1	Timothy A. La Sota, SBN # 020539 TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC		
2	2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305		
3	Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: (602) 515-2649		
4	tim@timlasota.com Attorney for Plaintiff		
5	Kari Lake for Arizona		
6			
7			
8	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA		
9	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY (OF MARICOPA	
10	KARI LAKE FOR ARIZONA, an Arizona political	No	
11	committee,	land.	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v.	VERIFIED SPECIAL ACTION COMPLAINT	
14	CTEDUEN DICHED in Line Co. in 1 April 1 and 1		
15	STEPHEN RICHER, in his official capacity as the Maricopa County Recorder; REY VALENZUELA,	(Show Cause Hearing Requested)	
16	in his official capacity as the Maricopa County		
17	Director of Elections for Election Services and Early Voting; SCOTT JARRETT, in his official		
18	capacity as the Maricopa County Director of Elections for Election Day and Emergency Voting;		
19	BILL GATES, CLINT HICKMAN, JACK		
20	SELLERS, THOMAS GALVIN, AND STEVE GALLARDO, in their official capacities as		
21	members of the Maricopa County Board of		
22	Supervisors; and MARICOPA COUNTY;		
23	Defendants.		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
∠0	d .		

Plaintiff Kari Lake for Arizona brings this special action to compel the prompt production of public records¹ pursuant to the Arizona Public Records Act, A.R.S. § 39-121, et seq. ("PRA").

Plaintiff desires that every lawful vote be properly counted and every voter who was eligible to vote be allowed to vote. Unfortunately, due to Defendants' failures, many eligible voters may not have been able to vote. Because Defendants were unable or unwilling to conduct a reconciliation of voter check ins against ballots cast of each polling center on election night in accordance with Arizona law and have now unlawfully refused to produce public records in response to two public records requests regarding how they administered the election, Plaintiff cannot determine that every lawful vote will be properly counted. The records Plaintiff requested in response to the numerous issues with Defendants' administration of the election are consistent with a parallel demand by the Arizona Attorney General for answers to questions about the Defendants' actions.

Plaintiff hereby alleges as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE CASE

- 1. The courts of this state have "the duty of insuring that the constitutional and statutory provisions protecting the electoral process (*i.e.*, the manner in which an election is held) are not violated." *Tilson v. Mofford*, 153 Ariz. 468, 470 (1987).
- 2. Following a series of failures in Defendants' administration of the election, Plaintiff, through Kari Lake's attorney of record, has requested from the Defendants the production of public records relating to the general election that took place on November 8, 2022. *See* Exhibit 1 & 2. Given instances of misprinted ballots, the commingling of counted and uncounted ballots, and long lines discouraging people from voting, as demonstrated in the attached declarations, these records are necessary for Plaintiff to determine the full extent of the problems identified and their impacts on electors.

¹ As the definitions of "records" and "other matters" have essentially merged, the term records, as used in this action, should be construed as encompassing other matters.

- 3. Because the law allows the public and the plaintiff only a short period of time in the context of an election to seek relief from the courts for violations of their rights, the Defendants' unlawful failure to produce the records of their actions promptly has prejudiced Plaintiff and is preventing the courts from performing their duty. Therefore, this court should require that the Defendants produce the requested records prior to the canvassing of the election.
- 4. If the Defendants do not produce the records prior to the canvassing of the election, then they will have not acted promptly as required by the Arizona Public Records Act, which provides that "access to a public record is deemed denied if a custodian fails to **promptly** respond to a request for production of a public record." A.R.S. § 39-121.01(E) (emphasis added). As explained below, the meaning of "promptly" is determined under the circumstances. In this case, "promptly" must mean sufficiently in advance of the canvassing to permit Plaintiff and the court to quickly determine the full extent of the problems identified and their impacts on electors due to the numerous documented failures in the Defendants' administration of the election.
- 5. Plaintiff lacks an equally plain, speedy and adequate remedy at law, and special action relief is necessary to ensure that the Defendants discharge the nondiscretionary duties imposed upon them by Arizona law.

JURISDICTION

- 6. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article 6, § 14 of the Arizona Constitution, A.R.S. §§ 12-2021, 39-121.02, and Arizona Rule of Special Action Procedure 4.
- 7. Venue lies in Maricopa County pursuant to Arizona Rule of Special Action Procedure 4(b) and pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-401(16) because the Defendants hold office in that county.

5 6

7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

PARTIES

- 8. Plaintiff Kari Lake for Arizona is an Arizona political committee that is registered with the Arizona Secretary of State. Kari Lake for Arizona is the authorized campaign committee of Kari Lake, a candidate for Governor of Arizona in the November 8, 2022 general election.
- 9. Defendant Stephen Richer is the Recorder of Maricopa County and is named in this action in his official capacity only. Defendant Richer is the officer in charge of elections in Maricopa County. The County Recorder is an "officer" within the meaning of A.R.S. § 39-121.01(A)(1). Upon information and belief, the County Recorder has custody, and is responsible for the preservation, maintenance and care, of some or all the public records requested by Plaintiff.
- Defendant Rey Valenzuela is the Director of Elections for Election Services 10. and Early Voting in Maricopa County, and is named in this action in his official capacity only. Director Valenzuela is an "officer" within the meaning of A.R.S. § 39-121.01(A)(1). Upon information and belief, Director Valenzuela has custody, and is responsible for the preservation, maintenance and care, of some or all the public records requested by Plaintiff.
- Defendant Scott Jarrett is the Director of Elections for Election Day and 11. Emergency Voting in Maricopa County, and is named in this action in his official capacity only. Director Jarrett is an "officer" within the meaning of A.R.S. § 39-121.01(A)(1). Upon information and belief, Director Jarrett has custody, and is responsible for the preservation, maintenance and care, of some or all the public records requested by Plaintiff.
- 12. Maricopa County is a political subdivision of the State of Arizona. Maricopa County is charged by law with various duties under the PRA and charge by law with conducting elections within its jurisdictional boundaries, including through its Board of Supervisors, appointing inspectors, marshals and judges to staff polling places on Election Day, and appointing certain Central Counting Boards. See A.R.S. §§ 11-251(3), 16-531; EPM at pp. 196–212. The Maricopa County Board of Supervisors is a "public body" within the meaning of A.R.S. § 39-121.01(A)(2). The Maricopa County Board of Supervisors has

1 custody, and is responsible for the preservation, maintenance and care, of some or all the public records requested by Plaintiff, and its members are likewise sued here in their official 2 3 capacities. 4 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS 5 The Printer/Tabulator Problem 6 13. Maricopa County had 223 polling centers open on Election Day. 7 14. Of these 223 polling centers, upon information and belief, at least 118 polling 8 centers, or 53%, had experienced problems when the County's ballot printers produced ballots that 9 were not printed darkly enough for the County's vote tabulation machines to read the ballots. (See 10 Decl. Sonnenklar Ex. e, ¶ 13; Decl. Patrick Ex. 4, ¶ 8-9). 11 The Defendants failed to detect, prevent or timely remedy this problem during setup 15. 12 and testing of their polling stations. Although poll workers tested the printers, according to 13 observers they did not test whether the tabulators could read the test print. (See Decl. Alford Ex. 5, 14 $\P 5$). Based upon information and belief, the following polling centers appear to have had 15 16. 16 a printer/tabulator problem: Buckeye City Hall 17 18 Altrain Medical and Dental Assisting Academy 19 Biltmore Fashion Park c. 20 Buckeye Fire Station 704 d. 21 Carefree Town Council Center 22 Cave Creek Town Hall f. 23 Dayspring United Methodist Church 24 Deer Valley Unified School District Office h. 25 i. **Envision Community Center** 26 Estrella Mountain Community College į.

27

Fountain Hills Community Center

1	l. Glendale Community College/Student Union
2	m. Mountain Park Health Center
3	n. Outlets at Anthem
4	o. Radiant Church Sun City
5	p. San Tan Village
6	q. Shadow Rock Congregational Church
7	r. Union Elementary School/District Office
8	s. Wickenburg Community Center
9	t. Youngtown Clubhouse
10	u. Asante Library
11	v. Black Mountain Baptist Church w. Burton Barr Library
12	w. Burton Barr Library
13	x. Camelback Christian Church
14	y. Chandler Bible Church
15	z. Church of Jesus Christ of LDS/Mesa Maricopa Stake
16	aa. Compass Church
17	bb. Copper Hills Church/Westwing
18	cc. Desert Christian Fellowship
19	dd. Eldorado Park Community Center
20	ee. Estrella Mtn School/Goodyear
21	ff. First United Methodist Church of Gilbert
22	gg. GCC North Chinle Bldg
23	hh. Glendale Christian Church
24	ii. Grace in the Desert Adventist Church
25	jj. Happy Trails Resort
26	kk. Islamic Center of the East Valley
27	ll. Laveen Elementary School District Office
28	mm. Lifeway Church
	6

1	nn. Light and Life Church
2	oo. Litchfield Park First Baptist Ch
3	pp. Love of Christ Lutheran Chr
4	qq. Marley Park
5	rr. Memorial Presbyterian Church
6	ss. Mesa Baptist Church
7	tt. Mesquite Groves Aquatic Center
8	uu. North Phoenix Baptist Church PV Campus
9	vv. North Scottsdale United Methodist Church
10	ww. Nozomi Aquatic Center
11	xx. Oasis Community Church
12	yy. Salt River Pima Community Center
13	zz. Scottsdale Elks Lodge PBOE #2148
14	aaa. Shepherd of the Hills United Church of Christ
15	bbb. Sheriffs Posse of Sun City West
16	ccc. St. Margaret's Catholic Church
17	ddd. Standing Stones Community Church
18	eee. Tumbleweed Recreation Center
19	fff. Velda Rose United Methodist Church
20	ggg. Victory Lutheran Church
21	hhh. Worship & Word Church
22	iii. Academies at South Mountain
23	jjj. Aire Libre School
24	kkk. Ascension Lutheran Church
25	Ill. Cactus High School
26	mmm.Calvary Free Lutheran Ch
27	nnn. Central Christian Church/Mesa
28	ooo. Chandler Nature Center

1	ppp. Charles W Harris School
2	qqq. Church of Jesus Christ of LDS Buckeye
3	rrr. Church of Jesus Christ of LDS Jomax
4	sss. Church of Jesus Christ of LDS Southern
5	ttt. Church of Jesus Christ of LDS Union Hills
6	uuu. Community of Christ
7	vvv. Community of Christ Church
8	www. Cooper Canyon School
9	xxx. Cottonwood Country Club
10	yyy. David Crockett School
11	zzz. Deer Valley Airport
12	zzz. Deer Valley Airport aaaa. Desert Hills Community Church bbbb. Dist 6 Community Service Center
13	bbbb. Dist 6 Community Service Center
14	cccc. Dove of the Desert Untd Methodist Chr
15	dddd. Dream City Church Phoenix Campus
16	eeee. Dream City Church Scottsdale Campus
17	ffff. Escalante Community Center/Tempe
18	gggg. Fstrella Foothills High School #201
19	hhhh. Faith Baptist Church
20	iiii. Gateway Fellowship Chr/Sbc
21	jjjj. Gilbert Freestone Frec Center
22	kkkk. Holiday Park School
23	IIII. Holy Trinity Greek Orthodox Cathedral
24	mmmm. Islamic Center – Scottsdale
25	nnnn. Journey Church
26	0000. Lakes Rec Ctr @ Westbrook Village
27	pppp. Laveen Baptist Church
28	qqqq. Madison Baptist Church
	8

1	rrrr. Messinger Mortuary
2	ssss. Mountain View Park Comm Ctr
3	tttt. Mountain View School
4	uuuu. Palm Lane School
5	vvvv. Peace Lutheran Church
6	wwww. Queen Creek Library
7	xxxx. SE Regional Library/Gilbert
8	yyyy. Sevilla Elementary School
9	zzzz. Shadow Mountain High School
10	aaaaa. Skyway Church – West Valley
11	bbbbb. St. Nikolas Serbian Orthodox Church
12	cccc. Sun lakes United Methodist Charch
13	ddddd. Sunland Village East
14	eeeee. Tomahawk School
15	fffff. Trilogy @ Power Ranch
16	ggggg. Trinity Bible Church of Sun City West
17	hhhhh. University Presbyterian Church
18	iiiii. Valley Baptist Chr/Tonopah
19	jjjjj. Valor Christian Center
20	kkkk. Venue 8600
21	lllll. Via Linda (Scottsdale) Senior Center
22	mmmmm. Vineyard Church of North Phoenix
23	nnnnn. Youngker High School #201
24	17. Because of the printer/tabulator problems, the polling locations were chaotic, voters
25	were frustrated, and voters had to endure long lines. (See Decl. Sonnenklar Ex. 3, ¶ 8; Decl. Marple
26	Ex. 6, ¶ 7; Decl. Prince Ex. 7, ¶ 6-7; Decl. O'Toole Ex. 8, ¶ 6-7; Decl. Buser Ex. 9, ¶ 9; Decl.
27	Lasham Ex. 10, ¶ 7; Decl. Tatom Ex. 11, ¶ 6; Decl. Liles Ex. 12, ¶ 7; Decl. Rathbun Ex. 13, ¶ 7;
28	Decl. Woodburn Ex. 14, ¶ 7; Decl. Raboin Ex. *15, ¶ 5; Decl. Mettler Ex. 16, ¶ 5; and Decl. Payne

13

14

12

15 16

> 17 18

19

21

22

20

23

25

24

26 27 28

Ex. 17, ¶ 110. The County regularly updates on Election Day, its online listing of polling places, including wait times. Those public records would provide additional information with regard to the lines and wait times.

- 18. Many poll workers attempted to call the County hotline but were unable to timely reach a tech person to fix the printer/tabulators. (See Decl. Sonnenklar Ex. 3, ¶ 27; Decl. Alford Ex. 5, ¶ 10; Decl. Liles Ex. 12, ¶ 7; and Decl. Payne Ex. 17, ¶ 8).
- 19. Even when technical support was reached, poll workers were told that they did not know how to fix the problem. (See Decl. Woodburn Ex. 14, \P 7).
- 20. Some poll workers ended up encouraging voters to go to different polling centers to vote. (See Decl. Lasham Ex. 10, ¶ 7; and Decl. Damon Ex. 18, ¶ 17).
- Many voters left without voting. (See Decl. Dasham Ex. 10, ¶ 7; Decl. Liles Ex. 12, 21. \P 7; Decl. Mettler Ex. 16, \P 9; Decl. Payne Ex. 17, \P 11, and Decl. Weiman Ex. 19, \P 10).
- 22. When a tabulator was unable to read a ballot, the voter was given the option to spoil the ballot and vote again or they could put the ballot in "door #3." (See Decl. Rathbun Ex. 13, ¶ 7; Decl. Woodburn Ex. 14, ¶ 7; and Decl. Lindberg Ex. 20, ¶ 7).
- 23. Based upon information and belief, "door #3" was the bin that voters could place their ballots into and these ballots would be tabulated at Maricopa County Tabulation and Election Center ("MCTEC").
- 24. Things were so chaotic that poll workers were unable to watch the voters feed their ballots through the tabulator. (See Decl. Liles Ex. 12, ¶ 7). Poll workers were pulled in so many different directions that one poll worker did not have the time to mark "spoiled" on original ballots. (See Decl. Sonnenklar Ex. 3, \P 17).
- 25. As a result of the printer/tabulator problem, many voters were in fear of their vote not being counted. (See Decl. Liles Ex. 12, ¶ 7).
- This problem with the printer/tabulator never needed to occur because as early as 26. November 2, 2022, a manager at MCTEC discovered that some of the printers were printing faded timing marks and the tabulators were not able to read those ballots. (See Decl. Patrick Ex. 4, ¶ 8-9).

REFERENCE BEROWN DE MOCRACYDOCKET, COM

27. Many poll observers saw poll workers mix counted and uncounted ballots in the same container at the end of the night. (See Decl. Mettler Ex. 16, \P 10; Decl. Lindberg Ex. 20, \P 7; and Decl. Blankenship Ex. 21, \P 8).

- 28. According to the 2019 Elections Procedures Manual which governs this election, "the election board must conduct an audit to ensure that the number of voters who signed in on the signature roster or e-pollbook matches the number of ballots cast, including regular and provisional ballots and, if the accessible voting equipment independently tabulates votes, any votes cast on the accessible voting equipment, A.R.S. § 16-602(A)". (Relevant Pages are attached as Exhibit 22, p. 192).
- 29. However, when asked on Election Night, many poll workers were unable to provide the observers with the number of voters who signed in on the signature roster or e-pollbook and therefore could not determine if those numbers matched the numbers of ballots cast. (See Decl. Marple Ex. 6, \P 7; Decl. Prince Ex. 7, \P 9; Decl. O'Toole Ex. 8, \P 8; Decl. Buser Ex. 9, \P 7; Decl. Woodburn Ex. 14, \P 7; Decl. Mettler Ex. 16, \P 11; and Decl. Blankenship Ex. 21, \P 9).
- 30. The canvass shall occur no "more than twenty days following the election," *unless* "the returns from any polling place in the election district where the polls were opened and an election held are found to be missing." A.R.S. § 16-642(A). In that case, "the canvass shall be postponed from day to day until all the returns are received or until six postponements have been had." A.R.S. § 16-642(C).
- 31. In addition, there are numerous reports of voters who left the voting center without voting because the tabulators continued to reject the voters' ballots. (*Id.* \P 22). The returns for those voters are deemed "missing."
- 32. Defendants violated A.R.S. § 16-602(A) and Defendants have further compounded this problem by refusing to respond to Plaintiff's Public Records Request (*see infra*).
- 33. In addition, based upon information and belief, Palm Ridge Recreational Center had over two bags of ballots that had been dropped off in Door #3 after the tabulators failed to count

their ballots. However, the County claims that there were only eighteen Door #3 ballots attributable to this polling center.

34. Furthermore, based upon information and belief, Plaintiff has been informed that certain ballots are not being counted at MCTEC because the blue ink used by the voter to mark their preference was too light for the tabulators.

Public Records Requests

- 35. The first request was submitted on November 15, 2022 (the "<u>First Records</u> Request") for the following public records:
 - a. "All public records related to voters who checked in to a vote center on Election Day in the sitebook, and who also submitted a mail ballot on Election Day, where the mail ballot was not counted, including names and all available contact information for these electors."
 - b. "All public records related to voters casting drop-offs ballots that were rejected due to voter submitting another ballot that day including names and all available contact information for these electors."
 - c. "All public records related to the number of voters who tried to check in at two different voting centers on Election Day and were (a) permitted to cast a provisional ballot at the second site or (b) did not cast a ballot at the second site."
 - d. "All public records related to the adjudication rates by legislative district, because the write-in candidates for legislative district 22, Arizona Senate."
 - e. "All public records related to the total number and names of any voter who checked into a vote center that had any print malfunction of an on demand printer such that ballots were placed into door 3."
 - f. "All public records to the total number of ballots in every category in any vote center that had any print malfunction of an on demand printer such that ballots were placed in door 3."

state law.

. . . .

26

27

cast. It's meant to provide a record of the votes counted and those that were not

legally cast. There will be no delays or games; we will canvass in accordance with

- 48. Although they do not specify when they will respond the First and Second Records Requests, Maricopa County is willing to respond to the Arizona Attorney General prior to the canvassing of the election. Defendants have been unwilling to produce responses to Plaintiff even though the Plaintiff is entitled to the information as a matter of law. Defendants' failure to conduct this election in a proper manner and refusal to produce records in response to a lawful request has caused voters to be concerned that about the validity of the election results.
- 49. Plaintiff will be prejudiced by Defendants refusal to produce relevant public records in advance of canvassing. These public records are vital to the integrity of the election process and necessary to show, ahead of canvassing, that every legal ballot was properly counted.

COUNT I

Special Action Relief to Compel Prompt Production of Public Records (A.R.S. § 39-121, et seq.)

- 50. Plaintiff incorporates by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set forth herein.
- 51. The Defendants individually and collectively are required by law to preserve and maintain all records "reasonably necessary or appropriate to maintain an accurate knowledge of their official activities and of any of their activities that are supported by monies from this state or any political subdivision of this state." A.R.S. § 39-121.01(B).
- 52. The Defendants are required by law to produce or make available such public records to "any person" upon request. *See* A.R.S. § 39-121.
- 53. A public records request need not be presented in any particular format or utilize any specific verbiage. See A.R.S. § 39-121.01(D)(1).
- 54. The PRA requires "the prompt and actual production of the documents" sought by a public records request. *Phoenix New Times, L.L.C. v. Arpaio*, 217 Ariz. 533, 538, ¶ 12 (App. 2008).
- 55. An officer or public body acts "promptly" when the officer or body is "quick to act" or "produc[es] the requested records 'without delay." *Am. Civil Liberties Union v. Ariz. Dept. of Child Safety*, 240 Ariz. 142, 152, ¶ 32 (App. 2016).

- 56. The officer or public body from whom public records are requested has the burden of proving that the response was "prompt given the circumstances surrounding each request." *Phoenix New Times*, 217 Ariz. at 538–39, ¶ 15.
- 57. Undue delay in the fulfillment of a public records request constitutes a denial of access to the requested records. *See Phoenix New Times*, 217 Ariz. at 547, ¶ 51.
- 58. A person who has been denied access to requested public records "may appeal the denial through a special action in the superior court." A.R.S. § 39-121.02(A).
- 59. A court in a special action proceeding may compel a public officer "to perform a duty required by law as to which he has no discretion." Ariz. R. Proc. Special Actions ("RPSA") 3(a); see also A.R.S. § 12-2021.
- 60. All the documents sought by the First Records Request and the Second Records Request are "public records" subject to mandatory and prompt disclosure under the PRA because they have a "substantial nexus" to the Defendants' official duties and activities in connection with the conduct and administration of elections in Maricopa County. See Griffis v. Pinal County, 215 Ariz. 1, 4, ¶ 10 (2007).
- 61. Upon information and belief, there are public records in the Defendants' custody that are responsive to the First Records Request and/or the Second Records Request.
- 62. The Defendants have a nondiscretionary statutory duty to promptly produce or make available to Plaintiff all public records sought in the First Records Request and the Second Records Request.
- 63. The Defendants have not produced or made available to Plaintiff the public records in response to either the First Records Request or the Second Records Request.
- 64. The Defendants' failure to promptly produce the requested documents constitutes an effective denial of access to public records and prevents Plaintiff from monitoring, and challenging, election activity in the most populous county of the state.
- 65. Plaintiff is accordingly entitled to a writ of mandamus or other relief compelling the prompt production of the requested public records.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff demands relief in the following forms:

- a. A writ of mandamus or other order requiring the Defendants to immediately produce or make available to Plaintiff all public records requested in the First Records Request and/or the Second Records Request.
- b. Such other relief as the Court deems necessary, equitable, proper, and just.

DATED this 23rd day of November 2022.

By: /s/ Timothy A. La Sota

Timothy A. La Sota, SBN 020539 TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC

2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305

Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: (602) 515-2649

Email: tim@timlasota.com

Attorney for Plaintiff Kari Lake for Arizona

Verification I, Caroline Wren, depose and say: I have read the foregoing Verified Special Action Complaint and know the contents thereof by personal knowledge. I know the allegations of the Verified Special Action Complaint to be true, except the matters therein on information and belief, which I believe to be true. Signed under penalty of perjury on this 23rd day of November 2022. Caroline Wren