

A Judicial Watch Special Status Report

**FOR INTERNAL STAFF AND
MEMBER DISTRIBUTION ONLY**



Election Integrity Project

Battle Plan Executive Summary

**Appendix A: Case Studies of Judicial Watch
Victories in Ohio and Indiana**

Status Update: August 1, 2014

Prepared by: Robert Popper, Esq., Senior Attorney and
Christopher Fedeli, Esq., Senior Attorney

“The health of democracies, of whatever type and range, depends on a wretched technical detail: electoral procedure. All the rest is secondary.”

Jose Ortega y Gasset: The Revolt of the Masses (1932)

Preface



Dear Judicial Watch Member,

Your support of Judicial Watch is so important to our work on behalf of keeping America's electoral processes honest that I want to share with you this Special Status Report on our **Election Integrity Project**.

I have included an Executive Summary of our Election Integrity Battle Plan that provides you with an outline of the battleground, including facts about the many opportunities for voter fraud presented by poorly maintained voter lists, the goals we have set for our litigation, and the legal actions we are undertaking to achieve them.

I have also included case studies of the breakthrough victories we achieved this year on behalf of honest elections in Ohio and Indiana. Litigation in this arena is lengthy and expensive, but we believe it is absolutely essential to keeping America's elections honest. We thought you might like to learn in more detail about how we carried our work to successful and precedent-setting conclusions in these two states.

Thank you for your generous commitment to Judicial Watch.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Fitton". The signature is fluid and cursive.

Thomas Fitton
President

Executive Summary & Status Update

Election Integrity Battle Plan

Context

Ample evidence suggests that there are continuing problems with inaccurate election rolls and voter fraud resulting from inadequate voter identification and law enforcement. Despite determined efforts by groups and candidates with vested interests in porous electoral systems to ignore or downplay violations of election law, reliable reports of voter fraud are widespread and more arise from each election. Since significant elements of the national media – and, sadly, many local enforcement authorities — cooperate in a “hear no evil, see no evil” strategy, cases of voter fraud have gone mostly unreported to the general public. But in 2012 when Judicial Watch launched **its Election Integrity Project**, it brought the reality of voter fraud forward in ways that the courts and even the media could not ignore.

Judicial Watch has achieved significant success in several states with a multi-pronged investigative and legal approach to restoring the integrity of the electoral process by researching, exposing and filing federal and state lawsuits to enforce provisions of the National Voter Registration Act (NVRA) that were hitherto ignored and violated; and by providing expert legal advice to state efforts to protect the integrity of their electoral process through passage of commonsense voter ID and other election integrity laws.

Yet, enormous challenges remain. Here are some important facts:

A. Voter lists are poorly maintained at the state and local levels:

In 2012, the non-partisan Pew Charitable Trust released an astonishing report noting that “[a]pproximately 2.75 million people have active registrations in more than one state.”

That same report observed that “24 million — one of every eight — active voter registrations in the United States are no longer valid or are significantly inaccurate,” and that “[m]ore than 1.8 million deceased individuals are listed as active voters.”

B. Unlawfully present aliens vote in American elections:

In December 2013, Michigan Secretary of State Ruth Johnson asked her attorney general to investigate 10 non-citizens who voted in Michigan elections.

Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted was able to confirm that at least 17 non-citizens voted in Ohio in the 2012 presidential election.

A 2012 Philadelphia City Commissioner report on voter fraud confirmed that 19 non-citizens were registered in the city, with at least 7 voting.

An NBC News report from 2012 found 94 non-citizens registered to vote in Florida; some have voted several times.

A Bosnian citizen was among those illegally registering and voting in Iowa.

In 2005, the Government Accountability Office found that perhaps 3 percent of 30,000 persons called for jury duty from voter registration rolls in a single U.S. district court were not U.S. citizens.

This kind of fraud could have an effect. There are many close elections. For example, Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted reported that, based upon a review of 110 recounts conducted following the 2013 General Election on November 5th, 35 local races and 8 local issues were decided by one vote or through breaking a tie. And certainly most Americans remember how the presidential election of 2000 was decided by just over 500 votes cast in Florida.

C. GOAL NUMBER ONE: Cleaning state voter rolls as required by Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (NVRA):

We have successfully pursued lawsuits that we initiated in 2012 and resolved in 2014 related to cleaning voter rolls to comply with the NVRA that will have a direct and positive impact in 2014 and 2016, in:

- i. Ohio
- ii. Indiana

We have threatened NVRA lawsuits, and are working currently to avoid going to court by obtaining settlement agreements in:

- i. Colorado
- ii. District of Columbia
- iii. Iowa

We have made official inquiries of, and have ongoing NVRA investigations in:

- i. Alabama
- ii. California
- iii. Illinois
- iv. Kentucky

- v. Mississippi
- vi. Missouri
- vii. New Mexico
- viii. North Carolina
- ix. West Virginia

We have hired experts to examine the voter rolls of all states covered by the NVRA. While the data is incomplete, we have learned that [REDACTED]

Because the U.S. Justice Department under Attorney General Eric Holder has shirked its responsibilities to enforce election integrity measures required by the NVRA, **Judicial Watch is now the number one private government watchdog organization doing so.**

- D. **GOAL NUMBER TWO:** Supporting voter ID and other election integrity laws, and defending them in court:

Amicus or other participation in these cases:

- i. Pending North Carolina federal and state cases;
- ii. Pending Arkansas state case;
- iii. Pending Tennessee federal case;
- iv. Pending Wisconsin federal and state cases;
- v. Pending Kansas and Arizona federal cases;
- vi. Other voter ID cases which are almost certain to be filed in the coming months.

Counseling states regarding passage of voter ID and other election integrity laws. For example, assisting Pennsylvania in redrafting and repassing its voter ID law.

Providing information in publications like *The Wall Street Journal* to the public in order to counter the fire-hose of left-wing talking points and misinformation that are disseminated regarding this issue. For example:

- vii. The general public is typically unaware of the fact that voter fraud of every

description is a common feature of every federal and local election, and that it can decide outcomes.

- viii. Large numbers of Americans profess no faith in our electoral integrity.
- ix. Voter ID regulations are wildly popular in this country and are the world standard. A September 2013 poll by the Bipartisan Policy Center/*USA Today* found that 82% of those polled support voter ID, including 72% of black voters, 83% of Hispanic voters, and 70% of Democrats.

Most nations have voter ID laws. Europeans in particular are mystified by our failure to do so. It is a common sense measure, given all the other ID requirements we have.

E. GOAL NUMBER THREE: Supporting other important litigation efforts relating to election integrity:

Supporting Kansas in its efforts to require that a federal registration form demand proof of citizenship from potential registrants. Kansas won that case but it is on appeal and we have filed an *amicus* brief in support of this measure.

Supporting Florida in its efforts to challenge a bizarre 2-1 circuit court ruling that forbids it from removing unlawfully registered voters – even illegal aliens – in the 90 days before a federal election. We plan to participate by filing an *amicus* brief in support of the state's efforts to clean its voter lists.

F. OUR OPPOSITION:

The usual well-funded constellation of left-wing legal and media organizations:

NAACP, League of Women Voters, League of United Latin American Citizens, Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Demos, ProjectVote, the George Soros-funded Media Matters for America, the Brennan Center.

Topping the list, sadly, is the United States Justice Department under Attorney General Eric Holder. To wit:

- i. The U.S. Justice Department is actively **bringing** cases opposed to election integrity, like the lawsuit opposing voter ID and other commonsense measures in North Carolina (and the one it lost in South Carolina);

At the same time, the U.S. Justice Department is **ignoring** its responsibilities under Section 8 of the NVRA, which requires states to remove from the rolls voters who have died or moved elsewhere.

The **mainstream media**, which gives all of the foregoing a free ride, reiterates their talking points, and ignores our facts.

In a recent *Wall Street Journal* article, Judicial Watch debunked a couple of bogus studies regarding voter fraud which were cited by President Obama in a recent speech before Al Sharpton's National Action Network. Yet we continue to hear these bogus studies cited by our opponents, and the media lets them get away with it.

Summary

The evidence is clear that inaccurate voter rolls, inadequate voter ID, and lack of enforcement of election laws are exacerbating the existing problems of voter fraud.

The U.S. Department of Justice under Eric Holder has not only abdicated its responsibility to enforce the clean voter rolls provision of the NVRA, but is also actively attempting to block states from enacting commonsense voter ID laws.

It has therefore fallen to Judicial Watch to take the lead in initiating legal actions to enforce existing federal election law and to support states attempting to keep their elections honest. The ongoing support of our members is clearly essential in this effort.

Judicial Watch Election Integrity Victory Case Studies: Ohio and Indiana

Ohio Litigation

In January of 2014, Judicial Watch and True the Vote concluded their NVRA Section 8 lawsuit against the State of Ohio by entering into a settlement agreement with Secretary of State Jon Husted. The agreement requires Ohio to take several annual or monthly list maintenance steps through November of 2018.

Judicial Watch and True the Vote first notified Ohio that it was violating Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (“NVRA”) by letter dated February 9, 2012. Judicial Watch and True the Vote then filed their federal lawsuit in August of 2012 alleging Ohio was failing to remove the names of dead voters and voters who moved from the voter registration rolls.

The Ohio NVRA litigation was very different from the Indiana NVRA litigation. Unlike Indiana, Ohio made efforts to correct its violations and clean up its voter registration rolls almost immediately after we notified it of the violations and the potential lawsuit in February of 2012. This is partly due to the fact that the Ohio Secretary of State already had broad powers to issue regulations and directives to ensure the voter rolls were cleaned up without the need for additional enabling actions by the Ohio legislature.

Judicial Watch and True the Vote have publicly applauded Ohio Secretary of State Jon Husted for taking steps to clean the voter rolls, and for entering into this historic settlement agreement. The NVRA was passed in 1993, and yet our 2014 settlement was the first and only time in 20 years that a U.S. State entered into a settlement agreement with private litigants to resolve NVRA Section 8 violations. In addition, the role of Judicial Watch and True the Vote’s actions in focusing Ohio’s attention on the issue of voter roll maintenance cannot be overstated.

During the 18 months of litigation, Judicial Watch and True the Vote engaged in discovery to collect evidence of Ohio’s past violations of NVRA Section 8, which included requesting documents from Ohio and taking the depositions of certain Ohio election officials. During the course of the litigation, we learned that Ohio’s voter registration rolls had fallen into neglect under Secretary Husted’s immediate predecessor, Jennifer Brunner.

To see how our actions influenced the state of Ohio’s efforts to clean up its voter registration rolls, consider the timeline of events following our February 2012 notice of violation letter and the August 2012 lawsuit. As illustrated below, most of the list maintenance actions Ohio formalized in our settlement agreement started after we sent them our February 2012 letter, and some of the actions were not implemented until 2013 or later:

- The first list maintenance term in the settlement agreement requires Ohio to access the interstate system known as the State and Territorial Exchange of Vital Events (STEVE)

database to identify deceased Ohio registered voters who have moved and died out of state, and for Ohio to regularly distribute this information to its 88 counties in order to keep local voter lists accurate.

According to deposition testimony from Matt Damschroder, Ohio's Deputy Assistant Secretary of State and Director of Elections, Ohio first began the process of gaining access to the STEVE database in February 2012 – the same month we notified Ohio of NVRA violations.

- Our settlement agreement also required Ohio to access another state system known as the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck program administered by the Kansas Secretary of State to identify registered voters who move out-of-state for list maintenance purposes.

Again according to Damschroder, the first time Ohio used the Crosscheck program for list maintenance was in January of 2013.

- The settlement also requires Ohio to use its Bureau of Motor Vehicles (BMV) driver's license database to automatically update its voter registration rolls whenever a voter changes his address.

According to Terry Burton, the Director of the Board of Elections for Wood County Ohio, the State of Ohio first implemented this BMV system for the counties to use in May of 2013. Notably, the NVRA specifically requires states to implement this list maintenance action, but as Secretary Husted admitted, Ohio had failed to comply with it for 20 years, until after we filed our lawsuit.

- The settlement also requires Ohio to allow voters to update their voter registration address online when they move, so that voters can easily and quickly notify the state and counties of inaccurate voter registration information.

According to Pat McDonald, the Director of the Cuyahoga County Board of Elections, this online program first began in August of 2012.

- Under the settlement terms, Ohio must ensure that all county election officials are conducting monthly checks for duplicate voter registrations using Ohio's statewide voter registration system, and must require counties to keep potential duplicate registrations to a minimum.

According to Terry Burton, Ohio imposed this duplicate registration check requirement on its counties in May of 2012.

- The settlement requires Ohio to coordinate with Ohio colleges and universities so that students leaving college are reminded to update their voter registration addresses so outdated information can be removed.

According to Terry Burton, as of June 2013 there was no active program in place to share information with election officials about college students who graduate and relocate.

- Finally, under the settlement, Ohio counties must send voter confirmation mailings once every year to all voters registered in the county who haven't voted or updated their registration in two years. These are usually called "inactivity mailings," but in Ohio they call them "Supplemental Notices." These kind of address confirmation mailings are separate from National Change of Address (NCOA) notices, which are address confirmations sent to voters who notify the US Post Office they are moving (Ohio sends NCOA mailings every two years).

According to Matt Damschroder, prior to settling its lawsuit with us Ohio was only issuing Supplemental Notices to confirm addresses for inactive voters every two years, instead of every year like the settlement now requires.

Indiana Litigation

In June 2014, after two years of litigation, Judicial Watch and True the Vote concluded their historic June 2012 lawsuit against the State of Indiana to force them to remove the names of dead people and people who have moved from the voter registration lists. After two years of litigation, Judicial Watch and True the Vote successfully forced major changes in the Hoosier state:

- *Indiana's Secretary of State Is Now in Charge.* Nearly one year after we filed our lawsuit, Indiana adopted two new state laws which completely overhauled its voter list maintenance spending and decision-making procedures within the Indiana state government, as well as adding several new required list maintenance tasks. Specifically, as explained in detail in our most recent brief to the Court, "Indiana failed to conduct reasonable list maintenance efforts for years because the state delegated such authority to two Election Division Co-Directors, who were perennially deadlocked over what constituted reasonable list maintenance efforts.... In 2013, after being sued by Plaintiffs and losing their Motion to Dismiss this lawsuit, Indiana finally adopted the long overdue legislative fix of allowing the Secretary of State to break deadlocks between the Election Division Co-Directors concerning list maintenance actions."
- *Indiana Spends Substantial Funds to Show it Is Serious About Voter List Maintenance.* Nearly two years after we filed our lawsuit, in May of 2014, Indiana Secretary of State Connie Lawson finally exercised her new state law authority and implemented one of the capstones of the new Indiana legislation by personally pushing forward with a \$2.1 million effort to send address confirmation mailings to every Indiana registered voter to remove outdated names from the voter rolls. Judicial Watch has long been advocating for Indiana to take this step, most recently in our motion for summary judgment when we explained that "reasonable activities" for Indiana under Section 8 of the National

Voter Registration Act (“NVRA”) must include “Conduct[ing] a statewide mailing to all registered voters pursuant to the NVRA to identify voters who have moved.”

Earlier in the lawsuit, federal Judge William T. Lawrence issued a precedent-setting decision finding that Judicial Watch and True the Vote had established their initial case that Indiana was violating the voter list maintenance requirements of the NVRA, and that Indiana’s violations were injuring True the Vote and Judicial Watch’s Indiana members. Now, with Indiana officials finally demonstrating true compliance with Section 8 of the NVRA, Judicial Watch and True the Vote moved to dismiss their lawsuit, concluding the litigation for achieving our objectives.

By way of background, Judicial Watch’s analysis of publicly available data for 2010 showed that the number of people listed on voter registration rolls in 12 Indiana counties exceeded 100% of the total voting-age population in those counties, provoking Judicial Watch to bring this lawsuit in 2012. It is fortunate we did, because Indiana’s voter rolls had only gotten worse. Once the same data became publicly available for 2012, Judicial Watch’s review showed that, by that time, 16 Indiana counties now had more people on the voter rolls than total voting-age adults living in those counties.

The injury to Judicial Watch’s members registered to vote in Indiana was real. We heard from dozens of members expressing their concerns and asking us to protect their voting rights against Indiana’s neglect of federal law. As we explained in our response to Indiana’s motion to dismiss, Indiana’s failure to clean its voter rolls was undermining Judicial Watch’s members’ confidence in the integrity of elections, making it less likely they would vote in upcoming elections:

As the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized and the Court in *McGuffage* reiterated, ensuring that voters have confidence in the integrity of elections is essential to ensuring citizens continue to participate in American democracy... When no less than twelve counties in the State of Indiana have more persons who are registered to vote than total voting age population, voter confidence in the electoral process is undermined and voters are less motivated to participate in that process. Defendants’ failure to satisfy their voter list maintenance obligations is burdening Judicial Watch, Inc.’s members’ right to vote by undermining members’ confidence in the electoral process.

Similarly, we explained that “True the Vote’s essential purposes and goals include obtaining and analyzing voter registration rolls to improve their accuracy and currency... By failing to satisfy their voter list maintenance obligations under Section 8 of the NVRA, Defendants are making it ‘difficult or impossible’ for True the Vote to fulfill one of its ‘essential purposes or goals.’”

The Court agreed on both counts, writing:

With regard to Defendant Judicial Watch, the Court finds that it has satisfied this burden by alleging that its members who are registered to vote in Indiana

are injured by Indiana’s failure to comply with the NVRA list maintenance requirements because that failure “undermin[es] their confidence in the legitimacy of the elections held in the State of Indiana and thereby burden[s] their right to vote.” ... There can be no question that a plaintiff who alleges that his right to vote has been burdened by state action has standing to bring suit to redress that injury. There is also no question that “the right of suffrage can be denied by a debasement or dilution of the weight of a citizen’s vote just as effectively as by wholly prohibiting the free exercise of the franchise.”

The Court added that “if True the Vote’s ability to carry out its mission of cleaning up voter registration rolls has been ‘perceptibly impaired’ by the Defendants’ alleged statutory violation, True the Vote has suffered injury.”

This was a landmark ruling from the Indiana federal court. In the 20 years since Congress enacted the NVRA, no private organization had ever successfully sued state government officials to hold them liable for violations of Section 8. Now that this precedent has been set, it will be easier for groups nationwide to bring Section 8 claims against states, knowing the standards the federal courts will mostly likely apply.

During the two year course of the litigation, Judicial Watch and True the Vote discovered that the voter list maintenance problems in Indiana were deep and systemic. To identify just a few examples of evidence uncovered in our lawsuit:

- At times, the Indiana Election Division improperly discouraged local county officials from conducting list maintenance. According to deposition testimony, a lawyer working for the Indiana Election Division told a county election official that conducting public records research into whether registered voters over 100 years old were deceased was “discriminatory against the elderly.”
- According to deposition testimony from county officials, local Indiana county officials indicated they could not keep the voter rolls clean on their own without the support and leadership of the Indiana State Government in coordinating the activities of 91 counties and 6 different state offices, and in identifying voters moving outside of Indiana – support the counties were not getting.
- According to deposition testimony from county officials, the State of Indiana prohibited local county officials from removing deceased voters from the rolls even if they read a voter’s obituary in the newspaper or attended a voter’s funeral.
- According to deposition testimony, the two Co-Directors of the Indiana Election Division disagreed for years and were deadlocked about whether the state should undertake even the most ordinary list maintenance activities, like obtaining the National Change of Address Database from the U.S. Post Office or the Social Security Death Index from the U.S. Social Security Administration to clean the voter rolls.

Effective in July 2013 – over a year after we filed our lawsuit – Indiana’s new state legislation imposed several important changes which should help Indiana’s state officials execute their voter list maintenance responsibilities under federal law in the future. Most importantly, the Indiana General Assembly gave Secretary of State Connie Lawson state law authority to break deadlocks between the two Election Division Co-Directors whenever they disagree about performing voter list maintenance. As discussed in our recent brief, the 2013 Indiana laws – House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1391 and Senate Enrolled Act (SEA) 519 – significantly restructured Indiana’s government on election administration responsibility. Some of the most important specific changes to the Indiana election code include:

- Indiana Code Section 3-6-4.2-3 was revised to allow the Indiana Secretary of State to break ties and decide matters whenever the Election Division Co-Directors “are unable to resolve a dispute between themselves regarding” the Indiana Election Division’s budget, expenditures, or contracts. This is a particularly critical change, since maintaining the accuracy of voter registration lists containing millions of names requires states to spend money on both database technology as well as traditional mailings and human analysis.
- Indiana Code Section 3-7-45-4 was revised to specify that county officials could remove the names of deceased persons from the voter rolls “after receiving a copy of an obituary, notice of estate administration, or other notice of death” published in a newspaper.
- Indiana Code Section 3-7-45-5 was revised to require the Indiana Department of Health to obtain out-of-state citizen death information monthly from the State and Territorial Exchange of Vital Events (STEVE) System and the Electronic
- Verification of Vital Events (EVVE) System, both administered by the National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems (NAPHSIS).
- Indiana Code Section 3-7-45-6.1 was revised to require Indiana to obtain the Social Security Death Index (SSDI) on a monthly basis to remove voters who have died and to provide deceased registered voters to counties each month, tasks to be performed by the Secretary of State if the Co-Directors fail to do so.
- Indiana Code Section 3-7-38.2-16 was revised to provide that, if the Election Division Co-Directors can’t agree on hiring a vendor to conduct a statewide address confirmation mailing to all Indiana voters, “the secretary of state may enter into the contract without the approval of the election division.”
- Indiana Code Section 3-7-38.2-8 was revised to require Indiana to provide counties with the names of voters who move each month so they can be removed from the rolls or updated as appropriate.
- Indiana Code Section 3-7-38.2-5 was revised to require Indiana to use the U.S. Post Office’s National Change of Address (NCOA) Service to identify registered voters who have moved, and to require Indiana to enter the Interstate Voter Registration Crosscheck

(IVRC) Program to identify and remove registered voters who have moved from Indiana to other states.

- Finally, Indiana Code Section 3-7-38.2-18 was revised to stipulate that if the Co-Directors do not perform any of the list maintenance activities identified in Chapter 38 of the Indiana Code, then “the secretary of state shall perform the duty.”

Furthermore, according to deposition testimony, Indiana’s General Assembly had considered making certain of these legislative changes in the past, but they never acted until Judicial Watch and True the Vote brought their lawsuit alleging the state was in violation of federal law.

As important as Indiana’s new state laws are, they only make a difference when the officials tasked with executing and enforcing the laws do their duty and carry out their obligations. That’s why Judicial Watch and True the Vote pressed on with their litigation until solid evidence emerged that Indiana’s long history of violating NVRA Section 8 was finally starting to fade.

On May 21, 2014, Indiana Secretary of State Connie Lawson announced via a press release that the \$2.1 million postcard mailing to all registered voters in Indiana was now underway. In the press release, Secretary Lawson confirmed that Indiana’s voter rolls contained inaccurate and outdated information, confirming the need for this list maintenance undertaking, stating:

“Last year [in 2013], I worked with state budget writers to secure the funding to update Indiana’s voter list,” said Secretary of State Connie Lawson. “It is estimated that at least one in eight voter registrations contains inaccurate information. Inaccurate voter information affects the integrity of our voting process. It may deflate voter turnout statistics because those numbers are based on total registered voters, which we know contain some outdated information.”

Judicial Watch and True the Vote had previously explained to the Court that, when a state’s voter rolls become as inaccurate and out of data as Indiana’s, a statewide address confirmation mailing is not only reasonable, it is essential for compliance with federal law:

- What constitutes reasonable voter list maintenance [under the NVRA] is situational and varies over time, depending on how accurate and current a state’s voter rolls are and what technologies and list maintenance resources are available to the state.
- Both the poor condition of Indiana’s voter rolls, and the failure of Co-Directors Deckard and King to institute any new list maintenance programs or activities upon learning of these inaccuracies, are factors that render Indiana’s voter list maintenance efforts unreasonable under industry standards applicable to election administration.
- The lack of NCOA, statewide, or county-wide mailings to registered voters is yet another factor rendering Indiana’s list maintenance effort unreasonable under industry standards applicable to election administration.

Judicial Watch and True the Vote's expert witness in their case against Indiana, former Georgia Secretary of State Karen Handel, explained that no state can completely avoid periodic statewide address confirmation mailings and still comply with the NVRA:

In my opinion, a "reasonable effort" for voter list maintenance is one that includes...a general mailing to all registered voters, whether conducted by the state or on a county-by-county basis, the frequency of which is determined by the frequency of the NCOA proactive statewide mailing, but not less frequently than every 10 years...

To address our lawsuit, Indiana's General Assembly and Governor had to overhaul their election code and restructure the Indiana government's election administration structure forever, making the Secretary of State the decision-maker on list maintenance and replacing the broken system of two perennially-deadlocked Election Directors. If this becomes the standard for addressing Section 8 claims going forward, it is a significant Judicial Watch achievement.

As Judicial Watch president Tom Fitton explained, Judicial Watch's Election Integrity Project is one of the most important the organization has ever initiated, and the results of this lawsuit demonstrate why. According to Fitton, "We're very pleased that Governor Pence and the Indiana General Assembly saw fit to correct the broken system of bi-partisan election administration in the State of Indiana following our lawsuit. We're even more pleased that Secretary of State Lawson is using her new powers to finally clean the badly outdated Indiana voter rolls by conducting a statewide address confirmation mailing. It is hard to imagine a bigger victory for election integrity than the results we obtained for our members here in Indiana."

Fitton continued: "Everyone knows how important it is to remove the names of dead people and people who have moved from the voter rolls, since leaving these outdated registrations on the rolls leaves our elections wide open to fraud. But not every state wants to roll up its sleeves and do the work necessary to keep their voter rolls accurate and up to date, even though federal law requires them to do so. As long as any state is shirking its obligation to guarantee elections are fair and honest for all Americans, Judicial Watch will continue to stand guard to fight for its members' interests."

If you would like additional copies
of the report please contact:

Judicial Watch, Inc.
425 Third Street, SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024

Tel: (202) 646-5172
FAX: (202) 646-5199

Email: info@JudicialWatch.org
www.JudicialWatch.org

SPECIAL



REPORT
