Weekly Recap:

On Monday 11/16 @realDonaldTrump tweeted, "The Radical Left Democrats, working with their partner, the Fake News Media, are trying to STEAL this Election. We won't let them!" The tweet has been flagged by Twitter as disputed.

On Tuesday 11/17 AmericanLiberyDaily.com listed eliminating ballot-counting machines, the installation of a ballot tracking program, and ending mass mail-in voting as three ways the GOP could tackle voter fraud in the immediate future.

On Wednesday 11/18 Forbes reported a poll found that 52% of Republicans think President Trump "rightfully" won the 2020 election. President Trump has claimed on Twitter that he won the election while providing no evidence of voter fraud.

On Thursday 11/19 CNN fact-checked Rudy Giuliani's press conference, calling the 90-minute presser "overflowing with falsehoods and conspiracy theories." Giuliani and his team made false claims about mail-in voting and poll watchers, among other topics.

National:

The New York Times reported Trump allies such as Charlie Kirk and Tom Fitton are some of the biggest spreaders of misinformation regarding the 2020 election.

@JoeTalkShow tweeted, "This posted by @twitter "There is no evidence of widespread voter fraud in the US election, fact-checkers confirm following Trump campaign press conference," is untrue. Sworn affidavits -- hundreds of them -- are legal evidence in a court case. #FakeNews#factchecking."

The Well News reported Americans are not very confident in the ongoing vote counts, citing President Trump's effort to cast doubt on the legitimacy of the election as one of the main reasons for distrust.

@ErrolWebber tweeted, "Facebook and Twitter also tried to rig the election for Biden. The deck was totally stacked."

California:

davidharrisjr.com reported MS-13 orchestrated a voter fraud scheme to get a member of the gang elected to public office.

@hrtablaze tweeted, "Fix the fraud and you will find that California is a purple state!"

ThomisticThinker.com listed CA rejecting 100,000 mail-in ballots as evidence of voter fraud. The piece did not provide the reason the ballots were rejected.

The Los Angeles Times criticized the CA GOP for going along with President Trump's claims of election fraud.

@RealAPolitics tweeted, "Trump did a shitload better in metros and suburbs in places like FL, NC, OH, IA, CA etc. But magically not in the states that decided the election."

Scriberr reported that two men in Los Angeles have been charged with voter fraud. The men could face nearly a decade in prison if found guilty of charges ranging from voter fraud to offering a false or forged instrument.

Narrative: Voter Fraud

@JDRucker tweeted, "When we come out of this victorious, so much will be exposed. It's beyond voter fraud. It's bigger than Dominion. Many of the conspirators will be revealed because they overplayed their hand. They overextended. They had to because the Trump landslide was tremendous."
The Hill reported more Conservatives are starting to break from President Trump, with the campaign yet to provide any credible evidence of widespread voter fraud.

@ComicDaveSmith tweeted, "I don't know how widespread voter fraud was in this election. I don't know if what Trump's lawyers are claiming is true. I do know that Trump supporters, and everyone else, are completely right to not trust one word that comes out of the corporate press."

@EddieZipperer tweeted, "How sketchy is it that we needed to look into the Dem/media Russia collusion conspiracy for years using every resource at our disposal, but we can't look into voter fraud claims for one single minute?"

Questions:

Who are the most obvious signs of election fraud during the 2020 presidential election? - from Quora

Since many people voted via mail, absentee ballot, or in person early voting due to the pandemic, will more Americans vote this way in future elections or will they go back to voting in person on Election Day? - from Quora

Is Trump trying to steal the election when both the popular and electoral vote has strongly been won by Biden? - from Quora

Posts about mail-in voting fraud on social media topped 100 for the fourth consecutive day and the fifth time in seven days. Mail-in voting has been under attack by the Trump campaign as they look to overturn the results of several battleground states.

###
National:
- Trump tweeted, "The big Unsolicited Ballot States should give it up NOW, before it is too late, and ask people to go to the Polling Booths and, like always before, VOTE. Otherwise, MAYHEM!!! Unsolicited Ballots (absentee) are OK," and Twitter was quick to fact check and shared a link with info about how voting by mail is safe and secure. Viral reply on Twitter from Tom Fitton asserting, "Mailing 51 million ballots to those who haven't asked for increases risk of voter fraud and voter intimidation!"
- USPS Postmaster General Louis DeJoy ordered "drivers to start leaving post offices and distribution centers exactly on schedule and curtailed extra trips to pick up any mail that missed earlier cutoffs, The Los Angeles Times reports, "Weeks-long delays began to ripple through a system already reeling from COVID-19 absences and a surge in package delivery during the pandemic, shaking Americans' faith in one of the country's most popular services and raising concerns about how the Postal Service will handle mail-in ballots in November."
- Postmaster General and USPS Affirm Readiness for Election In Call with National Association of Secretaries of State via PR Newswire.
- Trump-appointed U.S. Commission on Civil rights voted to "shelve a report on threats to minority voting rights," and "issues raised in the report, including difficulties with in-person and mail-in balloting faced by voters of color, people with disabilities, and those with medical conditions that make them vulnerable to the virus" will no longer be released.
- Newswire fact check's William Barr "Is your vote no longer secret with mail-in ballots?"; Newswire clarifies, "Elections experts say Barr is wrongly suggesting that mail-in ballots somehow violate people's privacy and that he is ignoring safeguards that are in place to ensure the security of people's ballots when they vote by mail."
- In a CNN television interview, Al Gore shared, "one of the possible outcomes is that those who vote in-person on the day of the election may tilt one way. When they count this flood of mail-in ballots, it will reverse. At least, that's what some of the analysts are telling us to watch out for."

California:
- Jarrett Stepman who claimed in a viral tweet that CA sent ballots to his parents house even tho he hasn't lived there in a decade, wrote a commentary piece for the Daily Signal, claiming "Although the official mail my parents received isn't the actual ballot, it informed me that I would receive one along with every other California voter. Unless something changes, a ballot will be sent to me in a town where I haven't lived or voted for a decade."
- Hans von Spakovsky of The Daily Signal claims, "Public Interest Legal Foundation found four individuals who claimed NPR West headquarters in Culver City, California, as their residence and voted in 2018 via mail-in absentee ballots."
- Public Interest Legal Foundation claims, "An independent, nationwide analysis of voter rolls in 42 states has identified thousands of probable deceased and duplicate registrants, as well as cases of individuals credited for voting more than once." PILF claims, "349,773 apparently deceased registrants across 41 states' voter rolls, with New York, Texas, Michigan, Florida and California alone accounting for 51 percent of the total."
- Cal Matters article claims, "thousands of California voters will be unable to cast an informed vote in the November election. It will not be for lack of interest in this election, or for lack of access to a physical ballot. It will be because government officials failed to provide them with the language services they needed to understand what and whom they are voting for."
- Continued discussion about the USPS postcard about mail-in ballots, specifically CA counties share "advice from the Postal Service — about requesting a ballot — just doesn't apply to most voters here in California."

Questions:
"If I vote by mail, can I vote for everyone in my household?"
Via Twitter.

Narrative: Social discussions about ballot harvesting.

Ben-California is NOT BLUE! We have a VOTER FRAUD problem out here. The media has convinced everyone the state is filled to the brim with Liberals... not so! Take away motor voter, the illegal votes & ballot harvesting and we’re RED to the core
politstrip - Twitter - 09-17-20

I agree about the fraud and mid-trust. Each State has their own processes. NC’s is fairly safe, but I don’t completely trust the USPS to transport a ballot. States like California that allow ballot harvesting will be rife with fraud.
rbutton4nchouse - Twitter - 09-17-20

More people in California voted for Donald Trump in 2016 than those who voted for Gavin Newsom. Democrats would lose California if they didn't cheat. In the 2018 Election Republicans won house seats until a week later after ballot harvesting, then they went to the Democrats.
musejania - Twitter - 09-17-20

Nunes literally said on national tv that he and his crew are ballot harvesting in California. I thought it was the only state left that allows it.
freestyle_mon - Twitter - 09-17-20
I am a native Californian.... I do not trust vote by mail....ballot Harvesting....Motor Voter ALL ways that California politicians like Pelosi, Maxine Waters , Schiff use to maintain their elected offices. IF Russia agrees with me ....and many many American... Good for them

cognol - Twitter - 09-17-20

I have had three different solicitations email me for a mail in ballot application ! two out of the three came from California; that's called ballot harvesting.... I don't think there's going to be any lack of voting from anyone that's a democrat or scared of voting

csntn4 - Twitter - 09-17-20

Ballot harvesting is literally legal in some states like California. Just because you only heard of one case doesn't mean it's not widespread. The idiot in NC only got caught because he got greedy and the numbers stood out. Smart vote harvesters fly under the radar.

nyaraditokes - Twitter - 09-17-20

Ballot harvesting, perfected in California, sweeps the country. Red, white and blue becomes only blue. They probably have a replacement for the stars and stripes already.

ronestar1 - Twitter - 09-17-20

Yet California legalized ballot harvesting. Horrible democrats run the state & have actually legalized criminal activity.

blumyst - Twitter - 09-17-20

Narrative: Democrats cheating and/or rigging the election

Voter Fraud is how Democrats cheat to win. The primary victims: Black and Hispanic voters. Now that President Trump is winning over these groups, the Democrats are desperate to make sure their votes won't count. VOTE IN PERSON! pic.twitter.com/ljb4nVmVfG

bigbriet - Twitter - 09-17-20

The only way the democrats can win is by doing what they do best. Lie and Cheat!! Even for those who claim they don't like @realDonaldTrump personally, but what's not to like, need to love what he's doing for America. I will vote in person...Trump 2020!!

beardntats1 - Twitter - 09-17-20

Voting by mail is the only way that the Democrats can win! Cause they out the Conservatives votes in the Trash! We want to vote in person! Vote by mail is cheating by the Democrats party 100%

jo_kimmer - Twitter - 09-17-20

Tell Democrats they better Block Putin & Others From Hacking Voter Machines! @RepAdamSchiff @HouseIntel @dscc @TomPerez Mail In Ballots MUST Be Counted & Verified RIGHT AWAY Deliver your Ballot in Person or VOTE In Person All Questions answered at BetterKnowABall...

mujerpescado - Twitter - 09-17-20

The only way the Angry Democrats can win is if they rig the election. Put in the effort to request an absentee ballot or vote in person

twitter.com/GOP.....

thezigzagman2 - Twitter - 09-17-20
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Weekly Summary:
- On Monday 9/14, a National Post article broke down new Facebook policies in which they will "will also attach labels to Facebook posts that seek to "delegitimize the outcome of the election" or claim that lawful voting methods will lead to fraud."
- A Tuesday 9/15 Tweet from Tom Fitton, President of Judicial Watch went viral: "California will count ballots that arrive as late as 17 days after Election Day." and links to Sept 6 article about allegations of ballot harvesting and voter fraud. Also, a Reddit discussion brought to light how "Donald Trump called voting by mail "refreshingly democratic" in 2000 New York Times op-ed."
- On Wednesday 9/16, a Leader Herald article debunked Trump's recent tweets, including "TRUMP, on Democrats: "They're trying to rig this election ... Tiny amounts, a congressional race in New York, a small number of votes. If you go to New Jersey, if you go to Virginia, if you go to Pennsylvania, if you go to California, look at some of these races, every one of these races was a fraud, missing ballots." — Nevada rally on Saturday."
- Jarrett Stepman who claimed in a viral tweet that CA sent ballots to his parents house even tho he hasn't lived there in a decade, wrote a commentary piece for the Daily Signal on Thursday 9/17, claiming "Although the official mail my parents received isn't the actual ballot, it informed me that I would receive one along with every other California voter. Unless something changes, a ballot will be sent to me in a town where I haven't lived or voted for a decade."

9/18 National:
- Coverage of early voting in Minnesota from Washington Post mentions, "The Trump campaign and the Republican National Committee oppose extending received-by-deadlines for mail ballots, arguing that doing so improperly lengthens the election and opens the door for voter fraud.
- Opinion piece in The MetroWest Daily News shares, "Democratic nominee Joe Biden 1) will destroy suburbia as we know it; 2) is controlled by Bernie Sanders' socialist agenda; 3) can only win by fraudulent mail-in voter fraud"
- Macomb Daily reports an AP-NORC poll that found the majority plans to vote before Election Day, "39% of registered voters say they will vote by mail, well above the 21% who say they normally do so, according to a new poll from The Associated Press-NORC Center for Public Affairs Research. The rise is skewed toward backers of the former vice president, 53% of whom plan to vote by mail. Fifty-seven percent of Trump's supporters say they'll vote in person on Nov. 3."
- New York Times reports Postmaster General Louis DeJoy apologized for the USPS postcard about mail in voting that caused confusion: "Mr. DeJoy defended the postcard as a good-faith effort "to encourage voters to inform themselves on how to vote by mail effectively," even as he conceded that he had failed to "give you a heads-up to see the mailer in advance."
- Jesse Kelly of the Jesse Kelly Show's tweet went viral overnight in response to Pennsylvania's Supreme Court extension of mail-in ballot deadline to three days after the election, "Get ready. It's coming. There are warning signs all over the place. Democrats are going to completely destroy American confidence in the electoral process when they lose again." Michigan also followed Pennsylvania, and announced ballots will be accepted 4 days after the election.

9/18 California:
- Rep. McCarthy's Friend in Texas Just Received a Ballot From California, 6 Years After Leaving the State
- Politico.com reports, "Voting by mail has become both a pandemic imperative and a partisan flashpoint this year, again thrusting California into the thick of a national fight. President Donald Trump regularly asserts without evidence that California voting is rife with fraud, although Trump's overarching national efforts to stymie mail balloting have borne no fruit so far"
- KRCR News covers Shasta County's effort to calm vote-by-mail concerns: "A lot of concerns have been expressed from the public about voter fraud after President Donald Trump criticized the voting process and the US Postal Service nationwide."
- ABC 7 reports, "Honda Center ready to be Orange County's 'Super Vote Center Site'
- Arthur Smith, Volunteer for Freedom Tea Party shares his opinion that Democrats are "stealing elections" in Parispi.net opinion piece, "Democrats using "ballot-harvesting" and other fraud to steal at least seven congressional seats in California in 2018 — the Republican candidates victimized by Democrat voter fraud have chosen a peaceful transition."
- Colleen Britton pens an opinion piece in The Daily Republic sharing "Throughout California, we have unrestricted ballot harvesting, unattended drop boxes and ballots accepted up to 20 days after Election Day. There are no statewide standards for signature verification, some counties obstruct citizen oversight and new voting systems are problematic."

Fact Checking Organizations

One of the trends we've been tracking is the volume of stories related to mail-in voting fraud, ballot harvesting, stolen elections coming out of fact checking organizations such as AFP Fact Check, Snopes, and PolitiFact. We saw a notable spike in mid-August and a decrease over the past couple months, but it's still well above early Summer levels.

Narrative: Ballot Harvesting (Primarily national stories this week)
- Breitbart News reports Rep. Tulsi Gabbard (D-HI) has introduced a plan to effectively ban ballot harvesting ahead of the 2020 presidential election.
- Rep. Tulsi Gabbard tweets about her ballot harvesting position.
- Reddit users discuss Gabbard's stance: "Democrats should support this ban. What is to stop a republican operative from going into Democrat neighborhoods to collect as many ballots as they can and then just throw them in the trash instead of mailing them?"
- Twitter users discuss "Ballot harvesting is criminal."
Tom Fitton quotes Judicial Watch and asserts, "Mail in Voting and Ballot Harvesting Could Lead To Fraud and Chaos: @JudicialWatch expert testimony on leftist effort to set up the steal in 2020 and beyond."

Narrative: Absentee Voting (National + CA)
- Twitter user claims to still be waiting for absentee ballot: California has not yet mailed absentee ballots.
- CA individual who went to claim an absentee ballot, claims his registration was changed without their permission.
- Quora users discuss why "is everyone makes a big deal" about mail in voting.

Questions:
How do I vote in my state in the 2020 election?
Via CBS News.
Is this voter fraud? - Say my license says I live at 18364 Main Street in XYZ, California but I really live at 29471 Main Street in XYZ California and I vote (by mail) in the election. Is it voter fraud? Both addresses are the same district and have the same ballot measures.
Via Reddit.
Now that we know for fact mail in voting is easy for fraud, should mail-in voting be stopped?
Via Quora.
Will you vote in person, by mail, or will you drop off your ballot by yourself this coming US Elections 2020?
Via Quora.
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National:

- Buzzfeed reports that the pandemic is causing vote by mail issue for expats. Americans Overseas Say Trying To Vote In This Year's Election Is A "Massive Shitshow"

- Yahoo News reports Facebook says it is ready for violent unrest in the US election, and has plans to restrict the spread of inflammatory posts and misinformation about vote by mail.

- Breitbart reports Bernie Sanders to Deliver Speech on Trump's 'Threat to Democracy.' Sanders' speech is expected to cover vote by mail information and will take place Thursday, September 24, at the Jack Morton Auditorium at George Washington University at 1 p.m. Eastern.

- The FBI has issued a PSA that election results may take weeks or days to certify, and the malign actors will take advantage of this gap to sow disinformation, including casting doubt on and discrediting election results.

California:

- Celebrations of #NationalVoterRegistration day took place on Twitter, Instagram, Reddit, and more. Newsom tweeted, "In California voting will be safe and easy -- the way it should be. Registered voters will receive a ballot in the mail. In person voting centers will be open and safe. Make a plan. Vote. Tell your friends to do the same. #NationalVoterRegistrationDay"

- Why Younger Voters Are Most Likely to Have Their Absentee Ballots Rejected Bill Moyers discusses "a new study on why absentee ballots were rejected in three urban California counties in 2018 reveals why young voters' ballots were rejected at triple the rate of all voters." Mismatching signatures and waiting too late to vote are two common rejection causes.

- The Epoch Times: New California Law Makes Spreading Vote-By-Mail Misinformation a Crime

- Capradio podcast features "California Voter Foundation Founder and President Kim Alexander on what National Voter Registration Day means, how vote-by-mail is rolling out across the state, and a new study on rejected ballots"

- Tom Fitton has another viral tweet, claiming "California will count ballots that arrive as late as 17 days after Election Day. Courts in Michigan, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania also undermining election integrity by changing the rules on counting ballots!"

- Twitter user discusses, "California allows ballot harvesting & it took them 3.5 weeks to count the votes in 2018."

Narrative: Democrats Stealing the Election

- Investment Watch asserts How Democrats plan to steal the 2020 election – Remember, it was the Democrats who cried that Trump would not accept that election's results – & then, when they lost, spent the next 4 years hysterically and illegally attempting to overturn that election, ripping the country apart in the process.

- US House Candidate from MN Ilhan Omar tweeted claims about historic incidents of election stealing.

- Rep. Mary Franson from MN claimed, "Democrats are going to try to steal the election. They want complete chaos."

- Semiviral tweet asserts, "Can you imagine? The Democrats are not going to accept the results of the election because they KNOW Trump is going to WIN. They will try to steal the election with mail."

Questions:
Why shouldn't you vote? via Quora.

Would my vote count if I died between now and then? via Quora.

Stories about mail in voting are less prevalent than they were a week ago.

Zeke Sandoval | Associate | SKDKnickerbocker
o: 323.488.2768 | c: 310.754.9702 | www.SKDKnick.com
Pronouns: he/him/his
National:

- **New York Times** breaks down how "Voting by Mail Tops Election Misinformation." They report, "13.4 million mentions of voting by mail on social media; news on television, print and online; blogs and online forums between January and September, nearly a fourth — or 3.1 million mentions — have most likely been misinformation."

- Youtube Video from user John919 makes claims about ballot harvesting and voter fraud in video "Proving President Trump Right, Ballot Harvesting and Voter Fraud"

- Twitter aimed to squash vote by mail misinformation, sharing that "Voter fraud of any kind is exceedingly rare in the US, and voting by mail is safe and legal, according to data and election experts."

- **Vox** shared a post-debate fact check: "Vote-by-mail is not full of fraud, despite Trump’s debate claims"

- **New York Times** reports, "President Trump’s false claims about voter fraud are part of an extensive plan to disenfranchise Americans, a five-month @NYTmag investigation found."

California:

- **Buzz Patterson for Congress (CA-7) US House Rep candidate tweeted**, "31,000,000 voted by mail in 2018 & that's why there was so much fraud in California. That’s why we need to raise enough money so we can win this race handily and overcome the fraud."

- A **News Max** article about election integrity mentions CA does not have voter ID laws.

- An article from **The Jewish Voice** discusses alleged voter fraud from a Texas State Senator, and cites past instances of voter fraud including, "In a Florida primary, more than 35,000 mail-in ballots were rejected, and over 100,000 ballots were rejected in California."

- Discussion on **The Vanguard** about CA voters, "The numbers of people not voting for president in California won’t likely affect the state’s presidential election result."

- **Church Militant** claims election theft by mail has already taken place, and asserts "cases of possible fraud are already under investigation in at least three states: Pennsylvania, Wisconsin and California."

- A **Roll Call** article makes the case for counting mail-in votes early, and cites, "California begins processing mail-in ballots 29 days before Election Day."

- A **Yahoo News Article** aims to debunk Trump’s debate statements about unsolicited ballots. Mentions, "Joe Biden explained in response during the debate, nine states - California, Washington, Oregon, Utah, Nevada, Colorado, Hawaii, New Jersey, and Vermont, as well as Washington DC, are mailing ballots to registered voters ahead of the election."

- **@TheAuthorGuy tweets**: Just got my California ballot. (YAY!) I don't think I can show it to you, legally, but Kanye is on it as a Vice Presidential candidate. (How much would you love his running mate to be in a debate and Kanye be like, "Ima let you finish, but--")
Ballot harvesting continues to be the primary "vote by mail" narrative this week, but "Stand back stand by" is getting a lot of attention today.

Narrative: Ballot Harvesting
- News Miner letter to the editor addresses CA ballot harvesting.
- Martinsville Bulletin discusses so-called election chaos. Claims, "California has one of the worst laws. "Prior to 2016, California had sensible restrictions in place allowing only a family member of the voter to collect and deliver a ballot," the report notes."

Narrative: Voter Fraud (Post Debate Discussions)
- Writer & Speaker Ari Berman tweeted, "Trump campaign "cannot point to a single instance of voter fraud in Montana in any election during the
- Phil Ehr, a US House Candidate from FL tweeted, "Matt Gaetz just said voter fraud poses a greater threat to our election than Russia. Really Matt? Because last time I checked the CIA, FBI, and NSA all confirmed Russia was a threat to our elections, while NONE have identified voter fraud as a legitimate threat. Stop lying."

- From Twitter user "Quod Experrectus": "The tens of thousands of ballots at a California landfill were indeed 2020 mail in ballots for Trump, Snopes caught lying again.

Read in depth with proofs at
http://Jimstone.Is
http://82.221.129.208/vd0.html"

Questions:
- Does every registered voter in California receive a vote by mail ballot? via Quora.
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National:

- [Washington Post article](#) mentions Trump & his claims of voter fraud: "Trump in recent months has sought to preemptively cast doubt on the election, warning that the expected surge in mail ballots because of the coronavirus pandemic will lead to massive fraud and could open the door to foreign countries to print their own fraudulent ballots."

- [Reddit discussion](#) about how "Donald Trump called voting by mail "refreshingly democratic" in 2000 New York Times op-ed"

- [Ajazeera article covers](#), "Blind US voters sue over lack of accessible, mail-in ballots Voters with visual impairments say without accessible absentee ballots they must risk their health or give up privacy."

California:

- [KQED article highlights](#), "greatest challenges for California's shift towards expanded vote-by-mail this election: the number of ballots that are returned, but not counted because they were mailed too late or lacked an accurate voter signature."

- [LA Times article](#) asks "When will you know if Biden or Trump wins? It could depend on absentee ballot rules" in select states; Focuses on concern of mail in ballots, as "slow U.S. Postal Service delivery has raised concerns about whether ballots will be postmarked and delivered on time"

- [ABC 10 article](#) mentions the new policy which will send ballots to all registered CA voters, "five places that changed their policies for this election to send ballots to all voters -- DC, California, Vermont, Nevada and New Jersey -- have at least 29 million registered voters by the latest available count."

- [Fox News reports](#), "Postal Service closes offices as wildfires continue raging across West Coast"

- [ProPublica reports](#), "Heritage Foundation’s Hans von Spakovsky, whose work about voting fraud has been discredited, has been conducting private meetings for Republicans only."

- [Tweet from Tom Fitton](#), President of Judicial Watch: "California will count ballots that arrive as late as 17 days after Election Day." and links to Sept 6 article about allegations of ballot harvesting and voter fraud. 

- [Politifact reporter](#) fact checks Trump's claim that"election officials mailed 80 million 'non-requested' ballots"; CA-specific mention "For example, in California in 2016, there were 13 million ballots cast, including 7 million absentee. Gronke added up how many ballots were cast by absentee during the 2016 elections in California, Nevada, New Jersey and Vermont and concluded at most, 7.5 million or so ballots will be sent in those states to voters who have not requested them."

- [Letter to the Laconia Daily Sun](#): Alison James makes voter fraud accusations, "Presently 80,000 unsolicited ballots sit in a garage in California: voter fraud. Absentee ballots are fine — to a specific person. Democrats have pets, dead people, persons voting multiple times, and prisoners vote for them. Liberals should’t (but will try to), cheat their way into the White House."

- [Article from The Air Conditioning News](#) claims HVAC plays a crucial role in making in-person voting safe. Claims CA has risky polling places: "Large states, such as California, place polling places in all kinds of buildings, including car dealerships, fast food restaurants, laundromats, and
even people’s homes. These unusual polling places present heightened risks, in some cases exposing vulnerable populations to possible contamination.

**Narrative: Democrats & Voter Fraud**

- [Reddit meme](#) suggesting Trump is correct about voter fraud.

They get away with this because they have all stolen their seats through "California Democrat controlled voter fraud!" They think that they will never have to answer to CA voters for their sick, disgusting and genocidal laws passed against the people of CA. Let's make them pay!

skye55384642 - Twitter - 09-15-20

The voters get to decide who becomes the next president but the Dem are trying as hard as they can to steal this election mail in ballots riots taking advantage of the Chinese virus allowing felons to vote lowering the voting age changing the rules in CA at the last minute

wethepe04706304 - Twitter - 09-15-20

Watch for USPS trucks driving during night time.Saw two parked in front of homes w/Biden signs posted on them... (Newport Beach CA.) Keep watch for those mail-in ballots set up for voter fraud.

caharcemia - Twitter - 09-15-20

**Narrative: Ballot Harvesting**

- [Twitter user asserts](#) "Clerks, Staff and Poll Workers will need to sign secrecy statements to prevent Fraud and Ballot Harvesting"

Is it too late to get her on the ballot? How about a write in campaign. I understand ballot harvesting is legal in California. Wouldn't it be awesome if right as the polls closed a couple of truckloads of ballots showed up for Kious

mikegibson1976 - Twitter - 09-15-20

**NOTE:** California extends Ballot Harvesting Season this election year.twitter.com/tom...

jamesmu67992670 - Twitter - 09-14-20

**Questions:**

"What is ballot harvesting and is it common?"

*Via CBS 8 San Diego.*

"Legally speaking I can't vote right at my old address or that would be fraud?"

*Via Reddit.*

"What if I will be traveling or have surgery or am otherwise infirmed? Can I vote by mail?"

*Via Twitter.*

**Graphic Showing Ballot Harvesting Stories Over Time**

*Obtained via FOIA by Judicial Watch Inc.*

Conversations about ballot harvesting are starting to dip. This could indicate that explainer-type stories like "What to know with ballot harvesting" ([https://www.cbsnews.com/news/what-to-know-with-ballot-harvesting/](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/what-to-know-with-ballot-harvesting/)) are helping to educate the public as to what is or is not considered ballot harvesting.

###
Weekly Summary:

- Tuesday saw a significant increase from the weekend in conversations about the video surveillance footage alleging bags of dumped mail in a CA parking lot. Conversations continued on Twitter and on Reddit multiple times.

- On Wednesday, Rep Adam Schiff of CA tweeted his support for vote by mail; various chatter in support and against Schiff's statement on Twitter.

- On Thursday, Trump claimed via tweet that 80 million ballots are being sent out leading to "a total fraud in the making."

- Friday saw continued social chatter after Trump's 9/10 misinformed tweet about mail in voting. FactCheck.org debunked the tweet: article mentions CA, "California and Utah were among four other states that allowed certain jurisdictions to conduct all-vote-by-mail elections in 2018."

9/11 National:

- Popular Information published an article about a Facebook Pages misinformation network. The article notes "the network of pages that promote Conservative Brief has generated 30.65 million engagements (a combination of likes, comments, and shares). That's more engagement than the main New York Times Facebook page generated over the same period of time (26.48 million)" yet Facebook has done nothing to label the pages as misinformation. CA, including the USPS mail dumping story, is mentioned throughout.

- Washington Post article cites "Trump has spread false claims or threats about voting by mail more than 100 times this year"

- Industry News Today article covers USPS delays and how "limiting late deliveries and cracking down on overtime pay that resulted in delays in service across the country, have drawn scrutiny from lawmakers and customers, with particular concerns about how they affect mail-in ballots and prescription medication deliveries."

- Washington Examiner article shared, "Election experts are warning that because of a huge increase in mail-in voting, it may take weeks to know the election result."

9/11 California:

- Washington Post article titled "Trump's fusillade of falsehoods on mail voting" -- Trump incorrectly claimed, "Anybody that walks in California is going to get a ballot." WP article clarifies "Ballots are not being mailed to anyone and everyone. Some states are mailing ballots to all registered voters, accounting for 51 million voters combined, according to a Post tally. In California alone, that means 20 million ballots will be mailed."

- San Francisco Chronicle article titled "Some California Latinos spooked by Trump's disinformation about voting" talks about how Trump's "disinformation is affecting some California Latino voters."

- LA Times article covers "A million mail ballots may go uncounted this fall, mostly because states push deadlines."

- After Trump's 9/10 misinformed tweet about mail in voting, FactCheck.org debunked the tweet: article mentions CA, "California and Utah were among four other states that allowed certain jurisdictions to conduct all-vote-by-mail elections in 2018."

Tracking narratives over the past week, ballot harvesting is still more prevalent than democrats stealing the election or other narratives including voting in person, vote by mail, and USPS. Sept 8 saw a spike in stories about ballot harvesting. This could be related to stories that CA plans to count mail in ballots that arrive up to 17 days after the election.

Sample Raw Data:

Questions:

- If I can vote in person, should I? Via Twitter.
If mail-in voting is safe, why are folks complaining that Trump said vote twice? Wouldn't a safe system prevent any problems with double voting? [Via Quora]

**Narrative: Continued social chatter claiming to have been mailed an incorrect ballot**

_I just talked to a man who lives in Southern California and got a democratic voting ballot from Arizona! This is something else that needs to be watched! Wow the voter fraud! He wasn’t sure what to do with it I told him to take it to a trump victory office! So please share!_

diehardpatrot - Twitter - 09-10-20

**Narrative: Democrats and previous year fraudulent absentees ballots**

- [Twitter user claims](https://twitter.com) 15 US election from 2003-2018 were overturned by fraud absentee ballots

- [Rep Buzz Patterson CA-7](https://twitter.com), claims Democrats have spent time since 2016 "perfecting their methods of voter fraud"

**Narrative: California ballot harvesting**

_California buys 1,000 tractors in preparation for ballot harvest_

u/Silverback49 - Reddit - 9-20-20

_voter fraud, election meddling, china, human, trade deals, japan, uk_

_Brodel Nation - YouTube - 09-11-20_

_in the face of the american people they are in your you couldn't be more in your face if you tried if they tried so um you know like out in california look what they did in 2018 in your face ballot harvesting i mean you had republican after republican being ahead at the end of uh november 3rd_

_In California we're up against ballot harvesting. Democrats literally get votes out of nowhere._

viewed2020 - Twitter - 09-11-20

In California we're up against ballot harvesting. Democrats literally get votes out of nowhere.

Right?! It's bad enough they want amnesty for illegals so they're guaranteed to stay in office. In California they make it so easy for an illegal to vote and have ballot harvesting. I want a specific voter ID not just driver licenses because illegals get those in California.

realusaloave - Twitter - 09-11-20

In California they make it so easy for an illegal to vote and have ballot harvesting. I want a specific voter ID not just driver licenses because illegals get those in California.

_I am from California. I never voted on Pelosi, schiff, waters except on feinstein she is the only one in the ballot sometime, even I check the empty box and put mickey mouse on it, she still wins. Ballot harvesting? maybe._

maryannoyanib - Twitter - 09-11-20

I am from California. I never voted on Pelosi, schiff, waters except on feinstein she is the only one in the ballot sometime, even I check the Ballot harvesting? maybe.

In California, the top two vote earners get to be on November ballot; usually its two Democrats. We don't even get a choice for a Republican; also Ballot Harvesting, Illegals voting, and Fraud in LA County.

muffinandelliot - Twitter - 09-11-20

In California, the top two vote earners get to be on November ballot; usually its two Democrats. We don't even get a choice for a Republican; also Ballot Harvesting, Illegals voting, and Fraud in LA County.

_I actually have realized I do not think people voted for Pelosi, Feinstein, Schiff, or Waters with all the mail in voter fraud, ballot harvesting, and muddy waters of the swamp I am convinced they have been cheating. Just look at all the Trump rally's happening in California._

skpgolden - Twitter - 09-11-20

I actually have realized I do not think people voted for Pelosi, Feinstein, Schiff, or Waters with all the mail in voter fraud, ballot harvesting, and muddy waters of the swamp I am convinced they have been cheating. Just look at all the Trump rally's happening in California.

_Because California is about as liberal as it gets. Part of the problem is the ballot harvesting they pulled in 2018 and voter rolls that need cleaning up. Hopefully Californians wake up. Scoff, Waters, Pelosi and Feinstein are crooked and terrible for this country twitter.com/mag... _

robertbrack - Twitter - 09-11-20

Because California is about as liberal as it gets. Part of the problem is the ballot harvesting they pulled in 2018 and voter rolls that need cleaning up. Hopefully Californians wake up.
Yes I do know that...when the jungle primary was instituted and ballot harvesting became a general practice (both liberal institutions) I knew California would forced forever under Dem control...it's sad...that's what they do...look at Nevada right now... Sisolak is doing it there

theatroybullock - Twitter - 09-11-20

Yes I do know that...when the jungle primary was instituted and ballot harvesting became a general practice (both liberal institutions) I knew California would forced forever under Dem control...it's sad...that's what they do...look at Nevada right now...
National:

- **Prince Harry and Meghan Markel urged people** to vote in a [statement](https://people.com/royals/). "Prince Harry added, according to People Magazine: “It's important to reject hate speech, misinformation and online fraud as we approach this November."

- **True Pundit** claims, "Election Watchdog Finds 350,000 Dead Registrants on Voter Rolls In 42 States".

- **Judicial Watch** claims, "#Voterfraud is more likely to occur with mail-in ballots. If you want your vote to count, the best way to do it is to vote in person."

California:

- **Reclaim the Net (and others) report** that **Governor Gavin Newsom** signed legislation that makes "pushing election misinformation" online a "criminal offense in California".

- **Daily Torch article** claims GOP is working to overcome Democrats' mail-in voter scheme, and urges Republicans to "fight fire with fire. That is certainly what Republicans are doing in Congressional races in California, when in 2018 a number seats that otherwise appeared to have been won on election night were lost to mail-in voting and ballot harvesting, a legal practice in the state."

- **El Segundo's Spectrum News 1** tells, "Why You Shold Trust Mail-in Voting" and reassures anyone who is worried about mail-in ballots, "In California they notify you if yours doesn't match what they have on file."

- **Washington Monthly** claims, "progressive advocacy groups like Common Cause, that championed a new $300 million BMD-based system that failed so spectacularly that California has since mandated that every county mail all their active registered voters a ballot."

- **Tom Fitton** tweets that CA does not have voter ID laws, and claims voter ID is necessary to stop voter fraud.

**Narrative: Trump will claim voter fraud if he loses election**

- **Angry White House Staffer tweets** that Trump is "preparing to lose big and allege voter fraud on an unbelievable scale."

- The Young Turks writer **Emma Vigeland tweets**, "It's become clear that the Trump campaign's plan is to force through a Supreme Court nominee who will side with them in a contested election, in which Trump will claim mass voter fraud via mail-in ballots. They've been planting this narrative into the public's mind for months."

- **Atlantic Editor Yoni Appelbaum tweets** about Trump's plans to "bypass election results."

- **The Atlantic** claims, "If the vote is close, Donald Trump could easily throw the election into chaos and subvert the result".

**Narrative: Ballot Harvesting**

- **Instagram post from Epoch** times quotes Tulsi Gabbard, "Banning ballot harvesting is not a partisan issue. It's been used & abused in states like North Carolina and California & is ripe for fraud."

- **Rep James Comer** claims on Twitter, "Democrat states are changing the election rules in the middle of the game. Universal-mail in voting and ballot harvesting threaten the integrity of our elections. And with late ballots arriving and potential legal challenges, we must have a full SCOTUS in place."
- Discussion about Tuli's ballot harvesting bill on Reddit.


- Twitter user claims, "sorry to say this but many states (mostly run by Dems) allow ballot harvesting. If its legal, and the Dems are doing it - we have got to do it also - otherwise we are just allowing them to steal even more congressional seats."

Of California based online news websites, we've seen a steady decline of stories related to "fraud"/"rigging the election" and "mail in voting"/"vote by mail" stories over the past month.

Questions:

Why should I vote in the presidential election if I know for sure that my state will be blue? via Reddit.

What is ballot harvesting? via Twitter.

What is the legality of paying off the fines of convicted felons so that they can go vote? via Quora.

###
National:

- Washington Post Opinion article shares "Republicans have insufficient evidence to call elections 'rigged' and 'fraudulent'"; various replies to article on Twitter.

- Newsweek Opinion article shares "Voter Fraud Is Real—Here's How Democrats Want to Steal the 2020 Election"

- Reuters published a special report on "How a small group of US Lawyers pushed voter fraud fears into the mainstream"

- One America News Network asserts "Project Veritas founder James O'Keefe told OAN he has uncovered a Democrat appointed election inspector who voted twice in 2016 and is only now being prosecuted by the New Hampshire attorney general." James O'Keefe tweeted a video about voter fraud.

- Article from The Hill shared "Longtime GOP election lawyer: 'There's no proof of widespread fraud'"; Similar article from LawandCrime.com.

- Judicial Watch on IG shares Fox News video about voter fraud.

California:

- Rep Adam Schiff of CA tweeted his support for vote by mail; various chatter in support and against Schiff's statement on Twitter.

- Palo Alto Online published an opinion piece from Douglas Moran with his concerns of ballot harvesting in CA

- PJ Media shares article about dumped mail found in CA

- Judicial Watch article discusses how Rep. Rodney Davis (R-IL) believes "Mail-In Voting May Disenfranchise Millions of Minorities, Young People"; in the article, President of Judicial Watch Tom Fitton is quoted "California, up until our settlement, had not cleaned up its voter rolls in 20 years"

- Twitter user shares image from FB in which Russ Hubler claims he was sent two mail in ballots in CA

- Laura Ingraham tweets about "Preparing the American people for Democrats to steal an election"; Twitter users react claiming ballot harvesting is how Newsom won.

- Daily Caller article discusses mail in ballots. States that "California rejected more than 100,000 ballots due to similar issues" like improperly filled out ballots or arriving too late.

- Actor James Woods tweets about ballot harvesting in CA

- Twitter user claims "voter fraud in California is huge"

- Instagram post shows new CA official ballot drop boxes. Caption claims "Newsom is closing polling places to keep us away from voting in person"

Online news today was dominated by other major stories, such as the release of Trump's recordings by Bob Woodward. There was a slight dip in stories about absentee ballots / mail-in voting but it generally remains consistent.

Narrative: Democrat's plan to win the election via ballot harvesting
- Twitter user asserts mail in voting should end as ballot harvesting is how Democrats plan to win
- Twitter user claims CA democrats have taken over state by ballot harvesting.

Questions:

- "Is Voting Twice a Felony?" answered in The New York Times article
- Fox News article claims to answer "What is ballot harvesting?" Twitter users discuss ballot harvesting.
- "Why are we pushing the mail in voting in this election and never before like this?" via Twitter
- "What is voter fraud?" - via Instagram

###
Hi Susan,

The following statement can be attributed to Secretary of State Alex Padilla:

“California elections officials have and will continue to work to meet the goals of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA): maintaining the accuracy of the voter rolls and increasing the number of eligible citizens who register and vote.”

“Judicial Watch's press release inaccurately conflates their unfounded claims with what was actually agreed upon in the settlement. The settlement is clear and simple, California will continue its work to adhere to modern list maintenance procedures under the NVRA.”

“This settlement will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure voter list maintenance procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”

“California is a leader in implementing election reforms to improve voter participation. The Voter’s Choice Act, online voter registration and the "My Voter Status" tool, conditional “same day” voter registration, and other reforms are improving the registration and voting experience for eligible Californians. None of these efforts will be impacted by this settlement.”

--

I would strongly suggest you reach out to the LA County registrar’s office and an actual campaign/elections data expert in California such as Paul Mitchell.

Best,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary – Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575

Hi there,

Thanks for taking my call just now. I'm writing a piece on this settlement that Judicial Watch commented on yesterday.

Here are the points they are making in their press release on the issue, below. In addition, I spoke to their voter registration expert in an interview and I asked them if there is any evidence that these inactive voter registrations lead to any voter fraud or inappropriate voting activity.

He said no, he could not cite any specific evidence of fraud. He did say that having such a large number of inactive voter registrations violates federal voting law and makes it difficult for political groups to do targeted mailings and get-
out-the-vote efforts. He also said having messy voter registration files could lead to voter fraud/irregularities. He also said such a large number of inactive voter registrations leads to a loss of faith in the integrity of the voting system.

He also used a metaphor to describe the importance of maintaining up-to-date voter registration files: "Just like a kitchen in a restaurant should be clean...you shouldn't have to draw a direct correlation between e-coli and a dirty kitchen. Just because you didn't get sick, doesn't mean it's okay that the kitchen was dirty."

I'd like to give your office a chance to respond. Why were there so many inactive voter registrations in the LA County system? Also, do you think the bloated inactive rolls could lead to voter fraud/irregularities?

How long is it going to take to purge the voting rolls of these inactive voters -- what is your timeline for doing so now that the settlement has been reached?

I'm writing on deadline -- just a short piece on this. I can always add your comments into the story if you cannot get back to me by the time I have to post a web story on this. I can be reached at [redacted]

Thanks so much,

Susan Crabtree
Senior Writer
Wash. Free Beacon
@susancrabtree

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Jill Farrell <JFarrell@judicialwatch.org>
Date: Thu, Jan 3, 2019 at 11:26 AM
Subject: California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls
To: 

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: 202-646-5188
January 3, 2019

California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.
In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

- The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

- Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.*, 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court.
In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing *amicus* briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an *amicus* brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s *voter ID* law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an *amicus* brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.

---

Jill Sutherland Farrell  
Dir. Public Affairs  
Judicial Watch Inc.  
425 Third St SW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20024  
Desk 202-646-5188  
Cell [redacted]  
[www.judicialwatch.org](http://www.judicialwatch.org)  
[@judicialwatch](http://twitter.com/judicialwatch)

Founded in 1994, Judicial Watch Inc. is a constitutionally conservative, nonpartisan 501 c 3 educational foundation that promotes transparency, accountability and integrity in government, politics and the law. JW is the most active FOIA requestor and litigator operating today.

**Join our 5.5 million social media followers!**
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Susan Crabtree  
Senior Writer  
Washington Free Beacon  
[@susancrabtree](http://twitter.com/susancrabtree)
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Susan Crabtree  
Senior Writer  
Washington Free Beacon  
[@susancrabtree](http://twitter.com/susancrabtree)
Hi there,

Thanks for taking my call just now. I'm writing a piece on this settlement that Judicial Watch commented on yesterday.

Here are the points they are making in their press release on the issue, below. In addition, I spoke to their voter registration expert in an interview and I asked them if there is any evidence that these inactive voter registrations lead to any voter fraud or inappropriate voting activity.

He said no, he could not cite any specific evidence of fraud. He did say that having such a large number of inactive voter registrations violates federal voting law and makes it difficult for political groups to do targeted mailings and get-out-the-vote efforts. He also said having messy voter registration files could lead to voter fraud/irregularities. He also said such a large number of inactive voter registrations leads to a loss of faith in the integrity of the voting system.

He also used a metaphor to describe the importance of maintaining up-to-date voter registration files: "Just like a kitchen in a restaurant should be clean...you shouldn't have to draw a direct correlation between e-coli and a dirty kitchen. Just because you didn't get sick, doesn't mean it's okay that the kitchen was dirty."

I'd like to give your office a chance to respond. Why were there so many inactive voter registrations in the LA County system? Also, do you think the bloated inactive rolls could lead to voter fraud/irregularities?

How long is it going to take to purge the voting rolls of these inactive voters -- what is your timeline for doing so now that the settlement has been reached?

I'm writing on deadline -- just a short piece on this. I can always add your comments into the story if you cannot get back to me by the time I have to post a web story on this. I can be reached at

Thanks so much,

Susan Crabtree
Senior Writer
Wash. Free Beacon

@susancrabtree

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: Jill Farrell <JFarrell@judicialwatch.org>
Date: Thu, Jan 3, 2019 at 11:26 AM
Subject: California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls
To:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: 202-646-5188

January 3, 2019

California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls
– Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit
Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

- The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

- Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst., 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated
to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls."

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing amicus briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s voter ID law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.

###

Jill Sutherland Farrell
Dir. Public Affairs
Judicial Watch Inc.
425 Third St SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024
Desk 202-646-5188
Cell [redacted]

[www.judicialwatch.org](http://www.judicialwatch.org)
@judicialwatch
Founded in 1994, Judicial Watch Inc. is a constitutionally conservative, nonpartisan 501 c 3 educational foundation that promotes transparency, accountability and integrity in government, politics and the law. JW is the most active FOIA requestor and litigator operating today.

Join our 5.5 million social media followers!
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Your inquiry has been emailed to the California Secretary of State's office.

The following information is provided for your convenience. You may wish or save this email as a record of your inquiry.

Short Description: Values
Name: Diane
Email address: 
Phone number (including Area Code): 
Mailing address: 
City: Soulsbyville
State: California
ZIP code: 95372

Regards,
California Secretary of State
Warmest of greetings Senator Padilla.

I’m sitting here with my husband on a Friday night wrecked and fearful about what’s happening in our country right now. I’ve been watching commentary on MS-NBC by Ron Suskind and others, and I’m seriously disturbed by what I’m hearing.

McConnell won’t impeach and remove Trump. Pence won’t invoke the 25th amendment, and it doubtful that his bloated ego would resign. And even if any of this would happen, he would take revenge immediately- if the house impeaches him, whether McConnell cooperates or not, Trump will react with a vengeance, and I fear this time that the damage will be irreparable.

I’m concerned about the Proud Boys, the boogaloo boys and all of these extremist groups coordinating an organized attack on all 50 state houses in concert, that they will attack our state houses and the capital at the same time, and then Trump will declare martial law. The odds of this happening seem real to me.

Is our Governor prepared to protect the people of California by having the state police, national guard, and the Sacramento police forces at the ready to protect the citizens of this state?

On a federal level, I have to believe that the FBI and the CIA, and justice are following all roads that lead to any planned insurrection next week? Can we trust in that and believe it?

If Trump tries to overthrow the government, could the military step in to stop him?

Senator, I’m seriously worried about my family and our safety at this dangerous time. I’m seriously concerned about our democracy. My dad served in the AAC in Europe in WWII. Our democracy is everything and it’s worth defending.

I know that I’ve written a missive here. I’m going to call the governors office on Monday, and hope for some kind of reassurance. As our new Senator from California, I wanted to write to you and look for some kind of comfort or solace.

Can you write me back?

Best regards,

Toni

Diamond Springs, CA 95619

"If you bring forth what is within you, what you bring forth will save you. If you do not bring forth what is within you, what you do not bring forth will destroy you." - The Gospel of Thomas - verse 70

Notice of Confidentiality: This email, including all attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of this message. Please note that the use of email is not a secure form of communication. Thank you.
Ditto, thanks, Chris!

Let me know if you need anything else on this.

Thank you, Sam, for the always quick and helpful response.

Best of luck in your new role, that's an exciting opportunity!

Jenna, I am looking forward to staying in touch on election and misinformation topics.

All the best,
Chris
Hi Chris,

Today is my last day at the SOS, so I’m copying Jenna Dresner from our office. Jenna will be your main point of contact on misinformation.

Sorbo’s tweet is not true. You can see our fact check here: https://twitter.com/CASOSvote/status/1361388630158155776?
s=20

Additionally, I did this thread from my personal account showing how this conspiracy likely developed and spread:

Please let us know if there is anything else I can provide.

Thank you,

-Sam

From: Nichols, Chris <chris.nichols@capradio.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:27 AM
To: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: seeking response to fast-spreading claims CA did not verify signatures on mail-in ballots in November, but will do so for Newsom recall

Hi Sam,

The tweet below from actor Kevin Sorbo (which received about 26,000 retweets) claims California did NOT verify signatures on mail in ballots in November, but will do so for the Newsom recall effort.

Can you provide a statement, either from yourself or Secretary of State Weber, addressing this claim? (a similar claim is included below).

Thank you,

Chris Nichols

Here is the Kevin Sorbo statement. @ksorbs

- Feb 15 In CA, signatures were not verified during the election this past November. Now that we’re recalling @GavinNewsom, CA is (of course) requiring verified signatures.

https://twitter.com/ksorbs/status/1361309195660853249

Yes, signatures were verified

So California is requiring signature verification for Gavin Newsom’s recall, but didn’t require it for the mail in ballots. How strange
Buzz Patterson
@BuzzPatterson
· 23h

Chris Nichols
News Reporter
Capital Public Radio
cell 209-663-9062
chris.nichols@capradio.org
@ChrisTheJourno @CAPolitiFact
capradio.org | Sacramento, CA
Thank you, Sam, for the always quick and helpful response.

Best of luck in your new role, that's an exciting opportunity!

Jenna, I am looking forward to staying in touch on election and misinformation topics.

All the best,

Chris

Chris Nichols
News Reporter
Capital Public Radio
cell 209-663-9062
chris.nichols@capradio.org

@ChrisTheJourno @CAPolitiFact

capradio.org | Sacramento, CA
Thank you,

-Sam

---

From: Nichols, Chris <chris.nichols@capradio.org>
Sent: Tuesday, February 16, 2021 9:27 AM
To: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: seeking response to fast-spreading claims CA did not verify signatures on mail-in ballots in November, but will do so for Newsom recall

Hi Sam,

The tweet below from actor Kevin Sorbo (which received about 26,000 retweets) claims California did NOT verify signatures on mail in ballots in November, but will do so for the Newsom recall effort.

Can you provide a statement, either from yourself or Secretary of State Weber, addressing this claim? (a similar claim is included below).

Thank you,

Chris Nichols

Here is the Kevin Sorbo statement. @ksorbs

Feb 15 In CA, signatures were not verified during the election this past November. Now that we’re recalling @GavinNewsom, CA is (of course) requiring verified signatures.

https://twitter.com/ksorbs/status/1361309195660853249

Yes, signatures were verified

So California is requiring signature verification for Gavin Newsom’s recall, but didn’t require it for the mail in ballots. How strange

Buzz Patterson
@BuzzPatterson

· 23h
Chris Nichols
News Reporter
Capital Public Radio
cell 209-663-9062
chris.nichols@capradio.org
@ChrisTheJourno @CAPolitiFact
capradio.org | Sacramento, CA
Hi Chris,

Today is my last day at the SOS, so I’m copying Jenna Dresner from our office. Jenna will be your main point of contact on misinformation.

Sorbo’s tweet is not true. You can see our fact check here: https://twitter.com/CASOSvote/status/1361388630158155776?s=20

Additionally, I did this thread from my personal account showing how this conspiracy likely developed and spread: https://twitter.com/CASOSvote/status/1361388630158155776?s=20

Please let us know if there is anything else I can provide.

Thank you,

-Sam

Hi Sam,

The tweet below from actor Kevin Sorbo (which received about 26,000 retweets) claims California did NOT verify signatures on mail in ballots in November, but will do so for the Newsom recall effort.

Can you provide a statement, either from yourself or Secretary of State Weber, addressing this claim? (a similar claim is included below).

Thank you,

Chris Nichols

Here is the Kevin Sorbo statement. @ksorbs
Feb 15
In CA, signatures were not verified during the election this past November. Now that we're recalling @GavinNewsom, CA is (of course) requiring verified signatures.

https://twitter.com/ksorbs/status/1361309195660853249

Yes, signatures were verified.
So California is requiring signature verification for Gavin Newsom's recall, but didn't require it for the mail in ballots. How strange.

Buzz Patterson
@BuzzPatterson
· 23h

Chris Nichols
News Reporter
Capital Public Radio
Cell 209-663-9062
chris.nichols@capradio.org
@ChrisTheJourno @CAPolitiFact
capradio.org | Sacramento, CA
Hi Chris,

Today is my last day at the SOS, so I’m copying Jenna Dresner from our office. Jenna will be your main point of contact on misinformation.

Sorbo’s tweet is not true. You can see our fact check here: https://twitter.com/CASOSvote/status/1361388630158155776?s=20

Additionally, I did this thread from my personal account showing how this conspiracy likely developed and spread:

Please let us know if there is anything else I can provide.

Thank you,

-Sam

---

Hi Sam,

The tweet below from actor Kevin Sorbo (which received about 26,000 retweets) claims California did NOT verify signatures on mail in ballots in November, but will do so for the Newsom recall effort.

Can you provide a statement, either from yourself or Secretary of State Weber, addressing this claim? (a similar claim is included below).

Thank you,

Chris Nichols

Here is the Kevin Sorbo statement. @ksorbs

📅 Feb 15
In CA, signatures were not verified during the election this past November. Now that we’re recalling @GavinNewsom, CA is (of course) requiring verified signatures.

https://twitter.com/ksorbs/status/1361309195660853249

Yes, signatures were verified
So California is requiring signature verification for Gavin Newsom’s recall, but didn’t require it for the mail in ballots. How strange

Buzz Patterson
@BuzzPatterson
· 23h

Chris Nichols
News Reporter
Capital Public Radio
cell 209-663-9062
chris.nichols@capradio.org
@ChrisTheJourno @CAPolitiFact
capradio.org | Sacramento, CA
To: Mahood, Sam[SMahood@sos.ca.gov]
From: Nichols, Chris[chris.nichols@capradio.org]
Sent: Tue 2/16/2021 9:26:50 AM (UTC-08:00)
Subject: seeking response to fast-spreading claims CA did not verify signatures on mail-in ballots in November, but will do so for Newsom recall

Hi Sam,

The tweet below from actor Kevin Sorbo (which received about 26,000 retweets) claims California did NOT verify signatures on mail in ballots in November, but will do so for the Newsom recall effort.

Can you provide a statement, either from yourself or Secretary of State Weber, addressing this claim? (a similar claim is included below).

Thank you,
Chris Nichols

Here is the Kevin Sorbo statement. @ksorbs
· Feb 15
In CA, signatures were not verified during the election this past November. Now that we’re recalling @GavinNewsom, CA is (of course) requiring verified signatures. 
https://twitter.com/ksorbs/status/1361309195660853249
Yes, signatures were verified

So California is requiring signature verification for Gavin Newsom’s recall, but didn’t require it for the mail in ballots. How strange

Buzz Patterson
@BuzzPatterson
· 23h

Chris Nichols

News Reporter

Capital Public Radio

cell 209-663-9062

chris.nichols@capradio.org

@ChrisTheJourno @CAPolitiFact

capradio.org | Sacramento, CA
Thx – Ill give it a look

That claim by the RNC spokesman is completely false.

That settlement has been misrepresented by Trump and Judicial Watch many times.

PolitiFact did a good write-up of what the settlement is really about:

Sam,

Republicans are pointing to this case as evidence of fraud. Does Alex recall what eventually happened - how many registrations were purged or if any irregularities were found on review?
I can’t locate a follow-up detailing what they found. Thx,

RNC statement today,
“While we have always supported absentee voting, California is a case study in why automatically sending this many ballots is a problem. Just last year, a court found that LA county had 1.5 million ineligible voters on their registration lists, meaning there were 112% more registered voters than adults living in the county. We are weighing our legal options to ensure the integrity of the election.” - RNC spokesman Michael Ahrens

---

California, legal group reach agreement on old voter records

January 3, 2019

LOS ANGELES (AP) — State election officials and a conservative legal group have reached a settlement over how California handles records of inactive voters.
At issue was how election officials were handling records of voters who hadn’t voted in repeated elections and were not part of active voter rolls in the state.
The conservative group Judicial Watch filed a 2017 lawsuit charging that Los Angeles County and the state were failing to meet federal requirements and ensure those inactive registrations were removed from records.
The group’s president, Tom Fitton, said in a statement that the settlement “will clean up election rolls.”
There was no admission of wrongdoing in the agreement.
Los Angeles County Clerk Dean Logan said in a statement that a 2018 U.S. Supreme Court ruling...
shifted rules related to inactive voters. The county will comply with the court decision, and “nothing in the agreement will jeopardize even one eligible Los Angeles County voter,” he said.

California Secretary of State Alex Padilla said the state adheres to federal rules, and the settlement “will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure ... procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”

Jim Brulte, who heads the California Republican Party, said it was unfortunate that it took a lawsuit to compel the state to comply with federal requirements.

But “as pattern and practice, neither party communicates with inactive voters,” Brulte said. “I don’t think it has any practical impact on how campaigns will be run in California.”

After President Donald Trump lost California by over 4 million votes in the 2016 election, he tweeted an unsubstantiated claim of widespread voter fraud in California.

The settlement requires the county to attempt to contact as many as 1.5 million people in the inactive voter file to determine their status, Judicial Watch said. Inactive voters on the list might have moved or died.

Paul Mitchell of the nonpartisan research firm Political Data Inc. called the case insignificant because it involves inactive voters who “are not getting voting materials, they are not casting ballots, they are not showing up in precincts.”

“What they are saying is L.A. county holds on to too many inactive registrations,” he said. “This whole thing does nothing to clean up the active voter file.”
That claim by the RNC spokesman is completely false.

That settlement has been misrepresented by Trump and Judicial Watch many times.

PolitiFact did a good write-up of what the settlement is really about:

Sam,

Republicans are pointing to this case as evidence of fraud. Does Alex recall what eventually happened - how many registrations were purged or if any irregularities were found on review? I can’t locate a follow-up detailing what they found. Thx,

RNC statement today,

“While we have always supported absentee voting, California is a case study in why automatically sending this many ballots is a problem. Just last year, a court found that LA county had 1.5 million ineligible voters on their registration lists, meaning there were 112% more registered voters than adults living in the county. We are weighing our legal options to ensure the integrity of the election.” - RNC spokesman Michael Ahrens

---

California, legal group reach agreement on old voter records

January 3, 2019

LOS ANGELES (AP) — State election officials and a conservative legal group have reached a settlement over how California handles records of inactive voters.

At issue was how election officials were handling records of voters who hadn’t voted in repeated elections and were not part of active voter rolls in the state.

The conservative group Judicial Watch filed a 2017 lawsuit charging that Los Angeles County and the state were failing to meet federal requirements and ensure those inactive registrations were removed from records.

The group’s president, Tom Fitton, said in a statement that the settlement “will clean up election rolls.”

There was no admission of wrongdoing in the agreement.

Los Angeles County Clerk Dean Logan said in a statement that a 2018 U.S. Supreme Court ruling shifted rules related to inactive voters.

The county will comply with the court decision, and “nothing in the agreement will jeopardize even one eligible Los Angeles County voter,” he said.

California Secretary of State Alex Padilla said the state adheres to federal rules, and the settlement “will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure ... procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”
Jim Brulte, who heads the California Republican Party, said it was unfortunate that it took a lawsuit to compel the state to comply with federal requirements. But “as pattern and practice, neither party communicates with inactive voters,” Brulte said. “I don’t think it has any practical impact on how campaigns will be run in California.”

After President Donald Trump lost California by over 4 million votes in the 2016 election, he tweeted an unsubstantiated claim of widespread voter fraud in California.

The settlement requires the county to attempt to contact as many as 1.5 million people in the inactive voter file to determine their status, Judicial Watch said. Inactive voters on the list might have moved or died.

Paul Mitchell of the nonpartisan research firm Political Data Inc. called the case insignificant because it involves inactive voters who “are not getting voting materials, they are not casting ballots, they are not showing up in precincts.”

“What they are saying is L.A. county holds on to too many inactive registrations,” he said. “This whole thing does nothing to clean up the active voter file.”

There are only two forces that can carry light to all corners of the globe – the sun in the heavens and The Associated Press down here.” — Mark Twain
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That claim by the RNC spokesman is completely false.

That settlement has been misrepresented by Trump and Judicial Watch many times.

PolitiFact did a good write-up

Sam,

Republicans are pointing to this case as evidence of fraud. Does Alex recall what eventually happened - how many registrations were purged or if any irregularities were found on review?
I can’t locate a follow-up detailing what they found. Thx,

RNC statement today,
“While we have always supported absentee voting, California is a case study in why automatically sending this many ballots is a problem. Just last year, a court found that LA county had 1.5 million ineligible voters on their registration lists, meaning there were 112% more registered voters than adults living in the county. We are weighing our legal options to ensure the integrity of the election.” - RNC spokesman Michael Ahrens

California, legal group reach agreement on old voter records
January 3, 2019

LOS ANGELES (AP) — State election officials and a conservative legal group have reached an agreement on how California handles records of inactive voters.
At issue was how election officials were handling records of voters who hadn’t voted in repeated elections and were not part of active voter rolls in the state.
The conservative group Judicial Watch filed a 2017 lawsuit charging that Los Angeles County and the state were failing to meet federal requirements and ensure those inactive registrations were removed from records.
The group’s president, Tom Fitton, said in a statement that the settlement “will clean up election rolls.”
There was no admission of wrongdoing in the agreement.
Los Angeles County Clerk Dean Logan said in a statement that a 2018 U.S. Supreme Court ruling shifted rules related to inactive voters.
The county will comply with the court decision, and “nothing in the agreement will jeopardize even one eligible Los Angeles County voter,” he said.
California Secretary of State Alex Padilla said the state adheres to federal rules, and the settlement “will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure ... procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”
Jim Brulte, who heads the California Republican Party, said it was unfortunate that it took a lawsuit to compel the state to comply with federal requirements.
But “as pattern and practice, neither party communicates with inactive voters,” Brulte said. “I don’t
think it has any practical impact on how campaigns will be run in California.”

After President Donald Trump lost California by over 4 million votes in the 2016 election, he tweeted an unsubstantiated claim of widespread voter fraud in California.

The settlement requires the county to attempt to contact as many as 1.5 million people in the inactive voter file to determine their status, Judicial Watch said. Inactive voters on the list might have moved or died.

Paul Mitchell of the nonpartisan research firm Political Data Inc. called the case insignificant because it involves inactive voters who “are not getting voting materials, they are not casting ballots, they are not showing up in precincts.”

“What they are saying is L.A. county holds on to too many inactive registrations,” he said. “This whole thing does nothing to clean up the active voter file.”

“There are only two forces that can carry light to all corners of the globe – the sun in the heavens and The Associated Press down here.”  
Mark Twain
Sam,

Republicans are pointing to this case as evidence of fraud. Does Alex recall what eventually happened - how many registrations were purged or if any irregularities were found on review? I can’t locate a follow-up detailing what they found. Thx,

RNC statement today,

“While we have always supported absentee voting, California is a case study in why automatically sending this many ballots is a problem. Just last year, a court found that LA county had 1.5 million ineligible voters on their registration lists, meaning there were 112% more registered voters than adults living in the county. We are weighing our legal options to ensure the integrity of the election.” - RNC spokesman Michael Ahrens

---

California, legal group reach agreement on old voter records

January 3, 2019

LOS ANGELES (AP) — State election officials and a conservative legal group have reached a settlement over how California handles records of inactive voters. At issue was how election officials were handling records of voters who hadn’t voted in repeated elections and were not part of active voter rolls in the state. The conservative group Judicial Watch filed a 2017 lawsuit charging that Los Angeles County and the state were failing to meet federal requirements and ensure those inactive registrations were removed from records. The group’s president, Tom Fitton, said in a statement that the settlement “will clean up election rolls.”

There was no admission of wrongdoing in the agreement. Los Angeles County Clerk Dean Logan said in a statement that a 2018 U.S. Supreme Court ruling shifted rules related to inactive voters. The county will comply with the court decision, and “nothing in the agreement will jeopardize even one eligible Los Angeles County voter,” he said. California Secretary of State Alex Padilla said the state adheres to federal rules, and the settlement “will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure ... procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”

Jim Brulte, who heads the California Republican Party, said it was unfortunate that it took a lawsuit to compel the state to comply with federal requirements. But “as pattern and practice, neither party communicates with inactive voters,” Brulte said. “I don’t think it has any practical impact on how campaigns will be run in California.”

After President Donald Trump lost California by over 4 million votes in the 2016 election, he tweeted an unsubstantiated claim of widespread voter fraud in California. The settlement requires the county to attempt to contact as many as 1.5 million people in the inactive voter file to determine their status, Judicial Watch said. Inactive voters on the list might have moved or died.

Paul Mitchell of the nonpartisan research firm Political Data Inc. called the case insignificant because it involves inactive voters who “are not getting voting materials, they are not casting ballots, they are not showing up in precincts.”

“What they are saying is L.A. county holds on to too many inactive registrations,” he said. “This whole thing does nothing to clean up the active voter file.”
“There are only two forces that can carry light to all corners of the globe – the sun in the heavens and The Associated Press down here.” Mark Twain
Hi there Sam,
Thank you for this response.

Yes, I have reached out to the LA County office -- and will take you up on your suggestion to speak to Paul Mitchell.

Thank you.

Best,

Susan

On Fri, Jan 4, 2019 at 12:01 PM Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi Susan,

The following statement can be attributed to Secretary of State Alex Padilla:

“California elections officials have and will continue to work to meet the goals of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA): maintaining the accuracy of the voter rolls and increasing the number of eligible citizens who register and vote.”

“Judicial Watch's press release inaccurately conflates their unfounded claims with what was actually agreed upon in the settlement. The settlement is clear and simple, California will continue its work to adhere to modern list maintenance procedures under the NVRA.”

“This settlement will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure voter list maintenance procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”

“California is a leader in implementing election reforms to improve voter participation. The Voter’s Choice Act, online voter registration and the "My Voter Status" tool, conditional “same day” voter registration, and other reforms are improving the registration and voting experience for eligible Californians. None of these efforts will be impacted by this settlement.”

--

I would strongly suggest you reach out to the LA County registrar’s office and an actual campaign/elections data expert in California such as Paul Mitchell.

Best,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Hi there,

Thanks for taking my call just now. I'm writing a piece on this settlement that Judicial Watch commented on yesterday.

Here are the points they are making in their press release on the issue, below. In addition, I spoke to their voter registration expert in an interview and I asked them if there is any evidence that these inactive voter registrations lead to any voter fraud or inappropriate voting activity.

He said no, he could not cite any specific evidence of fraud. He did say that having such a large number of inactive voter registrations violates federal voting law and makes it difficult for political groups to do targeted mailings and get-out-the-vote efforts. He also said having messy voter registration files could lead to voter fraud/irregularities. He also said such a large number of inactive voter registrations leads to a loss of faith in the integrity of the voting system.

He also used a metaphor to describe the importance of maintaining up-to-date voter registration files: "Just like a kitchen in a restaurant should be clean...you shouldn't have to draw a direct correlation between e-coli and a dirty kitchen. Just because you didn't get sick, doesn't mean it's okay that the kitchen was dirty."

I'd like to give your office a chance to respond. Why were there so many inactive voter registrations in the LA County system? Also, do you think the bloated inactive rolls could lead to voter fraud/irregularities?

How long is it going to take to purge the voting rolls of these inactive voters -- what is your timeline for doing so now that the settlement has been reached?

I'm writing on deadline -- just a short piece on this. I can always add your comments into the story if you cannot get back to me by the time I have to post a web story on this. I can be reached at [redacted]

Thanks so much,

Susan Crabtree
Senior Writer
Wash. Free Beacon
California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

- The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.
Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.*, 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing *amicus* briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an *amicus* brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s voter ID law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an *amicus* brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups.
Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.

###

Jill Sutherland Farrell  
Dir. Public Affairs  
Judicial Watch Inc.  
425 Third St SW, Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20024  
Desk 202-646-5188  
Cell [redacted]  
[www.judicialwatch.org](http://www.judicialwatch.org)  
@judicialwatch

Founded in 1994, Judicial Watch Inc. is a constitutionally conservative, nonpartisan 501 c 3 educational foundation that promotes transparency, accountability and integrity in government, politics and the law. JW is the most active FOIA requestor and litigator operating today.

**Join our 5.5 million social media followers!**

--

Susan Crabtree  
Senior Writer  
Washington Free Beacon  
@susancrabtree

[redacted]
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Hi Susan,

The following statement can be attributed to Secretary of State Alex Padilla:

“California elections officials have and will continue to work to meet the goals of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA): maintaining the accuracy of the voter rolls and increasing the number of eligible citizens who register and vote.”

“Judicial Watch’s press release inaccurately conflates their unfounded claims with what was actually agreed upon in the settlement. The settlement is clear and simple, California will continue its work to adhere to modern list maintenance procedures under the NVRA.”

“This settlement will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure voter list maintenance procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”

“California is a leader in implementing election reforms to improve voter participation. The Voter’s Choice Act, online voter registration and the "My Voter Status" tool, conditional “same day” voter registration, and other reforms are improving the registration and voting experience for eligible Californians. None of these efforts will be impacted by this settlement.”

--

I would strongly suggest you reach out to the LA County registrar’s office and an actual campaign/elections data expert in California such as Paul Mitchell.

Best,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary – Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575

Hi there,

Thanks for taking my call just now. I'm writing a piece on this settlement that Judicial Watch commented on yesterday.

Here are the points they are making in their press release on the issue, below. In addition, I spoke to their voter registration expert in an interview and I asked them if there is any evidence that these inactive voter registrations lead to any voter fraud or inappropriate voting activity.

He said no, he could not cite any specific evidence of fraud. He did say that having such a large number of inactive voter registrations violates federal voting law and makes it difficult for political groups to do targeted mailings and get-out-the-vote efforts. He also said having messy voter registration files could lead to voter fraud/irregularities. He also said such a large number of inactive voter registrations leads to a loss of faith in the integrity of the voting system.
He also used a metaphor to describe the importance of maintaining up-to-date voter registration files: "Just like a kitchen in a restaurant should be clean...you shouldn't have to draw a direct correlation between e-coli and a dirty kitchen. Just because you didn't get sick, doesn't mean it's okay that the kitchen was dirty."

I'd like to give your office a chance to respond. Why were there so many inactive voter registrations in the LA County system? Also, do you think the bloated inactive rolls could lead to voter fraud/irregularities?

How long is it going to take to purge the voting rolls of these inactive voters -- what is your timeline for doing so now that the settlement has been reached?

I'm writing on deadline -- just a short piece on this. I can always add your comments into the story if you cannot get back to me by the time I have to post a web story on this. I can be reached at [redacted]

Thanks so much,

Susan Crabtree
Senior Writer
Wash. Free Beacon
@susancrabtree

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Jill Farrell <JFarrell@judicialwatch.org>
Date: Thu, Jan 3, 2019 at 11:26 AM
Subject: California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls
To:

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: 202-646-5188
January 3, 2019

California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:
Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in _Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst._, 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing amicus briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in
the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s voter ID law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.

###

Jill Sutherland Farrell
Dir. Public Affairs
Judicial Watch Inc.
425 Third St SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024
Desk 202-646-5188
Cell 410-338-7776
www.judicialwatch.org
@judicialwatch

Founded in 1994, Judicial Watch Inc. is a constitutionally conservative, nonpartisan 501 c 3 educational foundation that promotes transparency, accountability and integrity in government, politics and the law. JW is the most active FOIA requestor and litigator operating today.

Join our 5.5 million social media followers!

--

Susan Crabtree
Senior Writer
Washington Free Beacon
@susancrabtree

Error! Filename not specified.
Hi Michael,

The following can be attributed to California Secretary of State Alex Padilla:

“California elections officials have and will continue to work to meet the goals of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA): maintaining the accuracy of the voter rolls and increasing the number of eligible citizens who register and vote.”

“Judicial Watch's press release inaccurately conflates their unfounded claims with what was actually agreed upon in the settlement. The settlement is clear and simple, California will continue its work to adhere to modern list maintenance procedures under the NVRA.”

“This settlement will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure voter list maintenance procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”

“California is a leader in implementing election reforms to improve voter participation. The Voter’s Choice Act, online voter registration and the "My Voter Status" tool, conditional “same day” voter registration, and other reforms are improving the registration and voting experience for eligible Californians. None of these efforts will be impacted by this settlement.”

Thank you,

-Sam

Hi Sam,

Just checking in on this ... thanks,

Sincerely,

-Sam
Sam Mahood
Press Secretary – Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575

From: Blood, Michael [mailto:mblood@ap.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2019 3:08 PM
To: Mahood, Sam
Subject: FW: California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls

Sam,

Does your crew have a statement on this?

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?

Tx,

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: 202-646-5188
January 3, 2019

California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.
The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst., 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA — and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing amicus briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s voter ID law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.
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Hi Sam,

Just checking in on this ... thanks,

---

Hi Michael,

I will follow-up with a statement.

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?

No.

Best,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary – Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575

---

Sam,  

Does your crew have a statement on this?

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?

Tx,
California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

- The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

- Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst., 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in
each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing amicus briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s voter ID law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.
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Hi Michael,

I will follow-up with a statement.

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?

No.

Best,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary – Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575
California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

- The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

- Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst., 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in
each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing amicus briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s voter ID law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.
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Sam,

Does your crew have a statement on this?

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?

 Tx,

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: 202-646-5188

January 3, 2019

California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

- The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

- Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that
more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.*, 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In *North Carolina*, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing *amicus* briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an *amicus* brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of *Alabama’s voter ID law*. In *Georgia*, Judicial Watch filed an *amicus* brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.
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Hi Susan,

I really wish I knew your story was going up in less than a day.

Judicial Watch is once again deliberately distorting this settlement to undermine voter confidence in democracy. An assertion that California ‘had not cleaned its voter registration rolls in at least 20 years’ is absolutely untrue. The settlement was clear and simple, California will continue its work to adhere to modern list maintenance procedures under the National Voter Registration Act. Updating the NVRA manual and providing guidance and training to county elections officials on voter list maintenance is a regular practice for the Secretary of State’s office, which was already in progress prior to the settlement.

Best,

-Sam

Hi there,

I'm forwarding this release to you -- because I know last time we emailed on this subject you took issue with how Judicial Watch was playing it. I'm interested in what appears to be the news in this release -- that you are alerting other California counties to clean up their lists as well. Is that all the counties? And is this being accurately characterized?

I can be reached at

In addition, the California secretary of state has alerted other California counties to clean up their voter registration lists to comply with the federal National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), as the secretary promised to do in that same settlement agreement.

Best,

Susan Crabtree
California Begins Massive Voter Roll Clean-Up – Notifies Up to 1.5 Million ‘Inactive’ Voters as Part of Judicial Watch Lawsuit Settlement

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it has been informed that Los Angeles County has sent notices to as many as 1.5 million inactive voters on its voter rolls.

This mailing is a step toward removing the names of voters who have moved, died, or are otherwise ineligible to vote. The massive mailing is the result of a settlement agreement with Judicial Watch requiring the County to remove as many as 1.5 million inactive registrations.

In addition, the California secretary of state has alerted other California counties to clean up their voter registration lists to comply with the federal National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), as the secretary promised to do in that same settlement agreement.

All of this is the result of a federal lawsuit Judicial Watch filed in 2017 to force the cleanup of Los Angeles County’s voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was joined in this lawsuit by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

Under the terms of the settlement agreement, voters who do not respond to the notices sent by the County and who do not vote in the next two federal elections must be removed from the voting rolls. Secretary Padilla also agreed to update the state’s online NVRA manual in order to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obliged to do this. On April 11, Secretary Padilla notified Judicial Watch that this part of the settlement agreement had been implemented.
The agreement also required the office of the secretary of state to send a written advisory to all county clerks/registrars of voters in California stating that current federal law requires the cancellation of a registrant who has failed to respond to an official notice and who then fails to vote, offers to vote, correct the registrar’s record, “or otherwise have their eligibility to vote confirmed for a period of time including the next two general federal elections.”

The updated California National Voter Registration Act Manual, March 2019, conforms to this standard. In April and May 2019, the California secretary of state provided a training presentation to all 58 counties in California regarding the proper list maintenance procedures under the NVRA.

As Judicial Watch previously noted, Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents. The County had allowed more than 20% of its registered voters to become inactive without removing them from the voter list.

Judicial Watch discovered that California had treated the removal of inactive voters as permissive, not mandatory, and had not cleaned its voter registration rolls in at least 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in an opinion affirming a historic Judicial Watch settlement with Ohio that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

“This Judicial Watch settlement will result in the immediate and ongoing clean-up of voter rolls in California and LA County,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “This victory for clean elections in California will set another national precedent for other states to take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the provisions of the NVRA. In early January, Judicial Watch announced that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. This was only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements were with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

###
Hi there,

I'm forwarding this release to you -- because I know last time we emailed on this subject you took issue with how Judicial Watch was playing it. I'm interested in what appears to be the news in this release -- that you are alerting other California counties to clean up their lists as well. Is that all the counties? And is this being accurately characterized?

I can be reached at [contact information]

In addition, the California secretary of state has alerted other California counties to clean up their voter registration lists to comply with the federal National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), as the secretary promised to do in that same settlement agreement.

Best,
Susan Crabtree

Sent with ProtonMail Secure Email.

------- Original Message -------
On Wednesday, June 19, 2019 1:42 PM, Judicial Watch <press@pr.judicialwatch.org> wrote:
California Begins Massive Voter Roll Clean-Up – Notifies Up to 1.5 Million ‘Inactive’ Voters as Part of Judicial Watch Lawsuit Settlement

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it has been informed that Los Angeles County has sent notices to as many as 1.5 million inactive voters on its voter rolls. This mailing is a step toward removing the names of voters who have moved, died, or are otherwise ineligible to vote. The massive mailing is the result of a settlement agreement with Judicial Watch requiring the County to remove as many as 1.5 million inactive registrations. In addition, the California secretary of state has alerted other California counties to clean up their voter registration lists to comply with the federal National Voter Registration Act (NVRA), as the secretary promised to do in that same settlement agreement.

All of this is the result of a federal lawsuit Judicial Watch filed in 2017 to force the cleanup of Los Angeles County’s voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was joined in this lawsuit by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

Under the terms of the settlement agreement, voters who do not respond to the notices sent by the County and who do not vote in the next two federal elections must be removed from the voting rolls. Secretary Padilla also agreed to update the state’s online NVRA manual in order to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obliged to do this. On April 11, Secretary Padilla notified Judicial Watch that this part of the settlement agreement had been implemented.

The agreement also required the office of the secretary of state to send a written advisory to all county clerks/registrars of voters in California stating that current federal law requires the cancellation of a registrant who has failed to respond to an official notice and who then fails to vote, offers to vote, correct the registrar’s record, “or otherwise have their eligibility to vote confirmed for a period of time including the next two general federal elections.”

The updated California National Voter Registration Act Manual, March 2019, conforms to this standard. In April and May 2019, the California secretary of state provided a training presentation to all 58 counties in California regarding the proper list maintenance procedures under the NVRA.

As Judicial Watch previously noted, Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents. The County had allowed more than 20% of its registered voters to become inactive without removing them from the voter list.

Judicial Watch discovered that California had treated the removal of inactive voters as permissive, not mandatory, and had not cleaned its voter registration rolls in at least 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in an opinion affirming a historic Judicial Watch settlement with Ohio that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

“This Judicial Watch settlement will result in the immediate and ongoing clean-up of voter rolls in California and LA County,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “This victory for clean elections in California will set another national precedent for other states to take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the provisions of the NVRA. In early

Obtained via FOIA by Judicial Watch Inc.
January, Judicial Watch announced that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. This was only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements were with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

###
From: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 11:48 AM
To: Luery, Mike <mluery@hearst.com>
Subject: RE: KCRA-TV Election Coverage

Hi Mike,

We have this phone number for Richardson:
(925) 550-3911

-Sam
Thank you,

-Sam

From: Luery, Mike <mluery@hearst.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 11:22 AM
To: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: KCRA-TV Election Coverage

Sam,
I'm doing a profile story on all the candidates running for Congressional District 7. We've got interviews set up with three of the five candidates listed in the race, but the other two have not responded to my emails.

Do you have campaign contact information for Republican, Buzz Patterson and Green Party candidate Chris Richardson?

If so, can you send that my way?

Thanks,
Mike

Mike Luery | Political Reporter
3 Television Circle, Sacramento, CA 95814

C: 916-717-7933
P: 916-325-3722
mluery@hearst.com
Hi Mike,

We have this phone number for Richardson:
(925) 550-3911

-Sam

From: Luery, Mike <mluery@hearst.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 11:35 AM
To: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: KCRA-TV Election Coverage

Thanks Sam!

Mike Luery
Political Reporter,
KCRA-TV
3 Television Circle
Sacramento, CA 95814

916-325-3722 (newsroom)
916-717-7933 (mobile)
mluery@hearst.com
Twitter: @KCRALuery

On Feb 25, 2020, at 11:28 AM, Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov> wrote:

Hey Mike,

Let me see if we have anything and I will get back to you ASAP.

Thank you,

-Sam

From: Luery, Mike <mluery@hearst.com>
Sent: Tuesday, February 25, 2020 11:22 AM
To: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: KCRA-TV Election Coverage

Sam,

I'm doing a profile story on all the candidates running for Congressional District 7. We've got interviews set up with three of the five candidates listed in the race, but the other two have not responded to my emails.

Do you have campaign contact information for Republican, Buzz Patterson and Green Party candidate Chris Richardson?
If so, can you send that my way?

Thanks,
Mike

Mike Luery  |  Political Reporter
3 Television Circle, Sacramento, CA 95814

C: 916-717-7933
P: 916-325-3722
mluery@hearst.com
Thanks Sam!

Mike Luery
Political Reporter,
KCRA-TV
3 Television Circle
Sacramento, CA 95814

916-325-3722 (newsroom)
916-717-7933 (mobile)
mluery@hearst.com
Twitter: @KCRALuery

On Feb 25, 2020, at 11:28 AM, Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov> wrote:

Hey Mike,

Let me see if we have anything and I will get back to you ASAP.

Thank you,

-Sam

Sam,
I'm doing a profile story on all the candidates running for Congressional District 7.
We've got interviews set up with three of the five candidates listed in the race, but the other two have not responded to my emails.

Do you have campaign contact information for Republican, Buzz Patterson and Green Party candidate Chris Richardson?

If so, can you send that my way?

Thanks,
Mike
Hey Mike,

Let me see if we have anything and I will get back to you ASAP.

Thank you,

-Sam

Sam,

I'm doing a profile story on all the candidates running for Congressional District 7. We've got interviews set up with three of the five candidates listed in the race, but the other two have not responded to my emails.

Do you have campaign contact information for Republican, Buzz Patterson and Green Party candidate Chris Richardson?

If so, can you send that my way?

Thanks,
Mike
Sam,

I'm doing a profile story on all the candidates running for Congressional District 7. We've got interviews set up with three of the five candidates listed in the race, but the other two have not responded to my emails.

Do you have campaign contact information for Republican, Buzz Patterson and Green Party candidate Chris Richardson?

If so, can you send that my way?

Thanks,
Mike
To: Carla Marinucci <cmarinucci@politico.com>
From: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Sent: Mon 6/24/2019 12:52:29 PM (UTC-07:00)
Subject: RE: new in the inbox from Judicial Watch

Hi Carla,

Judicial Watch is once again deliberately distorting this settlement to undermine voter confidence in democracy. An assertion that California ‘had not cleaned its voter registration rolls in at least 20 years’ is absolutely untrue. The settlement was clear and simple, California will continue its work to adhere to modern list maintenance procedures under the National Voter Registration Act. Updating the NVRA manual and providing guidance and training to county elections officials on voter list maintenance is a regular practice for the Secretary of State’s office, which was already in progress prior to the settlement.

You may also want to reach out to LA County Elections (since they are in settlement).

Thank you,

-Sam

---

From: Carla Marinucci <cmarinucci@politico.com>
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2019 12:40 PM
To: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: new in the inbox from Judicial Watch

Once again, these guys in Judicial Watch are at it— the editor now claiming “success” in a policy change in CA...we just got this in the inbox...is there any truth to what this guy is saying about a “settlement” he’s won in CA? he says 1.5 million folks on “dirty voting” rolls in CA...just want to call this out in our item tomorrow.


---

Carla Marinucci
Senior Writer, POLITICO California Playbook
Politico.com

SUBSCRIBE to the daily POLITICO CA Playbook:
http://politi.co/1N8zdJU

---

From: "Mahood, Sam" <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Date: Monday, June 24, 2019 at 12:23 PM
To: Carla Marinucci <cmarinucci@politico.com>
Subject: RE: Padilla on Trump Comments

Hi Carla,

Following-up, here are some stats on election system funding:

The 2019-2020 STATE budget includes an additional $87 million for counties to purchase modern voting equipment that has been certified to the state’s latest security standards. $134 million was allocated in last year’s state budget for counties to upgrade or replace aging voting systems. That money required a dollar for dollar match by counties.
Last year Congress approved the final $380 million from the 2002 Help America Vote Act in the 2018 Omnibus Appropriations bill. Of this appropriation, California received approximately $34 million.

Best,
-Sam

From: Carla Marinucci <cmarinucci@politico.com>
Sent: Monday, June 24, 2019 11:42 AM
To: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: Padilla on Trump Comments

White House holding a call right now with DOJ, FBI officials etc. on election security, talking about how it has reached out to all 50 states on the issue of potential foreign influence, ballot fraud etc. Can he talk about some of the details of that, and what’s changed specifically since the last election – especially given the White House’s continued attacks on CA?

Carla Marinucci
Senior Writer, POLITICO California Playbook
Politico.com

SUBSCRIBE to the daily POLITICO CA Playbook:
http://politi.co/1N8zdJU

From: "Mahood, Sam" <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Date: Monday, June 24, 2019 at 11:16 AM
To: Carla Marinucci <cmarinucci@politico.com>
Subject: Padilla on Trump Comments

Hi Carla,

I heard you called about Trump’s latest lies about “illegal voting” in California.

Secretary Padilla tweeted about this from his personal account yesterday:
https://twitter.com/AlexPadilla4CA/status/1142873027144634368

Please let me know if you’re looking for further comment from the Secretary.

Thank you,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary - California Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575
Thanks Sam

From: Mahood, Sam <SMahood@sos.ca.gov>
Date: Wednesday, October 21, 2020 at 5:52 PM
To: Passantino, Jon <Jon.Pass@turner.com>, Secretary of State, Press <SOSPRESS@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: CNN inquiry - Voter data used by foreign actors

The answer to both questions is no.

Thank you,
-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary - California Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575

Hi press team, I’m Jon from CNN.

Tonight, the Director of National Intelligence John Ratcliffe said both Iran and Russia have obtained US voter registration information in an effort to interfere in the election.

"This data can be used by foreign actors to attempt to communicate false information to registered voters that they hope will cause confusion, sow chaos and undermine your confidence in American democracy," Ratcliffe said.

I have a few questions about this I hope you can answer:

1. Has the Secretary’s office been made aware of the release or compromise of any state voter registration data?
2. Has the Secretary's office been notified of any California voters receiving threatening emails demanding they vote for a candidate, such as those claiming to be from the Proud Boys that have now been linked to Iran?

We’re working on a story tonight and would appreciate a response.

Thanks,
Jon

--

Jon Passantino
Director of Coverage
The answer to both questions is no.

Thank you,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary - California Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575

Hi press team, I’m Jon from CNN.

Tonight, the Director of National Intelligence John Ratcliffe said both Iran and Russia have obtained US voter registration information in an effort to interfere in the election.

"This data can be used by foreign actors to attempt to communicate false information to registered voters that they hope will cause confusion, sow chaos and undermine your confidence in American democracy," Ratcliffe said.

I have a few questions about this I hope you can answer:

1. Has the Secretary’s office been made aware of the release or compromise of any state voter registration data?
2. Has the Secretary’s office been notified of any California voters receiving threatening emails demanding they vote for a candidate, such as those claiming to be from the Proud Boys that have now been linked to Iran?

We’re working on a story tonight and would appreciate a response.

Thanks,

Jon

--

Jon Passantino
Director of Coverage

CNN Los Angeles
310-613-9503
Hi press team, I’m Jon from CNN.

Tonight, the Director of National Intelligence John Ratcliffe said both Iran and Russia have obtained US voter registration information in an effort to interfere in the election.

"This data can be used by foreign actors to attempt to communicate false information to registered voters that they hope will cause confusion, sow chaos and undermine your confidence in American democracy," Ratcliffe said.

I have a few questions about this I hope you can answer:

1. Has the Secretary’s office been made aware of the release or compromise of any state voter registration data?
2. Has the Secretary’s office been notified of any California voters receiving threatening emails demanding they vote for a candidate, such as those claiming to be from the Proud Boys that have now been linked to Iran?

We’re working on a story tonight and would appreciate a response.

Thanks,
Jon

--

Jon Passantino
Director of Coverage
CNN Los Angeles
310-613-9503
Hi press team, I’m Jon from CNN.

Tonight, the Director of National Intelligence John Ratcliffe said both Iran and Russia have obtained US voter registration information in an effort to interfere in the election.

"This data can be used by foreign actors to attempt to communicate false information to registered voters that they hope will cause confusion, sow chaos and undermine your confidence in American democracy," Ratcliffe said.

I have a few questions about this I hope you can answer:

1. Has the Secretary’s office been made aware of the release or compromise of any state voter registration data?
2. Has the Secretary’s office been notified of any California voters receiving threatening emails demanding they vote for a candidate, such as those claiming to be from the Proud Boys that have now been linked to Iran?

We’re working on a story tonight and would appreciate a response.

Thanks,
Jon

--

Jon Passantino
Director of Coverage
CNN Los Angeles
310-613-9503
Hi Kalen,

The following can be attributed to California Secretary of State Alex Padilla:

“Californians have a right to vote free from intimidation. While I expect a safe voting experience for all Californians, it’s important that elections officials are prepared for any attempts to disrupt or interfere with voting. California voters should be assured that we are in close contact with elections officials across the state, and will address any issues during in-person voting. As we do every election, the Secretary of State’s office will have poll monitors throughout the state. If any voters have concerns, they can contact their county elections office or the Secretary of State’s confidential voter hotline at 1-800-345-VOTE.”

--

There have been no reports of disruption of voting at any early voting sites in California.

We issued the following memo to county elections officials regarding voter intimidation ahead of this election: https://elections.cdn.sos.ca.gov/ccrov/pdf/2020/october/20236jl.pdf

Thank you,

-Sam

Hi Kalen,

Connecting you with the Secretary of State’s office who oversee elections in California.

Jesse

From: Jesse Melgar <Jesse.Melgar@GOV.CA.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 2:28 PM
To: Kalen Goodluck <kalengoodluck@hcn.org>; Governor’s Press Office <GovPressOffice@GOV.CA.GOV>
Cc: Secretary of State, Press <SOSPRESS@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: RE: Press inquiry - armed voter intimidation

Hi Kalen,

Connecting you with the Secretary of State’s office who oversee elections in California.

Jesse

From: Kalen Goodluck <kalengoodluck@hcn.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 11:03 AM
To: Governor’s Press Office <GovPressOffice@GOV.CA.GOV>
Subject: Press inquiry - armed voter intimidation

Dear press office of Gov. Newsom,

I'm a reporter for High Country News and I'm writing a story on voter intimidation in the west for this ongoing Presidential election.

As you know, President Donald Trump did not denounce white supremacy during the first presidential debate, instead telling the Proud Boys to “stand back and standby,” which actually emboldened and excited his far-right extremist base, many who say they will show up at polling sites on election day. He has also put out a call to assemble an "Army of poll watchers" who are undergoing training now and even asked county sheriffs to come armed to watch voting stations.
My question:

Is the Governor Gavin Newsom and the election board aware of the possible presence of armed poll watchers or extremists like militias at voting stations? And if they are, what steps are they taking to prepare for any armed confrontation with voters?

My deadline is this Wednesday, but I would need an answer this week, if possible.

Thanks so much.

All the best,
Kalen Goodluck

--

**Kalen Goodluck** (he/him)
Journalist, Indigenous Affairs

---

(505) 977-6970
High Country News
Twitter: @kalengoodluck

**Signal**: (505) 977-6970
**Threema**: PHBJR789

How to share confidential news tips
Hi Kalen,

Connecting you with the Secretary of State’s office who oversee elections in California.

Jesse

From: Kalen Goodluck <kalengoodluck@hcn.org>
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2020 11:03 AM
To: Governor’s Press Office <GovPressOffice@GOV.CA.GOV>
Subject: Press inquiry - armed voter intimidation

Dear press office of Gov. Newsom,

I’m a reporter for High Country News and I’m writing a story on voter intimidation in the west for this ongoing Presidential election.

As you know, President Donald Trump did not denounce white supremacy during the first presidential debate, instead telling the Proud Boys to "stand back and stand by," which actually emboldened and excited his far-right extremist base, many who say they will show up at polling sites on election day. He has also put out a call to assemble an "Army of poll watchers" (who are undergoing training now) and even asked county sheriffs to come armed to watch voting stations.

My question:

Is the Governor Gavin Newsom and the election board aware of the possible presence of armed poll watchers or extremists like militias at voting stations? And if they are, what steps are they taking to prepare for any armed confrontation with voters?

My deadline is this Wednesday, but I would need an answer this week, if possible.

Thanks so much.

All the best,
Kalen Goodluck

--
Kalen Goodluck (he/him)
Journalist, Indigenous Affairs

(505) 977-6970
High Country News
Twitter: @kalengoodluck

Signal: (505) 977-6970
Threema: PHB1R789

How to share confidential news tips

High Country News is a nonprofit 501(c)3 independent media organization that covers the important issues and stories that define the American West. Our mission is to inform and
inspire people – through in-depth journalism – to act on behalf of the West’s diverse natural and human communities.
Since sending this previous note, I came across this article in the Sacramento Bee. I'm not sure if there's anything new you can tell me (perhaps about how many people might have erroneously been registered to vote), but I figured I'd ask. Thanks,
Jessica

On Wed, Apr 29, 2020 at 10:07 AM Jessica Ravitz <jessica@leadstories.com> wrote:

Hello,
I'm a freelance journalist, based in Atlanta, who is contributing to a site that seeks to debunk fake stories going viral on social media.

I was asked to look into a post from April 8, 2020, that reads as follows: "Tom Fitton of Judicial Watch just WON a case against California proving 1 Million illegal votes were cast in the 2018 Election."

I, of course, know that this is not true and that nothing exists even on Judicial Watch's website to prove this. But try as I might, I can't get Judicial Watch to even acknowledge this is bogus. I will certainly reference that in the piece I write, but it would be great to get an authority on the record regarding this -- and I'm wondering if a statement from your office might be possible. Or if you might be willing to refer me to someone else.

Please let me know and thank you,
Jessica

Jessica Ravitz
Cell: [redacted] (Based in Atlanta, ET; not San Francisco.)
Hello,
I'm a freelance journalist, based in Atlanta, who is contributing to a site that seeks to debunk fake stories going viral on social media.

I was asked to look into a post from April 8, 2020, that reads as follows: "Tom Fitton of Judicial Watch just WON a case against California proving 1 Million illegal votes were cast in the 2018 Election."

I, of course, know that this is not true and that nothing exists even on Judicial Watch's website to prove this. But try as I might, I can't get Judicial Watch to even acknowledge this is bogus. I will certainly reference that in the piece I write, but it would be great to get an authority on the record regarding this -- and I'm wondering if a statement from your office might be possible. Or if you might be willing to refer me to someone else.

Please let me know and thank you,
Jessica

Jessica Ravitz
Cell:  (Based in Atlanta, ET; not San Francisco.)
Hi Michael,

The following can be attributed to California Secretary of State Alex Padilla:

“California elections officials have and will continue to work to meet the goals of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA): maintaining the accuracy of the voter rolls and increasing the number of eligible citizens who register and vote.”

“Judicial Watch’s press release inaccurately conflates their unfounded claims with what was actually agreed upon in the settlement. The settlement is clear and simple, California will continue its work to adhere to modern list maintenance procedures under the NVRA.”

“This settlement will not lead to unnecessary removal of active and eligible voters. Safeguards remain in place to ensure voter list maintenance procedures are followed before canceling any voter registration records.”

“California is a leader in implementing election reforms to improve voter participation. The Voter’s Choice Act, online voter registration and the "My Voter Status" tool, conditional “same day” voter registration, and other reforms are improving the registration and voting experience for eligible Californians. None of these efforts will be impacted by this settlement.”

Thank you,

-Sam

---

Hi Sam,

Just checking in on this ... thanks,

Hi Michael,

I will follow-up with a statement.

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?

No.

Best,

-Sam
Sam Mahood
Press Secretary – Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575

From: Blood, Michael [mailto:mblood@ap.org]
Sent: Thursday, January 03, 2019 3:08 PM
To: Mahood, Sam
Subject: FW: California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls

Sam,

Does your crew have a statement on this?

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?

Tx,

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

California and Los Angeles County to Remove 1.5 Million Inactive Voters from Voter Rolls – Settle Judicial Watch Federal Lawsuit

(Washington, DC) – Judicial Watch announced today that it signed a settlement agreement with the State of California and County of Los Angeles under which they will begin the process of removing from their voter registration rolls as many as 1.5 million inactive registered names that may be invalid. These removals are required by the Nation Voter Registration Act (NVRA).

The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.
• The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

• Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.*, 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch legal team in this litigation.

Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In *North Carolina*, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing amicus briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of *Alabama’s voter ID law*. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.

###

Jill Sutherland Farrell
Dir. Public Affairs
Judicial Watch Inc.
Founded in 1994, Judicial Watch Inc. is a constitutionally conservative, nonpartisan 501 c 3 educational foundation that promotes transparency, accountability and integrity in government, politics and the law. JW is the most active FOIA requestor and litigator operating today.
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Hi Michael,

I will follow-up with a statement.

And was there ever any evidence presented in the case that these inactive names were used to vote illegally, or other improper use?
No.

Best,

-Sam

Sam Mahood
Press Secretary – Secretary of State Alex Padilla
916-653-6575
The NVRA is a federal law requiring the removal of inactive registrations from the voter rolls after two general federal elections (encompassing from 2 to 4 years). Inactive voter registrations belong, for the most part, to voters who have moved to another county or state or have passed away.

Los Angeles County has over 10 million residents, more than the populations of 41 of the 50 United States. California is America’s largest state, with almost 40 million residents.

Judicial Watch filed a 2017 federal lawsuit to force the cleanup of voter rolls (Judicial Watch, Inc., et al. v. Dean C. Logan, et al. (No. 2:17-cv-08948)). Judicial Watch sued on its own behalf and on behalf of Wolfgang Kupka, Rhue Guyant, Jerry Griffin, and Delores M. Mars, who are lawfully registered voters in Los Angeles County. Judicial Watch was also joined by Election Integrity Project California, Inc., a public interest group that has long been involved in monitoring California’s voter rolls.

In its lawsuit, Judicial Watch alleged:

- Los Angeles County has more voter registrations on its voter rolls than it has citizens who are old enough to register. Specifically, according to data provided to and published by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, Los Angeles County has a registration rate of 112 percent of its adult citizen population.

- The entire State of California has a registration rate of about 101 percent of its age-eligible citizenry.

- Eleven of California’s 58 counties have registration rates exceeding 100 percent of the age-eligible citizenry.

The lawsuit confirmed that Los Angeles County has on its rolls more than 1.5 million potentially ineligible voters. This means that more than one out of every five LA County registrations likely belongs to a voter who has moved or is deceased. Judicial Watch notes that “Los Angeles County has the highest number of inactive registrations of any single county in the country.”

The Judicial Watch lawsuit also uncovered that neither the State of California nor Los Angeles County had been removing inactive voters from the voter registration rolls for the past 20 years. The Supreme Court affirmed last year in Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst., 138 S. Ct. 1833 (2018) that the NVRA “makes this removal mandatory.”

The new settlement agreement, filed today with U.S. District Court Judge Manuel L. Real, requires all of the 1.5 million potentially ineligible registrants to be notified and asked to respond. If there is no response, those names are to be removed as required by the NVRA. California Secretary of State Padilla also agrees to update the State’s online NVRA manual to make clear that ineligible names must be removed and to notify each California county that they are obligated to do this. This should lead to cleaner voter rolls statewide.

Prior to this settlement agreement, Judicial Watch estimated that based on comparisons of national census data to voter-roll information, there were 3.5 million more names on various county voter rolls than there were citizens of voting age. This settlement could cut this number in half.

This is only the third statewide settlement achieved by private plaintiffs under the NVRA – and Judicial Watch was the plaintiff in each of those cases. The other statewide settlements are with Ohio (in 2014) and with Kentucky (2018), which agreed to a court-ordered consent decree.

“This settlement vindicates Judicial Watch’s groundbreaking lawsuits to clean up state voter rolls to help ensure cleaner elections,” said Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton. “Judicial Watch and its clients are thrilled with this historic settlement that will clean up election rolls in Los Angeles County and California – and set a nationwide precedent to ensure that states take reasonable steps to ensure that dead and other ineligible voters are removed from the rolls.”

Judicial Watch Attorney Robert Popper is the director of the organization’s Election Integrity Project and led the Judicial Watch
Judicial Watch is the national leader in enforcing the list maintenance provisions of the NVRA. In addition to its settlement agreements with Ohio and win in Kentucky, Judicial Watch filed a successful NVRA lawsuit against Indiana, causing it to voluntarily clean up its voting rolls, and has an ongoing lawsuit with the State of Maryland.

Judicial Watch helped the State of Ohio to successfully defend their settlement agreement before the Supreme Court. In North Carolina, Judicial Watch supported implementation of the state’s election integrity reform laws, filing amicus briefs in the Supreme Court in March 2017. And, in April 2018, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in the 11th Circuit Court of Appeals in support of Alabama’s voter ID law. In Georgia, Judicial Watch filed an amicus brief in support of Secretary Brian Kemp’s list maintenance process against a lawsuit by left-wing groups. Judicial Watch and Georgia won when the Supreme Court ruled in the Ohio’s favor.

Judicial Watch was assisted in this case by Charles H. Bell of Bell, McAndrews & Hiltachk, LLP.
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Greetings Senator Padilla and thank you for taking the time to read this.

I don’t want to take too much of your time other than to share how deeply important I think it is that we label the group known as “The Proud Boys” as a terrorist organization. We all saw on January 6th the direct harm they intended to cause our civil servants at the highest levels of our government, while at the same time fighting to dismantle the democratic process that guides our nation.

Our neighbors in Canada are already taking this very appropriate action, and I hope we do the same. Our country is not safe while this organization is not criminalized and treated as a direct threat. [https://globalnews.ca/news/7598355/motion-passes-proud-boys-terrorists/](https://globalnews.ca/news/7598355/motion-passes-proud-boys-terrorists/)

I have signed the petition below along with over 450,000 others. [https://www.change.org/p/joseph-biden-declare-the-proud-boys-a-terrorist-organization?signed=true](https://www.change.org/p/joseph-biden-declare-the-proud-boys-a-terrorist-organization?signed=true)

Thank you!

☐ Megan [REDACTED] | Lead Specialist, [REDACTED] | [REDACTED]

Confidential Information
This email and any attachments may be privileged and may contain confidential information intended only for the recipient(s) named above. Any other distribution, forwarding, copying or disclosure of this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify me immediately by telephone or return email, and delete this message from your system.
Hi:
Please remove Lt. Col. Robert Buzz Patterson's email and phone number from the listing of candidates for CD-7

If you have any questions, please let me know as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Deborah Johns,
Campaign Manager
djohns@buzz4congress.com
(916) 716-2749
Your request has been received.

Thank you,
Kirsten Larsen

From: Deborah Johns <deborah.k.johns@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 22, 2019 10:22 PM
To: Elections Div Candidate Filings <candidate-filings@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: Lt. Col. Buzz Patterson for Congress CD-7

Hi:

Please remove Lt. Col. Robert Buzz Patterson's email and phone number from the listing of candidates for CD-7

If you have any questions, please let me know as soon as possible.

Sincerely,
Deborah Johns,
Campaign Manager
djohns@buzz4congress.com
(916) 716-2749
Looks like it will just take a phone call by Dec 24th, Tuesday.

Buzz Patterson
Lieutenant Colonel, USAF (Ret)
Candidate for US Congress, CA-7
www.buzzforcongress.com

On Dec 20, 2019, at 10:05 PM, Elections Div Candidate Filings <candidate-filings@sos.ca.gov> wrote:

Dear Candidate,

The Notice to Candidates containing the name, address, and if applicable, the ballot designation and party preference of each person who has qualified to be a candidate for the same voter-nominated office you have qualified for at the March 3, 2020, Presidential Primary Election has been posted to the Secretary of State’s website at:  https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/upcoming-elections/presidential-primary-election-march-3-2020/

Please check your information carefully and notify one of the following of any corrections to your listed contact information by Tuesday, December 24, 2019:

Kirsten Larsen
Wesley Keller
Carly Fields
SaVannah Black
(916) 653-9154
E-mail: candidate-filings@sos.ca.gov

If you have any issues related to information concerning an opponent, they must be resolved by the Sacramento County Superior Court, which is the exclusive venue for challenges pursuant to Elections Code section 13314(b), no later than the close of business on Thursday, December 26, 2019.

The Certified List of Candidates will be available on Thursday, December 26, 2019.

Sincerely,

Candidate Filing and Election Night Reporting Team

California Secretary of State, Election Division
Candidate Filing and Election Night Reporting
1500 11th Street, Sacramento CA  95814
Help Desk: (916) 653-9154 | Fax: (916) 651-6460
Email: candidate-filings@sos.ca.gov
Thank you!

-Carly
Secretary of State's Office, Elections Division
Candidate Filing and Election Night Reporting Team
Help Desk: (916) 653-9154 | Email: candidate-filings@sos.ca.gov

---

From: Becher. Taylor <bechert@saccounty.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2019 2:43 PM
To: Elections Div Candidate Filings <candidate-filings@sos.ca.gov>
Cc: Voters-Campaign Services <Voters-CampaignServices@saccounty.net>
Subject: Statement of Number of Signatures - Robert "Buzz" Patterson

Hello,

Attached please find the Statement of Signatures for Robert “Buzz” Patterson, candidate for US Representative, District 7.

Thank you!

**Taylor Becher**
Election Assistant - Campaign Services
County of Sacramento
7000 65th Street Suite A
Sacramento, CA 95823
Phone: (916) 875-6276
Fax: (916) 854-9567
bechert@saccounty.net

---

**County of Sacramento Email Disclaimer**: This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by other than the County of Sacramento or the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments thereto.
Hello,

Attached please find the Statement of Signatures for Robert “Buzz” Patterson, candidate for US Representative, District 7.

Thank you!

Taylor Becher  
Election Assistant - Campaign Services  
County of Sacramento  
7000 65th Street Suite A  
Sacramento, CA 95823  
Phone: (916) 875-6276  
Fax: (916) 854-9567  
bechert@saccounty.net

County of Sacramento Email Disclaimer: This email and any attachments thereto may contain private, confidential, and privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any review, copying, or distribution of this email (or any attachments thereto) by other than the County of Sacramento or the intended recipient is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copies of this email and any attachments thereto.
Thanks Jamie. Our Chief Counsel has been reviewing the document. Let’s connect soon about our offices planning.

James Schwab
Chief Deputy Secretary of State
Fact Sheet: Unlawful Militias in California

What is a militia?

Federal and state laws generally use the term “militia” to refer to all able-bodied residents between certain ages who may be called forth by the government to defend the United States or an individual state. See 10 U.S.C. § 246. When not called forth, they are sometimes referred to as the “unorganized militia.” A group of people who consider themselves part of the able-bodied residents referred to as members of the militia under state or federal law is not legally permitted to activate itself for duty. A private militia that attempts to activate itself for duty, outside of the authority of the state or federal government, is illegal.

How do I know if a group of armed people is an unauthorized private militia?

Groups of armed individuals that engage in paramilitary activity or law enforcement functions without being called forth by a governor or the federal government and without reporting to any government authority are acting as unauthorized private militias. They sometimes train together and respond to events using firearms and other paramilitary techniques, such as staking out tactical positions and operating in military-style formations. They often purport to have authority to engage in military and law enforcement functions such as protecting property and engaging in crowd control.

These groups often engage in behaviors that show their intent to act as a private militia, such as wearing military-style uniforms, tactical gear, or identifying insignia; wielding firearms or other weapons; and operating within a coordinated command structure. Other factors—such as statements by leaders or members’ efforts to direct the actions of others—also may suggest that a group is acting as a private militia. Groups of armed individuals may engage in unauthorized militia activity even if they do not consider themselves to be “members” of a paramilitary organization.

Does the Second Amendment protect private militias?


Is it legal to act as a private militia in California?

No. All 50 states prohibit private, unauthorized militias and military units from engaging in activities reserved for the state militia, including law enforcement activities. Some, including California, also prohibit paramilitary activity during or in furtherance of a civil disorder. California’s laws are described below:

California Constitution: The California Constitution forbids private military units from operating outside state authority, providing that “[t]he military is subordinate to civil power.” Cal. Const. art. I, § 5.

California Statutes

Prohibition on paramilitary activity: In California, it is a crime, punishable with up to one year in jail, to:

(1) assemble, in a group of “two or more persons,” as “a paramilitary organization for the purpose of practicing with weapons,” with “paramilitary organization” defined as “an organization which is not” a federal or state agency or a private school, “but which engages in instruction or training in guerrilla warfare or sabotage, or which, as an organization, engages in rioting or the violent disruption of” school activities, or
(2) teach or demonstrate “to any other person the use, application, or making of any firearm, explosive, or destructive device, or technique capable of causing injury or death to persons, knowing or having reason to know or intending that these objects or techniques will be unlawfully employed for use in, or in the furtherance of a civil disorder,” or

(3) assemble “with one or more other persons for the purpose of training with, practicing with, or being instructed in the use of any firearm, explosive, or destructive device, or technique capable of causing injury or death to persons, with the intent to cause or further a civil disorder.” Cal. Penal Code § 11460.

Prohibition on unauthorized wearing of military uniforms: In California, it is a misdemeanor for any person other than members of the U.S. or state armed services, state law enforcement officers, and veterans, to wear “the uniform of” any part of the U.S. armed forces, “the National Guard or Naval Militia, or any part of that uniform, or a uniform or part of a uniform similar thereto.” Cal. Mil. & Vet. Code § 422.

What should I do if I see armed groups near a polling place or voter registration drive?

First, document what you see:

- What are the armed people doing?
- What are the armed people wearing?
- Are they carrying firearms? If so, what type? If not, are they carrying other types of weapons?
- Are they wearing insignia? If so, what does it say or look like?
- Are they bearing signs or flags?
- Do they seem to be patrolling like a law enforcement officer might do?
- Do they seem to be coordinating their actions?
- Do they have a leader?
- Are they stopping or talking to people outside of their group?
- Do they appear to be provoking or threatening violence? If so, what are they doing specifically?
- Are people turning away from the polling station after seeing or speaking with them?

Second, call Election Protection at 866-OUR-VOTE (866-687-8683) to report what you see. Assistance in also available in Spanish at 888-VE-Y-VOTA (888-839-8682), in Arabic at 844-YALLA-US (844-915-5187), and Asian languages at 888-API-VOTE (1-888-174-8683). A video call number for American Sign Language is available at 301-818-VOTE (301-818-8683).

This Fact Sheet has been prepared by the Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection (ICAP) at Georgetown University Law Center, with the pro bono assistance of law firms Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld, Jones Day, and O'Melveny & Myers. ICAP's mission is to use the power of the courts to defend American constitutional rights and values. Visit us at www.law.georgetown.edu/icap/. Contact us at reachICAP@georgetown.edu.
Dear Governor Newsom,

The California Chapter of Brady United Against Gun Violence is concerned that private militias may attempt to interfere with the upcoming election and vote count – including by disrupting polling places, intimidating potential voters to prevent them from voting, and interfering with the orderly counting of mail-in ballots. Our concerns are based on the rise of self-styled militias that have shown up at protests ranging from Charlottesville to Kenosha. Those concerns were heightened by the September 29th presidential debate when, rather than condemn the extremist Proud Boys hate group, President Trump told them to “stand back and stand by,” and asked his supporters to “go into the polls and watch very carefully.”

As you likely know, private militias are illegal in California. The attached two-page fact sheet on Unlawful Militias in California identifies the state laws and constitutional provision that prohibit unauthorized private militia groups in our state and also includes citations to US Supreme Court authority holding that private militias are not protected by the Second Amendment. The fact sheet also explains what to do if groups of armed individuals are near a polling place or voter registration drive. This important information could help communities throughout our state secure their voting rights in the face of interference from unlawful militias.

The fact sheet, which was prepared by the Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection at Georgetown Law, is also available at https://www.law.georgetown.edu/icap/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2020/09/California.pdf.

We hope you will consider working with state and local elections and law enforcement officials to ensure they are fully informed about the illegality of private militias, how to recognize them, and the possibility of militias interfering with the upcoming election.

We also hope you will consider informing the public about the illegality of unauthorized private militias in our state. Doing so may dissuade people from participating in militias. It also could encourage people who encounter militias to contact law enforcement.

We are available to assist you and your staff in any way you may need in addressing this important issue.

As always, we thank you for your advocacy and actions to stem gun violence – including signing the microstamping and other gun violence prevention bills last week.

Thank you,

Mattie Scott, CA Brady President (415) 412-1469
Ruth Borenstein, SF Brady Co-lead (415) 310-2525
I read the SOS Memo below "General Election: Electioneering" dated September 28, 2020 about the 100 Foot Rule - no campaign buttons, etc. but no mention of guns.

In the Presidential "Debate," in Cleveland, Ohio we heard Trump tell the Proud Boys to "Stand Back and Standby," but to also "go into polls," and "watch very carefully." I flashed on that guy that drove hundreds of miles to Washington DC on December 4, 2016 to free up children. Trump supporters created "PizzaGate" and most likely the Russians ("Russia if you are listening..") pushed it millions of times. The guy shot up the place but fortunately no one was injured. He was sentenced to just 4 years in Prison. He is White.

QAnon (F.B.I lists them as a domestic terrorist group), etc are listening to their "Commander-in-Chief" Trump and California better be prepared for some of these thugs (with long sleeve shirts to cover up their Hitler tattoos) at polling sites, especially in Jewish neighborhoods, on election day, with weapons.

California Authorities should make it very clear what our Rules/Laws are about people showing up to intimidate American voters at polling locations. Can they bring Assault Weapons and how about those with Concealed Weapons, even if they have a Permit?

As one who served in Vietnam (101st Airborne, 1967-68) and was wounded, I understand what Assault Weapons can do but I do not understand why some Americans in many states walk around with Assault Rifles, maybe some were rejected by Military Recruiters for mental reasons. If someone takes the Safety off (very easy), a lot of bullets go out in seconds.

So please put out Advisories to Law Enforcement, County Elected Officials and the Public of what is and not permitted at polling sites. And the Attorney General should be clear that those with weapons at polling sites will be prosecuted, assuming our laws state that. The days are gone when we need to be "concerned," that a voter is wearing their candidate button 90 feet from the polling location, with Trump ordering his supporters to go inside polling sites.

P.S. Kyle Rittenhouse, a 17 year old boy drove across state lines to Kenosha, Wisconsin with an Assault Rifle to protect properties. Really? He heard some "voices," and now he is charged with killing two people. More such "Voices," are coming from Trump.
“Electioneering” is defined in California Elections Code section 319.5 as “the visible display or audible dissemination of information that advocates for or against any candidate or measure on the ballot within 100 feet of a polling place, a vote center, an elections official's office, or a satellite location under Section 3018.” This effectively means electioneering cannot be conducted within 100 feet of the entrance to the polling place. Prohibited materials and information include, but are not limited to:

- A display of a candidate’s name, likeness, or logo
- A display of a ballot measure’s number, title, subject, or logo
- Buttons, hats, pencils, pens, shirts, signs, or stickers containing information about candidates or issues on the ballot
- Any audible broadcasting of information about candidates or measures on the ballot
- Loitering near or disseminating visible or audible electioneering information near a vote-by-mail drop box...
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From: Dresner, Jenna <jdresner@sos.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 12:35 PM
To: Schwab, James <JSchwab@sos.ca.gov>; Valle, Paula <pvalle@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: Misinfo

Thanks, James. We'll be reporting.

From: Schwab, James <JSchwab@sos.ca.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2020 12:29 PM
To: Valle, Paula <pvalle@sos.ca.gov>; Dresner, Jenna <jdresner@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: Misinfo

https://twitter.com/prageru/status/1305332188121116677?s=20

James Schwab
Chief Deputy Secretary of State
Office of Secretary of State Alex Padilla
Thanks Jenna is adding it to our tracker and she is going to report it

https://twitter.com/prageru/status/1305332188121116677?s=20

James Schwab
Chief Deputy Secretary of State
Office of Secretary of State Alex Padilla
Thanks, James. We'll be reporting.

https://twitter.com/prageru/status/1305332188121116677?s=20

James Schwab  
Chief Deputy Secretary of State  
Office of Secretary of State Alex Padilla
https://twitter.com/prageru/status/1305332188121116677?s=20

James Schwab
Chief Deputy Secretary of State
Office of Secretary of State Alex Padilla
Your inquiry has been emailed to the California Secretary of State's office.

The following information is provided for your convenience. You may wish or save this email as a record of your inquiry.

Short Description: Intimidation free impeachment procedures

Your Question or Comment: Well, it's over and done with. The conduct of our senators was both disgusting and disappointing.
Hopefully the country will not ever have such a similar experience again.
As an act to protect ourselves from undue influence and intimidation in the future the impeachment procedure desperately needs modification. If there was ever a time to require a secret vote it was during ex-President Trump's second impeachment attempt. I'm sure you will agree with me that without the intimidation of the Trump voter base, The Oath Takers, The Proud Boys...a guilty verdict would have been a slam dunk. You as well as the rest of our decision-makers should be able to make decisions of this magnitude without fear of physical or economic threats.
We are counting on you to take the proper actions.

Name: DAVID
Email address: 
Phone number (including Area Code):
Mailing address: 
City: Modesto
State: California
ZIP code: 95355

Regards,

California Secretary of State
Thank you for contacting the California Secretary of State's Office. We have received your message and will be getting back to you as soon as possible. Our office is experiencing an increase of phone calls and emails related to the November 3, 2020, General Election. We appreciate your patience as our staff work as quickly as possible to reply to your inquiry.

In case it is helpful to you, some information pertaining to the most frequently asked questions is listed below. Additional resources may be found by visiting vote.ca.gov.

**Voter Registration:**

For questions pertaining to voter registration, including to confirm your registration status, update your address, or cancel your registration, please contact your county elections office. Contact information can be found here: https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/voting-resources/county-elections-offices/.

You can also check your registration status online at: https://voterstatus.sos.ca.gov/

**Vote by Mail Ballot:**

For this election every registered voter has been mailed a ballot. If you did not receive your ballot, please contact your county elections office. If your ballot has been damaged or needs to be replaced, please contact your county elections office. https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/voting-resources/county-elections-offices/.

You can return your mail ballot via regular mail (no stamp required), in an official ballot drop-box or at any polling place found here https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/polling-place. If you choose not to vote by mail, you can find a voting location here: https://caearlyvoting.sos.ca.gov/

Please bring your mail ballot to the voting location to surrender and receive an in-person ballot. If you do not bring your mail ballot, you will still have the ability to cast a provisional ballot.

**Where's My Ballot:**

You can track your ballot using the Secretary of State’s Where’s My Ballot? tracking tool. Visit wheresmyballot.sos.ca.gov to sign up to received automatic updates on the status of your vote-by-mail ballot.

If you are experiencing trouble signing up for Where's My Ballot?, please visit, ballottrax troubleshooting informationpdf.


Our Voter Hotline operators are also available to you. If you prefer to speak to one of our Voter Hotline operators, please call us at (800) 345-8683.

Thank you for contacting the California Secretary of State.

The following information is provided for your convenience. You may wish to save this email as a record of your inquiry.

Short Description: Concerns about the safety of California’s Electors
Your Question or Comment: California and Texas are the only two states with enough electors that their simple removal could affect the national election results.

Since Texas went to Trump, there should be no danger to that state’s electoral process, but California is a different issue.
I am concerned that illegal militia groups could violently target California’s electoral vote meeting place, and completely remove all 55 electors prior to their certified vote.

From what I have been able to learn, it seems like there might be no national recourse to such an event except to discard California’s votes and determine the Presidential election based on the remaining 483 delegates, with neither candidate receiving 270 votes. Different rules would apply then, with the possibility of a different result.

I know it sounds far-fetched, but I fear that Trump’s Proud Boys et al may be standing by for just such an opportunity.

Are sufficient safeguards in place in California to prevent such a terrorist attack on American democracy?

Name: : Tim
Email address: :
Phone number (including Area Code):
Mailing address: 
City:: San Jose
State:: Ca
ZIP code:: 95117

Regards,

Elections Division Staff

California Secretary of State
Short Description: Unlawful private militias and the upcoming election
Your Question or Comment: Brady United Against Gun Violence and the San Diego Gun Violence Prevention Coalition are concerned that private militias may attempt to interfere with the upcoming election and vote count— including by disrupting polling places, intimidating potential voters to prevent them from voting, and interfering with the orderly counting of mail-in ballots. Our concerns are based on the rise of self-styled militias that have shown up at protests ranging from Charlottesville to Kenosha. Those concerns were heightened by the recent presidential debate when, rather than condemn the extremist Proud Boys hate group, President Trump told them to “stand back and stand by,” and later asked his supporters to “go into the polls and watch very carefully.”

As you may know, private militias are illegal in California. The provisions of the California Constitution and California statutes that prohibit such militias are set forth in a two-page fact sheet on Unlawful Militias in California, which was prepared by the Institute for Constitutional Advocacy and Protection at Georgetown Law and is available at www.law.georgetown.edu/icap/wp-content/uploads/sites/32/2020/09/California.pdf. The fact sheet also includes citations to US Supreme Court authority holding that private militias are not protected by the Second Amendment.

We hope you will work with local elections and law enforcement officials to ensure they are fully informed about the illegality of private militias, how to recognize them, and the possibility of militias’ interfering with the upcoming election.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue and for all you do to protect California elections.

Mattie Scott, President CA Brady United
Ruth Borenstein, Co-lead SF Chapter of Brady United
Therese Hymer, Legislative Lead, SD GVP Coalition

Name: : Ruth Borenstein
Email address: :
Phone number (including Area Code)::
Company or Organization: Brady United Against Gun Violence, SF Chapter
Mailing address: :
City:: SAN FRANCISCO
State:: CA
ZIP code:: 94114

Regards,

California Secretary of State
Your inquiry has been emailed to the California Secretary of State's office.

The following information is provided for your convenience. You may wish to save this email as a record of your inquiry.

Short Description: Poll worker and voter safety, Proud Boys

Your Question or Comment: Given President Trump’s call for the Proud Boys to "stand by," what will be done to keep the polls safe for poll workers and voters? The Proud Boys are a White Nationalist hate group that wears recognizable emblems, are known to be violent, and are therefore extremely intimidating to many POC and non-POC citizens. It seems at least that their presence at the polls should be considered electioneering and they should not be permitted within 100 feet of poll stations.

Name: Alexis
Email address: 
Phone number (including Area Code): 
Mailing address: 
City: Santa Monica
State: CA
ZIP code: 90404

Regards,

Elections Division Staff

California Secretary of State
Your inquiry has been emailed to the California Secretary of State's office.

The following information is provided for your convenience. You may wish to save this email as a record of your inquiry.

Short Description: Voter Safety

Your Question or Comment: With Donald Trump ordering the "Proud Boys" to create chaos at the polls, how are you guaranteeing voter safety at the polls?

Name: Robert
Email address: 
Phone number (including Area Code): 
Mailing address: 
City: Compton
State: California
ZIP code: 90220

Regards,

Elections Division Staff

California Secretary of State
Dear Secretary of State Voting System Comments,

I’m writing to ask you not to certify Los Angeles' VSAP Tally 2.0 Ballot Marking Devices without rectifying core security problems and putting conditions on how Los Angeles uses the systems. As Dr. Philip Stark, who invented the protocol for risk-limiting audits, said, a key part of the VSAP design is a “security fail”.

Here are key issues we’re asking you to make conditions of certification to give voters confidence in the security of our elections:

-- Fixing the violations of the California Voting System Standards (CVSS) in the Functional Test Report, especially the excessive root access and the ability to boot the system from USB ports.

-- Fixing the violation of CVSS 3.2.7.a that “Voting systems shall not require page scrolling by the voter.” Candidates that appear on the second page underneath the “More” button will likely be at a disadvantage. The best way to fix this would be to show all the candidates for a race on the screen at once, as required by the CVSS, allowing people to touch to increase the font size if necessary.

-- Fixing the current BMD security fail of having the voter submit their verified ballots back through the BMD under its printer heads. It doesn’t matter if the software raises the print head, because software can be hacked. This is why you must only certify the VSAP BMDs on condition that they not act as ballot boxes and that the voting centers use traditional ballot boxes instead.

-- Lastly, many voters have very understandable concerns using BMDs at all. The recent University of Michigan study found that less than 10% of voters noticed when their votes were changed, seriously raising the question whether BMDs actually provide for verified voting. VSAP's system is even worse because voters are unable to verify the QR code that the system uses to scan, making it impossible for even diligent voters to verify their vote.

This is why it is absolutely crucial that voters be given the option to vote using hand marked paper ballots at voting centers. Without that option, voters who don’t trust BMDs won’t have faith that their vote is counted, raising serious issues of trust in elections.

This is all on top of the fact that VSAP’s source code hasn’t been released to the public as open-source nor are there yet any public plans to, further lessening voters’ confidence in the security of the system.

In an age in which foreign governments and possibly others are attacking our elections systems, it is incumbent upon you as Secretary of State to minimally require these conditions to lessen voters doubts about the security of our elections, especially as author of SB 360 that put all responsibility for certifying California’s voting systems in your hands.

And if doing the right thing isn't enough of an incentive, we can always call in Tom Fitton from Judicial Watch. You know, the guy who made you and your minions clean up the voter roles.

Sincerely,

Kerry
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-5159
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks!

Premiered Sep 22, 2020

5,107 views • Premiered Sep 22, 2020
Thanks Andrea!

Have a great rest of your weekend.

All the best,
Akilah

From: Andrea Holtermann <holtermann@google.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 27, 2020 7:03 PM
To: Jones, Akilah <ajones@sos.ca.gov>
Cc: Kevin Kane <kakevin@google.com>; civics-outreach@google.com <civics-outreach@google.com>; jdooley@google.com <jdooley@google.com>
Subject: Re: REPORT VIDEO: **ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks!

Hi Akilah,

Circling back on this. Thank you for raising this content to our attention, this has been removed from the platform for violating our policies. Please do not hesitate to reach out if there are any other questions or concerns you may have.

Best,

On Fri, Sep 25, 2020 at 8:16 AM Andrea Holtermann <holtermann@google.com> wrote:

Hi Akilah,

Thanks for reaching out. We will look into this and get back to you as soon as we can.

Best,

On Thu, Sep 24, 2020 at 7:41 PM Jones, Akilah <ajones@sos.ca> wrote:

Hi YouTube Reporting Team,
I am reporting the following video because it misleads community members about elections or other civic processes and misrepresents the safety and security of mail-in ballots.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rYhZobZ-51M#:~:text=california&text=ballot&text=harvesting&text=california&text=california
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Misinformation Tracking

5,107 views • Premiered Sep 22, 2020
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS**

Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks! - YouTube

Tom Fitton delves into the risks of mail-in-voting, providing viewers with important details on potential voter fraud and intimidation. Drawing from Judicial...

www.youtube.com

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

All the best,
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks!
Hi Akilah,

Circling back on this. Thank you for raising this content to our attention, this has been removed from the platform for violating our policies. Please do not hesitate to reach out if there are any other questions or concerns you may have.

Best,

On Fri, Sep 25, 2020 at 8:16 AM Andrea Holtermann <holtermann@google.com> wrote:

Hi Akilah,

Thanks for reaching out. We will look into this and get back to you as soon as we can.

Best,

On Thu, Sep 24, 2020 at 7:41 PM Jones, Akilah <ajones@sos.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi YouTube Reporting Team,

I am reporting the following video because it misleads

community members about elections or other civic processes and misrepresents the safety and security of mail-in ballots.
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rYhZobZ5IM#:~:text=california&text=ballot&text=harvesting&text=california&text=california
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting &...
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS**

Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks! - YouTube

Tom Fitton delves into the risks of mail-in-voting, providing viewers with important details on potential voter fraud and intimidation. Drawing from Judicial...

www.youtube.com

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

All the best,
Akilah

--

Andrea Holtermann

Civics Outreach

(443) 534-3483
25 Massachusetts Ave NW #900, Washington, DC 20001
Team Alias: civics-outreach@google.com
g.co/civicsresources

--

Andrea Holtermann

Civics Outreach

(443) 534-3483
25 Massachusetts Ave NW #900, Washington, DC 20001
Team Alias: civics-outreach@google.com
g.co/civicsresources
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks!

5,107 views • Premiered Sep 22, 2020
Hi Akilah,

Thanks for reaching out. We will look into this and get back to you as soon as we can.

Best,

On Thu, Sep 24, 2020 at 7:41 PM Jones, Akilah <ajones@sos.ca.gov> wrote:

Hi YouTube Reporting Team,

I am reporting the following video because it misleads community members about elections or other civic processes and misrepresents the safety and security of mail-in ballots.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rYhZobZ-5lM#:~:text=california&text=ballot&text=harvesting&text=california&text=california
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & More
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**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS**

Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks! - YouTube

Tom Fitton delves into the risks of mail-in-voting, providing viewers with important details on potential voter fraud and intimidation. Drawing from Judicial...

www.youtube.com

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

All the best,
**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks!
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Hi YouTube Reporting Team,

I am reporting the following video because it misleads community members about elections or other civic processes and misrepresents the safety and security of mail-in ballots.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rYhZobZ-5IM#:~:text=california&text=ballot&text=harvesting&text=california&text=california

**ELECTION INTEGRITY CRISIS** Dirty Voter Rolls, Ballot Harvesting & Mail-in-Voting Risks! - YouTube

Tom Fitton delves into the risks of mail-in-voting, providing viewers with important details on potential voter fraud and intimidation. Drawing from Judicial...

www.youtube.com

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

All the best,

Akilah
Hi Paula,

Finally back from my duties. Here is the biweekly update:

CHOP
Personal accounts report CHOP has two sides. During the day it is mostly peaceful but at night there is a trend of threatening behavior. There have also been third party actors showing up to the zone to cause problems. The link below shows an altercation between The Proud Boys and antifa. The individual assaulted told witnesses that the altercation started because he filmed the group leaving. He said they got out, told him to stop recording, and when he did not they took his phone and beat him up.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TNiNk-H2IU

Currently the CHOP is running out of steam. The threat level will lower as enthusiasm for the movement diminishes.

(I was unsure if this is happening where you are but there have been fireworks being set off in most major cities. We are looking into the reasoning behind it.)
Thank you for contacting the Secretary of State's Elections Division with your recent email.

If you feel threatened at a polling location you should call law enforcement. They will be able to handle any threatening persons or anyone intimidating voters.
We hope this information is helpful to you. If you have further questions about this or another matter related to the Secretary of State's Elections Division, please call (916) 657-2166.

Sincerely,

Elections Web Mail Representative

From: Secretary of State Webmaster <webmaster@sos.ca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2020 1:28 PM
To: Webmaster <Webmaster@sos.ca.gov>
Subject: Elections Inquiry

Your inquiry has been emailed to the California Secretary of State's office.

The following information is provided for your convenience. You may wish to save this email as a record of your inquiry.

Short Description: Voter Safety
Your Question or Comment: With Donald Trump ordering the "Proud Boys" to create chaos at the polls, how are you guaranteeing voter safety at the polls?
Name: : Robert
Email address: : 
Phone number (including Area Code): : 
Mailing address: : 
City: : Compton
State: : California
ZIP code: : 90220

Regards,

Elections Division Staff

California Secretary of State
Your vote can make the difference to assure our Republican candidates make it into the General Election. Have you voted yet?

Greetings!
The Presidential Primary Election ends next Tuesday, and there are several important races in Sacramento County including the Board of Supervisors, the State Assembly and Senate, and Congress. We have prepared a list of endorsed candidates, and a recommendation on Proposition 13 that we hope you will consider. You can view our Voter Guide at this link. Several candidates are highlighted below as well as useful tools for tracking your ballot, finding a voting location, and contact information for the Sacramento County Elections Office.

Our volunteers are calling voters, walking their neighborhoods, and spreading the word that this election is important and we need all Republicans to step up and vote. We can win elections in our County if we all show up!

Thank you,
Betsy Mahan
Chair, SacCountyGOP
www.SacCountyGOP.com
(916) 822-5618 (Headquarters)

Tamika Hamilton
Congress - District 3
After serving her country in the Air Force for 14 years, Tamika now works with homeless veterans throughout the 3rd Congressional District. 
Website

Christine Bish
Congress - District 6
As a realtor, Chris works daily to help people find clean affordable housing while navigating the Federal, State and Local laws and regulations. 
Website

Buzz Patterson
Congress - District 7
After serving his country in the Air Force for 20 years, Buzz now writes about his experience working in Washington during the Clinton Administration. 
Website
Eric Rigard  
Assembly District 9

Eric is a retired businessman with traditional values who is active in the Calvary Christen Center and the Center for Urban Renewal and Education. 
Website

SacCountyGOP

Voter Guide

More About

Our Candidates

All ballots have been mailed to Sacramento County voters the first week in February. You can submit your ballot using any Drop Box, Vote Center, or you can mail it by March 3rd. Be sure to sign the outside of the envelope!

Concerned about your ballot being counted? Sign up to have your ballot tracked and to receive notifications by email or text.

Questions? If you received the wrong ballot, need to change your registration, or have any concerns about voting, contact the Sacramento County Elections Office at (916) 875-6451.

The volunteers at the Sacramento County Republican Party would be pleased to assist you in the voting process. Just give us a call at (916) 822-5618.

DONATE

A Member Communication paid for by the Sacramento County Republican Party
9851 Horn Road, #100, Sacramento, CA 95827
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