

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BOARD OF ELECTIONS**

Sandra Seegars,)	
Challenger)	Administrative
)	Order #26-031
)	
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”). Sandra Seegars, (“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 28 signatures were invalid. Specifically, the Challenger contended that certain 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 address of the signer; the petition did not include the name of the signer where the signature was not sufficiently legible for identification; and/or the signer was not a registered voter in the ward from which the candidate sought nomination at the time the petition as signed.

Registrar's Preliminary Determination

The Registrar's review of the challenge indicated that 23 of the 28 signature challenges were valid. The Registrar found that 12 challenges were valid because the signer was not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition at the time the petition was signed; seven challenges were valid because the signers were not registered at the time the petition was signed; one challenge was valid because the petition does not include the name of the signer where the signature is not sufficiently legible for identification; one challenge was 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 signer was not a registered voter in the jurisdiction from which the candidate seeks nomination at the time the petition was signed; and one challenge was valid because the signer was 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 83 valid signatures, which is 17 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 both 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 Candidate contested the Registrar's findings that 12 were valid because the signer was not registered to vote at the address listed on the petition; that seven were valid because the signatory was not a registered voter; that one was valid because the signature was illegible; and that one was valid because the signatory was not registered to vote in the applicable jurisdiction. However, the Candidate presented no evidence to support his contentions beyond his verbal assertion.

The Challenger expressed agreement with the Registrar's ultimate finding that the Candidate lacked sufficient signatures to obtain ballot access. The Challenger and Candidate were not able to resolve their differences regarding ballot access. The case was accordingly set for a Board hearing on April 17, 2026. The Candidate and challenger were duly notified of the hearing.¹

¹ On April 8, 2026, the Candidate sent an email to the Office of General Counsel related to candidate access to the District's voter roll. The email asserted the Candidate's frustration that he never received a list of registered Ward 8 voters, seeking clarification of the Board's policy regarding voter roll access for candidates. The Office of General Counsel informed the Candidate on April 9, 2026 that the ballot access materials he certified receiving included a Board form that permits any eligible person to request and obtain a District voter list. The response also expressed the Board's understanding the Candidate never requested a voter list using the form or otherwise. The Candidate did not raise the issue again at the prehearing conference but because this may have been due to his legitimate misunderstanding regarding whether it was permissible to do so, the Board will address the issue in its discussion below.

April 17, 2026 Board Hearing

The Registrar was present at the hearing and presented her findings. The Challenger informed the Board that she appreciated its work and agreed with the Registrar's findings. 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 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 requests 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 signatures. The Challenger filed challenges to 28 signatures. The Registrar determined 23 of those challenges

were valid, reducing the valid signatures in the Petition to 83. The Board upholds the finding of the Registrar that the Petition contains 83 valid signatures. The Board accordingly concludes that there are insufficient signatures for ballot access.²

Conclusion

As a result of this challenge, the Board finds that the Petition contains 83 valid signatures – 17 signatures below the number required for ballot access. It is hereby:

ORDERED that Sandra Seegars’ challenge to the nominating petition of Tim Durant Jr. for the office of Ward 8 Committeeman for the Democratic Party in the June 16, 2026 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

² 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 required number of valid signatures, which he did not do. Accordingly, the Board cannot grant the Candidate ballot access.