1	SPILSBURY LAW, PLLC		
	s/David W. Spilsbury		
2	s/David W. Spilsbury David W. Spilsbury, 031145 18 East University Dr., Suite 208		
3	Mesa, AZ. 85201 (602) 388-8893		
4	dave@spilsburylaw.com		
5	ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENOR- PLAINTIFFS		
6			
7			
8	IN THE SUPRIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA		
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA		
10	KELLI WARD,		
11	Plaintiff,	Z COW.	
12	vs.	Case No. CV 2020-015285	
13	CONSTANCE JACKSON, FELICIA ROTELLINI, FRED YAMASHITA,	C100	
14	ILIAMES MCLAUGHLIN.		
15	JONATHAN NEZ, LUIS ALBERTO HEREDIA, NED NORRIS, REGINA ROMERO, SANDRA D. KENNEDY,		
	STEPHEN RUE LEWIS, and STEVE	MOTION TO INTERVENE UNDER	
16	GALLARDO,	RULE 24	
17	Defendants.		
18		JUDGE RANDALL H. WARNER	
19			
20			
20 21			
	Proposed Intervenor-Plaintiffs, Jame	es Stevenson, Baron Benham, Lynie Stone, and	
21	•	es Stevenson, Baron Benham, Lynie Stone, and ansel, hereby move the Court in accordance with	
21 22	Jessica Chambers, by and through their cou	·	
21 22 23	Jessica Chambers, by and through their cou	unsel, hereby move the Court in accordance with perior Courts 24(a) to intervene in this action as	
21 22 23 24	Jessica Chambers, by and through their cou Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure for the Su	unsel, hereby move the Court in accordance with perior Courts 24(a) to intervene in this action as	
21 22 23 24 25 26	Jessica Chambers, by and through their coulombers and through their coulombers. Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure for the Supadditional Plaintiffs. In support of this motifollows:	unsel, hereby move the Court in accordance with perior Courts 24(a) to intervene in this action as	
<ul><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>23</li><li>24</li><li>25</li></ul>	Jessica Chambers, by and through their coulombers and through their coulombers. Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure for the Sugadditional Plaintiffs. In support of this motifollows:  1. On November 24, 2020, Plaintiff initial.	insel, hereby move the Court in accordance with perior Courts 24(a) to intervene in this action as ion, Proposed Intervenor-Plaintiffs state as	

- 2. This action arises from Plaintiff's election contest based on election officials' refusal to allow legal observers to observe signature –verification constitutes "misconduct on the part of...officer[s] making or participating in a canvass for state election," pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-672(A)(1). Without legal observation, the result of the electoral contest is fundamentally uncertain.
- 3. Without examination of the signed envelopes through a court ordered inspection under A.R.S. § 16-677, Plaintiff has no way of knowing whether falsely or insufficiently verified ballots were counted.
- 4. Intervenor-Plaintiffs engaged in a separate investigation to discover additional election contest violations under A.R.S. § 16-672. Intervenor-Plaintiffs discovered several additional instances of disparate impact treatment of electors in areas where private corporate money was not made available to election clerks.
- 5. In addition, Intervenor-Plaintiffs engaged in a statistical analysis that determined Arizona's election officials did not enforce state law residency requirements on voters who changed addresses, moved out of state, or double voted before the November 3, 2020 election. Further, numerous requested absentee ballots were requested from election officials that were not requested by the actual named person on the ballot.
- 6. The government's data confirms the illegal votes counted and legal votes not counted are over 300,000, far exceeding the 10,457 margin in the Presidential contest.
- 7. Under Arizona law, Rule 24(a) provides that anyone shall be permitted to intervene in an action:
  - (1)[W]hen a statute confers an unconditional right to intervene; or (2) when the applicant claims an interest relating to the property or transaction which is the subject of the action and the applicant is so situated that the disposition of the action may as a practical matter

1	impair or impede the applicant's ability to protect that interest, unless	
2	the applicant's interest is adequately represented by existing parties.	
3	See also William Z. v. Ariz. Dep't of Econ. Sec., 192 Ariz. 385, 387, ¶ 8, 965	
4	P.2d 1224, 1226 (App.1998).	
5	8. Additional grounds and reasons are set forth in the separate memorandum	
6	supporting this motion.	
7	9. WHEREFORE, Intervenor-Plaintiffs, James Stevenson, Baron Benham,	
8	Lynie Stone, and Jessica Chambers respectfully request that (a) the Court set	
9	this Motion to Intervene for hearing at or before any further proceedings and	
10	(b) grant this Motion to Intervene and enter an order joining Intervenor-	
11	Plaintiffs to this action as additional Plaintiffs. That the Court <b>GRANTS</b> any	
12	other relief the Court <b>DEEMS</b> just and proper.	
13	<b>RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED</b> this 2 <sup>nd</sup> day of December, 2020	
14	SPILSBURY LAW, PLLC	
15	s/David W. Spilsbury David W. Spilsbury, 031145	
16	18 East University Dr., Suite 208	
17	SPILSBURY LAW, PLLC <u>s/David W. Spilsbury</u> David W. Spilsbury, 031145  18 East University Dr., Suite 208  Mesa, AZ. 85201  (602) 388-8893	
18	(602) 388-8893	
19	ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENOR- PLAINTIFFS	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		