

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
BOARD OF ELECTIONS**

Joseph Bishop-Henchman,	)	
Challenger	)	Administrative
	)	Order #26-032
	)	
v.	)	Re: Challenge to Nominating
	)	Petition Submitted by
	)	Tim Durant Jr.
Tim Durant Jr.,	)	
Candidate.	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

**Introduction**

This matter came before the District of Columbia Board of Elections (“the Board”) on April 17, 2026. It is a challenge to the nominating petition submitted by Tim Durant Jr. (“the Candidate”) to run for the office of Ward 8 Committeeman for the Democratic Party in the June 16, 2026 Primary Election (“the Primary Election”). Joseph Bishop-Henchman (“the Challenger”), a registered voter in the District of Columbia, filed the challenge pursuant to D.C. Official Code § 1-1001.08 (o)(1). Chairman Gary Thompson and Board member Karyn Greenfield presided over the hearing. All parties appeared *pro se*.

**Background**

On March 18, 2026, the Candidate submitted a nominating petition to appear on the ballot as a candidate in the Primary Election contest for the office of Ward 8 Committeeman for the Democratic Party (“the Petition”). A candidate for this office presently must submit at least 100 signatures of District voters registered in the same ward and party as the candidate to obtain ballot access. The Petition contained 106 signatures. Pursuant to Title 3, District of Columbia

Municipal Regulations (D.C.M.R.) § 1703.1, Marissa Corrente, the Board of Elections' Registrar of Voters ("the Registrar"), accepted 106 signatures for review.

On March 21, 2026, the Petition was posted for public inspection for 10 days, as required by law. On March 29, 2026, the Challenger challenged the petition, asserting that 32 signatures were invalid. Specifically, the Challenger contended the signatures were invalid pursuant to Title 3 D.C.M.R. §§ 1703, 1707.1 because the signer was not a registered voter; the signer, according to the Board's records, was not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed; the petition did not include the name of the signer where the signature was not sufficiently legible for identification; the signer was not a registered voter in the jurisdiction from which the candidate seeks nomination at the time the petition was signed; and/or the signer is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the petition is signed.

#### **Registrar's Preliminary Determination**

The Registrar's review of the challenge indicated that 29 of the 32 signature challenges were valid. The Registrar found six challenges were valid because the signers were not registered at the time the petition was signed; 10 challenges were valid because the signers were not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed; two challenges were valid because the signer's voter registration was designated as inactive on the voter roll at the time the petition was signed; one challenge was valid because the petition did not include the name of the signer where the signature is not sufficiently legible for identification; and 10 challenges were valid because the signer is not registered to vote in the same party as the candidate at the time the petition was signed.

Accordingly, the Registrar preliminarily determined the Petition contained 77 valid signatures, which is 23 signatures below the number required for ballot access.

### **April 13, 2026 Pre-Hearing Conference**

Pursuant to title 3 D.C.M.R. § 415.1, the Office of the General Counsel convened a prehearing conference with the parties on April 13, 2026. In her findings report issued prior to the prehearing conference, the Registrar outlined her determinations with respect to the validity of each signature challenged and provided a key code explaining the notations she used to indicate the basis for upholding or denying each challenge. At the conference, the Challenger noted the Registrar's report was thorough and correct as presented.

The Candidate contended that the Registrar should not have found six signers to be unregistered voters; two signers to be inactive voters; one signature illegible; 10 signers not to be registered to vote at the address on the petition; and 10 signers not to be within the Candidate's party. The Candidate made these assertions but did not provide further facts to support them. The Candidate also expressed frustration that he never received a list of registered Ward 8 voters.<sup>1</sup>

The parties were not able to resolve the matter or narrow the issues between them. The case was accordingly set for a Board hearing on April 17, 2026. The Candidate and Challenger were duly notified of the hearing.

### **April 17, 2026 Board Hearing**

The Registrar was present at the hearing and presented her findings. During the Board hearing, the Challenger urged that the Board accept the findings of the Registrar and deny the Candidate ballot access. The Candidate did not object to the Registrar's findings at the hearing. Rather, he solely contended that he never received a voter list from the Board and that this worked an unfairness on his candidacy. As the OGC representative explained to the Candidate

---

<sup>1</sup> The Candidate had previously noted his frustration with not receiving the voter list in an email sent on April 8, 2026.

in an April 9, 2026 email and again at the hearing, the Board makes the voter list available to the public consistent with its regulation at 3 DCMR § 510 and regularly complies promptly with such request it receives.

In addition, and as the Board explained in its April 9, 2026 email and at the hearing, when a prospective candidate for office comes to the Board to obtain a nominating petition package, the Board provides the candidate ballot access documents. Among these documents is a form titled “Request for Voter Registration Data, Maps or Petition Signature.” The document is specifically designed to facilitate a request for the voter list. The Candidate certified in a “Receipt of Ballot Access Documents” form that he received this Request for Voter Registration form as part of the ballot access documents package the Board provided him. The Request for Voter Registration form requires a candidate (or other requestor) to fill out basic biographical data and then sign, date and check a box requesting Voter Registration Data. The Board provides the voter list free of charge to any candidate that submits this form. Moreover, the Candidate never contended that he availed himself of his right to submit this form to the Board.

### **Discussion**

The Candidate needed to obtain 100 signatures from voters registered in his ward and party to obtain ballot access for this office. The Petition contained 106 presumptively valid signatures. The Challenger filed challenges to 32 signatures. The Registrar determined 29 of those challenges were valid. The Board upholds the finding of the Registrar. The Petition accordingly contains only 77 valid signatures. Thus, there are insufficient signatures for ballot access.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> While it appears that the Board unfortunately did not provide a voter list to the Candidate, it is not required to do so. Moreover, the provision of a voter list, which the Candidate had the opportunity to request at all times during the ballot access process, does not affect the Candidate’s independent obligation to submit a petition containing the

**Conclusion.**

As a result of this challenge, the Board finds that the Petition contains seventy-seven 77 valid signatures – 23 signatures below the number required for ballot access. It is hereby:

**ORDERED** that challenge to the nominating petition of Tim Durant Jr. for the office of Ward 8 Committeeman for the Democratic Party in the Primary Election is hereby upheld.

The Board issues this written order today, which memorializes its oral ruling rendered on April 17, 2026.

Date: April 18, 2026



---

Gary Thompson  
Chairman  
Board of Elections

---

required number of valid signatures, which he did not do. Accordingly, the Board cannot grant the Candidate ballot access.