTAL	116	116	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	77	77	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	120	120	0	
TOTAL	197	197	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	4	4	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	15	15	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	14	14	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	19	19	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	4	4	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	5	5	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	4	4	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	5	5	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	7	7	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	5	5	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	5	5	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	3	3	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	4	4	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	12	12	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	11	11	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	2	2	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	1	1	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	1	1	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	2	2	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	2	2	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	1	1	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	2	2	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	2	2	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	1	1	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	2	2	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	2	2	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	22	22	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	24	24	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	29	29	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	3	3	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	3	3	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	4	4	0	
TOTAL	238	238	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	82	82	0	
PROP 129 - NO	98	98	0	
TOTAL	180	180	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **33** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	17	17	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	18	18	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	8	8	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	28	28	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	45	45	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	23	23	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	17	17	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	4	4	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	2	2	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	163	163	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	83	83	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	117	117	0	
TOTAL	200	200	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	4	4	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	3	3	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	2	2	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	1	1	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	4	4	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	0	0	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	2	2	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	2	2	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	7	7	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	7	7	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	2	2	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	2	2	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	2	2	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	2	2	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	15	15	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	16	16	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	21	21	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	1	1	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	5	5	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	5	5	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	15	15	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	17	17	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	23	23	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	22	22	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	5	5	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	4	4	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	5	5	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	3	3	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	4	4	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	5	5	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	3	3	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	1	1	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	9	9	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	8	8	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	9	9	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	3	3	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	0	0	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	2	2	0	
TOTAL	245	245	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	79	79	0	
PROP 129 - NO	106	106	0	
TOTAL	185	185	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **12** #per Batch: **195**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	16	16	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	20	20	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	4	4	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	8	8	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	16	16	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	25	25	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	34	34	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	26	26	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	6	6	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	1	1	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	157	157	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	89	89	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	103	103	0	
TOTAL	192	192	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	4	4	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	5	5	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	5	5	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	9	9	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	1	1	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	2	2	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	3	3	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	4	4	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	1	1	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	1	1	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	1	1	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	1	1	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	10	10	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	11	11	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	5	5	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	2	2	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	3	3	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	3	3	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	5	5	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	4	4	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	12	12	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	13	13	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	20	20	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	21	21	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	25	25	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	7	7	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	8	8	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	7	7	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	1	1	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	1	1	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	2	2	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	0	0	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	0	0	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	5	5	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	5	5	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	9	9	0	
TOTAL	223	223	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	105	105	0	
PROP 129 - NO	71	71	0	
TOTAL	176	176	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **47** #per Batch: **198**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	7	7	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	7	7	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	4	4	0	
GALLEGRO, RUBEN - DIST 3	14	14	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	5	5	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	12	12	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	54	54	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	34	34	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	8	8	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	7	7	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	4	4	0	
TOTAL	156	156	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	82	82	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	111	111	0	
TOTAL	193	193	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	1	1	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	2	2	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	1	1	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	0	0	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	4	4	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	8	8	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	7	7	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	1	1	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	1	1	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	3	3	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	4	4	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	2	2	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	5	5	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	6	6	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	2	2	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	11	11	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	9	9	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	2	2	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	2	2	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	7	7	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	39	39	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	38	38	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	35	35	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	8	8	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	6	6	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	8	8	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	2	2	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	1	1	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	1	1	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	1	1	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	1	1	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	10	10	0	
TOTAL	236	236	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	91	91	0	
PROP 129 - NO	84	84	0	
TOTAL	175	175	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# 5 #per Batch: 199

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	27	27	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	35	35	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	6	6	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	5	5	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	8	8	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	26	26	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	24	24	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	4	4	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	137	137	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	85	85	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	111	111	0	
TOTAL	196	196	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	0	0	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	0	0	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	0	0	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	0	0	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	1	1	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	3	3	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	3	3	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	2	2	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	2	2	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	1	1	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	1	1	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	2	2	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	3	3	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	3	3	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	3	3	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	1	1	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	1	1	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	1	1	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	18	18	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	18	18	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	18	18	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	9	9	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	11	11	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	11	11	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	14	14	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	10	10	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	10	10	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	6	6	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	8	8	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	1	1	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	0	0	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	0	0	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	0	0	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	3	3	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	2	2	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	4	4	0	
TOTAL	177	177	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	94	94	0	
PROP 129 - NO	81	81	0	
TOTAL	175	175	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# 19 #per Batch: 200

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	19	19	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	35	35	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	6	6	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	9	9	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	22	22	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	8	8	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	6	6	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	1	1	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	108	108	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	89	89	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	108	108	0	
TOTAL	197	197	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	4	4	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	4	4	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	5	5	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	12	12	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	9	9	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	11	11	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	3	3	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	1	1	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	1	1	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	1	1	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	2	2	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	12	12	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	13	13	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	3	3	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	4	4	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	5	5	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	4	4	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	1	1	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	3	3	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	3	3	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	9	9	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	8	8	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	12	12	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	10	10	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	1	1	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	1	1	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	4	4	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	4	4	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	4	4	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	3	3	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	17	17	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	13	13	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	15	15	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	25	25	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	23	23	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	10	10	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	7	7	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	5	5	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	7	7	0	
TOTAL	283	283	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	97	97	0	
PROP 129 - NO	91	91	0	
TOTAL	188	188	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **11** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	57	57	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	61	61	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	16	16	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	4	4	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	17	17	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	6	6	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	8	8	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	1	1	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	171	171	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	86	86	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	113	113	0	
TOTAL	199	199	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	0	0	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	31	31	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	35	35	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	32	32	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	2	2	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	3	3	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	3	3	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	1	1	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	1	1	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	3	3	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	3	3	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	3	3	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	3	3	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	4	4	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	7	7	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	2	2	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	2	2	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	1	1	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	1	1	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	1	1	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	1	1	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	1	1	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	0	0	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	1	1	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	1	1	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	2	2	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	7	7	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	6	6	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	4	4	0	
TOTAL	173	173	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	88	88	0	
PROP 129 - NO	88	88	0	
TOTAL	176	176	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **48** #per Batch: **197**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	2	2	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	4	4	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	12	12	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	56	56	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	24	24	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	27	27	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	8	8	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	5	5	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	1	1	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	139	139	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	73	73	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	121	121	0	
TOTAL	194	194	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	2	2	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	5	5	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	0	0	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	0	0	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	0	0	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	1	1	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	0	0	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	4	4	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	4	4	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	10	10	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	11	11	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	15	15	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	16	16	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	8	8	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	8	8	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	6	6	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	15	15	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	44	44	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	43	43	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	5	5	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	4	4	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	7	7	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	5	5	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	5	5	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	2	2	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	5	5	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	1	1	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	2	2	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	2	2	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	2	2	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	2	2	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	4	4	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	3	3	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	6	6	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	7	7	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	6	6	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	10	10	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	2	2	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	2	2	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	1	1	0	
TOTAL	278	278	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	81	81	0	
PROP 129 - NO	95	95	0	
TOTAL	176	176	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **29** #per Batch: **198**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	26	26	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	35	35	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	9	9	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	3	3	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	3	3	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	19	19	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	19	19	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	5	5	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	121	121	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	85	85	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	113	113	0	
TOTAL	198	198	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	10	10	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	9	9	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	15	15	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	8	8	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	8	8	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	13	13	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	10	10	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	12	12	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	0	0	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	0	0	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	1	1	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	1	1	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	0	0	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	0	0	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	1	1	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	0	0	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	0	0	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	1	1	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	6	6	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	7	7	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	16	16	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	5	5	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	7	7	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	5	5	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	1	1	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	1	1	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	0	0	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	1	1	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	1	1	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	15	15	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	16	16	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	13	13	0	
TOTAL	192	192	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	87	87	0	
PROP 129 - NO	98	98	0	
TOTAL	185	185	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# 4 #per Batch: 200

Date of Election: November 8, 2022

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	9	9	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	14	14	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	1	1	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	18	18	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	18	18	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	14	14	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	14	14	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	2	2	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	3	3	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	95	95	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	85	85	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	112	113	1	
TOTAL	197	198	1	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred: Intent Discrepancy-Ballot had write-in & candidate name ovals filled-Should have been OV

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	7	7	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	9	9	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	7	7	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	10	10	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	1	1	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	0	0	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	1	1	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	1	1	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	2	2	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	2	2	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	2	2	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	2	2	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	24	24	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	23	23	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	22	22	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	0	0	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	3	3	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	2	2	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	2	2	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	8	8	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	7	7	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	10	10	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	17	17	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	15	15	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	14	14	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	7	7	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	6	6	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	11	11	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	11	11	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	9	9	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	17	17	0	
TOTAL	256	256	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	110	110	0	
PROP 129 - NO	78	78	0	
TOTAL	188	188	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **14** #per Batch: **199**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	13	13	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	23	23	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	6	6	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	48	48	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	8	8	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	33	33	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	1	1	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	0	0	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	0	0	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	132	132	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	65	65	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	130	130	0	
TOTAL	195	195	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	7	7	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	10	10	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	10	10	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	7	7	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	5	5	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	11	11	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	0	0	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	2	2	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	2	2	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	4	4	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	4	4	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	29	29	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	27	27	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	3	3	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	3	3	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	0	0	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	0	0	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	3	3	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	4	4	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	7	7	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	38	38	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	33	33	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	1	1	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	1	1	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	3	3	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	0	0	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	0	0	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	0	0	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	1	1	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	1	1	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	1	1	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	2	2	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	2	2	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	1	1	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	27	27	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	26	26	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	12	12	0	
TOTAL	289	289	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	87	87	0	
PROP 129 - NO	96	96	0	
TOTAL	183	183	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **36** #per Batch: **199**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	21	21	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	26	26	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	4	4	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	5	5	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	9	9	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	6	6	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	16	16	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	11	11	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	2	2	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	1	1	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	0	0	0	
TOTAL	101	101	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	93	93	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	98	98	0	
TOTAL	191	191	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	2	2	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	1	1	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	2	2	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	7	7	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	6	6	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	15	15	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	5	5	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	9	9	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	11	11	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	1	1	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	1	1	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	0	0	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	0	0	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	2	2	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	2	2	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	1	1	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	1	1	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	8	8	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	7	7	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	0	0	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	0	0	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	0	0	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	3	3	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	12	12	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	11	11	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	12	12	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	1	1	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	0	0	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	2	2	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	4	4	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	33	33	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	37	37	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	33	33	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	6	6	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	3	3	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	4	4	0	
TOTAL	248	248	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	101	101	0	
PROP 129 - NO	84	84	0	
TOTAL	185	185	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

EARLY VOTING (EV) BALLOT AUDIT HAND COUNT REPORT - OPTICAL SCAN BALLOTS

EV Batch# **13** #per Batch: **200**

Date of Election: **November 8, 2022**

Race Category: FEDERAL CANDIDATE		Race: US REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
SCHWEIKERT, DAVID - DIST 1	26	26	0	
HODGE, JEVIN D. - DIST 1	41	41	0	
CRANE, ELI - DIST 2	0	0	0	
O'HALLERAN, TOM - DIST 2	0	0	0	
ZINK, JEFF NELSON - DIST 3	1	1	0	
GALLEGO, RUBEN - DIST 3	4	4	0	
COOPER, KELLY - DIST 4	11	11	0	
STANTON, GREG - DIST 4	30	30	0	
BIGGS, ANDY - DIST 5	33	33	0	
RAMOS, JAVIER GARCIA - DIST 5	20	20	0	
SMITH, CLINT WILLIAM - DIST 5	5	5	0	
POZZOLO, LUIS - DIST 7	0	0	0	
GRIJALVA, RAUL - DIST 7	1	1	0	
TOTAL	172	172	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE CANDIDATE		Race: GOVERNOR		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAKE, KARI	85	85	0	
HOBBS, KATIE	107	107	0	
TOTAL	192	192	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATE LEGISLATIVE		Race: STATE REPRESENTATIVE		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
LAMAR, CHRISTIAN - DIST 2	2	2	0	
WILMETH, JUSTIN - DIST 2	3	3	0	
SCHWIEBERT, JUDY - DIST 2	3	3	0	
GRESS, MATT - DIST 4	18	18	0	
SYMS, MARIA - DIST 4	14	14	0	
TERECH, LAURA - DIST 4	22	22	0	
TREADWELL, JENNIFER "JENN" - DIST 5	3	3	0	
LONGDON, JENNIFER - DIST 5	7	7	0	
SHAH, AMISH - DIST 5	9	9	0	
DARROW, CADEN - DIST 8	2	2	0	
LOUGHRIGE, BILL - DIST 8	2	2	0	
HERNANDEZ, MELODY - DIST 8	6	6	0	
SALMAN, ATHENA - DIST 8	6	6	0	
MENDOZA, MARY ANN - DIST 9	2	2	0	
PEARCE, KATHY - DIST 9	1	1	0	
AUSTIN, LORENA - DIST 9	2	2	0	
BLATTMAN, SETH - DIST 9	2	2	0	
HEAP, JUSTIN - DIST 10	2	2	0	
PARKER, BARBARA ROWLEY - DIST 10	2	2	0	
HUNTER, HELEN - DIST 10	1	1	0	
PENA M., TATIANA - DIST 11	0	0	0	
DE LOS SANTOS, OSCAR - DIST 11	0	0	0	
QUINONEZ, MARCELINO - DIST 11	1	1	0	
CHASTON, JAMES "JIM" - DIST 12	8	8	0	
ROE, TERRY - DIST 12	6	6	0	
CONTRERAS, PATRICIA "PATTY" - DIST 12	20	20	0	
TRAVERS, ANASTASIA "STACEY" - DIST 12	18	18	0	
HARRIS, LIZ - DIST 13	34	34	0	
WILLOUGHBY, JULIE - DIST 13	34	34	0	
PAWLIK, JENNIFER - DIST 13	17	17	0	
GRANTHAM, TRAVIS - DIST 14	2	2	0	
HENDRIX, LAURIN - DIST 14	2	2	0	
REESE, BRANDY - DIST 14	3	3	0	
HUDELSON, ROB - DIST 16	0	0	0	
MARTINEZ, TERESA - DIST 16	0	0	0	
SEAMAN, KEITH - DIST 16	0	0	0	
PENA, MICHELE - DIST 23	0	0	0	
LUGO, JESUS JR. - DIST 23	0	0	0	
SANDOVAL, MARIANA - DIST 23	0	0	0	
PAYNE, KEVIN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
TOMA, BEN - DIST 27	0	0	0	
KISSINGER, DON - DIST 27	0	0	0	
LIVINGSTON, DAVID - DIST 28	7	7	0	
PINGERELLI, BEVERLY - DIST 28	6	6	0	
HOLBROOK, STEPHANIE BLAIR - DIST 28	4	4	0	
MONTENEGRO, STEVE - DIST 29	0	0	0	
SMITH, AUSTIN - DIST 29	0	0	0	
PODEYN, SCOTT - DIST 29	1	1	0	
TOTAL	272	272	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

Race Category: STATEWIDE BALLOT MEASURE		Race: PROPOSITION 129		
Candidate's	Hand Count Total	Machine Total	Absolute Difference	
PROP 129 - YES	95	95	0	
PROP 129 - NO	90	90	0	
TOTAL	185	185	0	

Comments for why a discrepancy occurred:

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

VERIFICATION

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-673(B), I, Abraham Hamadeh, hereby verify that the allegations contained in the foregoing Statement of Election Contest are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Executed under penalty of perjury, this 22nd day of November, 2022.



Abraham Hamadeh

Exhibit 2

Exhibit 2

NOV 29 2022 11:20a.m.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-015455

11/29/2022

HONORABLE RANDALL H. WARNER

CLERK OF THE COURT
A. Meza
Deputy

ABRAHAM HAMADEH, et al.

TIMOTHY A LASOTA

v.

KRIS MAYES, et al.

DANIEL C BARR

COCHISE COUNTY BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS
NO ADDRESS ON RECORD
GREENLEE COUNTY BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS
NO ADDRESS ON RECORD
DAVID ANDREW GAONA
KIMBERLY HUNLEY
KORY A LANGHOFER
SAMBO DUL
CELESTE MARIE ROBERTSON
MARK D BYRNES
JEFFERSON R DALTON
CEPHAS A PERKINS
RYAN N DOOLEY
KAREN HARTMAN-TELLEZ
RYAN ESPLIN
JASON MOORE
DANIEL JURKOWITZ
CRAIG C CAMERON
COLLEEN CONNOR
WILLIAM J KEREKES
COURT ADMIN-CIVIL-ARB DESK
DOCKET CV TX
JUDGE WARNER

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-015455

11/29/2022

MINUTE ENTRY

Under advisement are two motions to dismiss this election contest, and Plaintiffs' response. The Court concludes that this matter is premature under the election contest statute, and therefore dismisses it without prejudice to the filing of an election contest after the canvass and declaration of election results have occurred.

Plaintiff Hamadeh is the Republican Party candidate for Attorney General. He and the Republican National Committee filed this election contest on November 22, 2022, challenging the election of the Democratic Party candidate for Attorney General, Defendant Mayes.

Arizona law allows any elector of the State to file an election contest "of any person declared elected to a state office." A.R.S. § 16-672(A). The contest must be filed "within five days after completion of the canvass of the election and declaration of the result thereof by the secretary of state or by the governor." A.R.S. § 16-673(A). Under these statutes there can be no election contest until after the canvass and declaration of results because, until then, no one is "declared elected." It is undisputed that the canvass and declaration of results for the November 2022 election have not occurred.

Plaintiffs argue that the result of the election is now known, and the declaration of results is just a ministerial act. But an election contest is a statutory remedy, and the Court is required to follow the statutes' requirements.

Plaintiffs also argue that this lawsuit is, in addition to an election contest, a special action in the nature of mandamus. Special action relief, however, is available only where there is no adequate legal remedy. Here the election contest statute provides the remedy and process for challenging an election. *See Donaghey v. Attorney General*, 120 Ariz. 93, 95 (1978) (a mandamus action could not be brought when the "gravamen" of the complaint was that the election was improperly conducted).

For these reasons, Plaintiffs' lawsuit is premature. That does not mean Plaintiffs must wait to file suit until after a recount, which everyone agrees will be needed for this race. Rather, A.R.S. § 16-667 contemplates that an election contest might be filed despite a pending recount, and directs that "upon the initiation of such a contest, a proceeding begun under this article shall abate."

Based on this ruling, it is unnecessary to decide the remaining issues raised in the motions to dismiss.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-015455

11/29/2022

IT IS ORDERED granting Defendant Kris Mayes' Motion To Dismiss and Arizona Secretary Of State Katie Hobbs' Motion To Dismiss Statement Of Election Contest. This matter is dismissed without prejudice.



JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

Exhibit 3

Exhibit 3



649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor
 Phoenix, Arizona 85003
 (602) 382-4078
 Kory Langhofer, Ariz. Bar No. 024722
kory@statecraftlaw.com
 Thomas Basile, Ariz. Bar. No. 031150
tom@statecraftlaw.com

Timothy A La Sota, Ariz. Bar No. 020539
TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC
 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305
 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
 (602) 515-2649
tim@timlasota.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

ABRAHAM HAMADEH, *et al.*,
 Plaintiffs/Contestants,

v.

KRIS MAYES,
 Defendant/Contestee,

and

KATIE HOBBS, *et al.*,
 Defendants.

No. CV2022-015455

**RESPONSE TO CONTESTEE'S
 MOTION TO DISMISS**

(Assigned to the Hon. Randall Warner)

1 Fifth, the Statement of Contest pleads alternative claims for mandamus relief, *see*
2 Statement ¶¶ 66, 74, 80, 87, which are not governed by any particular accrual benchmark.

3 Finally, it bears noting that the Contestee’s argument on this score—particularly
4 when juxtaposed against her laches defenses—evokes a transparent “heads I win, tails you
5 lose” ploy. Because finality in elections is paramount to an orderly transfer of power,
6 election contests must be initiated, litigated and concluded with all deliberate speed. *See*
7 *Donaghey*, 120 Ariz. at 95. Plaintiffs who tarry risk discovering that their claims have
8 dissipated in the passage of time. *See Prutch v. Town of Quartzsite*, 231 Ariz. 431, 435, ¶¶
9 12–14 (App. 2013) (weighing laches defense to election contest). Unsurprisingly, the
10 Contestee maintains that no time is ever the right time to ensure meaningful judicial review
11 of the conduct of the 2022 general election. But to compel the Contestants’ claims to
12 languish for weeks pending the undisputedly ministerial and non-discretionary canvassing
13 processes—which already are in progress—would perversely penalize the Contestants for
14 acting promptly, undermine the expedited statutory timetables for bringing and resolving
15 election contests, and jeopardize a timely transfer of power in January.²

16 **B. The Question of the RNC’s Standing Is Superfluous**

17 The Contestee also argues that the Republican National Committee lacks standing to
18 pursue an election contest. *See Mot.* at 5. But when, as here, multiple plaintiffs seek non-
19 monetary relief, courts “consider only whether at least one named plaintiff satisfies the
20 standing requirements.” *Bates v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*, 511 F.3d 974, 985 (9th Cir.
21 2007). Because it is undisputed that Contestant Abraham Hamadeh has standing under
22 A.R.S. § 16-672(A), the question of the Republican National Committee’s standing is
23 superfluous. *See Poder in Action v. City of Phoenix*, 506 F. Supp. 3d 725, 728 (D. Ariz.
24 2020) (“[I]t is unnecessary to address the standing of each plaintiff in a multi-plaintiff case,
25 at least where all plaintiffs seek the same form of relief, so long as one of the plaintiffs has
26

27 ² Under the Contestee’s envisioned timetable, the election contest could not be
28 initiated until at least approximately mid-December, leaving barely two weeks prior to
Inauguration Day for a full adjudication of the contest, inclusive of appeals.

Exhibit 4

Exhibit 4

Veronica Lucero, Esq., avows to the Court as to the allegations filed in the Verified Complaint for a Special Action and Application to Show Cause Why Relief Should not be Granted.

Christina Estes-Werther Esq. argues the matter on the record.

Sambo Bo Dul Esq., states her position on the record.

Veronica Lucero, Esq. makes rebuttal arguments.

Veronica Lucero, Esq. advises the Court that there is a written declaration, that said declaration is in regard to the plaintiff's testimony; that if the Court decides that the space of the room is an issue, then she would like to present it as an offer of proof so that it can be on the record for appeal purposes.

The Court advises Ms. Lucero that she can collect said testimony now or present it as proof.

Justin Pierce, Esq. and Veronica Lucero, Esq. state on the record their position regarding the above-mentioned declaration. The Court states on the record that the Court's position is that if the Court were to determine that he has the right to be present in the room or to be involved in signature verification, the accommodations to allow him to do so would need to be made regardless of the size of the room, location, or whatever would require.

Veronica Lucero, Esq. states that if that as long as the ruling is based purely on the legal arguments and this factual issue isn't going to be a part of the decision, then we don't need to submit evidence.

The Court **FINDS** that it has jurisdiction and that Venue is proper. The plaintiff does have standing in this matter. The Court has reviewed the pleadings, the cited statutes, the cited case law, and the relevant portions of the 2019 Elections Procedure Manual, and listened carefully to the arguments presented in Court today, the Court does not find the legal authority to grant what is being requested by the Plaintiff in this case.

It is the Court's determination, that from listening to the arguments, and from the pleadings and statutes that essentially what is being asked from the Court is the connect the dot analysis, to pick and choose, and to piecemeal various sections of the different statutes, to go outside the plain meaning and plain reading of those statutes, to reach a conclusion that is not expressly provided for in the laws. It would essentially be the creation of a new law or a new procedure. This Court is not going to do that.

While pursuant to ARS 16-552(C), the County Chairperson for each political party may designate a party representative to act as an early ballot challenger, the laws under ARS 16-591 and 16-121.01 are very clear about the bases on which an early ballot challenge can be made and they do not include voter signature review or verification.

In contrary to the Plaintiff's arguments, the Court will not infer ARS 16-121.01(B)(1) or (B)(4), that the registrant is not the person whose name appears on the register or the making of the mark to mean that in order for the party representative to effectively challenge an early mail-in ballot on this basis, the party representative has the right to view the signatures on the affidavit to compare those to known signatures, or that it is the only way that a challenge can be made.

The Court **FINDS** that if it is what the legislature had intended, that is what would have been, or should have been stated. However, even if the Court was willing to make this leap on its own, this conclusion is further unsupported by the other statutes and the Elections Procedure Manual.

To include the very serious issue of voter signature confidentiality; ARS 16-168(F) prohibits disclosure of voter signatures except in limited circumstances, none of which apply to this case.

Again, if the legislature had intended for Party representatives to be able to personally view and compare the signatures on the early ballot affidavit with a known signature, there are many different places in the

statutes that they could have stated as such.

It could have been included in the signature verification mention of Section F, to include signature verification not just for petitions or candidate filings, but also early ballot verification. The Court does not believe that it should be a catch all provision for election purposes; it does not apply.

It could have been stated in ARS 16-550 (A). It clearly states on the receipt of the envelope containing the early ballot and the ballot affidavit, the county recorder or other officer in charge or elections shall compare the signatures. If they had intended for an early ballot challenge to be made, it could've been stated that the party representative is included. And, of course, it could have been expressly listed as a grounds for a challenge in ARS 16-121.01 (B), but it does not.

The Election Procedure Manual also does not support the Plaintiff's arguments in this case. The Court does not believe the communication between the County and the Plaintiff in this matter created a right that doesn't otherwise exist in the law.

Signature verification is a function and responsibility of the County Recorder's office and not the bases for an early ballot challenge.


Therefore , the requested relief is **DENIED**, to include the request for attorney's fees and costs.

Any other motions are moot.

This is a final and appealable order as of today's date.

The Court orders that a Minute Entry Order be prepared for the Court's signature.

There being no further issues pending before the Court at this time, the hearing is adjourned.



**JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
HONORABLE VANESSA CARTWRIGHT**

Copies to:

AK
Veronica Lucero, Esq
vlucero@davillierlawgroup.com
Attorney for Plaintiff

Christina Estes-Werther, Esq.
Christina@PierceColeman.com
Attorney for Defendants

Justin Pierce
Justin@PierceColeman.com
Attorney for Defendants

Sambo Bo Dul
bo@statesuniteddemocracy.org
Attorney for Amicus Curiae Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs