

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

**Case No. 4:23-cv-00111-AW-MAF**

VOTE.ORG; et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CORD BYRD, in his official capacity  
as Secretary of State of Florida; et al.,

Defendants.

---

**FIFTY-FOUR FLORIDA COUNTY SUPERVISORS OF ELECTIONS’  
ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS’ AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Defendants KIM BARTON, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Alachua County; CHRISTOPHER MILTON, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Baker County; MARK ANDERSEN, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Bay County; AMANDA SEYFANG, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Bradford County; TIM BOBANIC, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Brevard County; JOE SCOTT, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Broward County; SHARON CHASON, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Calhoun County; MAUREEN “MO” BAIRD, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Citrus County; CHRIS H. CHAMBLESS, in his official capacity as Supervisor of

Elections for Clay County; TOMI STINSON BROWN, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Columbia County; MARK F. NEGLEY, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for DeSoto County; STARLET CANNON, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Dixie County; MIKE HOGAN, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Duval County; DAVID H. STAFFORD, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Escambia County; KAITI LENHART, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Flagler County; HEATHER RILEY, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Franklin County; SHIRLEY G. KNIGHT, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Gadsden County; CONNIE SANCHEZ, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Gilchrist County; ALETRIS FARNAM, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Glades County; JOHN HANLON, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Gulf County; LAURA HUTTO, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Hamilton County; DIANE SMITH, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Hardee County; BRENDA HOOTS, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Hendry County; SHIRLEY ANDERSON, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Hernando County; KAREN HEALY, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Highlands County; THERISA MEADOWS, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Holmes County; CAROL A.

DUNAWAY, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Jackson County; MICHELLE MILLIGAN, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Jefferson County; TRAVIS HART, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Lafayette County; MARK S. EARLEY, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Leon County; TAMMY JONES, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Levy County; GRANT CONYERS, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Liberty County; HEATH DRIGGERS, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Madison County; VICKI DAVIS, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Martin County; JANET H. ADKINS, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Nassau County; PAUL A. LUX, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Okaloosa County; MELISSA ARNOLD, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Okeechobee County; BILL COWLES, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Orange County; MARY JANE ARRINGTON, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Osceola County; WENDY SARTORY LINK, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Palm Beach County; JULIE MARCUS, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Pinellas County; LORI EDWARDS, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Polk County; CHARLES OVERTURF, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Putnam County; TAPPIE A. VILLANE, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Santa

Rosa County; VICKY OAKES, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for St. Johns County; GERTRUDE WALKER, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for St. Lucie County; WILLIAM KEEN, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Sumter County; JENNIFER MUSGROVE KINSEY, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Suwannee County; DANA SOUTHERLAND, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Taylor County; DEBORAH K. OSBORNE, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Union County; LISA LEWIS, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Volusia County; JOSEPH MORGAN, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Wakulla County; RYAN MESSER, in his official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Walton County; and CAROL F. RUDD, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Washington County; (collectively, the “54 Supervisors”), pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8, hereby answer Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, D.E. 101 (“Amended Complaint”), as follows:

**NATURE OF THE CASE**

1. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 1 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations and they are therefore denied.

2. Denied as framed.

3. As to the statutes or case law cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 3 of the Amended Complaint, the cited statutes and the case law speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations and they are therefore denied.

4. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 4 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations and they are therefore denied.

5. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

6. The 54 Supervisors admit that Plaintiffs have asserted claims under the cited statutes. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 6 and they are therefore denied.

7. The 54 Supervisors admit Paragraph 7 for jurisdictional purposes only and denied for all others.

8. The 54 Supervisors admit Paragraph 8 for jurisdictional purposes only and denied for all others.

9. The first sentence is admitted. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations contained within the second sentence and they are therefore denied.

10. As to all statutes or rules cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 10 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes and rules speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 10 and they are therefore denied.

**PARTIES**

11. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 11 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

12. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 12 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

13. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

14. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

15. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

16. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

17. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 17 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

18. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 18 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

19. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 19 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

20. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 20 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

21. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 21 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

22. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 22 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

23. As to the statute cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 23 of the Amended Complaint, the statute speaks for itself and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 23 and they are therefore denied.

24. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 24 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 24 and they are therefore denied.

25. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 25 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

26. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 26 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

27. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 27 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

28. The first sentence is denied as to the 54 Supervisors and without knowledge for any other defendants. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to all other allegations in Paragraph 28 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

29. Admitted that Defendant Cord Byrd is the Secretary of State of Florida. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 29 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 29 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

30. The 54 Supervisors admit that Florida Supervisors of Elections are each responsible for election administration in their respective individual counties, but deny that they are the sole election administrators for each county because the Florida Division of Elections of the Department of State also has involvement in the administration of elections statewide. The 54 Supervisors also admit that Plaintiffs



have identified all supervisors of elections in each of Florida's 67 counties. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

**STATEMENT OF FACTS AND LAW**

31. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 31 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

32. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 32 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 32 and they are therefore denied.

33. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 33 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 33 and they are therefore denied.

34. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 34 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 34 and they are therefore denied.

35. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 35 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

36. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 36 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 36 and they are therefore denied.

37. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 37 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 37 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

38. As to any statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 38 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 38 and they are therefore denied.

39. As to the statutes or websites cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 39 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes and websites speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 39 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

40. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 40 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

41. As to any statutes or advisory opinions cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 41 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes and advisory opinions speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 41 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

42. As to the websites cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 42 of the Amended Complaint, those websites speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 42 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

43. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 43 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 43 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

**COUNT 1**

44. The 54 Supervisors re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs 1-43 as though fully set forth herein.

45. As to the statute cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 45 of the Amended Complaint, the statute speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

46. As to the statute cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 46 of the Amended Complaint, the statute speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

47. As to the case law cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 47 of the Amended Complaint, the case law speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

48. As to the case law cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 48 of the Amended Complaint, the case law speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

49. The 54 Supervisors deny the allegations against them in the first sentence of Paragraph 49. As to the caselaw cited, summarized, or described in the remainder of Paragraph 49 of the Amended Complaint, the caselaw speaks for itself and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

50. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 50 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

51. As to the statutes cited, summarized, or described in Paragraph 51 of the Amended Complaint, those statutes speak for themselves and thus no answer is required. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to any other allegations contained in Paragraph 51 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

52. The 54 Supervisors are without knowledge as to the allegations in Paragraph 52 of the Amended Complaint and they are therefore denied.

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

The 54 Supervisors do not take any position regarding the substance of Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and have agreed with counsel for Plaintiffs that the 54 Supervisors shall have limited participation in this action and were named as defendants by Plaintiffs solely to ensure that any relief granted has statewide application. The 54 Supervisors assert as their only affirmative defense that Plaintiffs have waived and are therefore not entitled to recover attorneys' fees, expenses, and costs against the 54 Supervisors.

Should it become necessary to actively defend this action notwithstanding the agreement with counsel for Plaintiffs, whether by Court order or otherwise, the 54

Supervisors and counsel for Plaintiffs have agreed that the 54 Supervisors may amend this answer and assert affirmative defenses.

[REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK -  
SIGNATURES ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE]

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

Date: June 26, 2023

Andrew J. Meyers  
Broward County Attorney  
115 South Andrews Avenue  
Suite 423  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301  
Telephone: (954) 357-7600

By: /s/ Nathaniel A. Klitsberg  
Nathaniel A. Klitsberg  
Fla. Bar No. 307520  
nklitsberg@broward.org  
Joseph K. Jarone  
Fla. Bar No. 117768  
jkjarone@broward.org  
Devona A. Reynolds  
Fla. Bar No. 704409  
dreynoldsperez@broward.org  
*Counsel for Defendant Joe Scott,  
Broward County Supervisor of  
Elections*

By: /s/ Susan Erdelyi  
Susan Erdelyi  
Florida Bar No. 648965  
Julianna Favale  
Florida Bar No. 1032046  
Marks Gray, P.A.  
1200 Riverplace Blvd., Suite 800  
Jacksonville, FL 32207  
Telephone: 904-398-0900  
sse@marksgray.com  
jfavale@marksgray.com  
jmcduffie@marksgray.com  
*Counsel for Defendants Christopher  
Milton, Supervisor of Elections for  
Baker County; Mark Andersen,  
Supervisor of Elections for Bay County;  
Amanda Seyfang, Supervisor of*

Respectfully submitted,

*Elections for Bradford County; Sharon  
Chason, Supervisor of Elections for  
Calhoun County; Tomi Stinson Brown,  
Supervisor of Elections for Columbia  
County; Starlet Cannon, Supervisor of  
Elections for Dixie County; Heather  
Riley, Supervisor of Elections for  
Franklin County; Shirley G. Knight,  
Supervisor of Elections for Gadsden  
County; John Hanlon, Supervisor of  
Elections for Gulf County; Laura  
Hutto, Supervisor of Elections for  
Hamilton County; Carol A. Dunaway,  
Supervisor of Elections for Jackson  
County; Travis Hart, Supervisor of  
Elections for Lafayette County; Grant  
Conyers, Supervisor of Elections for  
Liberty County; Janet H. Adkins,  
Supervisor of Elections for Nassau  
County; Charles Overturf, Supervisor  
of Elections for Putnam County; Tappie  
A. Villane, Supervisor of Elections for  
Santa Rosa County; Vicky Oakes  
Supervisor of Elections for St. Johns  
County; William Keen, Supervisor of  
Elections for Sumter County; Jennifer  
Musgrove Kinsey, Supervisor of  
Elections for Suwannee County; Dana  
Southerland, Supervisor of Elections  
for Taylor County; Deborah K.  
Osborne, Supervisor of Elections for  
Union County; Joseph Morgan  
Supervisor of Elections for Wakulla  
County; Ryan Messer, Supervisor of  
Elections for Walton County; and Carol  
F. Rudd, Supervisor of Elections for  
Washington County*

By: /s/ Robert C. Swain  
Robert C. Swain  
Florida Bar No. 366961  
Diana M. Johnson  
Florida Bar No. 69160  
Alachua County Attorney's Office  
12 SE First St.  
Gainesville, FL 32602  
Telephone: 352-374-5218  
bswain@alachuacounty.us  
dmjohnson@alachuacounty.us  
cao@alachuacounty.us  
*Counsel for Defendant Kim A. Barton,  
Supervisor of Elections for Alachua  
County*

By: /s/ Frank M. Mari  
Frank M. Mari  
Florida Bar No. 93243  
Roper P.A.  
2707 E. Jefferson St.  
Orlando, FL 32803  
Telephone: 407-897-5150  
fmari@roperpa.com  
ihaines@roperpa.com  
*Counsel for Defendants Tim Bobanic,  
Supervisor of Elections for Brevard  
County; Mark F. Negley, Supervisor of  
Elections for DeSoto County; Kaiti  
Lenhart, Supervisor of Elections for  
Flagler County; Connie Sanchez,  
Supervisor of Elections for Gilchrist  
County; Karen Healy, Supervisor of  
Elections for Highlands County;  
Michelle Milligan, Supervisor of  
Elections for Jefferson County; and  
Heath Driggers, Supervisor of  
Elections for Madison County*

By: /s/ Dale Scott  
Dale Scott  
Florida Bar No. 568821  
Roper, P.A.  
2707 E. Jefferson St.  
Orlando, FL 32803  
Telephone: 407-897-5150  
dscott@roperpa.com  
ehemphill@roperpa.com  
*Counsel for Defendant Maureen Baird  
Supervisor of Elections for Citrus  
County*

By: /s/ Ronald A. Labasky  
Ronald A. Labasky  
Florida Bar No. 206326  
Brewton Plante P.A.  
P.O. Box 350  
Tallahassee, FL 32302  
Telephone: 850-566-2396  
rlabasky@bplawfirm.net  
fsase@bplawfirm.net  
*Counsel for Defendants Chris H.  
Chambless, Supervisor of Elections for  
Clay County; Vicki Davis, Supervisor of  
Elections for Martin County; Mary  
Jane Arrington, Supervisor of Elections  
For Osceola County; Lori Edwards,  
Supervisor of Elections for Polk  
County; and Gertrude Walker,  
Supervisor of Elections for St. Lucie  
County*



By: /s/ John T. LaVia III  
John T. LaVia, III  
Florida Bar No. 853666  
Gardner, Bist, Bowden, Dee  
LaVia, Wright, Perry, & Harper, P.A.  
1300 Thomaswood Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Telephone: 850-385-0070  
jlavia@gbwlegal.com  
faith@gbwlegal.com  
*Counsel for Defendants Chris H. Chambliss, Supervisor of Elections for Clay County; Vicki Davis, Supervisor of Elections for Martin County; Mary Jane Arrington, Supervisor of Elections For Osceola County; Lori Edwards, Supervisor of Elections for Polk County; and Gertrude Walker, Supervisor of Elections for St. Lucie County*

By: /s/ Craig D. Feiser  
Craig D. Feiser  
Florida Bar No. 164593  
117 W. Duval Street, Suite 480  
Jacksonville, FL 32202  
Telephone: 904-255-5100  
cfeiser@coj.net  
bosburn@coj.net  
*Counsel for Defendant Mike Hogan, Supervisor of Elections for Duval County*

By: /s/ Christi Hankins  
Christi Hankins  
Florida Bar No. 483321  
221 Palafox Place, Suite 430  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
Telephone: 850-595-4970  
cjhankins@myescambia.com  
cmwhite@myescambia.com  
*Counsel for Defendant David H. Stafford, Supervisor of Elections for Escambia County*

By: /s/ Geraldo Olivo  
Geraldo Olivo  
Florida Bar No. 60905  
Henderson, Franklin,  
Starnes & Holt, P.A.  
P.O. Box 280  
Fort. Myers, Florida 33902  
Telephone: 239-344-1168  
geraldolivo@henlaw.com  
katherine.pagano@henlaw.com  
*Counsel for Defendants Aletris Farnam, Supervisor of Elections for Glades County; Diane Smith, Supervisor of Elections for Hardee County; Brenda Hoots, Supervisor of Elections for Hendry County; Therisa Meadows, Supervisor of Elections for Holmes County; Tammy Jones, Supervisor of Elections for Levy County; and Melissa Arnold, Supervisor of Elections for Okeechobee County*

By: /s/ Jon A. Jouben

Jon A. Jouben  
Florida Bar No. 149561  
Kyle J. Benda  
Florida Bar No. 113525  
Hernando County  
20 N. Main Street, Suite 462  
Brooksville, FL 34601-2850  
Telephone: 351-754-4122  
jjouben@co.hernando.fl.us  
kbenda@co.hernando.fl.us  
cao@co.hernando.fl.us  
phare@co.hernando.fl.us  
*Counsel for Defendant Shirley  
Anderson, Supervisor of Elections for  
Hernando County*

By: /s/ Mark Herron

Mark Herron  
Florida Bar No. 199737  
Messer Caparello, P.A.  
2618 Centennial Place  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Telephone: 850-222-0720  
mherron@lawfla.com  
clowell@lawfla.com  
statecourtpleadings@lawfla.com  
*Counsel for Defendant Mark S. Earley,  
Supervisor of Elections for Leon  
County*

By: /s/ Gregory T. Stewart

Gregory T. Stewart  
Florida Bar No. 203718  
Matthew R. Shaud  
Florida Bar No. 122252  
Nabors, Giblin &  
Nickerson, P.A.  
1500 Mahan Drive, Suite 200  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Telephone: 850-224-4070  
gstewart@ngnlaw.com  
gstewart@ngn-tally.com  
mshaud@ngnlaw.com  
mshaud@ngn-tally.com  
legal-admin@ngnlaw.com *Counsel for  
Defendant Paul A. Lux, Supervisor of  
Elections for Okaloosa County*

By: /s/ Nicholas Shannin

Nicholas Shannin  
Florida Bar No. 9570  
Shannin Law Firm  
214 S. Lucerne Circle East  
Orlando, FL 32801  
Telephone: 407-985-2222  
nshannin@shanninlaw.com  
*Counsel for Defendant Bill Cowles,  
Supervisor of Elections for Orange  
County*

By: /s/ David K. Markarian  
David K. Markarian  
Florida Bar No. 480691  
Jessica R. Glickman  
Florida Bar No. 118586  
The Markarian Group  
2925 PGA Blvd., Suite 204  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410  
Telephone: 561-626-4700  
dave@forbusinessandlife.com  
jessica@forbusinessandlife.com  
*Counsel For Defendant Wendy Sartory  
Link, Supervisor of Elections for Palm  
Beach County*

By: /s/ W. Kevin Bledsoe  
W. Kevin Bledsoe  
Florida Bar No. 29769  
123 W. Indiana Avenue  
Deland, FL 32720  
Telephone: 386-736-5950  
kbledsoe@volusia.org  
sjonas@volusia.org  
mefird@volusia.org  
*Counsel For Defendant Lisa Lewis,  
Supervisor of Elections for Volusia  
County*

By: /s/ Kelly L. Vicari  
Kelly L. Vicari  
Florida Bar No. 88704  
Pinellas County Attorney's Office  
315 Court Street, 6th Floor  
Clearwater, FL 33756  
Telephone: 727-464-3354  
kvicari@pinellascounty.org  
eservice@pinellas.gov  
*Counsel For Defendant Julie Marcus,  
capacity as Supervisor of Elections for  
Pinellas County*

### **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing complies with the size, font, and formatting requirements of Local Rule 5.1(C).

By: /s/ Nathaniel A. Klitsberg  
Nathaniel A. Klitsberg