

## Twitter Thread by President-elect ██████████ ██████



**President-elect ██████████ ██████**

@TeresaSkaggs5



**Lawsuits filed in Arizona December 2, 2020 regarding fraud against Doug Ducey & Katie Hobbs**

<https://t.co/Wy4HV3HsTX>

1 Sidney Powell (pro hac application forthcoming)  
2 Sidney Powell PC  
3 Texas Bar No. 16209700  
4 (517) 763-7499  
5 Sidney@federalappeals.com

6 Alexander Kolodin, AZ Bar No. 030826  
7 Christopher Viskovic, AZ Bar No. 035860<sup>1</sup>  
8 **KOLODIN LAW GROUP PLLC**  
9 3443 N. Central Ave. Ste. 1009  
10 Phoenix, AZ 85012  
11 Telephone: (602) 730-2985  
12 Facsimile: (602) 801-2539  
13 E-Mail:  
14 Alexander.Kolodin@KolodinLaw.com  
15 CViskovic@KolodinLaw.com  
16 SAtkinson@KolodinLaw.com (file copies)

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
18 *(Additional counsel listed on signature page)*

19 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

20 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

21 TYLER BOWYER, MICHAEL JOHN BURKE,  
22 NANCY COTTLE, JAKE HOFFMAN,  
23 ANTHONY KERN, CHRISTOPHER M. KING,  
24 JAMES R. LAMON, SAM MOORHEAD,  
25 ROBERT MONTGOMERY, LORAINÉ  
26 PELLEGRINO, GREG SAFSTEN,  
27 SALVATORE LUKE SCARMARDO, KELLI  
28 WARD, and MICHAEL WARD

Plaintiffs,

v.

DOUG DUCEY, in his official capacity as  
Governor of the State of Arizona, and KATIE  
HOBBS, in her official capacity as the Arizona  
Secretary of State

Defendants.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY,  
EMERGENCY, AND  
PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

(Election Matter)

(TRO Requested)

<sup>1</sup> District of Arizona admission scheduled for 12/9/2020.

1 or hostile foreign actors to access the system and manipulate election results, and moreover  
2 potentially to cover their tracks due to Dominion's unprotected log. Accordingly, a  
3 thorough forensic examination of Dominion's machines and source code is required to  
4 document these instances of voting fraud, as well as Dominion's systematic violations of  
5 the Voting Rights Act record retention requirements through manipulation, alteration,  
6 destruction and likely foreign exfiltration of voting records. See 52 U.S.C. § 20701.

7 11. These and other problems with Dominion's software have been widely  
8 reported in the press and been the subject of investigations. In using Dominion Voting  
9 Systems Democracy Suite, Arizona officials disregarded all the concerns that caused  
10 Dominion software to be rejected by the Texas Board of elections in 2020 because it was  
11 deemed vulnerable to undetected and non-auditable manipulation. Texas denied  
12 Certification because of concerns that it was not safe from fraud or unauthorized  
13 manipulation. (See Exhs 11A&11B ).

14 12. An industry expert, Dr. Andrew Appel, Princeton Professor of Computer  
15 Science and Election Security Expert has recently observed, with reference to Dominion  
16 Voting machines: "I figured out how to make a slightly different computer program that  
17 just before the polls were closed, it switches some votes around from one candidate to  
18 another. I wrote that computer program into a memory chip and now to hack a voting  
19 machine you just need 7 minutes alone with a screwdriver."<sup>3</sup>

20 13. Further, Dominion's documented, and intentional, security flaws facilitated  
21 foreign interference in the 2020 General Election. For example, in the accompanying  
22 redacted declaration of a former electronic intelligence analyst with 305th Military  
23 Intelligence with experience gathering SAM missile system electronic intelligence, the  
24 Dominion software was accessed by agents acting on behalf of China and Iran in order to  
25 monitor and manipulate elections, including the most recent US general election in 2020.  
26 (See Ex. 12, copy of redacted witness affidavit).

27 <sup>3</sup> Andrew W. Appel, *et al.*, "Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs) Cannot Assure the Will  
28 of the Voters" at (Dec. 27, 2019),( attached hereto as Ex. 10 ("Appel Study")).

1 resident of Maricopa County; Greg Safsten, a resident of Maricopa County; Kelli Ward, a  
2 resident of Mohave County; and Michael Ward, a resident of Mohave County.

3 29. Plaintiff Michael John Burke is a registered Arizona voter residing in Pinal  
4 County. Mr. Burke is the Republican Party Chairman for Pinal County.

5 30. Plaintiff Christopher M. King is a registered Arizona voter residing in Pima  
6 County. Mr. Burke is the Republican Party Vice Chairman for Pima County.

7 31. Plaintiff Salvatore Luke Scarmado is a registered Arizona voter residing in  
8 Mohave County. Mr. Burke is the Republican Party Chairman for Mohave County.

9 32. Presidential Electors “have a cognizable interest in ensuring that the final  
10 vote tally reflects the legally valid votes cast,” as “[a]n inaccurate vote tally is a concrete  
11 and particularized injury to candidates such as the Electors.” *Carson v. Simon*, 978 F.3d  
12 1051, 1057 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2020) (affirming that Presidential Electors have Article III and  
13 prudential standing to challenge actions of state officials implementing or modifying State  
14 election laws); *see also McPherson v. Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1, 27 (1892); *Bush v. Palm Beach*  
15 *Cty. Canvassing Bd.*, 531 U.S. 70, 76 (2000) (per curiam).

16 33. Plaintiffs bring this action to prohibit certification of the election results for  
17 the Office of President of the United States in the State of Arizona and to obtain the other  
18 declaratory and injunctive relief requested herein. Defendants certified those results on  
19 November 30, 2020, indicating a plurality for Mr. Biden of 10,457 votes out of 3,420,565  
20 cast.

21 34. The Defendants are Arizona Governor Doug Ducey, and Arizona Secretary  
22 of State Katie Hobbs.

23 35. Defendant Governor Doug Ducey is named as a defendant in his official  
24 capacity as Arizona’s governor.

25 36. Defendant Secretary of State Katie Hobbs is named as a defendant in her  
26 official capacity as Arizona Secretary of State, who serves as the chief election officer in  
27 the State of Arizona.

28 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**



1 system out of the building with him every night as a form of a ‘back up’ copy.” *Id.* ¶22.

2 51. Low’s fellow poll watcher, Affiant Gregory Wodynski, provides more detail  
3 on these regularities. First, Dominion employees and supervisors informed Mr. Wodynski  
4 “that about 12% of mail in ballots were being rejected and needed human intervention in  
5 the adjudication process,” which “amounted to tens of thousands of ballots that required  
6 intervention” in the days he was an observer. Ex. 22, Wodynski aff at ¶9. Mr. Wodynski  
7 confirms that “Bruce” stated that “he would perform a manual daily system backup to an  
8 external hard drive,” *id.* ¶10, and that “he made a daily second disk backup to a new spare  
9 hard drive[] ... [that] were being physically moved off site to another building outside the  
10 MTEC building,” but would not say where. *Id.* ¶11. Bruce further stated “**there was NO**  
11 **CHAIN OF CUSTODY on data backup hard drives leaving the MTEC facility on a**  
12 **daily basis for an undisclosed location.**” *Id.* (emphasis in original).

13 52. Mr. Wodynski also testified to a conversation with Dominion employee  
14 Bruce of the “the specifics of a process where he was manually manipulating stored scanner  
15 tabulation data files,” which “he described as a processing issue at the numerous  
16 adjudication computer workstations.” *Id.* ¶12. Bruce claimed that this was to split large  
17 files into small files for adjudication. *Id.* ¶13. Mr. Wodynski was concerned because this  
18 “**was a human intervention process and therefore creating a potential for intention or**  
19 **non-intentional errors or lost ballot files.**” *Id.*

#### 20 4. Problems with Certification of Dominion Voting Machines.

21 53. Affiant Linda Brickman, the 1st Vice-Chair of the Maricopa County  
22 Republican Committee, oversaw the Secretary of State certification of Dominion voting  
23 machines on November 18, 2020. Ex. 23, Brickman Aff at 1. Mr. Brickman observed the  
24 following problems:

- 25 • Signature verification standards were constantly being lowered by  
26 Supervisors in order to more quickly process that higher amount of early  
27 and mail-in ballots (from approx. 15 points of similarities, to a minimum of  
28 3, lowered to 1, and ultimately to none – “Just pass each signature  
verification through”) ...

1 finds historically unprecedented levels of turnout in specific counties or precincts. Using  
 2 publicly available data, Mr. Ramsland determined that 66 percent of Pima County precincts  
 3 (164 of 248) had turn out above 80%, and at least 36 had turnout above 90%, and that 54  
 4 percent of Maricopa County precincts (300 of 558) had turnout of 80% or more, and at  
 5 least 30 over 90%. *Id.* ¶14. The report concludes that these extraordinary, and likely  
 6 fraudulent, turnout levels “compels the conclusion to a reasonable degree of professional  
 7 certainty that the vote count in Arizona, in particular for Maricopa and Pima counties for  
 8 candidates for President contain at least 100,724 illegal votes that must be disregarded.  
 9 *Id.* ¶14.

10 60. Mr. Ramsland also identifies an impossibility: “an improbable, and possibly  
 11 impossible spike in processed votes,” *id.* ¶16, like those also found in Georgia, Michigan  
 12 and Wisconsin. Specifically, at 8:06:40 PM on November 3, 2020, there was a spike of  
 13 143,100 votes for Biden in Maricopa and Pima Counties. *Id.* Mr. Ramsland believes that  
 14 the spike in Arizona, like those in the other three States he analyzed could have been  
 15 manufactured by Dominion voting machines through a method described in greater detail  
 16 in Section III below. *Id.*

17 61. The summation of sections A through C above provide the following  
 18 conclusions for the reports cited above, respectively.

- 19 • Returned ballots that were deemed unreturned by the state (average  
 20 for Briggs Error #1): 219,135.
- 21 • Unreturned mail ballots unlawfully ordered by third parties (average  
 22 for Briggs Error #1): 86,845.
- 23 • Votes by persons that moved out of state or subsequently registered  
 24 to vote in another state for the 2020 election: 5,790.
- 25 • “Excess votes” to historically unprecedented, and likely fraudulent  
 26 turnout levels of 80% or more in over half of Maricopa and Pima  
 27  
 28

1 transparent process to give credibility to Wisconsin's Dominion-Democracy Suite  
 2 voting system, the processes were hidden during the receipt, review, opening, and  
 3 tabulation of those votes in direct contravention of Wisconsin's Election Code and  
 4 Federal law.

5 69. **Georgia.** Substantial evidence of this vulnerability was discussed in Judge  
 6 Amy Totenberg's October 11, 2020 Order in the USDC N.D. Ga. case of *Curling, et al. v.*  
 7 *Kemp, et. al*, Case No. 1:17-cv-02989 Doc. No. 964. *See*, p. 22-23 ("This array of experts  
 8 and subject matter specialists provided a huge volume of significant evidence regarding  
 9 the security risks and deficits in the system as implemented in both witness declarations  
 10 and live testimony at the preliminary injunction hearing."); p. 25 ("In particular, Dr.  
 11 Halderman's testing indicated the practical feasibility through a cyber attack of causing the  
 12 swapping or deletion of specific votes cast and the compromise of the system through  
 13 different cyber attack strategies, including through access to and alteration or manipulation  
 14 of the QR barcode.") The full order should be read, for it is eye-opening and refutes many  
 15 of Dominion's erroneous claims and talking points.

16 70. The Secretary of State appoints a committee of three people to test different  
 17 voting systems. The committee is required to submit their recommendations to the  
 18 Secretary of state who then makes the final decision on which voting system(s) to adopt.  
 19 A.R.S. § 16-442(A) and (C) In explaining that "In summary, [the court] rejected the  
 20 Secretary's argument that her certification of voting machines for use in Arizona is a  
 21 political question that is inappropriate for judicial review." In doing so, the court  
 22 explained the application of HAVA because Arizona requires that its voting systems are  
 23 HAVA compliant which includes accreditation pursuant to HAVA. *Chavez v. Brewer*,  
 24 222 Ariz. 309, 317, 214 P.3d 397, 405, 2009). During the subsequent four years, the  
 25 Arizona Legislature amended and enacted several statutes to effectuate HAVA. Among  
 26 these changes, the legislature amended Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) section **16-**  
 27 **442(A)** to require that the secretary of state determine the voting machines that are  
 28 "certified for use" in elections. 2003 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 260, § 9 (1st Reg. Sess.). The



1 This joint cybersecurity advisory was coauthored by the Cybersecurity and  
 2 Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) and the Federal Bureau of  
 3 Investigation (FBI). CISA and the FBI are aware of an Iranian advanced  
 4 persistent threat (APT) actor targeting U.S. state websites to include  
 5 election websites. CISA and the FBI assess this actor is responsible for the  
 6 mass dissemination of voter intimidation emails to U.S. citizens and the  
 7 dissemination of U.S. election-related disinformation in mid-October  
 2020.<sup>1</sup> (Reference FBI FLASH message ME-000138-TT, disseminated  
 October 29, 2020). Further evaluation by CISA and the FBI has identified  
 the targeting of U.S. state election websites was an intentional effort to  
 influence and interfere with the 2020 U.S. presidential election.

8 (See CISA and FBI Joint Cyber Security Advisory of October 30, 2020, a copy attached  
 9 hereto as Ex. 18.)

10 **c. Expert Witness Testimony on Dominion Vulnerability to**  
 11 **Foreign Interference and Ties to Hostile Foreign**  
 12 **Governments**

13 77. A PhD Declarant analyzed the cumulative vote percentages sorted by ward  
 14 or precinct sizes. This concept was previously used throughout the report on voter  
 15 irregularities in lulu Fries' dat and Anselmo Sampietro's "*An electoral system in crisis*" at  
 16 <http://www.electoralsystemincrisis.org/>. In Fries' dat's report there was an anomalous  
 17 dependency on precinct size in many of the 2016 primary elections. The larger precincts  
 18 had introduced the use of voting machines. However, one could also theorize the  
 19 opportunity for cheaters to cheat in small precincts, where there may be less oversight.  
 20 Normally, we would expect the cumulative vote percentage to converge to an asymptote,  
 21 and bounce around the mean until convergence. An example of this can be found from the  
 22 2000 Florida Democratic presidential primary between Gore and Bradley. (See Ex. \_\_, at  
 23 p. 8). This is shown in Figure 8, and is taken from Fries' dat's report:



1 addresses the concerns of foreign interference in our elections through hardware  
2 components from companies based in foreign countries with adverse interests.

3  
4 The concern is the HARDWARE and the NON – ACCREDITED VSTLs  
5 as by their own admittance use COTS. The purpose of VSTL’s being  
6 accredited and their importance is ensuring that there is no foreign  
7 interference / bad actors accessing the tally data via backdoors in  
8 equipment software. The core software used by ALL SCYTL related  
9 Election Machine/Software manufacturers ensures “anonymity”.

10 **Algorithms within the area of this “shuffling” to maintain anonymity**  
11 **allows for setting values to achieve a desired goal under the guise of**  
12 **“encryption” in the trap-door...**

13 (See Id. at ¶32).

14 83. Scytel, contracts with the AP – which receives the results tallied by SCYTL  
15 on behalf of Dominion. (See Exh. 13 at par. 33). This becomes highly relevant since  
16 SCYTLE is complete offshore. (See Exh. 13 at par.44) And where the ballots go through  
17 a process described in three categories for a ballot cast, Step 1 involves Configuring the  
18 Data; Step 2 involves Cleansing which means determining which ballots are valid and  
19 which are not; and Step 3 involves “Shuffling” where the ballots get mixed and the  
20 algorithm is applied to distribute the votes. It is when the algorithm is applied, that happens  
21 secretly and the parameters of that algorithm are only known to SCYTL and Dominion.  
22 (See Exh. 13, pars. 44-50) – and where it gets encrypted as “ciphertexts.”

23 Certification Program, nor is its’ provider. China is not currently the only nation  
24 involved with COTS system provided to election machines or the networking, so is  
25 Germany via a LAOS founded Chinese linked cloud service company that works with  
26 SCYTL named Akamai Technologies – that have their offices in China and are linked  
27 to the server for Dominion Software. (See Exh. 13 at par. 36))

28 Mathematical evidence of the seeding “injection” of votes can be seen from the data feed  
on November 3, 2020 for Maricopa and Pima counties, where a spike can be seen which  
means a large number of votes were injected into the totals. (See Exh. 13 at par. 69).

1 envelope on which votes are recorded. The term also includes a sheet or card,  
 2 filmstrip or other device listing or containing information relative to offices,  
 3 candidates and referenda which is placed, projected or composed on the  
 4 board or screen inside a voting machine. Wis. Stat. § 5.02 Every ballot, except  
 5 a voting machine ballot, shall bear substantially the following information on the  
 6 face: "Notice to electors: This ballot may be invalid unless initialed by 2 election  
 7 inspectors. If cast as an absentee ballot, the ballot must bear the initials of the  
 8 municipal clerk or deputy clerk. Wis. Stat. Ann. § 5.54 (emphasis in  
 9 original) Federal law also requires the states to maintain uniform voting standards.  
 10 Section 301 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 [HAVA], (Pub. L. 107-252,  
 11 116 Stat. 1704, codified at 42 U.S.C. § 15481. Among other things, it provides that,  
 12 "Each voting system used in an election for Federal office shall meet the following  
 13 requirements: ... (6) Each State shall adopt uniform and nondiscriminatory  
 14 standards that define what constitutes a vote and what will be counted as a vote for  
 15 each category of voting system used in the State." 42 U.S.C. §15481(a)(6)

18 **2. Dominion – By Design – Violates Federal Election & Voting Record**  
 19 **Retention Requirements.**

20 90. The Dominion System put in place by its own design violates the intent of  
 21 Federal law on the requirement to preserve and retain records – which clearly requires  
 22 preservation of all records requisite to voting in such an election.

23 **§ 20701.** Retention and preservation of records and papers by officers  
 24 of elections; deposit with custodian; penalty for violation

25 Every officer of election shall retain and preserve, for a period of  
 26 twenty-two months from the date of any general, special, or primary  
 27 election of which candidates for the office of President, Vice  
 28 President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the  
 House of Representatives, or Resident Commissioner from the

1 Hart InterCivic – collectively provide voting machines & software that  
2 facilitate voting for over 90% of all eligible voters in the U.S.” (See Ex.  
3 16).

4 H. Senator Ron Wyden (D-Oregon) said the findings [insecurity of voting  
5 systems] are “yet another damning indictment of the profiteering  
6 election vendors, who care more about the bottom line than protecting  
7 our democracy.” It’s also an indictment, he said, “of the notion that  
8 important cybersecurity decisions should be left entirely to county  
9 election offices, many of whom do not employ a single cybersecurity  
10 specialist.”<sup>11</sup>

11 93. The House of Representatives passed H.R. 2722 in an attempt to  
12 address these very risks on June 27, 2019:

13 This bill addresses election security through grant programs and  
14 requirements for voting systems and paper ballots.  
15 The bill establishes requirements for voting systems, including that  
16 systems (1) use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots; (2)  
17 make a voter’s marked ballot available for inspection and verification by  
18 the voter before the vote is cast; (3) ensure that individuals with  
19 disabilities are given an equivalent opportunity to vote, including with  
20 privacy and independence, in a manner that produces a voter-verified  
21 paper ballot; (4) be manufactured in the United States; and (5) meet  
22 specified cybersecurity requirements, including the prohibition of the  
23 connection of a voting system to the internet.

24 See H.R. 2722.

25 **9. Because Dominion Senior Management Has Publicly  
26 Expressed Hostility to Trump and Opposition to His Election,  
27 Dominion Is Not Entitled to Any Presumption of Fairness,  
28 Objectivity or Impartiality, and Should Instead Be Treated as  
a Hostile Partisan Political Actor.**

94. Dr. Eric Coomer is listed as the co-inventor for several patents on

---

<sup>11</sup> Kim Zetter, *Exclusive: Critical U.S. Election Systems Have Been Left Exposed Online Despite Official Denials*, VICE (Aug. 8, 2019) (“VICE Election Article”), available at: <https://www.vice.com/en/article/3kxzk9/exclusive-critical-us-election-systems-have-been-left-exposed-online-despite-official-denials>.



101. By putting an anti-Trump zealot like Dr. Coomer in charge of election “Security,” and using his technology for what should be impartial “ballot adjudication,” Dominion has given the fox the keys to the hen house ***and has forfeited any presumption of objectivity, fairness, or even propriety.*** It appears that Dominion does not care about even an appearance of impropriety, as its most important officer has his fingerprints all over a highly partisan, vindictive, and personal vendetta against the Republican nominee both in 2016 and 2020, President Donald Trump. Dr. Coomer’s highly partisan anti-Trump rages show clear motive on the part of Dominion to rig the election in favor of Biden, and may well explain why for each of the so-called “glitches” uncovered, it is always Biden receiving the most votes on the favorable end of such a “glitch.” (Id.)

102. In sum, as set forth above, for a host of independent reasons, the Arizona election results concluding that Joe Biden received more votes than President Donald Trump must be set aside.

#### COUNT I

##### **Defendants Violated the Elections and Electors Clauses and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.**

103. Plaintiffs reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

104. The Electors Clause states that “[e]ach State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors” for President. U.S. Const. art. II, §1, cl. 2 (emphasis added). Likewise, the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution states that “[t]he Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by *the Legislature* thereof.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1 (emphasis added).

105. The Legislature is ““the representative body which ma[kes] the laws of the people.”” *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 365 (1932). Regulations of congressional and presidential elections, thus, “must be in accordance with the method which the state has prescribed for legislative enactments.” *Id.* at 367; *see also Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm’n*, 135 S. Ct. 2652, 2668 (2015).

1 of Equal Protection. In Section II, Plaintiff experts provide testimony quantifying the  
2 number of illegal votes resulting from Defendants' statutory and constitutional violations.  
3 Finally, Section III details the additional voting fraud and manipulation enabled by the  
4 use Dominion voting machines, which had the intent and effect of favoring Biden and  
5 Democratic voters and discriminating against Trump and Republican voters.

6  
7 118. Defendants have acted and will continue to act under color of state  
8 law to violate Plaintiffs' right to be present and have actual observation and access  
9 to the electoral process as secured by the Equal Protection Clause of the United  
10 States Constitution and Arizona law. Defendants thus failed to conduct the general  
11 election in a uniform manner as required by the Equal Protection Clause of the  
12 Fourteenth Amendment, the corollary provisions of Arizona election law.

13 119. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief forbidding Defendants  
14 from certifying a tally that includes any ballots that were not legally cast, or that  
15 were switched from Trump to Biden through the unlawful use of Dominion  
16 Democracy Suite software and devices.

17 120. In addition, Plaintiffs ask this Court to order that no ballot processed  
18 by a counting board in Arizona can be included in the final vote tally unless a  
19 challenger was allowed to meaningfully observe the process and handling and  
20 counting of the ballot, or that were unlawfully switched from Trump to Biden.

21 121. Clearly the dilution of lawful votes violates the Equal Protection clause;  
22 and the counting of unlawful votes violates the rights of lawful Citizens.

23 122. There are also thousands of absentee ballots that Plaintiffs can show were  
24 sent to someone besides the registered voter named in the request, and thus could have  
25 been filled out by anyone and then submitted in the name of another voter specifically in  
26 violation of election law, one vote is one ballot. That is the dilution of lawful votes, while  
27 78,714 to 94,975 ballots out of 518,560 unreturned ballots recorded for voters who did  
28 return their ballot but were recorded as being unreturned, and their vote was taken from

1 a cleansing of invalid versus valid ballots, before the votes get tallied for distribution.

2 134. Plaintiffs seek declaratory and injunctive relief enjoining Defendants  
3 from certifying the results of the General Election. This Court should enjoin  
4 Defendants from certifying a tally that includes any ballots that were not legally  
5 cast, or that were switched from Trump to Biden through the unlawful use of  
6 Dominion Democracy Suite software and devices.

#### 7 COUNT IV

#### 8 Wide-Spread Ballot Fraud

9 135. Plaintiffs reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

10 136. The scheme of civil fraud can be shown with the pattern of conduct that  
11 includes motive and opportunity, as exhibited by the high level official at Dominion Voting  
12 Systems, Eric Coomer, and his visceral and public rage against the current U.S. President.

13 137. Opportunity appears with the secretive nature of the voting source code, and  
14 the feed of votes that make clear that an algorithm is applied, that reports in decimal points  
15 despite the law requiring one vote for one ballot.

16 138. The Supreme Court of Arizona set forth the standard of fraud for elections  
17 when it that held in the State of Arizona, fraud in an election is based on ballots procured  
18 in violation to the law: "We therefore hold that HN5 a showing of **fraud** is not a necessary  
19 condition to invalidate absentee **balloting**. It is sufficient that an express non-  
20 technical statute was violated, and **ballots** cast in violation of the statute affected the  
21 election. *Miller v. Picacho Elementary Sch. Dist. No. 33*, 179 Ariz. 178, 180, 877 P.2d  
22 277, 279, (S. Ct.1994).

23 "Contrary to *Findley*, election statutes are mandatory, not "advisory," or else they  
24 would not be law at all. If a statute expressly provides that non-compliance  
25 invalidates the vote, then the vote is invalid. If the statute does not have such a  
26 provision, non-compliance may or may not invalidate the vote depending on its  
27 effect. In the context of this case, "affect the result, or at least render it uncertain,"  
*id.* at 269, 276 P. at 844, means **ballots** procured in violation of a non-technical  
statute in sufficient numbers to alter the outcome of the election.

28 Id.



1 11. Plaintiffs further request the Court grant such other relief as is just and  
2 proper, including but not limited to, the costs of this action and their  
3 reasonable attorney fees and expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1988.  
4

5  
6 Respectfully submitted, this 1st day of December 2020.  
7

8 /s Sidney Powell\*

/s Alexander Kolodin

9 Sidney Powell PC  
Texas Bar No. 16209700

Kolodin Law Group PLLC  
AZ Bar No. 030826

10 2911 Turtle Creek Blvd, Suite 300  
11 Dallas, Texas 75219

3443 N. Central Ave Ste 1009  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

12 \*Application for admission pro hac vice  
forthcoming

13 Of Counsel:

14 Emily P. Newman (Virginia Bar No. 84265)

15 Julia Z. Haller (D.C. Bar No. 466921)

Brandon Johnson (D.C. Bar No. 491730)

16 2911 Turtle Creek Blvd. Suite 300  
Dallas, Texas 75219

17 \*Application for admission pro hac vice Forthcoming

18 L. Lin Wood (Georgia Bar No. 774588)

19 L. LIN WOOD, P.C.

P.O. Box 52584

20 Atlanta, GA 30305-0584

Telephone: (404) 891-1402

21 Howard Kleinhendler (New York Bar No. 2657120)

22 Howard Kleinhendler Esquire

369 Lexington Ave. 12<sup>th</sup> Floor

23 New York, New York 10017

(917) 793-1188

24 howard@kleinhendler.com  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Sidney Powell (pro hac application forthcoming)  
2 Sidney Powell PC  
3 Texas Bar No. 16209700  
4 (517) 763-7499  
5 [Sidney@federalappeals.com](mailto:Sidney@federalappeals.com)

6 Alexander Kolodin, AZ Bar No. 030826  
7 Christopher Viskovic, AZ Bar No. 035860<sup>1</sup>  
8 **KOLODIN LAW GROUP PLLC**  
9 3443 N. Central Ave. Ste. 1009  
10 Phoenix, AZ 85012  
11 Telephone: (602) 730-2985  
12 Facsimile: (602) 801-2539  
13 E-Mail:  
14 [Alexander.Kolodin@KolodinLaw.com](mailto:Alexander.Kolodin@KolodinLaw.com)  
15 [CViskovic@KolodinLaw.com](mailto:CViskovic@KolodinLaw.com)  
16 [SAtkinson@KolodinLaw.com](mailto:SAtkinson@KolodinLaw.com) (file copies)

17 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*  
18 *(Additional counsel listed on signature page)*

19 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

20 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

21 TYLER BOWYER, MICHAEL JOHN BURKE,  
22 NANCY COTTLE, JAKE HOFFMAN,  
23 ANTHONY KERN, CHRISTOPHER M. KING,  
24 JAMES R. LAMON, SAM MOORHEAD,  
25 ROBERT MONTGOMERY, LORAINÉ  
26 PELLEGRINO, GREG SAFSTEN,  
27 SALVATORE LUKE SCARMARDO, KELLI  
28 WARD, and MICHAEL WARD

Plaintiffs,

v.

DOUG DUCEY, in his official capacity as  
Governor of the State of Arizona, and KATIE  
HOBBS, in her official capacity as the Arizona  
Secretary of State

Defendants.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY,  
EMERGENCY, AND  
PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

(Election Matter)

(TRO Requested)

<sup>1</sup> District of Arizona admission scheduled for 12/9/2020.

1 or hostile foreign actors to access the system and manipulate election results, and moreover  
2 potentially to cover their tracks due to Dominion's unprotected log. Accordingly, a  
3 thorough forensic examination of Dominion's machines and source code is required to  
4 document these instances of voting fraud, as well as Dominion's systematic violations of  
5 the Voting Rights Act record retention requirements through manipulation, alteration,  
6 destruction and likely foreign exfiltration of voting records. See 52 U.S.C. § 20701.

7 11. These and other problems with Dominion's software have been widely  
8 reported in the press and been the subject of investigations. In using Dominion Voting  
9 Systems Democracy Suite, Arizona officials disregarded all the concerns that caused  
10 Dominion software to be rejected by the Texas Board of elections in 2020 because it was  
11 deemed vulnerable to undetected and non-auditable manipulation. Texas denied  
12 Certification because of concerns that it was not safe from fraud or unauthorized  
13 manipulation. (See Exhs 11A&11B ).

14 12. An industry expert, Dr. Andrew Appel, Princeton Professor of Computer  
15 Science and Election Security Expert has recently observed, with reference to Dominion  
16 Voting machines: "I figured out how to make a slightly different computer program that  
17 just before the polls were closed, it switches some votes around from one candidate to  
18 another. I wrote that computer program into a memory chip and now to hack a voting  
19 machine you just need 7 minutes alone with a screwdriver."<sup>3</sup>

20 13. Further, Dominion's documented, and intentional, security flaws facilitated  
21 foreign interference in the 2020 General Election. For example, in the accompanying  
22 redacted declaration of a former electronic intelligence analyst with 305th Military  
23 Intelligence with experience gathering SAM missile system electronic intelligence, the  
24 Dominion software was accessed by agents acting on behalf of China and Iran in order to  
25 monitor and manipulate elections, including the most recent US general election in 2020.  
26 (See Ex. 12, copy of redacted witness affidavit).

27 <sup>3</sup> Andrew W. Appel, *et al.*, "Ballot Marking Devices (BMDs) Cannot Assure the Will  
28 of the Voters" at (Dec. 27, 2019),( attached hereto as Ex. 10 ("Appel Study")).



1 resident of Maricopa County; Greg Safsten, a resident of Maricopa County; Kelli Ward, a  
2 resident of Mohave County; and Michael Ward, a resident of Mohave County.

3 29. Plaintiff Michael John Burke is a registered Arizona voter residing in Pinal  
4 County. Mr. Burke is the Republican Party Chairman for Pinal County.

5 30. Plaintiff Christopher M. King is a registered Arizona voter residing in Pima  
6 County. Mr. Burke is the Republican Party Vice Chairman for Pima County.

7 31. Plaintiff Salvatore Luke Scarmado is a registered Arizona voter residing in  
8 Mohave County. Mr. Burke is the Republican Party Chairman for Mohave County.

9 32. Presidential Electors “have a cognizable interest in ensuring that the final  
10 vote tally reflects the legally valid votes cast,” as “[a]n inaccurate vote tally is a concrete  
11 and particularized injury to candidates such as the Electors.” *Carson v. Simon*, 978 F.3d  
12 1051, 1057 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2020) (affirming that Presidential Electors have Article III and  
13 prudential standing to challenge actions of state officials implementing or modifying State  
14 election laws); *see also McPherson v. Blacker*, 146 U.S. 1, 27 (1892); *Bush v. Palm Beach*  
15 *Cty. Canvassing Bd.*, 531 U.S. 70, 76 (2000) (per curiam).

16 33. Plaintiffs bring this action to prohibit certification of the election results for  
17 the Office of President of the United States in the State of Arizona and to obtain the other  
18 declaratory and injunctive relief requested herein. Defendants certified those results on  
19 November 30, 2020, indicating a plurality for Mr. Biden of 10,457 votes out of 3,420,565  
20 cast.

21 34. The Defendants are Arizona Governor Doug Ducey, and Arizona Secretary  
22 of State Katie Hobbs.

23 35. Defendant Governor Doug Ducey is named as a defendant in his official  
24 capacity as Arizona’s governor.

25 36. Defendant Secretary of State Katie Hobbs is named as a defendant in her  
26 official capacity as Arizona Secretary of State, who serves as the chief election officer in  
27 the State of Arizona.

28 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

1 system out of the building with him every night as a form of a ‘back up’ copy.” *Id.* ¶22.

2 51. Low’s fellow poll watcher, Affiant Gregory Wodynski, provides more detail  
3 on these regularities. First, Dominion employees and supervisors informed Mr. Wodynski  
4 “that about 12% of mail in ballots were being rejected and needed human intervention in  
5 the adjudication process,” which “amounted to tens of thousands of ballots that required  
6 intervention” in the days he was an observer. Ex. 22, Wodynski aff at ¶9. Mr. Wodynski  
7 confirms that “Bruce” stated that “he would perform a manual daily system backup to an  
8 external hard drive,” *id.* ¶10, and that “he made a daily second disk backup to a new spare  
9 hard drive[] ... [that] were being physically moved off site to another building outside the  
10 MTEC building,” but would not say where. *Id.* ¶11. Bruce further stated “**there was NO**  
11 **CHAIN OF CUSTODY on data backup hard drives leaving the MTEC facility on a**  
12 **daily basis for an undisclosed location.**” *Id.* (emphasis in original).

13 52. Mr. Wodynski also testified to a conversation with Dominion employee  
14 Bruce of the “the specifics of a process where he was manually manipulating stored scanner  
15 tabulation data files,” which “he described as a processing issue at the numerous  
16 adjudication computer workstations.” *Id.* ¶12. Bruce claimed that this was to split large  
17 files into small files for adjudication. *Id.* ¶13. Mr. Wodynski was concerned because this  
18 “**was a human intervention process and therefore creating a potential for intention or**  
19 **non-intentional errors or lost ballot files.**” *Id.*

#### 20 4. Problems with Certification of Dominion Voting Machines.

21 53. Affiant Linda Brickman, the 1st Vice-Chair of the Maricopa County  
22 Republican Committee, oversaw the Secretary of State certification of Dominion voting  
23 machines on November 18, 2020. Ex. 23, Brickman Aff at 1. Mr. Brickman observed the  
24 following problems:

- 25 • Signature verification standards were constantly being lowered by  
26 Supervisors in order to more quickly process that higher amount of early  
27 and mail-in ballots (from approx. 15 points of similarities, to a minimum of  
28 3, lowered to 1, and ultimately to none – “Just pass each signature  
verification through”) ...

1 finds historically unprecedented levels of turnout in specific counties or precincts. Using  
 2 publicly available data, Mr. Ramsland determined that 66 percent of Pima County precincts  
 3 (164 of 248) had turn out above 80%, and at least 36 had turnout above 90%, and that 54  
 4 percent of Maricopa County precincts (300 of 558) had turnout of 80% or more, and at  
 5 least 30 over 90%. *Id.* ¶14. The report concludes that these extraordinary, and likely  
 6 fraudulent, turnout levels “compels the conclusion to a reasonable degree of professional  
 7 certainty that the vote count in Arizona, in particular for Maricopa and Pima counties for  
 8 candidates for President contain at least 100,724 illegal votes that must be disregarded.  
 9 *Id.* ¶14.

10 60. Mr. Ramsland also identifies an impossibility: “an improbable, and possibly  
 11 impossible spike in processed votes,” *id.* ¶16, like those also found in Georgia, Michigan  
 12 and Wisconsin. Specifically, at 8:06:40 PM on November 3, 2020, there was a spike of  
 13 143,100 votes for Biden in Maricopa and Pima Counties. *Id.* Mr. Ramsland believes that  
 14 the spike in Arizona, like those in the other three States he analyzed could have been  
 15 manufactured by Dominion voting machines through a method described in greater detail  
 16 in Section III below. *Id.*

17 61. The summation of sections A through C above provide the following  
 18 conclusions for the reports cited above, respectively.

- 19 • Returned ballots that were deemed unreturned by the state (average  
 20 for Briggs Error #1): 219,135.
- 21 • Unreturned mail ballots unlawfully ordered by third parties (average  
 22 for Briggs Error #1): 86,845.
- 23 • Votes by persons that moved out of state or subsequently registered  
 24 to vote in another state for the 2020 election: 5,790.
- 25 • “Excess votes” to historically unprecedented, and likely fraudulent  
 26 turnout levels of 80% or more in over half of Maricopa and Pima  
 27  
 28



1 transparent process to give credibility to Wisconsin's Dominion-Democracy Suite  
 2 voting system, the processes were hidden during the receipt, review, opening, and  
 3 tabulation of those votes in direct contravention of Wisconsin's Election Code and  
 4 Federal law.

5 69. **Georgia.** Substantial evidence of this vulnerability was discussed in Judge  
 6 Amy Totenberg's October 11, 2020 Order in the USDC N.D. Ga. case of *Curling, et al. v.*  
 7 *Kemp, et. al*, Case No. 1:17-cv-02989 Doc. No. 964. *See*, p. 22-23 ("This array of experts  
 8 and subject matter specialists provided a huge volume of significant evidence regarding  
 9 the security risks and deficits in the system as implemented in both witness declarations  
 10 and live testimony at the preliminary injunction hearing."); p. 25 ("In particular, Dr.  
 11 Halderman's testing indicated the practical feasibility through a cyber attack of causing the  
 12 swapping or deletion of specific votes cast and the compromise of the system through  
 13 different cyber attack strategies, including through access to and alteration or manipulation  
 14 of the QR barcode.") The full order should be read, for it is eye-opening and refutes many  
 15 of Dominion's erroneous claims and talking points.

16 70. The Secretary of State appoints a committee of three people to test different  
 17 voting systems. The committee is required to submit their recommendations to the  
 18 Secretary of state who then makes the final decision on which voting system(s) to adopt.  
 19 A.R.S. § 16-442(A) and (C) In explaining that "In summary, [the court] rejected the  
 20 Secretary's argument that her certification of voting machines for use in Arizona is a  
 21 political question that is inappropriate for judicial review." In doing so, the court  
 22 explained the application of HAVA because Arizona requires that its voting systems are  
 23 HAVA compliant which includes accreditation pursuant to HAVA. *Chavez v. Brewer*,  
 24 222 Ariz. 309, 317, 214 P.3d 397, 405, 2009). During the subsequent four years, the  
 25 Arizona Legislature amended and enacted several statutes to effectuate HAVA. Among  
 26 these changes, the legislature amended Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) section **16-**  
 27 **442(A)** to require that the secretary of state determine the voting machines that are  
 28 "certified for use" in elections. 2003 Ariz. Sess. Laws, ch. 260, § 9 (1st Reg. Sess.). The

1 This joint cybersecurity advisory was coauthored by the Cybersecurity and  
 2 Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA) and the Federal Bureau of  
 3 Investigation (FBI). CISA and the FBI are aware of an Iranian advanced  
 4 persistent threat (APT) actor targeting U.S. state websites to include  
 5 election websites. CISA and the FBI assess this actor is responsible for the  
 6 mass dissemination of voter intimidation emails to U.S. citizens and the  
 7 dissemination of U.S. election-related disinformation in mid-October  
 2020.<sup>1</sup> (Reference FBI FLASH message ME-000138-TT, disseminated  
 October 29, 2020). Further evaluation by CISA and the FBI has identified  
 the targeting of U.S. state election websites was an intentional effort to  
 influence and interfere with the 2020 U.S. presidential election.

8 (See CISA and FBI Joint Cyber Security Advisory of October 30, 2020, a copy attached  
 9 hereto as Ex. 18.)

10 **c. Expert Witness Testimony on Dominion Vulnerability to**  
 11 **Foreign Interference and Ties to Hostile Foreign**  
 12 **Governments**

13 77. A PhD Declarant analyzed the cumulative vote percentages sorted by ward  
 14 or precinct sizes. This concept was previously used throughout the report on voter  
 15 irregularities in lulu Fries' dat and Anselmo Sampietro's "*An electoral system in crisis*" at  
 16 <http://www.electoralsystemincrisis.org/>. In Fries' dat's report there was an anomalous  
 17 dependency on precinct size in many of the 2016 primary elections. The larger precincts  
 18 had introduced the use of voting machines. However, one could also theorize the  
 19 opportunity for cheaters to cheat in small precincts, where there may be less oversight.  
 20 Normally, we would expect the cumulative vote percentage to converge to an asymptote,  
 21 and bounce around the mean until convergence. An example of this can be found from the  
 22 2000 Florida Democratic presidential primary between Gore and Bradley. (See Ex. \_\_, at  
 23 p. 8). This is shown in Figure 8, and is taken from Fries' dat's report:

1 addresses the concerns of foreign interference in our elections through hardware  
2 components from companies based in foreign countries with adverse interests.

3  
4 The concern is the HARDWARE and the NON – ACCREDITED VSTLs  
5 as by their own admittance use COTS. The purpose of VSTL’s being  
6 accredited and their importance is ensuring that there is no foreign  
7 interference / bad actors accessing the tally data via backdoors in  
8 equipment software. The core software used by ALL SCYTL related  
9 Election Machine/Software manufacturers ensures “anonymity”.

10 **Algorithms within the area of this “shuffling” to maintain anonymity**  
11 **allows for setting values to achieve a desired goal under the guise of**  
12 **“encryption” in the trap-door...**

13 (See Id. at ¶32).

14 83. Scytel, contracts with the AP – which receives the results tallied by SCYTL  
15 on behalf of Dominion. (See Exh. 13 at par. 33). This becomes highly relevant since  
16 SCYTLE is complete offshore. (See Exh. 13 at par.44) And where the ballots go through  
17 a process described in three categories for a ballot cast, Step 1 involves Configuring the  
18 Data; Step 2 involves Cleansing which means determining which ballots are valid and  
19 which are not; and Step 3 involves “Shuffling” where the ballots get mixed and the  
20 algorithm is applied to distribute the votes. It is when the algorithm is applied, that happens  
21 secretly and the parameters of that algorithm are only known to SCYTL and Dominion.  
22 (See Exh. 13, pars. 44-50) – and where it gets encrypted as “ciphertexts.”

23 Certification Program, nor is its’ provider. China is not currently the only nation  
24 involved with COTS system provided to election machines or the networking, so is  
25 Germany via a LAOS founded Chinese linked cloud service company that works with  
26 SCYTL named Akamai Technologies – that have their offices in China and are linked  
27 to the server for Dominion Software. (See Exh. 13 at par. 36))

28 Mathematical evidence of the seeding “injection” of votes can be seen from the data feed  
on November 3, 2020 for Maricopa and Pima counties, where a spike can be seen which  
means a large number of votes were injected into the totals. (See Exh. 13 at par. 69).



1 envelope on which votes are recorded. The term also includes a sheet or card,  
 2 filmstrip or other device listing or containing information relative to offices,  
 3 candidates and referenda which is placed, projected or composed on the  
 4 board or screen inside a voting machine. Wis. Stat. § 5.02 Every ballot, except  
 5 a voting machine ballot, shall bear substantially the following information on the  
 6 face: "Notice to electors: This ballot may be invalid unless initialed by 2 election  
 7 inspectors. If cast as an absentee ballot, the ballot must bear the initials of the  
 8 municipal clerk or deputy clerk. Wis. Stat. Ann. § 5.54 (emphasis in  
 9 original) Federal law also requires the states to maintain uniform voting standards.  
 10 Section 301 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 [HAVA], (Pub. L. 107-252,  
 11 116 Stat. 1704, codified at 42 U.S.C. § 15481. Among other things, it provides that,  
 12 "Each voting system used in an election for Federal office shall meet the following  
 13 requirements: ... (6) Each State shall adopt uniform and nondiscriminatory  
 14 standards that define what constitutes a vote and what will be counted as a vote for  
 15 each category of voting system used in the State." 42 U.S.C. §15481(a)(6)

18 **2. Dominion – By Design – Violates Federal Election & Voting Record**  
 19 **Retention Requirements.**

20 90. The Dominion System put in place by its own design violates the intent of  
 21 Federal law on the requirement to preserve and retain records – which clearly requires  
 22 preservation of all records requisite to voting in such an election.

23 **§ 20701.** Retention and preservation of records and papers by officers  
 24 of elections; deposit with custodian; penalty for violation

25 Every officer of election shall retain and preserve, for a period of  
 26 twenty-two months from the date of any general, special, or primary  
 27 election of which candidates for the office of President, Vice  
 28 President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the  
 House of Representatives, or Resident Commissioner from the

1 Hart InterCivic – collectively provide voting machines & software that  
2 facilitate voting for over 90% of all eligible voters in the U.S.” (See Ex.  
3 16).

4 H. Senator Ron Wyden (D-Oregon) said the findings [insecurity of voting  
5 systems] are “yet another damning indictment of the profiteering  
6 election vendors, who care more about the bottom line than protecting  
7 our democracy.” It’s also an indictment, he said, “of the notion that  
8 important cybersecurity decisions should be left entirely to county  
9 election offices, many of whom do not employ a single cybersecurity  
10 specialist.”<sup>11</sup>

11 93. The House of Representatives passed H.R. 2722 in an attempt to  
12 address these very risks on June 27, 2019:

13 This bill addresses election security through grant programs and  
14 requirements for voting systems and paper ballots.  
15 The bill establishes requirements for voting systems, including that  
16 systems (1) use individual, durable, voter-verified paper ballots; (2)  
17 make a voter’s marked ballot available for inspection and verification by  
18 the voter before the vote is cast; (3) ensure that individuals with  
19 disabilities are given an equivalent opportunity to vote, including with  
20 privacy and independence, in a manner that produces a voter-verified  
21 paper ballot; (4) be manufactured in the United States; and (5) meet  
22 specified cybersecurity requirements, including the prohibition of the  
23 connection of a voting system to the internet.

24 See H.R. 2722.

25 **9. Because Dominion Senior Management Has Publicly  
26 Expressed Hostility to Trump and Opposition to His Election,  
27 Dominion Is Not Entitled to Any Presumption of Fairness,  
28 Objectivity or Impartiality, and Should Instead Be Treated as  
a Hostile Partisan Political Actor.**

94. Dr. Eric Coomer is listed as the co-inventor for several patents on

---

<sup>11</sup> Kim Zetter, *Exclusive: Critical U.S. Election Systems Have Been Left Exposed Online Despite Official Denials*, VICE (Aug. 8, 2019) (“VICE Election Article”), available at: <https://www.vice.com/en/article/3kxzk9/exclusive-critical-us-election-systems-have-been-left-exposed-online-despite-official-denials>.

101. By putting an anti-Trump zealot like Dr. Coomer in charge of election “Security,” and using his technology for what should be impartial “ballot adjudication,” Dominion has given the fox the keys to the hen house ***and has forfeited any presumption of objectivity, fairness, or even propriety.*** It appears that Dominion does not care about even an appearance of impropriety, as its most important officer has his fingerprints all over a highly partisan, vindictive, and personal vendetta against the Republican nominee both in 2016 and 2020, President Donald Trump. Dr. Coomer’s highly partisan anti-Trump rages show clear motive on the part of Dominion to rig the election in favor of Biden, and may well explain why for each of the so-called “glitches” uncovered, it is always Biden receiving the most votes on the favorable end of such a “glitch.” (Id.)

102. In sum, as set forth above, for a host of independent reasons, the Arizona election results concluding that Joe Biden received more votes than President Donald Trump must be set aside.

#### COUNT I

##### **Defendants Violated the Elections and Electors Clauses and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.**

103. Plaintiffs reallege all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

104. The Electors Clause states that “[e]ach State shall appoint, in such Manner as the Legislature thereof may direct, a Number of Electors” for President. U.S. Const. art. II, §1, cl. 2 (emphasis added). Likewise, the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution states that “[t]he Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by *the Legislature* thereof.” U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1 (emphasis added).

105. The Legislature is ““the representative body which ma[kes] the laws of the people.”” *Smiley v. Holm*, 285 U.S. 355, 365 (1932). Regulations of congressional and presidential elections, thus, “must be in accordance with the method which the state has prescribed for legislative enactments.” *Id.* at 367; *see also Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm’n*, 135 S. Ct. 2652, 2668 (2015).



1 them.

2 123. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law and will suffer serious and  
3 irreparable harm unless the declaratory and injunctive relief requested herein is  
4 granted. Indeed, the setting aside of an election in which the people have chosen  
5 their representative is a drastic remedy that should not be undertaken lightly, but  
6 instead should be reserved for cases in which a person challenging an election has  
7 clearly established a violation of election procedures and has demonstrated that the  
8 violation has placed the result of the election in doubt. Arizona law allows  
9 elections to be contested through litigation, both as a check on the integrity of the  
10 election process and as a means of ensuring the fundamental right of citizens to  
11 vote and to have their votes counted accurately.

### 12 **COUNT III**

#### 13 **Fourteenth Amendment, Amend. XIV & 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

##### 14 **Denial of Due Process On The Right to Vote**

15 124. Plaintiffs refer to and incorporate by reference each of the prior  
16 paragraphs of this Complaint as though the same were repeated at length herein.

17 125. The right of qualified citizens to vote in a state election involving  
18 federal candidates is recognized as a fundamental right under the Fourteenth  
19 Amendment of the United States Constitution. *Harper*, 383 U.S. at 665. *See*  
20 *also Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 554 (The Fourteenth Amendment protects the “the right  
21 of all qualified citizens to vote, in state as well as in federal elections.”). Indeed,  
22 ever since the *Slaughter-House Cases*, 83 U.S. 36 (1873), the United States  
23 Supreme Court has held that the Privileges or Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth  
24 Amendment protects certain rights of federal citizenship from state interference,  
25 including the right of citizens to directly elect members of Congress. *See Twining*  
26 *v. New Jersey*, 211 U.S. 78, 97 (1908) (citing *Ex parte Yarbrough*, 110 U.S. 651,  
27 663-64 (1884)). *See also Oregon v. Mitchell*, 400 U.S. 112, 148-49 (1970)  
28 (Douglas, J., concurring) (collecting cases).

1       139.       This Complaint presents expert witness testimony demonstrating that several  
2 hundred thousand illegal, ineligible, duplicate or purely fictitious votes must be thrown  
3 out, in particular:

- 4           A. Unreturned mail ballots unlawfully ordered by third parties: 219,135  
5           B. Returned ballots that were deemed unreturned by the state: 86,845  
6           C. Votes by persons that moved out of state or subsequently registered to  
7 vote in another state for the 2020 election: 5,790.  
8           D. “Excess votes” to historically unprecedented, and likely fraudulent  
9 turnout levels of 80% or more in over half of Maricopa and Pima  
10 County precincts: 100,724.  
11           E. And Plaintiffs can show Mr. Biden received a statistically significant  
12 Advantage from the use of Dominion Machines in a nationwide Study,  
which conservatively estimates Biden’s advantage at 62,282 Votes.

13       140.       The right to vote includes not just the right to cast a ballot, but also the right  
14 to have it fairly counted if it is legally cast. The right to vote is infringed if a vote is  
15 cancelled or diluted by a fraudulent or illegal vote, including without limitation when a  
16 single person votes multiple times. The Supreme Court of the United States has made this  
17 clear in case after case. See, e.g., *Gray v. Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368, 380 (1963) (every vote  
18 must be “protected from the diluting effect of illegal ballots.”); *Crawford v. Marion Cnty.*  
19 *Election Bd.*, 553 U.S. 181, 196 (2008) (plurality op. of Stevens, J.) (“There is no question  
20 about the legitimacy or importance of the State’s interest in counting only the votes of  
21 eligible voters.”); *accord Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533, 554-55 & n.29 (1964).

22       141.       Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law. Plaintiffs contest the results of  
23 Arizona’s 2020 General Election because it is fundamentally corrupted by fraud.  
24 Defendants should be enjoined from certifying an election where there were intentional  
25 violations of multiple provisions of Arizona law to elect Biden and other Democratic  
26 candidates and defeat President Trump and other Republican candidates.  
27  
28

