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## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

(June 26, 2023)
(In open court:)
DEPUTY COURTROOM CLERK: Your Honor, we are here
in the matter of Thielman, et al. v. Fagan, et al.
Case No. 3:22-cv-01516-SB for oral argument on the secretary of State's Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint,

Docket No. 73, and the Joint Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint, joining Secretary of State's motion, Docket No. 75, for oral argument.

Counsel, please identify yourselves, beginning with plaintiff.

MR. JONCUS: Yes. Hi, Judge Beckerman. I'm
Stephen Joncus. I'm here with Plaintiff Marc Thielman, and Plaintiff Chuck Wiese. Ben Edtl is in the crowd.

Janice Dysinger, Sandra Nelson, and Loretta Johnson are also here.

THE COURT: Thank you. Good afternoon.
For the defendants.
MR. MARSHALL: Good afternoon, Your Honor, Brian Marshall for the Secretary of state.

We have been invited to sit, if the Court prefers that.
THE COURT: Please do.
MS. PATEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
Bijal Patel, here for the State.

THE COURT: Good afternoon. Parties requested oral argument.

Oh, go ahead.
MR. JONES: Andrew Jones on behalf of Multnomah County, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
I will allow both sides as much time as you need to argue the motion and defend the motion. Because the defendant is the moving party, I'll start with the defendants' counsel.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Your Honor. There are two grounds for our motion. The first is jurisdictional -that the plaintiffs lack standing and thus the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction.

I will argue that the plaintiffs have failed to plead injury in fact and failed to plead a cognizable injury in fact, and then my colleague, Ms. Patel, will explain the complaints -- the complaint fails to also meet the traceability component of standing with respect to most of the 36 county defendants who have been named, and then she'll pass it back to me to argue that the complaint fails to state a claim under Anderson-Burdick, the standard that governs the plaintiffs' Fourteenth Amendment claims; and, of course, we invite the Court's questions throughout.

THE COURT: I will remind the folks on the phone
to please mute your phones.
MR. MARSHALL: So on the injury in fact component,
I think the starting place is the concession in the plaintiffs' opposition to the motion to dismiss, that they are, in fact, not seeking to allege that there's actually fraud in Oregon's elections, rather they are seeking to allege that individuals in Oregon fear there is fraud.

Without that critical allegation that there is, in fact, fraud, all of the plaintiffs' contentions that there are, in fact, problems with the underlying vote count ultimately fall away. Because there cannot be such an injury because they -- the only allegation that the vote count is incorrect is that vote by mail allows invalid votes to be fraudulently cast and counted. Plaintiffs have disclaimed that there's any allegation of fraud in their complaint, and so that basis no longer exists.

And the plaintiffs have also disclaimed -- and with -with plaintiffs disclaiming fraud, they also disclaim the machine counting allegation, that is, that allowing foreign adversaries to fraudulently manipulate ballot counts is occurring.

So the underlying basis of the plaintiffs' claim that there's some problem with the ultimate vote count is out of the case, according to the plaintiffs' opposition. At least that's our understanding of their position as of now.

Now, even if they did seek to pursue that allegation or revive it somehow, despite that concession, it is still -the underlying issue is that they would still have a generalized grievance. Because their claims are not that there are too many barriers between themselves and the ballot box, rather their claims are twofold: that others are voting illegally or that the ultimate ballot counts are inaccurate due to an allegation that machine counts are unreliable.

But either of those bases are shared in common with others. They're, in fact, shared in common with all others. Even those who are not voters. So a 15-year-old, for example, in Oregon has no right to vote, but they still have the same interest as the plaintiffs do in having a reliable vote count in Oregon elections in order that they are governed by officials and governed under laws for initiatives that reflect the will of the people, and that is an incredibly important interest, obviously. It's a preeminent interest. But it's also one that's a generalized interest and is an interest that is not specific to these plaintiffs, and therefore it's not cognizable under the Article III jurisdiction of this court.

So that is our -- those are our two principle grounds of our motion on standing on injury in fact.

As I understand it, the piece that the plaintiffs are
continuing to pursue is a notion that there's some sort of emotional injury or that their dissatisfaction with Oregon's elections is sufficient for them to enter into the Court and that that kind of emotional injury is sufficient to constitute an injury in fact.

That is -- essentially has the same problems as the other generalized grievance, that it's essentially a policy preference articulated in the voice of emotional injury that is not unique to any particular plaintiff, but rather is unique to their dissatisfaction with -- with Oregon's elections and the manner of them. Specifically, that we vote by mail and that we count ballots through machines. But their distaste or distrust of that process -- distaste for or distrust of that process is the kind of policy preference that is a prototypical example of a generalized grievance that is insufficient to gain standing.

Now, there is one citation to the voters' interest -or to the interest in -- in voters' underlying -plaintiffs -- plaintiffs rely on Purcell -- Purcell as one of their key pieces of case law in order to say that this is, in fact, a sufficiently -- a sufficient interest in the reliability and confidence in elections. That case is not a case about injury in fact standing. That is a case about the court's exercise of its equitable powers and how it weighs the balance of interests when it is considering
issuing preliminary relief close to an election. It doesn't have anything to do with the initial question, which is, "Is there a cognizable injury in fact?"

So in our view, the plaintiffs' complaint does not articulate an injury in fact. The only avenues to an injury in fact that are possible are foreclosed for two reasons: one, that the plaintiffs have disclaimed reliance on actual fraud or disclaimed that they are seeking to allege actual fraud; and, secondly, because anything that they would allege, that is based off of these set of allegations, would be a generalized grievance.

For that reason, the first prong of standing has not been met, and therefore plaintiffs are not able to establish standing, and the Court lacks subject matter jurisdiction.

So if the Court doesn't have questions at this point on that issue, I will hand it to my colleague, Ms. Patel. THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Patel.
MS. PATEL: Thank you, Your Honor. So as an initial matter, in January, plaintiffs amended their complaint to include all 36 counties. To date, 24 of those defendants have not been served. So only the 13 defendants have been served. That's the Secretary of State and the 12 -- what I'm going to refer to as the original counties. Under FRCP Rule 4, if a party is not served within 90 days
of the complaint being filed, the Court may -- the Court must, on its own motion, dismiss the action against those defendants.

Am I too close? Thank you.
So by our calculations, the first amended complaint was filed on January 27, 2023. If we add 90 days, they should have been served on April 27th -- by April 27, 2023.

Now, we didn't raise this in our papers because at that time plaintiffs still had an opportunity to serve. At this point, that opportunity has now passed.

In any event, service aside, most of these defendants can also be dismissed under the jurisdictional arguments that we have, that my colleague, Mr. Marshall, made, that I will make, and we will make further on.

Even if the Court was to find that plaintiffs have a cognizable injury in their lack of confidence in the elections or the negative feelings about the elections process and the way it's being administered, they must still show that the defendants are the ones that caused the harm, i.e., that there's a causal connection that their injury was caused by the defendants' conduct.

Now, we combed through the first amended complaint to find some connection between the plaintiffs and the defendant counties; and, Your Honor, if it's helpful, we have provided a chart to Ms. Williams and to the parties
that we hope will kind of outline their allegations and the traceability.

So for the Secretary of State, in seven of the counties, we do think there's enough to discuss the standing issue because -- as a plaintiff who's registered to vote and there are allegations of traceable conduct -- although we do maintain that those -- that those claims fail on the jurisdictional issues, but at least we could discuss them here today.

For the remaining counties, plaintiffs fail the traceability requirement for four primary reasons. The first is that the plaintiffs are only registered to vote in nine of these counties. A plaintiff cannot allege a defendant county harmed their voting rights in a county in which they are not even registered to vote. The harm has to have a causal connection to the plaintiffs' harm to the defendant.

So even if they were harmed by another county's mismanagement, assuming that that is true, this is still, as Mr. Marshall explained, a generalized grievance. We all share the effect of a misplaced ballot. This is not an injury that's unique to any of these plaintiffs.

But the remaining 27 counties, the plaintiffs fail to establish a line of causation between the defendants' actions, the alleged election misadministration, and alleged
harm. As we briefed quite thoroughly, the traceability standard requires that the defendants' connection to the alleged harm be more than attenuated. What does that mean? That means plausible. Not hypothetical, not speculative, and not conjecture.

But here any allegations of harm are based on pure conjecture. They're asking that the Court conclude that, because this -- they suspect that the laws are not being followed in one county in which they vote, every county is harming them.

Even if their suspicions were true, they still fail because they have to assert a concrete and personalized injury that's traceable to the conduct of the defendants.

For 20 defendants, there are either no allegations or the allegations are insufficient of conduct that is traceable to the defendants. And we say that these 20 should be dismissed entirely for failing the traceability prong for standing.

For seven of the counties, we found no allegations at all.

For 16 counties, the only allegations are that they have not removed enough voters from the registration lists. Now, any injury that comes from being a person being registered incorrectly is shared with all of the voters, a generalized grievance; and, in any event, they have no cause
of action tied to the fact that there's too many people on the registration lists alone.

Plaintiffs do not address the defendants' traceability argument in their briefings, except in their response, that they -- they seem to allege that because a couple of counties may have some irregularities in their elections processes that this is transferable to all of the counties -- the allegations under the standing standard have to show -- have to allow for a plausible inference that the defendants' conduct harmed the plaintiffs in an actual way.

But there's nothing specific about what these counties have allegedly done to harm the plaintiffs. They don't say that they -- that they suffered no injury attributable to the defendants by the mere existence of names on the registration list. That they suspect that all the counties are engaged in some kind of collective elections conspiracy is mere speculation.

The very conjecture that this Court is not permitted to entertain such implausible inferences to fault fails to meet the traceability requirement of standing.

Because standing requires that plaintiffs fairly trace their injury to the conduct of each defendant, we ask that plaintiffs' claims against every county defendant for which they cannot meet this requirement be dismissed.

So in summary, this means dismissing every county in
which no plaintiff is registered to vote, dismissing every county in which no specific conduct is alleged to have caused the plaintiffs' injuries, and for the counties that have not been served as a procedural matter, dismissal from this case under Rule 4.

Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Ms. Patel, if the Court were to
dismiss those counties who have not been served, should the dismissal be with prejudice or without prejudice?

MS. PATEL: Your Honor, the rule requires the dismissal be without prejudice. However, for the reasons that we've outlined in our motion and that we articulate today, we ask that they be dismissed with prejudice.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Marshall, before I turn to defendants'
Rule 12 (b) (6) motion, was there anything further on standing? I thought I would pause at standing and give Mr. Joncus a chance to respond.

MR. MARSHALL: Nothing further on standing in our initial presentation, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Joncus.
MR. JONCUS: The standing requirement that counsel relies on is there to ensure that judges do not engage in policymaking and cross over the boundary into infringing on
the right of the legislature. Their argument does not address the situation we have here. The situation we have here -- and I think it's very important to look to the hypothetical at the very beginning of our opposition brief -- what if the Government of Oregon is in complete control of the elections? They decide who wins and who loses; they can -- they can hide any fraud because it's all under wraps of computers. They block all opportunities, all attempts by the citizens to interrogate the validity of the elections. According to counsel's argument, there is no way out of that box, no legal theory that will allow a free people to escape from the tyranny of that Government.

Now, we don't know if that's the case. But with the circumstances we have and the evidence we have, we can't tell the difference. There's no way to tell the difference. The Constitution starts with, "We the People of the United States, in order to form more perfect union," and it goes on to say, "secure the blessings of liberty. We established, as a constitution for the United States of America."

This Government belongs to We the People, not the bureaucrats who have closed us out of running these elections and interrogating these elections and cross-examining these elections.

THE COURT: I want to pause and remind the folks on the phone to please mute. We can hear any noise in your
background, and we're picking up another conversation. If the noise continues, we're going to have to terminate the public lines.

So please mute your phones, everybody.
Mr. Joncus, go ahead. I apologize for the interruption.

MR. JONCUS: I'm sorry that I -- I wasn't -- I'm the one that spread the telephone number around; so I apologize for that. I thought it was intended for that.

THE COURT: Not a problem. Courts are open to the public, and I want to facilitate any interest in the hearing. I just want to make sure it's not disruptive.

MR. JONCUS: So the fundamental argument we have is based on statements by -- in Purcell and others, that -Purcell says -- and Purcell was about timing of actions before an elections. That's what it's cited for. But it also talked about the importance of confidence in the integrity of elections. Because the law at issue was an Arizona law that required drivers' licenses to be presented in order to vote and in order to register, and that law was challenged, and it was enjoined by the Ninth Circuit right before the election. The district court refused an injunction. The Ninth Circuit enjoined it right before the election. The Supreme Court said you can't do that. It's too soon -- too late in the process. So that's what Purcell
is mainly known for. But it talks about confidence -- the importance of confidence in the integrity of the election process. It says, "Confidence in the integrity of our electoral process is essential to the functioning of our participatory democracy."
"The right of such suffrage" -- the right to vote -"is denied by debasement or dilution of the weight of the citizen's vote, just as effectively by wholly prohibiting the free exercise of franchise."

It also points out voter fraud drives honest citizens out of the process and breeds distrust. Voters who fear -an emotion. Voters who fear that legitimate votes will be outweighed by fraudulent ones will feel disenfranchised. And then, citing Purcell, Justice Thomas, in a dissenting opinion for the court not taking up a cert, in

Republican Party v. Degraffenreid -- I'm sure I pronounced that poorly -- said, "Elections enable self-governance only when -- only when they include processes that give citizens, including the losing candidates and their supporters, confidence in the fairness of the election."

So confidence in the fairness of the election is the critical issue here. Because the only way you can escape that box that I talked about, that box canyon where a government has gotten complete control over the election process and complete control of any access to interrogate it
by the public so that you cannot determine whether there's fraud or not, we will never be able to allege fraud.

Because the government has it all wrapped up in computers that we can't get to, and they -- they're blocking us from getting to them. The only other criteria is confidence in the election process.

And what Justice Thomas says, "If you don't have confidence, if the public does not have confidence, there is no self-government."

That is amazing to talk about in the United States of America, where we have a situation with no self-government. Potentially. We don't know. But because we don't know, our current system, which doesn't allow us to know, is unconstitutional.

What are the facts? Election fraud is nothing new. It's happened throughout our history. Now we have mechanistic ways to make it more effective and more efficient because we're all computerized, and it's all impersonal.

There's a nationwide criminal conspiracy to pack the ballot box and steal elections. Now, these are facts that are plead. We have cites to those facts. So they have to be treated as true for the purpose of a motion to dismiss.

There is evidence of strong and rampant fraud in Oregon in the counties with the largest populations in the state.

Every county west of the mountains. A vote-by-mail system is something akin to an honor system.

What do we know about honor systems? It's human nature. Beings -- it's a nature of human beings to cheat. Even in our most prestigious institutions of learning, like West Point, where there's a strict honor code, people cheat.

Judge Posner has written that absentee voting is to voting in person as a take-home exam is to a proctored one. Everyone knows with a take-home exam, you can cheat. You can have someone else fill out the exam. Mail-in voting permits fundamentally simpler and more effective ways to commit voter fraud on a vast scale.

All the evidence of stolen elections involves absentee ballots and the like. So absentee ballots are a more restricted form of mail-in voting. Oregon is unique. It's the only state that has a hundred percent mail-in voting, and it started 20 years ago. Absentee ballots are fine with us as long as there are protections, but absentee ballots is where you see all the fraud.

It's like -- mail-in voting is like leaving your car in a bad neighborhood with the doors unlocked and the keys in the ignition. You're asking for problems. You're asking for someone to steal your car when you do that, and that's what this system does.

We have phantom voters. We have two huge problems. We
have lots of phantom voters and lots of excess ballots being printed.

More people are registered to vote in Oregon than are eligible to vote. The legislature has passed laws that undermine clean voter rolls. ORS 247.275 prohibits -prohibits removing names from the voter roll because they did not vote. Counties do not clean their voters rolls. Federal law requires reasonable efforts to remove names of ineligible voters. 52 U.S.C. § 20507, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993. 14 counties reported removing five or fewer voter registrations in a four-year period. Five or fewer.

Lane County's election officials have not updated voter rolls in over four years, and they have no plan to do so before the 2022 election.

Washington County, a sample of 4,400 voters records. 13 percent were dead. One as long as 2010. Twelve dead voters in Washington County cast their ballots. Washington County had another sample of 248 records. Eighty-five registered voters had moved out of the county out of those 248. Eighty-five. And all of those 85 had voted in Washington County. Illegal votes in Washington County.

Lane County had 85 voters registered at an Amazon Parkway address where no one lives. Lane County has a Walmart parking lot with 12 registered voters. One can
deduce from this kind of behavior that it is a policy of Oregon and its counties to violate federal law, to violate the National Voter Registration Act intentionally. That is a really good reason for crisis of confidence.

Oregon law registers people as voters on the most flimsiest of grounds.

Anthony Hanson lived at his address in Portland, Oregon, for a total of two weeks, and he somehow got registered as a voter. He now lives in Baltimore, and he still receives ballots at that address in Portland.

ORS 247.019 permits registration of voters where the only ID required is the last four digits of a social security number. This one is hard for me to wrap my head around. Anybody can invent four-digit numbers, and it's an online registration where you submit an electronic copy of your supposed signature.

You can be -- it's trivial to generate thousands, hundreds of thousands of phantom voters with four-digit numbers, and no one will ever know did if ever -- you can't identify people with a four-digit number. You can't go buy anything in the store with only the last four digits of your credit card.

You can't get your driver's license with the last four digits of your social security number. You can't go get a manicuring license with the last four digits of your
driver's license. You can't go get a passport with the last four digits of your social security number.

Social security number: You can register vote in Oregon with the last four digits of your social security number. The only reason for a law like that is to permit illegal voters to be registered. That's the only reason for something like that. It is clear as day and a reason -- and a really good reason why it's a crisis of confidence. There's no other explanation. No one can look at these rules and have confidence that our system is secure and accurate.

Excess ballots. Every University of Oregon student gets two ballots. The SEIU Union solicited recycling ballots. They sent out emails, asking for help with filling out ballots. So they put out a box in the bin. "Put your ballots here, your excess ballots." You can't vote two times. If you vote two times, the system will kick you out, but they recycle them. Why does the Union want recycled old ballots that can't be used? What are they going to do with a stack of ballots?

Well, the form is very valuable. They're asking people to come help fill them out for them, and witnesses say they were told how to fill those ballots out.

Now, what is the Union going to do with a stack of filled-out ballots? How hard is it to bribe some election
official to walk in there with a thousand ballots and say, "Here's a thousand dollars. Here's \$5,000. Here's \$10,000 if you will substitute that thousand ballots for the ones -that stack of a thousand ballots you have over there."

There is no chain of custody for these ballots. Once they're taken out of the envelope, it's over. They're counted, and you can't go back and undo that.

How hard is it for the Union or other organizations -the Union is not the only one -- to have employees infiltrate.

THE COURT: Give us a moment to turn your microphone back on. I believe it's muted.

Let me remind everyone on the phone, once again, to mute your phones. I think some of the attorneys on the phone are having trouble hearing.

MR. JONCUS: Okay. It turned off.
How hard is it for these -- an organization who wants to defraud our elections to infiltrate them -- these election systems -- and be the conduit for these stacks of ballots -- excess ballots?

So what the State is doing is figuring out ways to sprinkle as many ballots around the state as possible so that criminals will scoop them up and find a way to get them into the system.

In Lane County election workers were witnessed carrying
large bags stuffed with what appeared to be paper late at night out of the election office. There goes the 10,000 ballots that got replaced by the ones filled out by SEIU.

Ballot harvesting: An insidious practice designed to facilitate cheating. Antifa publishes instructions on how to vote more than once. Interest groups search out vulnerable citizens, such as nursing home residents, to get votes from them. They brag -- they brag online of how they've assisted blind elderly people with filling out ballots. Quote, "I filled out" -- "I filled it out not the way they told me, but I filled it out."

There's no chain of custody, as I mentioned, for ballots. Oregon bureaucrats cannot tell you that your vote was counted. They can only tell you that it was received. Once the ballot is separated from the envelope, there's no way to ensure your vote was counted. There's no way for We the People to know that it wasn't replaced.

The only control on the validity of a vote is an ineffective signature check. Signatures can be easily formed -- forged by machines. There's videos on the internet showing how to do it.

Very high rates of ballot challenges and rejections are inherent in signature checks. It's inherent in vote by mail. 5,000 ballots were rejected out of Clackamas County in the last -- 2022 election. They were rejected too late
for them to be cured after the deadline. Those 5,000 ballots are either fake, or they're legitimate. Either answer is not a good answer. If they're fake, that means -that just shows you how much fraud is going on. If they are legitimate, there's 5,000 people who voted -- 5,000 people who voted, but their ballots weren't counted.

Election observation is a sham. Observers cannot see the process. They have small monitors that rotate the view every 45 seconds so that no task can be seen beginning to end. They can't see the entire process to -- from beginning to the end. The ballots are stored in a back room that they can't see.

In-person observation of counting is not even allowed in Douglas County. They have to watch through small displays with a wide-angle lens. You can't tell what's going on. You can't even tell what the piece of paper is they're feeding into the machine. Cameras were only on in Douglas County for seven out of 35 days their votes were counted.

No mechanism exists for challenging the conduct of an election official. Complaints are ignored. And once the ballot gets counted, it gets out of the envelope, it's gone. There's never -- there's no appeal process. There's no way to undo the problem.

In Washington County, observers sought to challenge 230
signatures, but the vast majority were accepted despite the challenge. Can't ever recover that. No right to appeal. No way to undo the problem.

The audit process is a sham. Oregon Director of Elections relies on so-called risk-limiting audits. They tout risk-limiting audits as one of the pillars of Oregon's purported transparent and robust security measures.

No county can do a risk-limiting audit in the state of Oregon. No county has ever done a risk-limiting audit in the state of Oregon. And even if it was done, it's done by the same people who have a motive to stay in power, not We the People.

Computerized systems present an inherent and undeniable security risk. The parts and components are manufactured with Chinese components under the supervision of the People's Liberation Army. With thousands of people who -they have thousands of people dedicated to compromising western technology's computers. It's impossible to mitigate a risk like that. You can't mitigate it with observation, with monitoring, because those chips can be comprised in ways that cannot be detected.

Machines -- there's multiple experts who have hacked machines in minutes. They are not rigorously tested. Every single one, every single one has a WiFi chip in it, a WiFi modem, which can be activated by software and start
communicating unbeknownst to election officials.
Unexpected anomalies are rampant. An example is
Mei Wong, a candidate for Metro in the last primary, in May of 2022. Between 4:36 and 4:44 a.m. on a Sunday morning -May 29th -- her vote total, as reported by the Secretary of State, dropped by 6,371 votes. She has the screenshots to prove it.

Between 8:32 and 8:36 p.m., that same day, Sunday -what are they doing on Sunday? -- May 29th, her vote total decreased by 3,855 votes.

Between 4:57 a.m. and 4:58 a.m. on Saturday, June 10th, her vote total decreased by 6,390 votes.

No explanation given. When she asked, she was given the run-around. She's filed suit in this Court to try to get answers, and the State is trying to get that case dismissed. That cannot happen in a legitimately run system. That is, like, one of the fuzzy screens in The Matrix -- in the movie The Matrix. Zzzt-zzzt. It shows you the fraud going on behind the scenes.

Public records requests are a very poor and ineffective tool. But the only one the public has to try and understand what is going on with this system; yet Oregon officials are thwarting the ability of We the People to investigate the system through that means, through public records requests.

Janice Dysinger, a plaintiff in this case, in this
courtroom today, used to obtain ballot images and cast vote records at reasonable prices. At Multnomah County it was \$159 for the cast vote record and the ballot images. In Lincoln County, $\$ 60$. In Clatsop County $\$ 64$. In Polk County \$120. But then the authorities discovered that such records might reveal fraud.

One county clerk admitted to Ms. Dysinger that the Secretary of State's office told her to hold off on responding to any public records requests. Ignore those public records requests. That's a violation of the law.

Under the direction of the Secretary of State, counties are now quoting astronomical numbers to get the same records. Benton County, \$6,798; Harney County, \$7,939; Linn County, $\$ 77,376$; Deschutes County, $\$ 93,703$ to get the cast vote record and the ballot images.

Why did they do that? What -- it was to block We the People from interrogating this system. They came up with a frivolous rationale. The rationale is some people, even though they are not supposed to, write their name on the ballot. The Secretary says, "Oh, we can't have that. We can't have someone who waives their right to privacy be discovered by someone who looks at the ballot images. So we have to tell the counties to look at every single ballot image before they turn it over," and that's what this is. That's the time required to look at every single image to
make sure someone didn't violate the rule and write their name on the ballot, waiving their right to privacy. But still the Secretary of State says, "We're going to protect that privacy, and we're going to block the public from seeing those records."

Senate Bill 166 codified that reason. It just got approved this month.

By law now, such a ballot --
THE COURT: Let me pause you, Mr. Joncus.
We're having interference again from the folks on the phone. If you are not clear on how to mute, I'm going to ask you to hang up the phone. But if you know how to mute your phone, please mute your phone at this time.

Mr. Joncus, go ahead.
MR. JONCUS: Because someone might write their name on the ballot, by law now, such a ballot cannot be disclosed in the public records request. So they have established a rule in law that any future request for ballot images or -- cast vote records and ballot images are going to cost us on the order of 50,000 to 100,000 per county.

Oregon's lawmakers are doing everything they can to invite fraud and theft of our elections.

HB 3291 permits the counting of ballots -- and this was last year it was passed -- permits the counting of ballots received by mail up to seven days after an election. What
they advertised, when they did the Bill, was, "Well, the ballots are still required to be postmarked by Election Day."

But the Post Office doesn't postmark ballot mail. They have never done that. The law was constructed with a loophole which allows ballots without a postmark to be received after Election Day and counted.

This law makes it even easier for criminals to cheat. They can see what the results look like on Election Day; then they can calculate how many more votes they need for their preferred official to win, and they feed phantom votes into the system. They fill out more ballots that they got from SEIU, from University Oregon students, or Oregon State. Same thing. Bribe an election official: Read these thousand ballots with our candidate marked on each one.

And then the one I talked about before, House Bill 4133, only four digits of a social security number are required to register to vote. Incredible. Hard to wrap your head around that. What they are doing is saying park your car on the street, unlocked, with keys in the ignition, and put a sign on it that says, "Take me." That's what our government is doing to us.

We have extraordinary evidence of why we have lost confidence, have no confidence in the system.

We are no longer able to govern ourselves. We no
longer have control of our electoral process.
It is We the People who own this state. We own this government. We are the ones that are supposed to be doing the elections. Yes, we can delegate it to people, but if those people take over and block our will and refuse to let us in, all of a sudden, we're in a situation of tyranny. We will never be able to vote them out. We will never be able to meet the standards that counsel wants to say are necessary to have standing.

Confidence is very important. In a lot of different areas. Bank failures this year. What was the rallying cry of the government? "Restore confidence. We were going to save these banks to restore public confidence so we don't have a market crash." The debt ceiling limit. What's the argument by Janet Yellen? "You have to increase the debt limit to avoid harming consumer confidence so we don't have an economic crisis."

Shemia Fagan, the defendant in this lawsuit, resigned over a corruption scandal. She is corrupt. She's the one responsible for our election system, and she is corrupt. Governor Kotek said, "Let's remember" -- in response to Shemia Fagan resigning, "Let's remember this is an unprecedented situation." Kotek said, "This is a scandal. This is a crisis of confidence in the agency, the Secretary of State agency, the one controlling our elections. So most
of my conversations have been about 'How do you handle that?'"

That's a quote from OPB.
My answer to Governor Kotek is, "You stop opposing this lawsuit. You agree to an injunction against mail-in voting and computerized vote tabulation. You work with us to create a voting system that is run by We the People and can be audited by We the People. This Government belongs to We the People. You work for We the People. We the People tell you to -- who will represent us. We the People will be in complete control of the election process, and We the People will be in complete control of auditing the election."

Because we have lost confidence, we have lost self-governance, and it doesn't require proof of fraud to have lost self-governance.

Now, the law -- elections are the most fundamental -have the most fundamental significance under our constitutional structure. Illinois Board of Elections $v$. Socialist Workers Party. 440 U.S. 173, 1979. Through elections, we exercise self-governing.

And then Justice Thomas's quote, that I relied on a lot, "Elections enable self-governance only when" -- only when -- "they include processes that give citizens, including losing candidates and their supporters, confidence in the fairness of an election."

So we have outlined an extraordinary amount of evidence of why there's no confidence. That soars way over the threshold for standing.

What would -- what would the discovery in a trial look like? Well, this statement tells you right here what it looks like. Elections enable self-governance only when they include processes that give citizens confidence in the fairness of an election.

So we'll have a competition over what processes there are and how they give confidence in the fairness of elections. But in the final analysis, we believe they will -- there will be a finding of no confidence in the fairness of the election, and mail-in voting and computerized tabulation of votes will be declared unconstitutional.

I've already quoted Purcell. Confidence in the integrity of our election process is essential to the functioning of participating in democracy.

Now, confidence is not an objective measure. It cannot be measured objectively. But it doesn't make -- that doesn't prevent it from being the criteria for a constitutional violation for winning a case. Brown v. Board of Education. That case -- 1954. That case, even though there were tangible factors involved about the separate but equal school facilities for black children and white
children, the Court didn't go there. The Court didn't add up the amount of money that black schools got, the amount of money that white schools got, the facilities, the quality of the teachers. It did none of that. It said it ruled exclusively on the idea that separation of blacks from similar-aged other -- children of other similar age and qualifications because -- only because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect -- not that it will affect -- that may affect their heart and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone. That feeling was concrete enough to strike down all the laws on "separate but equal" prior to that time.

Here, there is evidence of undeniable feelings of lack of confidence. There's -- the facts show that there's no reason that anybody should have confidence in this election system. Oregon operates a system that shuts people out, prevents We the People from validating the results, generates suspicion and distrust in our government.

The facts show that We the People have completely lost control of our elections and election integrity.

Due process. The right to vote is a fundamental right protected by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. It's the most fundamental -- has the most -voting has the most fundamental significance under our constitutional structure. Illinois State Board of

Elections.
Because how the People govern themselves -- elections are the lifeblood of a democracy. There's no right more basic in our democracy than the right to participate in electing our political leaders. MCCutcheon v. FEC, U.S. Supreme Court, 2014.

The right to vote is a fundamental political right.
Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533, 1964, United States Supreme Court.

The right to have one's vote counted is as strong as the right to put a ballot in the ballot box.

Here, we can put the ballot in the ballot box. We never know whether our vote was counted. That was United States V. Mosley, 238 U.S. 383, 1915; and I -- Justice Thomas -- my favorite quote from Degraffenreid is his dissenting opinion. I won't repeat that. It is this lack of confidence in the integrity of Oregon's election system that is the injury that gives plaintiffs standing.

The characteristic of a trusted election system is transparency. Transparency being a bedrock principle in democracies. Elections developed in the United States with disparate small precincts, each counting votes. They knew their neighbors. They knew who was eligible to vote, who lived in the neighborhood. Dead people didn't tend to show up to vote. The votes were kept in the precinct. Actual
pieces of paper. You could go back and audit them if there was a question. You had both parties or whatever number of parties witnessing the entire process, witnessing an audit. Transparency is necessary to engender trust. That election system is in control of We the People; the audit system is in control of We the People.

Here we -- plaintiffs and all Oregonians -- have been shut out of the election process. Oregonians are not allowed to know or verify the trustworthiness of their elections. We're told, "Trust us." That's the only answer: "Trust us."

We don't trust you, Oregon. You're showing us why we shouldn't trust you by the way you pass laws and the way you treat us and the way you run the system.

These harms are suffered by each plaintiff individually. Each individual has a standing to sue because of disadvantage to themselves.

Voters who allege facts showing disadvantage to themselves as individuals have standing to sue. Baker $v$. Carr, 369 U.S. 186, 1962.

So in response to some of counsel's arguments: Generalized grievance. Well, yes. These are pretty generalized grievances. But counsel doesn't give you any option, any way that we can escape this hypothetical box where we are near a tyrannical government controlling the
vote, reelecting themselves, and not allow us to see the fraud.

Our grievances will always be generalized. There will always be concern about the election, about their confidence in elections. We'll never -- we'll never be able to show fraud. If that's the standard, we are Venezuela. We will never get out of that box.

By the way, Venezuela used to be a very prosperous nation, the most prosperous nation in South America. Then they got computerized voting, and the politicians fixed the vote in those computers. They will never escape that, except by arms.

So the cases are pretty uniform about standing. It's to prevent judges from making -- policymaking instead of elected representatives. But in this case, because there's no confidence in our elected representatives, we have no confidence in this voting system that elected them. That's not an option.

Now, it may not be a tyrannical government controling the vote. It certainly looks like it, but we can't tell from the outside one way or the other. We can't prove that they're stealing elections. It looks the same way. Either could be true. But that means that's why it's unconstitutional. Because we have to know. It's our state. It's our government. It is those standing cases that
counsel relies on that assumes there's a political process to correct the problem. Here there's no political process to correct the problem.

The public is unable to discover fraud because it's hidden from view. We've got proprietary computers and ballot processes without chain of custody. The State has no answer for what legal means a free People can use to extricate themselves from this box. No political process is possible. Are we supposed to take up arms?

This Court is the only way out. This Court has jurisdiction over this problem. There couldn't be a more fundamental problem of a People not being free anymore. This Court most definitely has jurisdiction over this case.

Now, counsel also made in their argument that Brown was not a standing case. No, it wasn't. They cleared that -standing has a low hurdle to get over the first hump. They cleared that by miles. They won the case in the Supreme Court on a feeling of inferiority.

The whole idea of election law is an odd peg to fit into the standing doctrine square hole. Harms are always widespread. Harms affect the structure of democratic governance itself. The more this is true, the more it's widespread, the more the courts are tempted to defer to the political branches; but, again, political branches are not an option here.

When the very rules regarding the franchise in elections are broken, it is that broken system that the incumbent officials have to thank for their incumbency. They like it that way. Such officials will not be motivated to reform the system that put them in power. Instead, they will tend to sincerely believe that the system is just fine. One must be always aware that the Constitution forbids, quote, "sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes of discrimination," Reynolds v. Sims, Supreme Court, 1964. To the extent that the citizen's right to vote is debased, he is that much less a citizen. That's our standing there. Because, as Purcell tells us, people who don't have confidence in the voting system just decide not to vote.

Counsel quoted -- I got a laugh out of this one. Counsel quoted a case saying that general emotional harm cannot suffice for injury in fact for standing purposes, quoting Human -- Human v. Babbit, a D.C. Circuit case. Human Society -- Humane Society. I'm sorry. In that case, members of the Humane Society claimed damages because they had a lost opportunity to study Asian elephants. They claimed they were emotionally injured as a result of Elephant Lota's move from the zoo.

That has nothing to do with this case. This is not about an emotional damage. This is about lack of confidence
that the government is counting our votes properly.
You have to go -- you can go way back and find case -Supreme Court case law. Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 111 U.S. 356, 1886. It is held that states establishing means for election systems may be held to account as to whether those are reasonable regulations. It's always open to inquiry to the federal courts.

So, again, I go back to my illustration. If I left my car in a bad neighborhood, with the doors unlocked and the keys in the ignition and a sign on the roof saying, "Steal me," I would be really worried if it would be there if I got back in an hour or two. That's exactly -- that's exactly the problem that Oregonians have. Because Oregon has designed a system that's designed to be stolen.

That's all I have, Your Honor, on that subject.
THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Joncus.
Let me ask a few questions. You have acknowledged that the grievances to the named plaintiffs in this case are generalized grievances. They are shared by all voters or all people in Oregon, and they are not particularized just to these group of plaintiffs. Have you found any cases in which the court has asserted jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, over such a generalized grievance as it relates to voting?

MR. JONCUS: Well, let me state a caveat on the
generalized grievance. To answer your question first, Yick Wo v. Hopkins, 111 -- I'm sorry -- 118 U.S. 356, 1886, says the regulations are always subject to inquiry by the court.

But every election also has winners and losers, and whether you characterize the equal protection between us and the people who vote, who actually are running the government, that -- it's helping them and hurting the people who don't want those people in government.

So there's a division between the people who win and lose elections. We know that's very -- that's been a pattern over the last decades.

So it's a generalized grievance and a term that affects everyone, but the ones getting harmed are the ones that are losing elections and on whichever side it is.

So, no, I don't think I found any cases -- current cases, but then I think this is a very unique claim. A first-time claim, a claim of first impression. I don't know of anybody else who has claimed that their state's election system is so bad that people have lost confidence; that it's unconstitutional.

And, again, the reason for that rule that courts resist taking jurisdiction -- finding standing where there's -because they don't want to invade the province of the legislative branch, the political process, it doesn't apply
in a case, where as here, we don't know whether we have a tyrannical government that is controlling everything. We can't tell.

And for that reason, the provenance of the political party and a -- the political process needs to be invaded. They need to be told that what they're doing is unconstitutional.

Did I answer your question? Did that answer your question?

THE COURT: It did.
Let me ask you a follow-up question. You've described a black box that creates suspicion and creates a lack of confidence in the election system, and it could be that this black box is hiding actual fraud. "We don't know. We can't tell," is what you just said. Does that support the defendants' argument that the injury here is speculative? "We don't know there's actual fraud. We think there might be"?

MR. JONCUS: No. Because we are not alleging fraud. It's lack of confidence. Lack of confidence is enough when you read Purcell v. Gonzalez and you read Justice Thomas's comment in his dissenting opinion.

Now, let me ask -- let me pose this question: Who would disagree that self-governance is enabled only when there's processes to give citizens confidence in the
fairness of an election? Who would disagree with that statement?

Counsel states the opinion was done by a dissenting judge, a solo judge in dissent; so it's not the opinion of the Supreme Court. It's not, but it's pretty profound. It's profound because it makes the measure of whether something is confident -- constitutional, the public's confidence in it. Confidence in its legitimacy.

Now, we can -- you know, after we get over the hurdle of the motion to dismiss, there will be a trial on whether we're right or they're right about what processes exist to make -- to ensure the public that they should have confidence in the election system.

But that's a matter for trial, for litigation. We're talking about here a motion to dismiss. And the legal standard is that lack of confidence is enough for a constitutional violation. It's enough to get over a motion to dismiss. It's enough to -- a feeling like that is enough to win a Supreme Court case in 1954.

THE COURT: Finally, Mr. Joncus, I don't believe you responded to Ms. Patel's argument with respect to traceability, specifically with respect to the fact that there's some counties named as defendants who don't have a matching plaintiff who voted in that county or who's registered to vote in that county.

MR. JONCUS: This is a class action complaint; so it's -- you know, we haven't been -- we haven't been -- a class hadn't been approved yet, but it's on behalf of the voters in Oregon.

So, you know, if -- I don't have a huge problem if the right avenue forward is to dismiss those counties, and then I can file a new compliant, and then we can join them.

We do have -- we did not serve a number of the counties. It was a matter of too many other things to do, but if they are dismissed without -- they should be dismissed without prejudice, and we can sue them again and get them served.

And if it's necessary to have a representative of each county, we will have no problem with doing that.

The primary -- the primary defendant here is the state of Oregon, the Secretary of State. They're the ones that write the laws that the counties have to follow. The counties are a source of evidence for us to uncover what's been going on.

Now, I would much rather -- I would -- I want an injunction again the counties. I want an injunction against the State, and I would much rather take discovery on the counties as parties rather than as third parties.

But I do recognize the procedural shortcoming of us not having served the counties that we added to the lawsuit in
the amended complaint.
THE COURT: Mr. Joncus, one procedural or technical matter is that the plaintiffs have named Shemia Fagan in her official capacity, and she has since resigned, as you noted. Do you -- is it your position that the government -- sorry -- that the Court should substitute Ms. Fagan with her successor -- her acting successor?

MR. JONCUS: I think that is standard.
THE COURT: Okay. Let me turn back to
Mr. Marshall, then.
Any reply on the standing issue?
MR. MARSHALL: Well, first, just on the substitution issue -- on the substitution question.

THE COURT: Is the green button on?
MR. MARSHALL: It is. On the substitution question --

THE COURT: Why don't we swap microphones.
MR. MARSHALL: On the substitution question, we agree that under Rule 25 (d) because Secretary Fagan was named in her official capacity, acting-Secretary Myers has been substituted as operation of law, and once the Governor designates -- or "appoints," I should say, a new Secretary of State, that Secretary of State will become a named defendant in this action for the same reason.

Moving on to the fraud -- to the injury in fact
standing questions -- it seems that the traceability questions have been resolved through the Court's inquiry to counsel regarding certain counties. On the injury in fact question, I'm a little bit confused as to whether or not there is an abandonment of these fraud claims. Because there seems to be a number of allegations that still -- that there are pieces of it that are continuing to be pursued, but I think that it's very clear in the papers and then ultimately at the end of counsel's presentation that they aren't seeking to meet the requirements of Rule $9(b)$. They are not seeking to claim that with particularity, and that they -- in their papers, on page 27, in the opposition -say very specifically that they are not relying on allegations of fraud.

And when the ultimate question, as the Court noted, is "We don't know" -- or the ultimate conclusion of a series of allegations is, "We don't know," that's insufficient, both under $12(\mathrm{~b})(1)$ because, in order to establish subject matter jurisdiction, that's the obligation of the plaintiffs, and it's also insufficient under $12(\mathrm{~b})(6)$, when we get to failure to state a claim, because facts consistent with the claim to relief are not sufficient. It has to be -- nudge it toward the realm of possibility, that is, it cannot simply be, under Twombly, equally consistent with -- with a claim to relief or no claim to relief.

I think, once we are out of that world -- well, you know, even if the Court were inclined to look at these allegations, I just -- most of them are ultimately conclusory allegations that are not entitled to the presumption of truth.

So I'll just -- there was one piece that was highlighted by counsel today. This claim from paragraph 84 of the first amended complaint -- that is a single sentence, that says that there are more individuals in Oregon registered to vote than are eligible to vote. You can look at the entirety of the first amended complaint, and you have no idea what the basis for that claim is. Just pure conclusory allegation.

And we provide, at ECF 64-7, a public record that says, specifically, that there are 2.96 million voters registered to vote at the time that that public record was made, and there are 3.19 million voters who are eligible to vote.

And given that it's subject to judicial notice and therefore can be considered on a motion to dismiss and in the allegations of the complaint and in the response there's nothing to suggest anything beyond the bottom line conclusory allegation that this is fraud or there are more individuals registered to vote than are voting, those, under Twombly and Iqbal, do not -- are not entitled to the presumption of validity.

So moving to the confidence claim. Purcell, it seems conceded, is not -- does not create an injury in fact under Article III. There's no court that has considered it. This is not the first case. We cite many cases where other election conspiracy cases have been brought to federal court, and they've basically been dismissed on two grounds. Number one, there's no sufficient allegations to demonstrate any of the underlying conclusory allegations of fraud, just like in this -- in this case; and, secondly, that the claims relating to confidence of the voters are generalized grievances. They are essentially policy disputes that are not cognizable in federal courts.

One of the cases is in our very first paragraph of our motion to dismiss. Washington State Election Integrity. The Western District of Washington dismissed, as a generalized grievance, very similar claims to those that are being asserted here, also a vote-by-mail state, for essentially the same reasons.

Now, Purcell is a case that talks about the interest in confidence when the court is exercising one of the -- two of the three -- two of the four prongs of the equitable inquiry -- balance of equities and public interest -- when it is determining the remedy for an alleged election law violation, particularly in a preliminary injunction posture. That doesn't mean it's sufficient to get -- open the
courthouse door as an injury in fact, nor does it mean that that is a freestanding action that can be brought in -under the Fourteenth Amendment, that you can go into court and say, "I don't have confidence that the election -- that these laws are adequate to count my vote."

That is my injury in fact, and that is my freestanding Fourteenth Amendment claim.

Purcell has been -- was decided in 2006. There's been legions of similar claims filed across the country. No one has cited this for -- for this proposition. None of the other courts have cited it, and the citation to Yick Wo, that's not a -- I mean, it's an 1886 case that is not about voting.

So I -- there's just no authority for the claim that we can go -- that this is sufficient for -- for voter confidence.

So it sounds like the claim -- the argument, then, is that there should be an exception to the rule against bringing generalized grievances into federal court and that there should be an exception in this instance because the plaintiffs' claims go to the core of the democratic process and that, therefore, the Court should not require standing in a voting case.

Well, courts do require voting in standing cases -- do require standing in voting cases. There's no authority for
the Court to abandon Article III limitations on its jurisdiction simply because they think they have a policy rationale that supports it in this instance.

And the second is -- I'm -- the second thing I would just like to say is that I'm just frankly puzzled by the motion that there are not judicial avenues to seek the types of claims that they are asserting in this Court.

So the first is one that the plaintiffs have several references to, including in argument today, which is the National Voter Registration Act. The NVRA has a free-standing statutory right in order to seek -- to enforce federal voter registration laws. They claim in argument and in the opposition that the state is violating that law. They're incorrect about that, but it is a statutory right that has nothing to do with the types of claims and remedies that -- or the types of claims they're seeking to assert here, and then there are state court actions. And I'll just name two. The first that I would point out is ORS 246.910, which is a right for any person adversely affected -- which has been interpreted to encompass all voters -- by any act or failure to act by the Secretary of State, a county clerk -- and it goes on -- has the ability to go into circuit court and seek to challenge and appeal any decision of an election official. So the idea that there's -- it's here or nowhere, I -- I'm just flabbergasted by that claim.

The notion that candidates could be affected -- well, they have their own specific remedies under Oregon election law. ORS 258.016 provides for a contest, which means that a candidate, if they think they lost because there were illegal votes or there's fraud in the count of the votes -I'm reading from the statute here -- can go into circuit court on an expedited basis and challenge the results of the election because they say any of the things that are purportedly alleged here are true.

And you can go to court, get a trial in circuit court, and get a judicial determination of whether the vote count is accurate.

Now, I mean, I'm a defense lawyer. I think I have given enough case ideas to the plaintiffs for this, but it is just not accurate to say that there are no -- that the only remedy available is a Fourteenth Amendment constitutional claim in a federal court in order to enforce the underlying principles of election law.

Now, I think maybe the most important thing that counsel said is that, yes, these grievances are generalized, and they will always be generalized because that goes to the question that may be central to the Court's decision at the end of this case -- or at the end of this hearing or when it's submitted, which is whether -- whether dismissal should be without leave to amend or with leave to amend.

I think that given the -- that the actual fraud claim -- allegations have been explicitly disclaimed and the basic position of counsel is that it is impossible to plead, and that he lacks access to the facts necessary to plead those claims, that that means that there's no reason to grant leave to amend for that reason, and the problem with the emotional injury route is that it is inherently a generalized grievance. It's also not an injury in fact, just as a legal matter, but neither of those are pleading problems. They are legal problems that present an insurmountable barrier. Thus for leave to amend to be granted, would be futile.

And when leave to amend -- when repleading is futile, the court dismisses with prejudice, not -- or not -- without leave to amend, I should say, rather than with leave to amend.

I think that completes what I had planned to say about the $12(\mathrm{~b})(1)$ component of the motion.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Joncus, anything further on standing?
MR. JONCUS: Yeah. I don't think I said that
we're not relying on allegations. Yes, we're relying on these allegations, and many of them indicate fraud. We're not making a claim of fraud. That's the difference. We can't make a claim of fraud without a whole bunch of
evidence that we have no access to, and the -- but these are -- this is smoke. And where you have smoke, you have a fire. There's -- we have no doubt there's fraud going on. We are not making that claim. We're making a broader claim that the whole system needs to be thrown out because of all of these indications that no one can have confidence in this system, knowing these facts.

Again, you know, their argument is too good to be true. No way out of this box. If this government is actually tyrannical and controlling the elections and preventing us from seeing the evidence of fraud, there's no way out. We are -- we are Venezuela.

There is a way out that they won't acknowledge. The way out is what Justice Thomas said. You don't have self-governance unless you have confidence in the elections. It's confidence in the elections that is their variable. That is the criteria for whether it's constitutional or not.

Now, counsel talked about several statutes where you can challenge the decision. That, again, requires lots of evidence that we don't have because they destroy the evidence when -- as soon as they take that ballot out of the envelope, the evidence can't be collected in the short statute of limitations period. It is like whack-a-mole to try and attack all these problems by going to the -- the Registration Act and complaining about the number of
registrations.
The overall evidence is they're not doing what they are required to do under federal law because they haven't taken people off the rolls. I mean, it's self-evident. You can't be a county as big as Multnomah County and only remove five people in four years.

The point about the number of voters -- number of registered voters and number of eligible voters -- well, we don't trust their numbers. Those numbers are doctored too that they put on their website.

We've added up the numbers from all the individual counties, and they don't agree with their numbers. That's, you know, another reason why we don't have confidence. We don't -- you know, conclusory allegation is -- is an allegation that "John breached the contract with me" without going through the specifics. That's a specific fact. That's not a conclusory allegation. That is a specific fact. I don't have to give him a cite or a calculation in order to support that fact in the complaint. I will do that when we get to discovery and experts. We will support that conclusion. They will ask -- ask discovery of us. "How do you support that conclusion?"

So I think the most important thing is to back away from all of the case law that talks about standing because virtually every single case, election case, gets dismissed
on standing, and they are all -- they are all similar in that they all claim fraud of one point or another.

We're different. We are not claiming fraud. We don't have a -- I mean, we don't have a claim for fraud. We have allegations of fraud that support our lack of confidence, but we don't have a claim for fraud. And in our -- in our situation, since we cannot tell the difference between a government that is completely in control of the election process and barring our vote and reelecting themselves by tyrants or one that isn't, they both look the same. From our perspective, from the People's perspective, that can't be constitutional because it is our system. It belongs -this government belongs to us. We have to know. We have to be confident in that system in order -- to enable self-governance. If we don't have confidence in that system, we are no longer citizens. We are subjects under a king or queen.

THE COURT: Thank you.
Mr. Marshall, you've already addressed some of the 12 (b) (6) section of your motion, but did you want to add anything with respect to the failure to state a claim? MR. MARSHALL: I do, and I'll try to be brief.

And the response -- the motion says -- explains why Fourteenth -- why under Ninth Circuit law all of the Fourteenth Amendment claims asserted under the rubric of the
right to vote are analyzed under Anderson-Burdick. That's both equal protection claims and due process claims.

Under Anderson-Burdick, the burden on the individual voter is weighed against the state interest, and the first thing I want to point out is that huge chunks of the claims that are asserted or the allegations in the complaint are -are not related to a burden on voters at all.

So there's large sets of descriptions of public records claims that would be state statutory claims that could be brought in state court for excessive fees or versions of, I guess, what has been called here "a runaround." And all of those are not cognizable Fourteenth Amendment claims under the right to vote rubric that they have described, that none of that fits into the question of "Is there a barrier between the voter and the ballot box?" That's what the right to vote under the Fourteenth Amendment is about.

And so when, for example, there's a long lines case that is brought in a polling place jurisdiction, the court weighs whether there's a sufficient state interest for the specific practices that are challenged. Usually, in those cases, plaintiffs say there's too few -- it takes too long to vote because there's too few polling places, there are too few places to vote at those polling places, and thus it's too burdensome against the state interest in only providing those particular requirement -- or those
particular numbers of polling places or the particular number of voting stations at those polling places. And so the court weighs the burden on the individual voter versus the state interest in the policy.

None of the things that are talked about in the transparency realm, like these public records claims or the election observation claims, read on any of -- of those issues at all, and so they -- they have a series of allegations that don't link to any type of -- of substantive claim. That's true also of the election observation claims. I mean, it's not to say there aren't claims in the world about those. I named a handful of them already relating to the specific challenged statute under state law, but those are not there.

Then we get to things like the registration claim. First, again, this is not an NVRA claim. It's essentially a claim that it is too easy to vote in Oregon. For this to even link back to the type of fraud allegations that they would like to support, there's a huge chain of causation that all has to be true, much of which is not allowed -alleged.

So the first is that the registered voter, who should not be a registered voter, there should be -- there has to first be an erroneously registered voter. So that's the first step. I think they probably are making that
allegation, at least in a conclusionary way.
The second, though, is that the registered voter has to receive a ballot. In Oregon, inactive voters, who are different from canceled voters, do not receive a ballot. That's the Whitehead case out of the Oregon Supreme Court. It's also clear from the vote-by-mail manual, I believe.

The third, that ballot then has to be intercepted by a bad actor.

Fourth, the intercepter has to vote the ballot fraudulently and in violation of state and federal law.

Fifth, the ballot has to be accepted and accepted over a signature verification issue.

And, sixth, the ballot can't be successfully challenged by an election observer under the Oregon statute provided -providing both for -- providing for a -- for challenges of individual ballots.

So I don't think they get over the ordinary pleading standard that applies to most claims under Twombly, but they certainly don't get over and I think they have conceded they don't get over Rule $9(b)$, and it sounds like the workaround that I'm now understanding at argument is that this is an allegation of fraud. It's not a claim of fraud.

The problem with that argument is that Rule $9(b)$ says, "In alleging fraud or mistake, a party must state with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or
mistake." It doesn't only govern claims of fraud. It governs all allegations of fraud. We cite authority on this point that it even encompasses fraud committed by third parties, and it doesn't only relate -- it couldn't -- I mean, the rule doesn't -- wouldn't make any sense. Because so far as I know, there's no standalone claim called a claim of mistake at all. So the rules are very clearly talking about all allegations of fraud.

The need for there to be particularity of such allegations exists regardless of whether it's a claim or just a pleading of fraud. And there's -- much of these allegations is not -- much of the chain of causation is not alleged at all. That which is alleged, I think, does not meet the requirements of Twombly and certainly doesn't meet the requirements of Rule 9 (b).

THE COURT: Mr. Marshall, anything further with respect to the Rule $12(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ motion?

MR. MARSHALL: Not at this time.
THE COURT: Mr. Joncus?
MR. JONCUS: Well, that's a lot of steps you have to go through to prove an election violation for a single voter. It's impossible. That's why we're in this situation in the first place. That never happens because that information isn't available. Who the voter was that had -wasn't supposed to be registered, how they -- when they
voted. You know, the steps that he went through.
The allegations of fraud here are not for the point of proving fraud, which is why you need specific allegations under Rule $9(b)$. It's to show why people have no confidence. Because these are -- these facts are known by people. That's what it's showing.

Now, the Anderson-Burdick test is a balancing test between, you know, some rule and the State's interest in that rule. But it's about discrete rules. It's about whether there's a -- the rule for deadlines on correcting the ballot and a missing signature was too tight or not and why the State thought that was a necessary rule and why it's unconstitutional what the -- the reason is it's unconstitutional.

We are making a much bigger, more global claim that that confidence in our electoral process is essential to the functioning of our democracy. There is no justification, none whatsoever that they made or is even possible to be made for the State to have taken away our right to see what's going on on the inside of these elections. There's absolutely no rationale that they have given or could give for why the State has a right to do that. Because, again, these are our elections. It's our government. We get to choose who leads us, who represents us. We get to run the elections, not the bureaucrats in Salem.

Again, from counsel's argument, there's no way out of the box. No way out of this catch-22, unless -- unless we can make a claim for lack of confidence, and Justice Thomas's statement is valid, which I think -- I didn't hear counsel say that it wasn't valid. It just -- he doesn't like that it's a minority opinion. The whole Supreme Court didn't say it, but I don't think you can argue that Justice Thomas isn't right when he says, "Elections enable self-governance only when they include processes that give citizens confidence in the fairness of elections." Only when. So without confidence, you don't have self-governance. That is our claim.

We're not saying it's too easy to vote. We're saying it's too easy to cheat. Their system is designed to enable cheating.

That alone is enough for us to have standing: The facts we have pled about how their system enables cheating. You can register as a voter with a four-digit number that you made up and a signature that you made up and a name that you made up. That's all you need, and you can vote. You can vote a thousand times. You can vote 10,000 times if you do -- register 10,000 people like that. 10,000 phantom voters.

That's unconscionable. It is unconscionable that our government enacted that law. But it exposes. It exposes
what they are doing. It exposes that they are tyrants, that they are controlling the elections because they're trying to clamp down and make it even harder for candidates that -for them to lose an election. Because it's the criminals that are going to go out there that -- to support their rule that will register a thousand names, fake names, under a thousand -- or 10,000, four-digit numbers. And, you know, the four-digit number is not a limit. Because a social security number has five additional digits. So it doesn't matter if you register five people with a social security four-digit number of 2222. Because that could still be a unique number when you consider the other five digits. There's a hundred thousand other social security numbers with the last four digits of 2222 .

This is a novel claim. I have not seen any other -I'm not -- as you know, I'm not an election lawyer expert, but I have not seen any other case that makes the claim we are making, and we -- we have certainly -- our allegations are so thorough that, reading them, I don't think you could have confidence that our election system is accurate, secure, and gives you confidence.

It's their behavior in making and operating the system is what's dividing us. We have huge divisions in the state and in this country. If the elections could be audited at the local level, you could go back and look at the paper.

Both sides -- all three sides -- all four sides -- whatever number of sides you have -- you could agree to the result of the election. Now, we don't. We can't because we can't look under the hood.

It's their behavior that is causing societal division. It creates disenfranchisement. It creates lack of confidence.

This idea to computerize elections was a bad one from the beginning. Experts warned about it. It is the most susceptible to fraud. France -- we -- we look to France as being -- we'd like to be more like France in many ways. They don't do computerized election systems. They do it on paper.

Vote Amish. Vote Amish. On paper, small groups, small precincts. Auditable after the fact. Sure, there can be fraud even in that system, but it has got to be on a small scale because it's so divided and spread out whatever fraud there is. There will always be some level of fraud.

Our claims soar way over the threshold of showing why there isn't confidence in these elections. We're not trying to show various little elements, actions that counsel mentioned. We're trying to show lack of confidence in the elections and why people don't have confidence, and people understanding these facts would never think that we have a safe and secure system. Accurate system.

That's my response, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Thank you.
We do need to wrap up by 5:00; so we have just a few minutes left.

Mr. Marshall, if you have anything further, I'll give you the final word as the moving party.

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honor, related to these claims, there are two pieces of Oregon's election system that are challenged. Vote by mail and machine counts. Over and over we're hearing about other issues that are not challenged in this complaint, about registration issues, about other aspects that are not part of what is actually challenged by the complaint.

For Anderson-Burdick-type claims to be asserted in this Court and to assert a right-to-vote claim, there has to be a showing of a specific state policy that burdens voters. They don't show the burden, and many of the complaints in the -- and many of the allegations in the complaint really do not relate at all to the two practices that they are challenging.

There are a lot of other things to be said. They're not to be said at a motion to dismiss, but it's fair to say that there are obviously huge factual disputes between the parties, but that -- about the fairness and accuracy of Oregon's elections, but none of them are relevant to whether
the plaintiffs have a claim that can be asserted in this Court, and therefore we ask that the complaint be dismissed without leave to amend.

THE COURT: Thank you.
I will take the motions under advisement today. With the addition of the new counties in the amended complaint, the Court no longer has full consent, and so I will docket my findings and recommendations as soon as I can. At that point, we will be assigned a backup district judge, and any party can object to my findings and recommendations within 14 days. The other parties may respond within 14 days, and then the district judge will take the motions under advisement.

Thank you all for your time today. Court is adjourned. (Hearing concluded.)
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|  | 14 [3] 19/10 64/11 64/11 15-year-old [1] 6/12 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 383 \text { [1] 34/14 } \\ 3: 22-c v-01516-S B[2] ~ 1 / 565 / 4 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DEPUTY COURTROOM | 16 [1] 11/21 |  |
|  | 16 [1] 11/21 <br> 166 [2] 2/4 28/6 | 4 |
| MR. JONCUS: [12] 3/13 13/23 | 172nd [1] $2 / 3$ | 4,400 [1] 19/16 |
| 15/7 15/13 22/16 28/15 39/25 $41 / 19$ 43/1 44/8 51/21 58/20 | 173 [1] 31/19 | 4133 [1] 29/17 |
| 41/19 43/1 44/8 51/21 58/20 MR. JONES: [1] 4/4 | 186 [1] 35/20 | 440 [1] 31/19 |
| MR. JONES: [1] MR. MARSHALL: [10] 3/20 | 1886 [3] 39/4 40/2 48/12 | 45 [1] 24/9 |
| 4/11 5/2 13/19 44/12 44/15 | 1915 [1] 34/14 | 4:36 and [1] 26/4 |
| 44/18 54/22 58/18 63/7 | 1954 [2] 32/23 42/19 | 4:44 [1] 26/4 |
| MS. PATEL: [3] 3/24 8/19 13/10 | 1962 [1] 35/20 | 4:57 [1] 26/11 |
| THE COURT: [26] 3/18 3/23 4/1 | 1964 [2] 34/8 38/9 | 4.56 [1] 26/11 |
|  | 1979 [1] 31/19 | 5 |
| 14/24 15/10 22/11 28/9 39/16 | 1993 [1] 19/10 | 5,000 [4] 23/24 24/1 24/5 24/5 |
| 41/10 42/20 44/2 44/9 44/14 | 2 | 50,000 [1] 28/20 |
| 44/17 51/19 54/18 58/16 58/1963/2 64/4 | 2.96 million [1] 46/15 | 500 [1] 2/13 |
|  | 20 [3] 11/14 11/16 18/17 | 501 [1] 2/13 |
| \$ | 2006 [1] 48/8 | 503 [1] 2/20 |
| \$10,000 [1] 22/2 | 2010 [1] 19/17 | $\begin{array}{lll} 52[1] & 19 / 9 \\ 533[1] & 34 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| \$120 [1] 27/5 | 2014 [1] 34/6 2022 [3] 19/15 23/25 26/4 | $\begin{aligned} & 533 \text { [1] } 34 / 8 \\ & 5: 00 \text { [1] } 63 / 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| \$159 [1] 27/3 | 2023 [7] 1/7 3/2 9/6 9/7 65/6 | 6 |
| \$6,798 [1] 27/13 | $20507[1] \quad 19 / 9$ | 6,371 [1] 26/6 |
| \$60 [1] $27 / 4$ | $22 \text { [1] 60/2 }$ | 6,390 [1] 26/12 |
| \$64 [1] 27/4 | 2222 [2] 61/11 61/14 | 7 |
| \$77,376 [1] 27/14 | 230 [1] 24/25 | 7/21/2023 [1] 65/16 |
| \$93,703 [1] 27/14 | 238 [1] 34/ | 73 [1] 3/8 |
| ' | 246.910 [1] 49/18 | 75 [1] 3/10 |
| 'How [1] 31/1 | 247.019 [1] 20/11 | 8 |
| I | $247.275[1] 19 / 5$ $\mathbf{2 4 8}$ [2] 19/19 19/21 | 8191 [1] 2/20 |
| /s/Jill [1] 65/15 | 25 [1] 44/19 | 85 [2] 19/21 19/23 |
| 0 | $258.016[1] ~ 50 / 3$ $26[3] 1 / 7$ 3/2 65/6 | 8:32 and [1] 26/8 |
| 0346 [1] 65/17 | 27 [4] 9/6 9/7 10/23 45/12 | 8:36 [1] 26 |
| 1 | 27th [1] 9/7 | 9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 10,000 [5] 23/2 60/21 60/22 } \\ & 60 / 2261 / 7 \end{aligned}$ | 29th [2] 26/5 26/9 | 9/30/2023 [1] 65/17 |
|  | 3 | 90 [2] 8/25 9/6 |
| 100 [2] 2/7 2/10 | 3,855 [1] 26/10 | 97201 [2] 2/7 2/10 |
| 100,000 [1] 28/201000 [1] $2 / 19$ | 3.19 million [1] 46/17 | 97204 [1] 2/19 |
|  | 301 [1] 2/19 | 97214 [1] 2/14 |
| 10th [1] 26/11 | 326-8191 [1] 2/20 | 98-0346 [1] 65/17 |
| 111 [2] 39/3 40/2 118 [1] $40 / 2$ | $3291[1] ~ 2 / 4$ | A |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12 \text { [8] } 8 / 2413 / 16 \text { 19/25 } 45 / 18 \\ & 45 / 2051 / 1854 / 2058 / 17 \end{aligned}$ | 35 [1] 24/18 | a.m [3] 26/4 26/11 26/11 |
|  | 356 [2] 39/3 40/2 | abandon [1] 49/1 |
| 13 [1] 8/22 | 36 [2] 4/20 8/21 | abandonment [1] 45/5 |
| 13 percent [1] 19/17 | 369 [1] 35/20 | ability [2] 26/23 49/22 |
| 13203 [1] 2/3 | 377 [1] 34/8 | able [6] 8/13 17/2 29/25 30/7 |



| A | backup [1] 64/9 | big [1] 53/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Arizona [1] 15/19 | bad [5] 18/21 39/9 40/20 57/8 | bigger [1] 59/15 <br> BIJAL [2] 2/9 3/25 |
| Army [1] 25/16 | bags [1] 23/1 | Bijal Patel [1] 3/25 |
| around [5] 15/8 20/14 22/22 | Baker [1] 35/19 <br> balance [2] 7/25 47/22 | Bill [3] 28/6 29/1 29/16 |
| 26/14 29/19 | balance [2] 7/25 47/22 balancing [1] 59/7 | bin [1] $21 / 15$ <br> bit [1] 45/4 |
| Article [3] 6/22 47/3 49/1 articulate [2] 8/5 13/12 | ballot [36] | black [4] 32/25 33/2 41/12 41/14 |
| articulated [1] 7/8 | ballots [39] <br> Baltimore [1] 20/9 | blacks [1] 33/5 <br> blessings [1] 14/18 |
| as [62] | Baltimore [1] 20/9 <br> Bank [1] 30/11 | blessings [1] 14/18 <br> blind [1] 23/9 |
| Asian [1] 38/21 aside [1] $9 / 11$ | banks [1] 30/13 | block [4] 14/8 27/16 28/4 30/5 |
| $\text { ask [9] } 12 / 22 \text { 13/13 28/12 }$ | barrier [2] 51/11 55/14 | blocking [1] 17/4 |
| 41/11 41/23 53/21 53/21 64/2 | barriers [1] 6/5 <br> barring [1] 54/9 | Board [3] 31/18 32/22 33/25 both [7] 4/7 35/2 45/17 54/10 |
| asked [1] 26/13 | based [3] 8/10 11/6 15/14 | both [7] 4/7 35/2 45/17 54/10 55/2 57/15 62/1 |
| asking [5] 11/7 18/22 18/22 21/14 21/21 | $\text { bases [1] } 6 / 10$ | bottom [1] 46/21 |
| 1] 6 | basic [2] 34/4 51/3 | Boulevard [1] 2/13 |
| assert [3] 11/12 49 | basically [1] 47/6 | boundary [1] 13/25 |
| asserted [6] 39/22 47/17 54/25 | basis [4] 5/16 5/22 46/12 50/7 | box[16] 6/6 14/11 16/23 16/23 |
| 55/6 63/14 64/1 | be [104] | 17/21 21/15 34/11 34/12 35/24 |
| asserting [1] 49/7 | because [59] | 36/7 37/8 41/12 41/14 52/9 |
| assigned [1] 64/9 | BECKERMAN [2] 1/15 3/13 | $55 / 15 \text { 60/2 }$ |
| assisted [1] 23/9 | become [1] 44/23 bedrock [1] 34/20 | brag [2] 23/8 23/8 branch [1] 40/25 |
| assumes [1] 37/1 | been [24] 3/22 4/20 8/13 8/22 | branches [2] 37/24 37/24 |
| assuming [1] 10 | 8/23 9/7 13/4 13/8 31/1 35/7 | breached [1] 53/15 |
| 1] $52 / 24$ | 40/11 43/2 43/2 43/3 43/19 | breeds [1] 16/11 |
| tempts [1] 14/9 | 44/21 45/2 47/5 47/6 48/8 48/8 | BRIAN [2] 2/6 3/20 |
| attenuated [1] 11 | 49/20 51/2 55 | bribe [2] 21/25 29/1 |
| attorneys [2] 2/12 22/1 | before [8] 1/15 13/15 15/16 | brief [2] 14/5 54/22 |
| attributable [1] 12/13 | 15/22 15/23 19/15 27/24 29/16 | briefed [1] 11/1 |
| audit [6] 25/4 25/8 25/9 3 | beginning [5] 3/11 14/4 24/9 | briefings [1] 12/4 |
| $35 / 335 / 5$ | 24/10 62/9 | bringing [1] 48/19 |
| Auditable [1] 6 | behalf [2] 4/4 43/3 | broader [1] 52/4 |
| audited [2] 31/8 61/24 | behavior [3] 20/1 61/22 62/5 behind [1] 26/19 | broken [2] 38/2 38/2 brought [4] 47/5 48/2 55/10 |
| auditing [1] 31/12 | being [11] $9 / 1$ 9/18 11/8 11/23 | $55 / 18$ |
|  | 11/23 19/1 32/21 34/20 37/12 | Brown [2] 32/22 37/1 |
| authority [3] 48/14 48 | 47/17 62/11 | bunch [1] 51/25 |
| available [2] 50/16 58/24 | beings [2] 18/4 18/4 | burden [4] 55/3 55/7 56/3 63/17 |
| avenue [3] 2/3 2/19 43/6 | believe [5] 22/12 32/11 38/6 | burdens [1] 63/16 |
| avenues [2] 8/5 49/6 | 42/20 57/6 | burdensome [1] |
| avoid [1] 30/16 | belongs [4] 14/20 31/8 54/12 | Burdick [5] 4/22 55/1 55/3 59/7 |
| aware [1] 38/7 | $\text { below [1] } 65$ | bureaucrats [3] 14/21 23/13 |
| away [3] 5/11 53/23 59/19 | Ben [1] 3/15 | $59 / 25$ |
| B | Ben Edtl [1] 3/15 | button [1] 44/14 |
| Babbit [1] 38/18 | Benton [1] 27/13 | buy [1] 20/20 |
| back [12] 4/21 22/7 22/12 24/11 | $\underset{2 f}{\text { be }}$ | C |
| $\begin{aligned} & 35 / 139 / 239 / 8 ~ 39 / 1244 / 953 / 23 \\ & 56 / 1861 / 25 \\ & \text { background [1] } 15 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | 55/15 59/8 63/23 beyond [1] 46/21 | calculate [1] 29/10 calculation [1] 53/18 |



| C | $3 \text { 6/15 }$ | day [5] 21/7 26/8 29/3 29/7 29/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| conduit [1] 22/19 <br> confidence [68] <br> confident [2] 42/7 54/14 <br> conformed [1] 65/12 <br> confused [1] 45/4 <br> conjecture [3] 11/5 11/7 12/18 <br> connection [4] 9/20 9/23 10/16 <br> $11 / 2$ |  | $64 / 1164 /$ |
|  | 23/16 24/6 24/19 24/22 29/7 | dead [3] 19/17 19/17 34/24 |
|  | 3 | deadline [1] 24 |
|  | counties [32] 8/21 8/24 9/2 <br> 10/4 10/10 10/13 10/23 11/19 | deadlines [1] 59/10 |
|  | 11/21 12/6 12/8 12/ | ment [1] 16/ |
|  | 13/3 13/8 17/25 19/7 19/10 20/2 | debt [2] 30/14 30/15 |
| consent [1] 64/7 | 27/11 27/23 42/23 43/6 43/9 | decades [1] 40/12 |
| consider [1] 61/12 | 43/17 43/18 43/21 43/23 43/ | decide [2] 14/6 38/ |
| considered [2] 46/19 47/3 |  | 1] |
| considering [1] 7/25 | $28 / 2434 / 2239 / 1$ | declared [1] 32/14 |
| consistent [2] 45/21 45/24 conspiracy [3] 12/16 17/20 47/5 | country [2] | decreased [2] 26/10 26/12 |
|  | counts [4] 5/20 6/7 6/8 63/9 | dedicated [1] 25/17 |
| constitute [1] 7/5 |  | deduce [1] 20/1 |
| constitution [3] 1 | county's [2] | defend [1] 4/8 |
| constitution [3] | couple [1] 12/ | defendant [13] 1/8 |
| constitutional [8] 31/18 32/22 | course [1] 4/2 | 4/9 9/24 10/14 10 |
| 33/25 42/7 42/17 50/17 52/17 |  | 12/23 30/18 43/15 44/24 |
| 54/12 | court's [4] 4/24 7/24 45/2 50/22 | defendants [12] 3/19 4/20 8/2 |
| constructed [1] 29/5 | courthouse [2] 2/18 48/1 | 8/22 9/3 9/11 9/19 11/13 11/14 |
| consumer [1] 30/16contentions [1] 5/9 | courtroom |  |
|  | $40 / 2247 / 1248 / 1148 / 2$ | $11 / 2 \text { 12/3 12/10 13/15 41/16 }$ |
| contest [1] 50/3 | crash [1] 30/14 | defense [1] 50/13 |
| continues [1] 15/2 | CRC [2] 2/18 65/15 | defer [1] 37/23 |
| contract [1] 53/15 | create [2] 31/7 47/2 | definitely [1] 37/13 |
| control [11] 14/6 16/24 16/25 | creates [4] 41/12 41/12 62/6 | defraud [1] 22/18 |
|  | 62/6 | Degraffenreid [2] 16/16 34/15 |
| 35/5 35/6 54/8 | credit [1] 20/22 criminal [1] 17/20 | delegate [1] 30/4 <br> democracies [1] 34/21 |
| controlling [6] 30/25 35/25 $36 / 1941 / 2 ~ 52 / 10 ~ 61 / 2 ~$ | $\text { criminals [3] } 22 / 23$ | democracy [5] 16/5 32/18 34 |
| conversation [1] 15/1 | crisis [4] 20/4 21/8 30/17 30/24 | 4/4 59/17 |
|  | criteria [3] 17/5 32/21 52/1 | mocratic [2] 37/21 48/2 |
| conversations [1] 31/ copy [1] 20/15 | critical [2] | strate [1] 47 |
| core [1] 48/21 | cr | ed [1] |
|  | cross-examining [1] 14/2 | partment [2] 2/6 2/ |
| correct [3] 37/2 37/3 65/9 correcting [1] 59/10 | cr | $s \text { [1] } 27 / 14$ |
| corrupt [2] 30/19 30/20corruption [1] 30/19 | CRR [2] 2/18 65/15 $\text { cry [1] } 30 / 11$ | $s \text { [1] } 55 / 8$ |
|  | CSR[4] 2/18 65/15 65/17 65/17 | designates [1] 44/22 |
| cost [1] 28/20 | cured [1] 24/1 | designed [4] 23/4 39/14 39/1 |
| 41/13 50/1 55/9 59/21 61/11 | current [2] 171 | 60/14 |
|  | custody [3] 22/5 23/12 37/6 | spite [2] 6/2 25/1 |
| 61/19 61/24 61/25 6 | cv [3] 1/5 3/6 65/4 | stroy [1] 52/20 |
| couldn't [2] 37/11 58/4 <br> counsel [17] 3/11 4/10 13/23 | D |  |
| 30/8 35/23 37/1 37/14 38/15 38/16 42/3 45/3 46/7 50/20 51/3 52/18 60/5 62/21 |  |  |
|  | damage [1] 38/25 | termining [1] 47/23 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { counsel's [4] 14/10 35/21 45/9 } \\ & 60 / 1 \end{aligned}$ | damages [1] 38/20 <br> date [3] 8/21 65/16 6 | developed [1] 34/21 <br> did [11] 6/1 19/7 20/19 27/16 |

(5) conduit - did

| D | 15/22 47/15 64/9 64/12 | efficient [1] 17/18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| did... [7] 29/1 33/4 41/8 41/8 | distrust [4] 7/13 7/14 16/11 | efforts [1] 19/8 |
| $41 / 1043 / 854 / 20$ | 33/18 | Eighty [2] 19/19 19/21 |
| didn't [7] 9/8 28/1 33/1 33/1 | divided [1] 62/17 | Eighty-five [2] 19/19 19/21 |
| 34/24 60/5 60/7 | division [3] 1/3 40/10 62/5 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \text { elther } \\ 36 / 22 \end{array}$ |
| difference [4] 14/15 14/15 51/24 54/7 | divisions [1] 61/23 | elderly [1] 23/9 |
| different [3] 30/10 54/3 57/4 | do [38] | elected [3] 36/15 36/16 36/17 |
| digit [7] 20/14 20/18 20/20 | docket [3] 3/8 3/10 64/7 | electing [1] 34/5 |
| 60/18 61/7 61/8 61/11 | Docket No. 73 [1] 3 | election [66] |
| digitally [1] 65/12 | Docket No. 75 [1] 3/10 | elections [54] |
| digits [10] 20/12 20/21 20/24 | doctored [1] | electoral [3] 16/4 30/1 59/1 |
| 20/25 21/2 21/4 29/17 61/9 | doctrine [1] 37/20 | electronic [1] 20/15 |
| 61/12 61/14 | does [10] 8/4 11/3 14/1 17/8 | elements [1] 62/21 |
| dilution [1] 16/7 | 18/24 | Elephant [1] 38/23 |
| direction [1] 27/11 | 58/13 | elephants [1] 38/21 |
| Director [1] 25/4 | doesn't [16] 8/1 8/15 17/13 29/4 <br> 31/14 32/20 32/21 35/23 40/25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { eligible [5] } 19 / 434 / 2346 / 10 \\ & 46 / 1753 / 8 \end{aligned}$ |
| disadvantage [2] 35/17 35/18 disagree [2] 41/24 42/1 | 47/25 58/1 58/4 58/5 58/14 60/6 | else [2] 18/10 40/19 |
| disagree [2] 41/24 disclaim [1] 5/18 | 61/9 | emails [1] 21/14 |
| disclaimed [5] 5/15 5/17 8/7 8/8 | doing [10] 22/21 26/9 28/21 | emotion [1] 16/12 |
| $51 / 2$ | 29/19 29/22 30/3 41/6 43/14 | emotional [6] 7/2 7/4 7/8 38/16 |
| disclaiming [1] 5/18 | 53/2 61/1 | 38/25 51/7 |
| disclosed [1] 28/17 | dollars [1] 22/2 | emotionally [1] 38/22 |
| discover [1] 37/4 | don't [46] | employees |
| discovered [2] 27/5 27/22 | $29 / 542 / 3$ | $54 / 1460 / 960 / 14$ |
| discovery [4] 32/4 43/22 53/20 | door [1] 48/1 | enabled [1] 41/24 |
|  | doors [2] 18/21 39/9 | enables [1] 60/17 |
|  | doubt [1] 52/3 | enacted [1] 60/25 |
| discuss [2] 10/4 10/8 | Douglas [2] 24/14 24/18 | encompass [1] 49/20 |
| disenfranchised [1] | down [2] 33/11 61/3 | encompasses [1] 58/3 |
| disenfranchisement [1] 62/6 | driver's [2] 20/23 21/1 | end [5] 24/10 24/11 45/9 50/23 |
| dismiss [13] 3/7 3/8 5/4 9/2 | drivers' [1] 15/19 |  |
| 13/8 17/23 42/10 42/15 42/18 | drives [1] 16/10 dropped [1] 26/6 | enforce [2] 49/11 50/17 engage [1] 13/24 |
| 43/6 46/19 47/14 63/22 | due [4] 6/8 33/21 33/22 55/2 | engage [1] 13/24 engaged [1] 12/16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { dismissal [4] 13/4 13/9 13/11 } \\ & 50 / 24 \end{aligned}$ | Dysinger [3] 3/16 26/25 27/7 | engender [1] 35/4 |
| dismissed [11] 9/12 11/17 | E | joined [2] 15/21 15/23 |
| 12/24 13/13 26/16 43/10 43/11 | each [6] 12/22 29/15 34/22 | $41 / 2142 / 1642 / 1742 / 1842 / 1$ |
| 47/6 47/15 53/25 64/2 | 35/15 35/16 43/13 | $50 / 1460 / 16$ |
| dismisses [1] 51/14 | easier [1] 29/8 | ensure [3] 13/24 23/16 42/12 |
|  | easily [1] 23/19 | enter [1] 7/3 |
|  | easy [3] 56/17 60/13 60/14 | entertain [1] 12/19 |
| displays [1] $24 / 15$ | ECF [1] 46/14 | entire [2] 24/10 35/3 |
| disputes [2] 47/11 63/23 <br> disruptive [1] 15/12 | ECF 64-7 [1] 46/14 | $\text { entirely [1] } 11 / 17$ |
| disruptive [1] 15/1 | economic [1] 30/17 | entirety [1] 46/11 |
| dissatisfaction dissent [1] $42 / 4$ | Edtl [1] 3/15 | entitled [3] 46/4 46/24 65/10 |
| dissent [1] 42/4 | Education [1] 32/23 | envelope [4] 22/6 23/15 24/22 |
| senting [4] 16/14 | effect [1] 10/21 | 52/22 |
| distaste [2] 7/13 7/13 <br> district [8] 1/1 1/2 1/16 2/18 | effective [2] 17/17 18/11 effectively [1] 16/8 | equal [4] 32/25 33/12 40/6 55/2 equally [1] 45/24 |


| E | explained [1] 10 | few [5] 39/17 55/21 55/22 55/23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| equitable [2] 7/24 47/21 equities [1] 47/22 erroneously [1] 56/24 escape [4] 14/12 16/22 35/24 $36 / 11$ essential [3] 16/4 32/17 59/16 essentially [5] $7 / 67 / 747 / 11$ | explains [1] 54/23 <br> explanation [2] 21/9 26/13 <br> explicitly [1] 51/2 <br> exposes [3] 60/25 60/25 61/1 <br> extent [1] 38/10 <br> extraordinary [2] 29/23 32/1 <br> extricate [1] 37/8 | 63/3 <br> fewer [2] 19/11 19/12 <br> Fifth [1] 57/11 <br> figuring [1] 22/21 <br> file [1] 43/7 <br> filed [4] 9/1 9/6 26/14 48/9 <br> fill [4] 18/10 21/22 21/23 29/12 |
| 47/18 56/16 | F |  |
| establish [3] 8/13 10/24 45/18 established [2] 14/18 28/18 establishing [1] 39/4 | facilitate [2] 15/11 23/5 <br> facilities [2] 32/25 33/3 <br> fact [27] 4/16 4/17 5/2 5/5 5/9 | filled-out [1] 21/25 <br> filling [2] 21/14 23/9 <br> final [2] 32/11 63/6 |
| et [8] $1 / 41 / 72 / 5$ $65 / 3$ | $5 / 106 / 116 / 247 / 57 / 217 / 238 / 3$ $8 / 58 / 612 / 138 / 1742 / 2244 / 25$ | Finally [1] 42/20 |
| even [19] 6/1 6/12 9/15 10/15 <br> 10/18 11/11 18/5 24/13 24/16 | 45/3 47/2 48/1 48/6 51/8 53/16 | finding [2] 32/12 40/23 |
| 25/10 27/18 29/8 32/23 46/2 | factors [1] 32/24 | findings [2] 64/8 64/10 fine [2] 18/17 38/6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 56/18 58/3 59/18 61/3 62/16 } \\ & \text { event [2] } 9 / 11 \text { 11/25 } \end{aligned}$ | facts [12] 17/15 17/21 17/2 | fire [1] 52/3 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ever [5] 20/19 20/19 25/2 25/9 } \\ & 33 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | 33/14 33/19 35/18 45/21 51 52/7 59/5 60/17 62/24 | first [24] 3/7 3/8 4/12 8/12 9/5 9/22 10/12 37/16 40/1 40/18 |
|  | factual [1] 63/23 | 40/18 44/12 46/8 46/11 47 |
| 18/1 21/12 24/9 25/23 25/24 | FAGAN [10] 1/7 2/5 2/8 3/5 30/18 30/22 44/4 44/7 44/19 | 47/13 49/8 49/18 55/4 56/16 56/22 56/24 56/25 58/23 |
| 27/23 27/25 40/5 53/25 | 65/3 | first-time [1] 40/18 |
| everyone [3] 18/9 22/13 40/14 | fail [4] 10/7 10/10 10/23 11/1 | fit [1] 37/19 |
| everything [2] 28/21 41/2 | failed [2] $4 / 154 /$ failing [1] 11/17 | fits [1] 55/14 <br> five [8] 19/11 19/12 19/19 19/21 |
| evidence [13] 14/14 17/24 $18 / 1329 / 2332 / 133 / 1343 / 18$ | fails [3] 4/18 4/21 12/19 <br> failure [3] 45/21 49/21 54/21 | 53/5 61/9 61/10 61/12 |
| $52 / 1552 / 1152 / 2052 / 2152 / 22$ $53 / 2$ | failure [3] 45/21 49/21 54/21 failures [1] 30/11 | fixed [1] 36/10 <br> flabbergasted [1] 49/25 |
|  | fair [1] 63/22 | flimsiest [1] 20/6 |
| exactly [2] 39/12 39 | fairly [1] 12/21 | folks [3] 4/25 14/24 28/10 |
| exam [3] 18/8 18/9 18/10 | fairness [9] 16/20 16/21 32/8 32/10 32/13 $42 / 160$ | follow [2] 41/11 43/17 |
| examining [1] 14/23 | 63/24 | follow-up [1] 41/11 followed [1] 11/9 |
| $\underset{55 / 17}{\text { example [4] } 6 / 137 / 1526 / 2}$ | fake [3] 24/2 24/3 61/6 | forbids [1] 38/7 |
| except [2] | fall [1] 5 | foreclosed [1] 8/6 |
| exception [2] 48/18 48/20 | far [1] | foregoing [1] 65/8 |
| excess [4] 19/1 21/12 21/16 |  | reign [1] 5/19 |
| $22 / 20$ | fear [3] 5/7 16/11 16/12 | form [3] 14/17 18/15 21/21 |
| exclusively [1] | FEC [1] 34/5 | formed [1] 23/20 |
| exercise [3] 7/24 | federal [10] | forward [1] 43/6 |
| exercising [1] 47/20 | $57$ | found [3] 11/19 39/21 40/16 <br> four [21] 10/11 19/11 19/14 |
| exist [1] 42/11 existence [1] | feed [1] 29/11 | 20/21 20/20 20/12 20/14 |
| existence [1] exists [3] 5/16 | feeding [1] 24/1 | 20/23 20/25 21/2 21/4 29/1 |
| expedited [1] 50/7 | feel [1] 16/13 | 47/21 53/6 60/18 61/7 61/8 |
| expert [1] 61/16 experts [3] 25/22 53/20 62/9 Expiration [1] 65/17 | $\begin{aligned} & 42 / 18 \\ & \text { feelings [2] 9/17 33/13 } \\ & \text { fees [1] } 55 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | 61/11 61/14 62/1 <br> four-digit [7] 20/14 20/18 20/20 <br> 60/18 61/7 61/8 61/11 <br> four-year [1] 19/11 |


| F | 50/14 51/1 5 | hadn't [1] 43/3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fourteenth [9] 4/23 33/22 48/3 | gives [2] 34/18 6 <br> global [1] 59/15 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { [1] } 8 / 16 \\ & \text { ful [1] } 56 / 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| 48/7 50/16 54/24 54/25 55/12 $55 / 16$ | go [21] $4 / 3$ 15/5 20/20 20/24 | handle [1] 31/1 |
| Fourth [1] 57/9 | 21/1 22/7 28/14 33/1 35/1 39/2 | hang [1] 28/12 |
| France [3] 62/10 62/10 62/11 | 39/2 39/8 48/3 48/15 48/2 | Hanson [1] 20/7 |
| franchise [2] 16/9 38/1 | 49/22 50/6 50/10 58/21 61/5 | happen [1] 26/16 |
| frankly [1] 49/5 | 61/25 | happened [1] 17/ |
| fraud [59] | goes [4] 14/17 $23 / 2$ 49/22 50/21 | happens [1] 58 |
| fraudulent [1] 16/13 | going [19] $8 / 24$ 15/2 21/19 21/24 24/4 24/16 26/19 26/22 | Happy [1] 2/4 <br> hard [5] 20/13 21/25 22/8 22/17 |
| fraudulently [3] 5/14 5/20 57/10 | 28/3 28/4 28/11 28/19 30/12 | 29/18 |
| FRCP [1] 8/25 | 43/19 52/3 52/24 53/16 59/20 | harder [1] 61/3 |
| $49 / 11$ | 61/5 | harm [8] 9/19 10/15 10/16 11/1 |
| free-stand | gone [1] | 11/3 11/6 12/12 |
| freestanding [2] 48/2 48/6 | Gonzalez [1] 41/21 | harmed [4] 10/14 10/18 12/10 |
| frivolous [1] 27/18 | good [8] 3/18 3/20 3/24 4/1 20/4 | 40/14 |
| full [1] 64/7 | 21/8 24/3 52/8 | harming [2] 1 |
| functioning [3] 16/4 32/18 | got[11] 20/8 23/3 28/6 29/1 | harms [3] 35/15 37/20 37/21 |
| 59/17 | 33/2 33/3 36/10 37/5 38/15 | Harney [1] 27/13 |
| fundamental [8] 15/13 31/16 | 39/11 62/16 | esting [1] |
| 31/17 33/21 33/23 33/24 34/7 | gotten [1] 16/24 | has [49] |
| 37/12 | govern [3] 29/25 34/2 58/1 | have [146] |
| fundamentally [1] | governance [11] 16/17 31/14 | haven't [3] 43/2 43/2 53/3 |
| further [6] 9/14 13/16 13/19 | 31/15 31/22 32/6 37/22 41/24 | having [4] 6/14 22/15 28/10 |
| 51/20 58/16 63/5 | 52/15 54/15 60/9 60/12 | 43/25 |
| futile [2] 51/12 51/13 | governed [2] 6/16 6/16 | Hawthorne [1] 2/1 |
| future [1] 28/18 | governing [1] 31/20 | [1] 28/23 |
| fuzzy [1] 26/17 | government [25] 14/5 14/12 | HB 3291 [1] 28/23 |
| G | 29/22 30/3 30/12 31/8 33/18 | 59/1 60/5 60/8 |
| gain [1] 7 | 36/19 36/25 39/1 40/8 | head [2] 20/13 29/1 |
| general [1] 38/16 | 40/9 41/2 44/6 52/9 54/8 54/13 | hear [2] 14/25 60/5 |
| generalized [20] 6/4 6/19 7/7 | 59/23 60/25 | hearing [5] 15/12 22/15 50/23 |
| 7/15 8/11 10/20 11/25 35/22 | Governor [3] 30/21 31/4 44/21 | 63/10 64/15 |
| 35/23 36/3 39/19 39/23 40/1 | governs [2] 4/23 58/2 | heart [1] 33/10 |
| 40/13 47/10 47/16 48/19 50/20 | grant [1] 51/6 | held [2] 39/4 39/ |
| 50/21 51/8 | granted [1] 51/12 | help [2] 21/14 21/22 |
| generate [1] 20 | green [1] 44/14 | helpful [1] 9/24 |
| generates [2] 33/8 33/18 | grievance [12] 6/4 7/7 7/16 8/11 | helping [1] 40/8 |
| get [26] 17/4 20/23 20/24 21/1 | 10/20 11/25 35/22 39/23 40/1 | her [8] 26/5 26/9 26/12 27/8 |
| 22/23 23/7 26/15 26/15 27/12 | 40/13 47/16 51/8 | 44/4 44/7 44/7 44/20 |
| 27/14 36/7 37/16 42/9 42/17 | grievances [7] 35/23 36/3 39/18 | here [27] 3/4 3/14 3/17 3/25 |
| 43/12 45/20 47/25 50/10 50/11 | 39/19 47/11 48/19 50/20 | 10/9 11/6 14/2 14/3 16/22 21/16 |
| 53/20 56/15 57/17 57/19 57/20 | grounds [4] 4/12 6/23 20/6 47/6 | 32/5 33/13 34/12 35/7 37/2 |
| 59/23 59/24 | group [1] 39/21 | 37/25 41/1 41/16 42/15 43/15 |
| gets [4] 21/13 24/22 24/22 | groups [2] 23/6 62/14 | 47/17 49/17 49/25 50/6 50/9 |
| 53/25 | guess [1] 55/11 | 55/11 59/2 |
| getting [2] | H | 22/2 22/2 22 |
| give [12] 13/17 16/18 22 <br> 31/23 32/7 32/10 35/23 | hacked [1] 25/22 | hidden [1] 37/5 |
| 53/18 59/21 60/10 63/5 given [6] 26/13 26/13 46/18 | had [9] 9/9 19/19 19/20 19/21 19/23 35/2 38/21 51/17 58/24 | hide [1] 14/7 hiding [1] 41/14 |


| H | illegal [3] 19/22 21/6 50/5 | 12/13 12/22 34/18 38/17 41/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| high [1] 23/22 | illegally [1] 6/7 <br> Illinois [2] 31/18 33/25 | 44/25 45/3 47/2 48/1 48/6 51/7 $51 / 8$ |
| highlighted [1] 46/7 | illustration [1] 39/8 | inquiry [4] 39/6 40/3 45/2 47/22 |
| him [1] 53/18 | image [2] 27/24 27/25 | inside [1] 59/20 |
| story [1] 17/16 | images [6] 27/1 27/3 27/15 | insidious [1] 23/4 |
| old [1] $27 / 8$ | 27/22 28/19 28/19 | instance [2] 48/20 49/3 |
| hole [1] 37/20 | impersonal [1] 17/19 | instead [2] 36/14 38/5 |
| home [3] 18/8 18/9 23/7 | implausible [1] 12/19 | institutions [1] 18/5 |
| honest [1] 16/10 | importance [2] 15/17 16/2 | insufficient [4] |
| honor [16] 3/4 3/20 3/24 4/5 | important [5] 6/18 14/3 30/10 50/19 53/23 | insufficient [4] 7/16 11/15 45/17 45/20 |
| 4/11 8/19 9/24 13/6 13/10 13/20 | impossible [3] 25/18 51/3 58/22 | insurmountable [1] 51/11 |
| 18/2 18/3 18/6 39/15 63/1 63/7 | impression [1] 40/18 | integrity [7] 15/18 16/2 16/3 |
|  | inaccurate [1] 6/8 | 32/17 33/20 34/17 47/14 |
|  | inactive [1] 57/3 | intended [1] 15/9 |
|  | inclined [1] 46/2 | intentionally [1] 20/3 |
| $\text { our [1] } 39 / 12$ | include [5] 8/21 16/18 31/23 | intercepted [1] 57/7 |
| House [1] 29/16 | 32/7 60/9 | intercepter [1] 57/9 |
| how [17] 7/24 21/23 21/25 22/8 | including [3] 16/19 31/24 49/9 | interest[17] 6/14 6/18 6/19 6/20 |
| 22/17 23/5 23/8 23/21 24/4 | incorrect [2] 5/13 49/14 | 6/20 7/17 7/18 7/21 15/11 23/6 |
| 28/11 28/12 29/10 32/10 34/2 | incorrectly [1] 11/24 | 47/19 47/22 55/4 55/19 55/24 |
| 53/21 58/25 60/17 | increase [1] 30/15 | 56/4 59/8 |
| However [1] 13/11 | Incredible [1] 29/18 | interests [1] 7/25 |
| huge [6] 18/25 43/5 55/5 56/19 | incredibly [1] 6/18 | interference [1] 28/10 |
| 61/23 63/23 | incumbency [1] 38/3 | internet [1] 23/21 |
| human [5] 18/3 18/4 38/18 | incumbent [1] 38/3 | interpreted [1] 49/20 |
| 38/18 38/19 | indicate [1] 51/23 | interrogate [2] 14/9 16/25 |
| Humane [2] 38/19 38/20 | indications [1] 52/6 | interrogating [2] 14/22 27/17 |
| hump [1] 37/16 | individual [5] 35/16 53/11 55/3 | interruption [1] 15/6 |
| hundred [2] 18/16 61/13 | 56/3 57/16 [1] 35/16 | [1] 40/24 |
| hundreds [1] 20/18 | individually [1] 35/16 | invaded [1] 41/5 |
| hurdle [2] 37/16 42/9 | individuals [4] 5/7 35/19 46/9 | lid [1] 5/ |
| hurting [1] 40/8 | 46/23 | invent [1] 20/14 |
| hypothetical [3] 11/4 14/4 35/24 | ineffective [2] 23/19 26/20 | tigate [1] 26/23 |
| I | inference [1] 12/9 | invited [1] 3/22 |
| I'Il [5] 4/9 46/6 49/17 54/22 63/5 | inferences [1] 12/19 | involved [1] 32/24 |
| I'm [18] 3/13 3/14 8/24 15/7 15/7 | inferiority [2] 33/8 37/18 | involves [1] 18/13 |
| 16/16 28/11 38/19 40/2 45/4 | infiltrate [2] 22/10 22/18 | Iqbal [1] 46/24 |
| 49/4 49/5 49/25 50/6 50/13 | information [1] 58/24 | irregularities [1] 12/6 |
| 57/21 61/16 61/16 | infringing [1] 13/25 | is [247] |
| l've [1] 32/16 | inherent [3] 23/23 23/23 25/13 | isn't [4] 54/10 58/24 60/8 62/20 |
| i.e [1] 9/20 | inherently [1] 51/7 | issue [8] 6/3 8/16 10/5 15/18 |
| ID [1] 20/12 | initial [3] 8/2 8/20 13/20 | 16/22 44/11 44/13 57/12 |
| idea [5] 33/5 37/19 46/12 49/24 | initiatives [1] 6/17 | issues [4] 10/8 56/8 63/10 63/11 |
| 62/8 | injunction [5] 15/23 31/5 43/21 | issuing [1] 8/1 |
| ideas [1] 50/1 | 43/21 47/24 | it [119] |
| identify [2] 3/11 20/20 | injured [1] 38/22 | it's [80] |
| ignition [3] 18/22 29/20 39/10 | injuries [1] 13/3 | its [5] 7/24 9/2 20/2 42/8 49/1 |
| Ignore [1] 27/9 | injury [30] 4/16 4/16 5/2 5/12 | itself [1] 37/22 |
| ignored [1] 24/21 | 6/24 7/2 7/4 7/5 7/8 7/23 8/3 8/5 |  |
| III [3] 6/22 47/3 49/1 | 8/5 9/16 9/20 10/22 11/13 11/23 |  |



| M | 65/10 | 58/17 63/22 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| machines [4] 7/12 23/20 25/22 | measure [2] 32/19 42 <br> measured [1] 32/20 | motions [2] 64/5 64/12 motivated [1] 38/4 |
| made [8] | measures [1] 25/7 | motive [1] 25/11 |
| $59 / 1859 / 1960 / 1960 / 1960 / 20$ | mechanism [1] 24/20 | mountains [1] 18/1 |
| MAGISTRATE [1] 1/16 |  | move [1] |
| mail [15] 5/13 7/12 18/1 18/10 | meet [7] 4/18 12/19 12/24 30/8 | moved [1] 19/20 |
| 18/15 18/16 18/20 23/24 28/25 | 45/10 58/14 58/ | movie [1] |
| /4 31/5 32/13 47/17 57/6 63/9 | Mei [1] 26/3 | moving [4] 4/9 44/25 47/1 63 |
| mail-in [6] 18/10 18/15 18/16 | Mei Wong [1] | Mr. [17] 9/13 10/20 13/15 13/ |
| 18/20 31/5 32/13 | members [1] 38 | 13/22 15/5 28/9 28/14 39/ |
| main | mentioned [2] 23/12 62/ | 42 |
| maintain [1] 10/7 | mere [2] 12/ met [1] 8/13 | Mr Joncus [10] 13/18 13/22 |
| majority [1] 25/1 | Metro [1] 26/3 | 15/5 28/9 28/14 39/16 42/20 |
| make [11] 9/14 9/14 15/12 17/1 | microphone [1] 22/12 | 44/2 51/20 58/19 |
| 28/1 32/20 42/12 51/25 58/5 | microphones [1] 44/17 | Mr. Marshall [7] 9/13 10/20 |
| makes [3] 29/8 42 | might [3] 27/6 28/15 41/1 | 13/15 44/10 54/19 58/16 63/5 |
| making [8] 36/14 51/24 52/4 | miles [1] 37/17 | Ms. [8] 4/17 8/16 8/18 9/25 13/7 |
| 52/4 56/25 59/15 61/18 61/22 | million [2] 46/15 46/17 | 27/7 42/21 44/7 |
| curing [1] 20/25 | minded [1] 38/8 | Ms. Dysinger [1] 27/7 |
| manipulate [1] 5/20 | minds [1] 33/10 | Ms. Fagan [1] 44/7 |
| manner [1] 7/11 | minority [1] 60/6 minutes [2] 25/23 63/4 | Ms. Patel [4] 4/17 8/16 8/18 13/7 |
| manual [1] 57/6 | minutes [2] 25/23 63/4 <br> misadministration [1] 10/25 | Ms. Patel's [1] 42/21 |
| manufactured [1] 25/14 | mismanagement [1] 10/19 | Ms. Williams [1] 9/25 |
| many [10] 6/5 12/1 22/22 29/10 $43 / 947 / 451 / 23$ 62/11 63/17 | misplaced [1] 10/21 | much [9] 4/7 24/4 38/11 43/20 |
| $63 / 18$ | missing [1] 59/11 | 43/22 56/20 58/11 58/12 59/15 |
| MARC [3] 1/4 3/14 65/3 | mistake [3] 57/24 58/1 58/7 | multiple [1] 25/22 |
| marked [1] 29/15 | mitigate [2] 25/18 25/19 | MULTNOMAH [5] 2/11 2/12 4/4 |
| market [3] 2/7 2/10 30/14 | modem [1] 25/2 | 27/2 53/5 |
| MARSHALL [9] 2/6 3/21 9/13 | modes [1] 38/8 | must [4] 9/2 9/18 38/7 57/24 |
| 10/20 13/15 44/10 54/19 58/16 | mole [1] 52/23 | mute [7] 5/1 14/25 15/4 22/14 |
| 63/5 | moment [1] 22/11 | 28/11 28/12 28/13 |
| matching [1] | money [2] 33/2 33/3 | muted [1] 22/12 |
| Matrix [2] 26/17 26/18 | monitoring [1] 25/20 | my [15] 4/17 8/16 |
| matter [12] 3/5 4/14 8/14 8/20 | monitors [1] 24/8 | 31/1 31/4 34/15 39/8 39/8 48/5 |
| 13/4 39/22 42/14 43/9 44/3 | month [1] 28/7 | 48/6 48/6 63/1 64 |
| 45/18 51/9 61/10 | more [19] 11/3 14/17 17/17 | Myers [1] 44/20 |
| may [11] 9/1 12/6 26/3 26/5 26/9 | 8/1 | N |
| 33/9 33/10 36/19 39/5 50/22 64/11 | 37/22 37/23 46/9 46/22 59/15 | name [5] 27/19 28/2 28/16 |
| May 29th [2] 26/5 26/9 | $\begin{gathered} 62 / \\ \text { mor } \end{gathered}$ | 49/18 60/19 <br> named [7] 4/20 39/18 42/23 |
|  | Mosley [1] 34/14 | 44/3 44/20 44/23 56/12 |
| McCutcheon [1] 34/5 me [14] 4/21 20/13 22/13 $23 /$ | most [17] 4/19 9/11 18/5 20/5 | names [5] 12/14 19/6 19/8 61/6 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { mer } 14] \text { 29/21 39/11 39/17 39/25 } \end{gathered}$ | 30/25 31/16 31/17 33/23 33/23 | 61/6 |
| 41/11 41/23 41/23 44/9 53/15 | 33/24 36/9 37/13 46/3 50/19 | nation [2] 36/9 36/9 |
| me ask [1] $41 / 23$ | 53/23 57/18 62/9 | National [3] 19/9 20/3 49/10 nationwide [1] 17/20 |
| mean [9] 11/3 47/25 48/1 48/12 | motion [23] 3/7 3/8 3/9 4/8 4/8 4/12 5/4 6/24 9/2 13/12 13/16 | nature [2] 18/4 18/4 |
| 50/13 53/4 54/4 56/11 58/5 | $17 / 2342 / 1042 / 1542 / 1746 / 19$ | $\text { near [1] } 35 / 25$ |
| means [10] 11/4 12/25 24/3 | 47/14 49/6 51/18 54/20 54/23 | necessary [5] 30/9 35/4 43/13 |




| P | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 64 / 10 \\ \text { record [5] 27/3 27/15 46/14 } \\ 46 / 16 \text { 65/9 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { remove [2] } 19 / 8 \text { 53/5 } \\ & \text { removed [1] } 11 / 22 \\ & \text { removing [2] } 19 / 6 \quad 19 / 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\text { 2] } 1$ |  |  |
|  | records [14] | $\text { repeat [1] } 34 / 16$ |
| purpose [1] 17 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 26 / 2427 / 227 / 5 \\ & 27 / 1328 / 528 / 1 \\ & 56 / 6 \end{aligned}\right.$ | replaced [2] 23/3 23/17 repleading [1] 51/13 |
| purposes [1] 38/17 |  |  |
| pursue [2] 6/1 7/1 | $\begin{aligned} & 56 / 6 \\ & \text { recover [1] 25/2 } \end{aligned}$ | reply [1] 44/11 |
|  | recycle [1] 21/18 | reported [2] 19/10 26/5 REPORTER [2] 2/18 65/16 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { put [7] } 21 / 1521 / 15 \text { 29/21 } 3 \\ & 34 / 1238 / 553 / 10 \end{aligned}$ | recycled [1] 21 recycling [1] 21 | represent [1] 31/10 |
| puzzled [1] 49/5 |  | representative [1] 43/13 |
| Q | reelecting [2] refer [1] 8/2 | representatives [2] 36/15 36/16 represents [1] 59/24 |
| qualifications [1] 3 | references [1] 49/9 <br> reflect [1] 6/17 |  |
| ] |  |  |  |
|  | reform [1] 38/5 |  |
| question [14] 8 | refuse [1] 30/5 |  |
| 41/9 41/11 41/23 | refused [1] 15/22 |  |
| 44/18 45/4 45/15 5 | regarding [2] 38/1 45/3 <br> regardless [1] 58/10 $27 / 10$ <br> require [4] 31/14 48/22 48/24  |  |
| questions [5] 4/24 8/15 39/17 |  |  |  |
| 45/1 45/2 | register [7] 15/20 21/3 29/18 $48 / 25$ <br> 60/18 60/22 61/6 61/10 required [6] 15/19 20/12 27/25 |  |
| quite [1] |  |  |  |
| quote [5] 23 |  | 29/2 29/18 53/3 |
| 34/15 38/8 | 10/15 11/24 13/1 19/3 19/20 | requirement [5] 10/11 12/20 <br> 12/24 13/23 55/25 |
| quoted [3] 32/16 38/15 38/16 | 19/23 19/25 20/9 21/6 42/25 |  |
| quoting [2] 27/12 38/18 | $56 / 2356 / 2457 / 258 / 25$ | 12/24 13/23 55/25 requirements [3] 45/10 58/14 |
| R | registers [1] 20/5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { requires [5] } 11 / 212 / 2113 / 10 \\ & 19 / 852 / 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| ra | registration [12] 11/22 12/2 |  |
| raise [1] | 12/15 19/10 20/3 20/11 20/15 <br> 49/10 49/12 52/25 56/15 63/11 | residents [1] 23/7 |
| rallying [1] 3 | 49/10 49/12 52/25 56/15 63/11 registrations [2] 19/11 53/1 | resigned [2] 30/18 44/5 |
| rampant [2] 17/24 |  |  |
| rates [1] 23/22 | registrations [2] 19/11 53/1  <br> regulations [2] 39/6 40/3 resigning [1] 30/22 <br> resist [1] 40/22  |  |
| rather [7] 5/6 6/6 | rejected [2] 23/24 23/25 $\quad$ resolved [1] 45/2 |  |
| 43/22 43/23 51/15 | rejections [1] $23 / 22$relate [2] 58/4 63/19 | respect [5] $4 / 19$ 42/21 42/2254/21 58/17 |
| rationale [4] 27/18 27/18 49 |  |  |
| , | relate [2] 58/4 63/1 related [2] 55/7 63/7 | respond [2] 13/18 64/1 |
| 2] | relates [1] 39/24 | responded [1] 42/21 responding [1] 27/9 |
| read [4] 29/14 41/21 | relating [2] 47/10 56/1 |  |
| reading [2] 50/6 61/19 | relevant [1] 63/2 | response [6] 12/4 30/21 35/21 |
| really [4] 20/4 21/8 39/11 63/18 | reliability [1] 7/2 | $\begin{aligned} & 46 / 2054 / 2363 / 1 \\ & \text { responsible [1] } 30 / 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| realm [2] 45/23 5 |  |  |
| reason [15] 8/12 20/4 21/5 21/6 | ] | restore [2] 30/12 30/13 <br> restricted [1] 18/15 |
| 21/7 21/8 28/6 33/15 40/22 41/4 | relied [1] 31/21 |  |
| 44/24 51/5 51/6 53/13 59/13 | relief [4] 8/1 45/22 45/25 45/25 | result [2] 38/22 62/2 |
| reasonable [3] 19/8 27/2 39/6 reasons [4] 8/6 10/11 13/11 | relies [3] $13 / 2425 / 537 / 1$ rely [1] $7 / 19$ | results [3] 29/9 33/17 50/7 |
| 47/18 | relying [3] 45/13 51/22 51/2 | revive [1] 6/2 |
| receive [2] 57/3 | remaining [2] 10/10 10/23 remedies [2] 49/15 50/2 |  |
| received [3] 23/14 28/25 29/7 |  | right [32] 6/13 14/1 15/21 15/23 |
| receives [1] 20/10 | dy [2] 47/2 | 16/6 16/6 25/2 27/21 28/2 32/5 |
| recognize [1] 43/2 | mber [2] 30 | $\begin{aligned} & 33 / 2133 / 2134 / 3 ~ 34 / 434 / 734 / 7 \\ & 34 / 1034 / 1138 / 1042 / 1142 / 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| recommendations [2] 64/8 | remind [3] 4/25 |  |
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