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CHAIR NICHOLS: Good afternoon. Calling to order the Special Board Meeting -Special Meeting of the Board of Elections.

Today is Monday, May 12th, 2014. The time is 3:02 p.m. We are meeting in Room 280 North of One Judiciary Square.

I am Deborah K. Nichols, Chairman of the Board of Elections. On the dais with me this afternoon is Mr. Kenneth McGhie, our General Counsel.

We are here this afternoon to conduct a hearing to determine challenges to the Nominating Petition for the Office of Ward 8 Member of the Board of Education.

In this case it is Seegars v. Jolly, and Seegars, et al. v. Simpson. I thought that was not going forward.

MR. McGANN: That case is going to proceed ex parte.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. All right.

So, we will proceed first with the Seegars v. Jolly hearing, petition -Nominating Petition Hearing.

So, we have the parties before us.
Would you identify yourself for the record first, and then 1 will go to your report, Ms. Brooks.

We will start with Mr. McGann.
MR. McGANN: Rudolph McGann, Staff Attorney for the Board of Elections.

MS. BROWN: BRITNEY Brown, Law Clerk for the Board of Elections.

MS. JOLLY: Tierra Jolly, candidate for State Board of Education, Ward 8.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Dara Lindenbaum of Sandler Reiff Young \& Lamb on behalf of Ms. Jolly.

MS. WILLIAMS: Sandra Seegars, 1107 Savannah Street, S.E., challenger.

MS. WILLIAMS: Sandra Williams, 847 Barnaby Street, assistant challenger -- to
the challenger -- with the challenger.
MS. BROOKS: Karen Brooks,
Registrar of Voters.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you.
Ms. Brooks, we will hear your report. Read your report for the record, please.

MS. BROOKS: Okay. On April 17th, 2014, Tierra Jolly submitted a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the July 15th, 2014 special election for the Office of Ward 8 Member of the State Board of Education.

That petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law and challenged on April 28th, 2014 by Sandra Seegars, a registered voter in the District of Columbia.

My preliminary review of the petition challenge indicates that Ms. Jolly submitted a total of 347 signatures. The minimum requirement for this office is 200

```
Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.
202-234-4433
```

signatures of District voters who are duly registered in the same ward as the candidate.

Challenger Sandra Seegars filed a challenge to a total of 201 signatures enumerated by line and page number on the individual challenges filed for each petition page.

Petitioner's signatures was challenged pursuant to Title 3 DCMR, Section 1607.1 of the Board's regulations on the following grounds.

The signer is not a dulyregistered voter, he signer, according to the Board's records is not a registered voter at the address listed on the Petition at the time the petition was signed, provided an address on the petition which is different than the address which appears on the Board's records shall be deemed valid if the signer's candidate's address is within the boundary from which the candidate seeks nomination, and a signed and filed a change of address with
the Board during the first ten days following the date on which the challenge for the nominee petition was filed.

The petition does not include the address of the signer. The petition does not include the name of the signer where the signature is not sufficiently legible for identification.

The signature is not made by the person whose signature it purports to be, and the signer is not a registered voter in the ward or same member district in which the candidate seeks nomination at the time the petition was signed.

My review indicates a total -indicates that a total of 139 of the 201 challenges are valid. This leaves the candidate's nominated petition with 208 signatures, eight signatures over the number required for ballot access.

At the prehearing conference, the registrar of voters received two changes of
address from Ms. Jolly, bringing her total to 210 valid signatures.

Additionally, as a result of another review by the registrar of voters, the nine signators raised by Ms. Jolly during the prehearing conference that have been initially determined to be invalid candidate Tierra Jolly was credited with the signature of Angela Cherry, page 5, line 18 because the address of the signer matched the address in the voter registration record.

This leaves candidate Tierra Jolly with 211 signatures, a total of 11 signatures over the number required for ballot access.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, Ms. Brooks.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. Beginning with the addressee, the candidate, do you accept the report of the Registrar of Voters?

MS. LINDENBAUM: Just with one note. I believe, in addition to Ms. Cherry, Andres Holman, we gave the voter his ID
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MS. BROOKS: Mr. Holman is an address change. He changed his apartment number.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Oh, okay. Okay. Okay. Yes. We do.

MR. McGHIE: And, Ms. Seegars, you are taking exception to the report?

MS. SEEGARS: I don't know. I don't know. I don't know at this point what she read is what she sent to us. Let's put it that way. I don't agree with it, though, but I heard -- I heard it.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. All right. Well, in any case, the challenger has the burden of proof and Ms. Brooks is indicating that the candidate has 11 signatures over the required amount.

So, do you have any evidence that you would like to present at this time that would reduce that number below the 200 required signatures?

MS. SEEGARS: Well, we went to find some of the ones that were -- that we thought were forged and the Board said -- not them, the Board said there wasn't a John Lewis on page -- or John James, Robert -- Robert Lewis.

We went to find him. We couldn't find him, so I don't know where he was. We went to another one, and the family said that that person had not lived -- hadn't lived there for years, since she was a child.

That was Seegars. Arnethia Seegars, number one on -- page 10, number one.

MR. McGHIE: What is that page?
MS. SEEGARS: Page 10.
MR. McGHIE: Oh, page 10, number one?

MS. SEEGARS: Line one.
MR. McGHIE: Line one.
MS. SEEGARS: Yes. And the family member said that she did not live there in a long time, and at least for the signature, it
wasn't a signature, or we did not actually talk to Ms. Seegars personally.

And the other one, same page, number 19.

MS. WILLIAMS: Line 19.
MS. SEEGARS: I mean, excuse me. Page 10, line 19. Robert Lewis. That person we could not find at all. And there is another one that was not the same as -- it was forged.

And this particular page has several forgeries.

MR. McGHIE: When you say you couldn't find them, you couldn't find their registration card or --

MS. SEEGARS: We couldn't find the actual person.

MR. McGHIE: Oh, the actual person.

MS. SEEGARS: We went to the address, could not find the person.

MR. McGHIE: Okay.

MS. SEEGARS: The person is no longer there.

At that point, \(I\) concluded that if -- if nobody found them the first time, to put a forged signature on the sheet, how can we find them a second time. So, we didn't look anymore.

And what I would like for you to do, and, you know, we have the burden of proof, 1 would like for you all to look at them again and give us your opinion on a couple of them. But I think we have some objections to the findings and they have some objections as well.

And what I think happened is, several people probably pulled the cards to compare and I think each one, maybe not paying attention or just trying to rush through it and came up with just anything to get it finished.

So that is what I would like for you to do. The ones that we said were -- were
forged.
MR. McGHIE: Okay. Well, I know you have been here before, so you know what usually happens. So, if you have any other signatures that you wanted the Board to take a look at, you can just give me the page and the number, and then, when the Board deliberates they will look at the -- they will compare the registration card with the signature on the petition.

MS. SEEGARS: On the -- what is this? What are you asking, the order, I guess it is?

MR. McGHIE: Right here.
MS. SEEGARS: On the order that was sent out they -- they listed the issues. Page four. I think it is page four, the issues that we had were the Board's finding. All of those.

MR. McGHIE: Page four?
MS. SEEGARS: Page four. Yes. I
think it is four, that kind of narrows it down
so maybe three. But we are starting -- Ms. Seegars' other issues are as follows:

Then, a number where a woman
signed it, Monekia General, Renee McFadden. Is that right?

MR. McGHIE: What number is, page four, line --

MS. SEEGARS: Page four, line 10.
MR. McGHIE: Line 10.
MS. SEEGARS: Page four, line 10.
MR. McGHIE: Okay.
MS. SEEGARS: There was another one that had two different names. I think the last name was Hall. All the forgeries I need you to look at again.

Yes. I can't say how because, I think it was something else and when the Board found it, it was a different name than they signed, and it is listed on here somewhere. I am not looking at it now.

But I have another issue, too. When Anthony Williams came before you all, you
were here, \(I\) don't know if they were here, and he had over 2000 signatures.

The Board did not let him run, get on the ballot, let's put it that way. And I think the same thing should happen now. Page 10 and 14 are full of forgeries, and at the prehearing I found others that I didn't agree with as far as what the Board found.

This group was wanted through -oh, the \(E\) is the I is the same, and you don't dispute that something is forged, they need to be prosecuted, and I think they should not be on the ballot because of a -- integrity, just like Anthony Williams was.

And I have this case here, too, and he was not allowed to be on it. And on a page like page 10 and page 14, where there are a lot of forgeries, and one of those done by the -- by the candidate, I don't think she should be allowed to be on the ballot because of that, and she should be prosecuted.

If you get one wrong, and then
there are a couple of more here with the initials and by the forgeries. At this point, I am thinking if somebody forged that many and there are going to be three or four people in the same house with the letter \(D\) in their first name, and that \(D\) could be anybody, and by people forging it is hard to say who it is or what it is, and I have an issue with that, as well.

MS. JOLLY: I apologize if this is out of order, and I know that I should allow my counsel to speak for me, but I would like to state for the record that I take great umbrage at being accused of forgery. And I take great umbrage to having my integrity and my character questioned.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Do you have any evidence that those are forgeries, Ms. Seegars?

MS. SEEGARS: Well, they don't match the card --

CHAIR NICHOLS: But not -- do you
-- other than that --
MS. SEEGARS: No.
CHAIR NICHOLS: -- do you have any evidence, any --

MS. SEEGARS: No. The ones that they agree to there was, I have that, and I have the card that matches --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Agreed to what? That they are what, that they are --

MS. SEEGARS: The ones that the board agreed with the valid challenge, because we challenged the signatures not matching, making this --

CHAIR NICHOLS: But we -- we resolved those, right?

MS. SEEGARS: No.
CHAIR NICHOLS: The ones that you have agreed to were valid challenges, you haven't -- okay. Well, what we would need, at least in part --

MR. McGHIE: You need to identify them with signatures you would like the Board
to take a look at.
So far she says page 10, page 14 and page four, number 10.

MS. SEEGARS: She would like to say something from --

MS. WILLIAMS: It was the -- we were questioned the total number of signatures she obtained on one day. That was -- that was the proof that we wanted to resubmit based on Anthony Williams case.

It was impossible that she could obtain that many signatures on that particular day.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Was that raised during prehearing?

MR. McGHIE: Yes, ma'am.
CHAIR NICHOLS: That was -- that issue is not before us.

MS. SEEGARS: It wasn't raised.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, you cannot
raise it --
MS. SEEGARS: It was not raised,
but as far as the --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Ms. Williams, you cannot raise that issue at this point. That is not the issue before us today.

MS. LINDENBAUM: But that was not proof --

MS. SEEGARS: I don't know -- wait a minute. I don't know if he wrote it down --

MS. LINDENBAUM: No, that was not raised --

MS. SEEGARS: I did -- I say it was --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, it is not in the --

MS. SEEGARS: I did say -- I did say nobody can get that many on one day.

MS. LINDENBAUM: You did not say that and neither did --

MS. SEEGARS: It wasn't -- it wasn't taken --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, that is not
a basis for

MS. SEEGARS: It doesn't matter. It doesn't matter.

CHAIR NICHOLS: But that is not a basis in the law for disallowing a petition. How would you -- I am just asking if you --

MS. SEEGARS: Oh. Well, there are other cases, too, that same thing, the Anthony Williams case. One person couldn't get so many on one day. So, --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.
MS. SEEGARS: -- it has been proven in the Court of Appeals, even --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay. So we are at page 10, page 14, and --

MR. McGHIE: Page four --
CHAIR NICHOLS: -- page four.
MS. SEEGARS: And that is the forgery part. And the two names that signed with another name. I don't know -- it is not -- I say it is not the person. I say they are not registered.

I don't think that the Board
should go and try to find someone who is not listed on the petition. Let me see. Let me start up here. Let me start from number one.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Can I just -would you like me to refute what she says now or should I wait until after --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Just wait. I think she is done. Just hold it for a second. We are --

MS. LINDENBAUM: Okay.
CHAIR NICHOLS: -- going to give her plenty of opportunity to --

MS. SEEGARS: Page one.
CHAIR NICHOLS: -- keep track.
MS. LINDENBAUM: Yes. I certainly will.

MS. SEEGARS: Page one. Page one, line three, four, five. Page three, four and five there are --

MR. McGHIE: Page one, lines three, four, five?

MS. SEEGARS: Yes.

MR. McGHIE: Okay.
MS. SEEGARS: Page three, four and five where the -- some kind of way it is not matching. The printed name and address line does not match with the signature line. Some kind of way it went cris-cross, and, to me, if a person is circulating -- let me see who is circulating this.

Tierra Jolly circulated this one, and that is the purpose, I think, of standing there or watching them sign and make sure they do it correctly.

So, out of those three, if you look at number -- let's see. I think it is three, four -- three is -- who is that, Black? Minnie Black. Number three.

MR. McGHIE: Yes. I think I already --

MS. SEEGARS: Minnie Black.
MR. McGHIE: The printed names don't correlate with the signatures.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Yes. However,
the signature lines are very much -- very clear that you can see number three --

MR. McGHIE: All right. That was one-by-one --

MS. LINDENBAUM: -- when we connect that.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. All right.
Next?
MS. SEEGARS: Yes. So, one of those -- one of those are not -- and somebody - -

MS. WILLIAMS: Number three.
MS. SEEGARS: It is not the person is Ashley.

MS. WILLIAMS: Ashley's name is -no, it is not printed.

MS. SEEGARS: Ashley -- well, her last name is --

MS. WILLIAMS: Right. And our question is concerning -- your petition is an official ballot, right, of an official document. Right? Correct?

MR. McGHIE: Yes, ma'am.
MS. WILLIAMS: Okay. So, based on your definition of this ballot, when we are asking for a printed name and address and signature of the petitioner, and then take an oath of the person who claimed they oversaw the petition, that is why we are challenging that area is not, because Ashley's name should have been printed or it should have been redone or scratched over and started over and just lost -- somebody could have lost a block.

It is just not professional to turn in anything like that. They have got, what, three out of the four because Eric squeezed his name on the line that he put his address, even though he started with five.

So, really, he is number five. Really, they should only have just probably two. But, as an official document, this -this should be a standby, by the definition of -- of what we expect to see on this, and turned in, in some kind of format.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Madam Chair, it may be helpful if \(I\) refute this point at -CHAIR NICHOLS: Just hold on a second.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Excuse me?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Just hold on a second.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Okay.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Just hold on. We have got -- no. Just hold on a second. You are going to have plenty of time.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Okay.
MS. SEEGARS: Okay. Then you have some with the -- either the apartment number or the quadrant of the city missing. And, to me, that is not an address.

And, again, I am going to say because of things not being right on certain of these petitions, things not matching, forgery, 1 would call it so -- you know, for lack of another word.

I don't trust that maybe -- it is
not even a person. So, Southeast, or the apartment number, I think there are two or three of them that he gave to them.

Of course, they found a name and I don't think there should be so. This petition is for a certain reason and it is to get people on here so they can come to ballot.

If it is half-done, I don't think they should have --

CHAIR NICHOLS: What else do you have, Ms. Seegars?

MS. SEEGARS: You got that. Okay. And we have got the forgeries. You have got the address issues, and you have got the -MS. WILLIAMS: And not the same name.

MS. SEEGARS: Not the same name. What else do we have? Prosecution. And -and the ones that we tried to find we couldn't find at all, so \(I\) think that is it.

So, I am going to stop for now. I might have something else in a minute.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you, ma'am. Proceed, ma'am.

MS. LINDENBAUM: First, on behalf of my client, \(I\) do want to say that she really takes offense to what was just said here, and I think, as any registered voter, anyone active in the civic process to -- these allegations of forgeries, it really goes against what we are here to do, what you are here to do, and voter intent and the franchise.
D.C. has always been welcoming to voters and welcoming to the signatures, and inviting people to take part in the process.

And when they are -- when it is alleged that they are forging these signatures, it truly is incredible.

My client is a teacher. She was circulating these petitions during her very, very short breaks. That is why she tried to get as many signatures as possible in that short amount of time and she worked really
hard to do so.
And she is really committed to running for the Board of Education. And a teacher should be an incredible board member and this is really an offensive and insulting process for Ms. Seegars to make these allegations.

That said, we have a -- I just want to say that Ms. Seegars has not met her burden as a challenger on disputing any of the findings of the registrar.

These signatures the registrar did go look and verify that these are correct signatures.

What we also have is a number of sworn statements from all of Ms. Jolly's petition circulators, saying that only if they circulated the petitions and witnessed everything. But they also, one-by-one, for those who Ms. Seegars alleges were forgeries and put the line number and say that they swear that they -- they witnessed that person
signing it.
We also -- again, my client is a teacher. She didn't have time to run out immediately and try to locate all of these -these voters who Ms. Seegars alleged were forgeries.

She went out and was able to have two of these challenged signatures, have them sign affidavits, and there was one other who, when she went there, the family -- the person wasn't home and the family was just very insulted by the fact that somebody would claim that this wasn't their signature.

You know, signatures change all the time. Mine is a scrawl. You make -maybe came without a \(D\), and it changes day-today, and that -- that happens here, too.

So, you know, the Board has always erred on the side of the voter, always sought to expand the franchise, rather than restrict that, and I think that certainly applies in this case.

And I will tell you the specific people who we have the affidavits from. So, we have affidavits from Hazel Mosby. She is on line 10. She is on sheet 10 , line two.

The registrar found that there wasn't a match on that signature, but she signed this sworn statement. And we also have the -- the signed affidavit for -- help me pronounce her name, Jonetta.

MS. JOLLY: Jonetta Mabin.
MS. LINDENBAUM: Jonetta Mabin, who is sheet 10, line 14 . And she signed this sworn statement.

As to what Ms. Seegars brought up on sheet one, first of all, my client is a first-time candidate. She is a novice at this. She is doing the best she can with little money and trying again to focus her attention on running here and teaching students.

But, the voter intent on this sheet one is quite clear. The signatures of
the petitioner all line up quite well, and you can actually make out their names, which is shocking.

The one that was officially on the record as a challenge by Ms. Seegars was sheet one, line three, and that you can clearly see this signature here.

Just because the addresses don't line up, that -- that is a formal error. All of Ms. Seegars' challenges are either formal errors or they are incredibly offensive attempts at saying that there is forgery here.

Okay. And that -- that is -unless she wants to go line-by-line --

MR. McGHIE: No. We are not going line-by-line. Did she -- are you sure those affidavits were from Ms. Seegars were --

MS. LINDENBAUM: No, we -- we just have them here so we -- these ones we don't have triplicate copies of. Those are just the originals. Then we also have all of these.

MR. McGHIE: We have copies of
those?
MS. LINDENBAUM: Yes.
MR. McGHIE: I got you.
MS. LINDENBAUM: Okay. I can't -thank you.

MS. SEEGARS: Well, page 10, number two are -- there was an issue. When we look at -- when we look at this copied sheet --

MS. LINDENBAUM: These are the --
MS. SEEGARS: -- these are a few of them that we saw the original petition, the original petition and a card. They did that. So, number 10, line two there is no issue, once we saw the original document.

MR. McGHIE: Number --
MS. SEEGARS: Number --
MR. McGHIE: Number 10, line two?
MS. SEEGARS: Yes. Page 10. It is page 10, number two.

MR. McGHIE: The one that she has an affidavit for?

MS. LINDENBAUM: Yes.
MS. SEEGARS: We didn't need that because the applicant saw the original here and it didn't match.

MS. LINDENBAUM: No. This is one that the registrar had objected -- had found to be invalid, so --

MS. SEEGARS: Okay. Once we saw it and saw the original card and the original petition, it was a closer match. So, that was no issue when we left out of here.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. So, for the record, that signature is not in issue today?

MS. SEEGARS: Right.
MS. LINDENBAUM: It was in issue.
MR. McGHIE: Well, no. It has --
MS. SEEGARS: Correct.
MS. LINDENBAUM: We challenged the registrar's finding for that one, so that would give us 212 instead of 211.

MS. SEEGARS: They had that before we left here.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. Well, --
MS. SEEGARS: We saw the original and we said it matched. So, they had that before you left. Have to. Should have had --

MS. LINDENBAUM: No, that was our -- that was our challenge, number challenge.

MR. McGHIE: Either way, it is not an issue --

MS. SEEGARS: Okay. We gave it to you because we saw the original. We agreed with you.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Okay.
MS. SEEGARS: Lord. Okay. And on page 14 --

MS. WILLIAMS: Same thing on page 10.

MS. SEEGARS: Line 10. Page 10, line 14. I don't think we -- I don't think we challenged that one. Because I wasn't sure what the name was and I saw the original and I believe I saw -- oh. Okay. That was something else, because the T or J, whatever
it is --
MS. WILLIAMS: The J, right.
MS. SEEGARS: -- was written to the word "Print name." And I couldn't make that out of the original.

MR. McGHIE: Well, if you did challenge it, you are now withdrawing the challenge?

MS. WILLIAMS: It was given to me among the challenge desk, so --

MS. LINDENBAUM: And that was line -- it was miswritten in the prehearing and, you know. It is page 10, line two, but it --

MS. SEEGARS: Line 14.
MR. McGHIE: Line 14. Page 10, line 14.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Are you talking about Hazel Mosby?

MS. WILLIAMS: No.
MS. SEEGARS: No. Line 14. And that Jonetta Mabin. Jeannette something. 3421. Line 14.

Neal R. Gross and Co., Inc.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Right.
MS. SEEGARS: And as far as people being offended by what they -- what we are saying, the Board has it as an option to challenge and, on the code that they gave us, which is separate from the codes here, on the forged was on here, and sometimes when we say doesn't match, what doesn't match.

The signatures, the printed names, so you have to say "forged" so it could be clear what it is.

And even -- and even as we sit here now, she is saying, "Oh, they gave us that." Why did they give it to you? They gave it to you because it was forged and, okay, it is close enough, a close-enough match.

So, they gave it to you. You didn't actually get this signature properly. It was given to you because, oh, it matches close enough. So, that is what that was. And I still say if a sheet with so many forgeries
on it, 20 percent, 30 percent, the whole petition should be thrown out.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Alleged
forgeries. These weren't give to us. These were signed, valid signatures.

MR. McGHIE: All right. It doesn't seem like this -- it doesn't seem like anybody else has any other evidence to present, so --

MS. SEEGARS: Excuse me. What is this? For me, explain to me what is this.

MR. McGHIE: So, --
MS. LINDENBAUM: This is her circulator. That is her circulator.

MS. SEEGARS: It said that he wouldn't -- I mean, \(I\) didn't get a chance to look -- I need to look this over to see what you have got here.

This is right, Jolly, right.
Well, she said he was a circulator. How many sheets being circulated? One?

MS. LINDENBAUM: On the next page
it will tell you, here. It will tell you.
MS. SEEGARS: Oh. Is it
notarized?
MS. LINDENBAUM: It is not notarized. It is a sworn statement.

MS. SEEGARS: It is not notarized.
MS. LINDENBAUM: Under penalty of
perjury.
MS. SEEGARS: Well, yes, this is, too.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Yes.
MS. SEEGARS: And you still get forgeries. Come on. Look at this. You can just look at that and tell it is forged. All of the --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Do you have anything else, Ms. Seegars?

MS. SEEGARS: Oh. No. Wait a minute.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Because we have got to move -- we have got to move this on, you know, we need to move it on.

MS. SEEGARS: \(I\) just got this.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Go right ahead. MS. WILLIAMS: And this is her signature.

MS. SEEGARS: Where is her signature? The signature on this. This is -this is this person saying he circulated and she signed it. I don't believe that. Okay.

So, no --
MS. WILLIAMS: Where is her signature, again?

MS. SEEGARS: This is just the circulator saying that he -- this is the same -- excuse me.

What leads -- what they are presenting to us -- whose signature is this one?

MS. LINDENBAUM: That is Ms. Mosby's.

MS. SEEGARS: And she was a circulator?

MS. LINDENBAUM: No, no. She
signed. She is the one that was --
CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, they are presenting that to us. MS. SEEGARS: I know. CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. MS. SEEGARS: Don't I have a chance to look at it?

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. Yes. But I am just -- you said you -- that they presented it to you.

MS. SEEGARS: I mean present it to --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Yes. I just wanted to clarify.

MS. SEEGARS: Oh.
CHAIR NICHOLS: I just wanted to clarify.

MS. SEEGARS: I wanted, too, because if she is disputing what we are saying -- so, what I am going to say about this, as far as the circulator, the same thing they just signed here is the same thing that he
signed here, which is the same thing, which is nothing.

If he have -- which is the same thing. I thought they were going to get the signatures of the ones -- we couldn't find them. The ones we looked for, we could not find to bring in anything from them. It wasn't there.

And so, them bringing in another signature from the same person accused of forgery is not dancing. Here is one that says Hazel, page -- have you seen that one?

MS. LINDENBAUM: I would just submit you haven't met your burden. These are clearly valid people because they are on the voter registration list. We didn't make these people up. These are all people that --

MS. SEEGARS: No. Some of them are not registered and look forged.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Only these -- no, those are valid.

MS. SEEGARS: Okay. Hazel Mosby.

Which number is Hazel Mosby?
MS. LINDENBAUM: Hazel Mosby is sheet 10, line two.

MS. SEEGARS: Ten, line two.
MR. McGHIE: All right. Let me -let's get back on track. So, let me just tell you what happened procedurally.

She just -- she submitted these affidavits and these affidavits are purportedly from the circulators of the petition, so the Board will examine these affidavits and the signatures on the -- on the affidavits to ascertain -- to make a determination on whether they believe it is the -- it is the signature of the circulators, and the Board will give whatever weight it decides to give to these affidavits.

And Ms. Seegars has stated for the record that she believes that these affidavits are not relevant.

So you are objecting to the affidavits and the relevancy of the -- of the
affidavits.
MS. SEEGARS: For the two -- this here that she did get from the signer, or the two we gave her. Anyway, everything else is the same.

MR. McGHIE: And the Board will make a -- the Board will make a decision on -on your objection.

MS. SEEGARS: Well, she is supposed to have them notarized. They are not notarized.

MR. McGHIE: Well, she is saying that is sworn under penalty of perjury.

MS. SEEGARS: Just like this whole

MR. McGHIE: What does the law require?

MS. WILLIAMS: But that was not what the instructions said.

MR. McGHIE: The instructions --
MS. SEEGARS: That is why we
didn't bring anything back, because we
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couldn't get anything notarized.
MR. McGHIE: The instructions do not say --

CHAIR NICHOLS: Oh, oh, oh, oh. Everybody. He is -- let him speak, please.

Go ahead.
MR. McGHIE: Yes. She could have submitted an affidavit, notarized. She could have submitted an affidavit under penalty of perjury.

In either case, the Board will weigh the -- give weight to these affidavits, to accept it, to reject, or to give it little weight or to give it no weight at all.

So, does anybody have any other evidence they would like to submit?

MS. SEEGARS: No. No. Not any more evidence. That is what you are looking at, what is already here, and I trust that you all will do the right thing.

And as far as evidence -- no more evidence, but --

MR. McGHIE: You directed the Board to the signatures that you want them to look at.

MS. SEEGARS: All of them this morning.

MR. McGHIE: And we have made a note that we will -- we have made a notation of what signatures you want them to look at.

MS. SEEGARS: Okay.
MR. McGHIE: The Board is going to look at those signatures. The Board is going to look at the registration. The Board is going to look at the affidavits and the signatures on the affidavits and the Board will make a decision -- and the Board will make a decision.

MS. WILLIAMS: We did get one proof at the house that we went to and had it notarized and dated. Can we mail that to you, because it is dated the day we did it.

MR. McGHIE: No. This is the -this is date you should have, for your
evidence.
MS. LINDENBAUM: MS. SEEGARS: Well, we didn't challenge the address. We challenged the signature, the person --

MS. WILLIAMS: The person who lived there.

MS. LINDENBAUM: -- wasn't there and hadn't been there for years. So, we didn't challenge the address.

So, I just want to say one more thing for the record.

Today I got a call from the attorney general regarding another case of forgery. I asked them if the person -- well, for the first time in circulating a petition, and they don't match, and the attorney general will investigate to see for themselves if this is the person's signature.

They have more people to do it than \(I\) can do it. They said if the person does it for the first time even, that they are going to be prosecuted.

So, when you get -- when you give your finding to us, if one doesn't match, I am asking for prosecution.

MR. McGHIE: And that is noted for the record.

MS. LINDENBAUM: For the record, these comments are really starting to bother -- to border on defamation, and I certainly want to get that on the record.

She has fully slandering my client, who is a teacher, who is trying to get on the Board of Education to help the students of the District.

I just don't understand how you as a community activist could do this to a young energetic teacher who is really willing to serve on the Board.

That said, \(I\) believe we don't need to get into the signature --

MR. McGHIE: Well, okay. Well, if there is no more evidence being submitted by either party, everybody is entitled to a
closing argument, which should be brief, beginning with the --

MS. SEEGARS: Okay. Again, you have all -- everything I am asking you to do or look at for us because we couldn't find the people so \(I\) am asking you to look at our -you know, trust that you will do what you are supposed to do.

However it comes out, it is fine with me. Let's hope you all do what is appropriate. I is -- the signature is not made by the person whose signature it purports to be, this Board of Elections has it as a reason to challenge.

So, we use the word "forged." We paraphrased what this is, instead of each time reading all this whole paragraph. So, defamation is not the issue.
Also, if we -- if we said it is
forgery, accuse them, anything, we are in the proper place to have it handled. So, it is not like we are in the street saying they
forged signatures, putting it on Facebook. We hare here in front of you all, asking for something to be done because we believe that there is forgery. It is not about defamation. It is about what we actually see.

So, whichever way it goes, it is fine with me, but if one is wrong, I will ask for prosecution.

MR. McGHIE: Would you like to make a closing?

MS. LINDENBAUM: Again, for the record, this is definitely defaming my client, and we will handle that if we need to handle that.

That said, I am just trying to do the addition here to see if we need to go into the phase of looking at these signatures. The challenger -- the challenges that came to play after -- or during the prehearing meeting, there are a number of those that were formalistic errors that she doesn't appear to
be disputing here.
But, I believe what pushed us over the threshold --

MR. McGHIE: Well, I think she did. So, the Board is -- the Board is going to make a decision on her -- her statement that some of them don't have apartment numbers and some of them don't have quadrants and some of them have missing -- something missing on them.

And the Board will make a decision on whether or not that should be waived as formal error or not.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Okay. Well, in terms of the -- those formal errors, this Board and the courts have consistently held that the -- the favor goes to the candidate and to the signer.

It is always opening a franchise
rather than narrowing it and you can look at Ms. Seegars' own challenges in Seegars v.

Fuller and, of course, Lawrence v. Board of

\author{
Election and Gollin v. D.C. Board of Elections.
}

These are people that the registrar was able to find on the voting rolls and these are valid signatures. They are -the intent of these signers and the intent of these voters is clear. And Ms. Jolly should certainly be on the ballot.

MS. SEEGARS: One more quick thing. Some -- some -- she is right on the part of what she just said, because when we looked on the disk and on what was emailed to us, as far as the voting roll, it wasn't on that, but Ms. Brooks did find them in that system. I think it was two or three of them.

And so, we ask them that when they -- when the challenge comes up, they try to be as updated as possible so you will see we are facing, so there was an issue.

And I don't know if you need this, but -- I don't know what you all consider an address, but the post office and the census
\[
\begin{gathered}
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considered everything, the street number, the house number, the quadrant, everything.

So, can I submit this, or do you need this for address?

CHAIR NICHOLS: You could submit it for the record. I don't see why not.

MS. SEEGARS: I want to submit this. Exhibit A.

CHAIR NICHOLS: They will probably
label that as an exhibit.
MS. SEEGARS: This -- you can -this is what -- the U.S. Post Office says everything. The Census Bureau says it is everything, not just 22nd. 22nd what? Hours?

MS. LINDENBAUM: And, to dispute that, again, the D.C. Municipal regulations, Title 3, Section 1606.4, the Board can waive any formal error and the -- the regulations don't say anything about full address. It is just "address."

And an address that you are able to verify them on. This is a formal error and
you are clearly able to find them in the voter registration rolls.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. Thank you, ladies. We appreciate it. We will take this under advisement and issue a decision as soon as possible. Thank you so much for coming.

MS. LINDENBAUM: Do you have a time line on --

CHAIR NICHOLS: I cannot give you a time line.

MS. SEEGARS: Ms. Nichols work at her own speed. When she comes back she is going to have a decent answer for us. I think we all will be satisfied with what she says, and with Mr. McGhie's help.

MR. McGHIE: What is the date?
PARTICIPANT: May 19th.
MR. McGHIE: May 19.
CHAIR NICHOLS: And I think that we -- by May 19. But, hopefully, well before that.

Okay.
MS. LINDENBAUM: Thank you.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Thank you so much,
ladies.
MS. SEEGARS: Thank you for your time coming in here.

CHAIR NICHOLS: It is my job. All right. The next is Seegars v -- oh, you are not moving on the Seegars exception.

Ms. Simpson, please come forward.
MR. McGANN: I would like to know at this time if Deputy Simpson expressed an intent not to attend this meeting.

CHAIR NICHOLS: Okay.
MR. McGANN: He was the subject of two challenges, one by Mr. Darrell Gaston, as well as Ms. Seegars.

We, for the sake of efficiency, being that Mr. Simpson is not going to refute any of the -- the issues raised in those challenges, and we are consolidating the two.

CHAIR NICHOLS: All right. All
right.
MR. McGHIE: All right. Then, Ms. Brooks, do you have a preliminary report on whether or not Mr. Simpson should qualify for ballot action?

MS. BROOKS: Yes, we do.
MR. McGHIE: Could you please just read it into the record.

MS. BROOKS: Okay. On April 17th, 2014, Derrell Simpson submitted a nominative petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the July 15, 2014 special election for the office of Ward 8, member of the State Board of Education.

That petition was posted for public inspection for ten days as required by law and challenged on April 28th, 2014 by Sandra Seegars, a registered voter in the District of Columbia.

My preliminary review of the petition challenge indicates that Mr. Simpson submitted a total of 289 signatures. The
minimum for this office is 200 signatures of District voters who are duly registered in the same ward as the candidate.

Challenger Sandra Seegars filed challenges to a total of 171 signatures enumerated by line and page number on an individual challenge sheet filed for each petition page.

Petition sheets were challenged pursuant to Title III, DCMR, Section 1607.1 of Board's regulations on the following grounds.

The signer is not a duly registered voter. The signer, according to the Board's records is not a registered voter at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed, provided that an address on the petition was a different address which appears on the Board's records shall be deemed valid if the signer's current address was in boundary for which the candidate seeks nomination, and the signer filed a change of address with the Board --
change of address form with the Board during the first ten days following the date on which the challenge to deny the petition is filed.

The signature duplicate of a valid signature, the petition does not include the address of signer. The petition does not include the name of the signer, but the signature is sufficiently legible for identification, the signature is not made by the person whose signature it purports to be and the signer is not registered -- a registered voter in the ward or same district for which the candidate seeks nomination at the time the petition was signed.

Additionally, Ms. Seegars alleges
that the individual does not meet the qualification for the office he is seeking such in the D.C. Official Code, Section 3826451.

> My review of the challenge
indicates that a total of 132 of the 171 challenges are valid. This leaves the
candidate with 157 signatures, 43 signatures below the number required for ballot access. MR. McGHIE: Okay. Ms. Seegars, the registrar of voters is recommending that Mr. Simpson denied ballot access for having submitted not a sufficient number of signatures.

Do you take exception or do you accept the registrar's --

MS. SEEGARS: I accept this one hundred percent.

MR. McGHIE: Okay. Madam Chair, I think it would be appropriate at this time if the Board consider a motion and whether to -denying Mr. Simpson ballot access.

CHAIR NICHOLS: A motion.

PARTICIPANT: Who seconded?
CHAIR NICHOLS: Well, we -because Mr. -- yes, there is no -- a decision.
(Simultaneous speaking.)
CHAIR NICHOLS: Since Mr. Simpson
has failed to reach the required number of signatures on his nominating petition, that number being 200, he will be denied access to the ballot.

All right. Is that it?
MR. McGHIE: Yes.
CHAIR NICHOLS: Is that it?
MS. SEEGARS: Yes.
CHAIR NICHOLS: There being no further business before us, this meeting is adjourned. The time is 3:47 p.m. It is Monday, May 12th, 2014.
(Whereupon, the meeting was concluded at 3:47 p.m.)
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\hline 54:19 & III 56:10 & Jolly's 28:16 & 37:3,13,22 38:4,7 & Madam 25:1 58:12 \\
\hline Gollin 51:1 & immediately 29:4 & Jonetta 30:9,10,11 & 38:11 39:18,22 & mail 45:19 \\
\hline Good 3:3 & impossible 18:11 & 35:21 & 41:13,20 42:2 & making 17:13 \\
\hline GOVERNMENT & include 7:4,6 57:5 & Judiciary 3:8 & 46:2,7 47:6 49:12 & match 16:21 22:5 \\
\hline 1:1 & 57:7 & July 5:11 55:12 & 50:14 52:15 53:8 & 30:6 33:4,10 36:8 \\
\hline great 16:13,15 & incredible 27:17 & K & 54:2 & 36:8,17 46:16 \\
\hline grounds 6:11 56:11 & 28:4 & & line 6:5 8:9 10:18 & 47:2 \\
\hline group 15:9 & incredibly 31:11 & K 1:13,16 3:9 & 10:19 11:5,7 14:7 & matched 8:10 34:3 \\
\hline guess 13:12 & indicates 5:20 7:15 & & 14:8,9,10 21:18 & matches 17:7 36:20 \\
\hline & 16 55:21 57:21 & 21:14 & 22:5,5 24:15 & matching 17:12 \\
\hline H & indicating 9:16 & Kenneth 1:21 & 28:21 30:4,4,12 & 22:4 25:19 \\
\hline half-done 26:8 & individual 6:6 56:7 & kind 13:22 22:3,6 & 31:1,6,9 32:14,18 & matter 20:1,2 \\
\hline Hall 14:14 & 57:16 & 24:22 & 34:17,18 35:11,13 & McFadden 14:4 \\
\hline handle 49:14,14 & initially 8:6 & know 9:9,10,10 & 35:14,15,16,20,22 & McGANN 1:20 \\
\hline handled 48:21 & initials 16:2 & 10:8 12:9 13:2,3 & 42:3,4 53:9,11 & 3:20 4:8,9,9 54:11 \\
\hline happen 15:5 & inspection 5:15 & 15:1 16:11 19:7,8 & 56:6 & 54:15 \\
\hline happened 12:15 & 55:16 & 20:19 25:20 29:14 & line-by-line 31:14 & McGHIE 1:21 3:11 \\
\hline 42:7 & instructions 43:19 & 29:18 35:13 38:22 & 31:16 & 8:17 9:7,14 10:14 \\
\hline happens 13:4 29:17 & 43:20 44:2 & 40:4 48:7 51:20 & lines 21:20 23:1 & 10:16,19 11:13,18 \\
\hline hard 16:7 28:1 & insulted 29:12 & 51:21 54:11 & list 41:16 & 11:22 13:2,14,20 \\
\hline hare 49:2 & insulting 28:5 & L & listed 6:15 13:16 & 14:6,9,11 17:21 \\
\hline Hazel 30:3 35:18 & integrity 15:13 & L & 14:19 21:2 56:15 & 18:16 20:15 21:20 \\
\hline 41:12,22 42:1,2 & 16:15 & Iaver je.10 & little 30:18 44:13 & 22:1,17,20 23:3,7 \\
\hline hear 5:5 & intent 27:10 30:21 & lack 25:21 & live 10:21 & 24:1 31:15,22 \\
\hline heard 9:13,13 & 51:6,6 54:13 & ladies 53:4 54:4 & lived 10:10,10 46:6 & 32:3,16,18,21 \\
\hline hearing 2:5 3:14 & invalid 8:7 33:7 & Lamb 4:17 & locate 29:4 & 33:12,16 34:1,7 \\
\hline 4:2,3 & investigate 46:17 & law 1:19 4:11 5:16
20:4 43:16 55:17 & long 10:22 & 35:6,15 37:6,12 \\
\hline held 50:16 & inviting 27:14 & 20:4 43:16 55:17 & longer 12:2 & 42:5 43:6,12,16 \\
\hline help 30:8 47:12 & issue 14:21 16:8 & Lawrence 50:22 & look 12:6,10 13:6,8 & 43:20 44:2,7 45:1 \\
\hline 53:16 & 18:18 19:3,4 32:7 & leads 39:15 & 14:15 18:1 22:14 & 45:6,10,21 47:4 \\
\hline helpful 25:2 & 32:14 33:11,13,15 & leaves 7:17 8:12 & 28:13 32:8,8 & 47:20 49:10 50:4 \\
\hline hold \(21: 8\) 25:3,6,9 & 34:8 48:18 51:19 & 57:22
left \(33 \cdot 11,2234.4\) & 37:17,17 38:13,14 & 53:17,19 55:2,7 \\
\hline 25:10 & 53:5 & left 33:11,22 34:4 & 40:7 41:19 45:3,8 & 58:3,12 59:6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline McGhie's 53:16 & 17:19,21 33:2 & numbers 50:7 & option 36:4 & 44:10 \\
\hline mean 11:6 37:16 & 37:17 38:22 47:18 & & order 3:4 13:12,15 & person 7:10 10:10 \\
\hline 40:11 & 49:14,17 51:20 & 0 & 16:11 & 11:7,17,19,21 \\
\hline meet 57:16 & 52:4 & oath 24:6 & original 32:12,13 & 12:1 20:8,20 22:7 \\
\hline meeting 1:6,11 3:4 & neither 19:18 & objected 33:6 & 32:15 33:3,9,9 & 23:13 24:6 26:1 \\
\hline 3:5,7 49:20 54:13 & Nichols 1:13,16 3:3 & objecting 42:21 & 34:2,10,20 35:5 & 28:22 29:10 39:7 \\
\hline 59:10,13 & 3:9,22 5:4 8:15 & objection 43:8 & originals 31:21 & 41:10 46:4,5,14 \\
\hline member 3:16 5:12 & 16:17,22 17:3,8 & objections 12:13,14 & oversaw 24:6 & 46:20 48:12 57:10 \\
\hline 7:12 10:21 28:4 & 17:14,17 18:14,17 & obtain 18:12 & & person's 46:18 \\
\hline 55:13 & 18:20 19:2,13,21 & obtained 18:8 & P & personally 11:2 \\
\hline Members 1:15 2:7 & 20:3,10,13,16 & offended 36:3 & P-R-O-C-E-E-D-.. & petition 3:15 4:2,3 \\
\hline met 28:9 41:14 & 21:7,11,14 25:3,6 & offense 27:5 & 3:1 & 5:10,14,20 6:6,15 \\
\hline Mine 29:15 & 25:9 26:10 27:1 & offensive 28:5 & p.m 1:13 3:2,7 & 6:16,17 7:3,4,5,14 \\
\hline minimum 5:22 & 38:16,20 39:2 & 31:11 & 59:11,14 & 7:18 13:10 20:4 \\
\hline 56:1 & 40:2,5,8,13,16 & office 2:6 3:15 5:12 & page 2:3 6:5,7 8:9 & 21:2 23:20 24:7 \\
\hline Minnie 22:16,19 & 44:4 52:5,9 53:3 & 5:22 51:22 52:12 & 10:5,13,14,15,16 & 26:5 28:17 32:12 \\
\hline minute 19:8 26:22 & 53:10,12,20 54:3 & 55:13 56:1 57:17 & 11:3,7,11 13:6,17 & 32:13 33:10 37:2 \\
\hline 38:19 & 54:7,14,22 58:16 & official 23:21,21 & 13:17,20,21 14:6 & 42:11 46:15 55:11 \\
\hline missing 25:15 50:9 & 58:19,22 59:7,9 & 24:19 57:18 & 14:8,10 15:5,17 & 55:15,21 56:8,9 \\
\hline 50:9 & nine 8:5 & officially 31:4 & 15:17,17 18:2,2,3 & 56:15,16,17 57:3 \\
\hline miswritten 35:12 & nominated 7:18 & oh 9:5 10:16 11:18 & 20:14,14,15,16 & 57:5,6,14 59:2 \\
\hline Monday 1:8 3:6 & nominating 2:6 & 15:10 20:6 34:21 & 21:13,17,17,18,20 & petitioner 24:5 \\
\hline 59:12 & 3:15 4:3 5:9 59:2 & 36:13,20 38:2,18 & 22:2 32:6,19,20 & 31:1 \\
\hline Monekia 14:4 & nomination 6:21 & 40:15 44:4,4,4,4 & 34:14,15,17 35:13 & Petitioner's 6:8 \\
\hline money 30:18 & 7:13 56:21 57:13 & 54:8 & 35:15 37:22 41:12 & petitions 25:19 \\
\hline morning 45:5 & nominative 55:10 & okay 3:22 5:8 8:17 & 56:6,8 & 27:19 28:18 \\
\hline Mosby 30:3 35:18 & nominee 7:3 & 9:5,5,6,14 11:22 & paragraph 48:17 & phase 49:18 \\
\hline 41:22 42:1,2 & North 1:12 3:8 & 13:2 14:11 17:19 & paraphrased 48:16 & place 48:21 \\
\hline Mosby's 39:19 & notarized 38:3,5,6 & 20:10,13 21:10 & part 17:20 20:18 & play 49:19 \\
\hline motion 58:14,16 & 43:10,11 44:1,8 & 22:1 23:7 24:2 & 27:14 51:11 & please 5:7 44:5 \\
\hline move 38:21,21,22 & 45:19 & 25:8,12,13 26:12 & parte 3:21 & 54:10 55:7 \\
\hline moving 54:9 & notation 45:7 & 31:13 32:4 33:8 & PARTICIPANT & plenty 21:12 25:11 \\
\hline Municipal 52:16 & note 8:21 45:7 & 33:12 34:1,9,12 & 53:18 58:18 & point 9:10 12:3 \\
\hline N & not & 34:13,21 36:16 & particular 11:11 & 16:2 19:3 25:2 \\
\hline N.W 1:12 & & 70:20 48:3 50:14 & & possible 27:21 \\
\hline name 7:6 14:14,18 & number 6:5 7:19 & 54:1,14 55:9 58:3 & party 47:22 & post 51:22 52:12 \\
\hline 16:6 20:19 22:4 & 8:14 9:1,4,21 & 58:12 & paying 12:17 & posted 5:14 55:15 \\
\hline 23:15,18 24:4,8 & 10:13,13,16 11:4 & once 32:15 33:8 & penalty 38:7 43:13 & Potations 2:6 \\
\hline 24:15 26:4,16,17 & 13:7 14:3,6 18:3,7 & one-by-one 23:4 & 44:9 & prehearing 7:21 \\
\hline 30:9 34:20 35:4 & 21:3 22:14,16 & 28:19 & people 12:16 16:4,7 & 8:6 15:7 18:15 \\
\hline 57:7 & 23:2,12 24:17 & ones 10:2 12:22 & 26:7 27:14 30:2 & 35:12 49:20 \\
\hline names 14:13 20:18 & 25:14 26:2 28:15 & 17:5,10,17 26:19 & 36:2 41:15,17,17 & preliminary 5:19 \\
\hline 22:20 31:2 36:9 & 28:21 32:7,14,16 & 31:19 41:5,6 & 46:19 48:6 51:3 & 55:3,20 \\
\hline narrowing 50:20 & 32:17,18,20 34:6 & opening 50:19 & percent 37:1,1 & present 1:15,18 \\
\hline narrows 13:22 & 42:1 49:21 52:1,2 & opinion 12:11 & 58:11 & 9:20 37:9 40:11 \\
\hline need 14:14 15:11 & 56:6 58:2,6 59:1,3 & opportunity 21:12 & perjury 38:8 43:13 & presented 40:9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline presenting 39:16 & 18:7 & reject 44:13 & 36:4,13 39:7,13 & 58:3,10 59:8 \\
\hline 40:3 & quick 51:9 & relevancy 42:22 & 40:19 43:12 48:22 & seeking 57:17 \\
\hline presiding 1: & quite 30:22 31:1 & relevant 42:20 & says 18:2 21:5 & seeks 6:21 7:13 \\
\hline Print 35:4 & R & Renee 14:4 & 41:11 52:12,13 & 56:21 57:13 \\
\hline printed 22:4,20 & R & report 4:7 5:6,6 & 53:15 & seen 41:12 \\
\hline 23:16 24:4,9 36:9 & raise 18:21 19:3 & 8:19 9:8 55:3 & scratched 24:10 & sent 9:11 13:16 \\
\hline probably 12:16 & raised 8:5 18:14,19 & require 43:17 & scrawl 29:15 & separate \(36: 6\) \\
\hline 24:18 52:9 & 18:22 19:10 54:20 & required 5:15 7:20 & second 12:6 21:8 & serve 47:17 \\
\hline procedurally 42:7 & reach 59:1 & 8:14 9:18,22 & 25:4,7,10 & sheet 12:5 30:4,12 \\
\hline proceed 3:21 4:1 & read 5:6 9:11 55:8 & 55:16 58:2 59:1 & seconded 58:18 & 30:15,22 31:5 \\
\hline 27:2 & reading 48:17 & requirement 5:22 & Section 6:9 52:17 & 32:8 36:22 42:3 \\
\hline process 27:7,14 & really 24:17,18 & resolved 17:15 & 56:10 57:18 & 56:7 \\
\hline 28:6 & 27:4,8,22 28:2,5 & restrict 29:20 & see 21:2 22:7,14 & sheets 37:21 56:9 \\
\hline professional 24:12 & 47:7,16 & resubmit 18:9 & 23:2 24:21 31:6 & shocking 31:3 \\
\hline pronounce 30:9 & reason 26:6 & result 8:3 & 37:17 46:17 49:6 & short 27:20,22 \\
\hline proof 9:16 12:10 & received 7:22 & review 5:19 7:15 & 49:17 51:18 52:6 & side 29:19 \\
\hline 18:9 19:6 45:18 & recommending & 8:4 55:20 57:20 & Seegars 3:17,18 4:2 & sign 22:11 29:9 \\
\hline proper 48:21 & 58:4 & right 3:22 9:14 & 4:19 5:17 6:3 9:7 & signators 8:5 \\
\hline properly 36:19 & record 4:6 5:6 8:11 & 13:14 14:5 17:15 & 9:9 10:1,12,13,15 & signature 7:7,9,10 \\
\hline prosecuted 15:12 & 16:13 31:5 33:13 & 23:3,7,19,21,22 & 10:18,20 11:2,6 & 8:8 10:22 11:1 \\
\hline 15:21 46:22 & 42:19 46:11 47:5 & 25:18 33:14 35:2 & 11:16,20 12:1 & 12:5 13:10 22:5 \\
\hline prosecution 26:18 & 47:6,9 49:13 52:6 & 36:1 37:6,19,19 & 13:11,15,21 14:2 & 23:1 24:5 29:13 \\
\hline 47:3 49:9 & 55:8 & 39:2 42:5 44:20 & 14:8,10,12 16:19 & 30:6 31:7 33:13 \\
\hline proven 20:12 & records 6:14 & 51:10 53:3 54:8 & 16:20 17:2,5,10 & 36:19 39:4,6,6,11 \\
\hline provided 6:16 & 56:14,18 & 54:22 55:1,2 59:5 & 17:16 18:4,19,22 & 39:16 41:10 42:15 \\
\hline 56:16 & redone 24:10 & Robert 10:5,5 11:7 & 19:7,11,15,19 & 46:4,18 47:19 \\
\hline public 5:15 55:16 & reduce 9:21 & roll 51:13 & 20:1,6,11,17 & 48:11,12 57:4,5,8 \\
\hline pulled 12:16 & refute 21:5 25 & rolls 51:4 53:2 & 21:13,17,22 22:2 & 57:9,10 \\
\hline purportedly 42:10 & 54:19 & Room 1:12 3:7 & 22:19 23:9,13,17 & signatures 5:21 6:1 \\
\hline purports 7:10 & regarding 46 & Rudolph 1:20 4:9 & 25:13 26:11,12,17 & 6:4,8 7:19,19 8:2 \\
\hline 48:12 57:10 & registered 5:17 6:2 & run 15:3 29:3 & 28:6,9,20 29:5 & 8:13,13 9:17,22 \\
\hline purpose 22:10 & 6:13,14 7:11 & running 28:3 30:19 & 30:14 31:5,10,17 & 13:5 15:2 17:12 \\
\hline pursuant 1:12 6:9 & 20:21 27:6 41:19 & rush 12:18 & 32:6,11,17,19 & 17:22 18:7,12 \\
\hline 56:10 & 55:18 56:2,13,14 & & 33:2,8,14,17,21 & 22:21 27:13,17,21 \\
\hline pushed 50:2 & 57:11,12 & S & 34:2,9,13,17 35:3 & 28:12,14 29:8,14 \\
\hline put 9:11 12:4 15:4 & registrar 5:3 7:22 & S.E 4:20 & 35:14,20 36:2 & 30:22 36:9 37:5 \\
\hline 24:15 28:21 & 8:4,19 28:11,12 & sake 54:18 & 37:10,15 38:2,6,9 & 41:5 42:12 45:2,8 \\
\hline putting 49:1 & 30:5 33:6 51:4
58:4 & Sandler 4:17 & 38:12,17,18 39:1 & 45:11,14 49:1,18 \\
\hline & 58:4 & Sandra 4:19,21 & 39:5,12,20 40:4,6 & 51:5 55:22 56:1,5 \\
\hline Q & registrar's 33:19 & 5:17 6:3 55:18 & 40:11,15,18 41:18 & 58:1,1,7 59:2 \\
\hline quadrant 25:15 & 58:9 & 6:4 & 41:22 42:4,18 & signed 6:16,22 7:14 \\
\hline 52:2 & registration 8:11 & satisfied 53:15 & 43:2,9,14,21 & 14:4,19 20:18 \\
\hline quadrants 50:8 & 11:15 13:9 41:16 & Savannah 4:20 & 44:17 45:4,9 46:2 & 30:7,8,12 37:5 \\
\hline qualification 57:17 & 45:12 53:2 & saw 32:12,15 33:3,8 & 48:3 50:21,21 & 39:8 40:1,22 41:1 \\
\hline qualify 55:4 & regulations 6:10 & 33:9 34:2,10,20 & 51:9 52:7,11 & 56:16 57:14 \\
\hline question 23:20 & \[
52: 16,18 \text { 56:11 }
\] & 34:21 & 53:12 54:5,8,9,17 & signer 6:12,13 7:5 \\
\hline questioned 16:16 & Reiff 4:17 & saying 28:17 31:12 & 55:18 56:4 57:15 & 7:6,11 8:10 43:3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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