

David A. Warrington\*  
Gary Lawkowski\*  
**DHILLON LAW GROUP, INC.**  
2121 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 608  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
703-574-1206  
[DWarrington@dhillonlaw.com](mailto:DWarrington@dhillonlaw.com)  
[GLawkowski@dhillonlaw.com](mailto:GLawkowski@dhillonlaw.com)

*\*Pro hac vice forthcoming*

Timothy A La Sota, Ariz. Bar No. 020539  
**TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC**  
2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305  
Phoenix, Arizona 85016  
(602) 515-2649  
[tim@timlasota.com](mailto:tim@timlasota.com)

Dennis I. Wilenchik, #005350  
John D. "Jack" Wilenchik, #029353  
**WILENCHIK & BARTNESS, P.C.**  
2810 North Third Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
602-606-2810 [admin@wb-law.com](mailto:admin@wb-law.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants*

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA**  
**IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE**

JEANNE KENTCH, an individual; TED  
BOYD, an individual; ABRAHAM  
HAMADEH, an individual; and  
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE,  
a federal political party committee

Plaintiffs/Contestants,

v.

KRIS MAYES,

Defendant/Contestee,

and

No. CV-2022-01468

**RESPONSE TO COURT'S ORDER  
REQUIRING WRITTEN  
SUBMISSIONS REGARDING ISSUES  
ON WHICH NO AGREEMENT HAS  
BEEN REACHED**

**HEARING REQUESTED**

(assigned to the Honorable Lee F.  
Jantzen)

1 KATIE HOBBS, in her official capacity as the  
2 Secretary of State; LARRY NOBLE, in his  
3 official capacity as the Apache County  
4 Recorder; APACHE COUNTY BOARD OF  
5 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
6 DAVID W. STEVENS, in his official capacity  
7 as Cochise County Recorder; COCHISE  
8 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in  
9 their official capacity; PATTY HANSEN, in  
10 her official capacity as the Coconino County  
11 Recorder; COCONINO COUNTY BOARD  
12 OF SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
13 SADIE JO BINGHAM, in her official  
14 capacity as Gila County Recorder; GILA  
15 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in  
16 their official capacity; WENDY JOHN, in her  
17 official capacity as Graham County Recorder;  
18 GRAHAM COUNTY BOARD OF  
19 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
20 SHARIE MILHEIRO, in her official capacity  
21 as Greenlee County Recorder; GREENLEE  
22 COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in  
23 their official capacity; RICHARD GARCIA,  
24 in his capacity as the La Paz County Recorder;  
25 LA PAZ COUNTY BOARD OF  
26 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
27 STEPHEN RICHER, in his official capacity as  
28 the Maricopa County Recorder; MARICOPA  
COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in  
their official capacity; KRISTI BLAIR, in her  
official capacity as the Mohave County  
Recorder; MOHAVE COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
MICHAEL SAMPLE, in his official capacity  
as Navajo County Recorder; NAVAJO  
COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in  
their official capacity; GABRIELLA  
CAZARES-KELLY, in her official capacity  
as the Pima County Recorder; PIMA  
COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, in  
their official capacity; DANA LEWIS, in her  
official capacity as the Pinal County Recorder;  
PINAL COUNTY BOARD OF

1 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
2 SUZANNE SAINZ, in her official capacity as  
3 the Santa Cruz County Recorder; SANTA  
4 CRUZ COUNTY BOARD OF  
5 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
6 MICHELLE M. BURCHILL, in her official  
7 capacity as the Yavapai County Recorder;  
8 YAVAPAI COUNTY BOARD OF  
9 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity;  
10 RICHARD COLWELL, in his official  
11 capacity as the Yuma County Recorder; and  
12 YUMA COUNTY BOARD OF  
13 SUPERVISORS, in their official capacity,

14 Defendants.

15 Pursuant to the Court's December 20, 2022, Order concerning the inspection of  
16 ballots, Plaintiffs/Contestees ("Plaintiffs") write to raise five issues as to which the parties  
17 have been unable to reach agreement regarding the process for inspecting ballots in advance  
18 of the evidentiary hearing scheduled for Friday, December 23, 2022. In addition, Plaintiffs  
19 request a hearing today to expeditiously resolve these matters. First, Plaintiffs ask the Court  
20 to compel Maricopa County to provide an unredacted electronic copy of the Cast Vote  
21 Record for the November 8, 2022 General Election for Plaintiffs' expert to search on his  
22 own computer system. Access to the Cast Vote Record will enable Plaintiffs to efficiently  
23 identify which ballots should be inspected, and should be granted on the grounds that the  
24 CVR is a public record or, in the alternative, a part of the "ballots" for purposes of inspection  
25 under A.R.S. § 16-677.

26 Second, Plaintiffs ask the Court to compel Maricopa County to provide the list of all  
27 voters whose provisional ballot was rejected along with the reason why the ballot was  
28 rejected.

Third, Plaintiffs ask this Court to reject Maricopa County's unilateral declaration  
that it will cut the ballot inspection period allowed by the Court in half. The Court's order

1 calls for the inspection of ballots in advance of the evidentiary hearing on Friday, December  
2 23, 2022. This effectively provides two days for Plaintiffs to inspect ballots. Defendant  
3 Maricopa County has represented that they will *only* permit the inspect of ballots on  
4 Wednesday, December 21, 2022. At best, this effectively cuts the ballot inspection period  
5 in half. At worst, it effectively eliminates the ballot inspection in light of the need to  
6 designate representatives and agree on how to proceed with inspection.

7 Fourth, Plaintiffs request that the Court clarify that A.R.S. § 16-677(B) requires that  
8 there be three people inspecting any given ballot – not that there can only be three people  
9 inspecting ballots at any given time in any given county or even the entire State.

10 Fifth, Plaintiffs request that the Court enter an order appointing inspectors in Pima  
11 and Navajo Counties.

12 **I. Maricopa County Should be Compelled to Provide an Electronic Copy of**  
13 **the Cast Vote Record**

14 A Cast Vote Record (“CVR”) is “essentially a spreadsheet in which each row  
15 corresponds to a ballot that has been cast and each column indicates a voter’s choice on that  
16 ballot for each race. The information in the CVR directly correlates, row by row with ballot  
17 images, that is, pictures of ballots.” *See* Exhibit A (Declaration of Former Arizona  
18 Secretary of State Kenneth R. Bennett) at ¶ 5. As described by former Arizona Secretary  
19 of State Kenneth Bennett:

20 For any effort to rapidly review ballots, the CVR is essential. You must have  
21 both a specific ballot image and its corresponding row in the CVR to be able  
22 to prove that in a particular race that ballot reflects a vote for a certain  
candidate (or no candidate). The CVR is thus the tally sheet for the election.

23 *Id.* at ¶ 6.

24 Access to the CVR is important because it allows Plaintiffs to quickly identify what  
25 specific ballots are implicated by the concerns raised in the Complaint. There were over  
26 1.5 million votes cast in Maricopa County in the 2022 General Election. Not all of them  
27 are implicated by the issues raised in the Complaint, nor is it feasible for a 3-person panel  
28 to inspect all of them before Friday’s hearing. With access to the CVR, Plaintiffs’ expert



1 can run a computer program that flags which ballots are potentially impacted by the issues  
2 raised in the complaint, use the ballot image to further narrow that subset of materials, and  
3 use the ballot number to expedite direct inspection of the ballots at issue.

4 These records should be considered public records and, as such, should have already  
5 been provided to Plaintiffs. A valid public records request was submitted to Maricopa  
6 County for the CVR used in the 2022 General Election. Instead, Maricopa County provided  
7 a redacted version that prevented linking the CVR record to a specific ballot image for  
8 review of adjudication of over votes and under votes. *Id.* Maricopa County has refused to  
9 provide an unredacted version of the CVR, either in response to public records requests or  
10 in conjunction with the ballot inspection process in this action. *See* Exhibit C (Email from  
11 Emily Craiger).

12 Maricopa County's refusal to provide an unredacted copy of the CVR is  
13 inappropriate. As former Secretary of State Bennett attests, "[a] cast vote record ('CVR')  
14 should be a public record." Exhibit A at ¶ 5. This conclusion is consistent with the recent  
15 ruling in at least on other jurisdiction, which found CVRs are public documents. *See Honey*  
16 *v. Lycoming County Office of Voter Services*, CV-22-00115 (Pa. Ct. Comm. Pl. Dec. 16,  
17 2022). It is also consistent with common sense. "The CVR does not contain any individual  
18 voter identifying information." Exhibit A at ¶ 5. Thus, access to the CVR does not  
19 implicate ballot secrecy.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, the CVR is not the original votes, thus there are not  
20 the same concerns of a third-party altering vote counts, accidentally or otherwise.

21 Even if the unredacted CVR were not a public record (it is), it should still be provided  
22 as part of the ballot inspection process. As described above, access to the unredacted CVR  
23 will allow the parties to implement a more targeted ballot inspection process that focuses  
24  
25

---

26 <sup>1</sup> If the CVR could be used to reverse engineer who a particular voter voted for, then there are  
27 much bigger problems than just those associated with making it public: the state would have  
28 access to a list of who voted for whom, in essence defeating the secret ballot. *See* Ariz. Const.  
Art. 7, § 1 ("All elections by the people shall be by ballot, or by such other method as may be  
prescribed by law; Provided, that secrecy in voting shall be preserved."). This cannot be correct.

1 on the ballots that are actually implicated by the concerns raised in this contest, rather than  
2 shooting in the dark through 1.5 million ballots.

3 In communications with Maricopa County, the County has suggested that this Court  
4 lacks power to order the production of the CVR. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit C (“No other discovery  
5 is permitted.”). This argument misses the mark.

6 First, access to the unredacted CVR is properly viewed as part of the ballot inspection  
7 process, which has been authorized by this Court under A.R.S. § 16-667.

8 Second, even if it is viewed as a discovery request, the Court retains authority under  
9 the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure to authorize it. As the Superior Court for Maricopa  
10 County recently ruled:

11 While an election contest is a “purely statutory” and “special proceeding,”  
12 *Griffin v. Buzard*, 86 Ariz. 166, 168 (1959), the legislature has mandated that  
13 such actions be “brought in the superior court of the county in which the  
14 person contesting resides or in the superior court of Maricopa County.”  
15 A.R.S. § 16-672(B). In turn, Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure “govern the  
16 procedure in all civil actions **and proceedings in the superior court of  
Arizona.**” Ariz. R. Civ. P. 1 (emphasis added). An election contest is a  
“proceeding in the superior court of Arizona.”

17 *Finchem, et al. v. Fontes, et al.*, CV2022053927 at 3 (Dec. 16, 2022) (Under Advisement  
18 Ruling). Defendants and Contestees have effectively conceded as much by brining motions  
19 to dismiss, which are not authorized by the contest statute but are instead creatures of the  
20 Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure. *See id.* (finding argument that an election contest is not  
21 subject to Rule 8 and Rule 12(b)(6) of the rules of civil procedure to be “frivolous”). Thus,  
22 whether as part of the ballot inspection process or as a separate discovery request under the  
23 Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, this Court has the power to compel Maricopa County to  
24 provide the CVR.

25 Finally, in their communications with Plaintiffs, Maricopa County has raised  
26 concerns that there are two CVRs: one associated with the initial count and one associated  
27 with the 2022 recount, and that the later cannot be provided because it is under seal. To  
28 alleviate these concerns, Plaintiffs are willing to work with the CVR from the initial count,

1 rather than the recount CVR. Moreover, while Plaintiffs do not believe it is necessary, as  
2 the CVR is properly considered a public record, Plaintiffs are also willing to support a  
3 protective order in this case to permit access to the CVR for the limited purpose of  
4 facilitating this election contest.

5 **II. Maricopa County Should be Compelled to Provide the Names of all Voters**  
6 **who Provisional Ballot was Rejected**

7 Maricopa County Election Department Canvas shows that 7,803 voters showed up  
8 to the polls to vote on election day and that they were given a provisional ballot. Maricopa  
9 County accepted 2,954 of those provisional ballots and rejected 4,849. Based upon the  
10 Maricopa County provisional ballot report, 2,556 voters did not have their provisional ballot  
11 accepted because they were not registered to vote while another 1,942 had their provisional  
12 ballot rejected because they were not registered to vote this election (counsel for Maricopa  
13 County explained at the December 19<sup>th</sup> hearing that these “B12” voters registered to vote  
14 after the time to register to vote expired).

15 Plaintiffs have requested that Maricopa County produce the list of all voters who  
16 Provisional Ballot was rejected along with the reason for the rejection of the provisional  
17 ballot. To date, Plaintiffs still have not received this record. This list of voters is important  
18 for Plaintiffs to ensure that every eligible vote is properly counted.

19 **III. The Court Should Clarify that Maricopa County Cannot Unilaterally Cut**  
20 **the Inspection Time in Half**

21 In its December 20, 2022, Order, the Court permitted the inspection of ballots in  
22 advance of the evidentiary hearing on Friday, December 23, 2022. As a practical matter,  
23 this provides Plaintiffs two days to inspect ballots. The Court also provided a deadline of  
24 noon today, December 21, 2022, for the parties to meet and confer regarding the inspection  
25 of ballots, and a deadline of 4:00 pm for the parties to submit any issues to the Court for  
26 resolution.

27 As part of the meet and confer with Maricopa County, the County has represented  
28 that “the only day the County is able to facilitate this ballot inspection is tomorrow

1 [Wednesday, December 21, 2022].” *See* Exhibit B. This unreasonably and unilaterally cuts  
2 the ballot inspection period in half and, given the Court’s schedule for briefing any issues  
3 concerning ballot inspection by 4:00 today, potentially eliminates it completely. This  
4 substantially prejudices Plaintiffs’ ability to gather evidence to support our case, which is  
5 already predicated on a quick turnaround.

6 Maricopa County should not be allowed to run out the clock on ballot inspection by  
7 placing arbitrary time limits that do not align with the Court’s Order. Nor should the second  
8 largest election district in the United States be permitted to decide that its staffing  
9 preferences and priorities should take precedence over compliance with this Court’s orders.  
10 Thus, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court direct Maricopa County to facilitate  
11 ballot inspections so that Plaintiffs have the opportunity to inspect the necessary ballots so  
12 that they can prepare for trial.

13 **IV. The Three Person Inspection Requirement Means Three People Looking at**  
14 **Any Given Ballot, Not *Only* Three People in the Entire State**

15 Arizona revised statute 16-677(B) provides in part “the court shall appoint three  
16 persons, one selected by each of the parties and one by the court, by whom the inspection  
17 shall be made.” Defendants have suggested that this means *only* three people may be  
18 involved in inspecting ballots. *See, e.g.*, Exhibit B. Section 16-677(B) is better read as a  
19 requirement that three people be present whenever a *specific ballot* is being examined.

20 Section 16-677(B) is effectively a procedural check against chicanery. It ensures  
21 that anytime one party is examining a ballot, a representative from the other party is there,  
22 along with a neutral representative selected by the Court. In doing so, it ensures that each  
23 party can look over the other’s shoulder and be confident that nothing untoward is  
24 happening.

25 Defendants’ interpretation of section 16-677(B) does not further this purpose and  
26 introduces a host of logistical problems. For example, Plaintiffs are seeking to examine  
27 ballots in multiple counties, including Maricopa, Pima, and Navajo. As a rough estimate,  
28 Navajo County is roughly four hours away from Maricopa and six hours away from Pima

1 County. The travel distances alone make it nearly logistically impossible for the same three  
2 people to conduct meaningful ballot inspections in multiple counties within the timeframe  
3 set by the Court. Even within a given county, the number of ballots makes it difficult for  
4 the same three people to inspect every ballot subject to review, or even a meaningful sample  
5 thereof, within the allotted time.

6 A better interpretation of section 16-677(B), which also serves its underlying  
7 purpose, is to read the statute to allow multiple three-person teams to inspect ballots, as long  
8 as three people are looking at the same ballot.

9 **V. The Court Should Enter an Order Concerning the Appointment of Ballot**  
10 **Inspectors in Pima and Navajo Counties**

11 Arizona Revised Statutes section 16-677(B) provides that “the court shall appoint three  
12 persons, one selected by each of the parties and one by the court, by whom the inspection  
13 shall be made. If either party fails to name a person to act in making the inspection, the  
14 court shall make the appointment.” Both Pima and Navajo county has requested an order  
15 appointing the inspectors. Plaintiffs request an order from this Court appointing Plaintiffs’  
16 designee as one inspector, the contestee’s designee as another inspector, and the respective  
17 County official with custody of the ballots that will make the ballots available for review as  
18 the third inspector.

19 **CONCLUSION**

20 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court direct  
21 Maricopa County to provide Plaintiffs with an unredacted copy of the initial 2022 General  
22 Election CVR, provide a list of voters names who provisional ballot was rejected, clarify  
23 that the inspection of ballots shall continue until Plaintiffs have the opportunity to properly  
24 review all ballots necessary to prepare for trial pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-677, clarify that  
25 A.R.S. § 16-677(B) allows for multiple three-person teams to inspect ballots as long as three  
26 people are looking at any given ballot, and appoint representatives for Navajo and Pima  
27 Counties.  
28

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 21st day of December, 2022.  
2  
3

4 By: /s/ Timothy A. La Sota  
5 Timothy A La Sota, SBN # 020539  
6 **TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC**  
7 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305  
8 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

9 David A. Warrington\*  
10 Gary Lawkowski\*  
11 **DHILLON LAW GROUP, INC.**  
12 2121 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 608  
13 Alexandria, VA 22314

14 *\*Pro hac vice forthcoming*

15 Dennis I. Wilenchik, #005350  
16 John D. "Jack" Wilenchik, #029353  
17 [admin@wb-law.com](mailto:admin@wb-law.com)

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Original efiled with the Mohave County Superior Court and served on the following  
2 parties through AZTurboCourt on this 21st day of December 2022:

3 Daniel C. Barr  
4 Paul F. Eckstein  
5 Alexis E. Danneman  
6 Austin C. Yost  
7 Samantha J. Burke  
8 Perkins Coie LLP  
9 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000  
10 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788  
11 Telephone: 602.351.8000  
12 Facsimile: 602.648.7000  
13 DBarr@perkinscoie.com  
14 PEckstein@perkinscoie.com  
15 ADanneman@perkinscoie.com  
16 AYost@perkinscoie.com  
17 SBurke@perkinscoie.com  
18 DocketPHX@perkinscoie.com

19 *Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes*

20 D. Andrew Gaona  
21 Coppersmith Brockelman PLC  
22 2800 N. Central Ave., Ste. 1900  
23 Phoenix, AZ, 85004  
24 agaona@cblawyers.com

25 Sambo (Bo) Dul  
26 State United Democracy Center  
27 8205 S. Priest Dr., #10312  
28 Tempe, AZ 95284  
bo@stateuniteddemocracy.org

*Attorneys for Defendant Arizona Secretary  
of State Katie Hobbs*

29 Thomas P. Liddy  
30 Joseph La Rue  
31 Joe Branco  
32 Karen Hartman-Tellez  
33 Jack L. O'Connor III  
34 Sean M. Moore  
35 Rosa Aguilar  
36 Maricopa County Attorney's Office  
37 225 West Madison St.  
38 Phoenix, AZ 85003  
liddy@maricopa.gov  
laruej@maricopa.gov  
brancoj@maricopa.gov  
hartmank@maricopa.gov  
oconnorj@maricopa.gov  
moores@maricopa.gov

1 raguilar@mcao.maricopa.gov  
2 c-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov

3 Emily Craiger  
4 THE BURGESS LAW GROUP  
5 3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224  
6 Phoenix, AZ 85016  
7 emily@theburgesslawgroup.com

8 *Attorneys for Maricopa County*

9 Celeste Robertson  
10 Joseph Young  
11 Apache County Attorney's Office  
12 245 West 1st South  
13 St. Johns, AZ 85936  
14 crobertson@apachelaw.net  
15 jyoung@apachelaw.net

16 *Attorneys for Defendants Larry Noble, Apache  
17 County Recorder, and Apache County Board of  
18 Supervisors*

19 Christine J. Roberts  
20 Paul Correa  
21 Cochise County Attorney's Office  
22 P.O. Drawer CA  
23 Bisbee, AZ 85603  
24 croberts@cochise.az.gov  
25 pcorrea@cochise.az.gov

26 *Attorneys for Defendants David W. Stevens,  
27 Cochise County Recorder, and Cochise County  
28 Board of Supervisors*

29 Bill Ring  
30 Coconino County Attorney's Office  
31 110 East Cherry Avenue  
32 Flagstaff, AZ 86001  
33 wring@coconino.az.gov

34 *Attorney for Defendants Patty Hansen, Coconino  
35 County Recorder, and Coconino County Board of  
36 Supervisors*

37 Jeff Dalton  
38 Gila County Attorney's Office  
39 1400 East Ash Street  
40 Globe, AZ 85501  
41 jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov

42 *Attorney for Defendants Sadie Jo Bingham, Gila  
43 County Recorder, and Gila County Board of*



1 *Supervisors*

2 Jean Roof  
3 Graham County Attorney's Office  
4 800 West Main Street  
5 Safford, AZ 85546  
6 jroof@graham.az.gov

7 *Attorneys for Defendants Wendy John, Graham*  
8 *County Recorder, and Graham County Board of*  
9 *Supervisors*

10 Rob Gilliland  
11 Greenlee County Attorney's Office  
12 P.O. Box 1717  
13 Clifton, AZ 85533  
14 rgilliland@greenlee.az.gov

15 *Attorney for Defendants Sharie Milheiro,*  
16 *Greenlee County Recorder, and Greenlee County*  
17 *Board of Supervisors*

18 Ryan N. Dooley  
19 La Paz County Attorney's Office  
20 1320 Kofa Avenue  
21 Parker, AZ 85344  
22 rdooley@lapazcountyaz.org

23 *Attorney for Defendants Richard Garcia, La Paz*  
24 *County Recorder, and La Paz County Board of*  
25 *Supervisors*

26 Ryan Esplin  
27 Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division  
28 P.O. Box 7000  
Kingman, AZ 86402-7000  
EspliR@mohave.gov

29 *Attorney for Defendants Kristi Blair, Mohave*  
30 *County Recorder, and Mohave County Board of*  
31 *Supervisors*

32 Jason Moore  
33 Navajo County Attorney's Office  
34 P.O. Box 668  
35 Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668  
36 jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov

37 *Attorney for Defendants Michael Sample, Navajo*  
38 *County Recorder, and Navajo County Board of*  
39 *Supervisors*

40 Daniel Jurkowitz  
41 Ellen Brown

1 Javier Gherna  
Pima County Attorney's Office  
2 32 N. Stone #2100  
Tucson, AZ 85701  
3 Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov  
Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov  
4 Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov

5 *Attorney for Defendants Gabriella Cázares-Kelley,*  
*Pima County Recorder, and Pima County*  
6 *Board of Supervisors*

7 Craig Cameron  
Scott Johnson  
8 Allen Quist  
Jim Mitchell  
9 Pinal County Attorney's Office  
30 North Florence Street  
10 Florence, AZ 85132  
craig.cameron@pinal.gov  
11 scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov  
allen.quist@pinal.gov  
12 james.mitchell@pinal.gov

13 *Attorneys for Defendants Dana Lewis, Pinal*  
*County Recorder, and Pinal County Board of*  
14 *Supervisors*

15 Kimberly Hunley  
Laura Roubicek  
16 Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office  
2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201  
17 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090  
khunley@santacruzcountyaz.gov  
18 lroubicek@santacruzcountyaz.gov

19 *Attorneys for Defendants Suzanne Sainz, Santa*  
*Cruz County Recorder, and Santa Cruz County*  
20 *Board of Supervisors*

21 Colleen Connor  
Thomas Stoxen  
22 Yavapai County Attorney's Office  
255 East Gurley Street, 3rd Floor  
23 Prescott, AZ 86301  
Colleen.Connor@yavapaiaz.gov  
24 Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov

25 *Attorney for Defendants Michelle M. Burchill,*  
*Yavapai County Recorder, and Yavapai County*  
26 *Board of Supervisors*

27 Bill Kerekes  
28 Yuma County Attorney's Office

1 198 South Main Street  
2 Yuma, AZ 85364  
3 bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov

4 *Attorney for Defendants Richard Colwell, Yuma*  
5 *County Recorder, and Yuma County Board of*  
6 *Supervisors*

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# Exhibit A

## Bennett Declaration

**DECLARATION OF KENNETH R. BENNETT**

I, Kenneth Bennett, hereby declare as follows under penalty of perjury:

1. I am over the age of 18 and competent to make this declaration.
2. I am a citizen of the United States and of the State of Arizona.
3. I reside in Prescott, AZ.
4. For six years, from 2009 to 2015, I served as the Arizona Secretary of State.

During my tenure, I oversaw 12 statewide or multi-jurisdiction elections, the most of any living Secretary of State. I was also formerly a state senator from 1999 to 2007 and served as the President of the Arizona Senate. In the past, I have also been a candidate for Congress and Arizona Governor. I am currently the senator-elect for Arizona Senate District 1.

5. A cast vote record (“CVR”) should be a public record. It is essentially a spreadsheet in which each row corresponds to a ballot that has been cast and each column indicates a voter’s choice on that ballot for each race. The information in the CVR directly correlates, row by row with ballot images, that is, pictures of ballots. The CVR does not contain any individual voter identifying information.

6. For any effort to rapidly review ballots, the CVR is essential. You must have a both a specific ballot image and its corresponding row in the CVR to be able to prove that in a particular race that ballot reflects a vote for a certain candidate (or no candidate). The CVR is thus the tally sheet for the election. It is the only way to verify that the votes on particular ballots were correctly recorded and tabulated.

7. I recently served as an expert witness in a Pennsylvania state court case, *Honey v. Lycoming County Office of Voter Services*, CV-22-00115 (Pa. Ct. Comm. Pl. Dec. 16, 2022), in which the court ruled last week that CVRs are public documents.

8. Candidates cannot effectively exercise their right to contest elections unless they are given an opportunity to review the election's CVR.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the above is true and correct.

Signed: Kenneth R. Bennett  
Kenneth R. Bennett  
12/21/2022  
Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Exhibit B

Craiger/La Sota email exchange



tim timlasota.com



To:

- Barr, Daniel (PHX) <DBarr@perkinscoie.com>

Cc:

- Emily Craiger <emily@theburgesslawgroup.com>

+5 others

Wed 12/21/2022 5:24 AM

I disagree. This is clearly part of the right to inspect ballots. For one thing it is implicit in that right because without it inspection is difficult and potentially futile....

I do not understand why you will not provide this data. Other than your hyper technical explanation about it being beyond the scope of what is permitted.

Thanks, Tim

Emily Craiger <emily@theburgesslawgroup.com>



To:

- tim timlasota.com

Cc:

- Joseph LaRue <laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov>

+5 others

Tue 12/20/2022 9:28 PM

Tim,

Your request for the unredacted Recount CVR is beyond the scope of the statute and the Court's order. Under A.R.S. § 16-677(B), your client may appoint one member of a three person panel to inspect ballots. No other discovery is permitted. Also, as the County has previously explained, it will not release the unredacted CVR. Further, the Recount CVR is currently under seal so even a redacted version cannot be released. As such, the County cannot agree to your request.

As we discussed on the phone this afternoon, the only day the County is able to facilitate this ballot inspection is tomorrow because of the hearing schedule in the *Lake v. Hobbs, et. al.* matter. We also informed you that preparing for the inspection takes a significant amount of time. Please let us know how your client intends to proceed.

Thanks, Emily

Emily Craiger

**The Burgess Law Group**

3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224

Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Tel: 602.806.2104

Mobile: 602.318-0197

Email: [Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com](mailto:Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com)

Web: [www.theburgesslawgroup.com](http://www.theburgesslawgroup.com)



## **Exhibit C**

### **Plaintiffs' List of Designees Pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-677**

## **Plaintiffs' List of Designees Pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-677**

### **Maricopa County**

- Heidi Grande
- Ben Thurston
- Dianne Serra
- Andrea Wolverton
- Marcela Orr
- Gina Godbehere
- Liesl Emerson
- Leslie White

### **Pima County**

- Shelley Kais
- Bill Beard
- Cindy Coleman

### **Navajo County**

- Lisa Green
- Lou Carlassara
- Ken Fisk
- Sandee McKinlay