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## INTRODUCTION

Like most States, Tennessee disenfranchises convicted felons. But Tennessee also provides disenfranchised felons with an avenue to regain their voting rights once they serve their sentence and satisfy certain financial obligations. Re-enfranchisement exists as a matter of legislative grace-not constitutional imperative. And until recently, the procedures for reenfranchisement "differ[ed] depending on the year in which the person was convicted." HB 1722, Summary (last visited August 2, 2023), https://wapp.capitol.tn.gov/apps/BillInfo/Default.aspx? BillNumber $=\mathrm{HB} 1722 \& \mathrm{GA}=104$.

That changed in 2006 when the General Assembly enacted degislative changes to the reenfranchisement process. In that legislation, the General Asscimbly vested specific officers with responsibility for issuing certificate-of-restoration forms which disenfranchised felons need to regain the right to vote. Tenn. Code §40-29-203(a) Once a disenfranchised felon has a restoration certificate, he or she must submit it to andministrative official who then transmits it to the Coordinator of Elections. Id. §40-29.293(d). The Coordinator reviews the certificate to verify that it was issued in compliance with Tennessee law. Id.

Less than two months ago, the Tennessee Supreme Court issued its decision in Falls v. Goins, --- S.W.3d ----, 2023 WL 4243961 (Tenn. June 29, 2023). The Court clarified that to regain the right to vote in Tennessee, convicted felons must comply with both an exception to the prohibition on voting for individuals with felony convictions pursuant to Tenn Code Ann. § 2-19143 and the additional requirements set forth in section Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-29-202. Id. at *68. In doing so, the Tennessee Supreme Court found that voting rights restoration statutes created a "two-step statutory process that is necessary to complete in its entirety before the right of suffrage is restored." Id. at *7. In other words, a individuals may only restore their right to vote by (1) obtaining a pardon or restoration of their full rights of citizenship, Tenn. Code Ann. § 2-19-143,
and (2) obtaining a certificate of restoration, Tenn. Code Ann. § § 40-29-201 through -205. See Falls, 2023 WL 4243961, at *7.

The plaintiffs in this case attack the constitutionality of the re-enfranchisement regime. Although they have not established their eligibility to receive restoration certificates, and in some cases they have not even applied for restoration certificates, they nevertheless claim a liberty interest in those certificates that is protected by the Due Process Clause. They also claim that the re-enfranchisement framework violates the Equal Protection Clause and that Tennessee's voter registration practices violate the Constitution and federal statutes.

None of those claims can survive summary judgment. To begin, the plaintiffs lack standing to bring any of the six causes of action alleged in the Amended Complaint. Neither the individual plaintiffs nor the organizational plaintiff have been injured in any legally cognizable way. Plaintiffs' standing deficiencies are especially problematic because they seek the forward-looking remedy of an injunction. Based on the evidence in the record, the plaintiffs have not and cannot demonstrate that they satisfy the injury in-fact requirement created by Article III.

On merits, the plaintiffs' c'aims fare no better. Count One asserts that Tennessee has deprived the plaintiffs of their constitutionally protected liberty interest in receiving restoration certificates under state law without due process. But the plaintiffs have no legitimate claim of entitlement to restoration certificates because they have not proven they are eligible for those certificates. And in any event, they are not entitled to additional process in connection with whatever liberty interests they do have.

The other constitutional claims are likewise meritless. Concerning Claim Two, which alleges a deprivation of a constitutionally protected interest in the right to vote without due process, plaintiffs' claim fails as a matter of law because disenfranchised felons have no fundamental right
to vote. Claim Three alleges that the defendants violate the Equal Protection Clause by administering the re-enfranchisement statute inconsistently. But that claim is subject to rationalbasis review, which the law as administered easily passes. The final constitutional claim, Count Five, alleges that Tennessee's voter registration practices deny eligible felons their constitutional right to vote. The discriminatory practices that the plaintiffs allege lack evidentiary support. There is no genuine dispute that Tennessee processes voter applications from felons in a manner consistent with federal law.

Next, the plaintiffs claim that Tennessee's voter registration forms and practices violate the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 ("NVRA"). In addition to the standing problems with those claims, the plaintiffs cannot muster enough evidence to piove that there is even a trialworthy dispute on the legality of Tennessee's forms and practices.

Finally, the plaintiffs seek sweeping injunctions that would effectively re-write Tennessee's re-enfranchisement system andi ís voter registration forms and practices. Those requested injunctions are improper as matter of law.

For all those reasons, the court should grant summary judgment for the defendants on all the claims and on the requested relief.

## BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs include the Tennessee Conference of the National Association of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People ("NAACP") and six disenfranchised felons acting on their own behalf and on behalf of a class of allegedly similarly situated individuals. (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 610.)

Plaintiffs assert six claims in the Amended Complaint:
Count One. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants deprive the class of their constitutional right to procedural due process in connection with their statutory interest in obtaining certificates of restoration.

Count Two. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants deprive the class of their constitutional right to procedural due process in connection with their constitutional interest in the fundamental right to vote.

Count Three. Plaintiffs allege that Defendants subject the class to unequal treatment in violation of the Equal Protection Clause.

Count Four. Plaintiffs allege that Tennessee's voter registration forms violate the National Voter Registration Act.

Count Five. Plaintiffs allege that Tennessee's voter registration practices deprive eligible voter applicants of their constitutional right to vote.

Count Six. Plaintiffs allege that Tennessee's voter registration practices violate the National Voter Registration Act.
(Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 648-57.) The parties engage in discovery, which closed on May 28, 2023. (Joint Mot. to Amend Sched. Order, R. 125. ©ageID\# 837-38; Order Granting Mot. in Part, R. 128, PageID\# 847-48.)

On July 21, 2023, the Tennessee Secretary of State and the Division of Elections announced policy revisions for the processing of voter-registration applications for individuals with felony convictions before January 'S, 1973, and for individuals with felony convictions between January 15, 1973, and May 17, 1981. (Ex. 1, Goins Dec., at 1-4.) The Division of Elections issued guidance to the county election commissions in Tennessee to provide clarity and avoid rejection of voter-registration applications for individuals who did not lose their voting rights. (Ex. 2., Memo on Older Felonies, at 1.) This guidance instructs county election commissions to process voter-registration applications for individuals in two categories: (1) individuals with pre-January 15,1973 , convictions that did not commit an infamous crime; and (2) individuals with convictions between January 15, 1973, and May 17, 1981. (Id. at 1-2.) The memorandum also provides a list of infamous crimes for the county election commissions to reference when reviewing a voter-registration application listing a pre-January 15, 1973, felony conviction. (Id. at 2.) The guidance further describes an updated Voter Registration Rejection

Appeal Form that allows an applicant to file an appeal from a denial of a voter registration application. (Id. at 2; Ex.3, Rejection Appeal Form, at 1.)

Tennessee's voter-registration application provides the following information about applying to vote with a felony conviction:

If you have had a felony conviction, your eligibility to register and vote depends upon the crime you were convicted of and the date of your conviction. To assist in processing your application, provide the required information in box 4 and any responsive documents you have. For more information about this process, call 1-877-850-4959 or visit sos.tn.gov/restoration.

Tennessee Mail-In Application for Voter Registration, Tennessee Secretary of State, https://sos-tn-gov-files.tnsosfiles.com/forms/ss-3010.pdf (last visited July 23, 2021). Box 4 of the voterregistration application is labeled "Felony Conviction," and it asks, "Have you ever been convicted of a felony?" Id. It provides a parenthetical explaining, 'If expunged, answer 'no.'" Id. Then, the form provides check boxes for "Yes" and "No" Id. It further states, "If yes, provide the following information (if known)." Id. Then, the form provides space for the applicant to list the crimes, dates, and place relating to the felony conviction. Id. Additionally, the form asks, "Have you received a pardon or had your voting rights restored?" Id. Immediately following, the form provides check boxes for "Yes" and "No." Id. Adjacent to the check boxes is an instruction stating, "If yes, provide copy of document." Id. The form requires an oath or affirmation and a signature of the applicant. Id. On the "Go Vote TN" online registration portal, an applicant cannot continue to fill out the voter-registration application after checking "Yes" in response to the felony question. (Ex. 3, Lim Dep., at 163.) However, the individual will be automatically directed to use the paper voter-registration application.

On July 21, 2023, the Tennessee Secretary of State and the Division of Elections also announced policy revisions regarding the certificate-of-restoration process. (Ex. 1, Goins Dec., at 1-4.) Based on the Tennessee Supreme Court's decision in Falls v. Goins, No. M2020-01510-SC-

R11-CV, 2023 WL 4243961 (Tenn. 2023), policies were revised to require applicants for certificates of restoration to follow new procedures:

A person convicted of a felony in a Tennessee court, an out-of-state court, or a federal court must:

1. Have been pardoned by a Governor, U.S. President, or other appropriate authority of a state or have had full rights of citizenship restored as prescribed by law, and
2. Have paid all restitution to the victim or victims of the offense order by the court as part of the sentence, if any; and
3. Have paid all court costs assessed, if any, unless the court made a finding of indigency; and
4. Is current in all child support obligations, if any
(Ex. 5, COR Memo, at 1.) Additionally, the certificate-of-restoration form has been updated to reflect this policy change. (Ex. 7, COR Form, at i). The Division of Elections also issued a frequently asked questions document to furthes inform Tennesseans. (Ex. 6, FAQs, at 1.)

The NAACP assists individuals vith voter restoration or voting registrations, regardless of whether the individual requesting assistance is a member of the NAACP. (Ex. 4, Morris Dep., at 10-11.) The NAACP goes to events and sets up a table to do voter registration. (Id. at 27.) The table is staffed with a NAACP member who volunteers to work the event. (Id. at 27.) The NAACP has a tablet at their table where an individual can use Tennessee voter-registration online portal to register to vote. (Id. at 28.) However, if an individual is unable to use the tablet to register to vote and the individual discloses that they need information about voting rights, the NAACP provides them with a worksheet created by the Free Hearts organization and a certificate-of-restoration form. (Id. at 29, 33.) The NAACP noted that the costs associated with a voter-registration event are only the volunteers' time and the gas getting to the location. (Id. at 66.) The NAACP also holds public education workshops on the certificate of restoration process, where they disseminate
publicly available information. (Id. at 61-63.) The NAACP has only held two workshops, and the noted expenses were time and gas money. (Id. at 62.)

However, the NAACP does not keep track of whether any of its members have a felony conviction or document the voting status of its members. (Id. at 24.) More specifically, the NAACP does track if members were convicted of a felony during the grace period. (Id. at 60.)

## STANDARD OF REVIEW

Summary judgment is appropriate when a party establishes that there is no genuine issue of material fact and that the party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). To survive a motion for summary judgment, the non-moving party nust go beyond the pleadings and come forward with specific facts to show that there is a gemuine issue for trial. Chao v. Hall Holding Co., 285 F.3d 415, 424 (6th Cir. 2002). The non-moving party "must do more than show that there is some metaphysical doubt as to the material facts;" rather, it must "present significant probative evidence in support of its opposition to the motion for summary judgment in order to defeat the motion for summary judgment." Id. A fact is "material" if it might affect the outcome. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 4.77 U.S. 242, 248 (1986). If a reasonable juror could not return a verdict for the non-movant, the Court should grant summary judgment. Id. at 251-52.

## ARGUMENT

## I. Plaintiffs Lack Standing On All Six Causes Of Action

"Article III of the Constitution limits federal courts' jurisdiction to certain 'Cases' and 'Controversies.'" Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA, 568 U.S. 398, 408 (2013). One case-andcontroversy requirement is that plaintiffs must establish they have standing to sue. Id. The burden to establish standing reaches "each claim" that plaintiffs assert along with "each form of relief that is sought." Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates, Inc., 581 U.S. 433, 439 (2017). Plaintiffs lack standing to bring any of their claims or to secure the relief that they seek.

## A. The Individual Plaintiffs suffered no injury in fact in connection with Counts One through Three.

The Supreme Court has established three elements that Plaintiffs must satisfy to meet the constitutional requirements for standing. First, Plaintiffs must demonstrate an "injury in fact," which is "concrete," "distinct and palpable," and "actual or imminent." Whitmore v. Arkansas, 495 U.S. 149, 155 (1990) (quotation and internal quotation marks omitted). Second, they must establish "a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of-the injury has to be 'fairly trace[able] to the challenged action of the defendant, and not . . . th[e] result [of] some third party not before the court."" Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) (quotation omitted). Third, they must show a "'substantial likelihood' that the requested relief will remedy the alleged injury in fact." Vt. Agency of Nat. Res.v. United States ex rel. Stevens, 529 U.S. 765, 771 (2000) (quotation omitted).

The Tennessee Supreme Court recently carified the process that felons must go through to restore their voting rights. In Falls v. Goin§, --- S.W.3d ----, 2023 WL 4243961, at *6 (Tenn. June 29, 2023), the court interpreted two statutory provisions addressing the same subject-the restoration of voting rights for felons. The court held that, to regain the right to vote under Tennessee law, felons generally must go through a two-step process. Id. at *7. First, they must comply with Tenn. Code Ann. § 2-19-143 by securing an order restoring their rights of citizenship-at least, if they have not been pardoned. But that alone is insufficient for felons to regain their voting rights. Under Falls, felons must also obtain a certificate of restoration under Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 40-29-202 through -205 before they may vote. Id. A felon cannot vote until both steps are complete.

None of the individual plaintiffs complied with the first step of the process. As described in Falls, plaintiffs must have their full citizenship rights restored or receive a pardon. The
undisputed material facts are that, at the time the Amended Complaint was filed, the individual plaintiffs had not been pardoned or had their full rights of citizenship restored for all their convictions. (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 621-26; Ex. 8, Weare Dep. at 1-56; Ex. 9, Tournier Dep., at 1-74; Ex. 10, Scott Dep., at 1-97; Ex. 11, Perry Dep., at 1-50; Ex. 12, Hendrix Dep., Vol. I and II, 1-73; Exhibit 13, Gray Dep., at 1-35 ). ${ }^{1}$

Because the individual plaintiffs are not eligible for restoration of the right to vote, they lack standing to assert Claims One through Three and their injuries are conjectural and hypothetical. They have not shown that they suffered an injury in fact or are substantially likely to suffer one. They have not been deprived of the right to have their right to vote restored because they are ineligible for restoration, Falls, 2023 WL 4243961 at $* 7$ ("Reading sections 2-19-143(3), 40-29-201, and 40-29-202 in pari materia creates a two-step statutory process that is necessary to complete in its entirety before the right of suffrage is restored."), and because they are ineligible to vote. They have not satisfied the requicernents of Tennessee Code § 2-19-143. Nor have Plaintiffs shown any substantial likeliheod that they will be injured by the application of § 40-29-202-and thus could receive reliet under this lawsuit-when they have not shown that they have first fulfilled the requirements of § 2-19-143. Any injury is thus remote, contingent, and hypothetical. It is not concrete, actual, or imminent.

## B. The NAACP lacks organizational standing to bring Counts One through Six.

An organizational plaintiff must follow "th[e] same black-letter rules" that apply to individual plaintiffs. Waskul v. Washtenaw Cnty. Cmty. Mental Health, 900 F.3d 250, 255 (6th Cir. 2018). The NAACP does not satisfy those rules for any of the six causes of action.

[^0]
## 1. The NAACP cannot show an injury in fact sufficient to support standing on Claims One through Three.

The NAACP lacks organizational standing. Allegations of shifting resources from the certificate of restoration process to the restoration of citizenship rights or an alleged effect on its political power-as it asserts, (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 620-21)-do not demonstrate injuries that confer standing. See Fair Elections Ohio v. Husted, 770 F.3d 456, 45961 (6th Cir. 2014) (holding that specific facts are required to support an injury due to diversion of resources at the summary judgment stage and that harm to abstract social interests do not confer standing). Nor has the organization shown that any of its members fully complied with Tennessee Code § 2-19-143 and then were deprived of a voting-restoration right due to an allegedly infirm application of Tennessee Code § 40-29-202. (See Ex. 4. (Vorris Dep., at 24-25, 44-66; Ex. 14, NAACP First Interrogatory Response, at 1-22; Ex. 15, fitachments to NAACP Third Interrogatory Response, 1-8; Ex. 16, NAACP Third Interogatory Response, at 1-15.) The NAACP consequently lacks standing to assert Claims One through Three.

## 2. The NAACP cannot show that an injury in fact sufficient to support its request for injunctive relief in connection with Counts Four through Six.

On Counts Four through Six, Plaintiffs seek to enjoin allegedly unlawful voter registration practices. At the pleadings stage, the court found that the NAACP had standing to bring these claims based on a diversion-of-resources theory of injury. The court accepted as true the NAACP's allegation that it was "injured when a person it helps register to vote is rejected despite being eligible because such denials cause it to divert significant time and resources to correct the error." (Memorandum Opinion, R. 83, PageID\# 460.) But mere allegations do not establish injury at summary judgment. Because Plaintiffs cannot satisfy the injury requirements necessary for injunctive relief, the court should grant the Defendants judgment for lack of standing.

Plaintiffs seeking "the forward-looking remedy of an injunction," Reform Am. v. City of Detroit, 37 F.4th 1138, 1148 (6th Cir. 2022), "must show a present ongoing harm or imminent future harm" to satisfy the injury-in-fact requirement, Shelby Advocates for Valid Elections $v$. Hargett, 947 F.3d 977, 981 (6th Cir. 2020) (per curiam). "The 'threat' of a prospective injury must be real and immediate and not premised upon the existence of past injuries alone." Gaylor v. Hamilton Crossing CMBS, 582 F. App'x 576, 579 (6th Cir. 2014) (quotation omitted).

Although "[p]ast may be precedent," "the Supreme Court has not been sympathetic to claims that past occurrences of unlawful conduct create standing to obtain an injunction against the risk of future unlawful conduct." Shelby Advocates, 947 F.3d at 981. The foundational case addressing standing in the context of injunctive relief is City aj Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95 (1974). There, the plaintiff sought to enjoin police officeis who had committed past constitutional violations from doing so again. The Court held that the plaintiff could establish standing only if he alleged "(1) that all police officers in Los Angeles always" engage in the challenged misconduct, or "(2) that the City ordered or authorized police officers to act in such manner." Id. at 105-06. But the plaintiff had nowing more than "conjecture" that "in every instance of a traffic stop, arrest, or other ercounter between the police and a citizen, the police will act unconstitutionally and inflict injury without provocation or legal excuse." Id. at 108. So the Court agreed that the plaintiff lacked standing for injunctive relief. See id. at 110.

The Sixth Circuit recently applied Lyons in the context of a voting rights dispute in Tennessee. An organizational plaintiff—Shelby Advocates for Valid Elections ("SAVE")—and individual plaintiffs sued Tennessee election officials. Shelby Advocates, 947 F.3d at 979. They alleged that, "in future elections, the defendants will burden their right to vote, dilute their votes, and disenfranchise them" in violation of the Constitution. Id. To prove those concerns were valid,
the plaintiffs pointed to past mistakes that had been made during Tennessee's elections. Id. at 979-81. The plaintiffs then sought an injunction requiring state and local officials to implement various measures designed to make future elections more secure. Id. at 980.

Those plaintiffs suffered no injury in fact. Importantly, " $[t]$ he complaint's allegations with respect to injury all boil[ed] down to prior system vulnerabilities, previous equipment malfunctions, and past election mistakes." Shelby Advocates, 947 F.3d at 981 . But that past harm stemmed from "human error"-and the "[f]ear that individual mistakes will recur, generally speaking, does not create a cognizable imminent risk of harm." Id. Relying on Lyons, the court found no standing because the plaintiffs could not plausibly allege hat "Shelby County election officials always make [the injury-inflicting] mistakes, and they did] not allege that the government entities ordered the election workers to make any such mistakes." Id. SAVE could not establish organizational standing for similar reasons. Id. at 982 . Although it complained about needing to divert resources to address future problems, those expenditures were based on "speculative fears of future harm" that provided no basis for forward-looking relief. Id.

The NAACP suffers from the same problem. It claims the allegedly unlawful practices will force the organization to redirect its resources in the future when a person that it helps register to vote is improperly rejected. If that happens, the NAACP says, it "must conduct extensive follow up" to correct the erroneous denial. (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 621.) Just like in Shelby Advocates, that injury occurs because of human error-that is, when an administrator mistakenly rejects an application that they should have approved. 947 F.3d at 981 . That an erroneous denial (and the accompanying diversion of resources) may have happened before does not prove that it will occur again, much less that it will happen "imminent[ly]." Bannisterv. Knox Cnty. Bd. of Educ., 49 F.4th 1000, 1017 (6th Cir. 2022). There is no evidence that administrators
"always" deny registration applications from felons. Nor is there evidence that election workers were ordered to deny those applications. See Infra, Argument V.

To the contrary, Tennessee recently issued detailed policy revisions to ensure that felons are not improperly deprived of the right to vote. That updated guidance provides "greater clarity" about treatment of voter registration applications from felons in an express effort "to avoid the unnecessary rejection of voter registration applications of individuals who had not lost their voting rights due to a felony conviction." (Ex. 1, Goins Dec., at 3; See Ex. 2., Memo on Older Felonies, at 1-2.) As explained, the guidance instructs that many applications from felons are treated the same as an application from those without felony convictions. (idi.) Other felons who have restored their rights must simply check a box and provide oroof of eligibility for state voter registration applications. The Coordinator of Elections sent that guidance to Tennessee's 95 County Election Administrators. (Ex. 1, Goins Dec, at 3.)

The Sixth Circuit's decision in Memphis A. Philip Randolph Institute v. Hargett, 978 F.3d 378 (6th Cir. 2020), confirms the NAACP lacks standing. There, the plaintiffs asserted as the basis for their injury the possibility that Tennessee would erroneously reject absentee ballots in future elections. See id. at 387 . The plaintiffs claimed that the prospect of future erroneous denials justified injunctive relief. See id. at 382. The Sixth Circuit rejected that argument, reasoning that the plaintiffs failed to prove they faced "an actual, concrete, particularized, and imminent threat of harm." Id. at 387. The asserted injury rested on "two layers of speculation about the upcoming election"-first, that Tennessee would reject absentee ballots; and second, that some of those rejections would be improper. Id. Yet the plaintiffs had no "official data to support their theory that some of the absentee ballots will be incorrectly rejected," nor did they submit adequate proof
of past erroneous rejections. Id. Because Tennessee had safeguards to prevent improper denials, it was "far from inevitable that an absentee ballot will be incorrectly rejected." Id. at 388.

That reasoning applies here with equal force. As in Memphis, the NAACP's theory of injury rests on two levels of speculation. It first speculates that Tennessee will erroneously deny voter registration applications from individuals with felony convictions. And then it speculates that the applications that are erroneously denied will be ones with which the NAACP assisted. Despite bearing the burden of establishing standing, Plaintiffs make the same mistake discussed in Memphis by failing to establish the extent of past harm or provide "official data" to support the assertion that future denials are imminent. Id.

Given Tennessee's recent guidance and the dearth of evidence from Plaintiffs about future erroneous rejections, "the possibility of future harm" is "conjectural at best," and thus is "not within the purview of disputes that the federal conets are permitted to adjudicate." Hyman v. City of Louisville, 53 F. App’x 740, 744 (6th Cir. 2002).

## II. Plaintiffs Have Not Been Depared Due Process In Connection With Their Alleged Statutory Right To A Certificate Of Restoration.

The Fourteenth Amencment guarantees "due process of law" before the government deprives any person of "iberty or property." Bazzetta v. McGinnis, 430 F.3d 795, 801 (6th Cir. 2005). But Plaintiffs have no "liberty or property interest" at stake, Phillips v. McCollom, 788 F.3d 650, 653 (6th Cir. 2015), nor can they show that Tennessee's "procedures" provide inadequate protection, Bazetta, 430 F.3d at 801 (citation omitted). Accordingly, the court should grant judgment for Defendants on Count One.

## A. Plaintiffs have no liberty interest in receiving restoration certificates.

"The first inquiry in every due process challenge is whether the plaintiff has been deprived of a protected interest in 'property' or 'liberty.'" Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Sullivan, 526 U.S. 40,

59 (1999). Whether a liberty interest exists "is a question of law," Walker v. Hughes, 558 F.2d 1247, 1260 (6th Cir. 1977), and here that question turns on state law because Plaintiffs argue that they have been deprived of their "statutory right to a COR." (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 648.) But as mere applicants for restoration certificates, Plaintiffs have no liberty interest in them whatsoever. And even if applicants could have a liberty interest in those certificates, Plaintiffs lack any protected interest here because they have not shown they satisfy the applicable eligibility criteria.

Applicants for state-created benefits are treated differently than recipients. The Due Process Clause protects interests "that a person has already acquired in specific benefits." $B d$. of Regents of State Colleges v. Roth, 408 U.S. 564, 576 (1972) Sut the Supreme Court has "never held that applicants for benefits, as distinct from those aready receiving them, have a legitimate claim of entitlement protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fifth or Fourteenth Amendment." Lyng v. Payne, 476 U.S. 926, 942 (1986); seeailso Am. Mfrs. Mut. Ins., 526 U.S. at 61 n. 13 (1999) (reserving question). Drawing on that applicant-versus-recipient distinction, the Sixth Circuit has held in various contexts that "first-time applicants" for state-created benefits have "no property or liberty interest" in those benefits. Women's Med. Prof'l Corp. v. Baird, 438 F.3d 595, 611 (6th Cir. 2006), abrogated on other grounds by Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org., 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022); see also Clair v. N. Ky. Indep. Health Dist., 239 F. App’x 997, 998 (6th Cir. 2007) (per curiam) (agreeing that "plaintiffs-first-time applicants for a food-service permit-did not possess a constitutionally protected property right for purposes of a due process . . . analysis").

As applicants rather than recipients, Plaintiffs likewise lack any protected interest in restoration certificates. Just like in Sanderson v. Village of Greenhills, 726 F.2d 284, 286 (6th Cir. 1984), Plaintiffs here are "initial applicant[s]" for a state-created individual benefit and are thus
"analogous to the original applicant for a liquor license, or the new applicant for food stamps, in that [they] ha[ve] no 'claim' upon the [benefit]." They are "not comparable to that of the welfare recipient who is cut from the rolls, the parolee facing revocation of his parole, or the driver confronting cancellation of his license" because those interests have already vested. Id. Plaintiffs' status as applicants belies any present entitlement to restoration certificates. Cf. Jon Jon's, Inc. v. City of Warren, 700 F. App’x 436, 444 (6th Cir. 2017) ("Hakim does not have a recognized property interest in the liquor license because she was a new applicant with no existing ownership of the liquor license."); Wojcik v. City of Romulus, 257 F.3d 600, 610 (6th Cir. 2001) ("first-time applicants for an entertainment permit are likewise not entitled to due process").

But even if applicants could have a liberty interest in res.oration certificates, Plaintiffs have none here. "The due process clause only protects those interests to which one has a legitimate claim of entitlement." Waeschle v. Dragovic, 576 F.3d 539, 545 (6th Cir. 2009); see Gojcaj v. Gonzales, 175 F. App'x 720, 725 (6th Cir. 2000) (per curiam) ("In order to have a liberty interest in a benefit, there must be a legitimete claim of entitlement thereto."). That happens when someone has "a present and legally recognized substantive entitlement" rather than a "judicially unenforceable substantial hope." Kerry v. Din, 576 U.S. 86, 98 (2015) (plurality opinion). And so, to prove that present entitlement, Plaintiffs must show they satisfy the certificate-of-restoration eligibility criteria. That much is clear from the relevant statute: the re-enfranchisement law provides that only "a person eligible" to "have the right of suffrage restored" "may request"-and "then shall be issued"-a certificate of restoration. Tenn. Code § 40-29-203(a) (emphasis added). Plainly, then, no legitimate claim of entitlement exists absent an affirmative eligibility determination because that is what triggers the obligation to issue the certificate.

There is no genuine dispute that Plaintiffs failed to make that eligibility showing. Throughout this litigation, Plaintiffs have insisted that the court need not consider whether they or the class are entitled to restoration certificates. They argued during class-certification proceedings that their "claim is not that each individual class member has been wrongfully denied a COR based on their specific circumstances." Plaintiffs' Response to Defendants' Motion to Stay Pending Appeal at 8, In re William Lee, No. 23-0502 (6th Cir. July 21, 2023), ECF No. 15 (emphasis added). They do not seek an order declaring that the class is entitled to restoration certificates or an order requiring certificates to be issued. It is too late in the day for Plaintiffs to argue that they-and the class-are entitled to certificates because they satisfy the eligibility criteria. Even if Plaintiffs want to make that showing, they cannot do so on inis record. Plaintiffs argued that "Defendants do not need to conduct discovery on the individual circumstances of each class member" because those circumstances were irrelevant. (See Plaintiffs' Response to Motion to Stay, R. 134, PageID\# 878.) Unsurprisingly, then, the record does not contain the facts the court would need to consider when deciding whether the entire class meets the statutory eligibility criteria.

Moreover, the record affirmatively demonstrates that some plaintiffs are ineligible to receive certificates. Some named plaintiffs have not paid all the necessary financial obligations. See Tenn. Code § 40-29-202(b); (Ex. 9, Tournier Dep., at 50 (indicating that restitution had not been paid); Ex. 10, Scott Dep., at 59, 61 (indicating that court costs are owed); Ex. 11, Perry Dep., at 10, 45-46 (indicating that child support is owed); Exhibit 13, Gray Dep., at 21, 24-25 (indicating that court costs are owed); Ex. 8, Weare Dep. at 40, 48 (indicating a lack of documentation that court costs had been paid). Other named plaintiffs testified that they have not even applied for a restoration certificate at all. (Ex. 8, Weare Dep. at 22.) And for whatever it is worth, when

Defendants asked the NAACP to identify individuals who had been erroneously deprived of their statutory right to restoration certificates, they identified only seventeen individuals who "may" have been so deprived—none of whom are named plaintiffs. (Ex. 14, NAACP First Interrogatory Response, at 1-22; Ex. 15, Attachments to NAACP Third Interrogatory Response, 1-8; Ex. 16, NAACP Third Interrogatory Response, at 1-15.) But, the NAACP provided no evidence that those individuals complied with Tenn. Code Ann. § 2-19-143. (Id.) Moreover, Of course, it makes little sense to say that individuals who do not satisfy the eligibility criteria or who have not applied for a certificate nevertheless have a vested liberty interest in those certificates that the Constitution protects.

The Sixth Circuit's decision in Hasanaj v. Detroit Pubic Schools Community District, 35 F.4th 437 (6th Cir. 2022), illustrates why Plaintiffs' fallure to make that eligibility showing warrants summary judgment. Mr. Hasanaj worked as a teacher in Michigan. When the school terminated his employment, he brought a lavsuit alleging that the school unlawfully deprived him of his property interest in tenure. Id. â 442 . The Sixth Circuit disagreed. It explained that, " $[\mathrm{i}] \mathrm{f}$ a plaintiff is not entitled to tenure under a governing statute, [then] he has no 'legitimate claim' to job tenure." $I d$. at 448 . Mr. Hasanaj did not allege that he satisfied the statutory tenure requirements. See id. at 448. Because he did not make that eligibility showing, the court concluded that he lacked a constitutionally protected interest in his job. Id. at 451. Here, too, Plaintiffs did not show that they satisfied the criteria required to be issued restoration certificates. Their due process claim thus suffers from the same legal defect as the plaintiff in Hasanaj.

## B. Plaintiffs received constitutionally adequate process in connection with whatever protected interests they may have.

Even assuming Plaintiffs have a protected interest, they cannot prove that interest was deprived without adequate process. Plaintiffs challenge the constitutional adequacy of the reenfranchisement framework as enacted. Thus, Plaintiffs deserve no additional process.
"In deciding what the Due Process Clause requires," the "Supreme Court has long distinguished between legislative and adjudicative action." Jones v. Governor of Florida, 975 F.3d 1016, 1048 (11th Cir. 2020) (en banc). "The State often deprives persons of liberty or property through legislative action-general laws that apply 'to more than a few people.'" Id. (quoting Bi-Metallic Inv. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization, 239 U.S. 441, 445 (1915)). And when that happens, "the affected persons are not entitled to any process beyond that provided by the legislative process." Id. That is because "the legislative process provides all the process that is constitutionally due when [an] alleged injury resuits from a legislative act of general applicability." Smith v. Jefferson Cnty. Bd. of Sch. Comm's, 641 F.3d 197, 216 (6th Cir. 2011) (en banc) (cleaned up); see, e.g., Kaminski v. Coulter, 855 F.3d 339, 347-48 (6th Cir. 2017) (adequate process when the state terminated healthcare benefits through "broad determinations" about recipients "as a whole" rather than "individualized determinations about specific [beneficiaries]"); Smith, 641 F.3d at 216-17 (adequate process where the county terminated teachers by making the "legislative" decision to shut down the school); Neinast v. Bd. of Tr. of Columbus Metro. Library, 346 F.3d 585 (6th Cir. 2003) (adequate process where the board of trustees deprived the plaintiff of a liberty interest via a policy "of general applicability").

Because of that distinction between legislative and adjudicative action, the court must determine whether the conduct "involve[s] the kind of individualized determination that triggers due-process protections in the first place." Kaminski, 865 F.3d at 347. Certain "hallmarks" set
legislative conduct apart from adjudication. Smith, 641 F.3d at 216 (quotation omitted). Legislative actions are "general in [their] scope rather than targeted on a specific individual." Id. (quotation omitted). And they often involve "discretionary, policymaking decision[s]" that implicate political priorities about the benefits a government "provides to its constituents." Id. (quotation omitted). Such rules of "general applicability" simply do not "trigger due process concerns." Pickney Bros., Inc. v. Robinson, 1999 WL 801514, at *4 (6th Cir. Sept. 30, 1999) (unpublished). Adjudicative actions, by contrast, concern a "relatively small number of persons" who are "exceptionally affected, in each case upon individual grounds," by state action. BiMetallic Inv. Co. v. State Bd. of Equalization, 239 U.S. 441, 446 (1915).

Plaintiffs raise "system-wide concerns" about how the General Assembly designed the reenfranchisement framework. R. 134 at 882. They argue that Tennessee's generally applicable process for issuing restoration certificates is inadequate for every single applicant. R. 102, वा $135-$ 36. But those procedures are "general in [theiir]'scope" because they apply to all applicants, Smith, 641 F.3d at 216 (quotation omitted) and the decision about how to structure those generally applicable processes implicates the legislature's "discretionary, policymaking decision" about how to allocate a political privilege that it provides as a matter of legislative grace, id. (quotation omitted). Plaintiffs essentially launch a facial challenge on the generally applicable reenfranchisement regime as enacted by the General Assembly. Their injury thus derives from the legislative decision not to include additional procedures for the re-enfranchisement framework. Because that alleged injury does not stem from any individualized determinations, Plaintiffs are not entitled to additional process. Id.

The Eleventh Circuit's decision in Jones v. Governor of Florida, 975 F.3d 1016 (11th Cir. 2020) (en banc), is instructive. There, disenfranchised felons sued Florida because its re-
enfranchisement law required them to satisfy certain financial obligations before regaining the right to vote. Id. at 1025 . They specifically alleged that Florida deprived them of their interest in regaining the right to vote without due process by creating a system in which they "cannot determine the amount of their outstanding financial obligations with diligence," id. at 1046-in other words, their statutory interest had been extinguished without due process because Florida's procedures did not provide adequate safeguards. Writing for the en banc court, Judge William Pryor rejected the procedural due process argument. The court concluded that " $[t]$ he felons were deprived of the right to vote through legislative action, not adjudicative action." Id. at 1048. And even accepting the argument that the law "deprive[d] felons of the fight to vote by conditioning reenfranchisement on the completion of all terms of sentence," the court concluded that "those laws also qualify as legislative acts," and thus the felons received all the process to which they were entitled. Id. at 1048-49. Likewise, Plaintiffs here challenge the legislative decision made by the General Assembly to enact an application process that lacks the procedural safeguards to which they believe they are entitled. They too have no right to any additional process.

At its core, Plaintiffs complain that state officials are not adequately performing their statelaw duties. (See, e.g., Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 651 (alleging that "TDOC agencies have abdicated [their] responsibility" to administer the felon re-enfranchisement statute).) But the "[m]ere violation of a state statute does not infringe the federal Constitution," Snowden v. Hughes, 321 U.S. 1, 11 (1944), and state-law violations are not cognizable in $\S 1983$ actions, Huron Valley Hosp., Inc. v. City of Pontiac, 887 F.2d 710, 714 (6th Cir. 1989). There is no genuine dispute that Count One fails.

## III. Plaintiffs Have Not Been Deprived Due Process In Connection With Their Alleged Constitutional Interest In The Right To Vote.

Count Two alleges that Plaintiffs have been denied "the fundamental right to vote without procedural due process." R. 102 at 652 . But disenfranchised felons do not have a fundamental right to vote. See Wesley v. Collins, 791 F.2d 1255, 1261 (6th Cir. 1986); Johnson v. Bredesen, 624 F.3d 742, 746 (6th Cir. 2010); see also Harvey v. Brewer, 605 F.3d 1067, 1079 (9th Cir. 2010) (O'Connor, J.) (felons "cannot complain about their loss of a fundamental right to vote because felon disenfranchisement is explicitly permitted"). Because Plaintiffs have no "legitimate claim of entitlement" to the fundamental right to vote, Waeschle, 576 F.3d at 545 , their due process claim necessarily fails, e.g., Jones v. McKinney, 172 F.3d 48 (6th Cir 1998) (unpublished) (dismissing a procedural due process claim when the plaintiff had no constitutional liberty interest).

That Plaintiffs assert a statutory interest in Count One is irrelevant. Count One alleges that Plaintiffs have been deprived of a liberty interest created by state statute. R. 102 at 648-51. Count Two, by contrast, alleges that Plaintiff, have been deprived of an interest created by the Constitution-namely, the fundameatal interest in the right to vote. R. 102 at 651-52. Count Two cannot proceed unless Defendant's deprived Plaintiffs of a constitutional liberty interest. Because no such interest exists, the claim fails no matter what the court does with the state-created interest asserted in connection with Count One.

## IV. Plaintiffs Have Not Been Denied Equal Protection Of The Law.

Count Three alleges that Defendants are violating the Equal Protection Clause by inconsistently administering Tennessee's re-enfranchisement statute. That claim is subject to rational-basis review. Because "summary judgment is an apt vehicle for resolving rational-basis claims," Tiwari v. Friedlander, 26 F.4th 355, 369 (6th Cir. 2022), and because the law as administered satisfies that standard, the court should grant Defendants judgment on Count Three.

## A. The equal protection claim is subject to rational-basis review.

Plaintiffs insist that the re-enfranchisement system is subject "to intermediate scrutiny" because it "implicates an individual's fundamental right to vote." (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 653.)

That is incorrect for reasons already explained. Tennessee's law does not burden disenfranchised felons' fundamental right to vote because they have no such right. See Johnson, 624 F.3d at 746 . Nor does a certificate of restoration confer that right. Obtaining a certificate is a necessary-but-not-sufficient step in the process that disenfranchised felons must follow to regain their voting rights. See Falls, 2023 WL 4243961, at *7 (explaining that felons who have not been pardoned must have their full citizenship rights restored before they are eligible to vote); Tenn. Code §40-29-203(d) (requiring additional layers of review before individuals with restoration certificates are approved to vote). So, as the Sixth Circuit has already decided with respect to this very statutory framework, rational-basis review applies. Johnson, 624 F.3d at 746 (applying rational-basis review to Tennessee's re-enfranchisement law).

For similar reasons, the couit need not apply the heightened standard from Bush v. Gore, 531 U.S. 98 (2000) (per curiam). That case examined whether Florida's recount procedures arbitrarily valued one person's fundamental right to vote over another person's fundamental right. The Court decided that "[t]he recount mechanisms" implemented by Florida did "not satisfy the minimum requirement for nonarbitrary treatment of voters necessary to secure the fundamental right." Id. at 105 (emphasis added). The non-arbitrariness principle thus derives from the need to safeguard the constitutional interest in the right to vote. But because felons do not have that interest, Bush is not on point. In any event, the Supreme Court made clear that its "consideration [was] limited to the present circumstances, for the problem of equal protection in election
processes generally presents many complexities." Id. at 109. Bush therefore does not regulate how Tennessee allocates restoration certificates among disenfranchised felons.

## B. Tennessee's re-enfranchisement framework satisfies rational-basis review.

The "highly deferential" rational-basis test is easy to satisfy-laws flunk that standard "only in rare or exceptional circumstances." Liberty Coins, LLC v. Goodman, 748 F.3d 682, 694 (6th Cir. 2014) (quotation omitted). So long as the law "rationally relate[s] to legitimate government interests," it withstands scrutiny. Doe v. Mich. Dep't of State Police, 490 F.3d 491, 501 (6th Cir. 2007) (quotation omitted). Plaintiffs must prove the lack of a rational basis "either by negativing every conceivable basis which might support the government action, or by demonstrating that the challenged government action was riotivated by animus or ill will." Johnson, 624 F.3d at 747 (quotation omitted). Even a law with a "tenuous" justification or that "works to the disadvantage of a particular group" will be upheld "if it can be said to advance a legitimate government interest." E. Brooks Books, Inc. v. Shelby County, 588 F.3d 360, 364 (6th Cir. 2009) (quotation omitted).

Tennessee's re-enfranchisement law divides responsibility for processing restoration certificates among various officials. By statute, the "incarcerating authority" and the "supervising authority" are the primary officers responsible for issuing CORs. Tenn. Code § 40-29-203(a). ${ }^{2}$ Those officers work in the Tennessee Department of Corrections ("TDOC") and regularly interface with felons as they begin their reintegration process. Parole and probation officers ("PPOs") fill out and issue certificate of restoration forms to eligible offenders. (Ex. 18, Exhibit 4 to Ricci Dep. at 1-3.) PPOs have detailed instructions about how to fulfill their responsibility to

[^1]"assis[t] eligible offenders in the restoration of their voting rights." (Id.) TDOC guidance instructs that "[a]ll offenders" must be provided with a blank certificate-of-restoration form "upon discharge." (Ex. 17, Ricci Dep. at 40, 46.) Applicants who are not immediately eligible upon discharge may later obtain a form once they become eligible. (See Ex. 17, Ricci Dep. at 40.) Once an applicant submits the completed certificate to the county election commission, the Elections Division reviews the certificate "to verify that [it] was issued in compliance with" Tennessee law. Tenn. Code § 40-29-203(d).

Structuring the re-enfranchisement framework that way advances legitimate government interests. For starters, it saves taxpayer resources. Tennessee's voting rights restoration process piggybacks off TDOC's preexisting framework-PPO officers already on the government's payroll and operating within TDOC execute certificate-of-restoration responsibilities. By administering the program in that manner, Tennessee avoids the costs that would accompany creating and maintaining a new administrative apparatus to process restoration applications. There is no question Tennessee has a "legitirate interest in reducing its administrative costs." Armour v. City of Indianapolis, 566 U.S. 613, 684 (2012); see City of Mayfield Heights v. Woodhawk Club Condo. Owners Assoc., 205F.3d 1339 (6th Cir. 2000) (per curiam) (unpublished) ("control of the costs in the City's sanitation department amounts to a legitimate government objective"). And although Plaintiffs believe that a centralized process is better policy, the government advances a legitimate interest in avoiding costs by choosing the current system. See Racine Charter One, Inc. v. Racine Unified Sch. Dist., 424 F.3d 677, 686 (7th Cir. 2005) (recognizing the avoided cost of busing students is a rational basis for a school district to choose to not offer busing services).

Besides saving resources, the current framework also eases administrative burdens on statewide officials and ensures that restoration certificates are handled by officers that regularly
assist felons. PPOs interface with felons and assist with their discharge, so it makes sense for them to be responsible for filling out the restoration certificates. After all, those officers-not an employee working in some centralized agency-are more familiar with the felon's circumstances and are more accessible to the felon if any question about the application process arises. The decentralized framework likewise reduces administrative burdens on officials, including those in the Elections Division, who already must discharge many important statewide responsibilities. See Strehlke v. Grosse Pointe Pub. School System, 654 F. App’x 713, 721 (6th Cir. 2016) ("administrative convenience can serve as a rational basis"); Beaumont v. FEC, 278 F.3d 261, 27 (4th Cir. 2002) ("administrative convenience constitutes a legitimate state interest"), overruled on other grounds by FEC v. Beaumont, 539 U.S. 146 (2003).

Those reasons amply justify Tennessee's re-enfianchisement framework. And because there are "plausible reason[s]" for the law, it "musfstand, no matter how unfair, unjust, or unwise the judges may see it as citizens." Tiwari, 265.4th at 361.

## V. Tennessee's Voter Registratiori Practices Comply with Federal Law.

Counts Four and Six allege violations of the National Voter Registration Act ("NVRA"). Both claims are deficient as a matter of law, so the court should enter judgment for Defendants.

## A. Tennessee's voter registration forms adequately notify applicants about state voting eligibility requirements.

Congress enacted the NVRA to increase voter turnout and "protect the integrity of the electoral process." 52 U.S.C. § 20501(b)(3). To advance those goals, States must "inform applicants" of "voter eligibility requirements." Id. § 20507(a)(5). Likewise, state mail-in forms must "include a statement" that "specifies each eligibility requirement." Id. § 20508(b)(2)(A).

Tennessee's voter registration form accomplishes both goals. As is true for most states, Tennessee forbids individuals convicted of certain felonies from registering to vote. The absence
of a disqualifying felony is thus a "voter eligibility requiremen[t]." 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(5). Without question, Tennessee "specifies" that eligibility requirement and "inform[s]" applicants that certain felons are ineligible to vote. Id. §§ 20507(a)(5), 20508(b)(2)(A). The mail-in form lists that eligibility requirement and directs applicants towards additional resources:

If you have had a felony conviction, your eligibility to register and vote depends upon the crime you were convicted of and the date of your conviction. To assist in processing your application, provide the required information in box 4 and any responsive documents you have. For more information about this process, call 1-877-850-4959 or visit sos.tn.gov/restoration.

Tennessee Mail-In Application for Voter Registration, Tennessee Secretary of State, https://sos-tn-gov-files.tnsosfiles.com/forms/ss-3010.pdf (last visited August 1,2023). The link provided on the form includes thorough guidance about the disqualifying-felonies requirement-including details about which felonies are permanently disqualifying, the dates between which felons were never disenfranchised (and are thus eligible to vote), and the process for disqualified felons to restore their eligibility to vote. And in case those instructions were not sufficiently clear, the form includes a toll-free number for applicanes to call and request help.

The NAACP alleges in Sount Four that Tennessee's registration form is inadequate because it does not describe "the blanket exception for felony convictions between January 15, 1973 and May 17, 1981" or enumerate the (nearly two dozen) "offenses punishable by disenfranchisement prior to January 15, 1973." R. 102 at 654 . Put differently, although the registration form specifies that the absence of a disqualifying felony is an eligibility requirement, the NAACP believes that the form is nevertheless deficient because it could be more specific.

Neither of the alleged omissions violate the NVRA. As the Eleventh Circuit recently explained, the NVRA is a "notice statute enacted for the convenience of voting registrants." Thompson v. Alabama, 65 F.4th 1288, 1309 (11th Cir. 2023). Tennessee carefully designed its form to maximize "accessibility," "readability," and "usability," (Ex. 3, Lim Depo. at 83-84)—all
values that further the NVRA's interest in voter registration. Section 20508(b)'s "specif[ication]" requirement does not mandate that states list every disqualifying felony or exhaustively describe the rules underlying each eligibility of Tennessee's four eligibility requirements. See Thompson, 65 F.4th at 1308-09 (rejecting the Campaign Legal Center's argument that Alabama's voter registration form must list every disqualifying felony). After all, that would produce the absurd result of making voter registration forms unworkable-they would be unwieldy and unnecessarily complicated. See Order Granting Motion to Dismiss at 7, League of Women Voters of Florida, Inc. v. Cord Byrd, No. 23-cv-165 (N.D. Fla. July 10, 2023), ECF No. 36 ("if the NVRA required applications to catalog every potential 'precondition to eligibility,' Florida's one-page, front-andback application form would explode into something hopelessly cumbersome, counter to the NVRA's goal of promoting convenient registration"); see also Lockhart v. Napolitano, 573 F.3d 251, 261 (6th Cir. 2009) (rejecting an interpretation that would produce absurd outcomes).

By specifying the eligibility requirement-namely, the absence of a disqualifying felonyand by linking to a website describing what constitutes a disqualifying felony, Tennessee put applicants on notice about who qualifies to successfully register to vote. See Thompson, 65 F.4th at 1308-09 ("Alabama's mail-in voting form has provided sufficient notice by informing registrants that persons convicted of disqualifying felonies are not eligible to vote and providing an easily accessible link."). ${ }^{3}$ The NVRA requires nothing more.

[^2]
## B. Tennessee ensures that eligible applicants are registered to vote.

The NVRA requires states to "ensure that any eligible applicant is registered to vote" in federal elections so long as they timely submit a "valid voter registration form." 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(1). The NVRA also requires states to "accept and use" a uniform Federal Form to register voters for federal elections. See id. § 20505(a)(1).

Count Six alleges that Defendants employ two practices which violate the NVRA's requirements. The first allegedly unlawful practice is that Tennessee allegedly "reject[s] all voter registration forms on which the applicant affirmed that they have a felony conviction." (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 655 (alleging that policy in Count Five); id. at 656 (alleging that same policy in Count Six).) Plaintiffs claim that policy applies even to voters "who never lost their right to vote or had the right restored." Id. at 655-56. The second allegedly unlawful practice is a requirement that applicants with felonies submit proof of eligibility to register to vote. $I d$. at 65657.

As to the allegation about a policy that Tennessee automatically rejects all applications from felons, the undisputed eviderice confirms that no such practice currently exists. Recent guidance from the Coordinator of Elections creates safeguards to prevent felons from wrongfully being denied their voting rights. See generally Ex. 2. For applicants with felonies from before January 15, 1973, their registration forms are processed just like someone without a felony conviction. Id. at 1. For applicants with felony convictions between January 15, 1973, and May 17, 1981, their voter registration forms are also processed just like applicants without felonies "because those individuals never lost the right to vote." Id. at 2. And for all other applicants with felony convictions, election officials will not reject their application to vote if they submit proof that their voting rights have been restored. (Ex. 3, Lim Dep. at 195.) Simply put, there is no
genuine dispute that Tennessee has no "blanket policy of rejecting or indefinitely delaying voter registration applications" submitted by voters with felonies. R. 102 at 656.

Even Plaintiffs' expert contradicts the baseless allegation that Tennessee employs that alleged blanket policy. Dr. Burch submitted an expert report about the voting-rights restoration process in Tennessee. And by her own estimation, thousands of felons "have had their voting rights restored in Tennessee" since 2006. (Ex. 19, Dr. Burch Dep. at 135-36.) Of course, that would be impossible if Plaintiffs were correct that Tennessee rejected or indefinitely delayed all voter applications from individuals with felony convictions.

Nor does Tennessee violate the NVRA by requiring applicants using the state voter registration form to submit proof of eligibility. In Arizona v. Lyter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc., 570 U.S. 1 (2013), the Supreme Court held that the NVRA's accept-and-use requirement forbids states from rejecting Federal Forms because applicants failed to submit supplemental documentation proving their eligibility to register. But the NVRA "also authorizes States, ‘ $i \mathrm{i}] n$ addition to accepting and using the' Federal Form, to create their own, state-specific voter registration forms." $I d$. at 12 (quotation omitted). Those forms "may require information the Federal Form does not." Id Under the NVRA, "States retain the flexibility to design and use their own registration forms" that create "procedural hurdles" not included on the Federal Form. Id. Thus, Tennessee does not violate the accept-and-use mandate by requiring state-form applicants to submit proof of voting rights restoration.

## VI. Tennessee Does Not Deprive Eligible Voters Of Their Right To Vote.

Count Five alleges that Defendants deprive Tennesseans of their constitutional right to vote in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. That happens, Plaintiffs say, because of the
above-mentioned practice of "reject[ing] all voter registration forms on which the applicant affirmed that they have a felony conviction." (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 655.) ${ }^{4}$

As discussed, Tennessee has no such practice. Supra Argument V. Because Tennessee's voter registration process does not burden the right to vote in the manner that the Plaintiffs allege, the court applies rational-basis review to Tennessee's voting process under the Burdick framework. See Ne. Ohio Coal. for Homeless v. Husted, 696 F.3d 580, 592 (6th Cir. 2012) ("a rational basis standard applies to state regulations that do not burden the fundamental right to vote"). The State has a legitimate interest in combatting voter fraud, safeguarding voter confidence, and ensuring accurate recordkeeping. Crawford v. Marion County Election Bd., 553 U.S. 181, 196-97 (2008). It advances these interests by requiring applicants to disclose whether they have a felony conviction-and, if so, to provide enough information for Tennessee to determine whether they are eligible to vote. See Hawkins v. DeWine, 968F.3d 603, 607 (6th Cir. 2020) (affirming validity of voter restrictions because they advanced election administration interests). ${ }^{5}$

## VII. The Court Should Grant Judgment For Defendants On The Requested Relief.

Plaintiffs seek a court rider rewriting state election law. The law does not allow that sweeping remedy, so the court should grant summary judgment foreclosing it. Loft v. Stationary

[^3]Eng'rs, Loc. 39 PTF, LLC, 87 F. Supp. 3d 1138, 1146 (N.D. Cal. 2015) (collecting cases that agree that a court may grant "summary judgment on the availability of a remedy").

Federal courts have limited power to remedy constitutional wrongs committed by States. When remedying such wrongs, federal courts must refrain "from 'rewrit[ing] state law to conform it to constitutional requirements." Ayotte v. Planned Parenthood of N. New England, 546 U.S. 320, 329 (2006) (quotation omitted). Institutional competence and principles of federalism caution federal courts against using injunctions to force new procedures on states. See Horne v. Flores, 557 U.S. 433, 448 (2009); Ayotte, 546 U.S. at 329. So although "federal courts can enter positive injunctions that require parties to comply with existing law," "they cannot usurp[ ] a State's legislative authority by re-writing its statutes to create new lant" Thompson v. DeWine, 959 F.3d 804, 812 (6th Cir. 2020) (per curiam) ("Thompson I") (cicaned up); see Thompson v. DeWine, 976 F.3d 610, 620 (6th Cir. 2020) ("Thompson II") "If we find a state ballot-access requirement unconstitutional, we can enjoin its enforcement," "[b]ut otherwise, 'state and local authorities have primary responsibility for curing constitutional violations"" (quotation omitted)); cf. Wilson $v$. $N L R B, 920$ F.2d 1282, 1289 (6th Cir. 1990) ("courts cannot . . . redraft statutory language").

Those principles hold true especially in the context of voting-rights disputes. "[T]he federal Constitution provides States-not federal judges-the ability to choose among many permissible options when designing elections." Thompson I, 959 F.3d at 812. As such, "federal courts have no authority to dictate to the States precisely how they should conduct their elections." Esshaki v. Whitmer, 813 F. App'x 170, 172 (6th Cir. 2020) (order). Injunctions requiring States to implement new procedures to remedy constitutional deficiencies in their electoral framework are thus improper. See, e.g., Thompson II, 976 F.3d at 620.

The first injunction sought by Plaintiffs flouts these limitations. Whether and in what circumstances to allow felons re-enfranchisement is a decision committed to Tennessee's discretion as it designs its elections. Richardson v. Ramirez, 418 U.S. 24, 54 (1974). Although the re-enfranchisement framework is subject to judicial scrutiny, that does not empower the court to rewrite the certificate-of-restoration system if it finds constitutional defects. Yet that is precisely what Plaintiffs ask the court to do here. They seek an injunction requiring Defendants "to implement constitutionally required safeguards to ensure that the COR system" satisfies due process-namely, "a uniform, formal mechanism to request a COR before an impartial decisionmaker," "a requirement to issue formal decisions on COR requests," "a requirement to provide a written statement of reasons for any denials of COP requests," "a requirement that any denials be based upon the statutory criteria for eligibility," "uniform procedures for interpreting the COR requirements," and "a uniform appeals process." (Amended Complaint, R. 102, PageID\# 658.) That remedy goes far beyond "enjoin[ing] the enforcement" of an unconstitutional law and "usurp[s]" Tennessee's "primary respensibility" for curing constitutional defects. Thompson I, 959 F.3d at 812; Thompson II, 976 F.3d at 620

The second injunction that Plaintiffs seek fares little better. To remedy alleged NVRA violations, Plaintiffs ask the court to compel Defendants to rewrite Tennessee's voter registration form and "issu[e] statewide guidance" prohibiting Tennessee from requiring applicants to submit proof of eligibility. R. 102 at 49-50. That amounts to nothing short of an improper request for the court to rewrite Tennessee voter registration procedures wholesale.

But the second requested injunction also suffers from a more fundamental problem. Remedies must be tailored to constitutional violations. Injunctive relief must be "limited to the inadequacy that produced the injury in fact that the plaintiff has established." Lewis v. Casey, 518
U.S. 343, 357 (1996). To the extent Plaintiffs seek to enjoin Tennessee from enforcing its requirement that applicants using the state voter registration form submit documentary proof, the requested relief exceeds the court's remedial powers because States may require applicants to submit proof of eligibility. See Arizona, 570 U.S. at 12.

To sum up, the injunctions requested by Plaintiffs are flawed and should not be issued. They would require the court to engage in "quintessentially legislative work" by re-writing Tennessee election law, Ayotte, 546 U.S. at 329, and restrict Tennessee from enforcing valid voter registration requirements. Because the remedies sought are impermissible, the court should enter summary judgment for Defendants.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, summary judgment should be granted in favor of Defendants on all Plaintiffs' claims and their request for relief.

Respectfully submitted,<br>JONATHAN SKRMETTI<br>Attorney General and Reporter<br>Sincerely,<br>/s/ Zachary L. Barker<br>ZACHARY L. BARKER, BPR \# 035933<br>Assistant Attorney Genera!<br>DAWN JORDAN<br>Senior Counsel<br>DAVID RUDOLPH<br>Senior Assistant Attorney General<br>Pubiic Interest Division<br>Office of the Attorney General<br>P.O. Box 20207<br>Nashville, TN 37202-0207<br>Zachary.Barker@ag.tn.gov<br>Counsel for Defendants
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## DECLARATION OF MARK GOINS, COORDINATOR OF ELECTIONS, TENNESSEE SECRETARY OF STATE, DIVISION OF ELECTIONS

I, Mark Goins, declare the following:

1. I am the Coordinator of Elections for the State of Tennessee. I am over the age of eighteen years, and I am competent io testify on the matters set forth herein.
2. On June 29, 2023, the Tennessee Supreme Court issued a decision interpreting the statutory restoration process of the right to vote for certain individuals with felony convictions in the State of Tennessee. Falls v. Goins, No. M2020-01510-SC-R11-CV, 2023 WL 4243961 (Tenn. June 29, 2023) (Exhibit 1). In that decision, the Court clarified that for an individual with a felony conviction to regain the right to vote in Tennessee, that individual must comply with both Tenn Code Ann. § 2-19-143 and the additional requirements set forth in Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-29-202. Falls, 2023 WL 4243961, at *7. The statutes read together create "a two -step
statutory process that is necessary to complete in its entirety before the right of suffrage is restored." Id.
3. Based on this decision, the Division of Elections determined that it was necessary to revise its policies and procedures for the restoration of voting rights for individuals with felony convictions and used the logic and analysis from Falls v. Goins to inform these revised policies and procedures. On July 21, 2023, the Division of Elections issued revised guidance on the COR process to require:

A person convicted of a felony in a Tennessee court, an om-of-state court, or a federal court must:

1. Have been pardoned by a Governor, U.S. President, or other appropriate authority of a state or have had full rights of citizenship restored as prescribed by law, and
2. Have paid all restitution to the victin or victims of the offense order by the court as part of the sentence, if any; and
3. Have paid all court costs assessed, if any, unless the court made a finding of indigency; and
4. Is current in all child support obligations, if any.
(See Ex. 3, Memo to County Elections Commissions.) This revised guidance was issued in a memorandum sent to the 95 County Election Administrators, the Clerks of the Circuit and/or Criminal Courts, the Tennessee Department of Correction, the U.S. Probation and Parole district offices, along with a new certificate of voting rights restoration form. (See Ex. 2, COR Form; Ex. 3, Memo to County Elections Commissions; Ex. 4, Memo to Tenn. Government Officials; Ex. 5, Memo to Federal Gov. Officials; Ex. 6, Memo to Clerks of Court.) These documents were issued in compliance with my statutory duties under Tenn. Code Ann § 40-29-205.
5. On July 21, 2023, the Division of Elections also announced policy revisions for the processing of voter registration applications for individuals with felony convictions prior to January 15, 1973, and for individuals with felony convictions between January 15, 1973, and May 17, 1981. These policy revisions were done to provide greater clarity to the process and to avoid the unnecessary rejection of voter registration applications of individuals who had not lost their voting rights due to a felony conviction. Under the prior policy, a voter registration application indicating that the applicant had been convicted of a felony was rejected unless the application was accompanied with a document demonstrating that the individual's voting rights had been restored (e.g., a Certificate of Restoration). The revised policy, set forth in a memorandum issued to the 95 County Election Administrators, instructs the Administrators to process voter registration applications for individuals iwo categories: (1) individuals with preJanuary 15,1973 , convictions that did not commit an infamous crime and (2) individuals with convictions between January 15, 1973, and May 17, 1981, if the person indicates on the face of the form that the person has a felony conviction in either of those categories. (Ex. 7, Memo on Older Felonies.) The revised pelicy further instructs that such persons do not have to provide any additional documentation to prove that they are eligible. In addition, the memo provides a list of the infamous crimes for the County Election Administrator to reference when reviewing a voter registration application listing a pre-January 15,1973 , felony conviction. (Id. at 2.)
6. If a County Election Administrator receives a voter registration application from an individual with a felony conviction, but it is not apparent from the face of the form that the individual's conviction(s) fall(s) within either of these two categories, the application will still be rejected unless the applicant provides supplemental documentation eligibility. However, that individual has a statutory right to appeal the rejection of their application. Specifically, Tenn.

Code Ann. § 2-2-125 requires the County Election Administrator to provide the reason for the rejection of an application, to inform the applicant of the right to appeal and to provide an appeal form. This form, the Voter Registration Rejection Appeal Form, has been updated to include as a ground for appeal that the rejected applicant did not lose their right to vote because they fall in one of the aforementioned categories. (Id. at 2; Ex.8, Rejection Appeal Form.)
6. As previously stated, these revised policies were issued and became effective on July 21, 2023.

Pursuant to U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing to be true and correct.


Executed on: 26 J4hy 2023

# Tennessee Secretary of State 



Elections Division
312 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, $7^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1102

615-741-7956
Mark.Goins@tn.gov

Mark Goins
Coordinator of Elections

## MEMORANDUM

To: County Election Commissions
From: $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Mark Goins Mawh Mon } \\ & \text { Coordinator of Elections }\end{aligned}$
Date: July 21, 2023
Subject: Restoration of Voting Rights

In order to avoid rejecting individuals for a felony conviction who did not lose their voting rights as a result of that conviction, the following process shall apply.

## 1. Felony convictions prior to Janıary 15, 1973

Due to this law applying to felonie $\leqslant$ committed 50 plus years ago, coupled with the age of the person at the time of conviction, it is extremely rare that you will have a person who falls in this category. Additionally, most of the individuals who committed a felony prior to January 15,1973 , will have already had their rights restored over the years since 1973. However, if you do have a pre-January 15, 1973, felony conviction, the process below should be followed.

For an applicant who indicates on the voter registration application that he/she was convicted prior to January 15,1973 , the following process applies:

Assuming all other information on the form is acceptable and eligibility requirements met, individuals who identify on the face of their voter registration form that they were convicted of a felony prior to January 15, 1973, for any offense NOT listed on the next page is eligible to register to vote because that person did not lose the right to vote. Accordingly, their voter registration form is to be processed.

- Abusing a female child
- Arson and felonious burning
- Bigamy
- Bribery
- Burglary
- Felonious breaking into a business house, outhouse other than a dwelling house
- Felonious breaking and entering a dwelling house
- Larceny
- Horse stealing
- Robbery
- Stealing bills of exchange or other valuable papers
- Receiving stolen property
- Counterfeiting
- Forgery
- Destroying a will
- Incest
- Rape
- Sodomy
- Buggery
- Perjury
- Subornation of perjury

If an individual indicates on the face of their registration that they were convicted of one of the above felonies prior to January 15,1973 , and declared infamous, the form must be rejected unless the applicant has had their rights restorec.

In order to provide an additional safeguard ior these individuals, the Voter Registration Notice of Appeal and Voter Registration Rejection Appeal Form have been updated in case a voter has not been convicted of an infamous felony.

## 2. Felony convictions between Jannary 15, 1973, and May 17, 1981:

We have another category $f$ voters that will be rare since it applies to felonies committed 40 plus years ago. However, for this category of applicants, assuming all other information on the form is acceptable and eligibility requirements met, individuals who identify on the face of their voter registration form that they were convicted of a felony between January 15, 1973, and May 17, 1981, are eligible to register to vote because those individuals never lost the right to vote. This voter registration form should be processed.

In order to provide an additional safeguard for these individuals, the Voter Registration Notice of Appeal and Voter Registration Rejection Appeal Form have been updated to account for voters who may be in this category.

In short, when processing a voter registration application where the applicant has indicated that he/she has a felony conviction, attention must be paid to the crime listed and the year of the conviction listed, if the applicant provides this information.

If you have any questions about this revised process, do not hesitate to contact my office. Thank you for your attention to details in processing voter registration applications for individuals previously convicted of a felony.
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The videotaped and videoconferenced
deposition of JESSICA LIM was taken on behalf of the Defendants on OCTOBER 29th, 2021, for all purposes under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The formalities as to notice, caption, certificate, et cetera, are waived. All objections, except as to the form of the questions, are reserved to the hearing.

It is agreed that Kasfe B. Hardy, being
a Notary Public and Court Reporer for the state of Tennessee, may swear the wititess, and that the reading and signing of thef completed deposition by the witness are reserved.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We're now on the record. Here begins the deposition of Jessica Lim. Today's date is October 29th, 2021 . Time on the video monitor is 9:34 a.m. This is in the matter of NAACP et al. versus William Lee, et al.

Would the court reporter please swear in the witness.

## JESSICA LIM,

was called as a witness, and after having been first duly sworn, testified as folłows:

## E X A M I NATMION

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Good morning, Ms. Lim. My name is Blair Bowie. I nepresent the plaintiffs in Tennessee NAAC versus Lee. I'm going to be asking you some quastions today.

For the record, can you note who else is present in your room?

A There is the court reporter to my right. My counsel, Alex Rieger and Matt Cloutier, and then also the videographer. And that's it.

Q Okay. Have you ever been deposed before?
A $\quad$ No.
Q Okay. So I'm going to go over some
BERES \& ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTERS
instructions before we start so you understand how this is going to work. I'll be asking you questions, and the court reporter is transcribing everything we say. So to make things easy on her, we can't be talking at the same time. So I appreciate if you'd please wait for me to finish asking my question before you give an answer, and I'll try to do the same when you're answering.

So that the court reporter is able to get everything on the record, please answer out loud with words rather than noddirg your head or saying "uh-huh."

If you don't understand a question for any reason, please tell me and I'll try to clarify it. If you answer ths question, I'll assume you've understood it.

Yourmight hear your attorneys object to a question that $I$ ask. That objection will be noted for the record, but you still must answer the question.

If you need a break at any time, just let me know and we'll be happy to accommodate you. I'd just ask that if $I^{\prime} v e$ already asked a question, you answer it before we go on any breaks.

Do you understand that you're under
oath today?
A Yes.
Is there any reason why you cannot give
truthful answers to my questions today?
A $\quad \mathrm{N} \circ$.
Q Are you taking any medications that impair
your memory?
A No.
Q Do you have any conditionsothat impair your
memory?
A No.
Q Could you please Shate and spell your full
name for the record.
A Jessica Cunn-ngham Lim. J-e-s-s-i-c-a,
$C-u-n-n-i-n-g-h-\infty-m, \quad L-i-m$.
Q Thank you. Do you have any documents or
papers in front of you?
A The exhibits that you sent. And then
otherwise, no.
Q Okay. I think you -- are you looking into
an iPad or are you looking into your own computer?
A An iPad --
Q Okay.
A -- tablet.
Q So there's nothing else open on that, other
than Zoom?
A $\quad \mathrm{Oh}, \mathrm{no}$.
Do you have your incoming text messages
visible to you?
A No.
Q Okay. Have you ever been a party to a
lawsuit in your personal or official capacity?
A No.
Q Okay. When did you first dearn about this
lawsuit, Tennessee NAACP versus Lee?
A About December of 2020, around the time that
the complaint was filed.
And what's your understanding of what this
lawsuit is about?
A I understand that it is about voter
registration a voter restoration for people with
felony convictions.
Q Have you read the complaint that initiated
this lawsuit?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Why?
A Why? Why, what?
Q Why did you read the complaint? What were
the circumstances under which you read it?
A To get more information about the lawsuit.

```
Q
this case?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Which ones?
A I believe I read the motion to dismiss
around the time that it was -- after it was filed.
I have read -- well, does that include Court orders
as well or...
Q Sure, yes.
A Okay. The Court order staying discovery.
Or, I guess it was a case status order. I believe
I - I might have read th@response in opposition to
the motion to dismiss as well. As far as pleadings,
I think that's it.
Q Okay. Have you read the request for
production that* plaintiffs made to the Division of
Elections in this case?
A Yes.
Q
Okay. Did you --
MS. BOWIE: I'd like to enter into the
record the document labeled A. Could you please
mark that as Exhibit 1.
                                    (Marked Exhibit No. 1.)
BY MS . BOWIE:
Q Thank you. Do you recognize this document
```

as the request for production from the plaintiffs in this case, the Elections Division?

MR. RIEGER: Blair, at this time, we are going to object to that question as well as the questions dealing with -- any future questions dealing with pleadings, as they do not fall within the topics provided for this $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ deposition. But you can go ahead and answer, Jessica.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Did you hedp prepare responses to this request for production?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection. We'll
continue it for sverything that deals with the request for production of documents and Exhibit $A$, that they fail outside of the enumerated topics in the $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ notice.

But please go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: No. I did not help with
the written responses to -- to this request for production.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Did you help produce any of the documents?
A Yes.

Q Okay. So you're familiar with the documents that were produced?

A Yes.
Q Okay. How did you prepare for this
deposition?
A I spoke to my attorneys. I read the complaint again, the Court order, which I'll call it, the -- I read the request for production again. I read the written responses as wedl, to the request for production, the notice of deposition, and then the -- I reviewed the documedits that we produced in response to the first requlest for production, Number 2 and Number 3.

I also spoketo several of the attorneys, or, I guess just the several of my -- of the employees in the Elections Division as well. Q Okar. So who did you speak with at the Elections --

MR. RIEGER: Blair -- Blair, since
the -- since the witness just referenced the 30(b) (6) notice, at this point, we're -- defendants are going to lodge a general objection to Topics 7 and 8 as outside of Counts 4 and 5 of the initial complaint and, therefore, stayed by the Court's case management order. We just wanted to make sure that
was on the record for posterity.
And I apologize for the interruption.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Returning to the question, who in the Elections Division did you meet with to prepare for this deposition?

A I spoke with the coordinator of elections, Mark Goins. I spoke to the deputy coordinator, Beth Henry-Robertson. I spoke to another attorney in the office named Andrew Dodd. And it also spoke to our elections specialist named Kathy Summers.

Q Okay. Did you spelak with anyone else about this deposition?

A About the slastance, no.
Q Okay. Ana understanding that I'm not asking you about anything that's privileged between your attorneys, when you met with them, was anyone else present at that meeting?

A No.
Q Okay. Have you had any written
communications with anyone to prepare for this deposition?

MR. RIEGER: I'll object -- I'll object to the extent that it seeks privileged communications.

Please go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: No, I don't believe so.

No, nothing written.
BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. Aside from what we've already
discussed, did you do anything else to prepare for this deposition?

A Oh, I - Yes. Well, I'll say I - - I looked back through the statutes as I was ceading the
complaint too. I reviewed our qurrent voter registration application.

I believe that's at.

Q Okay. And just to go back to the conversations that you had with other folks at the Elections Division, again, not asking about any communicationswith your attorneys, but can you tell me a little óit about what you talked about in those conversations?

MR. RIEGER: I'll - - I'll object to
that question to the extent that, as Ms. Lim is an attorney with her division, I'll object to maintain the attorney-client privilege between any communications that might have been had that would have been privileged apart from deposition preparation.

THE WITNESS: So with Beth, the
deputy - - excuse me, Beth Henry-Robertson, I spoke with her to -- to review the policy or the prior - I guess before $I$ joined the policy or the - - excuse me - - (drinking water). Stuff's going around.

-     - the -- the prior policy about the timing, the official policy on the timing of restoration and registration. I also spoke with her about the process for how we -- when we make changes to our voter registration, how we disperse and coordinate disbursement, I guess, to the agencies and the counties, the County Election Commissions, and the website, I guess I'll say too.

With

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay.
A Oh, Sorry.
Q No, go ahead.
A With Andrew Dodd and Kathy Summers as well, I had the same conversation about the process of how we disperse our voter registration applications when we make changes to the other government agencies and the counties, County Election Commissions.

With Andrew Dodd as well, I also spoke with him about the history, I guess, of our online voter
registration and any changes that had been made and the process, the -- I guess, technical process behind it.

And then with coordinator Mark Goins, I spoke to him about the same thing, about the history -- no, sorry, not the history. About the process of how we get changed voter registration applications to the government agencies, to the appropriate state agencies and theoconty Election Commissions.

And I believe that'sit.
Q Okay. Do you knowhow long each of those individuals has worked Eor the Elections Division? It's okay to estimate.

A Kathy Summers, like, 15 to 20 years. Andrew
Dodd, maybe 7 All of these are guesstimates. I apologize. I'm not - $^{\prime}$ I really don't know. They're ballpark. Coordinator Mark Goins, I don't -- 13 years. And then Beth Henry-Robertson, maybe 20 to 25.

Q Okay, thank you. Just going back a little to the work you did to produce documents in response to Exhibit 1 , can you tell me what you did to search for documents to respond to that request?

MR. RIEGER: Since there's been some
intervening time now, I'll renew the objection that this falls outside the deposition topics.

But please go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: For Request for
Production Number 2 -- my goodness. I started by gathering all our training that is internal by looking through our $H$ drives and then also the training that we share with the counties. And obviously, there was overlap thereowith the ones that we had, but wanted to makes sure that $I$ got everything.

I also looked on just the general Secretary of State's wobite to make sure there wasn't anything there that $I$ hadn't caught. Next, I checked my e-mails, both the ones just in my e-mail folder, the seft and received. I did that by -- by hand. I dian't do a search term. And I also checked any e-mails that $I$ had saved in a folder, in a digital folder.

Then $I$ next turned to any documents that others in the office would have. So I worked with the deputy, Beth Henry-Robertson, to gather her e-mails first. And then any older trainings or anything that she also had had saved on her computer or that she knew of that $I$ was missing.

The same with coordinator Mark Goins. We checked with him. Beth and -- Beth and I checked with him. And $I$ believe we also asked our election specialist, Kathy Summers and Andrew Dodd as well, just to make sure that they didn't have anything. Then $I$-- next $I$ turned to the -- my predecessor said that the person in my position before me -- I guess the persons -- back through 2015, I tried to check the foldersond files that we had available to us that were left to see if there were anything in there, any oomminications or documents that we had thate they had left behind in their personal files. believe that's it for Request for Production Number 2 .

For Kequest for Production Number 3, we, Beth Henry $\forall$ Robertson and I, looked back over our communications, so our e-mails first, and then also our -- anything saved that we had, any saved documents. For Request for Production Number 3, Beth -- she checked her computer and files for older documents that she had.

We also asked every -- I believe every person, every other employee in the office, to check their files and make sure that they also gave us any -- anything responsive to Request for Production

Number 3 .
I think we also checked the -- I think we also checked the -- any training that we had for that as well and then maybe also the Secretary of State's website to see if there was anything we had missed.

And $I$ believe that's it. I believe
that's everything
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q You mentioned a folder on your e-mail. Can you tell me what that folder for?

A There's not a folder on my e-mail.
Q A digital foldct.
A So on my -- $\quad$ n my - on my -- I guess, in our H drive, which is where we save stuff and we -we have our ow folders, sometimes when there are questions when the county has a question or even the individual has a question, $I$ will save it just actually to help them in case anything comes up in the future or if there's ever an issue. I'll try to save them. Obviously, there are a lot, so I - I don't catch them all. But $I$ will try to save them so I can do a quick search in the future if there are ever any issues.

Q And are you referring to questions about
eligibility status after a felony conviction specifically?

A Yes.
Q Your office also made a supplemental production, I believe, late this summer. Did you help with that?

A I don't believe I helped with that. I - I don't believe that $I$ helped with that. I think that -- yeah, no, $I$ personally didonot.

Q Okay. I'm going to move on to some easier
questions now. I just want le learn a little bit about your educational and professional background. Can you please start by describing or summarizing your educational banground.

A So I went to -- I guess I'll start with high
school. I went to high school here in Nashville at Ezell-Harding Christian School. I then attended college, undergraduate at Samford University in Birmingham, Alabama. I graduated from there in May 2011. And then I attended law school at the University of Virginia School of Law. And I graduated from there in May 2014.

Q Okay. And when did you start working at the Elections Division?

A August 4th, 2019, yeah.

was that part of the job description?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Who is your supervisor?
A Deputy Beth Henry-Robertson and the coordinator of elections, Mark Goins.

Q Okay. And is the coordinator the supervisor for the deputy coordinator?

A Yeah. It's not a formal -- it's not a formal vertical -- $I$ mean, our offece just isn't in a linear -- but, yes, I would sey he supervises her. Q Understood. Have you held any other roles with the Elections Division since you've been there?

A No. Well, I will say - and I didn't mean to leave this out, but $I$ interned with them actually back in the summs of 2008. I was an intern during college, so - $\quad$ but not - I have not held any other roles sincerbeing an attorney with them since 2019 , no.

Q Got it. You didn't leave it out. I haven't asked about that yet.

A Oh, okay. I had forgotten about it honestly, but, yeah.

Q I was just about to ask, what did you do for work before joining the Elections Division?

A So I actually wouldn't have even counted
that, I guess, because it was an intern.
Do you want all my internships and stuff, like, throughout college, or do you mean just -Q Did you go straight from law school to working at the Elections Division?

A No. So after law school, I worked in
Washington, D.C. at a law firm called wiley Rein.
Then $I$ moved here to Nashville and continued to work for Wiley Rein remotely. Technicaly, I was changed to, I think, a contractor rathe than an associate. But $I$ continued to work for that same firm.

And then in January 2018, I joined as an associate with the law irm here in Nashville named Leader, Bulso \& Nolan at the time. And then from there, in June - or, sorry, August 2019, I joined the Elections ivision.

Q During your time with those firms, did you have any particular areas of expertise in the law, or focuses?

A So at my D.C. law firm, Wiley Rein, I was in the insurance litigation group. So I would call that my focus. At Leader, Bulso, the Nashville firm, I would say I did tort litigation, catastrophic personal injury. I also did some insurance coverage work there as well. I would say
those were my main primary focuses. Maybe pharmaceutical stuff and litigation. But, yeah, those are the primary cases that $I$ had.

Q Okay. And can you describe any work you did while you were in law school?

A So the summer -- well, I volunteered -- I did pro bono with several law -- while $\quad$ was in law school. But I -- I guess I don't count those. And so if you just mean internships --osummer internships, the summer after mily year, I worked at Microsoft in Seattle. They recruited me, and I worked for their legal -- forgot what the -- it's LCA. I forgot what that acronym stands for. But their general counsel essentially and business teams.

So I worked in Microsoft my 1L year. My 2L year, the summer after my $2 L$ year, $I$ was a summer associate at Wiley Rein. And they hired me at the end of the summer to come back after I graduated. Q Okay. So I'd like to talk a little bit more about the structure of the Elections Division and the responsibilities of the division. So I'd like to help understand the different job titles and job responsibilities in the office. You've already told me a little bit about the coordinator, the deputy
coordinator, Mr. Dodd, and Ms. Summers. Are there any other people who work in the Elections Division?

MR. RIEGER: We'll object that this
falls outside the deposition topics.
But you can answer to your knowledge. THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Who else works in the Elections Division?
A We have a systems administrator. And
forgive me if these aren't theif technical titles, but we have a systems administrator. His name is Steve Griffy. Then we hare a, I guess, junior systems administrator whe helps Steve. His name's Carson Cook. And then we also have two, I guess, administrative assistants or executive assistants. Their names are Britney McDaniel and Amanda Mosley. Q Anodo you occasionally have legal clerks from law schools during the summer?

A Legal, no. Oh.
Q Okay.
A Oh, wait, sorry. I apologize. Yes, we had a -- yes, we had a -- it was actually right before I personally joined. But someone named Joshua Anderson. He was -- it was after his first year of law school, $\quad$ believe, at $\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{T}}$. He was helping
actually with felony restoration issues, among other things.

Q And for all those folks in your office, what are their roles related to checking the eligibility of people with felony convictions?

A In -- in terms of their roles, so I -- as we stated earlier, $I$ would be the primary person in the office. The -- can you repeat the question again? Was it checking the eligibility ofopeople registered?

Q Checking the eligibi\&ity of registrants with felony convictions.

MR. RIEGER. I'll object to the form of the question.

But you can go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Okay. I probably
should -- sor i would be the primary person. Steve and Carson, they will -- they will create reports based on -- so we -- so we get data from the Tennessee Department of Corrections. And Steve and Carson will -- they help on the database side, create -- $I$ mean, keeping it in a place that is usable, the data that is usable. So they help me with any issues that come up really. But also when counties have issues with their -- on the county
level, with anything really, but including felons and felon files and documents, Steve and Carson will help with that as well, so on the technical side. Britney McDaniel is the one -- so under
the NVRA, the U.S. attorney's offices are required to send us notices of felony convictions for any person who is a resident of Tennessee. Britney McDaniel is the one who receives those and will enter them into a database and disperse them to the correct counties.

And then that's about it. Beth will
supervise -- she will -sometimes for calls or sometimes the counties will -- just because she's been there for a long time, the countiss will reach out to her directly. And if it's a Yuick thing, she'll answer. So she is kind of filling in the gaps, $I$ would say. But, otherwise, that's it in the office BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. And what is the role of the Elections Division generally in the voter registration process?

A Can you clar- - can you clarify your question? I'm not -- I'm not 100 percent sure. Q Well, let's start somewhere else. What role
do the county offices of elections play in the voter registration process?

A So I guess we'll start - - so just generally,
all the counties process -- receive and process all voter registration applications for residents in each of their counties.

Q Okay. And what is the Elections Division's role in that work?

A In the initial processing, mone, unless they have questions. But the Elections Division is not involved in accepting or processing voter registration applications, if - -
Q So --

A - that's what you mean.
Q - do people ever send voter registration applications directly to the Elections Division?

A Yes, rarely. It used to be more often, but now especially rarely. When they come in, our - our two assistants will just directly send them out to the proper county. We don't keep them or process them.

Q Okay. And you mentioned that sometimes they have questions, the AOEs have questions as they're processing registrations. What kind of questions? A Truly any question. They can run the gamut.

It can be about a person who didn't correctly fill out the form. Although they know -- they take care of that as well. But it can be about -- I mean truly, any -- any issue that comes up when they're processing, if they have a question. If there's a -- if they're registered in another county, if there's any issue with processing them or reviewing their eligibility -- and $I$ mean that very broadly -to register.

Q Sure. And do you issue<instructions to the county offices of elections on how to process voter registrations?

MR. RIEGER: I'll object to the form of the question.

But you can go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: We -- so the statutes cover the process of processing voter registration applications. But the Elections Division has had at least one training on voter registrations generally. And then there was another training on -specifically on if a county has to deny or reject -if a voter registration is deficient or needs to be rejected, there's one -- at least one training on the process for that.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And that's a training that the Elections Division gives to the AOEs, the administrative offices of elections; is that right?

Sorry, I didn't define that term before, but
let me do that now. AOE means administrator of election, right?

A Yes.
Q Okay. So county, county aoininistrators of elections. And we'll refer to would you like to refer to the county-level ofices as county offices of elections, or do you halve another way that you like to refer to those?

A I generally say counties. Or if I say "election commisslons," I mean them, not the state. There is a State election commission. But, yeah, if I say election commissions. But, yeah, we can go with counties, whatever's easiest.

Q Okay. We'll use those, thank you.
And the question that $I$ have is, you -- you mentioned trainings and you meant the election division gives trainings to the counties; is that right?

A So by "trainings," it is a training that we have -- those are individual trainings that the

Elections Division gave in the past. We don't - - as far as $I$ know, since they were done, but especially not recently, we don't redo them. We haven't redone. So it's not an annual training on those topics, just to clarify. But, yes, it's from the Elections Division to the county AOEs.

Q Okay. And when were those trainings done, the ones that you know of?

A I believe the one on - just generally on voter registration, voter registration applications was in 2015. I can't remember without having them in front of me right now. But then I - and then the one about deficientor rejected applications was 2017. Again, I - I don't know without having them in front of me or seeing them on the computer with a date.

Q Okay. And so you said you don't do them every year. So the most recent training on each topic would be the definitive source unless you've issued another training that sort of supercedes it. Is that what I'm understanding?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Let me clarify. When -- you don't give trainings every year, so are the counties expected to retain those trainings from the past and refer back to them unless you've given them a more recent training on that topic?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

But please go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No, 的Ot necessarily.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Are those trainings -- those training materials, are they available to the counties? A With -- at the time they were given, they were all made avallable, yes. We also provide that -- so have them available to the counties. The -- somefof them available to the counties. The ones that we produced, I'm not sure. We looked at both what we had internally and then the ones that are still made available to the counties. But -and so some of them might not still be, but, yes, some of them are still available.

Q How do you make them available to the counties?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.
Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: We have a training website exclusively for administrators and the staff who they want to share it with, and $\operatorname{l}$ believe the county commissioners as well, that is password protected. That is just for them.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So some of the trainings are there. Do you expect that they will save the trainings when you give them to them and send them to them?

MR. RIEGER: ROject to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Can you repeat that?
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do rou expect that they will save the trainings that you send them?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: When we do the
presentation, like, at the time, yes, I think -- I don't know. But, yes, I think we assume most would save them.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you know which trainings are available on that website that you mentioned?

A Yes. I have access to it as well, if that's what you're asking. I can see.

Q Do you remember right now which trainings are available?

A Do you mean of the ones that we gave -- of the ones that we gave to you that ace responsive? Q No. I mean on that website, which trainings are on there?

A No. It's many.
Q Okay. Is the 2015 voter registration training on there?

A I believe so.
Q Have there been more recent trainings on how to process fégistrations for people with felony convictions?
Aith people with felony convictions
specifically, which is not -- which is more specific than what $I$ was talking about earlier, yes.

Q Can you describe those trainings, please. You can tell me the dates and what they covered. A Are you -- so you're asking for any training on processing voter registrations for people with

```
felony convictions?
```

Q Yes.
A So there are quite a few. I, again, don't
remember all off the top of my head. So I know
there is one on -- I think it's just called
"Restoration of voting rights." I don't -- I don't
know without seeing the date that it was given, but
maybe -- maybe 20 --
Q You can just give me the year.
A -- 13. Again, I don't know the dates.
Q Did you say 2013? Sorry.
A Maybe, yeah. I would -- I would count the
rejection and denial PcNerPoint that $I$ referenced
earlier as well as dealing with people -- I mean,
with voter registration applications for people with
felony convictions, because it does cover that
topic. Like I said, I believe that one was in 2017
[verbatim]. Again, $I$ can't know without seeing it
in front of me.

There have been -- there are many others that are available on the training website. Again, I . . .

Q Have you developed or given any of those trainings?

MR. RIEGER: Objection --

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Again, I'm asking about trainings on how to process voter registrations for people with felony convictions.

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: And these are the ones available on the training website?

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Yes.
A $\quad$ o.
Q Have you given $a n y$ that aren't available on
the training websit ?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q What was that training on and when?
A In September 2021, I gave a training on restoration of voting rights for people with felony convictions. And then -- but although -- it's not processing voter registrations, which is a different thing. But it's about people with felony
convictions.
And then $I$ also had a formal memo that we sent out to the counties kind of updating an old training on expungements and how to handle a proof of expungement or a document about expungement.

So, yes, that's another one. Again, I - I can't remember nearly all of them. But one of them we had on the training website was about expungements as well.

Q Okay.
A There are -- there ate - -
Q Other than - I'mborry.
A Sorry, I just can't remember all of them on the website, the traning website. I truly can't. Q Okay. Other than trainings, what other kinds of materials do you issue to the counties to help them with processing registrations for people with felony convictions?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: So like I mentioned, we will send out memos, formal memos, occasionally to clarify something or supplement something. We will also, just one-on-one, with counties when they have
questions during phone calls or in e-mails, $\quad$ guess, train them.
We also -- the administrators of
elections will -- when they become -- when they become the administrators after a certain time, they will take a test to be certified under the statutes. And I believe -- I do not give those trainings, but I believe those trainings do -- the questions differ from year to year. But they can cover voter registrations for people with felony convictions. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q When a - when a county calls the Elections Division with a question about a registration from somebody with a felgy conviction, do you take notes on that phone cal?

A It jus depends.
Q Do souve any notes electronically from those phone calls?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q You mentioned that sometimes you issue formal memos. What kinds of formal memos --
which -- can you tell me the dates and subjects of any formal memos that have been issued about processing voter registrations from people with felony convictions that you know of?

A That $I \quad k n o w$ of or can remember, again, in September, so very recently, we issued a formal memo about expungements and what to do when a county receives documentation showing that a person has had their felony conviction or convictions expunged. Q Any others that you know of?

A For felony convictioits, no, not that I can think of.

Q Where are the materials kept for the trainings for the administrators tasked? Are those on that same website that you mentioned?

A I dont believe so. I believe -- so the deputy, Bet? Henry-Robertson, and then the HAVA attorney, Andrew Dodd, are the main ones who
administer that. And coordinator Mark Goins is involved as well. But $I$ believe that they will send out the study materials to each class of administrators beforehand.

So, no, it's not kept on the training website.

Q Do you issue any template materials for the
counties to use when they're processing registration?

A Yes.
Q What kind of template materials do you issue?

A So we have a - we have provided the counties in the past with a template or sample letter to send to an applicant when the voter registration is deficient. And that's for any reason, but including issues with felony conviction.

We have a template or sample on - - or letter that the counties can send to a registrant when their voter registratior application is rejected or denied. And that's, again, for any reason, including a felony conviction.

We have -- again, without seeing them in front of mer- without seeing them in front of me, I can't remember many more. But we do provide them, and those are two examples.

Q Are the counties expected or required to use those materials?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: It depends. But, no, I
would not say required. So it depends on what you mean by "template." So there are official -- well, no. I'll just say no, they're not required. Yeah, I wouldn't say they're required. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do you review any of the county materials that they actually use?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No, unless they - - no, not unless the county asksfus for guidance on a specific individual or issue or unless something's brought to our atterition.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q So if whey ask for a specific guidance and, say, in thaz exchange, you see some of the template materials, and you think that they're deficient for some reason, would you correct the county?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yes, if the -- yes.
BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do you issue any handbooks to the counties?
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```
A On felony - - on felony issues?
Q On registration broadly.
A No, none that I can - - no. We have made,
like, registration press materials and, I guess,
maybe handbooks for the public that we provide to
the county and disperse. But, no, I wouldn't - -
nothing for the counties.
Q When a county reaches out to you with
questions about a registrant's eligibility, is the
determination that you make about that person's
eligibility - - and I mean the Elections Division - -
authoritative?
```

                            MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
    question.
Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Can you repeat the
question?
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q When a county reaches out with a question
about a registrant's eligibility to vote and asks
you a question about it, does your decision on that
person's eligibility, is that authoritative?
MR. RIEGER: Same objection.
Go ahead and answer, please.
THE WITNESS: If by "authoritative" you
mean that is -- that we are the final decision-maker, no.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So a county could make their own decision about whether that person is eligible that conflicts with the Elections Divisions' determination?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: The Councy Election
Commission can vote on voter registration applications. And their vote is the final determination.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. I'd like to ask a bit about how your office interacts with the agencies that are required to provide registration under the National Voter Registration Act. Are you familiar with what I'm talking about when I refer to those agencies?

A I believe you mean the Department of Safety, the Department of Human Services. If by that you mean those specific agencies, then, yes.

Q Are you okay with using the shorthand agencies when we're talking about those - those agencies that have been designated to offer voter registration services, just as shorthand for - -

As required -- for the ones who are required to under NVRA, yes. For now, yes.

Q Okay. What is the relationship between the Elections Division and those agencies?

MR. RIEGER: I'll object to the form of
the question.
But go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's different with
the -- each agency, I'm going to have to say.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Does the Elections Division offer any training to the agencies how to process voter registrations?

A No.
Q Does the Elections Division issue any
materials to those agencies for processing voter registration applications?

A Materials specific -- other than the voter
reg -- other than our voter registration
application, you mean materials specifically for
those agencies?
Q To help the agencies understand what they're supposed to do with the voter registration applications.

A I don't believe so. None specific to the
agencies or each one.
Q Do you help those agencies with questions about eligibility?

A No. The agencies don't determine eligibility.

Q What are the agencies' responsibilities in the registration process?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: They provide a -- they provide the voter registration application or have available to their -- Il say customers if you're comfortable using that, or clients. They make the voter registration application available to them. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do $\quad$ © potential registrants about their eligibility?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead, please.
THE WITNESS: What was the question, again? Do -- sorry, what was the question again?

MS. BOWIE: Can you read it back, please.
(The requested question was read back by the court reporter as follows:
"Question: Do the agencies answer questions from potential registrants about their eligibility?")

THE WITNESS: I don't know.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Does the Elections Division provide any materials or trainings to the agencies?

A I believe I answered that before, but, no, none spe -- don't believe ary specific to the agencies.

MS. BOWIE: Can you please mark the document labeled $B$ Eshibit 2 .
(Manked Exhibit No. 2.)
BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do rou know what this document is?
A Yes.
Q What is it?

A It is a training or a policy outline that we have provided to the counties on voter registrations in Tennessee.

Q And is this - when was this made?

A I believe 2015. This is the same one I was referencing earlier about processing voter
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registrations generally.
Q So is this up to date?
A (Reviewing documents.) I'm not sure if the websites with the internet forms are up-to-date. They should be, but I'm not -- I haven't checked. (Reviewing documents.)

Yes, then -- I mean, it appears that otherwise it is a -- not comprehensive, but it's an outline on -- and it appears all up-to-date. Q And you mentioned that this was issued to the counties. Is this availale to the agencies?

A I don't believe so.
Q Do the agencies coordinate with the county elections offices toceive materials or trainings on how to process voter registrations?

Mi2. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: The agencies do not receive, as far as $I$ know, trainings on how to process voter registration applications because they do not process voter registration applications. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do they have any -- do you issue any materials or trainings generally to the agencies?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Can you -- do we issue?

What was the question again?
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Does the Elections Division issue any
trainings or materials to the agencies?

A About anything?
Q About anything.
MR. RIEGER: I'I object to the extent that this exceeds the confines of Counts 4 and 5 of the complaint and the scope of the deposition topics.

But you can go ahead and answer to your knowledge.

THE WITNESS: Yes. So we provide them - - when there's a new - - well, I don't know if you would consider it training, but whenever we have a new voter registration application - - by "new," I mean revised - - we will provide notice to them of that. We give information on how to get those new voter registration applications, like, where to order them.

We have also -- when -- when a person
misses a voter registration deadline and - - and it brings it to our attention, most times when they vote provisionally, but says that they were registered but the county has absolutely no record of it, but the person claims that they were, if they did the registration, if they filled it out and turned it in at one of these agencies and they let us know which one, we have set up a system where we can - we have contacts at each agency to check on that.

So hopefully we Can get that - - I don't want to say back-dated, brit get that registration so the person - so it can be counted in case it was lost.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do yourknow who produced Exhibit 2?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form - -
BY MS. BOWIE:

Q The document we're looking at?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer to your knowledge.
THE WITNESS: The Elections Division.
BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Who in your office worked on it?

A Either Beth Henry-Robertson or me mainly MS. BOWIE: Okay. Can we take the document labeled $C$ and mark it as Exhibit 3 . BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do you know what this document is?
MR. RIEGER: If you'll wait just a
second, Blair. We're passing out papers.
MS. BOWIE: Okay.
MR. RIEGER: All right, we're set.
(Marked Exhibit No 3.)
THE WITNESS: (REviewing documents.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you know what this document is?
A I, personally, no, do not.
Q Okay. Dgés the Elections Division provide any training materials to the agencies on the intake and $<$ ransmission of voter registrations?

MR. RIEGER: I will object -- I'll
object to the question based on the fact that the topics identified are specific to Counts 4 and 5 and deal with applicants with felony convictions not general guidance. And $I$ do not believe anything in this document concerns -- concerns applicants with felony convictions.

But you can go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: Well, can you repeat the
question?
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Does the Elections Division provide any instructions or trainings to the agencies on the intake and transmission of voter registration information?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection.
But go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No, ${ }^{\text {d }}$ don't believe so.
MS. BOWIE: Okay. Why don't we take a
10-minute break.
MR. RIEGER. Sure thing.
THE VIR ${ }^{\text {P }}$ ORAPHER: Going off the
record. Time on the monitor is 10:50.
(Recess observed.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record. The time on the monitor is 11:01.

MS. BOWIE: Okay, thank you.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Before we move on, I'd just like to go back and ask one clarifying question from an earlier line.

Before you joined the Elections Division in
August of 2019 , who worked on eligibility questions
for people with felony convictions?
A So before me, the full-time employee in that position was named Tyler Cosby. He -- and then he had Joshua Anderson, the legal intern, who I mentioned before, helping him. And then also Beth Henry-Robertson would help too, especially right before $I$ came, or during the transition, she would -- she would help quite a bit. But I think mostly Tyler, and then Joshua, when he was there. Q Do you know how long Tyier was with the Elections Division?

A I believe 18 months or so, I believe.
Q Do you know whocovered that responsibility before he was there?

A It would have been the -- so there was a woman in the fice named Abby Tyler who was the one who helped who did that before. She worked in conjunction with the elections attorney named Cara Harr, who had been there for a long time. I can't even -- probably 15, 20 years. But she -- Abby and Cara worked on it.

And then there also was an elections attorney, $I$ believe, before Abby joined, before Tyler, before Abby, named Laura.

Q Okay, thank you. So I want to switch gears
and ask a question about who and -- who is and who is not eligible to vote in Tennessee after having been convicted of a felony.

So I'm sure you know in many states, every person who has been convicted of a felony loses the right to vote. Is that the case in Tennessee?

Does every person convicted of a felony lose the right to vote?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q How is the righto vote lost for a criminal conviction in Tennessee?

M2. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: So under -- so in the Tennessee Constitution, people convicted of infamous crimes lose the right to -- or can have the right to vote taken away, or lose the right to vote. And the legislature can make laws excluding people with felony convictions from the right to vote.

In subsequent cases, the courts have
held that people convicted of felonies before January 15th, 1973 -- well, $I$ guess I'll say the courts and a mix of the statutes as well -- infamous crime -- they had to have been judged infamous. And they were a certain -- it's a certain number of enumerated specific crimes that were also considered infamous. And so that was before January 15 th, 1973.

On January $15 t h, 1973$, until May $17 t h$, 1981, people with felony convictions did not lose their right to vote. Starti(1)9 May 18th, 1981, people with felony convictions lose the right to vote unless they have gotten their voting rights restored

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q When stomebody registers to vote, how do the counties krow if they were convicted of a felony?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of a question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: On the voter registration
application, one of the questions is whether the person has ever been convicted of a felony -- or I believe it says "or felonies." If the person answers truthfully under penalty of perjury, they
will mark "Yes." Although the form specifies if they have gotten expunged, they should mark "No." I don't consider expungements a felony conviction, but I just wanted to say that.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Are there any other ways that the counties might know that somebody was convicted of a felony when they were -- let me start over.

Are there any other ways that the counties might know that the registrant was convicted of a felony?

MR. RIEGER: Robject to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Many, many times before the process starts, the person will contact -- the person who interested in registering to vote will contact the county. Sometimes they'll contact me and say that they have a felony and they want to know about the process, or they will say actually they're not sure. If they had a felony, they -they were involved in a court case, but they can't remember for one reason or the other because it was a long time ago or because they were concerned with other things at the time. So those are two ways.

Another way is under the Tennessee statutes, the clerks of the courts in every county are required to send notices of felony convictions to each county, to -- to each county. And so that's another way that a county would know beforehand or at the time of registration if a person has a felony conviction. And also, counties can also share that information with each other.

MS. BOWIE: Can we maxk the document labeled D as Exhibit 4, please.
(Marked Exhibit No. 4.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you know what this document is?
A It looks like a rejection letter from the Weakley County Election Commission to a person who has completed voter registration application due to their vozing rights not being restored - or answering "Yes" to the following question on the voting rights not being restored and/or the office has received information that they were convicted of a felony and their voting rights were not restored. Q Does this form letter from Weakley County resemble the template rejection notice that was created by the Elections Division that you mentioned earlier in the deposition?

```
A I believe so.
Q Okay.
A I --
Q Sorry.
A Sorry, I...
    (Reviewing documents.)
```

    Well, I'll say the -- the "Answering no to
    the 18 years of age question" has been changed. It
    looked like they do it to help -- vell, I don't know
    why. But that's been changed. So there are --
    there are some changes, but resembles, I'll say.
    Q And you just read the boxes that were
checked, these top two?
A Uh-huh.
Q Can you can you just summarize those two
reasons for revection, those two top boxes.
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.

But go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: So this letter from
Weakley County says that -- so the first box says, "Answering yes to the felony question and the voting rights have not been restored."

It then specifies, "If your conviction
was between January 15, 1973 and May 17, 1981, you
did not lose your right to vote," and "Provide documentation showing your conviction date" fell between those.

The second box says -- or the
"Information received by this office that you've been convicted of a felony and your voting rights have not been restored."

And, again, it specifies, but "If your conviction was between January 15,193 and May 17, 1981, you did not lose your right to vote," and asks for documentation to show the conviction date. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. So just Kor purposes of organizing what we're talking about here, it seems -- is it fair to say that there are two buckets of ways a county or the mections Division might know if somebody was convicted of a felony? Either they -they answered yes to the felony question on the registration form, or you have -- you, the Elections Division, or the county -- has some other source of information that indicates that they may have been convicted of a felony?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, yeah. Sorry, I was
thinking. I had to think. Yeah.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. You mentioned before that AOEs or the counties sometimes call you to get more information about the eligibility of a registrant who might have a felony conviction. What kinds of searches for people with felony convictions are available to you at the Elections Division?

A So you're asking what I do to search when they contact me, not -- not the facts, the different types of situations wherefthey would ask for that information; is that cosrect?

Q Yes.
A Yeah. Sg $I$ check in several different
places. So werget data from the Tennessee Department 0 Corrections on felony convictions that they have in their database. It is updated -- their data is updated, $I$ would say, a little bit more than quarterly. I think probably every -- yeah, maybe two or three months. But so they -- and it's -it's a kind of automatic thing. But Steve Griffy and Carson Cook, who I mentioned earlier, set up that process with TDOC to get that information pushed to us and put into the database that's usable
to me.
So we get that information from the Tennessee Department of Corrections. I will check that information. The information from the Tennessee Department of Corrections includes people convicted here in Tennessee that they have the data for. It also can include people convicted in other states whose probation, parole or other type of community supervision was transferied here. And so the -- in those cases, TDOC can have records on their felony conviction.

In addition, will check the database that we have made for people with fel -- federal convictions. So as mentioned earlier, under the NVRA, the U.S. attorney's offices are required to send us noticeror information any time anyone who's a resident 0 fennessee is convicted of a felony.

As I also mentioned, we have an
employee, Britney McDaniel, who enters that into a database and disperses it to the correct county to handle the voter registration. But $I$ will check that federal -- I say database, but it's -- as well. I'll then also check the databases that $I$ keep, or that we, the Elections Commission Division, keeps on prior denials and prior restorations as well for
anyone that we have ever received.
And then finally, $I$ will also check the Tennessee Department of Corrections, their online felony offender website. In theory and in practice, I'll say, they overlap. The people who are in our TDOC database will be the same as on their website. The only reason $I$ do the website as well is because, like I also mentioned, our database is updated every two or three months. So I just want to make sure that for anyone whose status is changed in those two months, two or three months could have changed, that $I$ capture that. Or just make sure.

And then finally, $I$ will just do a public records searg on -- using Westlaw.
Oh, ànd I'll --

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Sorey. Go ahead.
A I'll also say too, if the person -- again, as $I$ kind of indicated before, there are many situations where this could arise. But if a person wants help and knows kind of -- or knows where their conviction was, say in another state or a specific county in Tennessee -- in that case too, I'll check with that court. I'll call that court, or I'll check with that state. If they have databases or
portals available online, I'll check. But then sometimes I'll call as well or send records requests. But that's if they -- they tell us. Q Okay. And since you said this, I just want to define for the record, TDOC, T-D-O-C, Tennessee Department of Corrections?

```
A Yes, apologies.
```

Q And the felony offender database, that's
shorthand transferred from to as foil, right?
A Yes.
Q $\quad \mathrm{F}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{I}-\mathrm{L}$ ?
A Yes.
Q So you said that there is a database from
TDOC. And you mentioned earlier that that's
maintained by a data specialist in the Elections
Division office.
A Waiz, can you say that again?
Q You mentioned that you-all keep a database
of information from TDOC on convictions. And you
had said earlier that that was maintained by Steve
Griffy in your office; is that right? Is that the
same database that you were talking about before?
A Yes. So Steve Griffy and Carson Cook -- I
don't know if $I$ would use the word "maintained," but
they -- when TDOC has the updates available -- I
mean, it's an updated tables and data available to us, again, $I$ think it's every two or three months. They are the ones who coordinate that -- and usualy overnight because I'm working in it all day. But usually overnight, they'll get the new data in. So I don't -- if that's what you mean by "maintain," yes.

Q And you keep -- is that database separate from the database you keep of the federal convictions that are reported te you by the U.S. attorneys?

A Yes. They're difflerent tables, yes. Q Okay. So that's two separate databases, two separate tables, well say.

A I also want to specify too that the TDOC state convictions and the TDOC -- what we call ISC, but they'refthe out-of-states that are transferred here, that's also two separate tables. But, I, yes, call them TDOC.

Q Understood, thank you. And you said that you also keep a database -- the Elections Division also keeps a database of prior denials. A Yes. Q Can you tell me about that. What is in that?

```
A
    Any time a person has submitted a document
    seeking to get their voting rights restored in order
to be eligible to register, if they are denied for
any of the reasons in the Tennessee statutes, we
will keep a record of that denial before sending out
the denial letter to the county.
Q If somebody submits a registration form
without attaching any paperwork on rights
restoration and either, you know, one of these two
triggers that we talked about has happened, they
checked the box or the county had some information
on them and they reach out to you about that person
to have a look at that, oerson, do you also mark that
in that database?
```

                                    MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
    question.
Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: No. That is not a
restoration document. That is registration. That's
a question about registration.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you keep track of any of those denials of
registrations based on felony convictions?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No. So as we mentioned earlier, we at the State level don't do denials of registration. So, for example, we don't send out these letters, like the sample one you had from Weakley County. So we do not keep track of those. We also, as $I$ mentioned, are not the final
authoritative vote. The election commissions are, if there's ever an issue. So, no, we do not.

If $I$ help though find, for voter registrations, issues on eligibility, for the registration though, $I$ wilI try to keep a copy of those e-mails. Again, $\quad$ - I -- I'm sure that I've missed some over the years. But I try to, in case that person ever needs help again. But it's not in a formal database, no.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. So the Elections Division wouldn't place a note in a file on someone who attempts to register and is denied because of a past conviction? You keep no record of that?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No. Other than what I

```
said, me doing, like, a search.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Right.
A No, no. They're not in our denial database,
n O.
Q Okay. Now, the counties on the other hand,
would they keep a record of that denial?
                                    MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: YeS.
```

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you know, dothe counties keep those records in electronid form?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: As I -- as I understand it from Steve Griffy, not related to this deposition. But as I've talked to him when issues have popped up, as $I$ understand it, there is no place in our formal system, as in, like, each county's voter registration system, when an application is received and rejected on its face for one -- any reason, there's not a place to enter that
denial into the system. But they do keep a record or a file on it.

Did that answer your question?
BY MS. BOWIE:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Q } & \text { Yes. } \\ \text { A } & \text { Okay. }\end{array}$
Q Okay. So they will keep some record?
A Yes.
Q It may or may not be electronic?
A Yes.
Q Does the Elections Division provide a template software for maintaining these lists?

A Not as far as thow, no.
Q Okay. Is there any information from rejections that gounties are required to keep?

A Yes. $h e y$ keep the voter registration
application They also will keep -- I guess I call it the supplemental documentation about the rejection. But, for example, a copy of the rejection or denial letter. But, yes, they keep that.

Q Okay. And you mentioned that as the
Elections Division gets lists of people who have been convicted of felonies in federal court from the U.S. attorneys, you have someone in the office go
through that list and disperse those to the appropriate county. How does that person know which is the correct county to send that list to?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: The notices from the U.S. attorney's offices have their address or their most current address in -- on the notice, I guess, I would say. Or they do it differently. Some just send us copies of the judgmeites. And those will have it on there. But some would send us notices or lists. But they -- they'll have the address.

Another way too is she will check our voter registration database. She does this first actually, but she'll check the voter registration database tof $\operatorname{see}$ if they are already registered and get their county, the correct county from there. But then also usually the address is on the notice or the judgment. If neither of those apply, the default is that -- if they're not registered anywhere, or the address is -- we don't have it for one reason or another, we'll send it to the county where the federal court sits if it's in state. And they kind of are a placeholder.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. And when you get new data from TDOC, which you indicated happens roughly quarterly --

A Yes.
Q -- do you go through a similar process of transmitting that information to the counties?

A No, not the same as - no.
Q Do you transmit any of that information to the counties?

A Do we transfer our TDOC<information to the counties just of any conviction we have in there? Is that what you're asking?

Q Yes.
A No. I'm not sure exactly what you're asking, but, no. When we get that data from TDOC, we don't just send that information out as we get it, no.

Q Other than using that TDOC database to search for records when the counties schedule you for assistance in making eligibility determinations, what else does the Elections Division use that data for?

A So just to clarify, so we will do it at the beginning stage to determine in the first place if a person is -- or $I$ don't want to say "in the first
place." At the stage of registration to see if they're eligible, which is what $I$ believe you were asking.

We'll also do it at, again, the restoration phase. So if a person definitely does have a felony conviction, they are not eligible to register, there's no question about that, then there's the restoration. So they'll submit a restoration document. Usually the Certificateof Restoration, which $I$ will, if it's fine with you, call the CoR from here on out. We use that to process the cors. We will alsof-- sorry. We will also, about -- well, on a -- so we will also compare the voter registration database to people in the TDOC database. And if there are any matches -- there are different leveIs of matches. But if there are matches, wequill disperse that information to the counties

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do the counties have access to that TDOC database on their own, or can they only access it by asking you to look somebody up?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: They do not have access to that TDOC database. They -- yeah.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. What kind of information does the TDOC database show you about a person's felony conviction?

A
Without having it in front of me, it's -I'm not 100 percent certain this covers everything. But it has their, first of all, first, middle, if available, last name; date of birth; Social Security Number; their TOMIS I.D. number. So TOMIS I.D. is a unique number that TDOC wíl assign to every person, I believe, convicted or maybe even charged, but every person that they use -- they try to use in place.

The purpose of it, I think, was to use it in place of Social Security numbers, so they can send those. But it's another unique identifier. It has the date of their conviction, their conviction offense. It has the county of conviction, the case number, the count. It also will have, if available, sentence end date. Again, that's if available.

And then sometimes it'll have specific information about, I guess, maybe the term. I don't want to say that. It'll just sometimes have, if
available, information about their conviction. Q When you say it'll have their sentence end date, if available, do you mean if they've completed their sentence, the end date will be in there?

A No. I mean the sentence end date as shown on the -- $I$ mean, under the judgment, if that makes sense.

Q Yes.
MS. BOWIE: Okay. I' like to mark the
document labeled E as 5, please
(Marked Exhibit No. 5.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you recognize this document?
A (Reviewing ciocuments.) Yes.
Q Can you júst describe it for the record briefly, please.

A It appears to be -- well, it is an e-mail from the Administrator of Elections in Crockett County, one of our 95 counties, asking if $I$ could do a search for a person who stated he did have a felony in April 1992. But -- and I don't know what she or the individual meant, but it says that "he thinks it's been taken care of and is no longer a felony."

And then it is my reply to the
administrator that our -- according to our database from the Tennessee Department of Corrections, he did have three felony convictions. Specifically he was convicted on September 28th, 1992 for Schedule II drugs, three different, in this case, cases, in Gibson County. And because they were felony convictions, we are -- we rely on that data from TDOC.

And so to answer his Question about he thinks it's been taken care of and is no longer a felony, I added if -- if he if they are not felonies for one reason or another, he just needs to submit documentation of that. But, otherwise, he would have to be recected and get his voting rights restored in order to register.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okar. So you didn't need to see any sentencing documents to confirm that these were felony convictions and that his application should be rejected?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Not the documents
themselves, but the TDOC data that we have is based
off of judgments and sentencing documents. It's just compiled into a database.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to take the document labeled $F$ and mark it as Exhibit 6, please. (Marked Exhibit No. 6.)

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you recognize this document?
A No, I don't remember it. But it appears to be an e-mail from me to Charles Giwson, who's an Administrator of Elections in Jefferson County. And it appears to be in response to call where he asked me to do a conviction search. And it is the result of that search.

Q And which databases or search methods did you utilize here?

A Presumaly based on my practice and the policy, it was all -- it was the TDOC in-state, the TDOC ISC, the federal, the denials, I guess rest -I checked the restorations to see if they've been restored. And then, again, FOIL, as we call it, and then a Westlaw search.

Q Okay. And there's an attachment here. Do you know which database -- do you recognize which database that's from?

A It looks like from FOIL.

Q Okay. So you mentioned before that one of the ways that the counties would know that a registrant has been convicted of a felony is that they check a box on a form, on a registration form. Can you explain what that means?

A So the -- I believe you're -- wait. Can you just repeat that question again or specify.

Q Sorry, I'm switching topics a little bit, but. . .

A Yeah, that's fine.
Q Going back to earlies, you said that one of the ways that counties world know that a registrant has been convicted of felony is that they've checked the box on the registration form. Can you explain what that means?

A Do youmean the felony box on the registration form?

Q If that's what you meant.
MR. RIEGER: I'll object to the form of
the question.
But go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I don't believe -- yeah, I don't believe that $I$ said anything other than felony. But -- so a person who completes a voter registrations application, one of the questions on
the voter registrations application form is whether they have ever been convicted of a felony. If a person marks "Yes" under penalty of perjury as the voter registration application is, then that is one way that indicates they have a felony conviction.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to take the document labeled I. I'm sorry, this one is slightly out of order, but I, and mark that as Exhibit 7.
(Marked Exhibit No. 7.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.
Q Can you descrihe it, please?
A It appears to be a previous or old version of the Tennessee Miail-In Application for Voter Registration, ale known as the SS-3010.

Q Okar. And when was this version of the form in use?

A It says that it was created or revised in September 2020. I'm not - I'm not sure when it - the dates it was in use. We have lots of versions that sometimes are beta or test. But it looks like the one that we used from about maybe September 2020 to about December 2020 or early 2021 .

Q Sorry. Can you say those dates again.

September 2020 - -
A It looks like the one -- again, I can't be 100 percent sure where this is from, but it looks like the one that we had in use from about September 2020 to maybe December 2020 or early 2021 . I can't remember the exact dates or when the new one became in use.

Q Okay. And so on this version of the form, the box asking about felony convictions is Question 11, 2. Can you read the declaretion and Question 2 in that box, please.

A Yes. To myself or out loud?
Q Oh, out loud, Nlease, for the record. Thank you.

A The voter declaration states, "I being duly sworn on oath, parenthesis or affirmation, end parenthesis, declare that the above address is my legal residence and that $I$ plan to remain at such residence for an undetermined period of time and say that to the best of my knowledge and belief all the statements made by me are true."

There's a Question Number 1 and then Question Number 2 which you've asked me to read is, "Have you ever been convicted of a crime which is a felony in this state, by a court in this state, a
court in another state, or a federal court?"
And then there is a checkbox for "Yes" and a checkbox for "No."

Q Okay. So you said that this is probably the form that came into use in September 2020 . And that is what the date says. Why did you revise the form in September 2020?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Right. So I don't know if - - again, just to clarity, I don't know if this is the one, the official one that we use. But if it is that we had in use around that time, $\quad$ believe that this one or the one we had was -- again, I think this was about in-person voting the first time, that took it off at around that time. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. And why did you revise the form again
in December 2020 or early 2021?
A There were - -

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer, please.
THE WITNESS: There were many changes
that we made.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to take the document marked as $G$, and please mark that as Exhibit 8.
(Marked Exhibit No. 8.)
BY MS. BOWIE:

```
                    Do you recognize this document?
A (Reviewing documents.) Yes.
Q Can you describe it?
A It looks like a sample or beta or test
version of the voter registration application that
someone made around November 2019.
Q And do you remginber when these revisions
were being made?
```

A What was that? Do I remember them?
Q Yes.
A Yes, I believe so, for the -- for the most
part.
Q Okay. There are some differences here with
the felony conviction questions. Do you remember
why the Elections Division was working on changing
those questions?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.

But go ahead.

THE WITNESS: We were contacted by a -we were working with a group, actually, counsel in this case, to -- the group had indicated that they believed that we needed more information on the voter registration application form, the SS-3010 to determine eligibility for people with felony convictions.

MR. RIEGER: If $I$ could clarify for the record, when you spoke about counsei, that was not your counsel as --

THE WITNESS: Not counsel - I'm sorry.
MR. RIEGER: Nhank you.
THE WITNESS: Counsel -- I'm sorry, for
the plaintiffs in thos case.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And what were the exact reasons why you needed morepinformation?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: You -- what was the reason why we needed more information? You would have to ask the counsel for plaintiffs. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Well, you-all tested this form. So why did
you think it was important to test these changes? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: The group had asserted
that they believed, again, that the voter registration application did not have sufficient information to determine the eligibility of a person with a felony conviction.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q And did the Elections Division believe that it would be better to havermore information from the forms to determine eligibility of registrants?

MR. RIFGER: Object to the form of the question.

You can go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Did we think it would be better? We were willing to work with the group and to help - - again, this looks like a sample or a beta test. I do know that something similar was eventually adopted. But we were willing to work with the group and to get more information. And, again, as $I$ said before, there were a lot of changes that needed to be made in general, but, yeah.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And for the record, the group you were referring to is the Tennessee NAACP, which is represented by plaintiff's counsel here?

A No. For the record, I mean the CLC.
MR. RIEGER: Can you elaborate on
CLC for the record.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. By that, I mean
the Campaign Legal Center had reached out to us.
NAACP, or Tennessee NAACP had not been mentioned in the time that $I$ was working on this.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q What goes into developing a new voter registration form?

A A lot. So, first of all, there's the wording. Always the wording and the words that we want to go to go on there.

Second, once we have -- even have the words or the substance of what we want on the form -- and by "on the form" I mean both the instructions part at the top and the actual form that the person completes and submits at the bottom.

Once we have those words, or at least the substance of what we want on there, we then try to look at accessibility issues, readability,
usability. We -- we try to get forms down to - I think the standard or the minimum is sixth grade reading level, ideally second grade. So we -- we try to look at all those things and how it -- how the changes would affect anyone reading this. And then also the specific group or type of people that we're also trying to help in making these changes. So we look at all that.

Another thing we look at io spacing and formatting. We -- as we discussed earlier, the agencies have this. Some of the agencies have them available on a -- kind of an electronic, like a kiosk. But it'll be it will look just like this. But it's just something that they can press rather than doing it by hand. And sometimes there are issues printing them out if we make it too long. We aiso -- as you can see from this exhibit, we try to make the back -- if it's printed front and back, we try to make the back an actual envelope that the person can then use to save them hopefully, just -- obviously a little bit of money. But so then we have to think about those spacing issues. So it has to be able to be folded in half. There has to be space at the top and the bottom for that, for the envelope.

We also have space for where the county - this is for the County Election Commission use only - - processes it and adds information as that voter registration application information is updated.

So all of that goes into it, all of that thought and all of that process. And it can take a while. Just even explaining it, hopefully you can tell.

After that -- and all ofthis is the Elections Division doing it. But then also if a third party group is involved, they'll work with us. We also bring in our publications team who provide the - - these draft tersions of it for us. And then we also will get teedback from the counties. So all that involves $4-$ can involve different players or actors, $I^{\prime} 1 \mathrm{I}_{1}$ say.

Once even something's finalized, then the process - - we will sometimes do a beta or a testing stage even on that final draft revision. We'll send it out to the counties to use and see how users and registrants use it and feedback that they get or issues that they see when using it.

And then so once that is all final and we decide, yes, this is a good form, the revisions are
good, it's easy for registrants to use -- after all that and it's final, we will then do several things. So we will disburse it. So we place it on the Secretary of State's website and have to make those changes everywhere and all the links that link to it. We will disburse it to -- we -- I guess I say we -- we disburse it to the government agencies we discussed before via the general services division. So they then will disburse it to the public assistance agencies.

And we then -- oh, we also disburse it to the counties. We do that electronically and then also by paper. So we'? send them out immediately. And then also the paper ones, we will order or the counties will order, or the government agencies also order them.

And then, finally, also for the federal forms, if there are any substantive changes to the EOC, we'll work, we'll submit those changes as well. That's all $I$ can think of right now. But that's some of what goes into the process of changing a voter registration application. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Would the Elections Division go through all
that work if it didn't believe that these changes
were warranted?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: There have - - it depends.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Did the Elections Division believe that the changes to the felony conviction section here were important?

MR. RIEGER: Objec\& to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Again, we were willing to
work with the group to see the changes and to test the changes. And ultimately they were adopted. But
we were willing to work with that group and hear their concerns.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q What was the reaction of the counties to this proposed form?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: It was mixed, I'll say.
At the -- so at the stage where we were still - - I
wouldn't even call it beta testing, but where we're still formatting and creating even a draft, a lot of the counties had feedback about how it really looked. There was a lot on there. And the more information -- I guess when people -- they were saying -- some of the counties said when people fill out this form, they really feel like they need to fill out everything. I mean, sometimes people will even put stuff in the "For County iection Commission use only." I think it's maybe human nature.

And so some the feedback we got was that the more we asked about felony convictions, it actually hurt people without felony convictions. They just would start putting stuff, like, any conviction théve ever had, including misdemeanors, which, as you know, are not disenfranchising. So that was something we got. Like, making it longer could be confusing.

Some of the -- again, this was not the actual version adopted. And so some of the changes about -- we -- we -- I think we moved the -- getting your voting rights restored up to the top part or maybe just higher.

So we made some changes that were
initially based on that feedback. But it was mixed.
MS. BOWIE: Okay. Can we take the
document labeled $H$ and please mark it as Exhibit 9. (Marked Exhibit No. 9.)

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you recognize this spreadsheet?
A Yes.
Q Can you say what it is?
A I believe it was the -- thas was not even feedback for the form that we - Exhibit 8. This was even earlier. And without having the voter registration in front of mer $I$ can't telly you which one it was about, what, what beta test. Sorry, I would not even call a beta test, which sample or draft that we sent out that this was in response to. But itrlooks like feedback from the counties on the draf or sample voter registration in general.

Q Lauderdale County -- if you would take a moment to read that. You don't need to read it out loud, but just refamiliarize yourself with what they said there -- and Shelby County seemed to have questions about why the counties would need to know the date of somebody's felony conviction; is that correct?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: (Reviewing documents.)
What was the question? That Lauderdale
and Shelby had feedback about --
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q $\quad$ Had questions --
A -- the form?
Q Yes, sorry. Had questions about why the county would need to know the date of somebody's felony conviction.

MR. RIEGER. The same objection.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So Lauderdale, yes, it
appears had questions about the date. The --
Shelby -- che, yes, they had a question about the date too, but $I$ think -- yeah.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Why would the counties need to know what the date of somebody's felony conviction was?

A So to -- because a person -- person's eligibility to get their voting rights -- or, sorry.

A person's eligibility to register to vote can depend on the date when they were convicted.

Q
And both of those counties also expressed questions about why the counties would need to know the crime. Why would the counties need to know the crime that somebody was convicted of?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: On -- so in order to determine whether a person is eligiole to register to vote, a county would need toknow crimes before January 15th, 1973. Also, at really the restoration phase, but for crimes aftel -- or for felony convictions after May 18th, 1981, as well, there are certain crimes that are permanently disqualifying.
Or Till say --

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Didyou - -
A -- sorry -- after July lst, 1986 , really, but, yeah.

Q Did you respond to any of the counties' questions about the changes to the felony conviction boxes on the form here?

A I personally did not. Beth Henry-Robertson was the one who did this. I believe that she did. And, again, with -- without seeing the actual test
or sample that this was, I don't know what changes were eventually -- but $\quad$ believe that she -- she reached out to them about their questions.

MS. BOWIE: I'd like to take the
document labeled J and mark that as Exhibit 10 , please.
(Marked Exhibit No. 10.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q All right. Can you tell us what this document is?

A It appears to be -- close to the current Tennessee mail-in application for voter registration, also known as the SS-3010. I cannot be sure without knowng where you got this form, but it looks similar or close to.

Q When was the current form put into use?
A I kow that it was created around
September 2020. We went through a beta testing phase, as in it was a final document. But we wanted some of the counties to use it first in order to give us feedback. So, again, it was created September 2020 .

I think by not counting the beta stage -- so after the beta testing, so use as in all 95 counties and up on our Secretary of State's website, I think
maybe late December 2020 or early 2021 . But also, so that we also to match this changed our instructions for the federal form with the EAC. And those weren't approved until March 2021 . So maybe around that date. That's what we were waiting for. Q What makes this the current form? Is it the only form that the counties are allowed to accept? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I didn't say this is the current form, first of ala to clarify, without knowing where you got this from. But if this is the one on the Tennessee Secretary of State's website, the official Form SS-3010, it's the current one that we -- like I $\dot{\text { wst }}$ said -- that we use, that we distribute the counties and to the public assistance agencies and that we have on the website.

To answer your question of whether this is the only form that counties are allowed to accept and process, no, it is not the only form. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Which counties did you beta test this in?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: First of all, again, to clarify, I don't know if this was the exact one beta tested. But when we did the beta test of the one we're now using, I know Davidson was one. Beth Henry-Robertson was the person in charge of kind of coordinating the beta test, so I - - I honestly am not sure of the other ones. I think Davidson, maybe Shelby, probably Shelby. I know we had a mix of small counties in there too. Maybe Houston. But otherwise - -

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Did you solicit feedback from the counties in the same way that you did for the 2019 proposed revision?

A
Sorry, I also want to add, I think wilson was one of them as well that I can remember now.

We did get feedback. It was not in the same format of a formal 95-county survey or even the counties that we did have survey. I think it was more in the form of call -- phone calls and e-mails, probably phone calls. But we did get feedback. Or Beth Henry-Robertson got feedback from them. I know she did.

Have you seen any of that feedback? Would
you be able to describe it?
A I don't know that I've seen any of the feedback. I have seen feedback, but I don't remember if it was for an earlier -- like this Exhibit 9 or if it was for the final beta testing starting in, like, November or December.

So I don't -- but, yeah, no, I can't say if I've seen the specific feedback for this, what turned into our final form.

Q Have you given the counties any instructions on how to process the new form?

A So we -- obviouslythere are instructions on
the top of the new form. That's for the counties
and the public generally. But we will give
instructions in the form of calls and e-mails when
they have questions. When we -- but, yeah, there's -- What's a yeah. We've given instructions that way.

Q Did the Elections Division give any written instructions on how to process these forms?

A Again, there are written instructions on here. And then in e-mails, if a county had a question, a specific question, one-on-one, we would give that information either with a phone call back or an e-mail back.

We also - - as I mentioned earlier about expungements specifically, which this - - or I, again -- whatever the final version is, the official one does cover expungements. We also just recently put out a memo about that.

Q How did the Elections Division announce to the counties that there was going to be a new form? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go again - go ahead, please.

THE WITNESS: We - well, it started by
announcing backin 2019. So kind of in conjunction with Exhibit 9, we had announced that they - - so the counties knew there was going to be a new form at some point.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Have any of the instructions for processing
registration forms changed with this new
registration form regarding how to process people with felony convictions?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: I would say yes. So we have touched -- with the counties, touched on, I
guess, if -- where the crime occurred and how to help that person determine eligibility based on that specifically, if it was in another state and what to help them look for. But, otherwise, no.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Are you in the process of revising the registration form again?

A Not -- we are looking at it and looking at changes and considering certain changes, yes.

Q And just to go back to 辞xibit 7 for a
moment. Do you have that?
A Yes.
Q Was the felony question on the registration
form the same as this one before September 2020?
MR. KIEGER: I'll object to the form of
the question.
Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Can you say that again? Was...

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Was the felony question, 11, 2, the same before this revision in September 2020?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I -- no. I believe
there -- I thought there had been something -- the answer is, I believe, no. I believe that the form -- this is not a -- this is just a -- I can tell someone just -- this is not an official form. But this -- $\quad$ believe that it had a place for and it said if you've ever been -- if you've had your conviction expunged, mark "No." I don't believe it -- I don't know if this was theofinal question. I believe there's more information on it.

Q Looking back at Exhibit 8 for a moment, I just want to be absolutelyclear, this proposal was never adopted, correct?

A No. I mean, yes, you're correct. No, it was not. This was not the final version adopted. Q Okay. And back to Exhibit 9 for a moment, would you say that the changes that were made to the current form regarding the felony question are useful?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Are -- what do you mean
by "useful"?

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Are they useful to the counties for processing registrations?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I think they -- the counties can use the -- and do use the additional information to verify if the person -- or check if the person has had a felony conriction, has gotten restored and/or generally is eligible. I will say the counties before thesefohanges did -- many of them, and most of the time, got that information anyways.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q You said that the Elections Division is in the processfof reviewing the form again. Are any changes being looked at to the -- changes to the felony section?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Why?

MR. RIEGER: I'll object to the question insofar as - - insofar as it seeks information covered by attorney-client privilege.

THE WITNESS: The Campaign Legal Center
had reached out. And - - with the argument or the assertion that this - not this form, but the current form that's in use by the Secretary of State's office does - - still does not have enough information to determine the eligiふility of people with felony convictions.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q What should the counties do when they receive the current forn with the box checked indicating that somebody has been convicted of a felony?

Mi2. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: It depends on the
situation. I mean, is anything else marked on that section? Has the -- do they have a record of the person's restoration or other documentation verifying eligibility? BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Let's say there's nothing else marked in
that section.
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: If a -- just to clarify, if a county receives a voter registration application that marks "Yes" to the felony question and there's nothing else marked, if the person has marked "Yes" to the felony question under penalty of perjury, it is rejected, if the don't have anything else, or any other documentation.

MS. BOWIE: Ifd like to take the document labeled $K$ and nark that as Exhibit 11 , please.
(Marked Exhibit No. 11.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Camyou just describe this document, please.
THE COURT REPORTER: Hold on just a
second.
MR. RIEGER: You're good.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Can you describe this document, please.

A This appears to be the federal voter registration application and the federal
instructions. And then it appears to be page 19 of the attached state instructions, so specific to Tennessee and Texas.

Q Can you please read the -- under Tennessee, under Number 9, the fourth bullet point.

A (Reviewing documents.) Read it out loud? Q Yes, please.

A So Number 9 says, "Signature. To register in Tennessee, you must not have been convicted" -the fourth bullet says, "not hay been convicted of a felony, but if convicted, your eligibility to register and vote dependspupon the crime you were convicted of and the date of your conviction. For more information about this process, call (877) 850-4959 or visit
https://sos.tn gov/restoration. If your conviction has been erpanged, you are not considered to have a felony conviction."

Q If a person had a felony conviction between January 15 th, 1973 and May $17 t h, 1981$, how should they fill out this registration form?

A The federal voter application form? Is that what you mean?

Q Uh-huh, yeah.
A The entire thing?

Is there anything that they should do that's different from any other voter when they fill this out?

A I can't answer that question. Every voter's different.

Q If a voter with a conviction during that grace period filled out and submitted this form, would their county or whoever's processing the form know that they have a felony conviction?

MR. RIEGER: Objecto the form of the question.

Go ahead.
A They would not know from the person who completed the form. But as we discussed earlier, they could have information from other sources.

Ms. BOWIE: I'd like to look at the document labeled L, please.
(Marked Exhibit No. 12.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes.
Q Can you describe it, please.
A It is a - looks like a 24-page document or outline of the -- and it's titled, "Felon Voting
Rights Restoration."
Q What is this document for?
A It appears to be a document that Abby --
Abby Tyler, who is a predecessor who worked on
individuals with felony convictions, that she
created for herself to use when processing, or
others.
Q Do you use this?
A No. I -- I -- when I first began in my
position, $I$ personally read over it. But in terms
of looking at it every day, $1+0$, $I$ don't, if that's
what you mean by "use it.
Q Is this first section, "Voter Registration
Application," consistent with the Elections
Division's current thinking?

Mi2. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: (Reviewing documents.)
No. There are some things that have been updated.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is Section a consistent with the Election Division's current thinking?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I -- well, you can see --
"a" is consistent with an old voter registration application that we had at the time. Under the current voter registration application, it would be -- if a person marks that they've been convicted of a felony and has not had their -- doesn't mark voting rights restored or other tye of eligibility requirement -- but, yeah, so it doesn't encompass the current voter registration application for a(1), which $I$ don't know if you're including in your question.

But for a(1), the policy really is that when a voter registration is rejected, we -- they need to send so they send the notice letter of rejection and a copy of the Cor. But they also send a copy of an appeal, the official appeal form. And then really -- and now a new voter registration as well as information about felony convictions. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Can you elaborate on what you said about just this first paragraph here? What is the policy for processing the new registration form?

A So --

```
Q
    What is different?
    A So if a person --
```

                            MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
        question.
            But go ahead.
            THE WITNESS: So if a person submits a
        voter registration application and marks "Yes" for
        the felony conviction, then also marks that they've
        had their rights restored or some ocher type of --
        or give some other type of information that shows
        they might potentially be eligible or not, and the
        county doesn't have any other information, then
        really usually they chock with me to get more
        information, or ther look in their files.
            So they -- I mean, they'll use that
        additional information.
        Q What additional information might be on the
        form that would indicate that somebody is eligible?
        A That they've had their voter rights restored
        I think by far is the most common that counties will
        ask me. They'll check their own records, which they
        really always did, even before this new form, to see
        if they've had a voter -- a restoration from this
        person. But if not, then they ask me.
            And sometimes they do. It was just
    submitted in another county earlier and they've had it restored. Sometimes they don't.

Q Anything else?
A Anything else, what?
Q Information on the form that might indicate that somebody's eligible?

A Oh, yeah. Sometimes people will put that they were convicted in the grace period, and the county will ask me about that, if diney have information. Or they will call their own clerks and ask for information. But, again, counties did that -- they used to do that already. But they - - I mean, now there's officially a place where the person can mark it.

Q So if somebody marks that they had a grace period conviction, the counties are supposed to contact you?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: They aren't supposed to, but they can and they do, if that information's on there. I wouldn't say it's a rule or a - BY MS. BOWIE:

Q If they don't --
BERES \& ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTERS
A -- requirement.
Q -- contact you, what should they do with the
form?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So if the person submits a voter registration application, marks "Yes" to the felony question, nothing else excef that they write
they had a felony conviction inthe grace period date and do not give any other information --
documentation or information, the county can, again, either contact their own court clerk or the court where the person was convicted, which is what they typically do.

Geanties truly go above and beyond to try to helpegather that documentation. They'll contact me to see if we have anything. But if not, then they're rejected if that person doesn't have - if we can't verify they're in the -- what you call grace period, but the May -- the January 15th, 1973 to May $17 \mathrm{th}, 1981$.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And do you have a different shorthand that you'd use for that?

```
A No. We call it --
Q Or are you comfortable with grace period?
A -- grace period too. But I just wanted to
specify.
Q Okay. Thank you.
And what other documentation are you looking
for?
```

                                    MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
    question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: AMything from the court verifying that the personf the person's felony conviction was indeed in that grace period. So it can either be a copy of the judgment -- but we've also accepted letters from court clerks stating that they have it. Yeah, just really any documentation from the court, the convicting court.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Looking at Section b on this exhibit here, so this -- the top section, "Voter Registration

Application b," is this consistent with the Elections Division's current thinking?

A (Reviewing documents.) Yes. It looks like it's consistent with the statute and then the policy that the County Election Commissions -- even before
the new voter registration would always check their -- their felony files for either restoration or information about a felony conviction that the person didn't mark.

Q What are the felon files?
A Again, so we had talked about this earlier. It's any information from the various sources, as required by statute or anywhere else, that the counties receive for people notifying them of a felony conviction or a previous voter registration application that the own person marked "Yes" under penalty of perjury to the $\bar{E} e l o n y ~ q u e s t i o n . ~$

So any information from the person, the Court, $a n y--\quad a n y w h e t e$.

Q So the fsion files would have information about prior refistrations where somebody might have indicated they have a felony, they might have their records of those lists that you mentioned earlier that are sent by the U.S. -- sent to you-all by the U.S. attorney and then broken out for the counties? A Yeah.

Q And they might have those felon lists that you mentioned you break out for the counties from the TDOC reports?

A $\quad U h-h u h$.

Q
Is that right?
A Those are some of the things, yes. Or the judgments from their own county clerks as required by statute. I don't know if you mentioned that.

But, yes, those are some of the sources of information.

Q Okay. Anything that we might be missing
there?
A So we said the voter registsation
application that the person comileted, the state felon list, the federal feloit notices, court orders that they get directly from the convicting court themselves.

I guess ther could keep e-mails and communications or documents from the state or county about it. So whose wouldn't technically fall into the formal 1 ist or the court orders. But if they'd ask me to do a felony conviction search and $I$ found something, that would be in there.

Also, under the Tennessee statutes, the jury coordinators for each county, they send lists to all the County Election Commissions of people who were disqualified due to a felony conviction. Those are not enough to purge, but they can keep those in case anything pops up in the future.

But that's all I can think of right now. Why - - thank you. Why are those not enough to purge those jury lists?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Our policy currently is that - - I mean, just under the statute, it's not - it doesn't fall under one of the trpes of documents required to purge.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. Do the counties keep these felon files electronically?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

G6 ahead.

THE WITNESS: It depends.

BY MS. BOWIE:

```
Q So some do and some don't? Is that what
you're saying?
A Yeah, or both.
Q Okay. And they check every registration
against these files?
```

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Every registration that
marks "Yes" to the felony question. So I guess going back to your question, $I$ didn't mean to overlook that. But $I$ would say every -- at least every application that marks "Yes" to the felon question at a minimum, uh-huh.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q But these are also the sources of, you know,
when we talked way back about the county has some information that indicates you might have a felony. So even if somebody doesn'l check "Yes," they might be flagged through this felon file, right?

A So if someone marks --
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form.
G6 ahead.
THE WITNESS: So you're saying if someone marks "No" to the felon question, they might be flagged?

Q Yeah.
A That's if the county checks -- again, so the -- I mean, not every county checks every application against the felon files. If they mark "Yes," they do. That's what $I$ was trying to say. But if -- if it's one of the ones that's marked
"No," and they do check against their felon files, then, yes, it would be flagged.

That's usually going back to what we were saying. In the counties that electronic -- that keep the felon files electronically -Q Uh-huh.

A -- it's easier to check obviously.
Q okay. So just to return to Exhibit L on "b" here, can you just read that firstontence?

A Out loud?
Q Yes, please.
A $\quad$ The County Election Commission checks every application against thcir felon files.

Q So you're saying that's -- that's not currently accurate?

A As I diderstand, no. When I said yes, it was, $I$ had sorry, $\quad$ had incorrectly been reading under the assumption of "a," that they marked "Yes." But I would say every -- every commission checks the application against felon files at least if they've -- if they've marked "Yes." Some do for every application. I don't think that all of them do.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. Can we take the
document labeled $M$ and mark that as Exhibit 13 ,
please.
(Marked Exhibit No. 13.)
MR. RIEGER: Hey, Blair, how much
longer do we think we're going to go before the next break?

MS. BOWIE: I was going to go until
1:45, if that's okay.
MR. RIEGER: 1:45 Eastern?
MS. BOWIE: Sorry, yes.
MR. RIEGER: I waskiike, ooh.
MS. BOWIE: My $\quad$ oad.
MR. RIEGER: RThat's fine. That's fine.
MS. BOWIE. Eight more minutes.
THE COUPT REPORTER: All right.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you describe this document, please?
A It looks like part of an e-mail chain that's been cut off that is from -- between the deputy in Shelby County who handles -- who mostly handes felony conviction issues and me about a felony conviction search.

I do remember that this had more pages. And so I don't know what facilitated the search and then the end result. Because it also looks like -- it turned out that he submitted an appeal form.

Q Uh-huh. Up at the top here, this refers to "ESM." Do you know what that means?

A Yes. So -- I'm not positive, but I believe that's the shorthand for Shelby County's system, voter registration system. So all 95 counties have the voter registration system because they are the ones who process and keep the voter registration applications. 91 of the counties use Voter Central, what we call Voter Center, is a syotem. But four of the counties, Davidson, Shelby, $k$ nox, and Hamilton, get to -- they use their own ecause they're so large.

And I believe that she's referring to their -- either theif system or their felon files, but some type of électronic system.

Q Okay. yo you know why it wouldn't be visible or complete?

A What was that?
Q Do you know why it wouldn't be visible or complete, as she says at the top here?

A No.
MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to take the
document labeled $N$ and mark it as Exhibit 14 .
(Marked Exhibit No. 14.)
THE WITNESS: And $I$ do want to clarify
here too --
BY MS. BOWIE:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q Hold on just a second. } \\
& \text { A Oh, I'm sorry. } \\
& \text { And I do want to clarify here too. I was }
\end{aligned}
$$

just thinking about it. I don't know if I used the
wrong dates earlier for the voter registration
application revisions and testing. I think I said

$$
2021 \text { for when it was approved by the EIC, and I }
$$

$$
\text { meant } 2020 \text {. I don't know if I did, but just to be }
$$

$$
\text { sure, } I \text { wanted to say that. }
$$

Q Which form are youreferring to?
A The EAC instructions.
Q okay, okay.
A I believethat -- I didn't know they were --

$$
\text { I mean, they were updated in } 2020 \text {, but } I \text { think } I
$$

$$
\text { might have áid } 2021 \text { there. I just thought of that, }
$$

because that would not --
Q Okay. Thank you.

$$
\text { A } \quad-\quad \text { there was much more, yeah. }
$$

Q Okay. Do you know what this document is?
A This appears to be a felon report created by

$$
\text { the State on or around April } 13 \text { th, } 2020 \text { for Weakley }
$$ County.

Q Okay. And can you tell me what the letters
in the second-to-last column mean?
A They are the class of felony.
Q Okay. And the numbers next to that?
A The county of conviction.
Q Okay. And I know that this is heavily redacted, but $I$ think that you probably know the answer anyway. Under that third to the right side column, which says "Voter ID" and "TOMIS date," there's a 9-digit number with a datte underneath it. What are those?

A I think I have the wisong --
MR. RIEGER: She's asking you about another redaction, $I$ bolieve.

Is that correct, Blair? MS. BOWIE: Yes, sorry. It's under the redaction.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Under the voter I.D. and TOMIS date.
MR. RIEGER: So are you asking --
MS. BOWIE: It's okay if you can't see it.

MR. RIEGER: Are you asking going from right to left?

MS. BOWIE: If you know from memory, that's fine. If not, that's all right.

MR. RIEGER: So I think, Blair, are you
asking if you go from right to left, what would be in the third column?

MS. BOWIE: Yeah, the third column, which I think is labeled "Voter ID TOMIS Date."

THE WITNESS: Okay. I don't see a 9-digit number, but --

MR. RIEGER: Well, she's asking if the redaction was not there -- so if there was no redaction, what would be there?

THE WITNESS: O\&, oh, okay. It would be -- so for every line, the person's -- so for every line, the person's name appears twice. It's where they appear in our TDOC databases or federal database, and then matched to how they appear on their voter refristration record. So the person's name is twice. The one that is where they appear in our voter registration record will have the voter I.D. on that line there. The name, as it appears in TDOC, will have the $T O M I S$ date on that line there. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. And the date of conviction, is that anywhere on here?

A That's the TOMIS date. That's what he -they call the TOMIS date.

Q Okay.
A And we say that because it's not always the date -- yeah, sometimes it's the date of the judgment. Sometimes it's the date of the sentence. So we just say the TOMIS date that they gave to us. Q And this was created by matching the TDOC data with the voter registration file; is that correct?

A It's -- it's correct, but mot entirely correct. So it's also -- so itus the TDOC data, also the federal data, and then the TDOC ISC, the interstate data.

Q Okay. And are - are all these convictions going to be recent gonvictions, or do they sometimes pull back in tims looking backwards into people's conviction history?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So it is -- it is all
convictions for that person going back in time. It is usually, $I$ think, the oldest date that appears here, if there's multiple. But $I$ want to specify it's not -- it's not the data pulling back and looking at that person. The person can be a new
registrant who was convicted a long time ago. And so that's why an older one would be on there, if that makes sense.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Yes. And how often does the Elections Division create these reports?

A Since $20-$ since 2019 or 20 - - so since around 2020 , it's been about every one to three months.

Q And the counties keep trese in their felon files; is that right?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: They can, yes.
Ms. BOWIE: Okay. I think we can take a break now

MR. RIEGER: Sure. What are you thinking?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: I'll take us off.

Going off the record. The time on the monitor is 12:47.
(Recess observed.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record. Time on the monitor is 1:32.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to take the document labeled 0 , and please mark that as Exhibit 15 .
(Marked Exhibit No. 15.)
(Ms. Danahy joins.)
MR. RIEGER: Oh, Blair, before $I$ start.
Was Molly here in the morning?
MS. BOWIE: She was not.
MR. RIEGER: Can we noce that for the record, that -- I guess I'll lef you do it, Blair, that Molly just joined us.

MS. BOWIE: yos, thank you. Molly is here and Danielle has feft.

MR. RIEGER: Just making sure.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can yo describe this document, please?
A Yes? Excuse me. It appears to be an e-mail
from me to Charles Gibson, the Administrator of
Elections in Jefferson County, about the results of
a felony conviction search.
Q What do you mean "about the results of a felony conviction search"?

A So when a county has any question about a person's eligibility due to a felony conviction, they will send me their -- send or call with -- in
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this case, it looks like it was a call -- their name and date of birth and Social Security Number. And I will check the databases that we discussed earlier, all the sources. So it appears that's what I did in this case, pursuant to a call from Charles.

Q Do you remember what prompted this call?
A I -- no, I don't -- I think it was that - I don't remember exactly. I'll say -- I want to with a caveat. But $\quad$ believe it was a woman whod appeared on a -- an old report and -- report from the state and had, a long time ago -- and they had purged her voter registrat/ron due to that felony conviction because she had not been restored.

And then she had -- they had sent a letter, you know, explainıng, and then asking her to follow up, and they gould help her, to give them more information And apparently she never followed up until 2021, very recently.

So I believe that's what happened.
Q When she followed up, did she attempt to register to vote?

A I don't remember.
Q Okay. And this one -- this is a case from Michigan, correct?

A Yes.

Why is this case from Michigan in -- why was this in the felon report?

A Because, as I stated, we include records from the Tennessee Department of Corrections and their ISC data, which is Interstate Compact, which is felony convictions from other states that are transferred, the supervision is transferred here.

Q And her -- and this -- you found her conviction number. Would that have been in the TDOC files, or did you look for thatin a different location?

A I -- I - it would have - the TDOC - ISC -- what $I$ call the $\mathbb{I} D O C$ ISC files, has the case numbers.

Q They havs the Tennessee case numbers or the out-of-state gase numbers when there's a transfer, or both?

A So to be clear, by the number, so the case numbers, it's -- there's only one case number. It's the out-of-state case number, the conviction.

Q Right. I'm just talking about where it says the Michigan case number is -- and then it has a redaction. Is that - that would be in the TDOC file is what you're saying?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And this person's conviction was in 1997, but she came up on the 2013 felony report. You stated earlier that that can happen when somebody is -- gets registered to vote after their conviction. Is there any other reason why an older conviction would show up on a later year's felony report?

A If the -- if there had been some type of clerical error or human error along the way where they had just gotten one Social Security Number wrong when entering a person - by that, I mean TDOC, when they enter them into their database, the Court -- so it could be any human error. And then later they fix it, and it moves on up to our database, suddenly there can be a match, even though there hadn't been.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. Can we mark the document labeled $P$ as Exhibit 16.
(Marked Exhibit No. 16.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you describe this document, please?
A This is a document that Steve Griffy, the Elections Division's administrator, sent to -- I'm not sure who he sent it to, but I'm copied on it. And it is about the felon list.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Q And every time you circulate the felon list, } \\
& \text { do you circulate new instructions like these? } \\
& \text { A No, but I do believe we update them } \\
& \text { regularly. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Q Do you think that these instructions are current, or have you issued instructions more recently than October 8th, 2019?

A I'm not sure. We might have issued ones more currently than October 8, 201g. But these are not about voter registration elifibility. To be clear, these are people who are already registered. Q And this document lialks about - gives them instructions for level of matches, which you also mentioned earlier. Can you just summarize how that works?

A Excuseme. The list is created by -- it's just data, ít's not by hand, but by running the TDOC data against voter registration database and -- for people who are already registered. So it's not determining their eligibility to register. They've already registered incorrectly. And so it's determining that.

And then it will subtract out, though. And on the back end, so it'll have this list. And on the back end though, it takes out anyone who's
already been restored or submitted other type of documentation showing they're eligible.

And then when you asked about the different categories, they -- at a minimum, every match has to be a 100 percent complete Social Security match. So every single number in the Social on their voter registration has to match up to every single number on -- in our TDOC -- when I say "TDOC data," I also mean the ISC data and our federal, out I'll just call it TDOC, but our felon data.

And then after that though, there can be some variances in the namer and date of birth. And so those are the different categories -- is any type of variation in the name or date of birth. Category $I$ is ths strongest match, like the exact same first, middle, and last. And then it goes down.

Q And you mentioned the felon lists as one of the sources of information that might populate a county's felon files earlier; is that correct?
A Yes.

Q So some counties retain these in their felon
files. Is there a policy requiring counties to retain these in their felon files?

A So just to be clear, I said that -- I said
that it is something that they can. But all the counties, as far as $I$ know, they do save these.

But to answer your question, $I$ don't think that there's any formal training that requires them to save these.

Q And - -
A I can't recall.
Q -- if the county determines that there's a match between their registration last and these files, and they determine that 1 , take someone off the rolls, will there be a flag placed on that person's filie, noting that they -that they have a felon, Conviction?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Gb ahead.
THE WITNESS: The -- the process is that the county -- once they determine that the person had -- registered voter has a felony conviction, they will purge that person's voter registration record. And the reason for the purge will be a felon. So the felon indicator will be -would be marked. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So they'll retain a record of that felon
indicator?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Does the Elections Division also keep
a record of that removal?
A We will get the data after the county does
it. I'm not - I'm not quite sure what you mean by
"a record of that removal." So we don't have the
documents behind it, but we will get the data after
the county does it, just in our voter registration,
state voter registration data.
Q Okay. And will you maintain that data and
keep a list of the peoplepho were removed for
felony convictions statewide?
MR. RIEGER: I'll object to the form of
that.

But go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: So we can create -- so we can -- yes, we will have -- we keep data on people who are purged. And if the reason for purge is felony conviction, yes.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Are there sometimes people on these lists who are a strong match with the registrant so they appear to be the same person, but they're not actually disqualified from voting?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Could there be people on this list whose convictions were during the grace period? A Yes. Q Okay. And could there be people on the list with convictions before 1973?

A In - no. In -- our data - I mean, in theory, but our data from TDoc does not go back that far, nor from the federal courts or ISC, so, no, they don't -- they aren't that old.

Q How far back does the data go?
A It goes back to when TDOC started digitizing their felon records. SO $I$ would say definitely through the early ' Ge' We'll sometimes have records from the ate ' 7 -- starting in the late ' 70 s.

Q Okar. These instructions ask people -- ask the county AOEs to contact you under certain circumstances. What do you do if the AOEs contact you and they have an order of expungement or judicial diversion?

A We immediately update. So that -- if that happens, that means that either the court or TDOC made an error. We could never know which, but when that happens we, on the voter side, immediately will
update our database. So we put them into a database. And -- so that the county will then -and then the county is instructed to reinstate the person immediately, remove any felon indicators and remove any documentation regarding a felony conviction about that person, which -- which is everything in the felon file that they have on that person. And then the person will not show up on felon reports in the future.

So basically we fix it as much as we can on our end.

Q So, sorry, you remove them for both -- you remove the indicators and ask them to be taken out of the felon files for both expungements and judicial diversigns?

A Yes. So those should not -- I mean, yes. So those should not appear on the felon report. But if they do, due to TDOC report error, then -- then, yes.

Q Okay. And this says, if you have proper -to contact you if you have proper documentation showing the voter was convicted during the grace period or prior to January 15, 1973. What do you mean by "proper documentation"?

A So for the grace period, as we've trained
the counties, it's any official documentation confirming their conviction date was in the grace period. And for convictions prior to January $15 t h$, 1973, as we've trained the counties, it should be a copy of basically the judgment or convicting document that shows, $A$, what the person was convicted of; and then B, if they were convicted -if they were, I guess, judged infamous.

Q So if -- if the person -- $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{E}}$ they have a felon report that shows a conviotion date in the grace period, let's say --

A Uh-huh.
Q -- but no other documentation according to these instructions, they don't contact you?

A Say that again.
Q If they have on the felon report a person that shows conviction date during the grace period, but they have no other documentation for that person, they don't contact you?

A Correct.
Q What should they do with that person?
A So - -
Q With that person's registration?
A So they or the person will go to the county or counties where they were convicted and get the
proper documentation.
Q What is the county -- what does the county do with that person's registration as a first step? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'm confused, sorry. What does the county do with that person's registration?

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Yes. They're not instructed here to contact you. They have a hard match. The date shows the grace period. What's the next thing that the county should do?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: They will -- they will --
it depends on the situation. But they will purge that voter until they get documentation and immediately reinstate them once it's confirmed. Or they will just keep them on hold. So the felon reports, it's not something that needs to be done that day. The counties get confirming documentation.

And so, again, it depends on the
situation. But most of the time they'll put it -they'll just hold that one and request the documentation.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q So the - you're saying that the policy with
a person who doesn't have documentation but whose conviction appears to be during a grace period based
on the felon report is not to purge that person?
MR. RIEGER: Object the form of the
question.
Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.
I said it depends on the situation. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Is thepolicy to purge that person?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, again, it depends on the situation.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q I mean, they can do it today or they can do it a few months from now. But is the ultimate result, if they don't have that paperwork, that they
will purge that person?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: If they don't purge the person, they will hold it until they get documentation.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q How long are they allowed to hold it?
MR. RIEGER: Objec\& to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: They - - there's no
official policy on how long. If the county has someone on a purge report for a long - - I mean, you know, a coupleperjury reports, we'll contact them and ask them what's going on, or if we can help with something. But there's no official policy on how long that counties have. Because some counties are longer than the others. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So a county could hold that record through the next election and allow that person to vote?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: So any - - so, first of all, these are not sent out close to elections. We don't send them out through -- up through 90 days before an election. So, no, that wouldn't happen. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So they cannot hold a record for that long. They would have to purge that person before the next election?

MR. RIEGER: I'm going to -- I'm going to step in at this point --

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I think I've answered your question

MR. RIEGER: Sorry, sorry. I'm going to step in at this point.

How is this related to Counts 4 and 5 of the compraint? It seems like we've gotten a little far afield from the voter registration form issues identified in Counts 4 and 5 of your complaint and talking about what we do to resolve, you know, purges that occur for matches on felon reports.

Is there some sort of -- some sort of causal link, or should this be something that should wait until after the court resolves the immunity
issues?
MS. BOWIE: Alex, we've established that one of the ways that the counties know that somebody's had a felony conviction and -- is that they've -- that person has appeared on a past felon list, which is what we're talking about. And that if that person attempts to register to vote in the future, we've also established that their registration might be referenced against that felon list and rejected as a result. < 'hat's why I'm asking about the felon list.

MR. RIEGER: Right, right. We're talking about hypotheticals about how long someone can -- can stay on that list, which seems -- which seems far afield fom what you have alleged to have established.

MS. BOWIE: I'm asking about what the policy is for somebody who is on that list whose conviction appears to be in the grace period, but for whom the county does not have documentation that their conviction also was in the grace period. It appears that the policy is to purge that person. And that is what $I^{\prime} m$ trying to ask.

MR. RIEGER: Right. But purging is different than the NVRA issues identified in your
complaint. I mean, we're only talking about Counts 4 and 5, which are form related. So, you know, unless --

MS. BOWIE: Right. That person may
register to vote again in the future, is my point.
MR. RIEGER: Well, just because they
can register to vote in the future doesn't mean there's an inherent weakness in the form, as you've alleged in your complaint. I'm ju®t trying to make sure that we don't inadvertently violate the court's order staying discovery on counts besides those that aren't 4 and 5. And 1 think --

MS. BOWIE: None of the other counts relate to purges either, Alex.

MR. KIEGER: I -- I understand. So if -- if nothirg relates to purges --

MS. BOWIE: We're not violating the Court's order. Look, your objection is noted.

MR. RIEGER: If you wouldn't mind, let's -- since we do have a court order staying discovery on everything that's not dealing with Count 4 and 5 specifically, if you wouldn't mind reserving the hypotheticals about purge reports until the end, maybe we can see if we can get a magistrate on the line.

MS. BOWIE: To be clear, the Court stayed discovery related to the other claims, not everything except Claims 4 and 5. There's more in the world than what's in Claims 1 through 7 .

MR. RIEGER: I understand. But we're talking about something that -- that -- you know, I can't even imagine the steps we have to go to get a causal nexus between the NVRA claims and where we are now. It feels a little bit lỉe fishing for future hypotheticals.

I mean, this is a $30(b)(6)$ on very specific topics. And $I$ dofot see the word "purge" anywhere on Topics 1 thkough 8. So I'm just trying to make sure that we - we -- you know, we've got two boundaries, which are the Court's order staying discovery and then the topics you've listed. And --

MS. BOWIE: Alex, I've already
explained the causal connection. Are you
instructing the witness not to answer?
MR. RIEGER: Can you repeat the
question for me?
MS. BOWIE: The question is --
MR. RIEGER: Sorry, not to you, Blair.
Can you read back the question, please.
(The requested question was read back by the court reporter as follows:
"Question: So they cannot hold a record for that long. They would have to purge that person before the next election?")

MR. RIEGER: All right. I'm going to note my objection for the record, that this falls outside of the eight topics. But $I$ will instruct the witness to answer to her persoral knowledge on this subject. And if you want $30(b)(6)$ answer, then $I$ think we probably better get a magistrate to talk about this further.

MS. BOWIE: Okay.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q You can answer.
A So, sofry. The question was whether a county can will have to purge before the election? Is that the question?

Q So you've said that if a county had a person
on their purge report where it shows the conviction to be during the grace period, but they don't have any documentation, that they can either purge that person or hold the record.

I'm just looking for what the ultimate
outcome is going to be if they continue to not have
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any paperwork for that person.
MR. RIEGER: Same objection and
instruction, please.
THE WITNESS: The ultimate outcome is they will be purged if -- if they don't submit or find the verifying documentation.

MS. BOWIE: Can we take the document marked -- labeled as Q and mark that as Exhibit 17, please.
(Marked Exhibit No< 17.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you describe this document, please.
A This appears tobe an e-mail from me to Charles Gibson, who Administrator of Elections in Jefferson County, about a person who -- they had appeared on the - on one of the felon reports.

Q Okar. And this person was on one of the felon reports, but it appears that they only had a misdemeanor; is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And how did you confirm that it was a misdemeanor?

A Either -- we got -- at the -- so we confirmed by getting confirmation from the court at the end of the day.

Q Uh-huh. So additional documents were provided here. And your records have shown initially that it was a felony; is that correct?

A $\quad$ TDOC records had shown that it was a felony -Q Yep.

A -- yes.
Q And if this person had not presented
additional paperwork, he would have been flagged as ineligible; is that correct?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: He would have been
flagged with a felon indicator. Is that what you mean, if he had not gotten --

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Yes.
A Well, and it's not always the person who gets it, I'll say. But if there had not been confirmation from the court.

Q Okay. And then if the person registered to vote in the future and checked the box -- the felony box saying "No," what would have happened to the application?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: So if a person registers to vote and marks the box -- checks the box marking "No," but they have something in their -- in the felon file that flags them, the -- the process is that they can -- the process is that the county Election Commission will reject the -- well, there are two options.

It just dependsfactually -- which you're not coming here. But they will reject the voter registration app? cation and request additional information in a letter and will tell them we have somsthing on you in a felon file. And, in fact, they will also attach both a Certificate of Restoratiorfand an appeal form along with a new voter registration and information about felony restoration.

If the person submits the appeal form saying, "I don't have a felony conviction," or a new voter registration again marking "No," at that point, they don't need other documentation. They can ask me to run another felony conviction search. As you've seen, a lot of times it
happens someone is flagged because of a felon report years earlier. And in the meantime, TDOC, or the Court, whoever made the data error, has fixed it. And so if nothing comes up, then they're fine.

Again, the election commission votes on it, on all appeals. But usually the outcome is that they vote that the person can be registered if nothing comes up after they just fill out another statement saying "I don't have anything." BY MS. BOWIE:

Q okay. So the policy s to reject the form and the packet?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: If a person shows up on the felon meport, yes.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. Can we mark the document labeled R as Exhibit 18, please.

THE COURT REPORTER: Hold on just a second.
(Marked Exhibit No. 18.)
BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Can you describe what this document is.
A Tomefrom Jefferson County about someone
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who appeared on a state felon report.
Q Okay. And this person was on the felon list, but did not have a felony conviction. They had a judicial referral; is that correct?

A It -- yes, it appears that either, again, TDOC or the Court made some type of error. And it -- what appeared to be a judicial diversion -or, sorry, a felony conviction was actually a judicial diversion.

Q Okay. And how did you oonfirm that it was a judicial diversion and not afelony?

A We got some type $\quad$ confirmation from the Court.

Q Okay. And you had not received that paperwork, what would have happened to this person's registration?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Their registration would
have been purged.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. And if they had tried to register down the line and checked the felony conviction box "No," what would happen to their application?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: They - - again, it depends
on the facts. But they would either be rejected and sent the appeal form, or the county would ask me to run a felony conviction search.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q The county would ask you to run a felony
conviction search before or after rejecting them?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.

Go ahead and answer.

THE WITIESS: Before.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q And our - would they be allowed to reject this persore ofore asking you to do that, or is there a policy that they have to contact you before rejecting someone?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: They - - they would be allowed to.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. But if you ran the search, wouldn't you have just found the same thing that was in the felon report, which was showing that this person did have a felony?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Unless tine -- unless
TDOC -- unless the TDOC database had been updated and corrected.

MS. BOWIE: DKay. Can we please take the document labeled $S$ and mark it as Exhibit 19 .
(Marked Exhibit No. 19.)
THE COURT REPORTER: All right. Hold on just a secord, please.

BY MS. BOWIE:

```
Q Can you describe these documents, please?
A (Reviewing documents.)
    It appears to be an online voter
```

registration for a person submitted to weakley
County Election Commission, a rejection letter from
the Weakley County Election Commission dated
November 18, 2020. I'm not sure if it's the same
person. A -- an eligibility -- or, sorry, a -- an
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e-mail from me to Ricka McDonald, who was the deputy in Weakley County Elections Commission with an eligibility letter for someone. Again, not sure if it's the same person. An eligibility letter -actually, a no felony letter for someone dated December 10 th, 2020 . The $n a m e ' s ~ b e e n ~ r e d a c t e d ~ s o, ~$ again, not sure if it's the same person.

And then it's also an expungement order
 Election Commission dated Septerber 1st, 2015 for the sale of a controlled substance, hydrocodone. Q So this person -- Iff you look on the -- the front sheet, which is the -- what appears to be, like, the voter recoid, up at the top it says, "rej. felon file."

To your understanding, does that mean this person regietered to vote and was rejected because they had a match in the felon file?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And this rejection letter was issued on November $18 t h$. And it appears that you were able to
verify that this person did not actually have a felony conviction on December 10 .

```
A I don't know --
```

Q So --
A -- if this is the same person, but I
verified someone did not have a felony conviction.
It could have been someone who marked "Yes"
accidentally. I'm not trying to be -- I really
don't know if it's the same person--
Q I understand, it's redaded.
A Yeah. I truly don't $\odot$
Q And I'm looking at the unredacted version.
It's the same person.
A Okay.
Q So this this person appears to have been
rejected. And then some sort of paperwork was
presented found by the office. And then it was
sent to you. So in this case, the person that --
the county rejected the person and then contacted
you?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.
Go ahead and answer.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is that correct?

```
A Yes.
Q Okay.
A Just based -- I mean, if that was the
```

scenario that you said, but $I$ don't know -- again,
just to clarify, $I$ can't tell from these.
Q Yeah. And here, how were you able to verify
that this was a judicial diversion rather than a
felony?
A Because, again, assuming this is -- the
order that you attached in Exhibit 19 matches up,
because the order of expungement says judicial
diversion. And then $I$ alwas -- if we have a record
of it, I match the docket number to the one we have
to see. In this case, again, assuming they're for
the correct person, it said we didn't have any
records. So they could have done the felony
conviction check too.
Q Okay.
A But either way, this person was registered.
MS. BOWIE: And can we take document
T -- or sorry -- yeah, the document labeled $T$ and
mark that as Exhibit 20, please.
(Marked Exhibit No. 20.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you recognize this document?

A (Reviewing documents.)
It appears to be the template that we provided to the counties through training for notice when they have received notice of a felony conviction for that person.

Q Okay.
A I don't -- ours is not dated 9/3/19 though. I don't know where that -- where that number came from.

Q Yeah.
A Yeah.
Q Does this -- is this -- does this appear to be current?

A I think so.
Q Okay. Okay. So we've talked a little bit about why a person's registration might be rejected. I'd like tofealk about what happens next. What should the county do next after they decide to reject a registration form because of a felony?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: The county -- so if it --
the county determines that the person should be rejected because of a felony conviction, they will
send a notice of rejection, which is a rejection letter. And included with that letter will be an appeal form and a Certificate of Restoration. We also have the county send a new voter registration application in case there was a mistake. And then if the rejection -- again, sorry, to go back.

All this is assuming the rejection was for a felony conviction or just in - okay, yes. So Certificate of Restoration and then also a document with more information about restoration. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. And is there a difference in what gets sent to them, deponding on if they're being rejected because they checked the box or because the county had some information indicating that they had
a felony convituton?
A No. We have instructed the counties - - any time there's a rejection for a felony conviction, really the policy is to send the same things barring some factual thing that $I^{\prime} m$, you know, not aware of, but...

Q So they'll send the appeal form and the restoration packet regardless?

A They should, yes.
MS. BOWIE: Okay. Let's look at that
appeal form. Can we take Document $\quad$ and mark it as Exhibit 21, please.

THE COURT REPORTER: All right. Hold on just a second.
(Marked Exhibit No. 21.)

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do you recognize this document?
A Yes. It appears to be the SS-3079, also known as the Voter Registration Appeal Request Form. Q And is this current?

A It appears to be.
Q Okay. This form has two reasons for appealing due to felonies. Can you read them, please, out loud?

A The - -

Q The tok two. The top two reasons why someone is appealing.

A The form states that by checking all the applicable questions below and signing their name, that the person is swearing or affirming that the information they have provided is true subject to the warning as stated.

The first reason is, "I have not been convicted of a felony."

The second reason is, "I have been convicted
of a felony but have had my rights properly restored or my record expunged. A certified copy of the supporting documentation must be included with this appeal to be considered by the election commission." Q Okay. Can a person who had a grace period conviction use this form to appeal their rejection? A They can --

MR. RIEGER: I'll object to the form of the question.

But go ahead.
A They can use the forit -- hmmm. Yeah, I guess not.

Q How about a person who had a conviction before January 15, 1973 that did not render them infamous?

Mr. RIEGER: I'll object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: They would not fit into either of those for the felony conviction, no. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Once the county has sent the rejection and the appeal form and the restoration packet, are they required to contact the Elections Division?

A Say that again.

So once the county has sent the rejection letter and the restoration packet and the appeal letter, are they required to contact the Elections Division about their decision?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No.
MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to mark Document $V$ as Exhibit 22 .

THE COURT REPORTER All right, hold on just a moment.
(Marked Exhiblt No. 22.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you des $\quad$ ibe this document, please?
A It appears to be an e-mail chain between
Jill Foster, wo is in Sevier County Election Commission, And me. And it is about someone who submitted documentation showing that their conviction was in February 1979. And she is asking for confirmation that he is eligible to vote.

Q Okay. And you instruct the AOE here to keep that person in the felon file. Why is that?

A Because he has a felony conviction.
Q Okay. So the felon file is for everybody with a felony conviction, regardless of eligibility?

| A |
| :---: |
|  |  |
|  |
|  |
| can you tell me what kind of documents you're |
| looking for to confirm that somebody had a grace |
| period conviction? |
|  |
| Court, verifying that the conviction fell between |
| the dates of January 15th, 1973 cto May 17 th , 1981. |
|  |
|  |  | those documents?

MR. RIEGER. Object to the form of the question.

But 90 ahead.
THE WITNESS: The county and the State will try toferind the documentation and will work with the voter. But at the end of the day, the voter is the one who knows where they were convicted. So without their help, we can't -- we wouldn't be able to even get it.

So, you know, when you say "the
burden," that person needs to be involved at some level to help us get the documentation.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q The newest registration form asks for information about what county someone was convicted in; is that right?

A What county? I believe so.
Q Okay. Is there a policy that the county
AOEs should try to collect that documentation?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.
Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: So just to go back, no, it doesn't say the county. I believe it says the city stayed, just to çarify, I believe.

But what was your question?
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is the a policy that the AOEs should try to collect Ehose documents for a person who says either on the registration form or offers to the register -- to the administrator that they had a grace period conviction?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection. Please answer.

THE WITNESS: There's no requirement --
official policy requiring the policy to get that documentation. Again, because many times the
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conviction will be so old that they'll be in archives. And so many times the Court won't release them to anyone except the voter, as $I$ found, because I always try to help these people too. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q What if those court records no longer exist? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Please go ahead and añiser.
THE WITNESS: We've had that happen
before. And we got some type of documentation. So in one case -- one time, If was able to get -- it was actually a -- $\quad$ believo a military -- so it counted as federal, a federal conviction. But it was on a military base. Ænd $I$ was able to get documentation showing that it burned down, that their records were in a fire on some date.

But that they had some type of record
for him. So we just didn't have -- we -- we -- we couldn't -- we had done -- we had done the best that we could to find it. And there was also -- in that same case, there was something showing, like, 1979 was the date of the -- was the date of the charge, so it was close enough to where we had -- we had considered that verifying documentation.

And - - so that was just one example that $I$ can think of off the top of my head. But we -- we will not -- if it -- if we get
documentation showing that, for some reason or
another, that documentation - - a documentation of the conviction doesn't exist, the policy has been we don't allow it to bar them from voting.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. And if it is just beEore an election
and somebody registers, let's sey on the new form, where they can attach under oath that they had a grace period conviction, and they do that and it is - - and there's - the county's unable to get documentation to ban that up, what would happen to that registration?

Mr. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Well, if it's just before an election, that person's not valid to vote in that election anyways - -

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Right. Let me --
A - because the registration - -

Q Let me amend that - -

A -- deadline is 30 days.
Q -- and say before the registration deadine.
MR. RIEGER: Same objection.
Go ahead and answer, please.
THE WITNESS: They have 30 days. Many
times, it will happen in that 30 days. It's a very quick process. But if they -- so they have to meet that 30-day deadine. At any point, even after the 30-day registration deadine, if the county or the individual or me, which many tifes $I$ become involved in these as well, gets the verifying documentation, it will count.

And I don't want to use the word
"back-date," but they -- they count as coming in before the voter registration deadline. So I want to clarify that, that they meet dead -- verification deadline even if we find the documentation any time before. If they can't get the documentation before the election, again, we would let them vote provisional and then again, hopefully, find the documentation in the meantime.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And if they don't find the documentation within the deadine to present that for a provisional ballot, their vote would not count?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the --
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is that correct?
MR. RIEGER: -- form of the question. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: They would not verify that they were eligible to register to vote.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to mark Document $W$ as Exhibit 23, please.

THE COURT REPORTER All right. Hold on just a moment.
(Marked Exhihit No. 23.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you descibe this document, please?
A It appears to be an e-mail chain between Debbie Killebrew, who is a deputy in the Sumner County Eleçion Commission, and me, asking if I could find -- do a felony conviction search on someone. They checked "Yes" to the felony question on OVR.

Q Okay. And what kind of sort -- what kind of search did you perform?

A The -- so it would be the same search that I always perform. It would be the TDOC data that we have, both for in-state and out-of-state. It would
be the federal convictions we have. I always check the denials to see if we've gotten something from them before; the restorations, in case they've been restored; the FOIL, the Tennessee FOIL website; and then also Westlaw public search.

```
Q And what information did you find here?
```

A It appears that $I$ found that the person has
three felony convictions.
Q And you found the dates ancthe crimes of
conviction, is that correct, and the county?
A As they appeared, yes, in the TDOC database,
which --
Q Okay.
A -- again is mot always -- it's the TOMIS
date, so it's not always the exact date of
conviction that they give us.
Q Okar. And you say that you would need the
judgment orders here for these first two in order
for this person to be registered to vote, assuming
they had restoration on the 3rd?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.

Go ahead.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is that right?

A Yes. Documentation verifying his
conviction. But, again, as you pointed out, he did
have a 1986 felony conviction that had not been restored, so he would need a Certificate of Restoration for that one.

Q And you performed the same kind of search here that you did back with Exhibit 5, which I'll remind you was the -- the search for the person who said that they thought that they that their felony convictions had been taken care of, quote. A Yes, it appears -- I mean, yes. There's nothing that would lead meto believe otherwise, that $I$ would have not done my normal search.

Q And on the frst page of this document, the AOE indicates that the person checked "Yes" to the felony conviction on ovR. Is that online voter registration?

A It's an online -- yes, application that they received.

Q Doesn't the online voter registration stop you from going any further once you check "Yes" to the felony conviction question?

A It does on the "Go Vote TN." It does not stop the person from submitting it at -- we believe the Department of Safety still submits them.

MS. BOWIE: Please mark Document $X$ as Exhibit 24.

THE COURT REPORTER: All right. Hold on just a moment.
(Marked Exhibit No. 24.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you describe this document, please?
A It appears to be a -- an e-mail thread between Lainny West -- or Aletta west, but she goes by Lainny -- who's a deputy, or the assistant AOE, in Montgomery County.

She was -- she had submitted -- well, this does not have the attachment, so I'll just say what it says. She said that the Rutherford -- sorry, wow -- the Montgomery County Circuit Court office had listed théapplicant as a -- as having a felony, but they copid not confirm that the felony conviction was in 1977.

Q Why was that?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't know why. Again,
I don't have the letter in front, which might have jogged my memory. But then even beyond that, I
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don't know why.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q The e-mail from the AOE says that the
Circuit Court said that they cannot have any records of charges dating back to 1977. Do you understand that to mean that they don't keep records going back that far?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No. Because I can tell from my e-mail back that that's not exactly what the letter said. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Do you remember what happened with this registrant?

A Ther- do you mean the ultimate voter registration decision?

Q Yes.
A That is up to the county. So, no. But as I stated here, if she could fill out -- I did a felony conviction search and didn't find anything, and so she could, with that information, fill out a new voter registration and mark "No" and would be eligible to vote.

But she believed she had a felony conviction in 1977. Wouldn't that be perjury?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: If she believed she did. So I didn't tell her she should. Again, I said if she's sure she had one in 1977, she'll need some type of documentation. And, agair, she also - I can tell from this e-mail wasn' sure it was in Rutherford County. And so I Said she'll need it if she does. But if that -- fif she's sure that it was and they don't have that record, then she can mark
" No."
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do youremember what registration form this person used? If it had just the checkbox, or if it had a space for her to fill in information about her conviction?

A I don't know.
Q Based on the date, can you guess?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Was there a form in use that allowed for additional information in September 2020?

A That might have been when we were beta testing, but I'm not sure.

Q Was Rutherford County one of the counties that you were beta testing in?

A Like I said earlier --
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: I don't remember all the counties that we beta tested in. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. Ana I'm sorry, it's Montgomery that I'd be asking about there.

A Yes. I said Rutherford earlier too. But, yes, Montgomery. I don't remember.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I'd like to mark
Document $Y$ as Exhibit 25, please.
THE COURT REPORTER: All right. Hold on just a moment.
(Marked Exhibit No. 25. )
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you describe this e-mail, please?

A It appears to be an e-mail thread between Vicki Collins, who's a Deputy Administrator of Elections in Shelby County, and me. And it is asking advice or an opinion on what to do. That apparently she already had an e-mail from me that a person did not have a felony conviction and was asking if he was good to register to vote.

I, again - it doesn't - well, I didn't say it this way, but it does not attach the documents that we're talking to or the original documents. But based on this, I'm guessing that this was a situation where he had asked -- lots of people aren't sure if they hawe felony convictions or not. And they ask if we Gan help them find out before they submit a voter registration so we - - we can help determine if they're even eligible to submit a voter regiswration.

And then, if we don't find anything or whatever happens, then they'll submit one that says "No." And I'm guessing this is one of those situations.

Q Okay. So this says if the person "affirmatively disclosed a felony conviction in 1979 Craighead County, then he ordinarily would need to provide paperwork on that conviction."

So if this person -- it appears that they did affirmatively disclose a felony conviction; is that right?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Again, it appears to be a situation where they contacted us beforehand, which is what $I$ meant by affirmatively disclosed. Or they even had a prior voter registration that said, "Yes," and filled out -- or told her 1979, Craighead County and then filled out a new one that said "No."

But when therle are differing,
conflicting ones like that, when $I$ run a felony conviction search and can't find something, then the policy is that they can register the person to vote. We don't have enough information otherwise. BY MS. BOWII:

Q Do you know why the rest of this e-mail conversation wasn't produced in discovery?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

And I'll note again, since some time has passed, verification of discovery was not one of the eight topics. So I'll instruct the witness to answer to her personal knowledge.

THE WITNESS: I'm assuming discovery we turned over in May 20 - - I don't know, May 2020, is it? And our retention policy is only for -- e-mails is only, I believe, 90 days. And so this is way past 90 days. But it looks like I saved a copy of this to help the individual in case anything ever came up in the future.

But the copy I saved, it didn't have -I mean, this -- this might have even been 90 days after the original conversation $\quad$ don't know. And so I just might have been trying to save it, but I don't know.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay.
A But thiswas all I had. Yeah.
M\& BOWIE: Can you mark Document Z as Exhibit 26, please.

THE COURT REPORTER: All right. Hold on just a second.
(Marked Exhibit No. 26. )
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you describe this document, please?
A It is an e-mail or two different e-mails between Charles Gibson who is the Administrator of Elections in Jefferson County and me about someone
who had appeared in the felony report with the TOMIS date of April 4th, 1979 . He wanted to know if he could register him because he fell in the grace period.

Q Okay.
A And I had -- as I say before, as in every case that $I$ am able to where the Court will give me documents, $I$ went ahead and got the documentation for him verifying that it was indeed in the grace period and sent an eligibility İetter to Jefferson $^{\text {ef }}$ County.

Q Uh-huh. And you skid that the TOMIS dates can be either the date of conviction or the date of sentencing; is that ight? What can the TOMIS dates be?

A Sometines they're just -- they are -- the TOMIS date i's the date that TDOC has as the -- of their date of conviction. Sometimes they -- they're not wrong, but they can just differ. So, for example, take a judicial diversion. If someone was convicted, the original conviction was in, say, 2002 and they were placed on probation for three years. The -- but then they -- which we don't consider that, again, a felony conviction. But they did fail to uphold probation, so it then turned into an
actual conviction on, say -- in, say, 2004 . What's the date that you use for that?

So it can just -- it can differ. Sometimes we don't have the exact righted date. Most of the time we do. The data is very good. But sometimes it can just differ.

Q What would be the correct date to enter for that?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: believe it would be the date of the conviction. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Which one is the date of the conviction?
A Sorry I don't count a judicial diversion as a conviceion. So the date that they were found to have violated their probation.

Q Isn't the effect of that that the original sentencing order is revised and a judgment of a felony conviction is entered on that original date? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: Can you say that again?
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The judgment is what?
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Let me rephrase.
A Yeah.
Q If you had a situation where you had -- you were looking at documents that showed that --

A Uh-huh.
Q -- which of the dates would you look at?
And let's say it's around the grace period. The original sentencing date was in the grace period, the date that they violated robation was outside of the grace period.

Which of those would you use to determine the date of convictions for purposes of knowing if they have the right to vote?

A You'récorrect. So I - -
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question. Please go ahead.

A So I actually said it backwards. And you, I believe, were correct. The date of conviction would be the original date, yes.

Q Okay.
A Is what legally, I believe, it is. And that would be a matter for criminal law.

Q Are there other reasons why the TOMIS date
might be different than the date that you would want to see in the sentencing documents to make that determination about eligibility?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I believe I mentioned before, but maybe not. Sometimes they will put the date that a plea agreement or an order was entered rather than the sentencing date, which is technically the conviction date.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. So you Jook at the sentencing date to determine when a person -- whether a person lost the right to vote or not?

A The corrts have held that the sentencing date is theqeffective date of conviction.

Q Okay. And for this person here, what
information did Jefferson County have on this person, on this person's felony conviction?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Nothing other than our
felon report.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q So just to review here, you've told us that your policy is that when a person submits a registration form, and if they're using the new form, indicates that they have a grace period conviction, they will not be registered to vote until they provide documentation that shows their sentencing date?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Until we get some type of verification from the Court showing their sentencing date. I didn't say that they have to get it. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Right They won't -- they won't be registered vote until you have that verification? A Yes. You had said until they submit.

Q Yeah.
A Uh-huh.
Q And just for the record, can you read --
we're still looking at Exhibit D -- sorry, Z --
where are we -- Exhibit 26, Document Z.
Can you read the sentence that starts with the word "Although."

| A | Out loud? |
| :--- | :--- |
| Q | Yes, please. |

A $\quad$ Although usually the burden is on the voter to submit documentation verifying the conviction falls in the 'Grace Period,' in this case, I went ahead and reached out to the Madison County court to verify it on his behalf. Because he submitted a voter registration application by October 5th, he is eligible to vote in this upcoming November 3rd election."

And it was dated October 13th.
Q Uh-huh. But if herhad an -- if that information -- if thos documents had not been obtained by the county, he would not have been registered to vote in time for that election; is that right?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: He -- so he would have been allowed to vote provisionally, again. But then if they did not -- if we had not gotten records by the date that's required, then he would not have had his vote counted.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And how long could the county hold his registration form before rejecting it?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

I'll instruct the witness to answer the question.

THE WITNESS: This was not the case of someone -- a new voter registration application. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q This was not the -- 're looking at Document 26?

A Uh-huh.
Q This person $\quad$ it says here he submitted a voter registratign application by October 5th.

A So -- ${ }^{\text {well, }}$ I had read it as -- and I - I had read itfas he had been purged from his old voter registration earlier in 2019 , and then he was reinstated. But because the documents aren't attached, I don't know. It might have been.

Q This looks like he submitted a voter
registration after he was purged. He was either purged in 2019 or his registration matched with a state-wide felon report.

A Okay.

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q At any rate - -
A Yeah, I don't - -
Q Yeah.
A So I don't know - - the documents weren't attached. Yeah, I don't - - the documents weren't attached, so I don't know.

Q Okay. If a person registers with the new registration form and they irdicate on that that they had a felony conviction before January 15, 1973, and that their folony was for one of the non - one of the convictions that couldn't render them infamous at that time, what is the policy for processing that registration form?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead and answer.

THE WITNESS: I don't believe on the current voter registration that there is a place for
them to mark, under penalty of perjury, that they were not convicted of an infamous crime. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So the current registration form does not
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allow people to write their crime of conviction? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So I misunderstood. Yes,
they can write the crime of conviction. But he can't write if he was judged infamous or not, which is what I meant.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is the list of pre-1973<infamous crimes on the voter registration form?

A The voter registration form refers to the Secretary of State's wchsite, which does have a list.

Q And is the list of pre-1973 non-infamous crimes on the $N$ ational Voter Registration form under Tennessee'spinstructions?

A Tennessee's instructions on the National
Voter Registration form instructions also refer to the Tennessee Secretary of State's website, which contains the list of infamous crimes before January 15th, 1973 .

Q So, again, if a person's registering with the new form, and they check the felony conviction box "Yes," they write a date that is before

January 15th, 1973, and they list a conviction for a crime that could not have possibly rendered them infamous, what is the policy for handing that form?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: They -- okay. That's what you meant. The person -- we would have to get some type of verifying documentation confirming that and then to confirm that they are eligible to register.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q So they will ngt be registered without that documentation?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: They -- the county would not know -- would not have enough information under the statute to know whether he is eligible to register, to submit a voter registration application.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is there any statutory -- is there any statute that requires the counties or the Elections

Division to give a response to a voter registration after a certain period of time?

A Say that -- sorry, say that again.
Q Is there any statute that requires the counties - - and I included the Elections Division in the off chance that you were processing the form - to respond to a voter registration application at - within a certain time period?

A Is there - you're asking it there's - if the statutes have a deadline for the county elected commissions because, again, the state does not process these, to make a decision about voter registration applications?

Q Yes.
A I believsthat's a legal question that's in the statutes.

Q So you - - are you saying you don't know?
MR. RIEGER: I'm going to go ahead and object at this point. I don't think that the $30(b)(6)$ topics require the deponent to be prepared on all aspects of Tennessee statutory law concerning elections. So I will go ahead and instruct her to answer as to her personal knowledge.

THE WITNESS: As to my - -

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q You stated --
A Sorry.

Q Sorry. You stated earlier that you prepared by reviewing the relevant statutes. That's why I'm asking.

A I reviewed some statutes, mostly the ones that you -- sorry, that opposing counsel cited in the complaint as $I$ was going through it.

Q Okay. How would a registrant whose registration is being placed $\quad$ n hold because the -they don't have the right aocumentation to show that they had a grace perioc conviction, know that that's what was happening to their application?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: So when a county needs more information, the process is, is that they contact that person, either by letter, by phone, requesting additional information. In the meantime, they also will help -- go out of their way in every way they can to help. And then $I$ also become involved too. But the person will know that there is additional information that they're seeking.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Do you provide a template letter for that scenario?

A No.
Q Isn't that what the rejection letter is for, to say we're not putting you on the voter rolls and we're seeking more information?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: NO
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q What is it for?
A It's sayingthat you are ineligible to register based on the information that we have. Q Is it your belief that the counties make a practice of sending some other letter saying that "We've put your registration on hold and we're sending more information"?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No. That's not what I
said. I said that they can send them a letter. They call them, which is usually the case. But
they -- I -- they don't -- I didn't say that they
make a practice of sending a letter.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Yeah. That - you didn't say that. That's
just why I was asking.
A Uh-huh, oh.
Q And for people who -- for people whofill
out the form, I know I asked about people with
pre-January 15, 1973 convictions whose -- who
indicated that they have one of <the crimes of
conviction that cannot rendet them infamous, so now
I'm asking about people wilth pre-January 15, 1973
convictions who indicate that they do have one of
the convictions that could have rendered them
infamous.
A
Uh-huh
Q Whats the policy for processing those
forms?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: It would be -- it would be a -- again, they would seek verifying or some type of documentation. But without that, it would be a rejection.

MR. RIEGER: For the record, can we clarify who "they" is?

THE WITNESS: The County Election Commission.

MR. RIEGER: Thank you.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Is there any reason not to instruct the County Election Commissions to always seek additional verifying documents before rejecting a form?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Can you say that again?
BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Is there any reason not to instruct the counties topalways seek additional verification and documents before rejecting someone who indicated that they had a grace period conviction?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection and
instruction. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Is there a reason not to instruct the counties not to seek documentation? BY MS. BOWIE:

Q No. You said that the counties can either
reject the forms from people who indicate that they have a grace period conviction or they can sit on them and try to do some additional research or contact that person to send additional information, right?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question. Go - -

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q That's the policy?
MR. RIEGER: -- ahead. Objection, go ahead.

THE WITNESS: I had said that the counties -- at the end, bf the day, no matter what, need some type of verification. So they will seek that verification either from the individual, or they will do i*, or $I$ become involved, whichever one, usually all three. Or they will reject it and seek that information from the individual.

Either way, they are seeking
verification. And either way, once we get that verification, they're -- they're right there el- - we have confirmed that they're eligible to register. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q And I'm asking if there is a reason not to instruct someone to always take that former path of
seeking the documentation before rejecting?
MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: As I mentioned before, at
the end of the day, the voter has -- or I will say the potential voter has the best information about their conviction. There are many times with the older convictions that we -- we carmot help because the person hasn't told us wheréhey were convicted. Sometimes they don't remember and we have to, you know, ask them, you know, lio go back through old documents.

Also, ourts sometimes will not give documents to anyone except the person because they do contain social Security numbers and other informatior. So there are many reasons why we cannot get that documentation. And at the end of the day, the voters -- again, sorry, the potential voter is in the best position to get those documents.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q And the new registration form provides an opportunity for a person to swear under oath that their conviction was during the grace period. Why
is that not sufficient to register them to vote? MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Because we do not have verification that that is correct, that that data is correct. Because they have a felony conviction, but we don't have verification that it actually fell in those dates.

MS. BOWIE: I'd like to look at the document marked AA.

MR. RIEGER: Hey, Blair, is this a good
time to take a 10-er?
MS. BOMIE: We are almost done if you'd
like to plow through. Otherwise, we can take a break if you want.

MR. RIEGER: What's your estimate? Is everybody comfortable?

MS. BOWIE: I would say 20 more minutes.

MR. RIEGER: Everybody all right?
Okay, we will plow through.
THE COURT REPORTER: All right. Hold on just a second.
(Marked Exhibit No. 27.)

MS. BOWIE: We can take two minutes to refill your water or anything like that, if you like.

MR. RIEGER: I just - my rule is
usually an hour and 45 is when I raise my hand and say, does anyone need a break or anything like that. But if everyone is good, then --

THE WITNESS: I'm good.
MR. RIEGER: - - we'll go.
MS. BOWIE: Okay. Thanks for keeping an eye on the clock.

BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. Please jet me know when you have that document.

A I believe everyone does.
Mr. RIEGER: We're set.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Can you describe this document, please.

A This appears to be another internal document
created by Abby Tyler like before that is just
really for her records, but I've seen it, I'll say, about changes that were pending at the time.

Q Do you know when this was created?
A No. I mean, she wasn't - - she didn't work

```
there for that long, so I can guess, like, 2018.
```

Q Uh-huh.
A And it just looks like changes to - - really
changes that she and Steve Griffy had worked on for
the restoration database. $\quad$ So not changes in - - not
really substantive other changes. But it's mostly
about the restoration database, it appears.
Q Okay. Okay. And do you know what the
felony grace period letter here is?
A Yes. So I believe thisis the same one that
we use today. When we get that verifying
documentation from the corrt, we enter their
information into our datibase. And there is a - - I
guess, a place wherewe can mark that it's a grace
period. And then it creates a form similar to the
one on Exhibit 26 .
Q $\quad \mathrm{OkCN}_{2}$.
A Oh, really, it is the one on Exhibit 26,
yeah.
Q Okay. I'd like to go back to Exhibit L for
a moment.
A Can you say the number? I think she
changed - - yeah.
MS. BOWIE: Oh, sorry. Exhibit L,
which is somewhere in the middle of the alphabet.

Exhibit 12 .
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q So you said before that this is -- this is an internal document created by Abby. And, I'm sorry, I'm forgetting her last name.

A Tyler. Abby Tyler, yeah.
Q Abby Tyler. And this reflected her
understanding of the policies at the time?
A Yes. It was an internaí document. I can't remember if it was when she started doing felony -so she did not originally in her role, do felony convictions. As I said before, it was Cara who was here during that tine as well. And then Tyler -both kind of ovenlapped with her.

But she -- she kind of took on a role helping outr. And so $I$ don't know if this was created around the time when she started that or around the time that she was leaving, but $I$ know it was -- it was made by her, kind of for her.

Q Okay. And we talked earlier about some of the changes in the Elections Division policy since this happened. But I'd like to put a fine point on this. You -- this says that the policy is web -the person marks that they have a felony conviction
or there is information that they have a felony conviction, the policy is always to reject that application. You are telling me that that policy has changed. Can you tell me when that policy changed?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

But go ahead.
THE WITNESS: ExCuse me. So I've said the voter registration applicat\&on has changed so that there is more information, such as the person's been restored. As an example, if the person has marked "Yes" to the fe§ony question, or if they have information that they have a felony but they've marked "Yes" to the restoration, then they'll go look in their files. If they do not have any in their own county showing they've been restored, they'll contact me and ask. And then $I$ can tell them if we have anything in our State restoration database.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q So that is different from the policy that's written here, is my point, right? You were saying there are different policies now than what's stated here?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I am saying because -just inherently because of a new voter registration application, when the county has additional information beyond what is stated here, like is now available on the voter registration application, they will use that additional inforination. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So the policy is no 1 onger when you have any information that somebody has been convicted of a felony, the voter registration application is rejected?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form.
G6 ahead.
THE WITNESS: So what I'm trying to say, I guess, is I don't know if -- by this sentence she meant -- if she is including if they had other information.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q It says that. "Or if you have information from the county or from the clerk's office that the person has been convicted of a felony."

A I meant other information about whether
they've been restored or otherwise might be eligible or have some type of verifying documentation. I don't know that she meant to include that in this statement.

I'm saying now our voter registration
application has that. But at the time, if a county had -- for example, if the person turned in a Certificate of Restoration, they would use that information as well at the same time. I don't know if she meant this -- this staterent to be comprehensive and including that. I don't know if she meant --

Q Are you saying that -- that there was no - -
A If there's other information, no other documentation.

Mi?. RIEGER: Hold on, hold on, holdon, y'all. Lett's ask the question, get an answer.

You're talking a little over each other right now. If we could keep --

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Are you saying at the time this was written,
there was no file keeping the letters of restoration?

A I'm saying I don't know at the time that this was written what she meant by this sentence. I
don't --
Q This seems pretty clear.
If a person marks -- "If a person marks that
they have been convicted of a felony, or if you have
information from the county that the person's been
convicted of a felony, the voter registration
application is rejected."

Whether or not -- you're saying that this is not the policy anymore. You've tod me this a couple of different ways that this can be -- these registrations can be rejectedor they can be held. And I'm asking if that has ever been put in writing to the counties?

MR. RIEGER: I'll object to the form of the question.

G6 ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: I -- so to clarify, no, I disagree that this statement is clear. I -- if they had -- in 2018, if the person turned in a voter registration application marking "Yes" to the felony conviction, and then also turned in a Certificate of Restoration at the same time, no, I -- they would not have been rejected.

> If they had turned in a voter
registration application and marked "Yes," and at
the same time submitted documentation showing they fell in the grace period, no, they would not have been rejected. The same thing for the pre-1973 convictions. I do not know what she meant by the statement, if it was all encompassing.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Have you ever put the policy you described to me where, when processing a grace period conviction -- a registration form from somebody who indicates that the have a grace period conviction, that the counties can either reject that or hold it and do more insestigation? Has that policy ever been put in writing?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the question.

G6 ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: I -- I'm not sure. I'm not sure.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Have you ever given instructions that are distributed to all the counties that say that?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Are you asking since the new voter registration application or -- or ever?

BY MS. BOWIE:

| Q | Ever. |
| :--- | :--- |
| A | I don't know. |

Q Has the Elections Division given any new -any training or instructions on the new registration form?

A We -- obviously the instructions at the top of the voter registration application and then when counties have questions, we -- in calls or e-mails, we have given them instructions

Q But no wholesale instructions or trainings to all the counties?

A To all 95 counties, no, other than what $I$ mentioned.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. Let's talk about Document AB, Miease. Mark that as Exhibit 27. THE COURT REPORTER: 28. AA was 27. MS. BOWIE: You're right. Excuse me. THE COURT REPORTER: All right. Hold on one second.
(Marked Exhibit No. 28.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Have you seen this document before?
A Yes.
Q Okay. Can you describe it, please.

again, to work - - willing to work with the Campaign Legal Center to address their arguments and issues. In response, the next letter had significant - - what we saw as significant additional issues with our suggestions in this letter. And we're still working on addressing those issues, which is - -

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay.
A $\quad-\quad$ why we hadn't, yes.
Q Understood, thank you. okay, at - - this page 2 talks about some changes to the online voter registration portal. Can you read - - this says if a person marks "Yes" to tine felony conviction question, that a sernes of additional questions will appear.

Can yar read that first one there?
A I am not seeing - -
Q That first bullet point.
A I'm not seeing if - - oh, okay.
"If the person marks 'Yes,' a series of
additional questions will appear depending on the prior answer as follows:"

The first bullet point says, "Were allyour felony convictions only between January 15, 1973 and May 17, 1981? If yes, the person can proceed with
no additional felony questions. If no, the next question will appear."

Q Okay. So -- and that -- that same thing is shown in these -- in the chart below.

A Uh-huh.
Q So no additional questions are asked for people who have grace period convictions. Was the plan to then just process that registration?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form of the
question.
Go again -- go ahead.
THE WITNESS: I believe -- I believe
that information was the point of an argument in the
next letter from thectc. So I believe that would be attorney-client privilege, was something that we had discussed with our attorneys.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q But no -- so here it says so no further questions would be asked. So you wouldn't be gathering any additional information that would help the -- the office -- the county offices of elections investigate and find the documents that we've been talking about to verify that; is that correct?

MR. RIEGER: Object to the form.
Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: What the question, we - what was the question?

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q This doesn't ask for any additional
information from the person after they check that box saying that they had a grace period conviction, correct?

A Yes. That was the suggested draft.
Q Okay. And is that still what the Elections
Division - - is that still a change that the
Elections Division is plannii19 on making?
MR. RIEGER: $\quad$ itill - I'm going to go ahead and object to tho extent that it calls for any privileged communications that might involve the deponent's duties as an attorney for the Division of Elections rather than her role as a deponent.

But go ahead and answer to the extent it doesn't broach privilege.

THE WITNESS: So, again, these were suggestions that we were willing and planning to make. But in a subsequent response letter from the Campaign Legal Center, there were what we saw as significant issues with our suggestions. And we're still working on those.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q What were the issues that came up in that letter?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection.
Go ahead and answer without broaching privilege.

THE WITNESS: The letter -- without it in front of me, $I$ can't -- I don't remember all of them. But the letter took issue with the fact that we did not include the pre -- wat I call pre-1973, but, you know -- January 15

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Sure.
A -- January 15-- yeah, the pre-1973
convictions in the oVR or the $S S-3010$, the paper voter registration form.

Therietter took issue with us collecting documents to verify -- to verify eligibility other than the initial Certificate of Restoration. The -I can't remember the other -- the other major arguments or issues. But there were several, several in that letter that we felt needed to try - that we were -- that we're working on. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Okay. And why - - why didn't this include a
separate question for -- to find out if a felony conviction was before January 15th, 1973?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm going to have to say all of the discussions were attorney-client privileged, $I$ believe, on that one.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. Please mark
Document AC as Exhibit 29 .
THE COURT REPORTER All right. Hold on just a moment.
(Marked Exhiblt No. 29.)
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Can you des $\quad$ ibe this document, please?
A This appears to be an e-mail thread from Blair Bowie tor-or from and with Beth Henry-Robereson, Mark Goins, and in the State Elections Division about correspondence back and forth.

MR. RIEGER: So I'm going to go ahead and launch a general objection to any line of questions dealing with this document.
I -- I just -- you know, in terms of the claims in the complaint, you know, even assuming that, you know, discovery can be -- can be broad
and - - this - I mean, this is from about two months ago and can't have any relationship to any claims in the complaint at this point dealing - considering that's from an entirely separate NVRA letter.

So I think this is fishing, and I'm going to go ahead and just put in a general objection - a general objection to the - - to any line of questions from this letter. And I'm going to go ahead and instruct the witness that she can go ahead and answer these questions to the best of her personal knowledge, but not as a 30 (b) (6) deponent, and as long as she doesn'tibreach attorney-client privilege. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q So as you said, this -- this is an e-mail correspondence about the letter correspondence of which Exhibit 28 was a part; is that correct?

A It appears to be. And as I remember it - Q Okay.

A $\quad-\quad$ yes.
Q And you also mentioned that you-all are in the process of responding to the suggestions that were made after Exhibit 28 was sent to counsel. And this e-mail chain is about where you-all are in that process; is that correct?
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A Yes. Yes.
Q Okay. So this says that the Elections
Division has run into several issues that are
delaying the response. Can you explain those,
please?

MR. RIEGER: I'm going to renew my
objection and specifically note that the witness is not instructed to answer, other than in her personal knowledge and without broaching attorney-client privilege.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I believe other than the information in that last e-mail -- I believe anything more would be attorney-client privilege.

But can -- I can reiterate when we tried to addres the issues in the last letter, it was -- it was -- it was -- we found it very difficult to incorporate the changes and add -yeah, we felt -- we found it difficult to incorporate the changes, especially for the paper voter registration form, where there are significant space limitations.

BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Okay. Does the Elections Division have a goal for completing this revision process of the

```
OVR?
```

MR. RIEGER: Same objection; same instruction.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, it would be
attorney-client privilege.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q Does the Elections Division have a goal for
completing any of the revisions to the registration
form?

MR. RIEGER: Same jbjection; same instruction.

THE WITNESS: That would be attorney-client privilpge, I believe. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q What do you view as the next steps in this process?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection; same instruction.

THE WITNESS: Is to continue -- yeah, attorney-client privilege, I would have to say. BY MS. BOWIE:

Q Would you say that the Elections Division is actively working on this?

MR. RIEGER: Same objection; same instruction.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, attorney-client privilege.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I think that we're done.

MR. RIEGER: Okay. Can we -- can we take a 10-minute break? So that way $I$ can decide if there's anything $I$ need to ask the deponent on cross.

MS. BOWIE: Sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off the
record. The time on the monitor is 3:36.
(Recess observed.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are back on the record. The time on the monitor is 3:43.

## E X A M I N A T I O N

BY MR. RIEGER ;
Q Alpright. I have one question for the cross.

In a few questions and answers this afternoon and this morning during the deposition, you used the word "we" with regard to processing voter registration applications. Is it ultimately the responsibility of the Division of Elections or the County Election Commissions to authoritatively determine the result of whether a voter will be
registered to vote, based upon the information, its possession, and the information provided by the voter?

MS. BOWIE: Objection, form.
THE WITNESS: It is ultimately on the county to determine and make the final decision.

MR. RIEGER: Thank you. And that's it for me, Blair.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MS. BOWIE: Okay, thanks, Alex.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Was there anything
further?

MS. BOWIE: Okay, I think that's it.
THE WITAESS: Okay.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This marks the end of the deposition. Going off the record. Time on the monitoreis 3:44.

FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT.
(Proceedings concluded at 3:44 p.m.)
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The deposition of LORETTA MORRIS was taken by counsel for the Defendants, at the offices of 1600 West End Avenue, Nashville, Tennessee, on May 17 , 2023, for all purposes under the Tennessee Rules of Civil Procedure.

All formalities as to caption, notice, statement of appearance, et cetera, are waived. All objections, except as to the form of the questions, are reserved to the hearing, and that said deposition may be read and used in evicence in said cause of action in any trial thereon or any proceeding herein.

It is agreed that MICHELLE CHECUGA, LCR, RPR, and Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness are not waived.

LORETTA MORRIS, was called as a witness, and having first been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. My name is Zach Barker, I'm with the Tennessee Attorney General's Office. And I represent the State Defendants in today's case, which are Governor Lee; Secretary of State, Tre Hargett; the Coordinate Of Elections, Mark Goins; and the TDOC OEficial, Frank Strada.

I'm accompanied with my cocounsel also from the Tennessee Attorney General's Office, Mr. Alex Rieger.

MR. BARKER: And would Plaintiffs' counsel like to introduce themselves at this time?

MR. GRANT: Charles K. Grant on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

MS. RICHARDSON: Valencia Richardson on behalf of the Plaintiffs.

MS. BOWIE: Blair Bowie on behalf of
the Plaintiffs.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Would you introduce yourself to us?
A. Oh, my name is Loretta Morris, and I am a representative from Tennessee State Conference NAACP .
Q. And how do you spell Morris?
A. $\quad M-O-R-R-I-S$.
Q. Perfect, just wanted to make sure that it was spelled the way I expected.

Have you been deposed before?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever testified at a trial before?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So to begin with, I'm going to go over just a few guidelines and things about how today's going to go. If you have any questions, feel free to ask as we go through them. And then I'll once we get through those ask you if you have any more questions.

So if through this process today you don't understand a question that $I$ ask, please just ask me to repeat it or rephrase the
question, and I'll do my best to make sure that everything's understandable and we're on the same page about my question.

If your attorney objects to a question that I ask, don't answer until your attorney and I have discussed the objection and everything's noted that's necessary. And once that is finished, I'll then ask you to answer the question or try to rephrase the question in a way that is not subject to the objection.

Don't guess at any answer. If you don't know, that's fine. If you cant specifically recall any sort of information that I'm asking you about, that's fine, fust state that you don't recall or proviae a reasonable estimate, if you can.

During the deposition, if you recall information that may have been responsive to a question that I asked earlier, just kind of as we're going along things come to mind or if you recognize that you need to add to a response that you gave earlier, just please say that you need to do that and we can kind of go back to that question and make sure that you give a full answer and that you have everything that
you want to say on that topic on the record.
And I will give you an opportunity as we go along to take some breaks. We want you to be comfortable. So if at any point you need a break, just let me know. I'll ask you to finish answering the question that has been posed and then we'll take a break. We're happy to take as many as you may need.

From time to time during the deposition, I may use the word "you." If I use the word "you," I'm referring both to you in your capacity as the NAACP and the NAACP as a whole or at least at the Tennessee Conference of NAACP as a whole since you are its representative and designee for today.

Do you have any questions about any of those guidelines so far?
A. No.
Q. Before we get into the questions about the case, $I$ have to ask you a few questions about you. It's just standard procedure. We have to make sure that nothing's going to affect your testimony today.

So is there anything that would prevent you from testifying truthfully today at the
deposition?
A. No.
Q. Is there any reason that you feel that
you cannot truthfully and accurately testify to
things today?
A. No.
Q. Are you under the influence of any alcohol or drugs at this time?
A. No.
Q. And have you taken any medications that might affect your ability to answer questions today?
A. No.
Q. Let's go over a little bit of your background. Where de you work?
A. I don't.
Q. Okay. Do you have a position at the NAACP?
A. I am first vice of our branch.
Q. And what do you do in that position?
A. Well, $I$ wear a lot of hats.
Q. Okay. What are those hats?
A. Get out to vote, legal redress, help the president whenever he's -- he needs help or stand in his head whenever he's gone.
Q. Do you have any other responsibilities beyond those that you've listed there?
A. Whatever comes up.
Q. Whatever comes up, okay. Sounds like you're a very versatile person at the NAACP. Have you held any other positions with the NAACP prior to this one?
A. Secretary.
Q. And what did you do there?
A. Everything that an admin in any other company would do.
Q. Okay. Did those positions -- I know you mentioned voting with your current position. Did the secretary position have any responsibilities wher it came to voting rights in Tennessee?
A. No.
Q. Okay. With your current position, what are your responsibilities when it comes to voting rights in Tennessee for NAACP members?
A. Well, we assist individuals that come and need assistance for voter restorations or voting registrations.
Q. Do those individuals have to be NAACP members?
A. No.
Q. So you will help anyone who comes in the door?
A. Anyone.
Q. All right. I'd like to get a little bit of background on your preparation for today's deposition. So you're the designee from the Tennessee Conference of the NAACP. Have you seen the notice of deposition for today?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MR. BARKER: I'd like to take a copy of that notice of depositicn and enter it as Exhibit 1 .
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit No. 1.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. All right. Have you seen that document before, Ms. Morris?
A. Yes, it looks like it's the same one.
Q. Did you review the topics in that
document for preparation today?
A. Yes.
Q. What, if any, other documents did you review in preparation for today?
A. The documents that were given to me by my attorney.
Q. Okay. Do you -- can you identify what those documents are for us?
A. Okay, the first amendment complaint. I can't recall all of them.

MR. GRANT: This is dated May 12th. MR. BARKER: Yes, that's the most recent one that we sent you guys.

Can we go off the record for a second?
(WHEREUPON, an off-the-record discussion was held.) MR. GRANT: We can proceed. MR. BARKER, Go back on the record then.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Who, if anyone, did you speak with in preparation for the deposition today?
A. I have a non-exhaustive list here of people that I've talked to.
Q. Okay, can you share that with us? Who are those individuals? You can just say them out loud.
A. Oh, just say --
Q. Yeah.
A. Okay.
Q. That will be fine.
A. You want me to read them all or just some of them?
Q. Read them all, that will be fine.
A. Latitia Gray out of Robertson County; Cheryl Guinn, former president of Nashville branch; Tamika White, Nashville branch; Daphne Nelson, State Conference; Dawn Harringion, Executive Director of Free Hearts; DarKenya Waller, Executive Director of Iiegal Aid Society of Middle Tennessee; Gicola Iane, Free Hearts and Campaign Legal Center; Keeda Haynes, Free Hearts; Tiffany Tiptoñ-Boyd, President, Dyersburg branch: Jimmie Garland, President, Clarksville branch; Thomas Staten, President Sumner County branch; Leola Scott, Get Out to Vote Chair, Dyersburg branch; Katie Wilson, former President Murfreesboro branch; the Honorable Robin Kimbrough, General Sessions judge and NAACP member; Honorable Rachel Bell, General Sessions judge; and Maryland Brown, Nashville branch.
Q. Was your conversation with each of those
individuals kind of the same or was it different with each one?
A. Different.
Q. And can you describe the different types of conversations that you had with them?
A. The topic was the same, but the answers were different.
Q. What was the topic?
A. The topic was the voter restoration.
Q. And specifically what about voter registration were you asking them aoout?
A. What their involvement was in helping others with the voter regisiration.
Q. And how are each of those individuals involved in helping ochers with voting registration?
A. It was tneir response from other people that they needed to go talk to were different.
Q. Okay. And were they talking to other people that were officials in the NAACP?
A. No.
Q. Were they talking to individuals that were members of the NAACP that were seeking the right to vote?
A. Wait, let's back that train up.
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. Okay.
Q. We can back up. Go ahead. Go ahead, take your time.
A. Okay. Now, the question before that when you asked me about the individuals that they was talking to, it -- can you explain who are you looking for? What are you looking for? Q. When you mentioned those -- that list of individuals --
A. Okay.
Q. -- and you said that you talked to them
--
A. Uh-huh.
Q. -- about who they were talking to. Who were they -- they yoing out and talking to and what was that those individuals' role?
A. Oh, okay, I gotcha. No, we was talking about who they had to -- what government entities that they were talking to about how they help their clients in getting the voter registration.
Q. And those --
A. I believe.
Q. And those clients, do you understand them
to be members of the NAACP?
A. Not all of them, no.
Q. Okay. But some of them?
A. Some .
Q. Okay. And do you know which government entities that they were speaking to?
A. Parole offices. Court clerks.
Q. Anyone else?
A. Not that I recall.
Q. Other than the individuals on that list, did you talk to anyone else in prefaration for today's deposition?
A. My attorneys.
Q. Okay. And were the attorneys that you spoke to the individuals in this room?
A. Yes.
Q. Without yoing into the content of that conversation -- I don't want to get into what they told you or you told them. When did the conversation occur with them?
A. What do you mean "when"?
Q. Like, was it a few days ago, months ago?
A. Oh. Well, it may have been started at the end of April, I think.
Q. Okay. How many times did you meet with
them?
A. About -- I don't know, probably about four or five times, maybe.
Q. Okay.
A. Maybe more.
Q. Okay. Other than the people that you
listed and your attorneys here, did you meet with anyone else in preparation?
A. No.
Q. So other than documents that ycu reviewed and speaking to those individuals, was there anything else that you did in mreparation for today's deposition?
A. Yes, I may have looked up some -- some laws.
Q. Okay. Can you recall which laws you looked up?
A. The one about the voter restoration.
Q. And would that be one that contains to criteria for eligibility?
A. Exactly.
Q. Okay, perfect. Perfect.

Anything else beyond that?
A. Nope.
Q. I want to move on and just ask you some
questions about the NAACP. And this -- some of these questions may sound a little bit basic, but just kind of bear with me, if we can, and we'll get through this.

What is the NAACP?
A. It's an advocacy group, okay, that advocate for the rights of individuals who have been discriminated against. May be political, education, health, social, okay. We just try to get quality for everyone.
Q. Okay. And you may have answered this question in what you just said, and if you did, that's fine, but what -- what is the organizational goal or the advocacy that the NAACP does?
A. Yep, I did answer that, didn't I?
Q. Yes, you did. So you caught my next question.

So what are some of the activities that the NAACP does in furtherance of that goal?
A. Are we talking the whole -- what are we -- we talking?
Q. Just kind of generally on the whole, the Tennessee Conference of the NAACP, what are some of the activities that you guys engage in
in furtherance of your goal of getting rid of discrimination and things like that?
A. Okay. Well, we do education to
individuals about eco -- any economic goals or
education. There's a plethora of things that we do there.
Q. Do some of those things involve voting rights?
A. Oh, yes. That's our main goal.
Q. That's your main goal, okay.

And what sort of things do you guys do in
furtherance of voting rights in your
organization?
A. We ensure that peopie are registered to vote.
Q. Okay. Help me understand a little bit how the NAACP is organized in Tennessee. Is there just one central group? Is it divided into divisions? How is it organized?
A. I'm trying to think of something that you -- you ever been in the military?
Q. I haven't, no, ma'am, but I can understand that if --
A. Okay.
Q. -- that analogy works for you, that works
for me.
A. Okay, okay, okay. You do have
corporations. You know, with corporations --
Q. Sure.
A. -- you have the head, that is the

Tennessee State.
Q. Okay.
A. And then we have branches in every county
or we try to have branches in every county.
Q. Okay.
A. And we have youth council and collegiate chapters.
Q. Does it -- what sort of benefits then does the NAACP provide to its members in each one of those divisions, if we'll call it that?
A. Benefits? binat type of benefit? What is
do you mean benefits?
Q. You were talking about education and advocacy, so what sort of activities like that are provided to NAACP members?
A. Well, we don't just provide to NAACP members. We divide -- we provide to everyone.

Okay? And any benefit is whatever the individual would need at that particular time. Q. When it'd comes to voting rights, what
are some of the benefits or things that your organization offers to its members or the public?
A. We -- we help them to -- to register.

Okay? Not quite sure what all you looking for.
Q. Well, so you help them to register. Do
you help people with the certificate of
restoration process?
A. Well, we guide them in that.
Q. Okay. Is there anything beyond helping them to register and helping them and guiding them in the certificate restoration process, is there anything ceyond that that the NAACP offers?
A. Is there something you particular looking for?
Q. No, I'm just asking you if you are aware of anything else?
A. Well, guiding them into where they --
where they should go.
Q. Okay.
A. Making sure they know about the -- the certificate.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay.
Q. Backing up to just kind of a birds's eye view of the NAACP and getting back to some of the basics, how does someone become a member of the NAACP?
A. They fill out a form and pay their dues.
Q. Where can they find the form?
A. They can -- they can either go on the NAACP.org or they can go to their -- the branch in that county.
Q. Is there anything beyond filling out the form and paying their dues that an individual has to do to join the NAACP?
A. Nope.
Q. Is there any membership criteria or anything like that, 广ike age or something like that, that you have to have -- that you have to meet, rather, io join the NAACP?
A. Not to join the NAACP.
Q. Okay. How much are the dues?
A. That depends on what you want.
Q. Okay. How so?
A. Well, there's levels of membership.
Q. What are the different levels of membership?
A. There are adult membership, okay, that
you pay yearly.
Q. Okay.
A. And there are lifetime memberships that you pay either one time or a certain amount for up to ten years.
Q. Are there any other levels?
A. Youth level.
Q. So what are the dues for an adult level membership on a yearly basis?
A. $\quad \$ 30$.
Q. And the life time membershie, how much does that one cost?
A. 750 .
Q. And a youth membership, how much does that one cost?
A. $\quad \$ 10$.
Q. Okay. Who can become a member of the NAACP?
A. Anybody.
Q. Does an NAACP keep a record of its membership?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that kept on a state level or a local level?
A. A national level.
Q. Okay. What sort of information is kept in those records?
A. Not sure if $I$ can give that information out.
Q. Okay. Can you speak generally of -- is it just like a name and an address and a phone number? You don't have to give me, like, specific individuals' information, just kind of the type of information, can you give that? A. Not sure if I can give anything out that has anything to do with membership.

MR. GRANT: You can answer the question as to the type of information that would be on the membership application. THE WITNESS: Okay. Name, address, telephone numbers. BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Okay. Does the NAACP keep track of whether any of its members have a felony? A. No.
Q. Does the NAACP document the voting status of any of its members?
A. No.
Q. Does the NAACP document whether an individual has received a certificate of
restoration for their voting rights?
A. No.
Q. Does the NAACP track or document a member's prison sentence?
A. No.
Q. Do you document or track a member's
parole?
A. No.
Q. Probation?
A. No.
Q. All right, I've got a couplemore.

MR. GRANT: Let him get it out.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Restitution? RO you track restitution,
any member's restitution?
A. No.
Q. Court costs?
A. No.
Q. Do you track or document child support?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about a little bit -you talked about guidance on voting rights and things like that that the NAACP offers. So what, if any, information does the NAACP share
about voting rights restoration in Tennessee?
A. Okay, just whatever we find on the -- on your website on how -- how to navigate the system.
Q. How does that -- how does the NAACP share that information?
A. Well, to any individual that comes.
Q. Okay.
A. That needs their rights restored.
Q. Is that in a document that you provide those people that come to the NAACP?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you have an e-mail? Is there an e-mail that the NAACF sends out about voting rights restoration?
A. No.
Q. Does the NAACP's website contain any information about voting rights restoration?
A. Not our website, no.
Q. Okay. So beyond sharing a document and, obviously, talking with an individual that comes into the office, is there any sort of publication or information put out about voting rights by the NAACP?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Now, you said that once again you offer guidance and assistance. Does the NAACP advertise that they offer this assistance to their members?
A. No, we don't advertise that.
Q. Okay. So this is something that an individual would have to come and ask for at the NAACP?
A. Well, when we try to do voter registrations, then they -- that's how we learn that someone might need that infornation. Q. So let's talk about that then for a second. This -- your voter registrations that you do, what's that process? What does that look like?
A. We hold events at wherever, whoever having an eveni, we set up a table so that we can do voter registrations at whatever event. Q. And who is at that table that someone can approach?
A. Any NAACP member that is manning that table at that time.
Q. Are those people that work for the NAACP or volunteers?
A. Well, we all are volunteers.
Q. Okay. Is there any sort of position that someone has to hold at the NAACP to work at one of those tables?
A. No.
Q. What sort of information do the people at those tables give out or tell to individuals who come by?
A. To tell about?
Q. Voting rights?
A. Oh, about voting rights or the voting registration?
Q. Both. Both, if you can speak on both.

We'll take it one at a time, though, just for clarity.

So what sort of information did they provide about voter registration, let's start there?
A. Well, we have a -- we have a tablet that we just allow them to go on to the online website of the State and register.
Q. Okay. If an individual is unable to register on that tablet, what is done then?
A. Well, I guess that depends upon what it is that their issue is at that time.
Q. Okay. Is there information about voting
rights at that point that is given to that individual?
A. If they disclose that they need that.
Q. Okay. And what is the information that
would be given to them?
A. It's a -- a worksheet or the COR, okay, we might give to them.
Q. When you give them the COR, what sort of instruction then is given to the individual?
A. The only thing we can tell them is they need to take it to their parole officer. Q. Okay. Does the NAACP offer any sort of guidance about the COR process and how to get that document filled out?
A. Yes. We let them know that they -- they have to go to their probation officer to get it started. And after that, their probation officer is supposed to take it to the county clerks and then take it to the election office.
Q. Does the NAACP guide them through each step of that process, the individual that's applying?
A. We do follow up.
Q. Okay. How does that follow-up occur?
A. Well, we call them and see if they
have -- if they had any issues.
Q. Are those follow-ups documented in any way?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So you mentioned the tables and setting up at voting registration events. Is there any other assistance that the NAACP offers to its members or the public regarding voting rights restoration?
A. Well, if there's -- if they have issues,
we do call in Free Heart, okay, tosee if there's anything that we can $-\omega$ what else we can do to help.
Q. And you mentioned Free Hearts when you were talking about some of the individuals that you spoke to about this deposition. So what is the relationship between NAACP and Free Hearts?
A. We collaborate with them.
Q. And what do you collaborate on?
A. Voter restoration.
Q. Okay. And what -- what do they do for the NAACP?
A. They help us whenever we have issues, okay? They have the -- the enroll to the campaign legal center if there's any questions,
any attorneys that the individual might need. Q. Do you offer at the NAACP any sort of educational programs about the COR process to your members or the public?
A. Yes, we may.
Q. Okay. And what are those?
A. Just how -- how the process is.
Q. Okay. And who generally presents the information at those educational events?
A. Sometimes we bring in Free Hearts --
Q. Okay.
A. -- okay, so they can educate the public.

Or any senators that may --any Tennessee senators or house representatives that may have worked on some of thein.
Q. Anyone beyona Free Hearts or Tennessee -elected officiais that presents at those educational events?
A. Unless it's an NAACP member, that's it.
Q. Okay. So if you could, could you walk me through the NAACP's understanding of the criteria for voting rights restoration in Tennessee?

MR. GRANT: Objection to the form of the question.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. You can answer.
A. Repeat the question.
Q. What is the NAACP's understanding of the
criteria for voting rights restoration in
Tennessee?
A. Okay, so --

MR. GRANT: Same objection.
You may answer, ma'am. You can
answer.
THE WITNESS: I can answer?
MR. GRANT: If you know, sure.
THE WITNESS: We häve a worksheet that we go through. BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Okay.
A. So that if there's any -- that way if there's anything that -- different for each individual, we know which step to go to.
Q. What information is on that worksheet?
A. I think we have one in this packet here.
Q. I may have a copy of it.
A. Okay.
Q. Let me see if I've got a copy of it here.

Let's go ahead and talk about this then.

MR. BARKER: Let's go ahead and mark this as Exhibit 2.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit No. 2.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. This is a document that was produced in discovery by the NAACP. It was labeled

PL000083 rights restorations sheet.
Do you recognize that document?
A. I do.
Q. Is that the restoration -- the worksheet that you're talking about?
A. Yes.
Q. All right, perfect So we're on the same page then.

So how does the NAACP use this worksheet?
A. So we use this so that we can gather information as to where we need to lead the individual.
Q. Did the NAACP create this worksheet?
A. No.
Q. Who created this worksheet?
A. Free Heart.
Q. Free Hearts, okay.

What sort of information is gathered on
this worksheet?
A. The name and -- the name -- oh, the person that helps them, the name of the citizen, their address, their phone number, their date of birth. If they know their convictions and the date of and the county. Then we check to see if by the date of their conviction is it with -- does it lie within any of the parameters of the different dates that people have lost their rights or have not lost their rights.
Q. Okay.
A. Okay? If there's any ineligible convictions, okay, that the State says that they're -- they can't. And if they have completed their seritence or any probation and parole. If their fees or restitution has been paid. And are they up to date on their child support.
Q. And I noticed that one of these -- C1 there, any ineligible convictions, referenced a table on the back of the document. Does -does the NAACP have a copy of the back of the document?
A. It's normally on the document.
Q. Okay. I don't have a copy of the back of the document. So what information is on the back of the document, if you can share that with us?
A. It is -- it states the dates and what offenses has been committed and that says whether or not they can or cannot get their rights restored.
Q. Okay. And this document also references the Campaign Legal Center. So what is the NAACP's relationship with the Campaign Legal?
A. We ask them any questions that -- any
legal questions that we might have.
Q. So do they serve as legal counsel for the NAACP on voting rights issues?
A. I guess we cán say that.
Q. Okay. And if an individual needs representation on voting rights, would you refer them to Campaign Legal?
A. We would.
Q. Okay. I think I'm done with that document.

So beyond this worksheet, is there anything else that the NAACP does with its members or members of the public when it comes
to voting rights restoration in Tennessee?
A. I'm not understanding, what are you
trying to ask me? Besides this document?
Q. Yes, so -- let me strike that. Let me rephrase and start over, that was not the best worded question. I'm sorry about that.

So we talked about the educational process that you guys do and we talked about this worksheet. If an individual comes to the NAACP seeking help with voting rights, is there anything beyond this document that you guys would provide them with?
A. No. Because -- well, the COR.
Q. Okay. Okay. And you mentioned that earlier, I apologize, I'm going back over some of the same -- some of the same stuff.

So when an individual fills out this form, does the NAACP do anything to verify the information?
A. No, that's not for us to -- to verify. Q. Okay. Does -- if an individual fills out the form and answers everything correctly, does the NAACP tell them whether or not they might be able to go on with the COR process?
A. Yes.
Q. If an individual fills out the form and it is apparent that they can't go on with the COR process, what does the NAACP do?
A. Now, that is different for each
individual.
Q. Okay. How is it different for each individual?
A. It will depend on whether or not they have finished their probation. Depends on whether or not they have any fees or restitutions they need to pay. And it will also depend upon their child support. Those are the only three criterias.
Q. Does the NAACP provide them with any instruction or information on how to become eligible?
A. The fact that they have to pay their court costs.
Q. Okay, so let's use that example then. If someone owes court costs, what does the NAACP tell them to do?
A. Well, it all -- it all depends upon the individual.
Q. Okay, okay. Would you refer them to someone outside of the NAACP, like a county
clerk's office?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. You mentioned providing
individuals with the COR form. What version of
the form is -- strike that.
When the NAACP provides an individual
with the COR form, do they check to make sure it's the most up-to-date version?
A. We get the form from Free Heart.
Q. Get the form from Free Hearts, okay. Do you get the form from anywhere else other than Free Hearts?
A. Off the website. Off the State website.
Q. And is that the Tennessee Secretary of State?
A. Tennessee Seeretary, uh-huh.
Q. Yes, ma'am. Trying not to re-ask you the same questions, I'm sorry.

Are NAACP members informed that someone else has to fill out the COR forms?
A. What do you mean by that?
Q. What is the NAACP's understanding of who can fill out the blanks on the COR form?
A. That -- the TDOC, the governor or the probation officer -- or correction -- I guess
it's called corrections, yeah, can fill it out.
Q. Okay. Does the NAACP provide them any instruction about not filling out the form
themselves?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What entity does the NAACP send an individual to to have the COR form filled out?
A. Their parole officer.
Q. Their parole officer, okay.

And that would vary by county and individual?
A. Yeah, exactly, because - yes.
Q. Does the NAACP contaci any government entities on behalf of an individual seeking a COR?
A. I guess that: would depend upon the individual.
Q. Are you aware of any instance in the past where the NAACP has contacted a government entity on behalf of an individual?
A. Yes.
Q. What government entity was contacted?
A. The parole, the parole board and -- or the -- depends upon the county because different conflict counties do it differently.
Q. Okay. Beyond the parole board, is there any other entity that you're aware of the NAACP contacting on behalf of an individual seeking a COR? And by "COR" I mean certificate of restoration, $I$ don't know if $I$ made that clear for the record. But who else might the NAACP reach out to on behalf of the individual?

MR. GRANT: Object to the form of the question. Witness just answered the question. BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Is there any other entity beyond the probation parole office that --
A. The county clerk.
Q. The county clerk's office.

Anybody beyond che county clerk's office?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do any employees or volunteers of the NAACP accompany individuals when they go to the parole office to have their -- their COR form filled out?
A. Some counties have.
Q. Some counties have.

Are you aware just of a ballpark of how often that happens?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of multiple instances of that happening?
A. Yes.
Q. About how many can you recall? Just -it doesn't have to be exact, an estimate?
A. Well, is there a time frame you trying to give me or?
Q. Since 2006. I know that's a pretty big time frame, but just --
A. You know, I don't know that.
Q. -- off the top of your head?

MR. GRANT: Objection to the form of the question. BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Let me rephrase and ask this a different way then.

Is it the normal procedure of the NAACP to accompany individuals when they visit the probation parole office to get a COR form filled out?
A. In some counties, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know which counties those are?
A. Off the top of my head it would be Dyersburg.
Q. Dyersburg, okay.

I'm trying to remember which county
Dyersburg might be in. But the city of
Dyersburg, right?
A. Yeah, uh-huh.
Q. Okay. Does the NAACP monitor the outcome of individual members' certificate of restoration?

MR. GRANT: Objection to the form of the question. You restated the question you asked earlier.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Can you go ahead and añiswer that for me? MR. GRANT: YOU can answer. THE WITNESS: No, I don't think we do.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Do you specifically track when
certificates are granted?
A. No.
Q. What about certificates that are denied?
A. No, we don't track that information.
Q. If the NAACP becomes aware that an individual's certificate of restoration has been denied, what, if any, assistance does the

NAACP offer them at that point?
A. Well, there -- we can't offer any
assistance, because of the fact that there
isn't any appeals process for that.
Q. So to the NAACP's knowledge, what, if any, appeal process or way to challenge a COR denial exists?

MR. GRANT: Objection to the form of
the question.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. You can answer.
A. There isn't a process.
Q. Okay. I want to move on to some
documents, if we --
A. Okay.
Q. -- if that's okay. And we'll just kind of work througn some different documents -A. Okay.
Q. -- in the case.

As a part of the NAACP's production in this case, an Excel spreadsheet was provided. And the file has a number and the file name PL00092. And I've printed that document and I'd like for us to take a look at it. And it's on a big sheet of paper rather that a normal
sheet of paper.
MR. BARKER: If we can make this the next exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit No. 3.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Do you recognize this document or spreadsheet at all?
A. No, I can't say I do.
Q. Have you ever seen a spreadsheet like this on a computer like in a Micresoft Excel file?
A. I'm looking at the -- the head -- the headers here, and $I$ don' $\dagger$ recognize those. Q. Okay. Let's look at another document then. In response to discovery, the NAACP provided three lists of members in its response to Defendant's first set of interrogatories.

Specific -- and in the third response ---- or excuse me, in the response to Defendant's third set of interrogatories, NAACP provided some descriptions for these lists. So I'd like for us to take a look at the list and the descriptions, and I'm going to pull those out of my box.

MR. BARKER: Here are the responses, if we could make those the next numbered exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit No. 4.)

MR. BARKER: And while we're at it to save some time, I'm going to go ahead and hand out copies of the lists. If we could make that the next exhibit, as well.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit No. 5.)

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. All right, let's look at this first document here, the one with the caption on the top that says "Plaintiff Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Responses and Objections to Defendant's Third Set of Interrogatories and Third Request for Production of Documents."

And let's go back here to page -- let's start first on Page 16. Do you recognize there kind of at the bottom of the page the individual's name listed?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's Gloria J. Sweet-Love. Who is
that?
A. President of the Tennessee State

Conference.
Q. Do you recognize that signature beside their name?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Let's look back then. I'm going to have you flip back in this document again to Page 13. There in the second paragraph under the heading "Response" it references Exhibit A. And then starting at the very bottom of the page, the next to last line and spilling over to the next page, it says, "ihe persons listed in Exhibit $A$, to the best of theirs and Plaintiff TN NAACP's knowledge are all Tennessee resident: have at least one felony conviction after 1981 and have not, or had not at the time of their response been restored their voting rights."

Looking at the second document that $I$ handed you, which is Exhibit 5, the list of names. Is that referring to this attachment, Exhibit A?
A. Yes.
Q. How did the NAACP compile this list
that's Exhibit A?
A. I don't know, this is the attorneys' list
that the attorneys compiled this.
Q. Have you seen this list before?
A. Yes, the attorneys have shown this to me.
Q. Does the NAACP use this list in its ordinary operations for any purpose?
A. I cannot answer that.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of whether these individuals are NAACP members?
A. Well, since the attorneys conpiled it, I think they are the ones that can tell you that.
Q. Do you have any documentation of these individuals' NAACP memberships?
A. I don't know that answer to that.
Q. Has the NAPCP reviewed these individuals felony convictions?
A. No, we don't view felony convictions.
Q. Okay. Let's look at -- going back --flip-flopping back to our other document that we were just on, which was Exhibit 4, the NAACP's responses to Defendant's third set of interrogatories. Moving on to Page 14 in the middle of the page there, it says Interrogatory 1 -- Interrogatory Number 10, rather, response.

It references Exhibit B, and that last full sentence of that response says, "The persons listed in Exhibit $B$ to the best of theirs and Plaintiff TN NAACP's knowledge are Tennessee residents otherwise qualified to vote, (2) have at least one felony conviction after 1981, (3) have requests $a \operatorname{COR}$ or at the request an advocate requested one on their behalf from the appropriate officials and (4) were refused issuance of a COR by at least one appropriate official."

Is it your understanding that that is turning over to Exhibit 5 what's labeled as attachment B?
A. Now what's the question?
Q. Is it your uriderstanding that this response that just read refers to that list?
A. That's my understanding.
Q. Did the NAACP create this list?
A. I believe their attorneys created that list.
Q. And I'm going -- I'm going to be asking some of the same questions about this list as I did the previous one.

How did the NAACP become aware of the
individuals listed on this list?
A. Now, I never got that information.
Q. Are these individuals NAACP members, can you verify that?
A. I cannot.
Q. Do you have any documentation of these individuals' membership in the NAACP?
A. I don't know.
Q. Have you reviewed their felony convictions?
A. No.
Q. And then let's talk about another one, going back to our other document, Exhibit 4. And it's going to be on Page 15. In response to Interrogatory Number 11, which is referenced on 14 , we're at the last full sentence of that response on Page 15. The last full sentence of that first paragraph, it says, "The persons listed in Exhibit $C$ to the best after theirs and Plaintiff Tennessee NAACP's knowledge all (1) are Tennessee residents otherwise qualified to vote, (2) have at least one felony conviction after 1981, (3) meet the eligibility criteria for voting rights restoration listed under T.C.A. 40-29-202, (4) have requested a

COR or at their request an advocate requested one on their behalf from the appropriate officials and (5) have not been restored the right to vote or if they have since received restoration, missed at least one election after they requested restoration while eligible for such."

Do you understand that to be a description of attachment $C$, which is the last page of Exhibit 5, our list of exhibits here?
A. Right.
Q. Did the NAACP compile this list?
A. The attorneys compiled it.
Q. How did the NAACP become aware of these individuals?
A. That's a gooú question. I don't know.
Q. Are each of these individuals NAACP members?
A. That we don't know. We don't track that.
Q. Do you have any documentation of these individuals' membership?
A. I don't, no.
Q. Has the NAACP reviewed these individuals' convictions?
A. We don't review their convictions.
Q. Has the NAACP reviewed whether they meet the criteria for a certificate of restoration?
A. I am not sure about that. I cannot answer that.
Q. Okay.

MR. BARKER: We've been on the record for about an hour, and I think this would be a good time to take a little break, if that's okay with everyone, and go off the record. (Short break.)

BY MR. BARKER:
Ms. Morris, did you talk to anybody about this case while you were on the break or this deposition?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I want to move on to another document. You understand you're still under oath at this point, too?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Just a --
A. I was going to make a joke.
Q. Just a couple procedural questions and then we'll move on to another document $I$ want to ask you about.
A. Okay.
Q. So in response to Defendant's second set of interrogatories served on November 18th, 2022, NAACP provided this response and an attachment.

MR. BARKER: And we'll attach that as Exhibit 6 to the deposition.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit No. 6.)

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. And if you'll -- the pages aren' $亡$
numbered, so I apologize, but if you'll flip through to right before the attachments. And let me properly identify this document, this is the -- "Plaintiff Tennessee Conference of National Association of Advancement of Colored People Responses and Objections to Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories."

If you'll flip to that last page there with the signature on it, right before attachment $A$. What's that date there?
A. November 17 th , ' 22.
Q. And whose name is listed?
A. Gloria J. Sweet-Love.
Q. Is she the individual that you previously reference as the president of the Tennessee

NAACP?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's her signature?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. In this document there's a description, and I've got to find it, so give me just a second because $I$ don't have page numbers. So if you go to Interrogatory Number 3 and then flip to the next page there, there's a big paragraph at the bottom that says, "In addition to the lists already prodiced," do you see? The next page, that last paragraph there. In addition -- begins with, "In addition to the lists already produced, "do you see that? Yes, okay.

So it says, "In addition to lists already produced by the Tennessee NAACP in response to Defendant's first set of interrogatories, Plaintiff Tennessee NAACP attached a list of individuals it has since identified as potential members of the punitive class, individuals who have lost the right to vote because of a felony conviction and who have requested or attempted to request certificates of restoration but to date have not received a

COR sufficient to restore their voting rights." And then it has in parentheses, attachment $A$.

So if you flip over two pages there, there's attachment $A$ and a long list of names here. Do you recognize this list?
A. I recognize it.
Q. Did the NAACP compile this list?
A. It said it did.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of how the NAACP
found out about these individuals?
A. No, no one said how they came about these individuals.
Q. Are you aware of whether each of these individuals are members of the NAACP?
A. No, I am not.
Q. Do you have any documentation of any of these individuals' membership in the NAACP?
A. No.
Q. Have you reviewed the felony convictions of these individuals?
A. No.
Q. All right. Have you, meaning the NAACP -- has the NAACP determined whether or not they were eligible for a COR based on the NAACP's understanding of the criteria?
A. Okay, so let's see. Does that say that? Let's see. Well, it says that right here.
Q. What does it say? Can you read that
aloud for me?
A. That the individuals who have lost their right to vote because of a felony conviction who have requested or attempted to request CORs but to date have not received COR.
Q. Okay. So that says that they attempted, but did the NAACP review them for whether they meet the criteria?
A. What criteria are you talking about?
Q. Has the NAACP reviewed those individuals for whether they owe court costs?
A. Well, if they have already sent up the COR, that's already been taken care of.
Q. So does inat mean that the NAACP has determined whether or not they owe court costs? A. Well, the NAACP doesn't, the court -- the clerk of courts does that.
Q. Okay. Does the NAACP have any documentation of whether those individuals owe court costs or not?
A. No.
Q. Does the NAACP have any documentation of
whether those individuals owe restitution?
A. No.
Q. Does the NAACP have any documentation of
those individuals' child support obligations?
A. No.
Q. Has the NAACP reviewed those individuals'
felonies to see if they are permanently
disqualified based on the type of felony
committed?
A. I don't think the NAACP did that.
Q. Okay. That's all for that document.

We're going to move on to another one.
In response to the diseovery request in this case, there was a document produced, which is labeled PL000084D Jemison Voter Registration Clinic.

MR. PARKER: We'll make a copy of this document Exhibit 7.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit No. 7.)

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. What is this document?
A. This is a document -- this is a document of an expungement clinic that was conducted in Montgomery County.
Q. Okay. What -- what happens at an expungement clinic?
A. Now -- well, the -- what they do is expunge records of the individuals.
Q. So we have this list of names and phone numbers. Who are these people? Why would they be signing up or why would this information be documented?
A. Because they had -- they needed their records expunged, and it just so happened that the person that was doing this was a candidate for judgeship. And I just wanted to make sure that -- because he's the one -- he was an
attorney at the time and he was going to expunge their recordß for them. Okay? And I just wanted to make sure that they had -- it actually got aone, okay? Because, I mean, he was a candidate.
Q. Okay. Who wrote this document then?
A. I did.
Q. You wrote this document, okay.

What is the relationship between this
document and voting rights restoration then? Are these individuals -- let me ask that question.

What's the relationship between this document and voting rights restoration?
A. None.
Q. Okay. Are these all members of the NAACP?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do you know if -- okay. That's fine.

Well, let me ask another question. Are you aware if any of these individuals are members of the NAACP?
A. None of them are.
Q. Okay.

MR. GRANT: Note my objection to the question.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Let's look at another document. I've got a copy of it here.

MR. BARKER: We can mark it as
Exhibit Number 8.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit No. 8.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. This is a document produced in discovery, which was -- I don't know that -- yes, labeled

PL000086L Morris, and then it has the number 7262021. What is this document?
A. This is a document of individuals that wanted to get their voting rights restored.
Q. Okay. Who wrote this document?
A. I did.
Q. Are these individuals NAACP members?
A. No.
Q. So what was the purpose then of writing down these names?
A. They had called and wanted their rights restored. And this was information that I was going to be passing onto scmeone else.
Q. Who would you be passed this information
--
A. Free Heart,
Q. Free Heart?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Okay. Did you follow-up with any of these individuals about the COR process?
A. Right, but they never responded.
Q. The individuals never responded?
A. Never responded.
Q. Do other documents like this exist?
A. I don't know.
Q. Okay. Have you searched to try to find other documents like this?
A. I have asked and no response.
Q. All right. So let's move on from documents, and I'd like to just ask you if the NAACP keeps track of a couple other things.

Does the NAACP track what is known as -let me back up. Strike that.

Are you aware of the effect of a felony conviction between January 15th, 1973. and May 17 th , 1981, on a person's voting rights? A. Yes.
Q. Is that what they call the grace period? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is it okay if we call it the grace period as we go forward with these questions? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Does the NAACP keep track of members that were convicted of a felony during the grace period?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Let's talk about something that's mentioned in the amended complaint, which you mentioned reviewing, which was a public education workshop on the COR process. I'd
like to explore that a little bit.
So what is a public education workshop? MR. GRANT: Objection to the form of the question. You all struck reference to topics related to the amended complaint.

MR. BARKER: Sure, but we -- can we go off the record?
(WHEREUPON, an off-the-record
discussion was held.)
MR. BARKER: Let's go back of the record then. BY MR. BARKER:

What is a public educa亡ion workshop?
A. Went down the wrong pipe.
Q. No worries. Are you okay?
A. Yeah, fine.

A publie workshop is just giving the public information that they should already know but they don't.
Q. Okay. Does the NAACP specifically put these on?
A. Yes.
Q. And are they about -- strike that.

Has the NAACP presented public education workshops on the voting rights restoration
process?
A. Yes.
Q. How many have they done?
A. Let's say about two.
Q. Two?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Do you recall when those were?
A. They have done one during the state convention in September. I can't remember what year it was, but $I$ know we had done one during the state convention.
Q. Was that within the last ten years?
A. Couple -- yes. Oh yes.
Q. Okay. And what was the other one?
A. And the other one is one that we have put
-- Montgomery County has put on, and all we did was just reiterated what's on your website.
Q. When was that offered?
A. That was done last summer.
Q. So summer of 2022?
A. Yes.
Q. Are these workshops available to the public at large?
A. Yes.
Q. So they're not just limited to NAACP
members?
A. Correct.
Q. Is the attendance at these workshops documented in any way?
A. No.
Q. Does the NAACP have the materials like a slideshow or a handout or anything that is offered at these workshops?
A. Yes.
Q. And what -- what would those be?
A. Those would be information we get from Free Heart.
Q. Okay. What sort of information?
A. What sort of information as to?
Q. Yes, is it a haindout, a PowerPoint
slideshow --
A. Okay, okay.
Q. -- what would that be?
A. They may be handouts, they -- well, with the -- with our it's handouts and also a PowerPoint slide.
Q. Okay. Can you recall any of the specific content from those handouts or slideshow?
A. The one specific that we make sure that we hand out is the -- the one from your web --
the Tennessee website that states what charges are eligible and what are not eligible and the grace periods and that kind of thing.
Q. Do you recall any other specific information that was given out at the public education workshops beyond what you just mentioned?
A. Just how to navigate -- how to -- the instructions to the city hall.
Q. I want to move on to a slightly different topic and kind of address NAACP - -

MR. BARKER: Sorry, Charles, I think I may have kicked you.

MR. GRANT: YO! did.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q. Address kind of some of the things that are -- let me back up. Sorry, I lost my concentration there.

So you've mentioned these public education workshops, assistance with the COR process, individuals that accompany members when they go to receive CORs and then just general voting rights, setting up tables and stuff at events and things like that. Let's break that down and talk a little bit about the
cost of those events.
A. Okay.
Q. How much does it cost to put on a public education workshop on certificate of restoration?
A. Well, that all depends upon the county and depends upon who wants to collaborate with us and who can -- who would just give us a -- a venue.
Q. So you've mentioned two specific public education workshops.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Can you give an estimate of the costs for putting on the public education workshop at -in Montgomery County?
A. In Montgomery County, okay. Now, recognize we are a volunteer organization, okay? And our resources is our time. And -or our gas, okay?
Q. Okay.
A. As far as a roundabout figure, we never -- we never did that -- added it up, okay? And if there is any cost that is actual that will come out of pocket besides our gas, then any printing that has to be done would be
tables that we have to buy at any of these events, okay?
Q. Let's talk about then the public education workshop at the state convention then.
A. Okay.
Q. Specifically the one on voting rights registration, that portion of the convention, do you have an estimate for how much that costs?
A. No, I don't.
Q. Okay. When you participate in voter registrations events and sei up a table and things like that, do you have an estimate of how much that costs?
A. Only our tine and gas getting there.
Q. How much time would it generally take to do one of those events?
A. Now that depends upon the event. How many hours that it has -- is holding, whether it's an 8-hour event, 2-hour, 4-hour event.
Q. Have you participated in events that hit all of those time marks, 2 to 8 hours?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. When an individual assists an

NAACP member with the COR process, do you have an estimate of just kind of the average interaction and how much that costs?
A. Well, that cost would be whatever time that labor cost would be for an individual that would be talking to -- a member that would be talking to an individual, okay? So that's actually taking away from other -- the voting registration portion of it, because that's what we're actually doing is the voter restoration -- I mean voter registration. Q. Do you have an estimate of a dollar figure that you could put $\mathrm{on}_{\mathrm{n}}$ that?
A. Oh, I don't know.
Q. What about wher an individual accompanies a member when they go to seek a COR?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Can you estimate the cost to the NAACP of doing that?
A. Well, I can tell you that it's taken away from other things that they could be doing, okay? Their gas going back and forth or -- and their -- their time.
Q. Are you able to estimate a dollar figure for that?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Does the NAACP reimburse members who volunteer for their gas and time at any of these events that you just described?
A. No.

MR. BARKER: Can we take another short five-minute break off the record?

MR. GRANT: Sure.
(Short break.)
MR. BARKER: At this time we have no further questions. And --

MR. GRANT: Okay.
MR. BARKER: -- if you guys have some, we may have some to follow-up on, but for now that's it.

MR. GRAllT: We do have a couple of questions or more.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. GRANT:
Q. Let me take a look at your exhibits.

Ms. Morris, for the record, I'm looking at Exhibit Number 7, a document titled Jemison's Expungement. And counselor asked you questions about that document earlier, and the
question was whether that document was related solely to expungement.

Did any of the people on that list also seek voting rights restoration?
A. Yes. Yes. The attorney was supposed to do -- expunge the records and -- for the misdemeanors and whatever felonies that he could expunge and also start the process for the voter restoration.
Q. Okay. So that list is composed of persons who not only sought expungement but also voting rights restoration?
A. Yes.
Q. Earlier you testified that there were -that there were two conferences or workshops that the conference was involved in as it relates to voting rights restoration. Did you make an effort to contact various branches around the states -- around the state -- strike that.

Let me ask it this way: Is the conference composed of the various branches around the state?
A. Yes. Yes, it is.
Q. Okay. Did you make an effort to notify
various branches of the NAACP around the state to determine what sort of outreach and
workshops that they were involved in?
A. Yes.
Q. And did they all -- and did some of them respond to you?
A. Yes.
Q. Did some of the branches also collaborate with third parties to do workshops and voting rights restoration --
A. Yes.
Q. -- workshops?

And I noticed that you had a list of chapters actively restored voting rights. This was something from Dawn Harrington, and Free Hearts --
A. Free Heart, uh-huh.
Q. -- provided you with that list?
A. Yes, it's a non-exhaustive list where the counties that work with her on voter restorations and also education on voter restorations.
Q. So she identified five chapters, Dyer, Franklin, Montgomery, Shelby, Tipton, and looks events with NAACP from August of 2020 through

March of 2023?
A. Yes.
Q. And you also reached out to the Legal Aid

Society of Middle Tennessee and the executive director DarKenya Waller?
A. Right.
Q. And she provided some information of some of the activities that they engaged in with the NAACP along the lines of voting rights
restoration?
A. Right.
Q. And some of the branches themselves actually responded to you aru said that they were involved in some workshops and activities centered around voting rights restoration; is that right?
A. It's -- yes.
Q. You received an e-mail from a Tiffany

Tipton-Boyd?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Who is she?
A. She's the president of Dyersburg.
Q. Was she someone who needed a COR?
A. Yes, matter of fact, she is.
Q. All right. And did they -- and did they
report that -- that they engaged in voting -voting registration and restoration work
beginning in January of 2021?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes.
Q. So again, what -- you all don't
necessarily track the -- the individual
outreach of each of the -- the outreach of each of the branches; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. You all don't necessarilytrack it, but it's an important part of the mission of each
$\qquad$
A. Exactly.
Q. All right. Of each branch to do some outreach on voiing registration and voting rights restoration?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. And because you all don't track are you able to put a cost or a monetary sum on the volunteer hours associated with all of the various branches' efforts at voting rights restoration?
A. I can't put a -- no.
Q. Okay.

MR. GRANT: That's all we have.
MR. BARKER: That's it for us too.
THE REPORTER: Mr. Barker, do you
want to order this?
MR. BARKER: Yes.
THE REPORTER: Would you like to order a copy?

MR. GRANT: We would like to order a copy and the witness would like to read and sign.

FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT
(Proceeding concluded at 11:37 a.m. CST)
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# Tennessee Secretary of State 

Tre Hargett


Elections Division 312 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, $7^{\text {th }}$ Floor
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-1102

## MEMORANDUM

To: County Election Commissions
From: $\quad \begin{aligned} & \text { Mark Goins Mark Mos } \\ & \text { Coordinator of Elections }\end{aligned}$
Date: July 21, 2023
Subject: Restoration of Voting Rights

In a recent case, Falls v. Goins, No. M2020-01510-SC-R11-CV (Tenn. Jun. 29, 2023), the Tennessee Supreme Court held that to restore one's vocing rights in Tennessee, a person convicted of an infamous crime in another state who had not regained the right to vote in the other state must comply with the provisions set forth in Tenn. Code Arn. § 2-19-143(3) and the additional requirements of Tenn. Code Ann. §§ 40-29-201 through 40-29-205 requiring a two-step process. Although the Court indicated that the holding in Falls $v$. Goins was limited to the facts before them, the application of the holding to other governing statutes requies the same interpretation to those convicted of a felony in both federal and Tennessee state courts because the statutory language that applies to in-state and federal felonies closely aligns with the statutory language at issue in Falls v. Goins.

Therefore, a person convicted of a felony in a Tennessee court, an out-of-state court, or a federal court must:

1. Have been pardoned by a Governor, U.S. President, or other appropriate authority of a state, or have had full rights of citizenship restored as prescribed by law, and
2. Have paid all restitution to the victim or victims of the offense ordered by the court as part of the sentence, if any; and
3. Have paid all court costs assessed, if any, unless the court made a finding of indigency; and
4. Is current in all child support obligations, if any.

In light of this interpretation of the voter restoration statutes, we will stop using the existing Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights (COR) - SS-3041 (Rev. 3/20) and begin using the COR included with this memo. With the use of the revised COR, you will note the following changes:

1. The first box of the form must be completed by the individual wanting to have voting rights restored. This section of the form collects the applicant's name, identifying information, contact information, and whether the individual received a pardon or has had full rights of citizenship restored.
2. The second box requires an agent of your organization to provide information about the felony conviction, restitution, if any, and court costs, if any.

Specifically, in BOX \#2, the proper authority/agent must provide the following information:
a) Felony Conviction Information:

- List the crime(s) for which the applicant was convicted. If the applicant has more than one felony, a separate COR must be used for each felony conviction.
$\square \quad$ The statute for the felony offense for which the applicant was convicted.
- The month, date, and year the applicant was convicted of the felony.
- The applicant's TOMIS ID No., County of Conviction, and the Case Number of the felony conviction.
b) Restitution:
- Check the appropriate box as it relates to any restitution that was or was not assessed to the applicant.
$\square \quad$ Sign and print the agents name and provide the agent's contact information.
c) Court Costs:
- Check the appropriate box as it relates to any court costs that were or were not assessed to the applicant.
- Sign and print the agent's name and provide the agent's contact information.

For the person to have voting rights restored, the person must submit evidence of either a Pardon by the appropriate authority, or evidence of the person's full rights of citizenship having been restored, such as by a court. A copy of the applicable document must be submitted with the COR. If the person has had full citizenship rights restored by a court, then a certified copy of the court order is required.

A person who submits a COR without evidence of either a Pardon by the appropriate authority, or evidence of the person's full rights of citizenship having been restored must be instructed to provide evidence of either one of these requirements.

If you have any questions about this revised process, do not hesitate to contact my office.
Thank you for your diligence and assistance in restoring the voting rights of eligible individuals previously convicted of a felony.

## Felon Restoration FAQs

## What was the Falls v. Goins case about?

In 2020, an individual convicted in Virginia who had moved to Tennessee challenged the process for restoring voting rights for felons who were convicted in another state after his application was denied. The chancery court, Tennessee Court of Appeals, and Tennessee Supreme Court all held that the Coordinator of Elections had followed the correct procedure in denying the application.

How can someone convicted of a felony have their voting rights restored?
Regaining the right to vote after a felony conviction is a two-step process. First, an individual must receive a pardon or have their full rights of citizenship restored. Second, the individual must meet requirements related to paying restitution and court costs, if any, and be current on any child support obligations, if any.

A pardon or restoration of full rights of citizenship is required for all restorations. An individual remains eligible to have their rights restored upon completion of their sentence and any period of supervision, however, they must receive a pardon or have their full rights of citizenship restored before submitting the certificate of restoration.

How does someone get their full rights of citizenship restored?
Under Tennessee law, full rights of citizenship can be restored by petition to the circuit court.

## Prior to Falls v. Goins, how could someone get their voting rights restored?

In addition to the methods above, an individual couliá submit a certificate of restoration without a pardon or court order restoring the full rights of citizenship.

Why is the felon voting rights restoration process being modified?
The process is based on the Tennessee Supreme Court's decision in Falls v. Goins. The Court's analysis only lays out a two-step process. The Coordinator of Elections did due diligence to review the ruling and related statutes before issuing thorough guidance.

Falls v. Goins is about sorieone convicted in another state. Why is the process changing for anyone seeking restoration of voting rights?
The law uses very similar language to describe the process for those convicted in another state and those convicted in a Tennessee court or federal court. The analysis in Falls v. Goins requires the same interpretation regardless of where someone was convicted. No matter where someone was convicted, a pardon or restoration of the full rights of citizenship is required as the first step of the process.

How does this change impact voters who had their rights restored without a pardon or court order?
All voters who have had their rights restored remain eligible to vote.
What kind of outreach is being done to make affected individuals aware of the change? The Division of Elections has updated its website, conducted training with county election officials, and provided the updated forms to the Department of Correction and Board of Parole.


# CERTIFICATE OF RESTORATION OF VOTING RIGHTS for Persons Convicted of a Felony on or after May 18, 1981 

This includes any federal or state felony conviction both within Tennessee or from another state.

## Eligibility

You must 1) have been pardoned by a Governor, U.S. President, or other appropriate authority of a state, or 2) have had your full rights of citizenship restored as required by law; and 3) not owe restitution to the victim(s); 4) have paid all court costs assessed against you, if any, unless the court made a finding you were indigent; and 5) be current in all child support obligations, if any.

## 1. To Be Completed by Applicant:

I hereby attest that the following is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge:
a.

First Name
Middle Name
SSN: $\qquad$ - $\qquad$ - $\qquad$
b.

| Residential Address | City | Email Address Optional) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Phone Number |  |  |

## c. Check one:

I have been pardoned by a Governor, U.S. President, or other appropriate authority of a state (Copy attached.); orMy full rights of citizenship have been restored as required by law $\hat{\text { Copy attached. If a court order, it must be a certified copy.) }}$Signature: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$

## 2. To Be Completed by an Agent of the Pardoning Autisority, an Agent or Officer of the Incarcerating Authority, or a Probation/Parole Officer or Agenti of the Supervising Authority.

a.

TOMIS ID, if Applicable
Case Number

## b. Restitution

I hereby certify that the following is true and correct: (check one)Restitution is not owed; or
$\square \quad$ Restitution ordered by the court is owed; or
$\square$ For Federal Convictions Only, 18 U.S.C. $\$ 3613(\mathrm{~b})$ applies in this case and therefore the liability to pay has expired.

Signature: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$
Printed Name: $\qquad$ Title: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$ Phone Number: $\qquad$

## c. Court Costs

I hereby certify that the following is true and correct: (check one)Court costs are not owed; or
$\square \quad$ Court costs ordered by the court are owed; or
$\square$ The court has made a finding at an evidentiary hearing that the above individual is indigent at the time of application.
Signature: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$
Printed Name: $\qquad$ Title: $\qquad$
Address: $\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Instructions for Completing the Certificate of Restoration

In order to complete any section of this form, the agent must have access to the information being attested to on this form.

1. In SECTION \#1, the applicant must provide the requested information and a signature attesting to the information provided.

## NOTES for 1.c.:

- If the applicant received a pardon by a Governor, U.S. President, or other appropriate authority of a state, a copy of the pardon must be attached to the application.
- If the applicant had full rights of citizenship restored, a copy of the instrument restoring the full rights of citizenship must be attached to the application. If that instrument is a court order, a certified copy of such order must be attached to the application.

2. In SECTION \#2, the proper authority/agent must provide the following information:
a. Felony Conviction Information:

- List the crime(s) for which the applicant was convicted.
- The statute for the felony offense for which the applicant was convicted.
- The month, date, and year that the applicant was convicted of the felony.
- The applicant's TOMIS ID No., County and State of Conviction, and the Case Number of the felony conviction.
b. Restitution:
- Check the appropriate box as it relates to any restitution that was or was not assessed to the applicant.
- Sign and print the agent's name and provide the agent's centact information.
c. Court Costs:
- Check the appropriate box as it relates to any coget costs that were or were not assessed to the applicant.
- Sign and print the agent's name and provide the agent's contact information.


## Persons convicted of any of the following, carnot have their voting rights restored:

- Between July 1, 1986, and June 30, 1996- first degree murder, aggravated rape, treason, or voter fraud
- Between July 1, 1996, and June 30, 2906 - murder, rape, treason, or voter fraud
- On or after July 1, 2006 - Any of the above, or any degree of murder or rape or any felony offense under TCA Title 39, Chapter 16, parts 1,4, or 3 ; or any sexual offense under TCA $\S 40-39-202(20)$ or any violent sexual offense under TCA §40-39-202(30) designated as a felony and where the victim of such offense was a minor


## Instructions to the Applicant Seeking to have His or Her Voting Rights Restored:

- After completion, the original form must be filed with the local county election commission office in the county the applicant desires to register to vote.


## NOTICE

A person is not eligible to apply for a voter registration card and have their voting rights restored unless the person is current in all child support obligations. Before restoring the voting rights of an applicant, the Coordinator of Elections will verify with the Department of Human Services that the applicant does not have any outstanding child support payments or arrearages.
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The videoconference deposition of JOHN WEARE was taken by counsel for the Defendants, by Notice, with all participants appearing at their respective locations, on May 24 , 2023, for all purposes under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

All formalities as to caption, notice, statement of appearance, et cetera, are waived. All objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved to the hearing, and that said deposition may be read and used in evidence in said cause of action in any Erial thereon or any proceeding herein.

It is agreed that Jerri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, Notary Piblic and Licensed Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness is not waived.

THE REPORTER: Good morning, my name Jerri Porter. I am a Tennessee Licensed Reporter, LCR Number 335. Today's date is May 24, 2023, and the time is approximately 10:00 a.m. Central Standard Time.

This is the deposition of John Weare in the matter of the Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, et al., versus Lee, et al., Case Number 3:20-cv-01039, in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Iennessee, Nashville Division.

At this time, I will ask counsel to identify yourselves, state whom you represent, and agree on the record that there is no objection to Jerri Porter administering a binding oath to the witness via Zoom.

MR. BARKER: Good morning, my name the Zachary Barker. I'm with Tennessee Attorney General's office. I'm accompanied by my co-counsel, Michael Stahl, who is also with the Tennessee Attorney General's office and we represent the State defendants in today's case, being Governor Bill Lee;
the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Correction, Frank Strada; the Secretary of State, Tre Hargett, and the Coordinator of Elections, Mark Goins.

We have no objection to Ms. Porter administering the oath.

MS. BOWIE: Hi, Ms. Porter, my name is Blair Bowie. I represent the plaintiffs. I'm joined by Kate Uyeda, also with the plaintiffs, and we have no objection to the reporter administering the oath via Zoom.
JOHN WEARE, was called as a witness, and after having been duly sworn, testified ás follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BARKER: Q Good morning, Mr. Weare, we've all introduced ourselves. Would you please introduce yourself to us.

A My name is John Weare. I'm just an American citizen.

Q Would you please spell your last name for the
record.
A It's W-e-a-r-e, as in we are. Q Thank you. Have you been deposed before?

A No.
Q Have you ever testified at a trial before?
A Not to the best of my recollection.
Q Okay. I'm going to take just a few minutes, then, at the beginning of our deposition, to kind of go over some guidelines for what is going to happen today and let you know the lay of the land before we get into the deposition.

If you don't understand a question that I ask, maybe I word it poorly or I stumble over my words as we go, please ask me to repeat or rephrase the question and I will do my best to make sure that it is understandable for you and for everyone in the deposition today.

If your attorney objects to any question that I ask, please do not answer that question until your attorney has fully stated their objection, and if necessary, I have finished discussing the objection with your attorney. I will then either ask you to answer the question that $I$ asked or try to rephrase the question in a way that addresses your attorney's objection.

Don't guess at any answer. If you can't recall specifically any piece of information that I ask about, that's fine, just state that you do not recall or provide a reasonable estimate, but don't just take any wild guesses to any answers of any of my questions.

If during the deposition at any point you recall some information that is relevant to a prior question that I've asked, just let me know and we can go back to that prior question and you can fully answer that question with any new information that you may remember or may be jogred in your memory as we go through the deposition.

A Okay.
Q Throughout the deposition, we may take a couple breaks. If at any point you need a break, please let me know. We'll be happy to take a break. We want you to be comfortable the entire time. My only request is if $I$ have just asked a question, please answer that question before we go on a break. A Okay.

Q Also, we're doing this deposition on Zoom, which is a little bit different than doing things in person, so I'm going to try my best not to talk over you and I'd ask that you please do the same, that we
try not to talk over each other for the court reporter's sake, so she can get everything down that all of us are saying.

I'll be displaying a few documents on the computer screen by sharing my screen with you. Will you be able to view those on your screen as I share them?

A I've not done too many zoom meetings.
Q They should just come up on your screen.
A Okay.
Q So, if at any point you cannot see a document that I share, please let me know. I want to make sure that we're all looking at the same documents and that no one is guessing at what we're talking about as we go througín. So, just please let me know if you cannot see a document that I share. Okay?

A Fair enough.
Q Do you have any questions about the stuff that I've just gone over about this deposition today?

A Not at this time. I'm just very nervous.
Q No worries. No need to be nervous. We've just got a few questions for you.

So, let's talk a little bit about your preparation for today's deposition. What did you do
to prepare for today?
A I spoke to my lawyers.
Q Without going into the content of the conversation that you had with your lawyers, when did you meet with them?

A The first two Wednesdays of the month.
Q Okay.
A I was getting used to Zoom.
Q And were those lawyers your attorneys that are present today here on the Zoom call?

A Yes.
Q Did you talk to anyone else beyond your attorneys about this deposicion?

A No.
Q Where are you located right now on your computer?

A I am in my home.
Q Is there anybody else in the room with you?
A No. Dogs, that's it.
Q Okay. They're more than welcome to stay in there with you.

Do you have any cell phones or any other communication devices with you in the room?

A I have my cell phone up there charging, but it's not on with anybody.

Q
Do you have any other applications open on your phone like email -- not your phone. Rather, your computer, like email or instant messaging?

A No, I don't have either of those. I have my
Google open -- well, that would be an email because
I had to click on the email to get to the Zoom. Q Okay.

A I'm a little scared to turn off the Google because $I$ don't know if it would -- what do you call it -- turn off the Zoom.

Q That's fine, that's fine. Tust wanted to know that information there.

So, I just want to get to know you a little bit and a little bit of your background. Where do you live?

A I currently live in Hohenwald, Tennessee.
Q And in what county is Hohenwald, Tennessee?
A Lewis County.
Q How long have you lived there?
A I want to say at least eight, maybe nine years.

Q Before living in Hohenwald, where did you live?

A Arizona.
Q How long did you live in Arizona?

A

Q only live in one place in Arizona or did you live in multiple places there?

A Multiple.
Q And can you recall those different locations that you lived at in Arizona?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Could you share those with me?
A I lived in Scottsdale, Arizona; I lived in Phoenix, Arizona; I lived in Yuma, Arizona, was the last place I was at.

Q What county in Arizoná, if you're aware, are each of those cities in?

A Maricopa and Kuma.
Q Okay. Haye you lived anywhere else other than Tennessee and Arizona?

A I was in the Navy for three years, a little over three years, so with them I moved different places. Other than that, no.

Q Are you married?
A My wife has passed on.
Q Do you have any children?
A Yes.
Q Do your children live with you?

A No.
Q you?

A What's the best way to answer that? Yes, but only at a young age.

Q Okay. Do you owe any child support payments for your children that you're aware of?

A No.
Q And are you a member of the NAACP?
A No.
Q All right. Let's talk a little bit about this lawsuit and how you came to become involved in it.

So, how did you become involved with this lawsuit that we're doing the deposition for today? A I was looking to restore my rights to vote. For the direct -- the most direct answer is as I had talked to either lawyers or -- and other people and nobody would really help me with it, a friend, a co-worker at the time, said, well, these people can help you get your rights restored. So, I contacted them.

Q And who are -- you said these people. What entity are you talking about?

A It's the Right to Vote group that Blair and

Kate are involved with.
Q Okay. Were you promised anything in exchange
for joining this lawsuit?
A No.
Q In your own words, what is this lawsuit about?

A This is basically to kind of help fix something, so I can at least have a mechanism to try to get my rights restored.

Q So, what would you like for the Court to do in this case?

A I'm not sure how to answer that.
Q Okay. That's fine, čhat's fine. Let's talk
a little bit about something different, then.
Were you convicted of a felony at some point in your life?

A Yes.
Q And are you wanting to restore your right to vote after losing it because of that felony?

A Yes.
Q Let's talk then a little bit about the Certificate of Restoration process in Tennessee.

Are you aware of the Certificate of Restoration process?

A Yes. I'm just going to go with a yes.

Q That's fine. I'll follow up with, what is your understanding of the process for restoring your right to vote in Tennessee?

A I had to send forms over to the places where I had my felony convictions to have somebody fill out those forms and then send them in to the State of Tennessee. I don't have those forms in front of me, so I wouldn't know the locations. But -- how do I put this best?

After they'd signed off on them saying I had served my time and that I owed no Eestitution, then I would be able to get my right to vote back. Q What is your understañding of the requirements to receive 3 Certificate of Restoration or the things that those people had to sign off on?

A I remember two, three years ago when I started this, looking over the internet when my friend was showing me this, and I can't remember the exact guidelines, but it seemed that I matched those guidelines, which $I$ was very excited about.

Could you restate the question? I want to make sure I'm answering correctly.

Q Yes. I was asking about the criteria that needs to be --

A Okay.

Q -- met or the requirements for receiving a Certificate of Restoration.

A Okay. So, I think I answered that pretty good. I just saw what they said, as long as you met this criteria, you'd be able to get your rights restored. It seemed to me at the time that I would meet those requirements.

Q Let's break that down just a little bit, if we can. Is it your understanding that one would need to complete their sentence or supervision as one of those requirements?

A Yes.
Q Is it your understanding that one would need to pay all restitution that was applicable to those felony convictions as being one of those requirements?

A Yes.
Q Is it your understanding that one would need to pay all court costs associated with those felony convictions as one of those requirements?

A Yes.
Q And is it your understanding that one would have to pay all of their child support in order to qualify --

A Yes.

Q -- under those requirements?
Was that a yes? I'm sorry.
A Yes.
Q Thank you. Are you aware that certain individuals have to fill out that COR form?

A Yes.
Q And what is your understanding of the types of individuals or officials that can fill out the COR form?

A From the best of what I saw, I had to go to the court and the court -- like court clerks, probation officers, perhaps, but it had to be somebody in an official capacity with the State of Arizona.

Q Have you seen a COR form before?
A I have --when I've sent them off, email, I'd seen them, but that was some time ago. Q I'm going to take a copy of the COR form and drop it in the chat and then I'm going to share my screen, showing you a copy of the COR form.

MR. BARKER: If we could mark this as the first exhibit to the deposition.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 1.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I'm going to share my screen here. Let me zoom in a little bit.

Can you see that, Mr. Weare?
A Yes.
Q And do you recognize that as a Certificate of Restoration form?

A Yes. It looks like what I'd sent, or something very similar.

Q So, based on the content of this form and your familiarity with it, what sort of information has to be put on this form?

A Applicant's naike, residence, applicant's phone number, the eonviction, month and year of conviction, my date of birth, Social Security. Q Let's pause right there for just a second because I've got to have it cut off a little bit, I think, for it to be zoomed in big enough for you to see it.

So, is it fair to say that that first section labeled Number 1 is just identification information for you and the felony conviction?

A Yes.

And in Box 2 here, which I'm going to scroll down to, what has to be placed -- what's your understanding of the information that needs to be put in Box 2?

A From what I'm understanding, this is something that would be filled out by the person I'm sending it to, stating whether I had -- the end result of the particular felony or crime with -(Overlapping speech.) Q So, would you agree that this relates to the completion of your sentence or supervision, Box 2? A Yes. Q And then let's look at Box 3 here. What is your understanding of the requirement that has to be filled out for Box $3 ?$

A It gets cut- off a little bit on this. I guess I have to point that way on that end. But it's basically certifying -- "I...certify that the following is true and correct" -- whether or not I had paid my restitution, I had done my -- I had served my time, or $I$ was given a pardon. Q Sure. And then let's talk about Box 4 here. What is your understanding about Box 4 and the requirement that has to be filled out in Box 4 ? A Whether or not restitutions have been paid?

Q Would that actually be about court costs instead of restitution in Box 4 ?

A Yes. Yeah, you're right. It's saying court costs.

Q Just making sure we're on the same page there.

So, once this form is filled out by the right individuals, what is your understanding of what has to happen next? And I'm going to stop sharing my screen here because $I$ think we are done with that form for the moment.

So, what is your understianding of what needs to happen after that form is filled out?

A That that paperwork would have to be sent to the proper people it needs to go to.

Q Okay. Do you know who that might be?
A No, but I would assume that the form would have addressed that.

Q Okay. I'd like to walk through the steps that you personally have taken in order to attempt to get your voting rights back. I want to start all the way back at the beginning, if that's Okay.

Have you ever been registered to vote in Tennessee or any other state?

A Arizona.

Q Arizona. And when -- if you can remember, when were you registered to vote in Arizona?

A At age 17, basically. Throughout the military $I$ voted. I voted in every special election. I tried to take interest in everything that was going on as a citizen to do my input. I lost that right when $I$ went to prison.

Q Can you give me a little bit of an estimation of the time frame? So, about when were you 17 and registered to vote, and then around what time did you lose your right to vote? Let ne make that two separate questions.

Around what time were you 17 and registering to vote?

A And I'd like to temper that, because that's when I joined the military, when I was 17. So, it may have actualiy been 18 .

Q Okay.
A I don't want the court reporter to hit me with the newspaper over the nose.

Let's see. I was born in 1962. So, that would have been ' 72 -- '80. 1980. Q And you recalled losing your right to vote as well. Around what year was that?

A I believe it was around '96 or '97.

Do you recall what conviction it was that led to you losing your right to vote?

A It was an aggravated assault charge.
Q And we'll get to that in just a minute and we'll talk a little bit more about that.

Have you attempted to restore your voting rights in Tennessee?

A Yes.
Q What did you do?
A The first thing I did is I tried going to different lawyers, asking them, can you help me get my voting rights restored. Most of them -- well, everyone I talked to said that's not something we handle.

I was a little lost after that and when I went to work at Ruffalo Valley, I met a friend and I told them, yean, I'd like to get my rights restored. We went online, it showed what $I$ had to do, but it was a little confusing. And $I$ was just like, I'd much rather have a lawyer do this for me because I just don't understand the whole process.

Even when my wife was alive, when we got our driver's licenses, of course they asked us do you want to register to vote, and I was like, I can't, because I've lost my rights.

I'd even -- there's a voting commission or an elections commission here, and when she was getting her -- registering to vote, and they asked, did you want to register at the same time? Well, I'm a felon, I'm not allowed to vote. I asked them, do you know somebody who could help me get my voting rights restored or how to do it. The person at the counter at that time told me they didn't know how to do it.

So, once I got with my friend and he found Right to Vote, he said contact these people and they can help you. So, that's where -- I got ahold of them. And they kind of walked -- well, you need to contact these people.

For four or five days, I tried to get through Yuma County and I a switch from one person, well, I can't help you but this person can. They'd switch me over there, they'd switch me over there. I remember at least once or twice the phone dropped, whether $I$ just got hung up on or it automatically dropped.

But when I got ahold of Maricopa County, they were very much, we can't fill out this form. What you can do is you can get your voting -- you can apply for your voting rights and then you can get
your voting rights restored. I can't remember the location they were telling me to go to at the time. The problem with that, from what I understood, from when I'd been looking online, was even if $I$ had gotten my rights restored in Arizona, that wouldn't apply coming to Tennessee, that I had to go through a certain process to get my voting rights back.

Does that answer your question?
Q Yes. That was pretty comprehensive, but I want to go back and kind of break down some things and ask you some more questions to see if you remember some things in more detail and some more specifics.

So, you startea off by talking about how you -- you talked to a friend about the voting rights process. Do you remember who that friend was?

A His name is Chris. I actually can't remember his last name right now. It's been a while. Q Where did you meet that friend? Was it at work?

A Yes.
Q And they directed you to a website that you said, if $I$ recall correctly.
A I'm not sure, but it was one of the
government websites here. It was a Tennessee --
Q Okay. So, that was a website, based on your
recollection, that was run by the State of
Tennessee?
A Correct.
Q Okay. And based on seeing that website, what
was your next step that you did specifically, if you
can recall?
A I'm just old and my memory is not that good.
So, please, I apologize. I ind of looked over it
and I didn't really understand what I needed to do,
as I remember. And tinat's -- like I said, he was
trying to help me out and that's when he -- well,
this group here can help you, these Right to Vote
people.
Q Okay.
A So -- go ahead. I'm sorry.
Q Well, I'm sorry. I talked over you. Do you
have anything further to add to that?
A No, because I'm trying to answer your
questions specifically.
Q Okay. I think I'm going to try to break some
things down as we go here. You also mentioned going with your wife to get her driver's license.

A Yes.
Q Did that happen before or after you talked with your friend from work?

A My wife passed on from cancer about two months before I went out to work.

Q Okay.
A While she was alive, I pretty much stayed with her the entire time, taking care of her.

Q You talked about going to the Election Commission office.

A Yes.
Q When did that occur, if you could give me a ballpark?

A It was when my wife was still alive because we were going io register her to vote.

Q Okay.
A And I can't exactly remember. It was very close to when we first got here, because we decided we wanted to -- we fell in love with the state, fell in love with the people, and we decided this is the place we wanted to live. So, we were going through the process of registering to vote, getting driver's licenses, all that good stuff.

Q
Was that the Lewis County Election Commission office?

A Yes, here in Hohenwald.
Q I know this was a while back. Can you recall
who you spoke to at the Lewis County Election
Commission office?
A No, I can't.
Q Okay.
A I was so new here. Everybody got to know me real quick because it's a small town, but my memory of people can be very bad. When my wife passed on, I was actually a little bit worried, because she's the one I would always go to, who is that again. So, I'm horrible with that. I'm sorry.

Q That's completely okay. Can you recall if they gave you any airection about someplace else to go for voting rights restoration, or anything like that?

A I'm not blaming the person that was at the counter because they just didn't know. It was one of those looks the deer give you when you're in the headlights type thing.

Q Did you follow up with anyone else at the Election Commission office in Lewis --

A No. After that first one, I hadn't.

Q Okay.
A I did try, like I said, going to lawyers later on, but...

Q At any point in the future, did you return to the Lewis County Election Commission office and ask them about voting rights restoration?

A No. I didn't feel like that was the place -from the feeling $I$ got in there the first time, it didn't seem like the place I'd be able to jump off from.

Q And to give you just kind of a point of reference, if we can, because I'm trying to put together like a timeline here in my head of events, did your interaction at the Lewis County Election Commission office happen before or after 2006, if you can estimate?

A It's '23 now. Eight years back would put us at 2015, I think.

Q Okay, perfect. Next you talked about the individuals at Right to Vote. Who did you speak to there, if you can recall?

A I can't remember the first person I talked to, but Blair was the person that pretty much was my contact there. And for me, she was a real blessing and gave me a lot of hope.

Q Around when did you first make contact with them? Just give me a year if that's a good ballpark. If you can remember more specifically, like a month or something like that, that's great. But around when did you first contact them?

A I know it was about two or three years ago. Actually, it would have been three years ago because COVID was going on full -- full-blown scale. You know what I'm saying. They were trying to get us to wear masks.

Q I think we all remember those days and what that was like. So, yes, that's good point of reference there.

So, you started taiking with Right to Vote. What steps did you take after talking to the folks at Right to Vote?

A Well, they had me get those forms and they had me trying to contact, call, write, contact the people that I needed to get those forms to to get them filled out.

Q And were those the COR forms, like the one that I just showed you earlier?

A Yes, to the best of my recollection, because they looked pretty familiar.

Q Who was the first entity that you contacted
about filling out a COR form?
A I tried to contact the Yuma clerk, I guess that would be, the Yuma Superior Court Clerk.

Q And what did they tell you?
A That they weren't the right person to fill it out, you'll have to talk to this person. Can you transfer me there or give me a number? I'd take down the number. I'd ask them for the number just in case -- you know how it is when people switch you over, you get lost sometimes. Then I'd contact that person. Then I'd go to a different person that they'd say. No, we're not the right person, you've got to talk to this person. No, I'm not the right person, you've got to talk to this person.

And then I knew I was going to be lost in the whole thing when the oh, no, I know the right person to contact and I went to the first person I talked to.

Q So, I want to break that down if you can remember. Do you know which entities, at least -you don't have to tell me the individual names, but which entities, at least, that you spoke with in Arizona?

A Well, with Maricopa, they gave me a straight answer right away, so that was nice.

With Yuma, the way they had me hopping around, I couldn't -- because they were just giving me names, they weren't necessarily giving me titles, and if they were, I don't remember what they were. That's probably the best, concise answer I can give you.

Q You said that Maricopa gave you a straight answer. Who did you talk to in Maricopa, then?

A Ooh. Well, I called the Clerk of the Superior Court, because I knew I had to get ahold of the court. And the person that answered the phone -- now, $I$ don't know if it was the elector clerk. There's six, seven, eight million people there.

But the person $I$ got ahold of said, no, we're not going to fill out those forms. What you have to do is come in and we'll get those rights restored for you. You know, you have to go through this process and we'll restore your rights here in Arizona. There was no -- I never got an email from them. They didn't switch me around every place. They just said, no, we're not filling them out. Q Okay. Did you go to Arizona to try to get those rights restored?

A The reason I didn't do it, because from --
okay. I could have gone to Arizona. I would have been willing to if $I$ thought it would have made a difference, even though with my financial it would be very hard. But from my understanding of what the whole process was, even if $I$ got my rights restored in Arizona, that wouldn't count for here in Tennessee. So, it would have been a big waste of time and money.

Q Let's talk a little bit, then, about Tennessee and Tennessee officials. Did you contact anyone in the State of Tennessee government about filling out your COR forms?

A No.
Q And I'm going to break this down just a little bit to be specific for the record, if we can. Did you contact any county clerk's office in Tennessee about filling out those forms?

A No, because the offenses weren't here. They were all in Arizona.

Q Did you contact any probation or parole office in Tennessee about filling out those COR forms?

A No.
Q Did you contact any Election Commission office in Lewis County or any other local county
about filling out those COR forms?
A No.
Q Did you contact the Division of Elections at the state level about filling out those COR forms? A No.

Q Did you contact any other -- I'm going to be broad here -- any other government entity in Tennessee about filling out those COR forms?

A No.
Q Okay. Have you requested a pardon or any assistance from the Governor of Tennessee with regard to your convictions?

A No. And I wouldn't kñow how to.
Q Have you researched at all the pardoning process in Tennessee For convictions that may be out of state?

A Only what my friend went over with me on the internet at work.

Q Have you looked at the Board of Paroles'
website and its description of the pardoning process?

A No.
Q Okay. Have you reached out in written communications or by phone or in any other way to the Governor's office or anyone related to the
executive branch of Tennessee about your COR forms? A No.

Q Okay. I want to move on, then, and just talk
a little bit about your felony convictions, if that's okay.

How many felony convictions do you have?
A Two, that I know of. And that's looking at them -- because I wasn't a career criminal. It was all domestic. It was all the family things.

You know, I had a chance to look at the conviction forms, and it only look like I had two felonies. All the rest are misdemeanors. To me, just any of it was bad at that time.

Q When did those convictions occur? Can you remember the years?

A One was around '96, '97, and then there was one around 2003, I believe. I can't actually, even after just looking at them, give you an exact date. I'm sorry.

Q That's fine, that's fine. Let's talk about the '96/'97 conviction, then. Do you recall what crime that conviction was for?

A Aggravated assault.
Q And then the 2003 conviction, what crime was that for?

A Assault on a minor
Q Are both of those convictions from the State of Arizona?

A Yes.
Q Are those convictions from the same county in
Arizona?
A No.
Q So, what counties are they from?
A The first one was in Maricopa and the second one was in Yuma.

Q Let's talk a little bit more about that '96/'97 conviction, then. Did you plead guilty?

A Yes.
Q And I have some documents pertaining to that guilty plea that $I$ just want us to take a quick look at, if we can. I going to drop it in the chat and then I'll share my screen. Bear with me one moment as I get this pulled up.

MR. BARKER: If we can make this
document the next-numbered exhibit to the
deposition, that would be great, Ms. Porter.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 2.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Weare, can you see the document I'm
sharing on my screen right now?
A Yes.
Q Do you recognize what that document is?
A Yeah. It's -- looks like it says it's a plea agreement.

Q Okay. And I'm going to scroll down in this document. Does that look like your signature there in the middle of the screen?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And the date beside your signature, I'm sorry, is that 8/21/97?

A Yes.
Q And this is your Plea Agreement for one count of aggravated assault, right?

A Yes. Yes, it says one count on it. Yes.
Q I can zoom in a bit more if that's better.
And that's a felony in Arizona?
A Yes.
Q I want to just ask you about one section here. It's got the Number 2 and then $I$ can kind of highlight it on the screen, I think, to make it look better.

Can you see the portion under Number 2 there? Did you agree to pay any restitution if it were ordered in this case?

A Yes.
All right. That's all of my questions about that specific document. I want to talk a little bit about another document with regard to that plea agreement. I'm going to get it pulled up here. MR. BARKER: I've shared the document in the chat. If we can make that the next-numbered exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 3.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Then I'm going to share my screen for this next document. Mr. Weare, can you see this document? I know I'm zoomed in pretty close on it. Can you see this dochment on your screen?

A Yes.
Q Kind of at the bottom of the screen, can you see Plea Agreement/Change of Plea?

A No.
Q Hold on. I'll scroll down. Do you see it now?

A Okay.
Q And is that your name, John Weare, right there?

A Yes.

And I know that your signature is not on this document, but do you recognize at all this case number up here, kind of at the top left of the screen, CR~97-91651?

A Yes, I see it.
Q Is it your understanding that that's one of your case numbers?

A Yeah, I wouldn't be able to tell you that. Q Okay. That's fine, that's fine.

Where it says "Offense" in bold and says,
"Count I: Aggravated Assault," is that the crime you were convicted of?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And then I'm going to stop sharing that document. I've got one more document for us to look at from 1997.

ME. BARKER: I'm sharing it in the chat and asking Ms. Porter to mark it as an exhibit, and then I'll share my screen.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 4.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Weare, can you see the document I'm sharing on my screen?

A Yes, with the CR 97-91651.

Q Yes. And is that your name right there,
John Weare?
A Yes.
Q Is that your date of birth?
A Yes.
Q In this document it says, "Sentence of
Imprisonment." Is that right?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to scroll through here for just a second to get to what I'm looking for. Can you see kind of the center of this page where it says,
"Sentence: 2.5 years"?
A Yes.
Q Do you recall if that was the sentence that was imposed for you on this conviction?

A I know I served three and a half years all together.

Q Okay.
A But, yes, I can see that they have two and a half there.

Q Okay. And then, I don't have anything else in particular on this document.

Are you aware of whether the Court imposed any restitution for your 1997 conviction?

A I can't recall, honestly.

Q Okay. Are you aware of whether there were any court costs associated with your 1997
conviction?
A I'm going to be very careful about answering this. I can't remember, but I'm sure there was.

Q Have you paid all of your court costs associated with that conviction?

A Yes.
MS. BOWIE: We're going to object insofar as that calls for a legal conclusion about what is considered court costs, Zachary.

MR. BARKER: Okay.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I'm going to reword my question. If there were any costs, any costs associated with your 1997 conviction, have you paid them?

A To the best of my knowledge, yes.
Q Do you have any documentation for paying any
costs from your 1997 conviction?
A No.
MS. BOWIE: Zachary, we've been about 50 minutes on the record. If there's a good breaking point soon.

MR. BARKER: I was actually about to move on to the 2003 conviction, so this is fine.

Would you like to take about ten minutes?
MS. BOWIE: Sure, that sounds good.
MR. BARKER: Let's just make it an even -- it will be 11:00 for me, so that would be about 12 minutes. Come back on the record at 11:00?

MS. BOWIE: That sounds good.
MR. BARKER: All right, thank you. We can go off the record, then.

MS. BOWIE: I'm just going to note, Zachary, that you're sharing several documents that were not disclosed to plaintiffs, despite several requests for supplementation of documents that you're going to rely on, which, as you know, under the federal rules is an ongoing responsibility that defense has. So, if you're going to bring out more documents that haven't been disclosed, I would ask that you share them now.

MR. BARKER: These are all documents that are publicly available from the County Clerk's office in Maricopa County. There is one other document from Yuma County Clerk's office that we called and requested from them. It's available publicly. I can go ahead and put it in the chat if you would like to see that.

MS. BOWIE: Thank you.

MR. BARKER: It is in the chat as well. MS. BOWIE: I appreciate that.

MR. BARKER: As these are all public records that are not kept in the possession of the State of Tennessee, but, rather, public records from Arizona that can simply be requested from a clerk's office, we don't understand that there's any obligation for us to produce them in discovery, as they're available to both parties. But to the extent that it needs to be supplemented, discovery is still open. These documents are in chat for you to review.

MS. BOWIE: Thank you.
MR. BARKER: All right. Let's go off the record.

MS. BOwIE: Yes, we're off the record.
(Eecess observed.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Okay. I want to turn to your 2003
conviction, Mr. Weare. Did you plead guilty in that case?

A Yes.
Q And do you recall what crime it was that you pled guilty to?

A Yes.

Q What was that crime?
A Assault on a minor.
Q Okay. I'd like to take a look at some documents from that case, if we could. I've shared it already in the chat.

MR. BARKER: If we can mark that as the next exhibit to the deposition.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 5.)

MS. BOWIE: I'm going to go ahead and object to the use of this document on relevance. This is an indictment. It's accharging document, not a convicting document.

MR. BARKER: I'hat objection will be noted on the record, of course. This document is linked by case number to the other documents in the case, including his Plea Agreement and is relevant to what his Plea Agreement and sentence is, so we'll go ahead and go through that on the record.

MS. BOWIE: I wouldn't object to the use of the Plea Agreement.

MR. BARKER: All right. That's fine. If this document needs to be redacted at some point in the future as an exhibit, we can do that if we need to.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Weare, is this document that we're
looking at -- can you see that?
A Yes.
Q What court and county does it say that document is from?

A In the Superior Court of the State of Arizona, in the County of Yuma.

Q And is that your name there listed as the defendant?

A Yes.
Q And is that the -- do you see that case number there, 126-GJ-205? Is that correct?

A Yes.
Q And in the midule of this document, it says aggravated assault as Count One, right?

MS. BOWIE: Objection, relevance.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes, I see it.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q All right. I want to move on, then, to the next document here. This is State of Arizona. Can you tell me what county this is out of in Arizona? A Yuma.

Q And this is your name there as the defendant,
right?
A Yes.
Q And the case number is written a little bit differently here. S1400CR200201106, did I read that right?

A Yes.
Q And this is a Plea Agreement?
A From what I'm reading, yes.
Q And down here, I want to scroll down on this document, is that your signature on this document?

A Yes.
Q And that date is January 31st, 2003?
A Yes.
Q And I just want to scroll right back up here,
if we can. It says, 'Count One: Aggravated
Assault" as the crime you were pleading guilty to, right?

A Yes.
Q And in association with that document -- I'm sorry. My screen is -- there's a whole blank section there. My apologies.

We have another document here that says,
"County of Yuma Adult Probation Department," right?
A Yes.
Q And that case and probation number there is

S1400CR200201106, right?
A Yes.
Q And that's the same case number that we just referenced in the above document?

A There's too many numbers for me to remember, so I can't --

Q Sure. We'll just go by the last four here.
Those last four are 1106, correct?
A Yes.
Q And then if I scroll up here to your
Plea Agreement, there's your signature. As we go on up, that case number there ends in 1106 -A Yes.

Q -- on that Plea Agreement? Okay.
Let's keep that 1106 in our heads, if we can, as we go through here, just to connect all of these things together.

And that is your name here on that, John Weare, on this Adult Probation Department document? A Yes. Q And that is -- let's see here. In the center where it says, "Current Offense, Count One:

Aggravated Assault," right?
A Yes.
Q And that's the same crime that you pled
guilty to in the Plea Agreement, correct?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to keep scrolling down here. This is a Presentence Report. The case number here ends in 1106, right?

A Yes.
Q And that's the same case number that we were going to keep in our head from the previous ones?

A Yes.
Q And that's your name, John Weare, at the top?
A Yes.
Q All right. I'm just going to scroll through that. I don't have any questions for you about the content of any of that.

MS. BOWIE: I'm going to object to that document on releyarice as well.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q Okay. Here we have another document. What county does this document say that it's from, Mr. Weare?

A Yuma County.
Q And is that case number again 1106?
A Yes.
Q And this document says, "Sentence of Probation," right?

A Yes
Q And we're going to kind of scroll down here where it says, "Fees, Fines, and Assessments." Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And were you ordered to pay probation fees?
A Yes.
Q Were you ordered to pay a Superior Court enhancement fee?

A Yes.
Q And were you ordered to pay an attorney assessment fee?

A Yes.
Q Have you paid those fees as ordered by the Court?

A To the best. of my knowledge, yes.
Q Do you nave any documentation of paying those
fees?
A No.
Q Okay. And I want to scroll on down here to this next document. That's your -- well, this is from the County of Yuma in Arizona, right?

A Yes.
Q Is that your name there as the defendant?
A Yes.

Q And your date of birth?
A Yes.
Q And this case number ends in 1106?
A Yes.
Q And is that the case number we were talking about previously?

A Yes.
Q And this order says, "Order for Discharge
from Probation." Were you discharged from probation
on this case?
A Yes.
Q And was that on -- around, let's see,
March 12th, 2006?
A From what I'm seeing in the document, yes. I can't actually remember the date myself.

Q Sure. Can you recall if there were any
requirements for you to pay certain fees or anything
before you were able to be discharged from probation?

A I can't remember.
Q Okay. And then this last document here, is
that from the County of Yuma?
A Yes.
Q And is that your name, John Weare, as the defendant?
 document.

Q
And I'm going to break that down just for the record to be really specific. Have you provided this document to any office of probation or parole in Tennessee?

A No.
Q Have you provided it to any Election Commission office in Tennessee?

A No.
Q Have you provided it to the State Division of Elections within the Secretary of State's office in Tennessee?

A No.
Q
Have you provided this document to anyone in the Governor's Office in rennessee?

A No.
Q All right I believe that is all with regard to those documents, so I'm going to stop sharing my screen.

MR. BARKER: Okay. If I could just take -- I think I'm about wrapped up with my questions. If I could take a short five-minute break off the record and then come back in five minutes, would that be okay?

MS. BOWIE: That's fine.
MR. BARKER: All right. Let's take
five minutes. I'll be back at 11:27.
(Recess observed.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Weare, I've got just a couple more questions for you, so hopefully it won't take too long.

I want to go back to something we were discussing a little bit earlier when you said that you got some COR forms and tried to get them filled out by officials in Arizona. Where did you get the COR forms?

A I can't recall. I think the first set I got from the state site. I realy didn't know what to do with them and $I$ was oreparing to try to get my rights restored, I want to think that maybe I got it -- had somebody send them to me so I could send them out. I can't recall. Q Okay. At any point, did you ask a Tennessee official to assist you in filling out the COR forms? A No.

Q And at any point, have you submitted a completed COR form to an official of the Tennessee government?

A No.
MR. BARKER: Okay. I think that's all
for me right now, and I'll pass the witness. I may have more questions, depending on if more questions are asked, but at this time I pass.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. Just a few questions for you, Mr. Weare.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. BOWIE:
Q You testified earlier that you had an interaction with the County Election Commission regarding restoration of your voting rights; is that right?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And in that interaction, did the County Election Commission tell you that there was a Certificate of Restoration?

A No. They basically didn't know what -- how I would go about it.

Q So, they didn't tell you anything about getting your voting rights restored?

A No.
Q Okay. And just now, Mr. Barker asked you about whether you've submitted a completed Certificate of Restoration to any Tennessee officials. Have you been able to obtain a completed

Certificate of Restoration?
A No.
Q Okay. Can you tell us a little bit about what you do for work.

A Well, currently, I volunteer over at a rehab center here called Hope Center Ministries. I work volunteer counseling, doing Bible studies, individual counseling with people that have addiction problems. I also am one of the leaders at Celebrate Recovery here. Pretty much my week is filled with, how do $I$ say it, trying to help people get past their addictions and try to lead normal lives again.

Q Thank you. What would it mean to you if you're able to get your right to vote back?

A Well, since I've not been allowed to vote, I've kind of felt like a noncitizen. I want to participate in voting and putting elected officials that I believe represent, you know, what I believe in in office.

It's kind of like -- for me, it's something that an American should do, is be involved with your government and who's in office and things like that. Basically, the base -- I guess the best way to put it is $I$ feel like a noncitizen not being able to
vote.
Q And Mr. Barker asked you earlier what you're hoping to get out of this lawsuit. Can you talk a little bit about that.

A Well, I'm hoping to be able to, one, get my own rights to vote back, but, you know, as we're going forward, I would just like to see it be a little bit of an easier system, because, you know, the CORs that I haven't submitted is because I couldn't get anybody to fill it out on the other end.

You know, I know I felt lost through this process. I feel once you've become -- you know, done your time and become a contributing member of society, because my - if $I$ can quote my dad, you're either somebody that's not contributing or you're part of the problem kind of thing. And, to me, part of that contributing is going out and voting.

I'm not very good at being articulate and I'm so nervous, so I apologize.

But for years now, I've been feeling like a noncitizen. I want to participate in the voting process, just like I participate in -- I mentioned Celebrate Recovery and the Hope Center Ministries. I'm also involved in a food distribution ministry
down here where we deliver food to people that really can't even make it to the food line because they're either handicapped or there's some other reason they can't get out of the house.

So, to me, being able to vote is just another process of being a contributing member of my society.

Does that make sense?
Q It does. Thank you.
MS. BOWIE: That's all my questions.
MR. BARKER: That's everything from me, then. I think we're ready to finish up and go off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)
Ms. Porter, we would like to request a copy of the transcript. Please bill it to the Office of the Tennessee Attorney General, not just my name, because that makes things complicated at times. Please bill it to the Office of the Tennessee Attorney General, and just standard time, however long that generally takes.

MS. BOWIE: We'll order a copy as well.
THE REPORTER: Would you like him to read and sign or waive signature?

MS. BOWIE: We'll read and sign, yes.

FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT
(Proceedings concluded 11:45 a.m. CST)
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The videoconference deposition of BENJAMIN TOURNIER was taken by counsel for the Defendants, by Notice, with all participants appearing at their respective locations, on May 25 , 2023, for all purposes under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

All formalities as to capiion, notice, statement of appearance, et cetera, are waived. All objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved to the hearing, and that said deposition may be read and used in evidence in said cause of action in ary trial thereon or any proceeding herein.

It, is agreed that Jerri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, Notary Public and Licensed Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness is not waived.

THE REPORTER: Good morning, my name is Jerri Porter. I am a Tennessee Licensed Reporter, LCR Number 335. Today's date is May 25, 2023, and the time is approximately 10:00 a.m. Central Standard Time.

This is the deposition of Benjamin Tournier in the matter of the Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, et al., versus Lee, et al., Case Number 3:20-cv-01039, in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville Division.

At this time, I will ask counsel to identify yourselves, state whom you represent, and agree on the record that there is no objection to Jerri Porter administering a binding oath to the witness via Zoom.

MR. BARKER: Good morning. My name is Zachary Barker. I'm with the Tennessee Attorney General's office and I'm joined by my co-counsel, Alex Rieger. Together we represent the State defendants in today's case, being the Governor of Tennessee, Bill Lee; the Secretary of State,

Tre Hargett; the Coordinator of Elections, Mark Goins; and the Commissioner of the Tennessee Department of Corrections, Frank Strada.

We have no objection to Ms. Porter administering the oath. And we'd also note that I am joined today in my office by an intern, Ms. Heather Perry. She will not be appearing in any other capacity other than observing.

MS. UYEDA: Good morning, everyone. My name is Kate Uyeda. I am joined here by my co-counsel, Blair Bowie. We represent -- we are counsel for the plaintiffs in this matter and we have no objection to Ms. Poster swearing in the witness.

BENJAMIN TOURNIER,
was called as a witness, and after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

MS. UYEDA: Before we jump in, Zachary, if I could just start off with, you know, as you know, you have an ongoing responsibility under the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26, to disclose documents that you intend to use during the discovery process. You know, we've requested these
documents multiple times to be supplemented and have not received them to date. So, we'd like to request now that you share any documents that intend to use during this deposition.

MR. BARKER: Sure. We can put those documents in the chat as we go along.

For the record, we would also note that any of the documents being used today are public record that were not in the possession of our clients, but rather retrieved by the aitorneys or our investigators from the county Clerks' offices in Arizona. So, they were not in the possession of our clients.

Furthermore, a couple of the documents that we will use today came other places, one being the COR form, which has been provided to opposing counsel. One is a document provided by opposing counsel to us, and the other is a news article that was published and actually quotes opposing counsel and Mr . Tournier in that news article.

I can place them all in the chat at once, if that's okay, and then $I$ will just identify each of those for Ms. Porter as we go along, if that's okay with her, to mark them as exhibits.

MS. UYEDA: That sounds good.

MR. BARKER: They are labeled
alphabetically at the beginning of each document name. If we don't use all of them, I will -- we can just go along as we need to. Here are the documents.

MS. UYEDA: Thank you.
MR. BARKER: We may not be admitting all of these. It will just depend on how things go, obviously, but these are the only ones we even contemplate that we might use.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. BARKER:
Q Good morning, Mr. Íournier. My name is Zachary Barker. Woußa you please introduce yourself to us.

A Yes, sir. My name is Benjamin Tournier. Q Could you spell your last name for the record.

A Yes, sir. T-o-u-r-n-i-e-r.
Q Mr. Tournier, have you ever been deposed before?

A What do you mean?
Q Have you been through a process like this before, where you were being asked questions by an
attorney and you were under oath?
A Yeah. When I got custody of my child, state custody in Arizona. But it wasn't on video; it was just over a phone.

Q Okay. Have you ever testified at a trial or at a court hearing before?

A No, sir.
Q All right. As we begin and get started, I just want to take a few minutes to go over some general guidelines and instructions for what we're doing so that we're all on the same page as to what's going on, if that's okay

A Yes, sir.
Q
So, first, if you don't understand a question that I ask, please ask me to repeat or to rephrase that question and $I$ will do my best to make sure that it's understandable to you and everyone else in the room so that we're all on the same page as to what the question is.

If your attorney objects to any of my questions, please do not answer until your attorney and I are finished discussing that objection. Once that discussion is finished, $I$ will either ask you to go ahead and answer the question, or you'll be instructed by your attorney not to answer the
question, or $I$ may rephrase the question in a way as to make it agreeable between your attorney and myself.

Do not guess at any answer. If you don't recall specifically the information that I'm asking about, just say that you do not recall or that you do not know. If you can provide a reasonable estimate -- I may be asking about some dates or times. If you can provide a reasonable estimate, just let us know that you're estimating and then provide us with that estimate for the date.

If during the deposition you recall something that was the answer to a question that $I$ asked a while ago, if something jogs your memory, let me know. We can go back to that topic and you can add whatever information you need to that answer. We want to make sure that all of the information that you have for each of these questions is complete and that it's on the record.

From time to time during the deposition we will take a break, but if at any point you need a break, please let me know. Happy to take as many breaks as you need to be comfortable. All I ask is that if there is a question that $I$ have just asked you, please answer the question before we go on a
break.
Do you have any questions thus far?
A No, not really.
Q All right. Let's get started, then, with how you prepared for this deposition. What did you do in preparation for the deposition?

A My attorneys mailed me a package of stuff, you know, like an amendment -- amended deposition, whatever it is. Stuff like that, we read over that, just getting me familiar. This has been going on for several years. So, my short-term memory don't always want to work real well, so I have to refresh myself sometimes.

Q Okay. We don't need to go into the content of any conversations chat you had with your attorneys. You don't have to tell me what you said or what they said.

How many times did you meet with your attorneys?

A Several times over the phone. I just now learned how to do this zoom.

Q All right. Can you give me an estimate for how many times you met with them?

A I don't know. I never kept count, to be honest with you. Most of it was through texting.

My job, I work a lot of hours, so sometimes phone calls are just hit and miss.

Q Other than your attorneys, did you talk to anyone else about this deposition?

A Yes. I talked to a lady named Katie when I first started this off a Facebook ad.

Q And who is Katie and how did you interact with her?

A It was through a Facebook ad and then we talked over the phone. She helped with a lot of the Arizona stuff.

Q Let's talk about this Facebook ad, then. What did the Facebook ad say?

A Pretty much, you might be eligible to get your voting rights back. I contacted them through Facebook and they Contacted me via phone.

Q When you say you contacted them, what is the entity that you contacted?

A It was through Facebook. It was a -- I can't remember the name of it, but it was a pro bono type thing to see if $I$ was eligible to get my voting rights back.

Q Did you talk to that specific individual about the deposition today?

A No. I've only talked to my two attorneys
about this deposition.
Q Where are you located right now?
A Jackson, Tennessee.
Q Okay. And are you at your home?
A No. I'm in a conference room at a place
called theCO, C-O.
Q And what is theCO?
A It's just an -- it's a place that has meeting rooms.

Q Okay, I understand. Is anyone with you in
that meeting room?
A No, sir.
Q know you and your background a little bit.

Where do you ©urrently live?
A Jackson, Ternessee.
Q Okay.
A I've been here since I moved to Tennessee.
Q What county is Jackson, Tennessee in?
A Madison County.
Q And when did you move to Jackson?
A Got here June 29th of 2003.
Q Where did you live before Jackson, Tennessee?
A Phoenix, Arizona.
Q What county is Phoenix, Arizona in in

Arizona, if you can remember?
A Oh, I'm sorry. Maricopa County.
Q Okay. Have you lived anywhere else other
than Phoenix, Arizona?
A Yeah. I lived in Minnesota until my freshman year of high school before I moved to Arizona. Q And is that -- did you live anywhere else other than Minnesota in your adult life?

A No. I didn't live in Minnesota in my adult
life. It was strictly Arizona and here.
Q How long did you live in Arizona?
A Fourteen years.
Q And can you give me a ballpark for what year you started living in Arizona?

A Well, let's see. I was supposed to have graduated, I believe, in '86 or '87. I got through my freshman year, so about four years before that, I guess. So, early '80s.

Q Early '80s. Are you married, Mr. Tournier?
A Divorced.
Q Have you only been married once or have you been married multiple times?

A Only once.
Q Do you have any children?
A Yes.

Do your children live with you?
A Yes. She's an adult. I've got two grandbabies that live there as well.

Q Have you ever owed any child support for your children?

A No, not that $I$ know of.
Q And this is kind of a random question, but are you a member of the NAACP?

A No.
Q Let's talk a little bit about this lawsuit, then, that you are a plaintiff in. How did you become involved in this lawsuit?

A From the Facebook ad saying I might be eligible to get my voting rights back.

Q Were you promised anything for joining this lawsuit?

A No, sir. Like I said, I'm just trying to see if I'm eligible to vote. I've been out of prison -you know, the last time $I$ got out in 2003. Ain't been in no trouble ever since. A couple of speeding tickets, but no criminal activity. I go to work, I go home, I go to church and I go home. That's pretty much my life.

Q In your own words, what is this lawsuit about?

A Hopefully being able to voice my vote. I'd like to at least have some of my rights back since I am a productive person, productive in society. Q So, you're seeking to get your voting rights back?

A Yes, sir. If I'm eligible.
Q And you've been convicted of a felony in the past.

A Yes.
Q And is it because of that felcny or those felonies, if there's more than one, that you're unable to vote?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

You can answer, Mr. Tournier.
THE WTYNESS: Okay. Repeat the question.

MR. BARKER: I'll rephrase the question. We can strike that, Ms. Porter. BY MR. BARKER:

Q What is your understanding of how you lost your right to vote?

A By my felonies. I didn't know that I was able to even try to get them back. So, it's been years since I tried. And I got -- like I said, once

I found out I might have an opportunity or blessing to be able to vote, I thought I'd see if I was eligible.

Q So, in your own words, what are you asking the Court to do in this case?

A Let me get my rights back, you know, God willing.

Q Let's talk, then, a little bit about the Certificate of Restoration process in Tennessee. Are you familiar with the term Certificate of Restoration?

A Kind of.
Q What is your understañding of what a
Certificate of Restoration is?
A It's where you -- well, I don't know -- I don't comprehend al that part. I do know I tried to go down to probation and parole to fill out that form.

The lady at the counter, receptionist or whatever, would not set me up with somebody to fill it out. She just handed me a form and told me to fill out the top portion, which I did, even though it said at the top not to fill it out myself, and then that they'd contact me. And I never heard a word back. That was, I think, almost two years ago.

Q Okay. We'll get into that scenario in just a minute and what happened there.

What is your understanding, then, of the requirements, meaning the certain criteria that you have to meet, in order to get your voting rights restored in Tennessee?

A I have -- to be totally honest with you, I have no idea. I'm not the sharpest knife in the drawer to go through all this stuff. I just assumed I couldn't get them back until somebcdy told me I might be able to.

Q Are you aware of the need to have completed your sentence or supervision in order to get your voting rights back?

A Yeah, which I ve done. I got off parole November of 2003 arid haven't been in trouble since legal-wise like that, like I said, except for a couple of tickets. You know, I'm working every day, paying taxes every day, but my voice ain't heard. Q Are you aware of the need to pay all of your restitution if ordered by a court in order to get your rights restored?

A I don't know what you mean.
Q Okay. Are you aware of the need to pay court costs if they are ordered by the Court in order to
get your rights restored?
A I'm not sure what court costs you're referring to, sir. When I got out the last time, you know, I did all my time. I did all my -- you know, I did my parole the way I was supposed to. I didn't know $I$ owed anything at that time. Q Maybe it will be a little bit easier if we go about things this way.

Have you ever seen a Certificate of Restoration form in Tennessee?

A Just the top portion that I filled out. Like I said, I don't really know a whole lot about it. I was relying on help.

Q Let's take a look at that COR form. I'm going to share my screen so you can see it, Mr. Tournier.

A Yes, sir.
MR. BARKER: Ms. Porter, that would be what is labeled as $A$, the COR form, in the chat. If we could move that in as the first exhibit to this deposition.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 1.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Tournier, I'm sharing my screen here and

I've got a document, which says at the top, "Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights." I've got it zoomed in, so hopefully you can see that.

Can you see what I've got to the screen there?
A Yes, sir.
Q And this is just part of the document. We'll scroll through it and kind of talk about it section by section. Is this the form that you're talking about that you filled out the top portion of?

A Yes, sir, it looks like it.
Q And it asks for your name, Eight?
A Yep.
Q Your county of resideñce, right?
A Yeah.
Q Did it ask for what your felony conviction was?

A I believe so.
Q And the month, day, and year of the conviction?

A Yes, I believe so. And, of course, my date of birth and all that, yes.

Q What is your understanding, based on the form and what's in the box there at the top, as to who can fill out these forms and sign them?

A What do you mean? Who can fill it out? I
thought somebody in the department was supposed to fill it out. You know, it says there that I'm not supposed to.

Q Okay. I'm scrolling down here to Box 2 on the form.

A Yes, sir.
Q What is your understanding of what Box 2 is asking about?

A I don't know what you mean.
Q Would it be your understanding that this box refers to the completion of your sentence or supervision?

A Like I said, I don't snow. I know I completed parole without no -- without any trouble. But I didn't read any of that stuff, and they told me just to fill qut the top portion, so I'm not familiar, sir.

Q Let me break it down this way. You filled out this top part, Box 1 here that I have on my screen, right?

A I believe so, yes.
Q And you didn't fill out any of the other boxes on the form?

A I can't remember, to be honest with you.
Like I said, that was back, I believe, in 2020.

Are you aware of any other requirements that need to be filled out for the other three boxes on this form?

A The other three boxes? What do you mean?
Q So, here is Box Number 2.
A Okay.
Q Here's Box Number 3. Are you aware of the requirements for those boxes?

A No, sir.
Q Okay. Is it your understanding -- I'll stop sharing my screen here so that that's not up there anymore.

A Okay. I know I didn't have no restitutions or anything in Tennessee.

Q Okay. Did you have any restitution in Arizona?

A On the paperwork I saw, it looks like I might have had probation fees in Yavapai County, but I didn't know I had them.

Q Okay. Let's go back to kind of the form and the initial process, though, in kind of broad strokes here.

Is it your understanding that someone other than you has to verify that your sentence was completed for the COR form?

A Yes, sir.
Is it your understanding that someone other than you has to verify the payment of restitution if it was ordered for the COR form?

A For Tennessee, yes, sir.
Q Is it your understanding that someone other than you would have to verify the payment of court costs, whatever they may be, for the COR form in Tennessee?

A I guess, yeah.
MS. UYEDA: Objection. Calls for legal conclusion as to what constitutes a court cost. You can answer, Mr. Tournier. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't think I had any restitutions in f'ennessee at all. As a matter of fact, I thought under Interstate Compact that I would be taken care of anyways. BY MR. BARKER:

Q So, Mr. Tournier, regardless of what court costs mean, are you aware that the words court costs appears on the COR form?

A Yes, sir, now that you showed it to me.
Q And are you aware that someone will have to sign and verify that court costs, whatever they may be, have to be paid to complete the COR form?

A Okay.
Q Are you aware of that?
A I am now.
Q Okay. After completion of the COR form, after all of these things have been signed, what is your understanding of the next steps that have to be taken?

A I have no idea of the understanding of what needs to be done next.

Q Okay. I'd like to walk through kind of the history of your voting rights. Have you ever been registered to vote in Tennessee?

A No.
Q Have you ever been registered to vote in any other state?

A Arizona.
Q When did you register to vote in Arizona?
A When I turned 18 when I signed up for the draft.

Q Do you know about when you turned 18, what year that was?

A Decades ago. I don't know the exact time. Like I said, I know I was supposed to graduate in '86 or ' 87 , but I dropped out my freshman year of high school and started working.

Q Well, how old are you now, Mr. Tournier?
A Sunday I'll be 54 or 55.
Q
Okay. Well, happy birthday for this coming Sunday. Let's, then, talk about how you lost your right to vote.

A Yes, sir.
Q Based on your understanding, how did you lose your right to vote?

A By being convicted of a felony in Arizona, by the felonies in Arizona.

Q When were you first convicted of a felony in Arizona?

A I don't remember the year. It's been a while.

Q Do you recall what that conviction was?
A I believe it was unlawful means of transportation and forgery. But the unlawful means of transportation, I believe, was dropped at one time in 2001.

Q Do you have any other felony convictions in Arizona or any other state?

A No. Just in Arizona. No other states. But I do have a couple that's in this packet here. I don't know what more -- I don't know what you want me to answer. I'm sorry.

Q Do you know what crimes those other convictions were for?

A One was for forgery, one was for drug paraphernalia, and then the unlawful means of transportation, I believe.

Q Have you attempted to restore your voting rights based on those convictions in Tennessee? A Whatever Ms. Kate and Blair has been trying to help me with.

Q Okay. I kind of want to take step by step things that you have done, then, to restore your voting rights.

A Okay.
Q What was the first step that you took to attempt to restore your voting rights?

A Here in Tenriessee, I filled out the top portion of that paper is what I've actually done. Q And I think our internet connection broke up there a little bit. I'm sorry. Can you state that again as to what the first thing was that you did?

A Filled out that paper at the parole/probation office.

Q Which probation and parole office was that?
A The one in Jackson, Madison County. I
believe it's on Hollywood Drive. I can Google the
address if you need me to.
Q Do you recall when it was that you went to that probation and parole office?

A Two or three years ago.
Q Do you have any recollection of who you
talked to at the probation and parole office?
A It was a lady at the front counter. She wouldn't let me talk to anybody else.

Q Okay. Do you recall her name?
A No, sir.
Q So, you filled out the top portion of the form you said. So, who gave you the form?

A The receptionist lady. She's the only person
I could talk to. I mean. I hit a brick wall.
Q Okay. She gave you the form and told you to fill out the top. What did you do after you filled out the top portion of the form?

A I turned it back into her. She said she
would give it to who needed it -- where it needed to go and that I'd be contacted.

Q What happened after that?
A Crickets. I never heard nothing back.
Q So, you never heard anything back from the Madison County probation and parole office?

A No, sir.

Did you ever hear anything back from anyone else about that COR form?

A No, sir.
Q Did you make any other attempts beyond going to the Madison County probation and parole office to fill out a COR form?

A No, sir. I didn't know what to do.
Q Did you make any other attempts to contact any Tennessee officials about getting your voting rights restored?

A No, sir. I didn't know what to do. I didn't know how to do it.

Q Okay. Did you talk có anybody else about getting your voting rights restored?

A Just the people that's been helping me, Ms. Blair and Ms. Kate. Like I said, I'm not the sharpest knife in the drawer, so I really didn't know what to do.

Q You said that you talked to Ms. Blair and Ms. Kate. What did you do based on those conversations?

A I believe it was Ms. Blair that is the one told me to go down and I had to do that form and have it filled out for me. I called her after I filled the form out. She said, well, I believe you
weren't supposed to fill the form out and I told her, I said, well, that's what the lady told me to do and that I'd hear back. And then, like I said, I never heard back.

Q Did you receive any other assistance from anyone other than Kate and Blair in this case with getting your voting rights restored?

A Just the Facebook post that I actually started the ball rolling with. Otherwise, no. Q Did, at any point, you reach cui to Arizona to try to get them to fill out a COR form for you? MS. UYEDA: Objection. Can you clarify who you mean by -- which officials in Arizona?

MR. BARKER: Sure. I'll rephrase the question. BY MR. BARKER: Q Mr. Tournier, did you contact any individual working for the government in Arizona to get them to fill out a COR form for you?

A Me personally or did I have somebody on my behalf try to do that?

Q Well, let's start with you personally.
A No, sir.
Q Did you have anyone reach out to government officials in Arizona on your behalf?

A Yes, sir.
Q And who was that?
A The lady from the Facebook post. I'm terrible with names. I could look at the email that was done if you need me to.

Q I think we may be getting to that email in a minute, but it might be all right to go ahead and talk about that now.

MR. BARKER: There's a document labeled C in the chat, Ms. Porter. If we could go ahead and make that the next exhibit, and we can talk about this email.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 2.)

BY MR. BARKER:
Q I'll go ahead and share my screen so you can take a look at it, Mr. Tournier. This is a document that was provided by plaintiffs' counsel in discovery and it's labeled PL000078 Benjamin Tournier. I'm going to share my screen and we're going to take a look at this document.

Mr. Tournier, do you recognize this document?
A Yes, sir. I've got it sitting in front of me.

Q So, that's the email you're referring to?

A Yes. I guess her name was Kayley.
Q Ms. Kayley Ingalls?
A Yes, sir.
Q Was there anyone beyond Ms. Ingalls who was assisting you in getting your rights restored?

A Not that I know of.
Q referring to that reached out to officials in

Arizona on your behalf?
A I believe so.
Q And this is a -- this is an email. It's a response from Maricopa County to Ms. Ingalls; is that right?

A Yes, sir.
Q And are you aware of what Maricopa County said would need to be done to restore your rights? A I'd have to read this to be sure, but...
(Reviewing document.)
I guess the application is with the clerk. Like I said, I don't know.

Q Did you ever submit any applications to a clerk's office in Arizona to attempt to get your rights restored?

A I believe she did. I didn't.
Q You didn't. Do you have any documentation
that was provided to you or by Ms. Kayley or anyone else about your application in Arizona?

A I don't know, there's so many things here. I do remember reading somewhere in one of these packets of papers that it didn't have -- Arizona didn't have -- something about Tennessee -- Arizona, trying to get my voting rights back in Arizona, but I don't remember where $I$ read it at in these papers.

MR. BARKER: Ms. Uyeda, we would request a copy of the documents that Mr . Tournier is relying on on his desk there as we go through the deposition. BY MR. BARKER:

Q So, you don't -- Strike that.
What documentation can you recall that you have about applying for your voting rights to be restored in Arizona?

A I don't know, sir.
Q Okay.
A I don't know how to answer that.
Q I'm going to stop sharing my screen. We'll go back to talking more generally about the COR process. I want to break this down and be really specific. It may sound a little bit repetitive, but I want to go entity by entity.

You talked about going to the probation and parole office and filling out the top portion of the form. Did you ever return to that probation and parole office and ask them to fill out COR forms for you?

A No. I was waiting for them to contact me. At the time, $I$ was working 12 to 14 hours a day, five, six days a week. I was raising my daughter on my own since she was ten. You know, like I said, I tried to do -- I did, but they said they'd contact me and that's what $I$ waited on.

Q Did you have anyone contact that probation and parole office in Madison County on your behalf about a COR form?

A Not that I know of. I don't know. Ms. Blair might have, but I. to be honest with you, that happened so long ago, my short-term memory just don't work the way it's supposed to. Q Do you have any documentation of someone reaching out to the Madison County probation and parole office on your behalf about a COR form? A A complaint, Tennessee Conference of National Association, National Association. Everything seems to have been done through Tennessee Conference of the National Association for Advancement, but...

Like I said, I'm not educated enough to know what half of this stuff says, to be honest with you. I don't want to answer wrong. I don't want to say something wrong.

Q Let me ask a follow-up question, then.
Beyond what you have right in front of you, those documents, which I'm sure your counsel is going to provide us, beyond those documents, do you have any documentation of someone reaching out to the Madison County probation and parole office on your behalf about a COR form?

A Not that I -- I don't know. Not that I know of.

Q
Have you ever reached out to a county clerk's office in Tennessee áoout receiving a Certificate of Restoration or a COR form?

A No, sir. I just relied on the probation and parole department.

Q Are you aware anyone reaching out to a county clerk's office on your behalf about a COR form?

A No, sir.
Q Have you ever reached out to the election commission office in Madison County about receiving a Certificate of Restoration form?

A I didn't know I -- I didn't know I could.

You know, I didn't know what avenues -- what steps I was supposed to take. Q So, that's a no, that you didn't reach out to the election commission?

A Oh, yes. No. Sorry.
Q Has anyone reached out to the election commission office about a COR form on your behalf?

A I don't know.
Q Do you have any documentation -- beyond what's in front of you, any --

A No, sir.
Q -- documentation about someone reaching out to the election commission office on your behalf?

A No, sir.
Q Do you -- did you contact any other entity, governmental entity in the state of Tennessee about receiving a COR form for restoring your voting rights?

A No, sir.
Q And are you aware of someone reaching out to any other government entity on your behalf about filling out a COR form or restoring your voting rights?

A Just what I talked to Blair about. Otherwise, no.

Do you have any documentation, beyond what's in front of you, of anyone reaching out on your behalf to any Tennessee government entity about getting a COR form filled out?

A I don't have no -- I have no papers for that. Q

So, beyond your conversation with the Madison County probation and parole office and your conversations with Kate and Blair in this case, have you done anything else in an effort to restore your voting rights in Tennessee?

A No.
Q Okay. I'd like to move on from that, then, and talk a little bit about à newspaper article in the "Jackson Sun."

MR. BARKER: This is labeled B in the chat, Ms. Porter, and if we could make that the next exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 3.)
MS. UYEDA: Actually, Zachary, we've been almost 45 minutes on the record. Would we be able to take a quick break, maybe five minutes now?

MR. BARKER: Sure.
MS. UYEDA: All the documents that Mr. Tournier has in front of him have been
previously disclosed by the plaintiffs.
MR. BARKER: Okay. Perfect. That's
fine. Let's go ahead and make it eight minutes and come back at a nice even 10:50, if that's okay.

MS. UYEDA: That sounds good.
(Recess observed.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Tournier, you do understand that you're still under oath?

A Yes, sir.
Q Did you speak to anyone on our break?
A Yes, sir.
Q Who did you speak wich?
A Ms. Kate and Ms. Biair.
Q You don't have to tell me what you spoke about -_

A Right.
Q -- just asking for information.
Okay. I believe we were about to talk about the "Jackson Sun" article, which is labeled B in the chat. I'm going to share my screen and we will take a look at that document.

Mr. Tournier, can you see that document?
A I can see it. I can't read any of it.
Q Let me zoom in here for you a little bit.

I'm sorry. It comes in a little bit zoomed out on the screen share there.

Can you see the article now?
A Yes, sir.
Q And this is an article from the "Jackson
Sun." Are you familiar with this article?
A Yes, sir.
Q
Do you remember speaking to a reporter from the "Jackson Sun"?

A Yes, sir.
Q And was that Adam Friedman?
A Huh?
Q Was that Adam Friedmañ, the person here
listed as the author of the article?
A Yes, sir.
Q What infornátion did you provide
Mr. Friedman?
A Just that $I$ was trying to get my voting rights back.

Q Did you talk to him in person?
A Well, over the phone. I talked to his -- the lady that come out and took pictures and stuff like that, she pretty much interviewed me as well.

Q Do you recall what you told Mr. Friedman and the other person from the "Jackson Sun"?


MS. UYEDA: I -- go ahead and finish
your question, Zachary. I apologize.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Were you sent to the Madison County Clerk's office?

A No, sir.
MS. UYEDA: Objection. This article is hearsay. We would direct Zachary and counsel to the Complaint which -- where the allegations in the lawsuit are contained.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q You can answer the question, Mr. Tournier. Were you sent to the Madison County Clerk's office? A No. The lady at the probation/parole office, they'd fill it out -- they'd direct it to where it needed to go and I'd oe contacted. They never told me to go anywhere. Otherwise, I would have.

Q So, you didn't go to the Madison County Clerk's office, then?

A No, sir.
Q This next portion says that "He," meaning you, "called a court clerk in Maricopa County, Arizona..."

Did you call the court clerk in Arizona? MS. UYEDA: Objection. This article is hearsay. We would direct counsel to the Complaint
which contains the included allegations.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q You can answer the question, Mr. Tournier.
A I don't remember if I did or not. That was quite a while back.

Q Do you remember having any conversation with
a court clerk in Maricopa County, Arizona?
A I don't.
Q Okay. Other than the email that we discussed earlier that we looked at, do you have any
documentation of communication on rour behalf with the Maricopa County Clerk's office?

A I don't have no paperwork.
MS. UYEDA: Objection. Asked and
answered.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q All rignt. I'll stop sharing that document. I want to take a moment and talk a little bit about each of your convictions.

So, in total, how many felony convictions do you have, Mr. Tournier?

A Let's see. I don't know if paraphernalia is considered a felony or not. If it is, I think I've got three.

Q Okay. And I want to walk through all three
of those convictions one at a time. We're going to start with one from 1997.

MR. BARKER: I'm sharing what's in the chat as Document D. Ms. Porter, if we can mark that as our next exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 4.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I'll get zoomed in here so you can take a look at this, Mr. Tournier, before $I$ share my screen. Can you see this document, Mr. Tournier? A Yes, sir.

Q And is that document -- does it say it's from
Yavapai County -- am I pronouncing that correctly, Yavapai County, Arizoña?

A Excuse me?
Q Right there at the top.
A Oh, yes, sir.
Q And is that your name, Benjamin Virgil
Tournier, listed as the defendant?
A Yes.
Q I want to scroll down in this document, so bear with me. I'm going to zoom out, scroll down, and then zoom back in here.

Is that your signature right there?

A Yes

Q
And the date, what date is listed beside your signature?

A February 24 th.
Q Of what year?
A Oh, '97.
Q All right. Now, I want to take a look at just a couple things in here. What is the conviction here that you pled guilty to?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Zachary, can you clarify what this document is and where it came from?

MR. BARKER: Sure.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Tournier, Chis is a Plea Agreement document that came directly from the -- I'm assuming I'm pronouncing this right -- Yavapai County Clerk's office in Arizona.

In this Plea Agreement, it states your offense here. Do you recall pleading or taking an offered plea to theft of a vehicle?

MS. UYEDA: Objection, lack of
foundation. We would direct counsel to the Complaint which indicates Mr. Tournier's convictions and any applicable pleas, as well as the court
documents which were provided to counsel during earlier propounded discovery.

MR. BARKER: May I ask what rule you're referring to that requires foundation for this document?

MS. UYEDA: Yes. So, we are thinking about -- this document is not confirmation that he pled guilty. Rather, the documents that would indicate his convictions have all been provided and they represent his conviction status.

MR. BARKER: Okay. We'll get into the confirmation of his convictions in a moment. BY MR. BARKER:

Q Mr. Tournier, you can answer my questions here. Did you plead an offered plea to theft of a vehicle?

A Yes.
Q And is that what's documented here in this plea agreement?

A Yeah, the guilty plea was scratched out and wrote in Alford, so yes.

Q Do you recognize this -- is the case number up here at the top 97-0359?

A I see it in the document. I don't know what you're asking besides that. I'm sorry.

Q
Did I read that correctly, 97-0359?
A Yes.
Q And this is the same document that $I$ just
scrolled down through that had your signature on it, right?

A Yes.
Q Okay. I want to take a look -- I'll stop sharing this document and we'll take a look at another document, which is labeled $E$ in the chat, E as in elephant.

MR. BARKER: Ms. Porter, would you make that the next-numbered exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 5.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I'm going tio share my screen here.
Mr. Tournier, Can you see that document?
A Yes.
Q And that says, "...for the County of
Yavapai...," up there at the top?
A Yes.
Q And that's your name, Benjamin Virgil Turner there in the top left?

A Tournier, yes.
Q Tournier, I'm sorry. And that case number
ends in 0359?
A Yeah.
Q With a date over there on the right of
February 24 th, 1997, right?
A Yes.
Q And this states that you entered a plea of guilty to theft, correct?

A It does. That was supposed to be an Alford plea, if it's the same one. I think that's the only conviction $I$ ever had in Yavapai County, which I successfully completed probation er.

Q And this says also that you were "advised restitution will be required in an amount not to exceed \$1,000..."?

A Yes.
Q And it's marked down here, "The Court accepts the plea at this time"?

A Yes.
Q Do you have any documentation of payment of restitution for this case?

A No, sir.
MS. UYEDA: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Okay. I am done with this document. I've
stopped sharing my screen. I'm going to move on to another document here.

Mr. Tournier, can you see this document I'm sharing?

A Yes, sir.
Q Does it say at the top, Yavapai County again?
A Yes, sir.
Q And the date over here on the left is
March 24th, 1997, right?
A Yeah.
Q It has a judge's name on it, Raymond W.
Weaver, Jr., right here in the center, right?
A Okay.
Q And is this court -- is this case number again ending in 0359:

A Yes.
Q And this is your name here, Benjamin Virgil Tournier, right?

A Right. I don't know who this Scott person is, but my name is above it.

Q Okay. And this document here says that -excuse me. Right here at the bottom, "It is the judgment of the Court that the Defendant is guilty of the crime of theft of a vehicle..." Is that right?

MS. UYEDA: Objection.
Zachary, could you explain again what this document is?

MR. BARKER: Yes. This is a document retrieved from the Yavapai County Clerk's office directly from them to my investigator. That is the judgment document for Mr . Tournier's conviction of theft in Yavapai County, which at some point $I$ would assume was served on him and in his own possession as well. We have retrieved it directly from the clerk's office and are questioning nim about this document.

BY MR. BARKER:
Q This document is 3 judgment of the court that you were guilty of theft of a vehicle, right, Mr. Tournier?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Calls for legal conclusion. BY MR. BARKER:

Q Mr. Tournier, does this document state,
"theft of a vehicle"?
A Yes.
Q Does it state, "It is the judgment of the Court that the Defendant is guilty of theft of a vehicle..."?

A Yes.
Q felony?

A I don't know what class means, but yes.
Q labeled "Special Conditions of Probation." In this second paragraph in "Special Conditions of Probation," it states, "...the Defendant shall pay restitution for the victim's economic loss through the Clerk of the Superior Court of Yavapai County in the total amount to be determined by competent evidence but not to exceed $\$ 1,000$ payable to the victims listed in the Presentence Report upon further Order of the Court."

Did you pay any restitution?
MS. UYEDA: Objection. Foundation.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Tournier, you can answer the question.
Did you pay any restitution for this conviction in Arizona?

A No, sir.
Q Are you aware of whether the Court put out any further orders about restitution in this case?

A No, sir.
Q Do you have any documentation about
restitution being paid with regard to this conviction?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q The question is, Mr. Tournier, do you have any documentation about restitution being paid? You can answer that question with regard to this conviction.

A No, sir.
Q All right. It further states that the
"Defendant shall pay reimbursement through the Clerk of the Superior Court," and then has some fees and prices there. I'm just going to jump straight to the point here, Mr. journier.

Do you have any documentation for paying any sorts of fees or anything in association --
(Overlapping speech.)
A No, sir.
MS. UYEDA: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
You can answer, Mr. Tournier.
THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Okay. Moving on --

A Like I said, that was several years ago. My memory is not -- I can't say if I paid the restitution or if $I$ didn't. I just don't -- I don't remember. I don't think so.

Q Okay. I've stopped sharing that document. I'm going to move on to one other document here. This is labeled Document $G$ in the chat. I'm going to zoom in here.

MR. BARKER: Can we mark Exhibit $F$ as the next-numbered exhibit and then now Document $G$ as the exhibit after that.
(WHEREUPON, a docurnent was marked as Exhibit Number 6.)
(WHEREUPON, (3) document was marked as Exhibit Number 7.)

BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Tournier, I'm sharing a document on my screen. Can you see that?

A Yes.
Q And this was a document retrieved directly from the clerk's office by my investigator in Yavapai County of Arizona, and it is a document entitled, "Conditions of Probation," and it has the case number and the citation at the top of it here.
Mr. Tournier, is this your name, Benjamin

Virgil Tournier, at the top left side of this document?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that case number or cause number there ends in 0359 ; is that right?

A Yes, sir.
Q I want to scroll down. Well, we'll start here. In the middle of the screen here, it says that "It is the judgment of this Court that the Defendant is [found] guilty of the crimes of theft of a vehicle, a Class 6 felony," right?

A Yes, sir.
Q I want to scroll down here to one of the conditions on the right-hand side labeled "As Special Conditions Defendant Shall," Number 5 here. That says, "Pay all court ordered monetary obligations as set forth in the sentencing order and as directed by the Adult Probation Department."

Do you have any --
A You said Number 5?
Q Five on the right-hand side here.
A All right. Okay.
Q Can you see where I'm kind of highlighting it there?

A Yes, sir.

Q Number 5 on the right-hand side, it says, "Pay all court ordered monetary obligations as set forth in the sentencing order and as directed by the Adult Probation Department."

Do you have any documentation of making those payments?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Tournier, can you answer the question.
A These are the same question $\mathfrak{F}$ about the other pages that you've been asking ree, so no.

Q Do you have any specific documentation at all from the Adult Probation Department in Arizona?

A That far back, I do not.
Q Okay. I warit to look at one last document here from -- vell, I've got two more documents from the 1997 case number. This was, once again, retrieved directly from the county clerk's office by my investigator from Yavapai County. This is a Judgment that was in your case file there, Mr. Tournier.

Is that your name, Benjamin Virgil Tournier, on the left?

A Yes.

Q And that case number, does that end in 0359?
A Yes, sir.
Q And does this have -- this document states, "...the State of Arizona shall have Judgment of
\$1,855 against Benjamin Virgil Tournier, specifically in the following amounts." And it does some math and has the remaining total amount due, \$1,855.

Have you paid that amount?
A No, sir.
Q And that's the signature ofa judge there. I can't make out the name, but there is a signature above the judge blank there at the bottom, right? A Yes.

Q And that was dated the 7th day of March, 2000, right?

A Okay.
Q Is that what it says there, 7th day of March?
A Yes, sir.
MR. BARKER: All right. Can we make that -- I don't know if I did this, Ms. Porter. Document $H$, can we make that the next-numbered exhibit?
/ /
/ /
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 8.)

MR. BARKER: And then I'm going to share one last document, Document $I$. If we can make that the next-numbered exhibit as well.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 9.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I'm going to share my screen. This was pulled directly from the web address listed in the bottom left-hand corner of the document. It's publicly available from the Arizona Judicial Branch website.

Can you see this document, Mr. Tournier?
A Yes.
Q Where it says case number, is that 0359 , the ending -- last Éour digits of that case number?

A Yes.
Q And is this your name here kind of in the center of my screen, Benjamin Virgil Tournier?

A Yes.
Q And are you identified as Defendant-D2 on this document?

A Yes.
Q Are you familiar with Sue Ann Hudson?

A Yes.
MS. UYEDA: Objection.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q You can answer the question, Mr. Tournier.
A Yes.
Q And she's identified as Defendant-D1,
correct?
A Yes.
Q Are you aware on this document of an order restoring the civil rights of the individual identified as D1 in this case?

A Yes, I see it.
MS. UYEDA: Objétion, form.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Have you attemioted to restore your civil rights with regara to this case, Mr. Tournier?

A I don't-- I think that's what $I$ was doing with all of this at one time, I believe, but I was told that Arizona won't do anything because I asked the Interstate Compact here in Tennessee, that I had to go for my rights here in Tennessee.

Q Okay. Do you see here the very top entry on this case where it says "Date" and "Description," "4/14/2022, OLCP post disposition auto send." Then it has "D2" as the party listed.

Did you receive anything from the court in Arizona on April 14th, 2022?

MS. UYEDA: Objection, form.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q You can answer the question, Mr. Tournier.
A I don't know what that -- I don't know what that OLCP, I don't know anything about that. Q Well, then let's not make it specific to that specific description, then.

Have you received any documentation or any documents from the Yavapai County Court on this conviction in the year 2022?

A Not that I remember.
Q Okay. I'm going to stop sharing my screen for that document. Iet's move on to a conviction from the year 2000 .

MR. BARKER: We'll take a look at Document $J$ from the chat. If we can make that the next-numbered exhibit, Ms. Porter.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 10.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I am sharing my screen for Document J. Mr. Tournier, can you see this document?

A Yes, sir.

Q And at the top there, does it say, "...for the County of Maricopa"?

A Yes, sir.
Q And there on the left-hand side of the
document, does it say -- is that your name --
A Yes, sir.
Q -- Benjamin V. Tournier?
A Yes.
Q And is that case number, the last five digits
of it, 10683? Did I read that correctly?
A Yes, sir.
Q And this document states that it's a Plea Agreement, correct?

A Yes.
Q And this document was retrieved, once again, directly from the Míaricopa County Clerk's office by my investigator.

Mr. Tournier, did you plead guilty to a crime in 2000?

A Yes.
Q And was that a guilty plea to possession of drug paraphernalia?

A Yes.
Q Does this document appear to be the Plea
Agreement that you can tell thus far?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
MR. BARKER: Let me back up. Strike
that question.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I need to do this. Mr. Tournier, is that your signature in the middle of the screen there?

A Yes, sir.
Q And is that the -- what's the date that is beside your signature?

A October 4th of 2000 .
Q And are these your initials here on the
left-hand side of the page?
A Yeah.
Q Scrolling back, I'm going to zoom in a little bit here. Is this the Plea Agreement that you signed for your possession of drug paraphernalia?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q You can answer the question, Mr. Tournier.
A Yes.
MR. BARKER: All right. I'm going to stop sharing Document $J$ and then we're going to move on to Document K .

Ms. Porter, if we could mark that as the next-numbered exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 11.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q If you'll keep bearing with me, Mr. Tournier, we'll get through all of these documents.

Mr. Tournier, this is another document pulled directly from the Maricopa County Clerk's office by my investigator. Mr. Tournier, does this document say Maricopa County at the top?

A Yes.
Q And this case number here, does it end in 10683?

A Yes.
Q And is that. your name, Benjamin Virgil
Tournier?
A Yes.
Q Is this document entitled, "Plea
Agreement/Change of Plea"?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to scroll down here a little bit. This document states, "The Defendant enters a plea of guilty to the following crime(s): Count 1:

Possession of drug paraphernalia, a Class 6
designated felony..."
Does that accurately depict the crime that you pled guilty to?

A Yes.
MR. BARKER: All right. I'm going to
move away from that document. We're going to look at Document $L$ next.

Ms. Porter, if you would please make that the next-numbered exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 12.)

BY MR. BARKER:
Q We're going through čie same thing here,
Mr. Tournier. Can you see this document?
A Yes.
Q Once again. this document was pulled directly
from the Mariecpa County Clerk's office by my investigator. Does it say Maricopa County at the top there?

A Yes.
Q And is that a case number ending in 10683 there on the left-hand side of this document?

A Yes.
Q Is that your name, Benjamin Virgil Tournier?
A Yes.

Q And is that your date of birth, May 28th, 1969, there?

A Yes.
Q And I want us to look at some stuff in this document. It states here, "Offense: Amended Count 1: Possession of drug paraphernalia, a Class 6 designated felony..."

Does that accurately state the felony that you pled guilty to in this case?

A Yes.
Q Under a section here stated "Reimbursement," it states, "It is ordered that the Defendant shall make and pay reimbursement Chrough the Clerk of the Superior Court of Maricopa County for the reasons stated on the record in the total amount of $\$ 100 . "$

Did you pay that $\$ 100$ ?
A I might have. It's been a long time. This is for drug -- this is probably drug court. Q Do you have any documentation of paying that \$100?

MS. UYEDA: Objection. Lack of foundation. Mr. Tournier has stated that he does not recall whether or not that was paid.

MR. BARKER: Then he can simply answer no if he doesn't have any documentation. No
foundation is needed.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Mr. Tournier, do you have any documentation of paying that $\$ 100$ ?

A No. From that far back I would not.
Q And there's a fine here listed. It says, "It is ordered that the Defendant shall pay a fine to the Clerk of the Superior Court of Maricopa County in the amount of $\$ 750 .$. "

Did you pay that $\$ 750$ ?
A I thought that was waived.
Q Do you have any documentiation stating that that $\$ 750$ was waived?

A No. That was my impression.
Q Do you have any documentation of paying that \$750?

A No.
Q It further states, "that the Defendant pay an assessment in the amount of $\$ 20$ to the Clerk of the Superior Court in Maricopa County as follows," right here in the center of the document.

Did you pay that $\$ 20$ ?
A I can't remember.
Q Do you have any documentation of paying that $\$ 20$ ?

A No
Q that's our last document for the 2000 drug paraphernalia conviction. I want to talk about your conviction from 2001 that you mentioned for forgery.

I'm going to share my screen here. This is, once again, a document pulled directly from the Maricopa County Clerk's office by my investigator.

Mr. Tournier, does that say County of Maricopa at the top of this document?

A Yes.
Q And is this Benjamin Virgil Tournier -- and I know that that may be spellea a little bit weird, but is that your name there on the left?

A Yes.

Q And this is case number, last four digits, 8579, right?

A Yes.
Q And this document states that it's a
Plea Agreement?
A Yes.
Q I'm going to scroll down here. Is that your signature in the middle of the screen?

A Yes.
Q And what's that date beside your signature?

A July 6th of '01.
Q And are those your initials there on the
left-hand side of the page?
A Yes.
Q And this document states that you agree to plead guilty to Count 1, forgery, a Class 4 felony. Does that accurately describe your plea agreement for your --

A Yes.
Q -- felony charge?
A Yes.
Q I'm sorry. Did I speak over you? Go ahead and answer.

A Yes.
BY MR. BARKER:
Q Okay. Now. I want us to look at another document pertaining to that plea.

MR. BARKER: Can we make -- I don't know if I did that, Ms. Porter. Did we make M the next-numbered exhibit?

THE REPORTER: No.
MR. BARKER: Can we go ahead and make that the next-numbered exhibit at this time.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 13.)

MR. BARKER: And then we're looking at Document N next. If we could go ahead, Ms. Porter, and make that one the next-numbered exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 14.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I'm going to share my screen and take a look at this document, Mr. Tournier. There s only one more left after this one.

This one was, once again pulled directly from the Maricopa County Clerk's office by my investigator and is publicly available to anyone. Does this state Marisopa County at the top center of the document, Mr Iournier?

A Yes.
Q And does it have the case number, 8579, here on the left-hand side of the page?

A Yes.
Q And is that your name there, Benjamin Virgil Tournier?

A Yes.
Q I'm going to scroll down in this document a little bit. It says, "The Defendant enters a plea
of guilty to the following crime(s): Offense: Count 1: Forgery, a Class 4 felony."

Does that accurately describe the crime that you pled guilty to?

A Yes.
Q I'm done with that document. Moving on to the last one, the last document that we're looking at here today, Mr. Tournier.

Once again, pulled directly from Maricopa County Clerk's office by my investigator and is publicly available to anyone. Does this document say Maricopa County at the top center of it, Mr. Tournier?

A I don't see no document.
Q Can you see that document there?
A No.
Q I'm not sharing my screen. My apologies.
This is Document $O$ that I'm sharing on my screen.
MR. BARKER: Ms. Porter, if we can make
Document $O$ the next numbered exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 15.)
BY MR. BARKER:
Q I've got it shared up there, Mr. Tournier.
Can you see it?

A Yes, sir.
Q Does that say Maricopa County at the top center?

A Yes, sir.
Q And the case number ending in 8579?
A Yeah.
Q And is that your name, Benjamin Virgil
Tournier?
A Yeah.
Q And is that your date of birth, May 28, 1969?
A Yes.
Q Scrolling down here. Where it says "Offense" here and "Felony Class," and it says, "Count 1: Forgery, Felony Class: 4\% does that accurately represent the crime tinat you pled guilty to?

A Yes.
Q And where it says sentence, 2.5 years, does that accurately describe the sentence that you received as a basis of your guilty plea?

A Yes.
Q All right. I think I'm also done with that document.

Mr. Tournier, are you aware of having to pay any restitution in accordance with your 2001 forgery conviction?

A No
Q Are you aware of having to pay any court
costs in association with your 2001 forgery
conviction?

A No.
Q Okay. Do you have any documentation one way or the other on those?

A No.
MR. BARKER: All right. I think I'm ready to take another break, if we cculd. Would everyone be amenable to that? Let's make it 13 minutes and come back at 11:4.5.

MS. UYEDA: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. BARKEit: All right. Ms. Porter,
let's go off the record and come back at 11:45.
(Fecess observed.)
MR. BARKER: At this time, we have no
further questions for Mr. Tournier and pass the witness.

EXAMINATION
QUESTIONS BY MS. UYEDA:
Q Mr. Tournier, I'd like to ask a few questions. So, going back a little bit to earlier
in the deposition, you stated that you saw an ad on Facebook about voting rights restoration; is that correct?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And before you saw that ad, did you think you were not going to be able to vote again?

A Yes.
Q when you saw the ad.

A I turned my life around, you know, when I got out in 2003, became a Christian, put God above all things. So, I thought, maybe it's God opening a door to be a blessing to give me a normal -- back to as close of a normal life as I could possibly earn. Q And you responied to the Facebook ad?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And the individual who responded offered to help you with your voting rights restoration?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And you told them you had felony convictions
in Arizona; is that correct?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q Did they offer to help you with your felony convictions in Arizona?

A Yes, ma'am. I told them I couldn't afford to
do it on my -- I couldn't afford to do any of this, and they told me that they'd help me with all of that as well.

Q Okay. Did they offer to reach out to Arizona officials on your behalf about voting rights restoration?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And did you authorize them to do so?
A Yes, ma'am.
Q You stated earlier that you also went to the Madison County probations office; is that correct?

A Yes, ma'am. They weren't very helpful.
Q Okay. You spoke to čhe, you said,
receptionist at the Madison County probations office?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And colld you walk us through again what happened when you asked her -- when you spoke with her.

A I told her that the person who was helping me with my voting rights told me to come down here and fill out a paper requesting my voting rights back and I needed to see somebody that would fill the paper out with me. And she handed me a paper and told me to fill the top portion out and give it back
to her and she'd direct it to where it needed to go. Q Okay. She instructed you to fill out the top portion of the paper?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And did you fill out the top portion of the paper?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q What happened after you did so?
A I gave it back to her and she said somebody would be contacting me and then I never heard anything back.

Q Did she tell you who she would be giving the Certificate of Restoration form to or do you remember?

A I thought she said she would give it to one of the probation or parole officers, but I don't remember, to be honest.

Q Have you heard from Madison County probations again?

A No, never.
Q Mr. Tournier, what would the restoration of your voting rights mean to you?

A It means that -- it would be the next step to having me back on track to being a normal person again.

MS. UYEDA: With that, we have no further questions. Thank you, Mr. Tournier and Zachary, for your time.

MR. BARKER: Nothing further from us, too. I think we're done.

THE REPORTER: Attorneys, same orders as the previous two days?

MR. BARKER: Yes, same as the previous two days.

MS. UYEDA: Yes, please.
FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT
(Proceedings concluded 12:00 p.m. CST.)
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TN CONF OF THE NATL ASSOC FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

## VS

LEE, et al.

## LEOLA SCOTT

May 23, 2023


Jerri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, CLR, LCR
Chattanooga (423)266-2332 Jackson (731)425-1222
Knoxville (865)329-9919 Nashville (615)595-0073 Memphis (901)522-4477

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION 

TENNESSEE CONFERENCE OF
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,
vs.
Case No. 3:20-Cv-01039
Judge Camples 11
Magistrate Judge Frensley
WILLIAM LEE, et al.,
Defendants.

Videoconference Deposition of:
LECLA SCOTT
Taken on behalf of the Defendants May 23, 2023

Commencing at 9:00 a.m. CST

Elite-Brentwood Reporting Services www.elitereportingservices.com Jerri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, LCR

555 Marriott Drive
Nashville, Tennessee 37214
(615)595-0073

For the Plaintiffs:
DANIELLE LANG
ELLEN BOETTCHER
BLAIR BOWIE
KATE UYEDA
Attorneys at Law
Campaign Legal Center
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 400 Washington, DC• 20005 (202)736-2200
dlang@campaignlegalcenter.org eboettcher@campaignlegalcenter.org bbowie@campaignlegalcenǐer.org kuyeda@campaignlegalcenter.org

For the Defendants:
PABLO VARELA
ZACHARY L. EARKER
Attorneys at Law
Assistant Attorney General
Public Interest Division
Offié of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 20207

Nashville, TN• 37202-0207
(615)532-4098
zachary.barker@ag.tn.gov pablo.varelo@ag.tn.gov
$\mathbf{I} \quad \mathbf{N} \quad \mathbf{D} \quad \mathbf{X}$

Examination
By Mr. Varela
Examination
By Ms. Lang
Examination
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { By Mr. Varela } & 92\end{array}$

## Page

Exhibit No. 1
10
Leola Scott Notice cF Deposition
Exhibit No. 2
First Amended Complaint for
Declaratory and Injunctive Relief
Exhibit No. 3
Tennessee Code Annotated 40-29-203
Certificate of Voter Rights Restoration;
Voter Registration Card
Exhibit No. 4
Blank Certificate of
Restoration of Voting Rights
for Persons Convicted of a Felony
on or after May 18, 1981
Exhibit No. 5
Leola Armstrong, Evading Arrest Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights Bates PL000087
$\begin{array}{llllllll}\mathbf{E} & \mathbf{X} & \mathbf{H} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{B} & \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{T} & \mathbf{S}\end{array}$ (Continued)
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Exhibit No. 6
Leola Armstrong Possession of Schedule II Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights Bates PL000089

Exhibit No. 7
Leola Armstrong
Fraudulent Use of Credit Card
Certificate of Restoration
of Voting Rights
Bates PL000088
Exhibit NO. 8
6/29/22 Dyer Circuit Court Cost Bill
Case Number 23CCI-1991-CR-4?
Bates PL000091
Exhibit No. 9
6/29/22 Dyer Circuit Court Cost Bill
Case Number 23CCI-1.391-CR-32
Bates PL000090
Exhibit No. 10
5/18/23 Dyer Circuit Court
Party Detail for
Leona Armsirrong Jenkins
Exhibit No. 11
5/22/23 Dyer County Voter Registration Records for
Leola Scott
Exhibit No. 12
Tennessee Secretary of State GoVoteTN webpage

$$
\begin{array}{llllllllllll}
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The videoconference deposition of LEOLA SCOTT was taken by counsel for the Defendants, by Notice, with all participants appearing at their respective locations, on May 23 , 2023, for all purposes under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

All formalities as to caption, notice, statement of appearance, et cetera, are waived. All objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved to the hearing, and that said deposition may be read and used in evidence in said cause of action in any Erial thereon or any proceeding herein.

It is agreed that Jerri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, Notary Public and Licensed Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness is not waived.

THE REPORTER: Good morning. My name is Jerri Porter. I am a Tennessee Licensed Reporter, LCR Number 335. Today's date is May 23, 2023, and the time is approximately 9:00 a.m. Central Standard Time.

This is the deposition of Leola Scott in the matter of the Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, et al., versus Lee, et al. Case Number 3:20-cv-01039, in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Iennessee, Nashville Division.

At this time, I will ask counsel to identify yourselves, state whom you represent, and agree on the record that there is no objection to Jerri Porter administering a binding oath to the witness via Zoom.

MR. VARELA: Good morning, Ms. Scott. My name is Pablo Varela. I, along with Zachary Barker, we're attorneys with the AG's office and we represent the defendants. I will be taking the deposition today.

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.

MS. LANG: My name is Danielle Lang. I am counsel for the plaintiffs, working at Campaign Legal Center, and I will be defending this deposition today for Ms. Scott. I have no objection with respect to the oath.

MR. VARELA: No objection by the State either.

MS. BOETTCHER: My name is Ellen
Boettcher and I represent the plaintiffs as well in this case.

> LEOLA SCCTM,
was called as a witness, and after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. VARELA:
Q Good morning, Ms. Scott. As I said before, my name is Pablo Varela. I will be taking your deposition.

Have you ever given a deposition before?
A No, sir.
Q So, we're doing a deposition virtually and just some ground rules for a virtual deposition.

They're kind of a little bit different than a regular deposition where we're face to face.

I'll be asking questions and you'll be providing responses. During the process, I will be referring to documents and showing documents on the screen. Are you at a computer where you can see those documents?

A I'm on an iPad, so I should be able to.
Q Okay. I'm going to be dropping those documents into the chat for this video deposition so that the court reporter can get the documents and also your counsel can see the documents.

A Yes, sir.
Q During the questioning, you may hear your attorney make an objection to the question. That's fine. That means that she is putting that on the record and preserving the objection. But unless she states a reason for you not to answer and instructs you not to answer a question, you are to answer the question. Is that okay?

A Yes, sir.
Q The court reporter, Ms. Jerri, is going to be taking down stenographically what we say, so we need to make sure that $I$ don't talk over your answers and I will try to make sure to do that. And then, if
you would wait until $I$ finish the question before answering it, that will give her the ability to make sure that she's getting everything down correctly on her stenographic notes. Is that okay?

A Yes, sir.
Q The last thing, if you ever need a break during this deposition, just tell me. I'm happy to take as many breaks as you need. The only thing I ask is, if $I$ 'm in the middle of asking a question, that the question be answered before we take a break. Is that okay?

A Yes, sir.
Q I am going to share a document right now. I'll put it in the chat.

Do you see this document on your screen?
A Yes, sir.
Q It says, "Notice of Deposition of Leola Scott."

A Yes, sir.
Q Have you seen this before today?
A Yes, sir.
MR. VARELA: Let's mark that as the first exhibit. I just put it on there early so that we make sure that this video sharing works. / /
（WHEREUPON，a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 1．）
BY MR．VARELA：
Q Let me ask you quickly，Ms．Scott，where are you right now？Are you in an office，are you at home？

A I＇m at home．
Q Is there anybody in the room with you？
A No．
Q Do you have any documents with you？
A Yes．
Q For this deposition，I mean．
A Yes．
Q Okay．What documents are those？
A The court documents from the Notice of
Deposition that what you＇re showing，I have that．
Q Okay．Anything else？
A No，sir．
Q So，when did you first learn about－－that you were going to be giving a deposition in this case？

A I＇m not－－I can＇t say the specific date．It hasn＇t been about－－probably two，two to three weeks ago．I＇m not sure of the date．

Q That＇s okay．I understand．And during that
time, after you learned that you were going to give a deposition, what did you do to get prepared for the deposition?

A I spoke with my attorney.
Q Did you speak with anybody else?
A Just the attorneys on this case.
Q Okay. Did you review the documents that you referred to earlier, the Notice of Deposition?

A Yes. I went over them, went through some of them.

Q Did you review the Complaint or the Amended Complaint in this case?

A The amended?
Q Amended Complaint
A Yes. We went over some of it.
Q Okay. Can you tell the Court where you currently live.

A It's 712 Finley Street, Dyersburg, Tennessee, 38024 .

Q How long have you lived at that address?
A Over -- about 13 years.
Q So, around 2010; is that correct?
A Yes. Yes, sir.
Q And where were you living before that address?

A 1011 Custer, Dyersburg, Tennessee.
Q
A Yes, sir.
Q How long did you live at that address?
A Oh, that's my family's home, my father. I grew up there.

Q Oh, okay. So, much further back than 2000 or even 1990 or before.

Are you currently married?
A Yes, sir, I am.
Q Is this your first marriage, second marriage?
A Third.
Q Third marriage, sorry. Do you have any
children from prior marriages?
A Yes.
Q Are there $\ldots$ I know this is rare, but do you know if you have any child support obligations for those children?

A No.
Q Do they live with you?
A I only have -- I'm 56. I only have one minor child.

Q Okay. So, currently -- let's talk about your employment right now. Where are you employed currently?

A I'm employed at Rough Country.
Q Wealth country?
A Rough.
Q Rough Country?
A Rough Country.
Q What do you do for Rough Country?
A Operator of a brake press.
Q
A
Over a year.

0

Rough Country, where were you employed?
A I was in food safety at Pictsweet in Bells,
Tennessee.
Q For how long?
A Probably about three years, two or three
years. I took a leave of absence. My husband was going through a medical condition, so I took a medical leave.

Q From that food safety position?
A Yes.
Q Prior to that position -- if I understand correctly, that was, you said, three or four years?

A Uh-huh.
Q So, did you start that position around

A In there, I think.
Q you employed?

A I was a housewife.
Q Did you ever work --
A My husband --
(Overlapping speech.)
Q
A Yes. I worked different places before that, but as of 2020 -- in 2010, my husband didn't want me to work.

Q Okay. Although -- just as an aside, and I think you can agree, and you can correct me, but being home is still very much a lot of work, correct?

A Very much.
Q So, prior to that, prior to you working at home instead of outside the home, were you -- where were you employed before that?

A Before then I worked at Firestone. I just did different jobs here and there. Firestone and then I did home health as well.

Q Do you know how much time you worked at those jobs?

A Different amount. I did home health where I
sit with -- I did that all the time, but the factory, I worked at different factories here and there. Rough Country, Worldcolor.
Q Okay.

A Then my husband has always -- I guess that was three husbands, though. Most of the time I stayed home to take care of the kids.

Q Okay. And that is, indeed, a job in and of itself, I understand.

A Yeah, it is.
Q So, turning kind of to this lawsuit, are you a member of the NAACP, the Tennessee chapter?

A Yes, I am.
Q And when did you become a member?
A 2021 .
Q 2021?
A 2021/2022.
Q How does one become a member of the NAACP?
A What do you mean, how do you become a member?
Q Yeah. Do you have to like register or fill
out a form or just what? I don't know.
A It's an application, but we talk with you and if you want to be a part of the organization, then you submit a -- you know, paperwork, basically. Q Are there any particular requirements other
than $I$ just want to be a member?
A No, there's really not.
Q You said you fill out paperwork. Do you have to pay like a fee or a registration fee or --

A Yes, you have to pay a fee. A fee, and then you submit that.

Q Okay.
A You submit the form with the fee.
Q Okay. So, turning to the First Amended Complaint in this case, how did you come to be a plaintiff in this lawsuit?

MS. LANG: Objection to the extent it calls for any communications with counsel.

So, Ms. Scot+, you can answer, but please be sure not to disclose any of your conversations with the lawyers in this case.

THE WITNESS: So, the question was how did I become a part?

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Of the lawsuit, yes, ma'am.
A Well, I was -- I went to get my voter's rights after the death of my son and I was -- when I went to the courthouse to do the paperwork, I found out that there was other things going on so that I wasn't able to get my voter's rights.

Q Okay. And how did it -- from that point where you found out you couldn't get your voter's rights, how did you -- what transpired or what happened to the point where you're now a named party in this lawsuit?

MS. LANG: Same objection to the extent it calls for communications with lawyers.

Ms. Scott, you can answer any part of that question that doesn't require you to share communications with your attorneys.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q I just want to clarify that with your
attorney, Ms. Scott, that yoúre not -- I'm not asking you to tell me like what was discussed in a conversation with your lawyers, like the substance, but I believe that I'm entitled to know whether there was a conversation and that after that you became a party to this lawsuit.

A Well, first of all, in the process of me getting my voter's rights back, when I found out that I wasn't able to, I spoke with the president of NAACP concerning that and basically that's when I kind of found out that, you know, this was going on, that, you know, different things were taking place that $I$ wasn't aware of.

I went to the courthouse and spoke with different -- the circuit court clerk and different ones, trying to get my -- you know, being able to vote and I wasn't able to. So, the president of the NAACP, I spoke with her as well.

Q And who was that?
A Ms. Tiffany Boyd.
Q Did Ms. Boyd ask you to join the lawsuit?
A Did she ask me to join it?
Q Yes. To be a party to the lawsuit.
A No, I wouldn't say she asked me to join it, no. She --

Q Did you -- I'm sorry. Go ahead.
A No. We discussed how the steps that she went through on getting het voter's -- you know, because she was having to go through the same thing, the process. She didn't ask me to join it at all, but I was wanting to get my voter's -- I'm yet trying to get my voter's rights.

Q So, when you found out that this lawsuit was going on about voter's rights process, did you ask to be a party to the lawsuit?

A Well, basically -- well, the first I heard of it was through the president of the NAACP and I said I would be willing because $I$ wanted to get my
voter's rights back. So, the first I ever heard was through her.

Q So, correct me if I'm wrong, I understand you to be saying that when you heard about it, you told the president of the NAACP that you would be willing to be a party to the lawsuit. Is that right?

A Yes. Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Thank you.
First of all, do you see the document that
I've shared?
A Yes, sir. Wait. Is this a different one?
Q This is the First Amended Complaint for
Declaratory and Injunctive Relief.
A Yes, I see it.
Q Do you have a copy of that with you, in front of you?

A Yes, sir.
MR. VARELA: I'm going to mark that as the next exhibit in the case, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 2.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q In your own words, Ms. Scott, if you would, please tell me, what is this lawsuit about?

A It's helping minorities to be -- I feel that

I made mistakes in my past and I paid for my mistakes. I don't think that the mistakes of your past should carry on. It's been over 20-plus years and I'm yet not able to vote.

And I feel that -- I think that's -- whereas, if you make a mistake and you pay for that mistake and you're yet paying for it throughout your life. And I don't think that's right. Because once we pay for our mistakes, we shouldn't have to carry that continuing on. It's basically like we re still guilty of the mistakes we made in our past. Q Okay. Anything else?

A Not at this time. Scniething may come up, but not at this time. I'll keep that open. Q Just for your knowledge, if you answer a question that I've asked and you think of more information that you want to add to your answer later on, just let me know.

A Okay.
Q And one of the ground rules that I guess I didn't go over, if $I$ don't ask a question -- or if $I$ ask a question that doesn't make a lot of sense to you or it's complicated or $I$ ask a really bad question, which $I$ do all the time, just let me know. Ask me to rephrase it or clarify it, something, and

I'll try to do that for you. Okay?
A Okay. Thank you.
Q And if you -- if it's okay -- if I ask a question and you answer it, it's okay to assume that you understood the question.

A Okay.
Q Is that fair?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. So, in the Complaint, you are making certain claims about just you, Leola Scott. In your own words, how are you harmed by the process for getting your voting rights back in Tennessee? You personally.

A Could you say --
(Overlapping speech.)
MS. I AivG: Objection.
ME. VARELA: Go ahead, Danielle.
MS. LANG: I was going to make an
objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, but you can repeat the question, Mr. Varela.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, in this Complaint, you are making certain claims about yourself. My question is, how are you -- how have you been injured by the process
to get your voting rights back in Tennessee?
A Is it okay? The attorney said something. Q Yes, ma'am. She made an objection on the record. You can still answer.

A Okay. Well, when I -- the process when I went, I paid off all of my fines. I was placed on a -- it was an in-house -- I call it an in-house. It's where -- it was called Community Corrections. So, I never had to take any funds to the courthouse. I paid everything off and I was released off of my probation successfully.

So, after 20-plus years, when I go to get my -- to get everything -- when I found out we could go and get our votes reinstated, you know, our rights to vote, when got to the courthouse -well, let me back up.

I went io the state probation office and they signed off on everything, basically. When $I$ got to the courthouse, I was told I owed money. I didn't owe any money because $I$ paid everything off.

And I have to say, Judge Moore, he's the circuit court judge, and at the time it was Phil Bivens, he was a district attorney, they didn't play. You know, no disrespect. They were officers of the court. And when we went there, we -- you
know, they were a big court.
So, I paid everything off. I never had anything saying for nonpayment. I successfully completed everything. And then to get -- when I go to the courthouse and find out that no funds was turned in to the courthouse, basically, they told me that I owed them money.

So, after I got to the courthouse, I went to the city court clerk and asked them to pull up -because I said, now -- at that moment, I felt like, so, has any money I've been paying being turned in? So, basically, I went to the city court clerk and asked them to pull up everyching. Everything there was paid because I took the money there. But I've never had to take anyching to the big courthouse. I've always had to take it to the probation people. That's when $I$ found out that nothing was turned in.

When I went to the Community Corrections offices, they told me that they didn't keep paperwork except for five years. So, I said, have y'all -- you're officers of the court and you're telling me that you have no paperwork concerning when I was on your -- you know, that's a problem.

Because it's like they asked me, did I have receipts. So, my question was to them, do y'all
have receipts, because $I$ was successfully released off of all of my probation. But basically nothing was turned in to the courthouse.

Q So, if I hear you correctly, your injury in this case is that you believe you've paid all your court costs and restitution and you've completed all your supervision for --

A No, I did. Not believe. I did. Yeah, I did.

Q And that for some reason they're saying at the courthouse that you still owe costs or fees or fines related to your felonies; is that correct? A Yes, sir.

MS. LANG: Chjection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion about what a legal injury is.

MF. VARELA: Okay. I wasn't asking -- I was just trying to express what she just told me and reiterate it. I wasn't asking her that, but I understand. Thank you, Danielle.

THE WITNESS: I was saying, basically, everything that when I asked -- so, I asked for copies of all of my cases. There's nothing -excuse me.
It's as if I was on these -- I was -- I
have cases and nothing was paid on them. I have no way of proving that. But like I told the clerk, if you -- if I'm placed on probation -- you're a district attorney, correct?

BY MR. VARELA:
Q I'm an attorney general.
A Well, it's in the same --
Q They're different.
A They're different?
Q Very much so.
Let me just back up a second. Let's talk about -- let's go a little bit more systematically through some of this. I think it's in the Complaint, so we'll go through it in the Complaint if that's okay.

A Okay.
Q I just scrolled to Page 16 of the First Amended Complaint in this case. Do you see that on your screen?

A Yes, sir, I see it. Forty-four.
Q Paragraph 44 is there on the screen?
A Yes, sir.
Q In Paragraph 44, you basically state that you're a resident of Dyer County. That's correct, right?

A Yes, sir.
Q
And that you are the Civic Engagement Chair for the Dyersburg Chapter of the Tennessee NAACP; is that right?

A Yes, sir.
Q What is that -- what does a civic engagement chair do at the NAACP? I'm just curious.

A I deal with more of hands on with the community, different issues that come up in our community, and bring awareness to it, basically. So, I get out -- you know, in the community when different things are happening, I'm normally the one that deals with a lot of the youth, different things and issues that goes on. And if they have issues, then they'll bring it to me and I'll take it to the committee and we'11 discuss it.

Q Is this a paid position with the NAACP or a volunteer position?

A It's not paid. It's volunteer.
Q Okay. In the Complaint you also indicate that you help NAACP members and constituents in attempting to restore their voting rights. Is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q When you say constituents, what does that
mean?
A When I say constituents?
Q
In the Complaint, that you "help NAACP members and constituents," who is constituents?

MS. LANG: Objection. Ms. Scott did not draft the language in the Complaint, but you're free to ask her what she thinks that that term might mean.

MR. VARELA: Okay.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, the Complaint states that you help NAACP members and constituents attempt -- in their attempts to restore their vo亡ing rights.

My question is --I understand what NAACP members means, but what does constituents mean in that paragraph?

A Well, I can only tell you what -- my work in helping. Basically, when my little son passed, I got out and made sure -- you know, I'd set up booths and help the youth and young or old that was trying to vote and didn't know.

You have a lot of people now that they really don't even think about voting. So, during this time, I got out and showed them how to -- the paperwork to submit. I went to the courthouse and
got the -- I'm sorry. I'm getting confused with the words.

I'm trying to say the paperwork to submit to vote. So, I made sure that different ones, you know, did what they needed to so they could vote. Even though I couldn't vote, I continued to make sure that others could and showed them the steps they need to take in order to vote. Q Okay. So, correct me if I'm wrong, but my understanding of what this phrase constituents means is that these are people who are not NAACP members that you are also trying to help get their rights restored; is that right?

A Correct.
Q Okay. So, it's anybody that might need help getting their rights restored?

A Getting their rights restored, as well as just the process of voting.

Q Okay.
A So, basically, $I$ also -- it wasn't just -- I wasn't focusing on the people that couldn't vote. I was helping people that could vote who didn't vote as well.

Q Okay. So, that's basically what the civic engagement chair position is at the NAACP that you
do right now?
A Some. I mean, that's part of it as well. Q Part of it. And how long would you say that you've been in that position?

A Not even a year.
Q Not even a year. In the time that you've been in that position, how many people would you estimate that you've helped restore their voting rights?

A I'm sure over 50 or more. Not restore. No, no, excuse me. Hold on just a moment. That was the school calling. I'm sorry.

Not restore their rights. Just the application to vote. Now, as far as -- do you understand what I'm saying?

Q Let me repeat back to you what I think you said and you can tell me if I'm right.

But before I do that, you said you had a phone call from the school. Do you need to take that? Do we need to take a break?

A If you don't mind.
Q Not at all.
MS. LANG: Thank you.
(Recess observed.)

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, before the break, I had asked you about how many people you estimated you helped get their voting rights restored. I think what you were telling me, and correct me if I'm wrong, that you've assisted about 50 or more people in the process by helping them with the paperwork. Is that correct? A Well, being able to vote. A lot of the young individuals that $I$ helped out, they could vote anyway, they just hadn't applied. Sc. I got out and made sure that a lot of the younger generations, as well as middle aged, that they knew the process on filing the necessary paperwork in time to vote for our local election and to get them -- you know, to let them know. Because, you know, they were young and a lot of them aidn't even know what to do. And then a lot of people that -- after that, realized that maybe they owed fines and maybe was in the same boat that $I$ was in and wasn't aware of it. Q And -- okay. So, based on the paragraph in the Complaint that we're looking at right now and this particular sentence, as the civic engagement chair for the Dyersburg Chapter of the NAACP, how many individuals would you say you've helped or attempted to help to restore their voting rights who
have lost them because of a felony?
A Well, see, when you say the civic engagement chair, okay, the civic engagement chair, it deals with -- what $I$ do, it deals with more than just the voting aspect. It deals with different issues going on in our community as well.

Q Okay.
A It doesn't have anything to do with the voting part.

Q Let me rephrase that.
A Yes.
Q Since you've been volunteering with the NAACP, how many people, individuals, would you say you've helped or attempted to help to restore their voting rights?

A Restoring I don't want to say a number and I'm not compleiely sure of that number because -(Overlapping speech.)

Q Would it --
A You keep saying to help their voting rights back and a lot of people that I've helped they wasn't -- they had no felonies, so they could vote anyway.

Q Have you helped anyone who did have a felony that didn't have their right to vote?

A Okay. I gave them the proper information. And then Goodman, he -- there's a district attorney in our community, Goodman, he offered a workshop and they went from there.

Q So, of those people that you gave the paperwork to, or you helped, you know, connect them with the right paperwork to help get their rights restored, how many people would that be, roughly? I mean, is it more than ten, more than 100 , more than 1,000?

A More than ten. I'm going to say 100. More than ten.

Q So, between ten and 100 , somewhere in there?
A I'm not going to say 100 , now. Between ten -- yeah, I'm not going to say 100 because a lot of the ones I deal with, they didn't have felonies. Q I'm only asking about those who did have felonies.

A Pardon?
Q
I'm only asking you about people who came -who had felonies and did not have their rights to vote restored, how many of those people would you say you helped them somewhere, anywhere along the process, either just by giving them paperwork or pointing them in the right direction?

A Well, I probably can't answer that question. Ms. Tiffany Boyd would probably answer that better than I can because after -- she would be the one that really -- I would find someone and then $I$ would direct them to her, basically, because she knew the steps and the more in and out than what I did. Q All right. Well, of those people that you maybe found that were in that position, just like you, and you directed them to Ms. Boyd, do you know if any of those people, that you heard, actually got their rights back?

A I'm not sure completely. I don't want to tell you an answer. I don'ci want to say yes and I'm not sure because when that time -- see, I'm not only civic engagement, $I$ also deal with PADD, you know, the Prevention Alliance of Dyersburg and Dyer County. I was also dealing with that with the overdose in our community. So, a lot of other things was going on as well.

Q Okay.
A So, I directed -- when I found someone, I sent them to Ms. Boyd.

Q Okay. Do you know any of the other named plaintiffs in this lawsuit?

A Do I know them?

Yes.
A No.
Q Have you ever met them?
A No.
Q Even in the process of being the civic engagement chair where you're helping people to restore their voting rights, you've never met Benjamin Tournier, Curtis Gray, John Weare, Lamar Perry, Amanda Martin, or Reginald Hendrix?

MS. LANG: Objection. Asked and answered.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Is that a no?
MS. LANG: You may answer, Ms. Scott. THE WITNSSS: No, sir.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Okay. What is your understanding about the process to restore somebody's rights if they lost them due to a felony?

MS. LANG: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, but Ms. Scott, you can answer as to your understanding of the process.

THE WITNESS: Well, basically, the process that -- I just assumed it was a simple process. Once you completed your probations,
successfully completed everything, paid everything, I was told that once the probation, state probation signed off on everything, you would take it to the courthouse and then they would sign off on it and we would take it to the next building. Now, that's what I was told, but $I$ was stopped at the courthouse.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Okay. You said several things in there that you were told that you take something.

A No. I was told that I would -- I would go to the state probation office and they would sign off that I received the paperworn -- I don't know the name of the formal whatever. It's the Certificate of Restoration.

Q Okay.
A So, I vould take that and probation would sign off stating that we successfully completed everything. And I did that. And after I left the probation office, they said take that to the courthouse and they would notarize it. And then I would take it to the voting -- the office where we go get the voting.

That's the steps they said was completely simple. It wasn't tedious, you know, everything
would just work out just fine. Once you complete everything, it wouldn't be a problem. Basically, yeah.

Q Okay. So, is it fair to say that the first step in the process, as you understand it, is that you need to get this Certificate of Restoration of Rights?

A Yes. That was my first step, was getting the form for the Certificate of Restoration filled out with your felony.

And they also said that we could get everything expunged from your record as well, you know, your felony would be expunged. I was told that one of them could be expunged, but at that moment, I said expuncying that still didn't give me the right to vote.

Q Let me share another document with you, Ms. Scott. Do you see that document on your screen entitled T.C.A. 40-29-203?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that is -- that's a Tennessee Code
Annotated section, Tennessee laws, and it says -it's entitled, "Certificate of voter rights restoration; voter registration card." Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q And then Part (a) of that code section says, "A person eligible to apply for a voter registration card and have the right of suffrage restored, pursuant to Tennessee Code Annotated 40-29-202, may request, and then shall be issued, a certificate of voting rights restoration upon a form prescribed by the coordinator of elections."

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes, sir.
Q And that's the Certificate of Restoration you were just talking about; is that right?

A Yes.
MS. LANG: Cbjection. Calls for a legal conclusion.

MR. VArELA: Let's make that the next exhibit in the deposition, please. Let me drop it in the chat.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 3.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, I'm sharing a new document with you entitled, "Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights." Do you see that on your screen?

A Yes, sir.

Q And this is a blank copy; is that correct?
A Yes, sir.
Q Have you seen one of these before?
A Yes, sir.
Q In the gray box at the top it states that it's "to be completed by an agent of the pardoning authority, an agent or officer of the incarcerating authority, or a probation/parole officer or agent of the supervising authority."

Do you see that?
A Yes, sir.
Q And the next sentence reads, "A separate form must be completed for each félony conviction with a different docket/case number."

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes, sir.
Q Did you receive any certificates of restoration of rights from your probation or parole or supervising authority?

MS. LANG: Objection. Form.
You can answer.
THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q How many of these did you receive?
A The forms? Three.

Now, you see on this form that there are numbered sections, 1, 2, 3, and 4 on this page? Let me reduce that and make it smaller. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir. The 1, 2, 3, and 4?
Q Yes, ma'am.
A Yes, sir.
Q This Part 1 is your identifying information, correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that would have the type of felony conviction and the year of the conviction and then your date of birth and Social Security number on it?

A Yes, sir.
Q Do you see Section 2?
A Yes, sir.
Q Can you read that section to yourself and let
me know when you're finished?
A Section 2?
Q Yes, ma'am.
A (Reviewing document.) Yes, sir.
Q Is it fair to say that Section 2 deals with the completion of a sentence, whether or not someone completed their sentence or supervision?

A Excuse me? Could you repeat that?

Q I said, is it fair to say that Section 2 is dealing with completion of a sentence or probation?
A The completion?
Q Correct.

A Yes.
Q Whether or not someone completed it is indicated in this section, right?

A Yes.
Q Do you know how parole or probation verifies if you've completed a sentence?

MS. LANG: Objection. Lack of foundation.

You can answer if you know, Ms. Scott. THE WITNESS: When $I$ was on the probation, once I pajía everything off, I was released. So, wher I completed -- I was on Community Corrections, and when I completed it and paid everything, $I$ was released off of it successfully.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Okay. I understand that. My question was, that information about your sentence and that you completed it or not, is it your understanding that the parole office has to verify that you've completed your sentence?

MS. LANG: Objection. Calls for legal conclusion, lack of foundation.

You can answer if you understand or know, Ms. Scott.

THE WITNESS: You were saying parole, and that's where the problem lies, because we were placed on -- to me it's like an in-house probation. I wasn't placed on parole. I was on Community Corrections. BY MR. VARELA: Q Okay.

A So, I'm kind of, you knovt... Q Let me clarify it. I understand.

Who did you ask for the certificate of restoration of rights when you got your three certificates?

A I was told to go to Darrell McElrath. He works for the state probation office. I wasn't required to go to the Westate Community Corrections in which I was -- that's who I reported to. I never reported to the state probation office.

Q Okay. So, did you, in fact, go to the probation office to request your certificate of voter rights?

A Did I go to the probation office or the state
probation office?
Q My question is, how did you get your
certificates? Who did you ask to get them?
A The Certificate of Restoration?
Q Yes, ma'am.
A The state probation.
Q Did you yourself go to the state probation
office to request them?
A Yes.
Q Did anybody go with you --
(Overlapping speech.)
A I called -- I'm sorry.
Q
Did anybody go along with you when you made that request for your Certificate of Restoration of Voter Rights?

A No. I called Mr. Gary McElrath and he told me to come out there.

Q Okay. And did you go out there?
A Yes, sir.
Q And did you go by yourself, then?
A Yes, sir. See, Mr. McElrath, he worked at Westate probation before he went to the state probation office. Now he works for the state parole and probation office, but prior to that, he worked at Westate Corrections.

Q Okay.
A So, I knew him through there, so I called him for information.

Q And he told you to go out to the probation
out and make the request for the certificate of restoration of rights and you did that.

A Yes, he told me to -- yes, sir.
Q And part of that process, is it your
understanding, that they have to fill out Section 2 on this form?

A Yes, sir.
Q And is it your understanding that they have to verify that information cefore they sign it?

A Yes, sir.
Q Can you read Section 3 for me and let me know when you're done,

A (Reviering document.) I'm through. Yes, sir.

Q Is it fair to say that Section 3 deals with court-ordered restitution?

A Yes.
Q This is another section that the parole office would have to fill out for each court, correct?

A Yes, sir.

Q And it's also your understanding that they
would have to verify whether or not you had
restitution first, right?
A Yes, sir.
MS. LANG: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q And then they would have to verify that that restitution had been paid off, correct?

MS. LANG: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
You can answer to the best of your understanding, Ms. Scott.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Do you need me to repeat the question, Ms. Scott?

A Yes.
Q Okay. Do you remember in Section 2 we talked about -- I asked you, is it your understanding that they have to verify information about your sentence and that you completed it, and you said yes, you understood that.

The same thing is true about Section 3, correct? The probation office would have to verify that information before they signed off that you had
completed it, correct?
A
Yes.
MS. LANG: Same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Can you read Section 4 for me and let me know when you're finished.

A (Reviewing document.) I'm done.
Q Is it fair to say that Section 4 is
addressing the issue of court costs and court-ordered costs assessed against someone in a case?

A Repeat that.
Q Is it fair to say that Section 4 is dealing with court costs and whether or not they've been issued and paid off?

A Well, okay, when you -- that question, but when you go up to the court costs and restitution, okay, Number 3 and 4 kind of intertwine, if you ask me. You know, it says the court costs and then the restitution.

So, yes, I guess. Because that was one of my questions because they would check $a \operatorname{box}$ and then -so I'm kind of confused. That was part of my -with me, it was just, yeah, it was kind of... Q So, what you're saying is that like you are
of the opinion or the thought that court costs and restitution are the same thing?

MS. LANG: Objection. Misstates the testimony.

THE WITNESS: No. I know the
difference.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Okay. And when you read Section 3, there's no reference to court costs in Section 3: is that correct?

A Section 3 was relating to restitution.
Q And Section 4 relates to court costs; is that correct?

A Court costs, correct.
Q And the probation office would have to verify that information t. correct?

MS. LANG: Objection. Calls for
speculation, lack of foundation.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q On the back of the form, there are instructions. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q And at the bottom there's a notice. Do you see the notice at the bottom?

A Yes, sir, I see the notice.
And that notice reads, "A person is not eligible to apply for a voter registration card and have their voting rights restored unless the person is current in all child support obligations. Before restoring the voting rights of an applicant, the Coordinator of Elections will verify with the Department of Human Services that the applicant does not have any outstanding child support payments or arrearages."

Did I read that correctly?
A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Now, after you received your Certificate of Restoration, or your three Certificates of Restoration, what did you do with those?

A I took them to the courthouse.
Q For what purpose?
A I was told to take it to the courthouse. When I left Darrell, the state probation, he filled out, I guess, the 1 and 2, and then the courthouse did the bottom as far as the 3 and 4.

Q So, you took the COR that were issued to you with verification that you completed your sentence in the top, Section 2, and you took it to the
courthouse for them to verify that you've paid off restitution and paid off your court costs; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q And when you went to the courthouse to do that, what happened?

A That's when $I$ was informed that nothing that I paid to the Community Corrections was turned in to the courthouse.

Q Okay. Let me ask you about that a little bit. When you would make payments, you would submit them to Community Corrections?

A Yeah. That was the rame of it at that time. It's now Westate Corrections now.

Q Okay. Is that a physical place you would take -- you would actually take money to?

A Yes. That was our probation office.
Q Okay. When you did that, did you typically take cash or check, cashier's check? How would you make those payments?

A Cash.
Q And when you gave the cash to the officer there at the Community Corrections, what did they -did they issue you a receipt?

A Yes, sir.

Q Did you keep those receipts?
A During the time, yes.
Q
Do you have access to them now?
A No. That was over 20 years ago, so, you
know.
Q I understand.

A
me to keep it. I'm sure they did what they were
supposed to --
(Overlapping speech.)
Q Now let's talk about -- I'm sorry.
You said that was about 20 years ago. Would that be related to the 2004 felony conviction that you described in your Complaint? Let me share that again.

A $\quad 2004$ ?
Q Let's go back to the First Amended Complaint.
Do you see that on your screen, Ms. Scott? I'm going to highlight a section of Paragraph 44 again. It says, "In 1992, Plaintiff Scott was convicted of fraudulent use of credit cards and drug possession in Dyer County."

Is that accurate?
A Yes, sir.
Q Is that two separate felony convictions in

1992?
A They were right there. Well, they was two separate, but $I$ was in the court at the same time, if that makes sense. I think $I$ was at the court on both cases around the same time, if I'm not mistaken. It's been so long. Q Do you recall if restitution was ordered in those cases?

A Yes. The credit card, that was with First Citizens National Bank. I remember that. And I remember when $I$ went back to First Citizens -because I have an account with First Citizens as we speak.

At the time when went to the bank to reopen up an account and they told me I owed them, I said no, I don't, I had paid it. And I went to Ms. Gracie Ashford, she was the probation officer at the time, one of the officers in there, and I told her that they said that $I$ owed them. I said, I paid y'all. And then that amount of money was submitted. Q Okay.

A That got paid off.
Q When was that that you reopened the account at First Citizens? About what year?

A Not sure.

Q Was it -- let me ask it a different way. Was it before 2004 or was it after?

A Probably after, because when that happened, I went to her because $I$ wanted to make sure everything with First Citizens was paid and they told me that they hadn't received anything that I owed them. So, I went to the probation, Community Corrections, and let Ms. Gracie Ashford know what was going on, because I was complete. I had paid everything. Then that money was turned in. That's how I have an account with them now.

I'm not sure -- because $I$ have an account with Regions Bank as well, dut I'm not sure. So, I can't even say because I'm not sure when it was opened. But I remember that because I went to the probation and askea about that.

I didn'i even realize -- I didn't even think anything about it. But there was an incident with the Community Corrections with money being basically embezzled within there and I never thought that I was -- you know, was going to be under this umbrella with this agency that money -- one of their employees was -- did not turn money in.

One of the head clerks, circuit court clerk, also as well had said that the process that they
were doing back then, they were just -- after a length amount of time, they would just turn money in to the courthouse. So, basically, we would take our money and turn it in to the probation office, but $I$ don't know how they did it to turn it over to the courthouse.

Then there was one of the ladies, an employee, she got charged for not turning -- you know, taking some of the money. Q Okay. As a result of the 1992 Convictions, did you ever serve any time in incarceration?

A Of the '92?
Q Yes, ma'am.
A 1992?
Q Yes, ma'am.
A No. If I aid, it wasn't much. I can't even recall, but $I$ don't think so. If $I$ did, it wasn't, you know.

Q Okay. The next sentence in the Complaint says that, "In 2004, she was convicted of felony evading arrest also in Dyer County."

Is that accurate?
A Yes.
Q And that was just one conviction, correct?
A Yes.

Q Do you know or recall if restitution was ordered in that case?

A No.
Q Were you -- did you serve any incarceration time for that particular conviction?

A I don't think so. I'm not for sure, though. I'm not for sure. I don't think so. I don't think I -- maybe five days, if that.

Q Okay. And my understanding is that your testimony was that you were in Community Corrections as a result of that conviction, cerrect?

A Yes. Most of -- everything I did, it was Community Corrections. It wäs never what we call, you know, ever being on parole or anything like that.

Q Okay.
A We was placed on Community Corrections, the in-house. I call it in-house probation with the state is where -- a stage before you go to parole, state parole and probation.

Q Okay. And then, not the next sentence, but in the sentence after that, it says, "In 2022," so last year, "she attempted to restore her voting rights by asking a probation officer in Dyer County for a COR."

A COR means Certificate of Restoration. Is that your understanding?

A Yes, sir.
Q Is that -- did I read that correctly?
A What part?
Q The highlighted part. "In 2022, she attempted to restore her voting rights by asking a probation officer in Dyer County for a COR."

A Yes, sir.
Q How much Community Corrections Lime were you given by the Court as a result of that 2004 felony conviction?

A In 2004? It couldn'c have been but two years, if it was -- $T$ m assuming maybe two years, because you only -- 1129 is a misdemeanor. So, it had either been a year or two years. I never had anything over that. Q Okay. So, is it accurate to say that after your conviction in 2004, about two years or so later you had completed your supervision?

A Yes. For sure. Yes, sir.
Q Okay. So, between 2006 and 2022, you never attempted to get your voting rights restored?

A No.
Q Can you tell me why?

A I just didn't. August 28, 2021, is when my son was killed. Him and four other guys was stabbed by a white guy. The guy -- our district attorney dropped charges within -- it happened that Friday and he was released on that Monday.

And my question to the district attorney was if -- and this guy, he was around a female that he wasn't supposed to be around, and at the time when my son passed, the community was in an uproar. It was bad. I asked the district attorney to allow him -- I said, the community is in an uproar. He violated that protection order being around this female. I said, you can hcla him because our community was in such an uproar. He let him go that Monday.

I just wanted due process of the law. I don't feel that the guy woke up that morning planning on killing my child. That's not what $I$ felt. At that moment, the district attorney to me was embarrassing his office. And that's what caused me to really want to make a difference, if that's makes sense to you.

Q That makes a lot of sense, yes. So, that was the predicating event that lead you to want to get your voting rights?

A Yes, sir.
MR. VARELA: Have we marked that Certificate of Restoration as an exhibit yet?

THE REPORTER: No.
MR. VARELA: I'm going to move that the blank Certificate of Restoration that we discussed earlier be marked as the next exhibit. I believe that's Exhibit 4.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 4.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q I'm going to share another document with you,
Ms. Scott. Ms. Scott, I'm sharing with you -- do you see on your screen a copy of a Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights that's been filled out? A Yes, sir.

Q Is that one of the certificates that were issued to you?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that's related to evading arrest, it says there on felony conviction in Part 1. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
MR. VARELA: I'm going to mark this as the next exhibit, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 5.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, same thing for this next document
I'm showing you. This is another Certificate of
Restoration of Voting Rights that was issued to you; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q And this is related to a 1992 conviction for drug possession; is that right?

A Yes, sir.
MR. VARELA: We'll mark that as the next exhibit, please.
(WHEREUPON, 3 document was marked as

```
Exhibit Number 6.)
```

BY MR. VARELA:
Q And this is the third document I'm showing you here, a third restoration of voting rights form related to the other 1992 conviction for fraudulent use of a credit card; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
MR. VARELA: We'll mark that as the next exhibit. I believe that's Exhibit 7.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 7.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, you testified earlier that when you went to the courthouse to verify Parts 3 and 4 of those CORs, that the court clerk advised you that you had outstanding costs on your conviction; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Ms. Scott, I'm sharing with ycu a document that was provided in discovery in this case. Do you see that in front of you?

MS. LANG: No. like larger desktop here.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Is that showing the document now?
A Yes, sir.
Q I'm sharing with you a document that's been shared or provided in discovery as a cost bill related to Case Number 23CCI-1991-CR-42. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q Okay. Was that provided to you by the court clerk?

A Yes, sir.

Do you know what that case number -- which of the convictions that case number relates to?

A I don't. It would have to be the -honestly, I really don't, because in 1992, that's the one that -- the payment that went to the First Citizens National Bank, they submitted that amount. So, that's the 209. I'm not sure -Q Just a second. My machine is acting up. A That would be the possession of cocaine. Q Okay. And this cost bill that was provided to you indicates that no -- that there was an assessment of total fees and fines assessed against you in that charge for possession of $\$ 2,297$, correct?

A Yes.
Q And that there were no payments made as to that particular cost bill, correct?

A Correct.
MR. VARELA: Let's mark that as the next exhibit, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 8.)
THE WITNESS: That's when I asked the clerk to pull up the court records to show that -because this charge would have had me in big court
with Judge Moore and Phil Bivens. And I told her, I said, you can pull it up and see, but if $I$ hadn't made payments, if $I$ wasn't making payments, they would have had me back in court.

MR. VARELA: Okay. Thank you, Ms. Scott. BY MR. VARELA: Q I'm sharing another document with you. Do you see another cost bill on your screen?

A Yes, sir. That's for the fraudulent use of a credit card. And the amount that fas paid on that was what was turned in to the First Citizens National Bank.

Q I'm going to zoomin a little bit on that. Do you see that this cost bill indicates that for this particular charge there was a total assessment of $\$ 897$ in court costs and a judgment which would be restitution; is that correct?

A Uh-huh. Yes, sir.
Q And do you see that it also indicates that there were payments made for $\$ 804$ on this cost bill? A Uh-huh, yes, sir.

Q Do you see that last column on the -- the first column after "Fees Due Date," says, "Last Paid Date"? Do you see that column?

A Uh-huh.
Q payment was made on March 19, 1992? Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And do you also see that on the last column at the bottom that there's an outstanding balance as to this cost bill of $\$ 93 ?$

A Correct, but if you go back, you'll see that the month and day of the conviction was 4/21/1992. Q Okay.

A So, if that conviction, the year of that conviction -- do you see what I mean, the 3/19? Q That's the date that there was a last payment made, as least as this cost bill indicates is what that says. Is that correct?

A That's what that paper says, yes, sir. MR. VARELA: Let's mark that as the next exhibit, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 9.)

THE WITNESS: I have a question for you. Because you're saying the last payment was made on that date, correct? If you see, all payments were made on that date, correct?

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, I'm not saying anything about the document. I'm just indicating and confirming that that document says what it says.

A I know, but it says that for all of the payments. You said the last date, but every payment on there says $3 / 19$, so I'm kind of confused whatever you're saying, because each one of them say $3 / 19 / 92$. Q Thank you, Ms. Scott. I understand that. I'm not making any comment about that particular document. I'm just asking questiens about what it says and whether or not that was the document that was presented to you.

My understanding is that those two cost bills were the cost bills tinat were given to you by the court clerk; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q Did the clerk also give you a cost bill for the 2004 felony conviction?

A The only other one that I received was the next one and it doesn't have the -- it's dated 6/29. It doesn't really have any dates, so I'm not sure. I'm only assuming that c91-261, that's the only one -- the only other one I received. Q Okay.

A Basically, she said that's what -- those are the two amounts that's owed, the 2,297 and the 93. Q I'm going to share another document with you, Ms. Scott. Do you see the document on your screen entitled, "Dyer Circuit Court Party Detail"?

A Yes, I see it.
Q And do you see the name, the party name is Leola Armstrong Jenkins at the top?

A Yes, sir.
Q Ms. Scott, is that you?
A Yes, sir.
Q Is Armstrong Jenkins your maiden name then?
A Armstrong is my maideñ name. Jenkins was my first husband.

Q Okay. And since 2004 or whenever, your information was put into this particular system that you were married and now your name is Leola Scott; is that correct?

A Yeah. Now my name is Leola Scott, yes. Q And that address that's listed as home address, was that your address at the time in 2004? A Yes. Yes, sir.

Q So, this is related to you. Is that your understanding?

A It's related to me? This is me, yes.

Q Do you see that first section that's highlighted on this document? It has Case Number 23CC1-1991-CR-32. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that's related to the fraudulent use of credit card felony conviction?

A Yes, sir.
Q And do you see that the balance amount
indicated is \$93?
A Yes, sir.
Q And that's the same as what the cost bill
that we were just talking about for this particular charge reflected? Is that right?

A Yes, sir.
Q And then the next one is Case
23CC1-1991-CR-42. Do you see that?
A Yes, sir.
Q And that's related -- it just says "Charge:
Drugs," but that's related to the possession of narcotics charge; is that correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that indicates that there's a balance amount of $\$ 2,297$ on that cost bill; is that right?

A Yes, sir.
Q And that's the same as the cost bill that we
were just talking about; is that correct?
A Correct.
Q So, that's two separate case numbers for two separate convictions and then the costs related to those that are outstanding. Is that your understanding as well?

A Yes, sir.
Q Now, scrolling to Page 2, at the bottom, do you see there's a Case Number 23CC1-2003-CR-424? Do you see that case number?

A Evading arrest, yes, at the oottom.
Q Do you see that it shows that there's a
balance of zero as to that particular cost bill?
A Yes, but if you go -- yes. Go ahead.
Q Do you see that?
A Yes, sir.
Q And it also indicates that the last payment on that cost bill was made on February 2nd, 2004.

A It says a balance of zero.
Q Right there, it says balance zero.
A Uh-huh.
Q And then last pay, February 2nd, 2004. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q So, that indicates that for the evading
arrest felony conviction, there's no balance. That's been paid off, correct?

A There wasn't. Yeah.
Q That's what it's showing on this sheet, correct?

A That's what it's showing, yes, sir.
MR. VARELA: Okay. We'll mark that as the next exhibit, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 10.)
MS. LANG: Pablo, just for the record, I don't think this document has been put in the chat yet. Is that right, Ms. Porter?

MR. VARELA: I'm dropping it right now.
MS. LANG. Okay, great. For the two prior bill costs, were we marking those as exhibit numbers?

MR. VARELA: I didn't have them in the naming of the document.

MS. LANG: But yes.
MR. VARELA: Whatever the court reporter marks it, whatever number is the next number, yes. I'm assuming this one is 10 . Is that correct?

THE REPORTER: Yes.
MS. LANG: Okay. Just wanted to make
sure.
THE WITNESS: Can I ask you a question on that form that you just --

MR. VARELA: Yes, ma'am, you can ask me a question. I don't know if $I$ can answer it because this is a deposition where $I$ ask the questions and you give me the responses. We're trying to find out information from you, but you can make whatever comments or ask whatever questions you would like.

THE WITNESS: Well, it's just that -well, you can't answer it, so neverinind.

MR. VARELA: Do you mind if we take like a ten-minute break?

MS. LANG: Sure. Ten minutes. We'll come back at 11:42 or thereabouts. Thank you, everybody.
(Eecess observed.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, just before the break, we were talking about the cost bills related to your three felony convictions in Dyer County. I believe your testimony was that when you made payments for the 1992 convictions, at least, when you made those payments, receipts were provided to you but you don't have them anymore. Is that correct?

A Correct, because in 1992, during that time I was at 1209, and I had a fire.

Q Okay.
A So, I'm not sure of the year, but I had a fire at my home.

Q Do you have any documents in your possession that would indicate how much you paid towards your court costs and restitution in 1992?

A No, but when you pull up those, each case I had back then -- and I want to state this.

Basically, if you go back to the where it had all of my convictions, whether they were misdemeanors or felonies, the top one was the fraudulent use of a credit card. And you can see there was only -because first is the - the bank had restitution and that was paid to them.

But if you go down, all those other cases, nothing was applied to any of those cases, no money, no funds. It's as if I got charge after charge after charge and was not making a payment. So, I made the payments on all of those cases, but they wasn't applied because $I$ made it to Community Corrections and it wasn't turned in to the courthouse.

So, now what I'm getting is that I have to
repay everything that $I$ honored. I paid my debt to society. And because I paid it to Community Corrections and whatever happened in their division and they didn't do what they was supposed to do, now it's penalizing me. And now it's like I have to prove what I did, but they don't have to prove what they did wrong. And then when I ask them, they don't have any paperwork as well. So, if you were of the court, you should have those records.

Q Okay. Let me reshare the First Amended Complaint. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q I believe what you're talking about right now is this last sentence on Page 16 where it says, "Plaintiff Scott believes that the summation of LFOs," which stanct for legal financial obligations, "is in error and that payments she made to her community supervision officer were not properly accounted for."

That's what you're describing right now, correct?

A Yes, sir.
Q You also state right after, "If there were an appeal process, Plaintiff Scott would appeal." Correct?

A Yes.
Q Is that what it says?
A If I would appeal the -- that I paid, yes, I would appeal that because I paid that.

Q Is that what you're talking about in this sentence or is that what that sentence means to you, that if there was an appeals process for the court costs not being properly accounted for that you would appeal? Is that what you mean?

MS. LANG: Objection. Calls for a legal conclusion, misstates testimony.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, can you tell me what that sentence means to you?

A I feel that I oaid my debt to society. And I not only just -- ve're speaking about the felony cases. I'm talking about everything that I paid. Every time I got in trouble, I paid what I was supposed to pay. But nothing got turned in.

So, yes, if there was an appeal process or whatever, yes, I would file it, because I feel like I'm being penalized again. And now I'm being having to bear the burden of proof, but I was released successfully off of everything.

Because if I wouldn't have, there would have
been -- I would have been reprimanded, placed back in jail. All these things would have happened if I hadn't made -- honored everything that the Judge required me to do. And I did that.

And when $I$ went to the Community Corrections, they said, well, as long as they signed off on it, that's all you need. Do you understand? So, that's what I was told.

Q Okay. Other than joining this lawsuit that we're here for today, have you taken any other actions to try to get those CORs completed or appeal that notice that there are still costs owed?

MS. LANG: Objection. Lack of
foundation.
THE WITNESS: NO.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Is that a no? Is that what I heard you say?
A My attorney, she said objection, so I
didn't --
Q Yes. You --
MS. LANG: I apologize. Ms. Scott, you can answer. I think I heard a no, but you can repeat that.

THE WITNESS: No.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q All right. Ms. Scott, let's talk a little bit about your voter history in the state of Tennessee. Have you ever been registered to vote in Tennessee?

A No.
Q You didn't register to vote when you turned 18; is that correct?

A Correct.
Q Do you recall registering to vote in 2003?
A No, I really don't. I know when I received the felony, I knew we couldn't vote.

Q I'm going to share a document with you.
A I think. I don't recall.
Q Ms. Scott, I'm sharing with you a document entitled, "Automat:ed Election System, Voter Detail."

Do you see thai on your computer screen?
A Yes, sir.
Q And is this voter detail related to you?
A Yes, that's my name. Yes, that's my
information.
Q That's your information? Is that the correct last four digits of your Social Security number?

A Yes. That's on Southern Avenue. That's when I had the fire, right after I had the fire.

Q Okay. Were you at that address in 2003?
A Yes.
Q On the right-hand side at the top, do you see where it says, "Registration Date"?

A Uh-huh.
Q Do you see underneath that, it says,
"2003-10-09"?
A Yes.
Q And then below that, do you see several -there's three columns. Right under that date, there's a column that starts with "Voter ID." Do you see that?

A Uh-huh.
Q It says, "37595." Is that correct?
A Yes.
Q And the county is Dyer County; is that right?
A Yes.
Q And below that, it says, "Registration Date," and that's the same date as is listed above. Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And that would be October 9th, 2003. Is that your understanding?

A Yes.
Q And below that, it indicates "Voter Status."

Do you see that?
A Uh-huh.
Q And the status says, "Purged." Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And then, below that, it has the "Voter Status Date" of March 4th, 2004. Do you see that?

A Yes, sir.
Q And below that, it says the "Purge Reason" was "'04 felony." Do you see that?

A Uh-huh.
Q Does that help your recollection at all of whether or not you were reqistered to vote in 2003?

A No. I was registered? You're saying I was registered to vote?

Q Is that your understanding of what this document reflects?

MS. LANG: Objection. Lack of
foundation. My understanding is Ms. Scott has never seen this document before and does not know where it came from or what authority it has.

THE WITNESS: You say, "Birth Location, Ward," what does that mean? MR. VARELA: That's a separate column. THE WITNESS: Location, Ward? I was
born in Dyer County.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Birth location is not filled out in this particular document. Ward is the next column over indicating what ward you were registered to vote in. A Okay.

MS. LANG: Mr. Varela, would you care to explain to Ms. Scott what this document is because --

MR. VARELA: Yes.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, this document. that I'm showing to you is a voter detail produced by our client, the Tennessee Division of Elections, that I requested to see if you had ever ween registered to vote in the state of Tennessee. What was returned was this document that indicates in 2003 you were registered to vote in Dyer County and that in 2004, March 2004, after your 2004 conviction, you were purged from the voter roles as a result of having been convicted for a felony.

A Wait a minute. You're saying that $I$ was registered to vote before 2003?

Q No, ma'am. On October 9th, 2003, you were registered to vote in Tennessee, according to this
document.
A I've never voted in Tennessee.
Q Have you ever registered to vote in
Tennessee?
A Not that --
(Overlapping speech.)
MS. LANG: Objection. Asked and answered.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q So, it's your testimony here that --
A I don't recall.
Q -- you don't recall filling out a voter registration form in 2003 to register to vote; is that correct?

MS. LANG. Objection. Asked and answered.

You can go ahead and answer, Ms. Scott. THE WITNESS: The only explanation I maybe have for this is maybe I possibly could have went online and maybe tried to see if I could vote, but I don't recall, you know, being -- ever filing to vote. I don't recall it. MS. LANG: Mr. Varela, do you have the additional voter history for Ms. Scott that might explain the format in which the alleged voter
registration occurred? That is typically information that is accounted for, like whether or not it was a voter registration form or through the DMV or whatnot.

MR. VARELA: That, I don't know at the moment because it was 2003 that -- I don't know that they have that. So, all I know is that when the voter registration detail for Ms. Scott was pulled up, it indicates that she was registered to vote in '03, in October, and that she was purged from the voting rolls after her felony conviction in 2004. BY MR. VARELA:

Q By the way, Ms. Scoti, that conviction in 2004 for evading arrest was in January of 2004; is that correct?

A On the evading arrest?
Q Yes, ma am.
A January, yes.
Q So -- okay.
A So, basically, there was no way that I -that was what -- I'm kind of confused. The first felony $I$ received was in 1992. So, you're stating that $I$ was able to vote and already had felonies in 1992?

Q No, Ms. Scott, I'm not saying anything. I'm
just asking you if that's what the information on this document reflects. I'm going to direct you to -- okay.

Ms. Scott, do you recall if you ever
attempted to vote -- or to register to vote, not attempted to vote, but attempted to register to vote in 2020?

A COVID? 2020?
Q Yes, ma'am.
A No.
Q Okay. I'm going to direct rou to this document, which is Page 3 of the document I'm showing you, and it says at the top, "Dyer County Election Commission, Online Registration Detail for Leola Scott."

Do you see that?
A I see iit.
Q Is that the correct last four numbers of your Social Security number?

A Yes.
Q And is that address that's listed there your address --

A Yes, it is.
Q -- on September 21st of 2020?
A Uh-huh.

Do you see at the top it has a transaction date of 2020-09-21?

A Uh-huh.
MS. LANG: Mr. Varela, could you please explain what this document is before we go over its contents?

MR. VARELA: Sure.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott, this is a document from the Tennessee Division of Elections that was obtained from Dyer County. It is the details for an online registration to vote from September 21st, 2020 .

Do you see it says ai the top, "Online Registration Detail for $\uparrow$ eola Scott"?

A Uh-huh.
Q Do you recall attempting to register to vote online on September 21st, 2020?

A I'll be honest with you, I don't recall, but it probably happened. Maybe if I had went on there to see if I could vote.

Q Okay. And so, in order to -- have you seen the voter registration website where you can register to vote online?

A Have I seen the website?
Q Have you seen the -- yeah, the webpage where
you would register to vote online.
A You know how that -- it comes across your feed, yes. You click on it.

Q Okay. So, this is the online voter
registration detail and we've discussed that it was submitted on September 21st, 2020, and that that is the last four digits of your Social Security number and that's your current address and was your address at the time in 2020? Is that right?

A Yes.
Q And scrolling down, do you छee this column on the left-hand side, it says "Citizen"? Do you see that?

A Yes.
Q And in the next column it says, "Y" for yes?
A Uh-huh.
Q And the next line says, "Tennessee resident."
Do you see that?
A Uh-huh.
Q It says, "Y" for yes?
A Uh-huh.
Q And the next line says, "18 before election."
Do you see that?
A Uh-huh.
Q And it says, "Y" for yes; is that correct?

A Yes．
Q And then the next line says，＂Felon，＂and the next line says，＂N＂for no．Do you see that？

A Uh－huh．
Q And then，down towards the bottom，it says，
＂U．S．citizen．＂Do you see that？
A Yes．
Q yes．Do you see that？

A Uh－huh．Can you go back up to the felon part？

Q Yes，ma＇am．
A Okay．So，my brother，he did 17 years in Fayette，and he got out and he has his right back to vote．So，during one period of time，I was told after seven years，everything，it＇s gone away．But obviously，thai＇s not true，though．

MS．LANG：I＇d like to take a break to look at the records．Mr．Varela，I don＇t think any of these records were provided to us in any of the disclosures that you＇ve made．So，if you could provide us the records that you plan to rely on for the remainder of the deposition，I would appreciate it．

MR．VARELA：I will．Once I move to
enter this document, $I$ 'm done going through it, that will be provided to you as the next exhibit, Danielle. Okay? I've just got one more page to go through.

MS. LANG: All right. But I'd like to take a break with my client, so we're going to take a break.

MR. VARELA: Sounds good. I'll put that in the chat, then.

MS. LANG: Are there remaining documents that you plan to go through that you haven't previously disclosed?

MR. VARELA: Yes, there is one more document that I will be using. There's one more page on this related co this voter registration that I'd like to go through, but not to ask her any questions specifically, but just to verify the information.

MS. LANG: We're not verifying any information except for what you say this document says. But in any event, I would like the documents that you plan to use that you did not disclose until now and I would like to take a break.

MR. VARELA: Here's the document that we were talking about and the last document is also in
the chat.
How long of a break would you like,
Danielle?
MS. LANG: I'll let you know when we're going to be back. I'm not sure.
(Recess observed.)
MS. LANG: So, before we resume questioning, $I$ do want to make a statement on the record, which is that none of these documents were provided to the plaintiffs prior to today's deposition, despite multiple attempts for supplementation of responses to discovery requests during the several years of discovery that has been ongoing in this case.

And Ms. Scott will not be answering any future questions about alleged attempts to register to vote prior io 2022 and she will be invoking her right to the Fifth Amendment to the extent that the State continues to ask questions about any prior attempts to register to vote.

And with that, I'm happy to hand it over to Mr. Varela and Ms. Scott.

MR. VARELA: Thank you, Danielle. I appreciate your statement on the record.

The voter detail information I didn't
even receive until yesterday, and that was in the voter registration records maintained by the Tennessee Division of Elections, which is one of the clients through the named Coordinator of Elections.

However, the Dyer County Election
Commission was the entity in possession of the Dyer County Online Registration Detail, as well as -- but the voter registration, that's also centrally located.

I am not sure if voter registration history was one of the documents that was requested in discovery, but nonetheless, discovery remains open pursuant to our extension of the schedule in this case and, therefore you know, because these are being produced today, you can consider these as supplementation of sorts to those discovery requests, if tney're even applicable to those. But I am going to continue asking questions. BY MR. VARELA:

Q Ms. Scott, you are free to invoke your Fifth Amendment right at any point that you feel necessary, of course.

Before we went on break, we were discussing the Dyer County Election Commission Online Registration Detail for Leola Scott. And there was
one more document that $I$ wanted to discuss with you, Ms. Scott, and that is this last page that is "Voter Central - Rejections." Do you see that on your screen?

A Yes, sir.
Q
Is that document relating -- related to you?
MS. LANG: Objection.
THE WITNESS: I plead the Fifth.
MS. LANG: Ms. Scott has elected to adopt -- to take her Fifth Amendment right not to answer any remaining questions about these documents or alleged attempts at voter registration.

So, Ms. Scott, you should feel free to invoke your right not to answer.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q Ms. Scott I'm not asking you if this is actually yours. I'm asking you if that information is consistent with your current information.

MS. LANG: Like I said, Ms. Scott has elected to not answer any future questions about alleged registration attempts or these documents, and Ms. Scott has elected to invoke her Fifth Amendment right not to answer those questions.

Ms. Scott, you should feel free to do so.

MR. VARELA: Am I understanding you, Danielle, that you're instructing your client not to answer any questions related to this document?

MS. LANG: Yes.
MR. VARELA: I'm going to go ahead and mark that as the next exhibit, Ms. Porter.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 11.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q I just had one more document to show, which is also in the chat already.

Ms. Scott, do you see a document on your screen that appears to be a webpage of the Tennessee Secretary of State?

A Yes, sir.
Q Do you recognize this webpage?
MS. LANG: I am going to repeat again
that Ms. Scott is not going to be answering any questions about any alleged voter registration attempts prior to 2022, and she will not be answering any questions about these documents.

MR. VARELA: Danielle, I haven't asked her any questions about --

MS. LANG: You asked her if she recognized the document.

MR. VARELA: Correct. Public document.
MS. LANG: That's asking about her experience with this document. It is my understanding that Ms. Scott is going to invoke her right not to testify and Ms. Scott is free to do so now.

MR. VARELA: I understand your objection, however, Ms. Scott earlier testified that she does recall seeing the voter registration website online, so I'm asking if this is what she recalls that she's already testified to.

MS. LANG: Mr. Varela, I'm going to repeat that regardless of any prior testimony, Ms. Scott has made an election not to answer any further questions about her experience with the online voter registration form and she will be invoking her $r$ ight not to testify and I would ask you to respect that.

MR. VARELA: I'm going to move this as the next exhibit in the deposition, Ms. Porter.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 12.)
MR. VARELA: All right. Give me a five-minute break. I need to confer with co-counsel on this matter.
(Recess observed.)
MR. VARELA: We're going to move on from Ms. Scott's voter registration and the alleged attempts to register to vote. BY MR. VARELA:

Q Ms. Scott, I just have a few more questions and I think I'll be done after that.

During this process of you attempting to get your voter rights back, do you have any written communication with any of the governmental entities involved in this case?

A No, sir.
Q Do you have any writien communications from the Governor's office, for example?

A No, sir.
Q Or Division of Corrections?
A No, sir.
Q Or the Tennessee Division of Elections?
A No, sir. The only -- well, not concerning my situation. I only went up there to get the forms to pass out to different individuals to vote.

Q I'm just asking about your situation.
A No, sir.
MR. VARELA: All right. I don't have any further questions. Pass the witness.

MS. LANG: Thank you. Ms. Scott, I just have one, maybe two questions for you. I know that you work the night shift and that you would very much like to go to bed. So, we will keep this brief.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. LANG:
Ms. Scott, you were asked some questions about your experience with trying to get the Certificate of Restoration and that you -- first you went to the probation office, the corrections office or -- I'll take that back -- the probation office and they were able to fill out the top part of that form for you and ther they sent you to the clerk's office at the courthouse; is that correct?

A Yes, ma am.
Q Okay. And you had three felony convictions and so you had three certificates. And for two of those certificates, the clerk's office told you that they thought you owed money and so they could not sign off on your Certificates of Restoration. Correct?

A For two of them.
Q For two of them?

A Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am.
Q something that says you owed -- you owed money on the Certificate of Restoration, they gave you a kind of invoice of the money that you owed for those two convictions, correct?

A Yes. I requested that.
Q Okay. I am going to pull up one of those documents here. Can you see that?

A Yes, ma'am.
MS. LANG: Perhaps somejody could help
me. I think this is marked as either Exhibit 8 or 9. It's the bill of cosis for Case Number 23CCI-1991-CR-42.

Do you see that there?
THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.
MF. VARELA: I believe that's Exhibit 8.
(Discussion off the record.)
BY MS. LANG:
Q On this bill of costs, do you see that last line that says, "Fines"?

A Yes, ma'am.
Q And what's the amount of fines that they say were imposed and are due?

A $\quad 2,000$.

Q Okay. In addition to giving you this invoice, did the clerk explain to you which, if any -- or which of these outstanding fines and fees would have to be paid in order for you to qualify to restore your right to vote?

MR. VARELA: Object to the form.
THE WITNESS: No. He said something.
Do I answer?
BY MS. LANG:
Q Yes, you can answer. Mr. Varela objected but you can answer.

So, I'll repeat my question for you, which is, when you were given this document from the clerk's office, did the clerk or anyone at the courthouse explain to you which of these fines and fees would have to be paid in order for you to be eligible to voie -- restore your right to vote? A No, ma'am.

Q Okay. Did anyone explain to you that you would not have to pay that $\$ 2,000$ in order for you to be eligible?

A No, ma'am.
Q Did anyone at the courthouse advise you of any option to appeal their decision that you could not get a Certificate of Restoration?

A No, ma'am.
MS. LANG: I have no further questions.
MR. VARELA: Just one second, Ms. Scott. I think I have one follow-up question, maybe.
(Pause in proceedings.)

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. VARELA:
Q I do have a few follow-up questions. I'm going to share the First Amended Complaint again on the screen. Let me know if you see that.

A Yes, sir, 44.
Q At the bottom of 44 , this second-to-last sentence -- or third-to-the-last sentence, it states, "The Court dia not provide her," meaning you, "an explanation of which of these obligations are considered court costs for purposes of Tennessee Code Annotated 40-29-202(b)." Is that correct?

A Yes, that's what it says.
Q It also states that, "Instead, the clerk orally stated that [you] would need to pay all debts to complete those CORs." Is that correct?

A Yes.
Q Is it correct that the clerk advised you that you would have to pay all of the debts on that cost
bill in order to complete the COR?
A Well, the paper that you submitted earlier that had all of the -- you know what I'm referring to? It had all not only --
(Overlapping speech.)
Q The cost bill?
A Excuse me, sir?
Q The cost bill that we talked about?
A That had -- it had all of the charges, like different misdemeanors and all that, basically, that's what she gave me. I asked for the printout. And basically she said that, you know, you still owe fines, you owe money on these. That's why -- she didn't give me an exact amount. On the Certificate of Restoration of Voter Rights it says court costs still owed. If you look on the --
(Overlapping speech.)
Q Do you recall just now talking about this document?

A Do I recall?
Q When your attorney was asking you about this cost bill.

MS. LANG: Pablo, this is the wrong one. I asked about --

THE WITNESS: Not that one. It's the
one that has a list of everything.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q Hold on one second. Do you see that document there?

A Yes.

A Not that one. It was another one.
Q now about this document?

A Yes. When she said the fines, yes, sir.
Q Talking about these fines. Do you recall she asked you if anybody told you you would have to pay -- whether or not you would have to pay this fine in order to get your Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights?

A I was told that I owe court costs and fines, as well in the paper.

Q My question was, do you recall your attorney asking you if anybody told you that you would have to pay these fines in order to get your Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights?

A Yes.
Q Okay. And you said no. Is that correct?
A Wait a minute. You just asked me do I recall asking her and -- that she asked me and I said yes,

I recall my attorney asking me about this.
Q Do you recall your testimony that when she asked you did anybody tell you you had to pay this fine in order to get your Certificate of Restoration of Voting Rights, that your response was no, nobody told you that? Do you recall that?

MS. LANG: Objection. Misstates
testimony.
We can read back the question because you're --

MR. VARELA: That's fine. Ms. Porter, would you go back and read the question that was asked about whether -- aboui fines and fees on this sheet by Ms. Danielle?
(The requested testimony was read back by the court reparter as follows:
"Question: In addition to giving you this invoice, did the clerk explain to you which, if any -- or which of these outstanding fines and fees would have to be paid in order for you to qualify to restore your right to vote?
"Mr. Varela: Object to the form.
"Answer: No. He said something. Do I answer?
"Question: Yes, you can answer.

Mr. Varela objected but you can answer.
"So, I'll repeat my question for you, which is, when you were given this document from the clerk's office, did the clerk or anyone at the courthouse explain to you which of these fines and fees would have to be paid in order for you to be eligible to vote -- restore your right to vote?
"Answer: No, ma'am.
"Question: Okay. Did anyone explain to you that you would not have to pay that $\$ 2,000$ in order for you to be eligible?
"Answer: No, ma'arn.
"Question: Did anyone at the courthouse advise you of any option to appeal their decision that you could not $g \in t$ a Certificate of Restoration?
"Answer: No, ma'am.")
BY MR. VARELA:
Q So, my question, Ms. Scott, do you recall those questions and answers that the court reporter just read back to you?

A Yes.
Q And what $I$ was asking you earlier was that in the First Amended Complaint, it states that the clerk orally stated to you that you would need to pay all debts to complete the CORs; is that correct?

A Yes. She said basically I owed costs and fines and then that's when I -- yeah. So, I asked for a printout of everything and that's when $I$ saw that nothing had been applied.

MR. VARELA: I have no further questions. Pass the witness.

MS. LANG: Nothing further.
Ms. Scott, we can let you go.
MR. VARELA: Ms. Porter, we would like to order a copy, please.

THE REPORTER: Ms. Lang, did you want her to read and sign?

MS. LANG: Yes, please. Thank you.
THE REPORTER: And do you want a copy?
MS. LANG: Yes, please.
FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT
(Eroceedings concluded 12:00 p.m. CST)
$\mathbf{E} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{R} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{T} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{E}$
I, LEOLA SCOTT, having read the foregoing deposition, Pages 1 through 97 , do hereby certify said testimony is a true and accurate transcript, with the following changes (if any):

PAGE
LINE
SHOULD HAVE BEEN
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

LEOLA SCOTT

Notary Public:
My Commission Expires: $\qquad$
Reported by: Jerri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, LCR

STATE OF TENNESSEE
COUNTY OF Davidson

I, Jerri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, Licensed Court Reporter, with offices in Nashville, Tennessee, hereby certify that $I$ reported the foregoing deposition of LEOLA SCOTT by machine shorthand to the best of my skills and abilities, and thereafter the same was reduce a to typewritten form by me. I am not related to any of the parties named herein, nor their counsel, and have no interest, financial or otherwise, in the outcome of the proceedings.

I further certify that in order for this document to be considered a true and correct copy, it must bear my original signature, and that any unauthorized reproduction in whole or in part and/or transfer of this document is not authorized, will not be considered authentic, and will be in violation of Tennessee Code Annotated 39-14-104, Theft of Services.

$\checkmark$


Jeri L. Porter, RPR, CRR, LCR Elite-Brentwood Reporting Services Notary Public State of Tennessee

My Notary Public Commission Expires: 3/3/2026 LR 335 - Expires: 6/30/2024



Bells 13:12
Benjamin 34:8
big 23:1,15 59:25
bill 58:19 59:10,17 60:9,15,21 61:8, 15 62:18 64:11, 23,25 65:13,18 66:16 90:13,20 93:1,6,8,22
bills 62:14,15 67:20
binding 6:18
birth 39:13 74:22 75:3
bit 8:1 25:12 48:11 60:14 72:3

Bivens 22:23 60:1
blank 38:1 56:6
boat 30:19
Boettcher 7:8,9
booths 27:19
born 75:1
bottom 46:24,25 47:22 61:7 65:8, 11 81:592:13
box 38:5 45:22
Boyd 18:7,8 33:2, 9,22
brake 13:7
break 9:6,11 29:20 30:2 67:13, 19 81:18 82:6,7, 23 83:2 84:23 87:24
breaks 9:8
bring 26:10,15
brother 81:13
building 35:5
burden 70:23
C

C91-261 62:23
call 22:7 29:19 53:13,18
called 7:14 22:8 42:12,16 43:2
calling 29:12
calls 16:13 17:7 21:19 24:15 34:21 37:14 41:1 46:18 70:10

Campaign 7:2
card 36:24 37:4 47:3 50:9 57:20 60:11 64:6 68:14
cards 49:21
care 15:7 75:7
carry 20:3,9
case 6:117:10
10:21 11:6,12 16:10,16 19:19 24:5 25:18 45:11 53:2 58:11,20 59:1,2 64:2,15 65:3,9,10 68:9 83:14 84:14 88:11 90:13
cases 24:23 25:1 50:5,8 68:17,18, 21 70:17
cash 48:19,21,22
cashier's 48:19
caused 55:20
Center 7:3
Central 6:6 85:3
centrally 84:9
certificate $35: 14$ 36:6,9,23 37:6,11, 23 41:14,23 42:4, 1443:5 47:14 54:1 56:3,6,14 57:5 89:11 90:4 91:25 93:14 94:14,20 95:4 96:15
certificates 38:17 41:16 42:3 47:15 56:17 89:19,20,22
chair 26:2,7 28:25 30:23 31:3 34:6
chapter 15:12 26:3 30:23
charge 59:13,25 60:16 64:13,18,20 68:19,20
charged 52:8
charges 55:4 93:9
chat 8:10 9:14 37:18 66:12 82:9 83:1 86:11
check 45:22 48:19
child 12:17,22 47:5,9 55:18
children 12:14,18
circuit 18:2 22:22 51:2463:5
citizen 80:12 81:6
Citizens 50:10, 11,12,24 51:5 59:6 60:12
city 23:9,12
civic 26:2,6 28:24 30:22 31:2,3 33:15 34:5
claims 21:10,24
clarify 17:12 20:25 41:13
clerk 18:2 23:9,12 25:2 51:24 58:6, 24 59:24 62:16,18 91:2,14 92:20,24 95:18 96:4,24
clerk's 89:15,20 91:14 96:4
clerks 51:24
click 80:3
client 75:13 82:6 86:2
clients 84:4
co-counsel 87:24
cocaine 59:9
code 36:21 37:2,5 92:18
Colored 6:10
column 60:23,24, $2561: 673: 11$ 74:24 75:4 80:11, $1581: 8$
columns 73:10
comment 62:10
comments 67:9
Commission
78:14 84:6,24
committee 26:16
communication 88:10
communications
16:13 17:7,10 88:13
community $22: 8$
23:18 26:9,10,11 31:6 32:3 33:18 40:17 41:8,19 48:8,12,23 51:7, 19 53:10,13,17
54:10 55:9,11,14 68:22 69:2,18 71:5

Complaint 11:11, 12,14 16:10 19:12 21:9,23 25:14,18 26:20 27:3,6,11 30:21 49:14,17 52:19 69:11 92:10 96:23
complete $36: 1$ 51:9 92:22 93:1 96:25
completed 23:4 24:6 34:25 35:1, 18 38:6,13 39:24 40:6,10,16,17,23, 25 44:21 45:1 47:24 49:7 54:20 71:11
completely 31:17 33:12 35:24
completion
39:23 40:2,3
complicated 20:23
computer 8:6 72:17
concluded 97:17
conclusion 21:20 24:15 34:21 37:15 41:2 70:11
condition 13:17
confer 87:24
Conference 6:9
confirming 62:3
confused 28:1 45:23 62:7 77:21
connect 32:6
considered 92:17
consistent 85:18 constituents 26:21,25 27:2,4, 12,15 28:10
contents 79:6
continue 84:18
continued 28:6
continues 83:19
continuing 20:10
conversation 17:15,17
conversations 16:16
convicted 49:20 52:20 75:20
conviction 38:13 39:12 49:13 52:24 53:5,11 54:12,19 56:21 57:9,19 58:7 61:10,12,13 62:19 64:6 66:1 75:19 77:11,13
convictions 49:25 52:10 59:2 65:4 67:21,23

68:12 89:18 90:6
coordinator 37:8 47:7 84:4
copies 24:23
copy 19:15 38:1 56:14 97:10,14

COR 47:23 53:25 54:1,8 93:1
correct 11:22 14:13,15 19:3 24:12 25:4,24 26:23 28:9,14 30:5,7 38:1 39:9 40:4 43:24 44:9, 24 45:1 46:10,13, 14,17 48:3 52:24 53:11 57:7,20 58:8 59:14,17,18 60:18 61:9,16,24, 25 62:16 63:18 64:20 65:1,2 66:2, 5,23 67:25 68:1 69:21,25 72:8,9, 22 73:14 76:14 77:15 78:18 80:25 87:1 89:16,23 90:6 92:18,22,24 94:23 96:25
corrections 22:8 23:18 40:17 41:9, 19 42:25 48:8,12, 14,23 51:7,19 53:10,13,17 54:10 68:23 69:3 71:5 88:16 89:12
correctly 9:3
13:22 24:4 37:9 38:15 47:11 54:4

CORS 58:6 71:11 92:22 96:25
cost 58:19 59:10, 17 60:9,15,21 61:8,15 62:14,15, 1864:11,23,25
65:13,18 67:20
92:25 93:6,8,22
costs 24:6,11
45:9,10,14,17,19
46:1,9,12,14 48:2
58:7 60:17 65:4
66:16 68:8 70:8

71:12 90:13,20 92:17 93:15 94:16 97:1
counsel 6:15 7:2 8:12 16:13
country 13:1,2,4, 5,6,11 15:3
county 25:24 33:17 49:22 52:21 53:24 54:8 67:21 73:16 75:1,18 78:13 79:11 84:5, 7,24
court 6:12 8:11,22 10:15 11:16 18:2 22:22,25 23:1,9, 12,21 24:6 43:23 45:9,14,17,19 46:1,9,12,14 48:2 50:3,4 51:24 54:11 58:6,23 59:24,25 60:4,17 62:16 63:5 66:21 68:8 69:9 70:7 92:15,17 93:15 94:16 95:16 96:19
court-ordered 43:20 45:10

## courthouse

 16:23 18:1 22:9, 15,19 23:5,6,8,15 24:3,11 27:25 35:4,7,21 47:17, 19,21 48:1,5,9 52:3,6 58:5 68:24 89:16 91:15,23 96:5,13COVID 78:8
credit 49:21 50:9 57:20 60:11 64:6 68:14

CST 97:17
curious 26:7
current 47:5 80:8 85:18

Curtis 34:8
Custer 12:1

## D

Danielle 7:1
21:17 24:20 82:3 83:3,23 86:2,22 95:14

Darrell 41:17 47:20
date 6:5 10:22,24
39:13 60:24,25
61:14,24,25 62:6
73:4,10,18,19
74:7 79:2
dated 62:21
dates 62:22
day 61:10
days 53:8
deal 26:8 33:15
dealing 33:17
40:2 45:13
deals 26:13 31:3, 4,5 39:22 43:19
dealt 32:16
death 16:22
debt 69:1 70:15
debts 92:21,25 96:25
decision 91:24 96:14

## Declaratory

19:13
defendants 6:23
defending 7:3
Department 47:8
DEPONENT 97:16
deposition 6:8,24
7:4,21,22,24,25
8:2,10 9:7,17
10:12,16,20 11:2,
3,8 37:17 67:6
81:23 83:11 87:20
describing 69:20
desktop 58:14
detail 63:5 72:16, 19 75:13 77:8 78:14 79:14 80:5 83:25 84:7,25
details 79:11
difference 46:6 55:21
digits 72:23 80:7
direct 33:5 78:2, 11
directed 33:9,21
direction 32:25
disclose 16:15 82:22
disclosed 82:12 disclosures 81:21
discovery 58:11, 19 83:12,13 84:12,16
discuss 26:16 85:1
discussed 17:14 18:14 56:6 80:5
discussing 84:23
discussion 90:18
disrespect 22:24
district 6:12,13 22:23 25:4 32:2 55:3,6,10,19
division 6:14 69:3 75:14 79:10 84:3 88:16,18
DMV 77:4
docket/case 38:14
document 9:13, 15 10:1 19:9,20 36:17,18 37:19,22 39:21 43:17 45:7 56:9,12 57:1,4,14, 17 58:1,10,16,18 59:21 60:8 61:20 62:3,4,11,12 63:3,

4 64:2 66:9,12,19
72:13,15 74:17,20
75:4,8,12,17 76:1
78:2,12 79:5,9
82:1,14,20,24,25
85:1,6 86:3,7,10,
12,25 87:1,3,21
91:13 93:19 94:3, 9 96:3
documents 8:5, 7,10,11,12 10:10, 14,15 11:7 68:6 82:10,21 83:9 84:11 85:11,21 86:21 90:9
draft 27:6
drop 37:17
dropped 55:4 dropping 8:9 66:14
drug 49:21 57:10
Drugs 64:19
due 34:1955:16 60:24 90:24
duly 7:14
Dyer 25:24 33:16 49:22 52:21 53:24 54:8 63:567:21 73:16 75:1,18 78:13 79:11 84:5, 7,24
Dyersburg 11:18 12:1,2 26:3 30:23 33:16

## E

earlier 11:856:7 58:4 87:8 93:2 96:22
early 9:23
elected 85:9,20, 22
election 30:14
72:16 78:14 80:22
84:5,24 87:14
elections 37:8 47:7 75:14 79:10

84:3,4 88:18
eligible 37:3 47:3 91:17,21 96:7,11
Ellen 7:8
embarrassing 55:20
embezzled 51:20
employed 12:24 13:1,8,11 14:3,19
employee 52:8
employees 51:23
employment 12:24
engagement 26:2,6 28:25 30:22 31:2,3 33:15 34:6
enter 82:1
entities 88:10
entitled 17:16
36:19,23 37:23
63:5 72:16
entity 84:6
error 69:17
estimate 29:8
estimated 30:3
et al 6:11
evading 52:21
56:20 65:11,25
77:14,16
event 55:24 82:21
exact 93:14
EXAMINATION
7:17 89:7 92:7
excuse 24:24 29:11 39:25 93:7
exhibit 9:23 10:2
19:19,21 37:17,20
56:3,7,8,10,25
57:2,13,15,23
58:2 59:20,22
61:19,21 66:8,10, 16 82:2 86:6,8
87:20,22 90:12,17

94:6
experience 87:3, 15 89:10
explain 75:8
76:25 79:5 91:2, 15,19 95:18 96:5, 9

## explanation

76:18 92:16
express 24:18
expunged $36: 12$, 13,14
expunging 36:15
extension 84:13
extent 16:12 17:6 21:19 24:14 34:20 83:18

## F

face $8: 2$
fact 41:22
factories 15:2
factory 15:2
fair 21:7 36:4
39:22 40:1 43:19

$$
45: 8,13
$$

family's 12:5
father 12:5
Fayette 81:14
February 65:18, 22
fee $16: 4,5,8$
feed 80:3
feel 19:25 20:5
55:17 70:15,21
84:21 85:13,24
fees 24:11 59:12
60:24 91:3,16
95:13,19 96:6
felon 81:2,10
felonies 24:12
31:22 32:16,18,21
68:13 77:23
felony 31:1,24
34:19 36:10,13 38:13 39:11 49:13,25 52:20 54:11 56:21 62:19 64:6 66:1 67:21
70:16 72:12 74:10
75:21 77:11,22 89:18
felt 23:10 55:19
female 55:7,13
file 70:21
filing 30:13 76:21
fill 15:20 16:3 43:9,23 89:14
filled 36:9 47:20 56:15 75:3
filling 76:12
financial 69:16
find 23:5 33:4 67:7
fine $8: 16$ 36:1 94:14 95:4,11
fines 22:6 24:12 30:18 59:12 90:21,23 91:3,15 93:13 94:10,11, 16,20 95:13,19 96:5 97:2
finish 9:1
finished 39:18 45:6

Finley 11:18
fire 68:2,5 72:25
Firestone 14:20, 21
five-minute 87:24
focusing 28:21
follow-up 92:4,9
food 13:12,19 14:2
form 15:21 16:8 36:9 37:7 38:12, 20 39:1 43:10

46:21 57:18 67:3
76:13 77:3 87:16
89:15 91:6 95:22
formal 35:14
format 76:25
forms 38:25 88:20
Forty-four 25:20
found 16:23 17:2, 20,23 18:20 22:13 23:17 33:8,21
foundation 40:12
41:2 44:6,11 46:19 71:14 74:19
fraudulent 49:21 57:19 60:10 64:5 68:13
free 27:6 84:20 85:13,24 87:5

Friday 55:4
front 19:15 58:12
funds 22:9 23:5 68:19
future 83:16 85:20
$\mathbf{G}$
Gary 42:16
gave 32:1,5 48:22 90:4 93:11
general 25:6
generations 30:11
give 9:2 11:1 36:15 62:18 67:7 87:23 93:14
giving 10:20 32:24 90:2 91:1 95:17
good 6:3,20 7:19 82:8

Goodman 32:2,3
governmental 88:10

## Governor's

88:14
Gracie 50:17 51:8
gray 34:8 38:5
great 66:15
grew 12:6
ground 7:25
20:20
guess 15:5 20:20 45:21 47:21
guilty 20:11
guy 55:3,7,17
guys 55:2
H
hand 83:21
hands 26:8
happened 17:4
48:6 51:3 55:4 69:3 71:2 79:19
happening 26:12
happy 9:7 83:21
harmed 21:11
head 51:24
health 14:22,25
hear 8:14 24:4
heard 18:23 19:1, 4 33:10 71:17,22
helped 29:8 30:3, 9,24 31:14,21,24 32:6,23
helping 19:25 27:18 28:22 30:7 34:6

Hendrix 34:9
highlight 49:19
highlighted 54:6 64:2
history 72:3
76:24 84:11
hold 29:11 55:13

94:3
home 10:6,7 12:5
14:14,18,22,25
15:7 63:20 68:5
honest 79:18
honestly 59:4
honored 69:1 71:3
housewife 14:4
Human 47:8
husband 13:16
14:6,10 15:5 63:14
husbands 15:6
I

ID 73:11
identify 6:16
identifying 39:8
imposed 90:24
in-house 22:7
41:753:18
incarcerating 38:7
incarceration 52:11 53:4
incident 51:18
indicating 62:3 75:5
individuals 30:9, 24 31:13 88:21
information
20:17 32:1 39:8
40:22 43:3,13
44:20,25 46:16
63:16 67:8 72:21,
22 77:2 78:1
82:18,20 83:25
85:17,18
informed 48:7
Injunctive 19:13
injured 21:25
injury 24:4,16
instructing 86:2
instructions 46:22
instructs 8:18
intertwine 45:18
invoice 90:5 91:2 95:18
invoke 84:20 85:14,22 87:4
invoking 83:17 87:17
involved 88:11
ipad 8:8
issue 45:9 48:24
issued 37:6 45:15 47:23 56:18 57:6
issues 26:9,14 31:5
J
jail 71:2
January 77:14,18
Jenkins 63:8,12, 13
Jerri 6:4,18 8:22
job 13:10 15:8
jobs 14:21,24
John 34:8
join 18:8,9,11,17
joining 71:9
judge 22:21,22 60:1 71:3
judgment 60:17
K
kids 15:7
killed 55:2
killing 55:18
kind $8: 1$ 15:11
17:23 41:12

45:18,23,24 58:13 62:7 77:21 90:2,4
knew 30:12 33:5 43:2 72:12
knowledge 20:15

L
lack 40:11 41:2 44:5,10 46:19 71:13 74:18
ladies 52:7
Lamar 34:8
Lang 7:1 16:12 17:6 21:16,18 24:14 27:5 29:23 34:10,14,20 37:14 38:20 40:11 41:1 44:5,10 45:3 46:3, 18 58:13 66:11, 15,20,25 67:14
70:10 71:13,21
74:18 75:7 76:7,
15,23 79:4 81:18
82:5,10,19 83:4,7
85:7,9,19 86:4,17,
24 87:2,12 89:1,8
90:11,19 91:9
92:2 93:23 95:7
97:7,11,13,15
language 27:6
larger 58:14
law 55:16
laws 36:22
lawsuit 15:11
16:11,20 17:5,18
18:8,10,20,22
19:6,24 33:24
71:9
lawyers 16:16 17:7,15

LCR 6:5
lead 55:24
learn 10:19
learned 11:1
leave 13:16,18

## Lee 6:11

left 35:19 47:20
left-hand 80:12
legal 7:3 21:19 24:15 34:21 37:14 41:1 69:16 70:10
length 52:2
Leola 6:87:12 9:17 21:10 63:8, 17,19 78:15 79:14 84:25

LFOS 69:16
Licensed 6:4
lies 41:6
life 20:7
list 94:1
listed 63:20 73:19 78:21
live 11:17 12:4,20
lived 11:20
living 11:24
local 30:14
located 84:9
location 74:22,25 75:3
long 11:20 12:4 13:8,14 29:3 50:6 71:6 83:2
lost 31:1 34:18
Iot 14:14 20:22
26:13 27:22 30:8,
11,16,17 $31: 21$
32:15 33:18 55:23

| $\mathbf{M}$ |
| :--- |
| machine $59: 8$ |
| made $20: 1,11$ |
| 22:3 27:19 28:4 |
| 30:11 42:13 59:16 |
| 60:3,21 61:3,15, |
| 23,25 65:18 |
| 67:22,23 68:21,22 |
| 69:17 71:3 81:21 |
| 87:14 |

maiden 63:12,13
maintained 84:2
make 8:15,24,25 9:2,24 20:6,22 21:18 28:6 37:16 39:3 43:5 48:11, 20 51:4 55:21 66:25 67:8 83:8
makes 50:4 55:22,23
making 21:9,23 60:3 62:10 68:20

March 61:374:7 75:18
mark 9:22 19:18 56:24 57:12,22 59:19 61:18 66:7 86:6
marked 10:1
19:20 37:19 56:2, 7,9 57:1,14 58:1 59:21 61:20 66:9 86:7 87:21 90:12
marking 66:16
marks 66:22
marriage 12:11, 13
marriages 12:14
married 12:9 63:17
Martin 34:9
matter 6:9 87:25
Mcelrath 41:17 42:16,21
meaning 92:15
means 8:16 27:15 28:10 54:1 70:6, 14
medical 13:17,18
member 15:12, 14,18,19 16:1
members 26:21
27:4,12,15 28:11
met 34:3,7
middle 6:13 9:9 30:12
mind 29:21 67:12
minor 12:21
minorities 19:25
minute 75:22 94:24
minutes 67:14
misdemeanor 54:16
misdemeanors 68:12 93:10
misstates 46:3 70:11 95:7
mistake 20:6
mistaken 50:6
mistakes 20:1,2, 9,11
moment 23:10 29:11 36:15 55:19 77:6

Monday 55:5,15
money 22:19,20 23:7,11,14 48:16 50:20 51:10,19, 22,23 52:2,4,9 68:18 89:21 90:3, 5 93:13
month 61:10
Moore 22:21 60:1
morning 6:3,20
7:19 55:17
move 56:5 81:25 87:19 88:2
multiple 83:11

## N

NAACP 15:12,18 17:22 18:5,24 19:5 26:3,7,17,21 27:3,12,14 28:11, 25 30:23 31:13
named 17:4 33:23 84:4
naming 66:19
narcotics 64:20
Nashville 6:13
National 6:10 50:10 59:6 60:13
needed 28:5
nevermind 67:11
night 89:3
nonetheless 84:12
nonpayment 23:3
notarize 35:21
notes 9:4
notice 9:17 10:15
11:8 46:24,25
47:1,2 71:12
number 6:5,11
10:2 19:21 31:16,
17 37:20 38:14
39:13 45:18 56:10
57:2,15 58:2,20
59:1,2,22 61:21
64:3 65:9,10
66:10,22 72:23
78:19 80:8 86:8
87:22 90:14
numbered 39:2
numbers 65:3
66:17 78:18
0
oath 6:18 7:5
Object 91:6 95:22
objected 91:10
96:1
objection 6:17
7:4,6 8:15,17
16:12 17:6 21:16,
19 22:3 24:14
27:5 34:10,20
37:14 38:20 40:11
41:1 44:5,10 45:3
46:3,18 70:10
71:13,18 74:18
76:7,15 85:7 87:8
obligations 12:17 47:5 69:16 92:16
observed 29:24 67:17 83:6 88:1
obtained 79:10
occurred 77:1
October 73:22 75:24 77:10
offered 32:3
office 6:22 10:5
22:17 35:12,20,22 40:24 41:18,21, 23,25 42:1,8,23, 24 43:23 44:24 46:15 48:17 52:4 55:20 88:14 89:12,13,16,20 91:14 96:4
officer 38:7,8 48:22 50:17 53:24
54:8 69:18
officers 22:24 23:21 50:18
offices 23:19
ongoing 83:14
online 76:20 78:14 79:11,13, 17,23 80:1,4 84:7, 24 87:10,16
open 20:14 84:13
opened 51:15
Operator 13:7
opinion 46:1
option 91:24 96:14
orally 92:21 96:24
order 28:8 55:12 79:21 91:4,16,20 93:1 94:14,20 95:4,20 96:6,11 97:10
ordered 50:7 53:2
organization

15:23
outstanding 47:9 58:7 61:7 65:5 91:3 95:19
overdose 33:18
overlapping 14:7 21:15 31:18 42:11 49:10 76:6 93:5, 17
owe 22:20 24:11 93:12,13 94:16
owed 22:19 23:7
30:18 50:15,19 51:6 63:2 71:12 89:21 90:3,5 93:16 97:1

## P

p.m. 97:17

Pablo 6:21 7:20 66:11 93:23

PADD 33:15
paid 20:1 22:6,10, 20 23:2,14 24:5
25:1 26:17,19
35:1 40:15,18
44:9 45:15 48:1,2, 8 50:16,19,22 51:5,9 60:11,24 66:2 68:7,16 69:1, 2 70:3,4,15,17,18 91:4,16 95:20 96:6
paper 61:17 93:2 94:17
paperwork 15:24
16:3,23 23:20,22 27:25 28:3 30:7, 13 32:6,7,24 35:13 69:8
paragraph 25:21, 23 27:16 30:20 49:19
Pardon 32:19
pardoning 38:6
parole 38:18 40:9, 24 41:5,8 42:23

43:22 53:14,19,20
part 15:23 16:18 17:8 29:2,3 31:9 37:2 39:8 43:8 45:23 54:5,6 56:21 81:11 89:14

Parts 58:5
party 17:4,18 18:10,22 19:6 63:5,7
pass 88:21,25 97:6
passed 27:18 55:9
past 20:1,3,11
pause 92:5
pay 16:4,5 20:6,8 65:22 70:19 91:20 92:21,25 94:13,20 95:3 96:10,25
paying 20:7 23:11
payment 59:5 61:3,14,23 62:6 65:17 68:20
payments 47:9 48:11,20 59:16 60:3,21 61:24 62:6 67:22,24 68:21 69:17
penalized 70:22
penalizing 69:5
people 6:11 23:16 27:22 28:11,21,22 29:7 30:3,6,17 31:13,21 32:5,8, 20,22 33:7,10 34:6
period 81:15
Perry 34:9
person 37:3 47:2, 4
personally 21:13
Phil 22:22 60:1
phone 29:19
phrase 28:10
physical 48:15
Pictsweet 13:12
place 17:24 48:15
places 14:9
plaintiff 16:11 49:20 69:15,24
plaintiffs 7:2,9 33:24 83:10
plan 81:22 82:11, 22
planning 55:18
play 22:24
plead 85:8
point 17:1,4 84:21
pointing 32:25
Porter 6:4,18 66:13 86:6 87:20 95:11 97:9
position 13:19, 21,24 14:2 26:17, 18 28:25 29:4,7 33:8
possession
49:21 57:10 59:9, 13 64:19 68:6 84:6
possibly 76:19 predicating 55:24
prepared 11:2
prescribed 37:7
presented 62:13
preserving 8:17
president 17:21 18:4,24 19:5
press 13:7
Prevention 33:16
previously 82:12
printout 93:11 97:3
prior 12:14 13:21 14:17 42:24 66:16 83:10,17,19 86:20

## 87:13

probation 22:11, 17 23:16 24:2 25:3 35:2,12,17, 20 38:18 40:2,9, 15 41:7,18,21,23, 25 42:1,6,7,22,23, 24 43:4 44:24 46:15 47:20 48:17

$$
50: 1751: 7,16
$$

52:4 53:18,20,24
54:8 89:12,13
probation/parole 38:8
probations 34:25
problem 23:23 36:2 41:6
proceedings
92:5 97:17
process 8:4 17:19 18:17,21 21:11,25 22:5
28:18 30:6,12 32:24 34:5,18,22, 24,25 36:5 43:8 51:25 55:16 69:24 70:7,20 88:8
produced 75:13 84:15
proof 70:23
proper 32:1
properly 69:18 70:8
protection 55:12
prove 69:6
provide 81:22 92:15
provided 58:11, 19,23 59:10 67:24 81:20 82:2 83:10
providing 8:4
proving 25:2
Public 87:1
pull 23:9,13 59:24 60:2 68:9 90:8
pulled 77:8

Purge 74:9
purged 74:3
75:19 77:10
purpose 47:18
purposes 92:17
pursuant 37:5 84:13
put 9:14,23 63:16 66:12 82:8
putting 8:16

## Q

qualify 91:4 95:20
question 8:15,19, 20 9:1,9,10 16:17 17:9 20:16,21,22, 24 21:4,5,20,24 23:25 27:14 33:1 40:21 42:2 44:15 45:16 55:6 61:22 67:2,5 91:12 92:4 94:18 95:9,12,17, 25 96:2,9,13,18
questioning 8:14 83:8
questions 7:18 8:3 45:22 62:11 67:6,9 82:17 83:16,19 84:18 85:11,20,23 86:3, 19,21,23 87:15 88:6,25 89:2,8,9 92:2,8,9 96:19 97:6
quickly $10: 4$

## R

rare 12:16
read 37:9 38:15
39:17 43:15 45:5
46:8 47:11 54:4
95:9,12,15 96:20
97:12
reads 38:12 47:2
realize 51:17
realized 30:17
reason 8:18 24:10 49:7 74:9
recall 50:7 52:17 53:1 72:10,14
76:11,12,21,22
78:4 79:16,18
87:9 93:18,20
94:8,11,18,24
95:1,2,6 96:18
recalls 87:11
receipt 48:24
receipts 23:25
24:1 49:1 67:24
receive 38:17,24 84:1
received $35: 13$ 47:13 51:6 62:20, 2472:11 77:22
recess 29:24 67:17 83:6 88:1
recognize 86:16
recognized 86:25
recollection 74:12
record 6:17 8:17 22:4 36:12 66:11 83:9,24 90:18
records 59:24 69:9 81:19,20,22 84:2
reduce 39:3
reference 46:9
referred 11:8
referring 8:5 93:3
reflected 64:13
reflects 74:17 78:2

Reginald 34:9
Regions 51:13
register 15:20
72:7 76:13 78:5,6
79:16,23 80:1
83:16,20 88:4
registered 72:4 74:13,14,15 75:5, 15,17,23,25 76:3 77:9
registering 72:10
registration 16:4
36:24 37:3 47:3
73:4,18 76:13
77:1,3,8 78:14
79:12,14,22 80:5
82:15 84:2,7,8,10,
25 85:12,21 86:19
87:9,16 88:3
regular 8:2
reinstated 22:14
reiterate 24:19
Rejections 85:3
related 24:12
49:13 56:20 57:9, 19 58:20 63:23,25 64:5,18,19 65:4 67:20 72:19 82:15 85:6 86:3
relates 46:12 59:2
relating 46:11 85:6
released 22:10
24:1 40:16,18
55:5 70:23
Relief 19:13
rely $81: 22$
remainder 81:23
remaining 82:10 85:11
remains 84:12
remember 44:18 50:10,11 51:15
reopen 50:14
reopened 50:23
repay 69:1
repeat 21:20
29:16 39:25 44:15
45:12 71:23 86:17
87:13 91:12 96:2
rephrase 20:25

31:10
reported 41:20,21
reporter 6:3,4 8:11,22 56:4 66:21,24 95:16 96:19 97:11,14
represent 6:16,23 7:9
reprimanded 71:1
request 37:6 41:23 42:8,14 43:5
requested 75:14 84:11 90:7 95:15
requests 83:12 84:17
require 17:9
required 41:19 71:4
requirements 15:25
reshare 69:10
resident 25:24 80:17
respect 7:5 87:18
response 95:5
responses 8:4 67:7 83:12
restitution 24:6
43:20 44:3,9
45:17,20 46:2,11
48:2 50:7 53:1
60:18 68:8,15
restoration 35:15 36:6,9,24 37:7,11, 23 38:18 41:15 42:4,14 43:6 47:14,15 54:1 56:3,6,15 57:6,18 89:11,22 90:4 91:25 93:15
94:14,21 95:4 96:15
restore 26:22 27:13 29:8,10,13 30:25 31:14 34:7,

18 53:23 54:7
91:5,17 95:21
96:7
restored 28:13,
16,17 30:4 32:8, 22 37:4 47:4
54:23
restoring 31:16 47:6
result 52:10 53:11 54:11 75:20
resume 83:7
returned 75:16
review 11:7,11
reviewing 39:21 43:17 45:7
right-hand 73:3 81:8
rights 16:22,25 17:3,20 18:19,21 19:1 21:12 22:1, 15 26:22 27:13 28:12,16,17 29:9, 13 30:4,25 31:15, 20 32:7,21 33:11 34:7,18 36:7,23 37:7,24 38:18 41:15,24 42:15 43:6 47:4,6 53:24 54:7,23 55:25 56:15 57:6,18 88:9 93:15 94:15, 21 95:5
roles 75:20
rolls 77:11
room 10:8
Rough 13:1,3,4,5, 6,11 15:3
roughly 32:8
rules 7:25 20:20

## S

safety 13:12,19 14:2
SAITH 97:16
schedule 84:13
school 29:12,19
Scott 6:8,20 7:4, 12,19 9:18 10:4 16:14 17:8,13 19:23 21:10,23 27:5,11 30:2 34:14,21 36:18 37:22 40:13 41:4 44:13,16 49:18,20 56:13 57:4 58:4, 10 60:6 62:2,9 63:4,10,17,19 67:19 69:15,24 70:13 71:21 72:2, 15 74:19 75:8,12 76:17,24 77:8,13, 25 78:4,15 79:9, 14 83:15,22 84:20,25 85:2,9, 13,16,19,22,24 86:12,18 87:4,5,8, 14 88:6 89:1,9 92:3 96:18 97:8

Scott's 88:3
screen 8:6 9:15 25:19,21 36:18 37:24 49:18 56:14 60:9 63:4 72:17 85:4 86:13 92:11
scrolled 25:17
scrolling 65:8 80:11
second-to-last 92:13

Secretary 86:14
section 36:22 37:2 39:15,17,19, 22 40:1,7 43:9,15, 19,22 44:18,23 45:5,8,13 46:8,9, 11,12,16 47:25 49:19 64:1
sections 39:2
Security 39:13 72:23 78:19 80:7
sense 20:22 50:4 55:22,23
sentence 30:22 38:12 39:23,24

40:2,10,22,25
44:20 47:24 52:19
53:21,22 69:14 70:6,13 92:14
separate 38:12 49:25 50:3 65:3,4 74:24

September 78:24 79:12,17 80:6
serve 52:11 53:4
Services 47:8
set 27:19
share 9:13 17:9 36:17 49:14 56:12 63:3 72:13 92:10
shared 19:10 58:19
sharing 9:24
37:22 56:13
58:10,18 60:8
72:15
sheet 66:4 95:14
shift 89:3
show 59:24 86:10
showed 27:24 28:7
showing 8:5 10:16 57:5,17 58:16 66:4,6 75:12 78:13
shows 65:12
side 73:3 80:12
sign 35:4,12,18 43:13 46:16 89:22 97:12
signed 22:18 35:3 44:25 71:6
simple 34:24 35:25
sir 6:25 7:23 8:13,
21 9:5,12,16,19,
21 10:18 11:23
12:3,10 19:7,11, 17 21:8 24:13 25:20,22 26:1,5, 24 34:15 36:20

37:1,10,25 38:2,4, 11,16,22 39:5,7, 10,14,16,21
42:19,21 43:7,11,
14,18,25 44:4
46:23 47:1,12
48:4,25 49:24
54:3,9,21 56:1,16,
19,23 57:8,11,21
58:9,17,22,25
60:10,19,22 61:17
62:17 63:9,11,22
64:4,7,10,14,17,
21,24 65:7,16
66:6 69:12,22
72:18 74:8 85:5
86:15 88:12,15,
17,19,23 92:12
93:7 94:10
sit $15: 1$
situation 88:20, 22
smaller 39:3
Social 39:13
72:23 78:19 80:7
society 69:2 70:15
somebody's 34:18
son 16:22 27:18 55:2,9
sorts 84:16
Sounds 82:8
Southern 72:24
speak 11:5 50:13
speaking 70:16
specific 10:22
specifically 82:17
speculation 46:19
speech 14:7 21:15 31:18 42:11 49:10 76:6 93:5, 17
spoke 11:4 17:21 18:1,5
stabbed 55:2
stage 53:19
Standard 6:6
stands 69:16
start 13:24
starts 73:11
state 6:16 7:6 22:17 25:23 35:2, 12 41:18,21,25 42:6,7,22,23 47:20 53:19,20 68:10 69:23 72:3 75:16 83:19 86:14
stated 92:21 96:24
statement 83:8, 24
states 6:12 8:18 27:11 38:5 92:15, 20 96:23
stating 35:18 77:22
status 73:25 74:3, 7
stayed 15:7
stenographic 9:4
stenographically 8:23
step 36:5,8
steps 18:14 28:7 33:6 35:24
stopped 35:6
Street 11:18
submit 15:24 16:6,8 27:25 28:3 48:11
submitted 50:20 59:6 80:6 93:2
substance 17:15
successfully
22:11 23:3 24:1
35:1,18 40:19
70:24
suffrage 37:4
summation 69:15
supervising 38:9,19
supervision 24:7 39:24 54:20 69:18
supplementation 83:12 84:16
support 12:17 47:5,9
supposed 49:9 55:8 69:4 70:19
sworn 7:15
system 63:16 72:16
systematically 25:12

## T

T.C.A. 36:19
taking 6:23 7:20 8:23 17:24 52:9
talk 8:24 12:23 15:22 25:11 49:11 72:2
talked 44:18 93:8
talking 37:12 64:12 65:1 67:20 69:13 70:5,17 82:25 93:18 94:8, 11
tedious 35:25
telling 23:22 30:5
ten 32:9,11,12,13, 15 67:14
ten-minute 67:13
Tennessee 6:4,9, 13 11:18 12:1 13:13 15:12 21:12 22:1 26:3 36:21, 22 37:5 72:4,5 75:14,16,25 76:2, 4 79:10 80:17 84:3 86:13 88:18 92:17
term 27:7
testified 7:15 58:4 87:8,11
testify 87:5,17
testimony 46:4 53:10 67:22 70:11 76:10 87:13 95:2, 8,15

## thereabouts

 67:15thing 9:6,8 18:16 44:23 46:2 57:4
things 16:24 17:24 26:12,13 33:19 35:9 71:2
thinks 27:7
third-to-the-last 92:14
thought 46:1 51:20 89:21

Tiffany 18:7 33:2
time 6:6,7,15 11:1 14:23 15:1,6 20:13,14,24 22:22 27:24 29:6 30:13 33:14 48:13 49:2 50:3,5,14,18 52:2, 11 53:5 54:10 55:8 63:21 68:1 70:18 80:9 81:15
today 6:24 7:4 9:20 71:10 84:15
today's 6:5 83:10
told 19:4 22:19 23:6,19 24:18 25:2 35:2,6,10,11 36:13 41:17 42:16 43:4,7 47:19
50:15,18 51:5
60:1 71:8 81:15 89:20 94:12,16,19 95:6
top 38:5 47:25
63:8 68:13 73:3
78:13 79:1,13
89:14
total 59:12 60:16

Tournier 34:8 transaction 79:1 transpired 17:3 trouble 70:18 true 44:23 81:17
turn 51:23 52:2,4, 5
turned 23:6,11,17
24:3 48:8 51:10 60:12 68:23 70:19 72:7
turning 15:11 16:9 52:8
type 39:11
typically 48:18 77:1

## U

U.S. 81:6

Uh-huh 13:23
60:19,22 61:1
65:21 73:5,13
74:2,11 78:25
79:3,15 80:16,19, 21,24 81:4,10
umbrella 51:21
underneath 73:6
understand
10:25 13:21 15:9
19:3 24:20 27:14
29:15 36:5 40:21
41:3,13 49:6 62:9 71:7 87:7
understanding
28:10 34:17,22
40:23 43:9,12
44:1,13,19 53:9
54:2 62:14 63:24 65:6 73:23 74:16, 19 86:1 87:4
understood 21:5 44:22

United 6:12
uproar 55:9,11,14

## V

Varela 6:20,21
7:6,18,20 9:22 10:3 16:19 17:11 19:18,22 21:17, 21,22 24:17 25:5 27:9,10 30:1 34:12,16 35:8 37:16,21 38:23 40:20 41:10 44:7, 14 45:4 46:7,20 56:2,5,11,24 57:3, 12,16,22 58:3,15 59:19 60:5,7 61:18 62:1 66:7, 14,18,21 67:4,12, 18 70:12 71:16
72:1 74:24 75:2,7, 10,11 76:9,23
77:5,12 79:4,7,8 81:19,25 82:8,13, 24 83:22,23 84:19 85:15 86:1,5,9,22 87:1,7,12,19,23 88:2,5,24 90:17 91:6,10 92:3,8 94:2 95:11,22 96:1,17 97:5,9
verification 47:24
verifies 40:9
verify 40:24 43:13 44:2,8,20,24 46:15 47:7 48:1 58:5 82:17
verifying 82:19
versus 6:11
video 8:10 9:24
violated 55:12
virtual 7:25
virtually 7:24
volunteer 26:18, 19
volunteering 31:12
vote 18:4 20:4 22:15 27:21 28:4, 5,6,8,21,22 29:14



TN CONF OF THE NATL ASSOC FOR THE ADVANCE. OF COLORED PEOPLE

LEE, et al.

## LAMAR PERRY

May 13, 2023

> IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

```
TENNESSEE CONFERENCE OF
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION )
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF
COLORED PEOPLE, et al., )
Plaintiffs,
V.
WILLIAM LEE, et al.,
Defendants. )
No. 3:20-cv-01039
) Judge Campbell
) Magistrate Judge Frensley
Class Action
```

Zoom Deposition of:
LAMAT PERRY
Taken on behalf of the Defendants
MAY 13, 2023

Shana Crawford, LCR
(615) 595-0073

$$
A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S
$$

For the Plaintiffs:
MS. BLAIR BOWIE
MS. ELLEN BOETTCHER
Attorneys at Law
Campaign Legal Center
1101 14th Street NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005 (202)736-2200

Bbowie@campaignlegalcenter.org
Eboettcher@campaignlegalcenter.org

For the Defendants:
MS. DAWN JORDAN
MR. PABLO A. VARELA
Attorneys at Law
Public Interest Division
Office of the Attorney General.
P.O. Box 20207

Nashville, TN 37202-0207 (615)532-4098

Dawn.jordan@ag.tn.gov
Pablo.varela@ag.tn.gov
I-N-D-E-X

Page No.
Examination by Ms. Jordan 5

Examination by Ms. Bowie 48

Further Examination by Ms. Jordan 49

No. 1 - First Amended Complaint 16

No. 2 - E-mail Chain. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 29
No. 3 - Document. . . . . . . . . . . . . . ................. . 30
No. 4-2017 Bankruptcy......................... . 36
No. 5 - Document. . . . . . . . ............................ . 38
No. 6 - Document. . . .................................. . 39
No. 7 - Plaintiff Lamar Perry's responses and Objections to defendant's second set of Interroqatories. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42

No. 8 - Document from Juvenile Court of Memphis And Shelby County, Tennessee...................... 44

No. 9 - Spreadsheet. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 45
S-T-I-P-U-L-A-T-I-O-N-S

The Zoom Deposition of LAMAR PERRY, was taken by counsel for the Defendant, by Subpoena, via ZOOM, and with the witness appearing at his respective location, on the 13 th day of May, 2023, commencing at 9:00 a.m., for all purposes under the Tennessee Rules of Civil Procedures.

All formalities as to the caption, notice, statement of appearance, et cetera, are waived. All objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved to the hearing, and that said deposition may be read and used in evidence in said cause of action in any trial thereon or any proceeding herein.

It is agreed that Shana C. Crawford, Licensed Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness is waived.
$\square$ LAMAR PERRY, being first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Good Morning, Mr Perry.
A. Good morning, how you doing?
Q. I'm doing great. My name is Dawn Jordan and I am with the Attorney General's Office of Tennessee and I represent the defendants in this case. And what we are doing this morning is we are going to be taking your deposition; do you understand that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Have you ever Given a deposition before?
A. No, this is my first time.
Q. Have you ever testified before?
A. My first time.
Q. Well, you've just been placed under oath, as you know. And you understand what that means, right?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. Just sure we can go over a few ground rules, I am sure your attorney has covered this with you as well, but I just want to make sure we get a good clean record for everybody; is that okay?
A. Perfect.
Q. Okay. Now, what we will be doing is that $I$ will be asking you questions, of course, and then hopefully you will be answering them. And because there is a court reporter taking down what everybody says, if you will wait until I finish my question before you begin your answer, then the court reporter won't get all flummoxed and we will be able to take down everything that everybody says; is that fair?
A. Yes, sounds good.
Q. And I likewise will do my best to not interrupt you. In normal conversation we do that, but let's try to -we will both try to refrain from that; is that fair?
A. Sounds good to me.
Q. And I may be reminding you of that from time to time and I'm not trying fo crack wise with you or be wise with you, I'm just trying to make sure that we all stay on the same page; is that fair?
A. Understood.
Q. For every question, you need to give, a verbal response. Even though we are on zoom, a nod or shake of the head is not sufficient. And you can't say "uh-huh" or "huh-huh" or that kind of thing. It needs to be either yes or no or some other verbal response that the court reporter can take down accurately; is that fair?
A. Yes, that's fair.
Q. And again, I may be reminding you of that, but I'm not trying to be wise with you, I'm just trying to makes sure that we get a good clean record; is that fair?
A. Yes, it's fair.
Q. And your attorneys may be objecting from time to take. And since we don't have a judge here to rule on the objections, you will go ahead and answer unless the attorney instructs you not to answer; do you understand that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. Okay. And so sitting here today, do you have any medical conditions that will prevent you from remembering correctly or testifying accurately?
A. No.
Q. Are you under any medications that will prevent you from remembering correctiy or testifying accurately?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And other than you, is there anyone in the room with you?
A. No, I'm by myself.
Q. Do you have a cell phone?
A. I do.
Q. Is it there with you?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you mind turning it off?
A. (Witness complies.)
Q. It's something that takes a long time. It takes a long time to turn off.

Okay. And so what did you do to prepare for today's deposition?
A. What did I do?
Q. Yes, sir.
A. Um, just talked to my attorneys.
Q. And I don't want to be -- obviously I'm not going to ask you what you talked about with them or as you that.

Did you read any documents to prepare for the
deposition?
A. No, didn't.
Q. Okay. So you didn't seview the complaint or your interrogatory responses or anything like that?
A. Yes, I did. yes, yes, I did. I -- I read some of them. I read a little portion of them yesterday.
Q. Okay. Okay. So let's go through all of those. Did you read the complaint to prepare for the deposition?
A. No in its entirety. I just scanned through it. Yeah, because I pretty much got everything in my mind.
Q. And I understand that, it's a long complaint. That would be a lot.

Did you go over your interrogatory responses, just with you reading them to prepare?
A. Again, I -- again, I just scanned through
everything. Nothing in -- nothing in depth that I tried to memorize because I can recall everything that I said previously.
Q. Okay. Fair enough. And just a few background questions, what's your date of birth?
A. June 30th, 1975.
Q. And your place of birth?
A. Cleveland, Mississippi.
Q. And what is your current address?
A. 4545 Heartwood Road, Memphis, Terinessee, 38128.
Q. How long have you lived there?
A. Since April of 2014.
Q. And does anybody else live there with you?
A. My wife and kids.
Q. How old are your children?
A. $\quad 17,14$ and 11 .
Q. What's your wife's name?
A. LaKeva. LaKeva Johnson.
Q. LaKeva Johnson. And she lives with you there?
A. Yes, uh-huh.
Q. And three children live with you there?
A. Yes.
Q. You ever voted?
A. I have, it's been a long time since I have.
Q. Right. Okay. And where did you vote?
A. The last place I voted was in -- was in DeSoto

County where I was -- where I used to reside.
Q. Is that in Tennessee?
A. That's in Mississippi.
Q. That's what I thought. Have you ever voted in Tennessee?
A. No, I haven't.
Q. And so you just indicated that you are married?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is that a yes?
A. Yes. Yes, sorry about it. Yes.
Q. You're fine. Everybody does it, you don't have to worry about that.

And you have three children. Do you owe any child support?
A. Yes.
Q. And how much do you owe?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay. We will get to that in just a minute, I've got that.

All states that you've lived in since 18 ?
A. All states, just Mississippi and Tennessee.
Q. Well, that's easy. And can you tell us a little bit about your educational background?
A. Yes, I graduated from Shaw High School in 1994.

And I after I graduated high school, I attended Jackson State University from 1994 to 1997. And after that, I went to Concord Career Institute, which is here in Memphis, Tennessee. Studied there, and after that, I went to Strayer University and I majored in business, business management with a concentration in operation management.
Q. And did you have and a degree?
A. I have an associate degree.
Q. Are you still pursuing education?
A. Yes, I am. I haven't gone back since COVID hit, but I plan to go back to Jackson State on-line and finish up where I started, because it wasn't ©-
Q. And what --
A. Because that -- that's where my heart is.
Q. That's where your what is?
A. My heart is.
Q. And what are you pursuing? What degree are you pursuing?
A. Business management, concentration in operation management. I've been in management for -- for 19 years now.
Q. And where do you currently work?
A. I work for Glidewell Dental Laboratories.
Q. And you indicate your in management there; is that right?
A. Yes. Yes. I'm the shipping manager.
Q. Shipping manager. And how many people do you manage?
A. Right now, I have a team of 12.
Q. So you've been in Glidewell for how many years?
A. It hasn't been a year yet. It will be a year May 16th, actually Tuesday -- this Tuesday coming up, it will be a year. Glidewell is new here in Memphis, going on its second year here.
Q. Congratulations. Where did you work for before?
A. Where I work before? I work for Uohnson Controls/Hart \& Cooly.
Q. How long did you work for Johnson Controls?
A. I worked there from April of 2018 up to January 14 th of 2021. My joh got eliminated due to COVID.
Q. Lot -- that happened to a lot of people, sorry about that. Where dia you work before Johnson Controls?
A. I worked for Neovia Logistics in Southaven, Mississippi. I worked there from 2014 to 2018.
Q. And then before that?
A. Before that, I worked at the Mid-South Food Bank from 2012 to 2014.
Q. And have you been pretty much been continuously employed since you graduated from -- and got your associate's degree?
A. I got my associate's degree back in 20 -- 2019,

2020, round that time. I was -- but yeah, I have been continuously getting employment, yes. Having to get a lot of doors closed in my face, but I -- I just had to keep on moving.
Q. So continuously employed pretty much since you graduated from high school?
A. Yes, uh-huh.
Q. In and out of college, I understand that. But you've been --
A. Yes, uh-huh.
Q. Have you ever filed my lawsuifs other than this one?
A. No.
Q. And, of course, we know that you've been to convicted of three felon forgeries; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Any other criminal offenses?
A. Not that I recall. No, not that I recall.
Q. None in Mississippi?
A. No, not from Mississippi.
Q. And there was a probation violation at one point; do you recall that?
A. I don't recall, don't recall. Let me see, no, I don't recall that.
Q. Okay. I know you said that the only felonies that
you have are the three forgeries?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever serve time in a jail or prison facility?
A. When the -- for the forgery case, I was -something -- I was out of town at a wedding up the St. Louis area and had a hotel room in my name. And that Saturday morning, the police was at my door, said I had a warrant in Memphis so they held me in that jail for like 14 days. Extradited me to Hopkinsville, Kentucky, held me there for about 5 days. And then transported me to 201 Poplar where I stayed there for about 4 days.

And when my court date came, I was able to get out -- get out that day, that's when I was placed on probation for two years where I hau to may restitution fees and do -do community service.
Q. Do you recall how much the restitution was for?
A. I think it was 224 -- 224 -- $\$ 242$ a month.
Q. For how many months?
A. 24 months.
Q. Okay. And you had to do some community service?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And you are also on probation for two years?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you complete your community service? I am
assuming you have.
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Okay. And you paid your restitution?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. And how was that paid? Was that -- were you working when you were on probation?
A. Yes, I found a job and I had to, yeah, work it and pay it off, yes.
Q. Were your wages garnished or did you pay voluntarily? How did that work?
A. I paid voluntarily.
Q. And what about your court costs?
A. I paid -- I was paying them on the monthly basis.
Q. And how were you were paying those? Was your wages garnished or did you --
A. Yes, my waces were garnished for the court costs.
Q. Now, you indicate -- did you read the amended complaint before it was filed?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Okay.

MS. JORDAN: I'm going to mark as Exhibit 1, the first amended complaint.

And Ms. Crawford, I will be sending you all of the exhibit after deposition is done and I will indicate which

```
exhibits they are, if that's okay?
```

    COURT REPORTER: Thank you, yes.
        MS. JORDAN: What I will do is, I will share my
    screen.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 1 was marked.)
BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. And Mr. Perry, can you see what I have up on the screen?
A. Not at the moment. It just says, "Dawn Jordan has started screen sharing".

MS. BOWIE: I can't see it either, Dawn. THE WITNESS: i see it now.

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Okay. Wonder why there is a delay? That's neither here nor there. So now you can see what I have up on the scene?
A. Yes.
Q. And there is a -- this is the first amended complaint in your case. And do you see it says "40" right there?
A. Yes, I see it, uh-huh.
Q. And it starts with, "Plaintiff, Lamar Perry", do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. I want to ask you a few questions about this particular paragraph. Do you recall -- and you can look through this and I can scroll up and down if you need.

But did you read this and approve this before the first amended complaint was filed?
A. Yes, I did. Yeah, I remember now. $\{$ just didn't understand your terminology, but yes, I did. I remember reading it.
Q. And that's fine. Let me also tell you: If there is a question that I ask that you don't understand, please feel free to request me to ask it again or clarify or something.
A. Okay.
Q. We don't always ask the best questions. We don't, bit it's okay.

So you did approve this particular paragraph before the first amended complaint was filed; is that correct?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Want to ask you a couple of questions about it. We talked about that you served two years on probation, right?
A. Yes.
Q. The paragraph 40 of the first amended complaint also says that in 2013 you went through a Second Chance Program?
A. Yes, that is correct.
Q. Can you explain that to us, what that is?
A. That's a Second Chance Program to where this program helps felony conviction -- helps them get a job and help with jobs and help us get a trade. And I completed that -- that program in 2013.
Q. Who sponsors that program?
A. From my understanding Shelby county.
Q. And so how long was the program?
A. Now, that I do not recall how long was it. I'm thinking -- well, honestly $I$ don't recall. I don't want to -- I don't want to -ri don't want to speculate.
Q. That's fine. What was involved in going through the program?
A. We had to go -- we had to take classes. We had to go to a class there every -- every week. And we was learning -- learning different trades, how to do resumes, you know, graphs, power points. You know, things that -- that will enhance us as far as giving us a skill set and -- and a whole lot of knowledge -- knowledge based things that -that -- that we would need.
Q. And the class was once a week or was it like every
day?
A. No, it was once a week.
Q. Got it. Got it. Did you graduate or get a certificate at the --
A. Yes. I -- yes, I got a certificate at the end.
Q. And did they -- did this program help you find jobs or was just helping you learn how to do the various things that you need to get a job?
A. To answer your question: Both. It helped me find one. It will give you a list of jobs that -- that do hire -hire felony conviction.
Q. And were you able to get a job through that program?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And what job was that?
A. Mid-South Food Bank.
Q. Okay. The one that you mentioned earlier?
A. Yes.
Q. Good. Good. And then going on with paragraph 40, it says that at the conclusion of that program, you learned of the availability of the COR, that's C-O-R, to restore voting rights in Tennessee. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And this was -- so you learned about this through the Shelby County program, the COR?
A. Yes.
Q. When you finished your probation, were you informed of the core at that time?
A. I wasn't.
Q. Okay. And so then going on in paragraph 40, it says that, "Plaintiff Perry sought a COR, but was told he did not qualify because he had been assessed $\$ 3,288.10$ in LFO's", which I believe are legal financial obligations. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And let's kind of unpack that for a minute. It says that you sought a COR. Who did you seek a COR from? Where did you go?
A. Actually I didn't go, I made a -- after I completed my Second Chance Program, they gave us some paperwork inside of a pamphlet where i received my certificate upon completion. Then notified me that we are able to get our voting rights restored. So they had a phone number where I can reach -- reach downtown, which was the clerk's office downtown. And when I was called, I was informed that I would not be eligible to get my voting rights back due to the fact that I owed that $\$ 3,288.10$.
Q. Okay. So what I'm understanding -- just let me make sure that I'm clear. What you did was: You were given a telephone number and it was to the criminal court clerk's
office; is that right?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And so you telephoned them and were told over the telephone that you were not eligible?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you go in person at all at that time or just make that telephone call?
A. Now that I can't recall. Because I'm thinking I did go and the line was long, so I think I left and then I just end up calling. I know I called multiple times and I was told the same thing.
Q. Okay. Did you try to go Eo any probation office?
A. No. No. Because I had no knowledge that the probation office would help me get my voting rights restored.
Q. So -- okay. Sa you just went to the clerk's office, I understand. Right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And when did you finish the Second Chance Program?
A. In 2013.
Q. Okay. Now, going further in paragraph 40 , it says that, "Plaintiff Perry was surprised to learn that he owed these LFO's", did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you under the impression that you were -- I'm
taking it that you were under the impression that you had paid all of your legal financial obligations?
A. Yes, I was.
Q. And why -- what lead you to that belief?
A. Because my probation informed me that all of my -my probation officer informed me that all of my restitution fees were -- were -- were paid off and never mentioned anything about court costs, because I didn't know anything about court -- court costs, court fines.
Q. I see. Okay. So at that time you had paid your restitution, but you were unaware of court costs; is that what I'm hearing?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then going further in paragraph 40 it says that you worked to pay down that debt?
A. Yes.
Q. And so how did you do that? How did you go about doing that?
A. Well, what I did, I filed for Chapter 13 bankruptcy and I added the -- the Court cost to my -- to one of my -- I can't think of the word I'm trying to say. But one of the ones -- ones that I had -- excuse me. One of the ones that I had to pay, and that's how I was able to -- to get it down. Get it down to where it is now.
Q. So you filed three bankruptcies?
A. Yes.
Q. One in 2015, one in 2016, and one in 2017; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you were under the impression that your bankruptcies would help you discharge that debt?
A. No, I wasn't under that impression. I knew that I just paid it through my bankruptcy because $I$ was just trying to get some -- get my credit -- get my credit squared away.
Q. I see. So there was a trustee and the trustee was working with you from -- with a payment plan?
A. Yes.
Q. For each of those bankruptcies, the three?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, the last hankruptcy, 2017, was dismissed in October of 2022; is that right? We will go over that. I've got some paperwork. We will go over that in a minute, that's fine.

So in 2020, going further with paragraph 40. "In 2020, Plaintiff Perry believing his debt to be fully paid, again sought a COR", did I read that correctly?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is that "yes"?
A. Yes. Yes. Yes, I'm sorry.
Q. You're fine. You're fine. Like I said, everybody
does it, you're fine.
What lead you to believe that your debt had been fully paid?
A. Because when I ran my credit again and looked at my credit report, I didn't see the -- the court cost on my credit.
Q. And you referred to it -- what do you mean by credit report?
A. When I looked on Experian, TransUnion and Equifax, I didn't see Shelby County Criminal Court on my credit saying I owed as one of my debtors.
Q. Did you ask your bankruptcy trustee whether you owed any on the court costs?
A. Well, I didn't have that kind of contact information with the trustee downtown. I just ran my own credit and did it. I took it upon myself and did it.
Q. Did you ever meet with your trustee?
A. Well, no, I really was dealing with my lawyer. Like I said, I didn't really see a trustee. The only time I saw a -- the only time $I$ was hearing from a trustee was via mail.
Q. Okay. So I see, you had your own attorney for these bankruptcies?
A. Yes.
Q. And did your attorney -- did your attorney provide
you with any information that you had paid off these LFO's?
A. No. No. He had just -- what he will do is: He will just -- once he received anything from the trustee's office, he will just -- he will just mail it to me.
Q. I see. I see, okay.

So what I'm understanding is -- and just make to sure that I am clear: Is that in 2020, you ran your credit reports through the agencies that you just described and you didn't see anything on those credit reports to indicate that you owed anything in court costs; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So the next sentence says that, "Because probation officers in Shelby Courcy routinely refused to fill out CORs, Plaintiff Perry sought his COR from the Shelby County Clerks of Crimina Court, which will sometimes complete CORs upon request". Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Let's unpack that for a minute. You said because probation officers in Shelby County routinely refused to fill out CORs; where did you get that information?
A. Well, because I -- I learned that my probation officer was supposed to been informed me that I was supposed to get my voting rights back. And however, that didn't -that didn't happen. And -- and honestly, they -- they refused to inform me. And then also they -- they didn't fill
out the necessary paperwork for me so that I would know that I can or could.
Q. Now, you just said that they "refused to inform you", how did they recuse to inform you?
A. Well, because I didn't know. I -- I just -- I found out that they were supposed to be informed me that I was able to get my voting rights back.
Q. But just so I'm clear, they didn't refuse to inform you, it's just they -- for whatever reason, they did not; is that fair?
A. Well, I guess you've got your opinion and I have mine, okay. So...
Q. Well, I want to kind of understand this -- this refused to -- refused to inform you. I mean, you're telling me -- what I'm hearing you saying is that they just did not tell you; is that right?
A. Well, J. think it's both -- I think -- I think they refused and they didn't -- didn't do it.
Q. Okay. How did they refuse?
A. Well -- well, I guess refuse -- I see refused it's -- so well , I guess they just failed me. They just failed not to tell me that.
Q. Okay. And now did you go to any probation officer -- officers ever to seek a COR?
A. Well -- well, the probation officer I was assigned
to was supposed to have done all of that. Because I was meeting -- I was meeting -- because I had to go there monthly just to check in with him on a monthly basis.
Q. And how long did that last?
A. Well, 24 months.
Q. How many? 24 months, right? Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And so that ended in 2008?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so did you go to your probation officer after you ended your probation in 2008?
A. No.
Q. Did you go to any probation office after 2008?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And let me circle back a minute to when you were paying off your debt through the bankruptcies. Other than paperwork that you would get from your lawyer in the bankruptcies, do you have any records indicating that you kept up with how much you owed, how much you paid in court costs, fines, that kind of thing?
A. No. I don't have any. Any records. I lost that in my house fire. I lost all of that in my house fire.
Q. When was your house fire?
A. In 20 -- I had a house fire in 20 -- was it 2020, I believe. I don't recall. But I had a house fire here where

I live at now.
Q. And at your current address?
A. Yes, uh-huh.
Q. And what all burned in the fire?
A. Really -- really it was fire within the wall, it was an electrical fire and really a lot of -- lot of smoke damage and we just threw everything out. I didn't seek to save anything.
Q. So you threw out your papers?
A. Yeah, uh-huh.
Q. All of your pictures?
A. Yeah. A lot of that was damaged a lot of smoke damage was done to it.
Q. Okay. Going back to the paragraph 40 in Exhibit 1, the first amended complaint. It says, "In August of 2020, the Shelby County Clerk of Courts Office refused to fill out his COR stating by e-mail that he still owed $\$ 1,116.10$ in court costs" -- I'm gonna scroll down, sorry -- "on his case". Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. I'm going to stop sharing the complaint for a moment and will share another -- or actually I should probably, okay.

Can you see what I have on the screen?
A. Yes.

MS. JORDAN: The e-mail chain. And this will be marked as Exhibit No. 2.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 2 was marked.)

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. And you see in the middle of the page, there is a from Horton, Cassandra; do you see that?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is that a "yes"?
A. Yes.
Q. And is this the e-mail that you were referring to in the complaint?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is an e-mail from a Cassandra Horton to Blair Bowie; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And Ms. Bowie is on the deposition with us?
A. Yes.
Q. She's one of your attorneys?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, is the complaint back up, do you see that? No?
A. Not yet, e-mail is.
Q. E-mail is still up there?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now you're seeing the complaint again, Exhibit 1?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, it says -- goes on to say that at the time of the original filing in this case, however, his records showed that his only outstanding LFO was a criminal fine of $\$ 952.10$; did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MS. JORDAN: Now, do you see what we are going to mark as Exhibit Number 3?
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 3 was marked.)

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. And this is at the left top left it says the State of Tennessee versus Lamar Perry; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm going to scroll through here, I hope I don't -- and is this all looking familiar to you? And if you need me to scroll up or down, you just let me know.
A. I'm fine.
Q. Okay. All right. And is this the document that
your relying on to claim that you only owed $\$ 952.10$ in fines? And I will go up to you can see it. There we go. It's right here, the fines.
A. Can you go back up some so I can see the date of that --
Q. Absolutely. Absolutely. Does that help?
A. Yes, that is the balance. Yes.
Q. So is this the document that you relied on?
A. Yes.
Q. And it says this document was printed on 10-26-2020; is that correct?
A. Yes. That was -- that's what it has on the bottom, yes, ma'am.
Q. Did you obtain this document yourself?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Okay. And who obtained this document?
A. I do not know.
Q. Who gave it to you?
A. Blair.
Q. Okay. Now, do you understand what is required for you to get your rights restored?
A. I beg your pardon? Can you repeat that again?
Q. Yeah, I'm sorry. Yes. Do you understand what it is that you are required to do or what the requirements are for you to get your rights restored?
A. I thought I did, but it looks like now I have to pay a fine just in order to get it back.
Q. Okay. Do you understand court costs and fees, right?
A. Now I -- yes, I do now. Yeah, I do.
Q. Okay. And also you need to be current in child support obligations; do you understand that?
A. I don't even understand why they got me on child support. I've been fighting that battle for a while. I just understand it from you telling me this.
Q. Okay. This is the first time you have understood that to be the case?
A. Yes, as far as the --as far as the child support goes and I was surprised about court costs and fined as well too.
Q. That that was what was a requirement?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How many times all together have you actually affirmatively sought to get a COR?
A. I tried myself once I learned -- one I learned upon completion of the Second Chance Program, and after that, I seen a couple of commercials on TV about an organization that would help you -- that would help me get them back, particularly in my case, and so I reached out to them.

And after I reached out to them, I've been working
with them, working with them. And honestly, they've been doing all of the leg work and contact of trying to -- trying to -- trying to help me get my voting rights back.
Q. Okay. After you, after the -- and let me make sure I understand. The last time you sought a COR was in 2020 ?
A. Yes.
Q. And that was through these different agencies that you learned about on TV?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you gone to -- have you been involved in that process at all?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. Okay. Explain that for me, if you would.
A. In it -- everything -- anything and everything that comes up new, I will receive a call on either -- either an e-mail, just keep me ácclimated on this -- on the -- on the steps and the --
Q. Can I hold -- if your about to talk about anything that you talked about with any of your attorneys, please don't tell me about that.
A. I'm not.
Q. Okay. Thank you. Then go right ahead.
A. Yeah, but everything -- but every -- but every step in the process of what they've done, they keep me abreast of what's -- of what's -- of what's going on.
Q. And you have been corresponding with them via e-mail?
A. Phone majority of the time.
Q. But do you have some e-mails?
A. I received some, but I don't have any -- I don't save e-mails. I just go ahead and keep my inbox cleared out.
Q. Okay. Who are those -- who are the agencies that you have been dealing with?
A. Well, I wouldn't say -- well, let me retract. I wouldn't say agency, I just say my attorney, Blair, she just keep me abreast of what's going on.
Q. Okay. Okay. Like I said. I don't want to know what the two of you talked abou' and I don't need any e-mails regarding that. But you have received some e-mails that Ms. Bowie has -- Ms. Bowie has responded to maybe not agencies, but -_
A. No, I wouldn't say they corresponded with other agency, just let me know the steps of where this process is going.
Q. Okay. That's -- I'm going to get into what you all discussed or agreed on. I want to be very careful about that.

Okay. And after you were denied a COR or whoever had asked for a COR denied you a COR, did you seek any administrative remedies?
A. No, I didn't.
Q. Okay. And just so we are clear, have you done anything with respect to in the legal sense other than filing this complaint?
A. No.
Q. Have you paid the $\$ 952.10$ ?
A. No.
Q. Have you paid any of it?
A. No.
Q. And why not?
A. Because I just -- I -- I just don't understand why that court fines would prevent me from getting voting rights. That doesn't -- that doesn't make sense to me. So that's why -- that's why I'm just trying to see how this -- this -my case going to -- going to pan out before I make another financial obligation.
Q. And just so we are clear, you do understand that your bankruptcies did not discharge that debt?
A. Yeah. I -- I know now. I know now.
Q. Okay. In the 2017 bankruptcy, that was dismissed in 2022; is that right.
A. I don't recall that in 2022. I think it was before, but don't quote me on it, so I don't recall. I'm not going to speculate.
Q. That's fine. I've got some documents here. Can

```
you see on my screen?
```

MS. JORDAN: This will be what we will mark as Exhibit 4.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 4 was marked.)

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. And this is in the United States Bankruptcy Court Western District of Tennessee; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is your 2017 bankruptcy, right?
A. Yep, that's it.
Q. And this is a document of Chapter 13 Standing Trustees Final Report and Account; is that right?
A. Yep, that's it.
Q. And did you ever receive a copy of this from your lawyer?
A. Can you scroll -- can you take it up some so I can look at it for --
Q. Yes, absolutely. Absolutely.

I'm sorry, it's actually dismissed in 2021. So I beg your pardon about that. Do you see that?
A. Yeah, I see that.
Q. I beg your pardon about that, I thought it was
2022. I beg your pardon.
A. But I don't recall receiving one of these.
Q. Okay. Can you see here where it says schedule of creditors?
A. Yes.
Q. We are still on Exhibit 4. And we've gone down here and it says, Heidi Kuhn Criminal Court Clerk; do you see that?
A. Yes, I see that.
Q. And it says claim -- under claim schedule, it says $\$ 2,616.10$.
A. Yes, I see that. Yes.
Q. And it says -- then i's got claim allowed not applicable and nothing is paid on that; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And then go down further, it's Heidi Kuhn Criminal Court Clerk, clajin allowed $\$ 3,064.10$; did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And the principal paid is $\$ 2,028$; is that right?
A. It's what they got, it's got on there.
Q. Okay. And this was -- let's see, let's go down. And it was filed February 1, 2022; is that right? Right here.
A. Yeah, I see it.
Q. Okay. Yeah, it was filed in two -- so at least as of February 1, 2022, according to the bankruptcy trustee, you still owed Heidi Kuhn Criminal Court Clerk, correct?
A. Yes. That's what the paperwork got, yeah.
Q. Okay.

MS. JORDAN: We will mark this one as Exhibit 5.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 5 was marked )

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Do you see at the top, case 17-31205?
A. Yes, I see it.
Q. And the debtor is tamar Perry, which is you, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is a proof of claim; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And it lists the creditor as the criminal court clerk's office; is that right?
A. It does.
Q. And in this paragraph seven it says, "how much is the claim," and it's $\$ 3,064.10$; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you recall receiving this from your lawyer?
A. I do not.
Q. Okay. And this was filed January 5th, of 2018?
A. Yes, that's what's the date on it is written on there, yes.

MS. JORDAN: All right. Mark this next exhibit as Exhibit 6.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 6 was marked )

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. So Mr. Perry, do you see at the top it says in the United States District Court for che Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville division; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And wie will scroll down, this is still Exhibit 6. Plan of Lamar Perry's responses and objections to defendant's third set of interrogatories; did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And I can scroll down and show you these, but I just want to make sure that you saw these, read these and approved these before they were sent over to us. Do you want me to scroll down?
A. Yes, please. Yeah, you can scroll down.
Q. Okay. And if I'm going to too fast, you can let me know.
A. Yes, I -- I remember this.
Q. Okay. We will just go over, general objections. Now, in answer to interrogatory number 1 -- okay. Interrogatory number 1, it says that, "Who told you in 2013 that you did not qualify for a COR because you had been assessed $\$ 3,288.10$ ? And in your response, include an explanation as to why you believed that you did not owe anything." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And then part of your answer -- I'm not going to read the whole answer, but part of your answer is: "Plaintiff does not remember the name of the person who informed him that he did not qualify for a COR in 2013 because one decade had passed since that initial request. He did not believe that he owed any legal debt on this conviction because he had successfully completed two years on probation and a Second Chance Program as described in the first amended compliant, doc number 102." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Now, why -- what lead to -- why would you believe that after you have completed two years of probation, the Second Chance Program, that you would have fulfilled or paid
off your court costs?
A. Because what I understood that -- that my -- that restitution -- restitution fees when I paid all of that back in two months has -- has taken care of all -- all of that.
Q. Okay. And then on interrogatory number 2, which says in part, I'm not going to read the whole thing. Do you need a break Mr. Perry, are you okay?
A. I'm good. I'm fine.
Q. Okay. Interrogatory number 2 reads in part, "State all facts and identify all persons and documents which support your allegation in paragraph 40 of the amended complaint that because probation officers in Shelby County routinely refuse to fill out CORs, did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And where do you get that information that probation officers in Shelby County routinely refused to fill out CORs?
A. Like then we just had the discussion about that word "refused", right there.
Q. So what you had said before?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. That's fine. And the part of your response states that, "Plaintiff Perry responds as follows with respect to his individual claims: Plaintiff and his agents did not ask any Shelby County probation officers to fill out
his COR". Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. I understand I didn't read the whole thing, but that part I read correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Who are the agents you are referring to?
A. I do not know who -- what agents are there.

MS. JORDAN: Okay. We are going to mark this as Exhibit 7.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. T was marked.)

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. And the title of this document is: "Plaintiff Lamar Perry's responses and objections to defendant's second set of interrogatories." Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And I will cross through this and just make sure that you have seen this document before. It's very similar to the first set.
A. Yes, I remember the document, yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm going to scroll down, interrogatory 3. It says in interrogatory number 3, which states in part that, "To your knowledge please identify any potential class
member including name, their felony convictions, other identifying information, documentation that such person is not subject to a disqualifying conviction as defined in Tenn Code Annotated section mark 40-29-204 and other documentation supporting that each potential class member has satisfied the requirements of Tenn Code Annotated section mark 40-29-202 as described in paragraph 122 of your first amended complaint". Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in part -- I'm going to bring part of this paragraph here, "Plaintiff Perry responds as follows with respect to his individual clains: Plaintiff Perry identifies himself as a member of the punitive class. He states that he has been disentranchised because of a felony conviction and has requested or attempted to request a COR from the pardoning, incarcerated or supervising authority, but to date has not received a COR sufficiat to restore his voting rights". Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And we've talked about this previously, but just so we are clear, in order to get your rights restored, one of the things that you have to do is to be current on your child support obligations; do you understand that?
A. I do now. I didn't know it had anything to do with it until you just spoke it earlier.
Q. All right. And you do acknowledge that you owe child support, correct?
A. I do.

MS. JORDAN: Okay. And we will mark this as Exhibit 8.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 8 was marked.)

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. And can you see that this is document from the Juvenile Court of Memphis and Shelby County, Tennessee; do you see that?
A. Yes, I do.
Q. And it's State of Tennessee ex rel LaKeva Shanell Johnson as a petitioner versus Lamar Dwayne Perry, defendant; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And Lamar Dwayne Perry is you, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it's docket number S 5375 ; is that right?
A. I don't see the docket number. I can't --
Q. It's over on the right-hand side. Do you see that docket number where my curser is?
A. Yeah, I see it now.
Q. Okay. And this is the order which ordered you to pay child support, have you seen this? Is that correct?
A. Yeah, it's been a while ago, but I've seen it, that's correct.

MS. JORDAN: Okay. Last exhibit, which I will mark as Exhibit 9.
(WHEREUPON, Exhibit No. 9 was marked )

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Okay. Can you see this spreadsheet that is in front of you?
A. Yes, I can see it.
Q. Okay. And again, it says docket number 55375 ; do you see where the cursor is?
A. Yes, I see it.
Q. And that was the same docket number that we just saw in Exhibit No. 8, right?
A. Right.
Q. And it LaKeva Johnson as the petitioner?
A. Yeah, that's my wife.
Q. And Lamar Perry as a respondent?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I didn't go back all of way, but just
starting in 2019 -- in 2019 -- or I should say, October 1, 2019, it shows that you owed or you are in arrears $\$ 16,053.59$, correct?
A. Yeah. But I have a court date with child support on the 30th of June coming up to dispute all of this because I took -- we took marriage license down there, my wife gave them a letter and showing that the kid been living -- all three kids have been living with me since day -- since day one. So...
Q. Well, okay. Let's just keep gozng. The last time that you paid any child support was --
A. 2021 right there.
Q. March 1, 2021, in the amount of $\$ 6,735$, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you haven't paid any child support since, right?
A. Right
Q. On March 1, 2021, was not a voluntary payment, you were forced to make that payment, correct?
A. Well, they just took my income tax.
Q. Okay. Well, it wasn't a voluntarily payment?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Sorry, let me make sure, it was not a voluntary payment; is that correct?
A. Yeah, that's correct.
Q. Okay. Now, how do you claim that your due process rights have been violated by the COR process?
A. Read that again, now?
Q. Sure. How do you claim that your due process rights have been violated by the whole COR process?
A. Again, back to my previous answer I gave that I -I don't understand what -- what -- what fines and now child support has to do with me getting my voting rights. I'm still confused about that whole thing. And I see that and that's how you made you case against me, charged that too. So -- but I don't understand and I still don't understand what voting has to do with criminal court charges and child support. Because that's -- I think child support is -that's my personal life, you know, that shouldn't have anything to do with voting rights. So again, you know, it is what it is.
Q. And what do you expect to get out of this lawsuit?
A. I expect to get my voting rights back, that's my expectation.
Q. Anything other than that?
A. Yeah. And I can have a voice -- a voice -- a voice of who that I think would be a great candidate who should be in office, that's -- that's my right.

MS. JORDAN: That's all I've got. Thank you,

Mr. Perry. You've been most patient. Appreciate it. Thank you.

MS. BOWIE: Can we take a quick break.
(Break was taken.)

EXAMINATION BY MS. BOWIE:
Q. Mr. Perry, I just have a couple of quick questions. You mentioned earlier that you learned about the possibility of restoring your voting rights through your Second Chance Program; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And was that program chrough the Shelby County Office of Reentry?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And Eney provided you with some information instructions on how to restore your voting rights through a certificate of restoration; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And that information directed you to the Shelby County Criminal Clerk's Office; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did it mention the probation office at all in relation to the restoration of your voting rights?
A. No.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. That is all I have.

FURTHER EXAMINATION BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Just a couple of real short questions for you, Mr. Perry.

Remember I had asked you about a probation violation and you couldn't recall it; do you remember that?
A. Yes.
Q. And I was looking through -- I just want to make sure, I don't think this will have any bearing on anything, but just to make sure: In November of 2001 , do you recall being arrested for a violation of probation?
A. I do not.
Q. And do you recall on November of 2001 being found in possession of a controiled substance which probably is what lead to a violation of probation?
A. No. I know that's -- that charge was my brother charge. And it's -- I remember the charge of a controlled substance charge, but they gave that charge to my brother Zachary, to my brother Zach, but somehow I guess they gave me a citation or for some of it of the sort.
Q. Okay. So it was your brother that had these issues not you?
A. Yeah, they got -- you got all of that -- got all of that confused up, yes.
Q. Okay. Sorry about that then.

MS. JORDAN: But thank you, Mr. Perry, you've been most patient. And I'm very happy that you've done so well. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT.
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The videoconference deposition of REGINALD HENDRIX was taken by counsel for the Defendants, by Notice, with all participants appearing at their respective locations, on May 16, 2023, for all purposes under the Tennessee Rules of Civil Procedure.

All objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved to the hearing, and said deposition may be read and usen in evidence in said cause of action in any tria? thereon or any proceeding herein.

It is agreed that Deborah H. Honeycutt, Notary Public and Ificensed Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness remotely, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness was not discussed.

THE REPORTER: Good afternoon. My name is Deborah Honeycutt. I am a stenographic reporter with Elite-Brentwood Reporting Services. My license number is 472.

Today's date is May 16, 2023, and the time is approximately 1:03 p.m. Central time.

This is the deposition of Reginald Hendrix in the matter of Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, et al., vs. William Lee, et al., filed in the United States District Court, Middle District of Mennessee, Nashville District. The case number is 3:20-cv-01039.

This deposition is being taken by videoconference, and the oath will be administered remotely by me. Any digital exhibits marked during this deposition will be deemed as "original" for purposes of said deposition.

At this time, I will ask counsel to identify yourselves and state whom you represent. If you have any objections with the procedures I've outlined, please state so when you introduce yourself. We will start with the noticing attorney.

MR. VARELA: Good afternoon. My name is Pablo Varela and I'm here with Dawn Jordan of the Tennessee Attorney's General Office representing the State Defendants in this case.

MS. HULING: Good afternoon. My name is Alice Huling. I'm here on behalf of Plaintiffs. I'm with Campaign Legal Center. And I'm here with my colleagues, Blair Bowie and Ellen Boettcher, both also with Campaign Legal Center.

REGINALD HENDRIX, was called as a witness, and after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Hendrix. My name is Pablo Varela. I'll be taking your deposition this afternoon.

MR. VARELA: Before we get started, Alice, $I$ just wanted to run a couple of things by you. I'm going to be dropping the exhibits into the Chat and as I bring them up. And then I will share my screen if that's okay, Ms. Honeycutt, to go
through them.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Mr. Hendrix, do you have capability there to download those documents and to read them where you are?
A. I am not computer savvy. Okay? I am not.
Q. What $I$ will be doing then is sharing my screen, and when I do that, the documents I'm referring to will be on your screen and you'll be able to read them. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. We may need to -- I may need to scroll through documents so that you get to read the whole thing since you're not going to be able to download them and you may not be able to download them and look at them locally Is that okay?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So a couple of ground rules. Have you ever taken a deposition or given a deposition before?
A. No, sir.
Q. A deposition is just a lawyer asking questions of a witness, just like as if we were in the courtroom talking to the judge or a jury or whatever. I will be asking questions to you and
you'll be answering them. I may not ask a very clear question sometimes and I'm prone to do that. So if $I$ ask you a question that's confusing or you don't understand it and you want me to rephrase it, just tell me and I'll try to do that. Okay?
A. Okay.
Q. If you answer one of my questions, is it okay if $I$ assume that you understood what $I$ was asking? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. During the deposition you may hear the lawyers for the NAACP make an objection. They are noting that objection for the record. However, you're still required to answer, unless they tell you not to answer and have a legal basis for telling you not to answer the ciestion. Does that make sense?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. <Ne can take as many breaks as you need. If you're feeling like you need to get up and stretch, use the facilities, whatever, just let me know. I'm glad to take a five-, ten-minute break whenever you need it.
A. Okay.
Q. And I'll do the same. I may need a break from time to time. And the only thing I'd ask is
that if $I$ have asked a question that you don't -you want to take a break, you answer the question first and then we'll take a break after the answer. Is that okay?
A. That's fine.
Q. Okay. So first thing I want to present is this document. Okay. See if that works. Do you see the document?
A. Yes, I sure do.
Q. Have you seen -- have you been provided a copy of this document, Mr. Hendrix?
A. Yes, I have.
Q. And this is the notice of your deposition; is that right? Hold on a segond. I need to put that in the chat. I'm going to ask that that be marked as Exhibit 1. Can you still see it?
A. Yes, I do I see it.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 1.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Pause sharing that. So tell me right now, where are you located, Mr. Hendrix? Are you in somebody's office? Are you at home?
A. I'm at home.

Q
Is there anybody else with you in the room?
A. My dog. She's -- no. It's just my dog. Q. Well, I think like we all know from the Bush Beans commercial, the dogs keep the secret, right?

Okay. So when did you get -- when were you told that you were going to be giving your deposition?
A. I was told -- I think it's been about a week now. About a week now.
Q. And what did you do to prepare for the deposition?
A. I just went over the documents and everything that was given, the information gave, and make sure it was verified.
Q. So what document -were you provided with documents to review in preparation for the deposition?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you tell me what those documents were?
A. Well, the depositions, and the complaint, and the amended judgments, and everything that you have.
Q. And do you have any documents with you in front of you?
A. No.
Q. No documents?
A. No.
Q. So in preparation for your deposition, did you talk to anybody about it?
A. Well, I went over -- I went over some points with -- with the attorneys. Yes.
Q. With the counsel? I'm not asking what you talked about. But anybody other than the attorneys for the NAACP? Did you speak to anyone?
A. No.
Q. When you spoke with counsel for the NAACP, was it just you and an attorney, or were there other people present?
A. Attorney and I.
Q. All right. If you dor't mind, tell the court where you currently reside
A. I reside in Nashville, Tennessee.
Q. And how long have you lived in Nashville?
A. Most of my entire life.
Q. And that's in Davidson County?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Have you ever lived anywhere else?
A. No.
Q. So you said most of your entire life. Was there a time that you didn't live in Davidson County, Nashville?
A. Yes. This is when $I$ was incarcerated. I
lived in another county.
Q. Okay. Can you -- do you know which county that was?
A. Only, Tennessee.
Q. Are you married?
A. No. I'm divorced.
Q. Any children?
A. No.
Q. Any children other than like not related to your wife or just at all, no children?
A. None.
Q. Are you currently employed?
A. Yes, I am.
Q. Can you briefly give me a description of where you are employed, what you do?
A. I'm, basically, a handyman. I just cut grass and take care of my mom and, you know, just little odds and ends jobs and stuff like that.
Q. And so you own your business; is that accurate?
A. I mean, it's not really a -- it's a small
little grass-cutting, handyman thing.
Q. How long have you been doing that?
A. Off and on since I was released. Uh-huh.
Q. When was that, roughly?
A. It was --
Q. Do you remember?
A. Vaguely, it's like 2016 or so. I'm not exactly sure.
Q. So since about 2016 you've been
self-employed, handyman, doing lawn work and that sort of thing?
A. Yeah.
Q. Is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. How long were you incarceratea then?
A. Off and on, I'm not exactIy sure. It's probably about nine years.
Q. Okay.
A. Not exactly sure
Q. Were you employed at all during that nine-year period when you weren't incarcerated? A. No.
Q. So that would be roughly 2007 to 2016 that you were incarcerated?
A. Yes.
Q. And, I apologize, I have been doing this, I have been kind of talking over your answers and that's my bad. I apologize. I'll try not to do that. That's one of the standard ground rules that
we have because the court reporter is trying to write down what we say. So I'll try not to talk over you and if you wouldn't mind let me finish the question before answering. It'll slow down a little bit but also it'll let her write down what we're talking about and it makes sense. Okay?

Okay. So prior to incarceration, were you employed?
A. Yes.
Q. What were you employed as?
A. I was a -- I was a landscaper.
Q. During what time period? Nhat years?
A. Before incarceration? I can't remember. I honestly can't remember.
Q. Well, what other employment did you have prior to landscaping?
A. I worked in restaurants. And I was like a musician. I played sparingly as a musician.
Q. What do you play?
A. I play bass guitar and keyboards.
Q. Upright?
A. Either, upright and. I started off playing classical in high school, symphony.
Q. So are you a member of the Tennessee Chapter of the NAACP?
A. No, I'm not.
Q. You're not?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And how then -- okay. Let's talk a little bit then about the complaint that was filed in this case.

How did you come to be involved in this lawsuit then?
A. Initially, when I was -- after I had -had -- was released from probation, paid all my fines and all that, I had a, you knoli -- I had some obstacles trying to get through and wasn't given proper information to -- to vote. I was trying to get my voting rights restgred and I tried other organizations but nobody would never respond. And I was never -- by the state -- when $I$ was on state probation, I never had given -- nobody has never given me the resources.

So what happened, I found -- I was unsuccessful initially, and then $I$ found a service and they connected me with a service that could help me get my restoration restored of voting, to vote. Q. So you were looking to get your voting rights restored after you completed your sentence and everything related to the felonies; is that right?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. You reached out to several organizations to try to help you do that; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you remember what the name of those organizations were or some of them?
A. I don't. I really don't.
Q. Do you still have any contact information for those organizations somewhere?
A. Oh, yeah, probably on my phone. Yes.

MR. VARELA: Okay. Coula I ask that you provide those to your counsel and that they turn those over to the State after the deposition. Is that okay, Alice?

MS. HULING: Certainly. I think we can circle back on that at the end of the deposition and touch base on what that is.

MR. VARELA: Okay, great.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. And, Mr. Hendrix, what I'm asking for is that you provide your attorneys for the NAACP a list of the organizations you reached out to and contacts for those organizations so that they can provide those to the State.

So, Mr. Hendrix, if I understood your
testimony just now, you finally found an organization that was able to help you; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Which organization was that?
A. It was through -- it wasn't really an organization. It was some -- I don't exactly know the name. I don't know the name.
Q. Do you know who you spoke with?
A. Amy .
Q. Amy?
A. Yeah.
Q. Do you still have contact information for Amy?
A. I sure do. That s the organization. Yes, I do. Yes.
Q. And what gou said is that that organization connected you to the NAACP; is that right?
A. Right, exactly.
Q. So then how did it come about that you -were you asked to join the lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask to join the lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. Well, then how did it come about that you are
a named plaintiff in this lawsuit?
A. Excuse me. I misunderstood the question. Can you repeat that, again?
Q. Sure. Let me do this. Let me share --
A. Okay.
Q. -- the complaint. Or the amended complaint.

Do you see that on your screen?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see right here where I'm highlighting?
A. Oh, yes, yes. Okay. I remember Yes.
Q. So my question is like how dia it come about
that you decided to join the lawsuit? How did you join this lawsuit?
A. Yes, through the organization, through the NAACP. Yes.
Q. Did you ask them to join the lawsuit?
A. Yes, I did.
Q. Did they tell you -- first of all, did you talk with anybody at the NAACP that was not a lawyer?
A. No.
Q. So you only spoke with counsel at the NAACP?
A. Yes.
Q. In your own words, what is this case about?
A. This case is about -- was about, you know,
people that's been formerly incarcerated was just having problems, you know, you know, voting again. My whole gist of this is what I have -- basically what I had to go through in order to vote. I was just like -- I wasn't given information or anything like that. It was kind of frustrating.
Q. What $I$ hear you saying is that this case is about the process to get your rights to vote back? A. Yes.

MR. VARELA: So in the complaint -- and I'm going to drop that in the chat. I'm going to ask that the first amended complaint be marked as Exhibit 2, please.
(WHEREUPON, a diocument was marked as
Exhibit Number 2.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Mr. Hendrix, if I can turn your attention to page two, right here that should be on your screen. A. Okay.
Q. Of the first amended complaint. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see the word introduction at the top?
A. Yes.
Q. And then paragraph one, I'm going to
highlight a sentence. It says: Plaintiffs' claims arise under the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and the Twenty-Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Did I read that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And it also says: Plaintiffs also challenge aspects of the voter registration process for individuals with felony convictions unerer the National Voter Registration Act, NVRA. Did I read that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So in the complaint, you're alleging that your due process and ecual protection rights have been violated by what?

MS. UULING: Objection to the extent that calls for a legal conclusion. Mr. Hendrix, you can answer to the extent you know.

THE WITNESS: Can you please repeat
that, please?
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Absolutely. I think it was a terrible question also, so I'll try to rephrase it.

So in your complaint you're alleging that
your due process rights were violated by the State's restoration process, the voting rights restoration process; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. What due process was violated by the State's restoration process? Which of your due processes were violated?

MS. HULING: Same objection.
MR. VARELA: Go ahead.
MS. HULING: Go ahead. Mr. Hendrix, you can go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Well, the process how -it was kind of hard for me to, to register to vote. Every -- I wasn't given any kind of information of how to vote after $I$ was released and after $I$ had paid my fines and dues for the court. Okay? I was just running inte shut doors after, you know -nobody would not give me any information. That's why I had to reach out to these organizations in order to get my rights restored as a voter. BY MR. VARELA:
Q. So if I understand you correctly, the process violated your due process rights because it was difficult? Is that what you're saying?

MS. HULING: Same objection. You can go
ahead, Mr. Hendrix, to the extent you know.
THE WITNESS: Not particularly that. It's just that $I$ wasn't given any information how this process worked through the State. I was under State probation and I, you know, the probation officer, any of those, they have never given me any kind of avenues to do this. I, basically, had to go and seek my own -- the process of how to restore my voting, you know. Through the meetings, the Alcoholics Anonymous meetings that $I$ went through, and a lot of people in recovery had gone through that process as well, you know. And I just, you know -- I was kind of like dumiofounded to -- to -how to get it restored.
Q. So you testified earlier that you were incarcerated; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And yoa were released in 2016; is that right?
A. Yeah.
Q. Approximately?
A. Yeah.
Q. Can you walk me through like on your last day or leading up to your release date, what happens when you're being released?
A. Well, actually, I was in the Williamson

County Drug Court and it wasn't -- I wasn't released. I was released from probation. I was released from probation. I wasn't released from a prison itself. I went through Drug Court in Williamson County. I don't know the judiciary district. I successfully was under Judge Timmy Sterr (phonetic) and -- and I graduated and paid my fines. And after $I$ had paid my fines and all that, I was just trying to, you know, get my voting rights restored. And it was just like ran into obstacles after obstacles.
Q. Did you -- we'll get to the history. I'm just curious. When you were Celeased from Drug Court, were you provided any documents from the court, from the attorncys that represented you or were prosecuting or presenting you for graduation to the court?
A. No.
Q. And at that time, did you have any restitution that was ordered for you to pay?
A. Yes.
Q. And were there court costs assessed against you related to those criminal cases?

MS. HULING: Objection to the extent these are calling for legal analysis. But you can
go ahead, Mr. Hendrix.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. I wasn't quite clear on your testimony. Did you say that when you graduated those had already been paid, your court costs and your restitution, or did you then pay it?

MS. HULING: Same objection. Go ahead, Mr. Hendrix.

THE WITNESS: I paid them as I -- yes. In order for me to be formally released, I had to pay my restitution and fines. BY MR. VARELA:
Q. So that was a condition to graduating from the Drug Court?
A. No, sir. No. It's just to be -- to get to a point of, you know, of getting released from -- from probation, yoa know. Because I was told at the time that if the fines and restitution is not paid, I don't think I could be released from probation. Q. Okay.
A. I don't know if that's fact or legal. I don't know.
Q. Did you have representation in your criminal cases?
A. Yes.
Q. In Williamson County?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that court appointed or did you retain an attorney?
A. It was retained.
Q. And did your attorney explain to you anything related to the probation process, the restoration of rights process, the graduation from Drug Court process?
A. No. She represented me and noved to -- I did not have any contact with her afear my sentence. She never -- she explained what I -- when I was sentenced, what I would one as far as restitution and fines and I, you know -- during the -- the -the incarceration I never -- I never -- I never heard anything eise from her from that point. Q. Okay. I'm going to turn your attention to the amended complaint, page 37 now. Can you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you see where it says class allegations on your screen?
A. Yes.
Q. Paragraph number 120 , it reads that:

Plaintiffs Perry, Gray, Weare, Tournier, Scott, and Hendrix seek to represent the class of COR seekers. COR or is certificate of restoration of rights; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. It goes on to say: This class consists of Tennessee residents who have been disenfranchised because of a felony conviction and have requested or attempted to request a COR from the bardoning, incarcerating, or supervising authority, but to date have not received a COR sufficient to restore their voting rights; is that corract?
A. Yes.
Q. So paragraph 120 , is it fair to say that it defines what the class is in this case?

Ma. HULING: Objection to the extent that's calling for a legal conclusion. BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Are you a member of this class?

MS. HULING: Objection to the extent that calls for a legal conclusion. Go ahead, Mr. Hendrix.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. So you requested a COR and did not receive one?
A. I did receive one after -- after I had gone through the process.
Q. Okay. So did you get your voting rights restored?
A. Eventually, I did.
Q. So, currently, do you have the right to vote?
A. I do.
Q. So are you currently a member of this class then?

MS. HULING: Objection to the extent that calls for a legal condiusion.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. You can go ahead, Mr. Hendrix.
A. Yes.
Q. Do you still consider yourself a member of this class that does not have a COR and has not had their voting rights restored?
A. No.

MS. HULING: Same objection. This is all legal analysis and legal conclusions.

MR. VARELA: Noted.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. So you don't consider yourself a member of this class now?
A. No.

MS. HULING: And same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Paragraph 121 states: Individual plaintiffs do not to seek claims for compensatory relief. They seek only declaratory and injunctive relief that is broadly applicable to all class members. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So, in your own tords, what are you asking this court to do in this case?

MS. UULING: Same objection to the extent that'scalling for legal analysis.

Mr. Hendrix, you can go ahead to the extent you know.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think to that extent, make it easier and more informative and make it easy for people who want to get their rights restored. That's -- that's -- make it easier for people that is incarcerated to easily have their
voting rights restored.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Is that -- in your opinion, is it fair to say that to make it easier for incarcerated persons to get their voting right restored, that you're asking the court to provide something to protect your rights that you're complaining were violated here? MS. HULING: Objection. Legal
conclusion. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: No. It's just an easier path for people to have information how to get their rights restored after paying their fines, going through everything in the court system, and just making it easier. It s just like -- I mean, I -- it was just kind of frustrating. And I know some people that doesn't have any kind of formal education and fiaish and done all the things they were supposed to do according to the law of restoration, make it easier for them and give them information. The State did not give me any information how to get my rights restored after I had paid my fines.
Q. Okay. If I understand correctly, and you correct me, in this complaint you're alleging that your right to this process was violated; is that
right?
MS. HULING: Same objection. Legal
conclusion. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. And if I understand what you're saying, you're asking the court to order the defendant to make it easier by providing information to incarcerated individuals who have lost the right to vote on how to restore those rights; is that correct?

MS. HULING: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Corcect.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. I'm sorry?
A. Correct.
Q. So now that you've gone through the process of obtaining your certificate of restoration of rights and your voting rights back, what is your understanding of how that works?
A. My understanding of --

MS. HULING: Same objection. I'm sorry, Mr. Hendrix. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Now can you repeat that? I'm just kind of --

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Now that you've gone through the process and gotten your certificates of restoration of rights and your voting right back, what is your understanding of how the process works?
A. Well, my understanding of how the process works now that you have to really, you know, find -find someone that -- that can, you know, kind of guide you through the process. Because me, I'm not a legal expert or anything like that. I just -somebody to help you just kind of, vou know, going through the path of restoration. BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Did you ever go to the Tennessee Division of Correction's parole office and ask for a certificate of restoration of rights?
A. After -- after I -- after -- after -afterwards, yes, I did.
Q. And when you say afterwards, do you mean after you found out that you had to go and ask for them?
A. I had to go, yes.
Q. That makes sense.
A. Yeah.
Q. So what you're saying is the first thing is
you needed to find out the information, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And then you had to get a certificate of restoration of rights; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And there's a process to that, correct?
A. Right.
Q. What is your understanding of what a
certificate of restoration of rights is?
A. My understanding is that you have done your time, you have paid your restitution, and you have paid your fines, and after that process you go back petition the courts and to get whatever information you need. I don't know ir legal terms what. That's why I had to seek help.
Q. I'm going to share with you another document, Mr. Hendrix. Do you see the document on your screen titled TCA Seztion 40-29-203?
A. Yes.
Q. And underneath that box, in the citation, it says -- it's titled: 40-29-203. Certificate of voter rights restoration; voter registration card. Is that correct? Is that right?
A. Yes.

MR. VARELA: Okay. I'm going to ask
that that be marked as the next exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 3.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Section A says that: A person eligible to apply for a voter registration card -- sorry, let me scratch that.

A person eligible to apply for a voter registration card and have the right of suffrage restored, pursuant to 40-29-202 may request and then shall be issued a certificate of voter rights restoration upon a form prescribed by the coordinator of elections. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Is it your understanding that a certificate of voting rights restoration is a form?

Ma. HULING: Objection to the extent that's a legal conclusion.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. And do you understand by what I have read here that it is a form that's prescribed by the coordinator of elections?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you, Mr. Hendrix. I'm going to share -- I'm going to share another document with you. Let me know if you see a document entitled certificate of restoration of voting rights on your screen. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen one of these before?
A. I sure have.
Q. What is this document?
A. A certificate of registration.
Q. Certificate of voter -- of restoration?
A. Yes. Yes, sir.

MR. VARELA: I'm going to ask that that be marked as the next exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 4.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Thank you. Is it your understanding that this document is provided to you upon request?
A. Excuse me. Can you repeat that?
Q. Is it your understanding that you have to ask for a certificate of restoration of voting rights?
A. Yes. After I had, you know, gone through the formal.
Q. And what is your understanding about what
needs to be filled out on this form?
A. It's --

MS. HULING: Sorry. Objection for legal conclusions there. But go ahead, Mr. Hendrix. THE WITNESS: Yes. Just applying my information, my prison sentences and all that, you know.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. But that's not filled out by you, correct?
A. Excuse me?
Q. You don't fill out this form do you?
A. No. Huh-uh.
Q. Turning your attentior to this gray box at the top of the certificate of restoration of voting rights form, the seconc sentence, I'm going to read that. It says: A separate form must be completed for each felony conviction with a different docket case number. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. What does that mean to you?

MS. HULING: Objection to the extent it
calls for a legal conclusion. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Yeah. It's just basically all a separate form. Basically, all my convictions, the convictions I made, I have to fill
them out to the extent of what kind of crime it was. Q. Okay. So if I understood you correctly, you understand that this form needs to be filled out for each separate felony conviction that has a separate docket number; is that right?
A. (No response.)

MS. HULING: Same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Is that a yes, Mr. Hendrix? I'm sorry.
A. Yes.
Q. If I can turn your attention to Section 2. I'm going to highlight. Would you please read that to yourself and let me know when you're done.
A. Okay.
Q. What is Section 2 addressing on this form?
A. This, basicaliy, the sentences, okay. And when you were released in, you know, the supervision of -- of, you know, probation and parole.
Q. Is it fair to say that Section 2 addresses if a person has completed their sentence for a probation or parole or of incarceration?
A. Correct.

MS. HULING: Objection to the extent that's a legal conclusion. / /

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Is it your understanding that the entity or the organization that issues this form has to verify that those sentences were complete?
A. Correct.

MS. HULING: Same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Under Section 3, can you read to yourself and let me know when you're done.
A. Okay.
Q. What does Section 3 discuss or address?
A. About restitution and fines, court fines.
Q. Is it your understanding that this section requires the entity or organization issuing the form to verify that restitution and court costs or court fines have been paid before issuing it?
A. Correct.

Ms. HULING: Same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Now, in some cases you may not be ordered to pay restitution; is that right?

MS. HULING: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. And then would you do the same for Section 4.

Read that to yourself and let me know when you're done.
A. Okay.
Q. What is Section 4 addressing on that form?
A. If these fines have been paid.
Q. Which fines are those?
A. Court fines.

MS. HULING: Same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Is it your understanding that the issuing entity has to verify that your court costs have been paid in Section 4?
A. Correct.

MS. HULING: Same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. So you understand that the form can't be issued unless this information in each of these sections is verified; is that right?

MS. HULING: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Okay. All right. Let's go back -- let's go now and talk about the felony convictions related to -- your felony convictions related to this case. Let me share with you a document. First let's go to
the complaint. Direct you back to the first amended complaint. Mr. Hendrix, let me know when you see that on your screen.
A. I see it.
Q. On page 17 of the first amended complaint, do you see paragraph 45?
A. Yes.
Q. And in paragraph 45, the third sentence states: Mr. Hendrix struggled with drug addiction and was convicted of a series of drug and theft crimes in Williamson and Davidson County over a roughly 15 -year period starting in his early 30 's; is that correct?
A. Yes?
Q. Thank you, Mr. Hendrix. And now let me direct your attention to this document. I'm sharing with you a document that is titled at the top Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole Post-Sentence Report. Do you see that on your screen?
A. Yes.
Q. And the name under defendant information, is that referring to you?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. Is the address listed there the address that
you live at or lived at in 2012?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'll direct you to page two of the report. Down near the bottom, it lists a series of years, case years, and a docket number. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that docket number reads. I-CR095913; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then if I direct you to nage three, this page is entitled official version. Is that what it says at the top?
A. Yes.
Q. If you could read that to yourself and let me know when you're done.

Is this related to a felony conviction of yours from 2012 in Williamson County?
A. Yes, sir.
Q. And there are six counts on this page; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Three of them are for burglary and three of them are for theft over $\$ 500.00$; is that right? A. Correct.
Q. On page four, in the middle of the page, there's a section entitled prior record. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm going to scroll through this to the end so we can discuss about how many pages because I believe it's in reverse chronological order. So this I'm showing you now page ten of the report. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And at the top, it's still got that section prior record. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And there's only one offense date on that page. Do you see that tip there?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's dated 1991?
A. Yes.
Q. And then four lines down, the disposition date was in 1992; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And then on page nine, at the bottom, it's showing an offense date of 1991 for a separate offense; is that right?
A. Correct.

MS. HULING: Counsel, to the extent it's helpful, $I$ just want to state that we can stipulate to his convictions, if that makes things easier on your end. But the sort of contours of his convictions aren't really relevant to the case. MR. VARELA: I understand what you're saying, Alice, and I appreciate the offer to stipulate to his convictions. I'm going to go ahead and move this into evidence as the next exhibit. (WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 5.)

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. But I wanted to discuss with you, Mr. Hendrix, starting on gage nine, there are a series of offenses and convictions and they were in 1992. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm going to see if I can direct you to the parts of pages that I'm looking at. On page nine, at the top, the third offense down, there's an offense with a Docket Number 39-A-114. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And that's for aggravated burglary; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And you see one above that with a separate docket number, 93-B-734; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Also for aggravated burglary?

MS. HULING: I'm sorry, I just would put in again that if you're putting this into evidence and we're stipulating to the convictions, I think we are getting close to harassing here to go through all of these. I'd -- I mean --

MR. VARELA: Your objection is noted, Alice. I'm not trying to harass I'm trying to make a point here and it's not to harass Mr. Hendrix.

MS. HULING: And, again, he's --
MR. VAREEA: And I will make an objection here to your speaking objection at this point.

MS. HULING: Agreed to the convictions. He's not trying to argue them. That's not a point in contention.

MR. VARELA: I'm not making that point, Alice. If you would let me finish.

MS. HULING: I'll -- yes, you can
continue but --

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Let me make this a little bit easier. I apologize for having to go through all of the convictions. I'm not trying to put those out there. What I am trying to indicate to you is that on this page there are three separate docket numbers for three separate felony convictions in 1993; is that correct?
A. Right.
Q. Now, on page eight, there are four docket numbers, and I can point those out to you for four separate felony convictions; is that correct? A. Correct.
Q. Now I'm going to read those docket numbers so that they're on the record. And that would be 93-B-731 for aggravated burglary; 93-B-730, same; 93-B-729, same; and 93-B-853. Do you see that one at the bottom?
A. Yes.
Q. And that one lists a conviction offense of aggravated assault; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Now, on page seven, starting at the bottom, there are three more docket numbers, 93-B-726, 93-B-732, and 93-B-727, all for separate docket
numbers for separate felony offenses; is that correct?
A. Right.
Q. And that's 1993. So by my count, that's ten separate docket numbers in 1993, nine of them for aggravated burglary and one for an aggravated assault. Did I count those correctly?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you know if restitution was ordered in any of those cases?
A. Yes. I'm exactly not a hundjed percent sure, but I'm almost certain it did.
Q. Now, aggravated assaul is not a drug crime, is it?
A. No, sir.
Q. Aggravated assault --

MS. UULING: Objection. Objection to
the extent these are calling for legal conclusions. Go ahead.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Aggravated assault is also not a theft crime, is it?
A. Correct.

MS. HULING: Same objection.

BY MR. VARELO:
Q. Now, turning to page five and six, these list several docket numbers for convictions in 1995. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And on page six, there's one offense, Docket Number 94-B-2262. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And on page five, there's four more docket numbers for separate felony offenses and convictions; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And so in 1995 by my count in Williamson County there were five separate docket numbers, four felony convictions for theft and one for forgery. Did I count those up correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. And then on page four -- I'm sorry. Do you know if restitution was ordered in any of those cases in 1995?
A. I'm almost certain it was, yes.
Q. And on page five at the top, there are -there's a criminal conviction for a case in 2002. Do you recall that conviction? It's Docket Number 2002-I-890?
A. I don't remember. I don't remember.
Q. Okay. That's fair. And then on page four, I think there are -- there's one more separate felony conviction with a separate docket number.

Now, by my counting in this document is reflected at least 18 separate felony convictions with separate docket numbers. Did I count those up correctly, Mr. Hendrix?
A. Yes, I guess. Yes.
Q. Now, after these convictions, did you have any other convictions in 2012?
A. I think so. I vaguely remember because during that period $I$ was -- I wasn't in recovery.
Q. Was that maybe in Davidson County?
A. In 2012?
Q. Yes.
A. I can't remember.
Q. That'sfair. Now, after conviction, after you served your sentences and paid restitution, did you ever seek expungement of any of your criminal record?
A. Yes. I did in Davidson County.
Q. And what was the result of that?
A. I can't remember.
Q. You don't remember if the record was expunged
or not?
A. I can't remember.
Q. Okay. Did you seek to expunge your record in Williamson County?
A. No.
Q. Why not?

MS. HULING: Objection. I'm not sure how this is relevant, why. But you can answer to the extent you can, Mr. Hendrix.

THE WITNESS: I just never did. I just don't know why. BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Okay. All right. Going back to the amended complaint. On page nine, 1 believe -- no, sorry. Page 17. In the complaint, you allege that you requested -- you requested a COR from parole and probation office in Williamson County and was given two complete OORs covering his five convictions in that county; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. What did you do after you received those two --
A. Yes. Okay. Basically, after I was trying to get the criminal restoration, okay, restored, this is when I had to -- I had to do, okay, for

Williamson County.
Q. After you received them, what did you do with those CORs after you received them?
A. I can't remember.
Q. Did you submit them to an election office to get your rights restored?
A. Yes, yes, yes. Yes, I did.
Q. Is it fair to say that the first step was to get the CORs and then the next step was to present the CORs to the election office to get your voting rights back?

MS. HULING: Objection to the extent that calls for a legal conclusion. Go ahead, Mr. Hendrix.

THE WITNESS Correct.
BY MR. VARELO:
Q. So you didn't get to register to vote through the Tennessee Division of Corrections parole office, did you?
A. No.
Q. Is it fair to say that your understanding is that TDOC does not restore your right to vote?

MS. HULING: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: No. I don't think so.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. No, they don't or no, that's not your understanding?
A. They don't. I don't think so. I'm not sure.
Q. So is it fair to say that the Division of Elections is the body that restores your right to vote or allows you to register to vote?

MS. HULING: Same objection.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. And what happened after you presented those two certificates of restoration of rights to the election commission?
A. I was rejected because they said that I had not at that time -- I had paid all my fines and restitutions.
Q. How did they notify you that you were denied your right toregister to vote?
A. Through mail.
Q. Now, was that the Davidson County Election Commission?
A. Yes.
Q. So they sent you a letter in the mail; is that right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And was a copy of that letter provided to the State Defendants in discovery?
A. Yes.
Q. That was provided to your attorneys?
A. Yes.

MR. VARELA: Okay. I'm going to go back and check, Alice, but I looked for that and I couldn't find it. So if you wouldn't mind resending that?

MS. HULING: I believe that it was actually contained within Defendants production but we can talk about it.

MR. VARELA: That's fine. I didn't go look there yet. But I'll take a look, and if I find it I'll let you know.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Mr. Hendrix, when you got that letter, what did you do?
A. With the organization that was helping me, that was helping me, they had went back to the court and to find out whatever $I$ owed in Davidson County in order to get it, you know -- they said all the fines wasn't paid, basically. Fines and restitution wasn't paid.
Q. At the time you presented the certificates of
restoration from Williamson County, had you -- did you present also certificates of restoration for your felony convictions from Davidson County?
A. I'm not sure of the time. I'm not sure.
Q. I'm sorry, I -- maybe I wasn't clear. But --
so you got two certificate of restoration from
Williamson County; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then you presented those to the election commission to get the right to vote back, right? A. Correct.
Q. At any time, did you ask 0 get your certificates of restoration for your convictions from Davidson County befors you presented those to the election commission
A. Yes. At that time, I didn't know if $I$ owed any fines because it was so many convictions I did not, you know - things was popping up on me, like I didn't even -- they didn't even know initially when I first started paying the court's fines and all that. And so, you know, more and more, that the crimes that I -- that was -- I was convicted of, you know, these fines they found out that other fines wasn't paid in certain cases.
Q. At a certain point after you received that
rejection letter, did you ever ask the election commission to appeal that rejection?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the response?
A. I can't remember. I cannot.
Q. Did you present an appeal to the election commission?
A. I believe -- I believe the organization that was helping me get the restoration did.
Q. So your rights to this process of getting your certificate of restoration and then your voting rights restored, in your mind, would it protect your rights if there was an appeal process where a rejection can be appealed to an authority?

MS. HULING: Objection to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion. Go ahead. THE wITNESS: I don't know. I really don't know.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. You understand that if you were to appeal a rejection of those rights you would have an
opportunity to present your case to somebody, some authority; is that right?
A. Yeah, I understand that. Yes.
Q. And they can make a determination on whether
that was properly or improperly rejected; is that right?
A. I don't know.

MS. HULING: Same objection.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. And is that correct? I'm sorry, I didn't hear what your response was.
A. That's correct.
Q. And so would that protect you, to make sure that your rights weren't being violateo as to the voting rights restoration?

MS. HULING: Same obfection.
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Okay. Let me turn your attention to another document. I'm sharing with you a document, Mr. Hendrix, entitled Plaintiff Reginald Hendrix's Responses and Objections to Defendant's First Set Of Interrogatories. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And I'm going to turn your attention to page seven, interrogatory number three at the bottom. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And I want to read that. It says: Identify
all documents relating to your answers to each of these interrogatories, including all documents relied upon in answering Defendant's first set of interrogatories; is that correct?
A. Right. Yes.
Q. And then if $I$ turn your attention to page nine -- well, let's start on page eight. There's interrogatory number four. Do you see that? A. Yes.
Q. And it states: To your knowledge, please identify any potential class members including name, their felony conviction, ofher identifying information, documentation that such person is not subject to a disqualifying conviction under Tennessee Code Annotated 40-29-204 and other documentation supporing that each potential class member has satisfied the requirements of Tennessee Code Annotated 40-29-202 as described in paragraph 122 of your first amended complaint. Did I read that correctly?
A. Correct.
Q. And on page nine, in the middle of the page, your response states: Without waiving the above objection Plaintiff Hendrix responds as follows with respect to his individual claims: Plaintiff Hendrix
identifies himself as a member of the punitive class. He states that he has been disenfranchised because of a felony conviction and has requested or attempted to request a COR of the pardoning, incarcerating, or supervising authority but to date has not received a COR sufficient to restore his voting rights. Did I read that correctly? A. Correct.
Q. Are you saying here that you asked for a COR and you did not get one sufficient to get your voting right back?
A. Correct.
Q. If I turn your attention to page ten, the last sentence at the top portion, it says: Despite this improper rejection, Plaintiff Hendrix restarted the process seeking additional CORs for his Davidson County convictions from the Davidson County Probation Office and submitted them to the Davidson County Election Office. His COR was approved and his voting right restored 11 days after the first amended complaint was filed. Did I read that correctly?
A. Correct.
Q. So my question to you, Mr. Hendrix, is which is it? Did you ask for CORs and didn't get them or
did you get them and now have your voting rights back?

MS. HULING: Objection. Form.
THE WITNESS: I requested them and I did not receive them and then later it was approved. BY MR. VARELA:
Q. So you did get them and you do have your voting right now?
A. Yes, I do. Now I do.
Q. Now, were copies of your certificates of restoration that you received provided to your counsel in this case and provided to Defendants in response to discovery requests?
A. Repeat that, sir.
Q. Did we get copies of your CoRs that you received?

MR. IIARELA: That's what I'm asking, Alice.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. VARELA: Alice, are those in our production as well?

MS. HULING: I believe so. I believe they're in the elections division production, to be more clear.

MR. VARELA: Okay. How about we take a
short break? Is that okay?
MS. HULING: Yes. So we'll be back on at 2:20.
(Recess observed.)
BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Mr. Hendrix, just a few more questions. Thank you for your patience. I know this is not the most fun thing in the whole world. Question to you.

Now that you've had your voting right restored, I think your complaint said that it happened in May of 2022; is that cofrect?
A. Correct.
Q. Is that not correct?

MS. HULING: That's not correct. That's not what the complaint says.

MR. VARESA: Never guess. Always
verify, right?
BY MR. VARELA.
Q. I'm sorry. That's when your first attempt was denied because there were additional criminal felony convictions that were not on the COR; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. After that, you received CORs from Davidson County, submitted those to the elections division,
and then you were approved; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. How were you informed that you were approved to have your voting right restored?
A. The election commission contacted me.
Q. By phone, by email, by letter?
A. By phone.

MR. VARELA: By phone, okay. And so, Alice, what you're saying is that a letter has not yet been sent from the election commission confirming that Mr . Hendrix has his rights restored? MS. HULING: That the elections division has all of them for the State and so should also have Mr. Hendrix and they produced the denials and approvals up to a certain date but his approval came after that date and we've not gotten a supplement that included that.

Mp. VARELA: Got you. And if you don't mind, just putting that in an email specifically, about whatever date supplement went through, we'll work on getting that.

BY MR. VARELA:
Q. Mr. Hendrix, last question. Do you have your voter registration card.
A. Yes, I do.

MR. VARELA: Congratulations. I have no further questions.

MS. HULING: I do have a few questions. Mr. Hendrix, I'm sure you were hoping that that was it, but just a few more and I promise to be brief.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. HULING:
Q. When you were speaking with Mr. Varela -- am I saying that correctly?

MR. VARELA: That's righe.
BY MS. HULING:
Q. When you were speaking with Mr. Varela, I believe you said that someone helped you in the process of getting the completed CORs and submitting them?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And when Mr. Varela said that you submitted something to your elections office, was that you personally or with the help of the volunteer who you were working with?
A. The help of the volunteer. I was kind of confused a little bit.
Q. Absolutely. Not a problem. We all use shorthand sometimes. Okay.

And so just to the best of your understanding through that process, when you were first working with that volunteer, you-all asked the designated official from the Department of Corrections [sic] for CORs; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And then -- actually -- and I'm going to pull up, actually, the denial letter here since we have it. One second, please. I'm going to share my screen in a minute.

All right. Mr. Hendrix, do vou see a document here? It says at the top, Tennessee Secretary of State on that top line?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And I'm going to scroll down. So you, with the help of the volunteer that you were working with, contacted an official from the Department of Correction seeking CORs that you needed to get your rights restored; is that accurate?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you recognize the document that I've scrolled down to here, the certificate of restoration?
A. Yes.
Q. It looks like here we see two of them. Are
these the two CORs you received at that time covering some of your convictions, it looks like? A. Yes.
Q. And with the help of the volunteer you were working with, were these then submitted for your rights restoration?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. And it looks like these were then submitted.

And if we scroll up to the top here, we have this letter, which if you look at the bold in the middle, that says reason for denial of restoration and this is that May 13, 2022 date. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you seen this latter before?
A. Yes, I have. I received that letter.
Q. Okay. Do you know who you received that from?
A. It came from the State, I believe, if I'm not mistaken. I could be wrong. I can't -- vaguely remember. Because I remember seeing that letter. Q. Okay. But you're not sure who exactly shared it with you?
A. No.
Q. Okay. This says the reason for denial of restoration is additional convictions not listed on
the COR. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you understand that to mean?
A. There was more convictions that -- that -that hadn't -- hadn't been submitted.
Q. Okay. I'm going to scroll down back through the fax and the CORs that we just looked at to the last page here. This is an email. It is sent from Jessica -- someone named Jessica Limm to someone named Carlatina Hampton. Do you see this?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever seen this email before?
(Technical difficolty. Court Reporter lost connection at 2:30 p.m.)
(Transcript continues in Volume 2, page 65.)
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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Exhibit No. 7
Letter Labeled Tennessee Secretary of State
(WHEREUPON, Shana Crawford, LCR, was the stenographer for the remaining deposition of Reginald Hendrix:)

*     *         * 

MS. HULING: This document that's up right now, I don't think we moved that into evidence, but $I$ would like to move that into evidence.

MR. VARELA: Not yet, and I was going to suggest that. If you wouldn't mind dropping it in the chat as well.

MS. HULING: Yeah. Let me actually see if Ellen -Ellen, if you can hear me, would you be able to drop that into the chat?

MS. BOETTHER: Ies, I can do that.
MS. HULING: Thank you, so much.
MR. VAKELA: And just -- could we ask that it be redacted? I think that there are social security numbers and stuff on some of those pages, Alice.

MS. HULING: Got it.
MS. BOETTHER: Do you want me to redact it before I put it in the chat?

MR. VARELA: It would be better.
MS. HULING: Or if it's -- if it's all the same, we could also follow up via e-mail with the redacted copy to Ms.

Crawford and everybody on the call. If you can't do it then, Ellen, but if you can, that would be great.

MS. BOETTHER: Okay.
MS. HULING: Okay. Great.
MR. VARELA: One last thing, Alice, do you recall what exhibit we were on for the court reporter?

MS. HULING: You know what, I think I might actually. Let me see, $I$ think this would be Exhibit 6.

MR. VARELA: Did we move the interrogatories in too as an exhibit?

MS. HULING: I'm not positive. If we did, this would be Exhibit 7.

MR. VARELA: Okay. I t'nink that would -- we should have. I may not have dropped them in the chat. Why don't we do that right now. The interrogatory responses, I will put them in chat as Exhibit 6 and then you can put this in the chat as Exhibit 7, how about that?

MS. HULING: That sounds good.
(Exhibits Number 6 and 7 were marked.)

CONTINUED EXAMINATION BY MS. HULING:
Q. All right. Mr. Hendrix, we were talking about this letter it says: Tennessee Secretary of State on the top line there; do you see this on your screen?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Great. Do you recognize this letter?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you see halfway down this letter where it says, "reason for denial of restoration"?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And it reads: Additional convictions not listed on COR, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. So is it that your understanding that's why your restoration application was rejected?
A. Correct.
Q. As opposed to saying chat you were ineligible?
A. Correct.
Q. And I -- I'm SGiry I scrolled very quickly down there. These are the certificate of restorations, the first ones that you had received that were submitted and the letter denying restoration was in response to these. And here at the end, we have an e-mail from Jessica Lim to a Carlatina Hampton; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And have you seen this e-mail before?
A. No.
Q. If you would take a minute to look at this, it say that's it's attached the denial letter for you. The reason
for the denial is that Mr. Hendrix has 18 additional felony convictions in Davidson County for which he must submit CORs; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And it lists them out in the next paragraph with bulleted points. And then in the final paragraph it says, "As you can see, the CORs he submitted cover only the last five felony convictions in Williamson County. To get his voting rights restored, Mr. Hendrix must have an authorized agent complete CORs for his first 18 felony convictions from 1993 to 2002, all of which were in Davidson County"; do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And nowhere in this e-mail does it say that you are ineligible to have your rights restored; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Scrolljing back up to the top to the denial letter, you said you received this; is that correct?
A. I received that first page, I did.
Q. Okay. And when you -- when you received this, what action did you take next?
A. I called the organization and they looked into the matter.
Q. The organization that was helping you with your rights restoration?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. When you say that they looked into the matter, is that helping you to get the additional COR forms?
A. Right. Yes.
Q. And did they reach out to Department of Correction -- them, or with them with you, reach out to a Department of Corrections official to get the original CORs that you had not been given?
A. Right, they did.
Q. Okay. And then you were able to get the additional COR forms that you needed when you went back to the Department of Correction officials at that point?
A. Correct.
Q. When I said "you" there, that is you and/or the volunteer that you were vorking with?
A. Yes. The volunteer, yes.
Q. And then those additional COR forms were submitted to your elections office; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And at that point were your rights restored?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was there any -- you may remember earlier you and Mr. Varela were talking about whether you appealed the case; do you remember that conversation?
A. Yes. Yes, I do.
Q. Was there anything else outside of the process that we just discussed that you -- any other sort of appeal beyond getting the additional CORs that happened?
A. No, not that I know of.
Q. Okay. So when you said that there was an appeal, it was continued -- you continued to work on getting everything you needed to?
A. Right. Right. Exactly.
Q. Okay.
A. That was -- that was kind of a misstatement.
Q. Not at all. I just wanted to make sure we were all clear. Thank you.

MS. HULING: Okay. I think then with that, those are all of the questions that I have. Thank you very much.

MR. VARELA: I don't have anything else.
FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT.
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The videoconference deposition of CURTIS GRAY was taken by counsel for the Defendants, by Agreement, with all participants appearing at their respective locations, on May 21,2023 , for all purposes under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

All objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved to the hearing, and said deposition may be read ancoused in evidence in said cause of action in any trial thereon or any proceeding herein.

It is agreed that MELISSA M. SMITH, RPR, Notary Public and Licensed Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness remotely, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness was not discussed.

THE REPORTER: Good morning. My name is Melissa Smith. I am a stenographic reporter with Elite-Brentwood Reporting Services, and my license number is 122.

Today's date is May 21, 2023, and the time is approximately 7:02 a.m. central time.

This is the deposition of Curtis Gray in the matter of Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, et al. versus William Lee, et al., filed in the United States District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee. The case number is 3:20-cv-01039.

This deposition is being taken by videoconference, and the oath will be administered remotely by me. Any digital exhibits marked during this deposition will be deemed as "original" for purposes of said deposition, with the actual original document retained by counsel introducing the exhibit for purposes possibly needed for in-court hearing.
At this time, I'll ask counsel to
identify yourselves and state whom you represent.

If you have any objections with the procedures I've outlined, please state so when you introduce yourself.

We will start with the noticing
attorney.
MS. JORDAN: Yes. Good morning my name is Dawn Jordan. I'm here on behalf of the State defendants.

MS. BOWIE: Blair Bowie on behalf of plaintiffs, and I'm joined by Ellen Boectcher, also on behalf of plaintiffs.


CURTIS GRAY, was called as a witness, and after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Good morning, Mr. Gray. We're not able to meet in person, but my name is Dawn Jordan. I'm with the Tennessee Attorney General's Office, and I represent the State defendants in this matter. What we'll be doing this morning is what we'll be calling taking your deposition.

Have you ever given a deposition before?
A. No.

Have you ever testified in court before?
A. No.
Q. Okay. And just a few ground rules.

You understand that you've been placed under oath, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And you know what that means?
A. Yes.
Q. And so what will be happenirig is that I'll be asking you questions which you will then answer, and the court reporter is taking down everything that everybody says. So if you would, just wait until $I$ finish my question before you begin your answer And I, likewise, will try not to interrupt you. That way, the court reporter can get a fair and accurate reporting for everybody. Is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. And I may be reminding you of that from time to time, but I'm not meaning to crack wise or make you uncomfortable. I'm just trying to make sure we get a good, good record; is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. For every question that calls for a yes-or-no answer, that's what you will need to say, is "yes" or "no," not "uh-huh" or a "huh-uh" or nod or shake of the head because the court reporter cannot take down those things accurately. Is that fair?
A. Yes.
Q. And, again, I may be reminding you of that or prompting you of that from time to time.

Everybody does it. Don't worry about it. I'm just trying to get a fair record. Is that okay?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. If there are any questions that I ask that you do riot understand, please ask me to either restate the question or say it again or clarify in some respect. Otherwise, I will assume you understood the question; is that fair? A. Yes. Q. Do you have any medical condition that will prevent you from testifying accurately today?
A. No.
Q. Are you under any kind of medications that
will prevent you from testifying accurately today?
A. No.
Q. And is there anybody else in the room with you? I don't see anybody.
A. No.
Q. I'm assuming there will be somebody? Are you waiting for somebody?
A. No. Not to my understanding we're not.
Q. Okay.

MS. BOWIE: It was just a tech person
from Baker Donelson helping out.
MS. JORDAN: Oh.okay.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q. Do you have a felephone, cell phone with you?
A. No.
Q. And what did you do to prepare for this deposition?
A. Read over the transcripts and stuff like that a little bit to refresh my memory. That's all.
Q. Did you read the complaint?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you read your answers to some
interrogatories, to some discovery questions that we had?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And did you talk with your attorneys?

I don't want to know what you said or anything, but did you talk with them?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. Now, are you a member of the NAACF?
A. No.
Q. Do you contribute to the NAACP?
A. No.
Q. Okay. What is your dace of birth?
A. $1 / 30 / 60$.
Q. And your place of birth?
A. Fort Bragg, North Carolina.
Q. So you are a military brat?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is your current address?
A. 2179 Albany, Memphis, Tennessee 38108.
Q. 2179 Albany? Is that what you said?
A. Albany, yeah.
Q. And who all lives there with you?
A. Me and my mama. My mother.
Q. Is that Delores Gray?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Janice Norwood?
A. That's my younger sister.
Q. Does she live there with you as well?
A. No.
Q. Who is Lionel Gray?
A. That's my first son.
Q. Does he live there with you?
A. No. Just me and my mom.
Q. Okay. Where does Mr. Gray live?
A. Mr. Gray? I'm Mr. Gray.
Q. I'm sorry. Lionel Gray. where is Lionel

Gray?
A. Oh, Lionel. He stays in another house out in another part of Menphis.
Q. Okay. So helives in Memphis as well?
A. Yes.
Q. Who is Curtis J. Perkins?
A. That's one of my sons.
Q. Do you have any other children other than

Lionel and Curtis?
A. I had three, but one passed away.
Q. Do you owe any child support for either of your children?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever voted, Mr. Gray?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been married?
A. No.
Q. And except for North Carolina and Tennessee, what all states have you lived in since you were about age 20?

MS. JORDAN: Oh. Where did he go?
THE WITNESS: What?

MS. JORDAN: For some reason, the
view -- there we go. That's better.

For some reason you were farther away, but you're back now so chat's good. BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Now, other than North Carolina, where you were born, and Tenriessee, where you live currently, whai all states have you lived in since you were age 20?
A. Well, at the age of -- only really here in Memphis itself. I got out of the service in '81, so I've been here ever since then, nowhere else but here. I was in the service for like three years.
Q. For three years. Okay.

Well, $I$ won't ask you where all you were
in the service because you probably were moved around a bit.
A. Yeah.
Q. So you've lived in Memphis pretty much
since then?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you ever live in Mississippi?
A. No.
Q. Can you tell us about your education?
A. Well, I graduated high school, and I did a year or two -- graphic designs for two years. That's about it.
Q. Where did you go for fraphic designs?
A. Tennessee -- they keep changing the name
so I don't know what is now. It was a technical school here in Memphis.
Q. I hear that. They do change them quite frequently, don't they?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you get any kind of certificate or
degree for your graphic design?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is it called? What is it referred to?
A. Excuse me?
Q. What is your certificate called? What is it referred to as?
A. That's what -- it's graphic design, like printing and different things like that.
Q. So what did you -- I'm sorry to interrupt you. Go ahead, sir.
A. That's it.
Q. Is that what you do for a living, is graphic design?
A. No. I don't do anything now. I'm retired.
Q. Where are you retired from?
A. Well, I just stopped ivorking.
Q. Okay. Can you ten us about your work history?
A. You want to know every job I had?
Q. Well, I understand you were in the service for three years.
A. Yeah.
Q. Then after you were in the service or you left the service, what did you do?
A. Did some security work, all kind of jobs, different jobs.
Q. So you did some security work and what else?
A. Warehouse work. I -- so many different jobs.
Q. Have you ever been fired from any of your jobs?
A. No. I was always laid off. I guess you would call it firing if you want to say that. Q. No. It wasn't that you -- you were fired for any particular reason by punishment? A. No.
Q. Okay. And what is the last place that you worked?
A. WM Barr. WM Barr. It'sCa chemical company.
Q. Can you spell that for us?
A. $\quad W-M \quad B-A-R-R$.
Q. WM Barr. Okay.

And what did you do for WM Barr?
A. Put labels on boxes.
Q. When did you leave WM Barr?
A. I can't recall when $I$ left there
because -- it had to be back in the '90s. Ever since then $I^{\prime}$ ve been doing -- been working for myself mostly.
Q. So you have your own business?
A. I did, like a yard-cutting service.
Q. Okay. When did you stop doing that? A. Have to be January 30th, for health reasons.
Q. January 30th of this year, 2023?
A. Yes.
Q. What health reasons? Why did you have to leave your job?
A. My back. I was having problems with my back and with my stomach also. They working on that now, trying to find out what is rrong. Q. So you haven't worked since January 30th of this year?
A. No. So that's why I said I just retired. I just stopped working.
Q. Are you getting social security now?
A. Not yet.
Q. Do you plan on going back to work?
A. If they can solve my problem, I will, with my stomach. I know mostly what is wrong with my back, but they're trying to figure out my stomach, that's causing the problem. If not, probably, no.
Q. Did you have anybody work with you on your yard service?
A. A number of people. I just picked up
friends of mine and different things like that, but mostly by myself.
Q. And other than this lawsuit, have you ever
filed any other lawsuits?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been a defendant in any
lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever been sued for child support?
A. No.
Q. And then with respect to your criminal history, we understand that you were convicted of one count of drug possessior in 1989?
A. Yes.
Q. Was that here in Tennessee?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you have any convictions in

Mississippi?
A. No.
Q. Did you serve any of your parole or probation in Mississippi?
A. No.
Q. Did you ever serve any time in a department of correction facility? A. No.
Q. You were always on probation?
A. Yeah. For three years.
Q. When did you complete your probation?
A. Probably three years after I was
convicted. That was -- I can't remember the
number. I can't recall. '92 or something like that when I finished up.
Q. Were you ever convicted of any misdemeanors?

MS. BOWIE: I'm going to object to relevance there. BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Go ahead. You can arrswer.
A. No.
Q. Did you ever review the amended complaint before it was filed?
A. Yes.

MS. JORDAN: I'm going to pull that up as the first exhibit.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked Exhibit Number 1.)

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. So, Mr. Gray, do you see on the screen where it says in the "United States District Court"?
A. No.

MS. BOWIE: We can't see your screen yet, Dawn.
(Technical discussion had off the record.) BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Mr. Gray, can you see that now?
A. Not really.
Q. "In the United States District Court," do you see that?
A. Yes. But not clear.
Q. Can you take a seat a little closer to the screen and see if that helps?
A. Okay. I can see now.
Q. Do you have problems with your eyesight,

Mr. Gray?
A. No. Yeah. These are glasses.
Q. Right. Okay. Okay. So do you see it now? "In the United States District Court," at the top, do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And if we scroll down -- well, it says Tennessee Conference for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on behalf of itself and its members and Lamar Perry, Curtis

Gray Junior, and some other people.
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm assuming that Curtis Gray Junior is you?
A. Yes.
Q. If we can, scroll down to Paragraph 41.

Do you see Paragraph 41, Mr. Gray?
A. Yes.
Q. And it says "Plaintiff Curtis Gray Junior is a resident of Shelby County, Teriessee"?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. If you kind of read through this paragraph
and just let us know if everything in there is correct.
A. Okay. (Reviews document.)

Okay. I'm finished.
Q. Is everything in that paragraph correct?
A. Not to my recognition it's not because

I don't even remember how much they had fined me and...
Q. Okay.
A. I can't recall.
Q. Okay. That's fair enough.
A. I never got a printout of anything.
Q. You've never been shown a printoff of your court costs and fines?
A. No.
Q. If we go to this sentence, just make sure we're all on the same page. Do you see where my cursor is?

It says "His court records show that he owes on $\$ 279$ in court costs and no restitution." Did I read that correctly?
A. Yeah. That's what it's saying.
Q. But you're unaware of chat?
A. They never charged me for court costs.
Q. Have you ever paid anything to the circuit court clerk?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever paid anything to the circuit court clerk?
A. Not that I could recall. I never got a printout. Never sent me anything.
Q. Did you go to the circuit court clerk and ask them about your court costs and fines?
A. No.
Q. Did you ask anybody at the probation
office about your court costs and fines? A. No.
Q. Have you asked anybody about your court costs and fines?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Have you ever taken any steps to get a Certificate of Restoration of your voting rights?
A. No.
Q. Do you want to vote?
A. Yeah, I would like to. I woild like to be able to vote.
Q. Have you taken any steps to get your voting rights restored?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever gone to any office to ask for a Certificate of Restitution?
A. No.
Q. So just so I'm clear, you haven't asked anybody from department of correction, Shelby County elections, the circuit court clerk, or anybody for a Certificate of Restitution for your voting rights?
A. No. I didn't know I could get them back. No.
Q. And just so I'm clear, you have not paid any court costs to the circuit court clerk? A. No.
Q. Am I correct about that, that you have not?
A. Yes, you're correct.

MS. JORDAN: So let's quit sharing
this. That was Exhibit 1.
This will be Exhibit 2.
(WHEREUPON, a document was inarked Exhibit Number 2.)

BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. So, Mr. Gray, what we have up on here is Exhibit 2. Do you see that it says "Curtis James Gray"?
A. Yes.
Q. And the date is 9-19-91. Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever seen this before?
A. Not until probably last week.
Q. Okay. Do you know what this is?
A. Look like a printout where they tell you what to pay and you pay. I don't recall nothing. Q. Have you paid any amounts towards this, what we see in Exhibit 2?
A. No. I don't recall.
Q. How did you find out about this lawsuit, Mr. Gray?
A. Probably on the web. It was -- it was on Facebook, advertisement or something, and I just wanted to try to see could I get my voting rights back.
Q. Then who did you contact?
A. Well, I don't remember who I contacted, but I did talk to someone.
Q. And was that someone with the NAACP, or was it a different organization?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Did you respond on this Facebook page, or did you actually call somebody?
A. I don't remeinber.
Q. Do you have any reason to dispute the costs and fines that are shown in this Exhibit 2?
A. This page here you're talking about?
Q. Yes.
A. Well, I can't remember paying anything.
Q. I understand that, but do you have any reason to dispute that they're saying you owe this amount?
A. No. I don't dispute it because they
that's what they say I owe. It's up to them.
Q. But you do recall seeing this for the first time last week?
A. Last week, yes. A printout like that, yes. I never got anything in the mail all these years.
Q. Am I correct that you did not follow up with the county clerk's office to see whether you owed any court costs or fines after your conviction?
A. No, I did not.

MS. JORDAN: Okay. We can stop sharing that one.

We'll mark this as Exhibit Number 3.
(WHEREUPOA, a document was marked
Exhibit Number 3.)
BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. Mr. Gray, can you see what we have shared,

Exhibit 3?
A. No.
Q. Do you see anything on the screen where it says "Mail, Blair Bowie, Outlook"? Can you see, Mr. Gray, what's on the screen?
A. Yes, I can.
Q. And do you see that at the very top it
says "Mail, Blair Bowie, Outlook"?
A. Yes.
Q. Have you -- do you recall seeing this
document before?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. Do you see at the very bottom, Mr. Gray,
where it says, "Good morning. These are the
court costs still owed by Mr. Gray." Do you see
that?
A. It's kind of in small print. Yeah. I see
it, yeah.
Q. Do you see at the very bottom it says
these are the court costs still owed by Mr. Gray?
Do you see that?
A. Yes.
Q. And this is on Exhibit 3, the e-mail that
we've been referring to.
A. Yes.
Q. Have you ever seen this e-mail? Have you
ever seen this document, Exhibit 3?
A. No, I have not.
Q. Other than filing this lawsuit, Mr. Gray,
have you done anything to try to get your voting
rights restored?
A. No.

Q
Have you ever sought expungement of your conviction?
A. No. I thought about it, but no.
Q. Have you tried to get a pardon for your conviction?
A. No.
Q. And did you provide any documents to your attorneys for any kind of document production? A. No.
Q. Have you provided any documents to your attorneys at all?

I'm not trying to get into any attorney/client privilege, buic have you provided them with any documents?
A. Like what? What kind of documents?
Q. Anything about your conviction, your probation, anything to do with your criminal history.
A. No.
Q. Okay. Now, I assume that you've been e-mailing back and forth. I don't want to know about that, or any telephone conversation, anything like that.

What do you expect to get out of this lawsuit?
A. Trying to get a chance to get my voting rights back. That's it.
Q. Do you understand what you need to do in order to get your rights restored?
A. No.
Q. Have you been provided with any
information from anybody about how to go about getting your rights restored?
A. No.
Q. Have you done any research on your own in order to determine how to get your voting rights? A. No.

MS. JORDAN: That.'s all the questions I have.

MS. BOWIE: Why don't we take a quick 5-minute break.
(Short break.)
MS. BOWIE: We have just a few questions on redirect.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. BOWIE:
Q. Mr. Gray, a little bit earlier the Attorney General's Office was asking you about your effort to get your voting rights restored.

When you responded to those questions, were you responding for yourself personally, like you have not asked the Shelby County Clerk personally for a Certificate of Restitution?
A. Yes.
Q. So let's clarify that a little bit.

You mentioned earlier that you saw an ad on Facebook. Do you remember when that was? A. Had to be 2020.
Q. Okay. And then -- after you responded to that ad, did you have a conversation with someone about getting your voting rights restored? A. Yes.
Q. And did that person explain to you how to get your voting rights restored through a Certificate of Restitution?
A. Yeah. They explained some of the details, and they looked into it.
Q. And you authorized them to reach out to the proper authorities to try to get that?
A. Yes.
Q. And what was the result of that effort?
A. They came back to me and said that

I couldn't get them back because I owed fines.
Q. Did they say who told you that -- sorry,
did they say who told them that?
A. Shelby County Clerk's Office.
Q. So you found out in 2020 that the Shelby County Clerk's office said you couldn't get your voting rights back because of fines; is that correct?

MS. JORDAN: Object to the form, but go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
BY MS. BOWIE:
Q. You can answer.
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So you said earlier that you haven't heard that Shelby County thinks you owe court costs or fines. You meant that the clerks never told you that; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. So in the decades after your conviction they never gave you notice you owed outstanding legal financial obligations; is that right?
A. No.
Q. No one from the probation office ever told you you could get your voting rights restored; is that right?
A. No.
Q. But you did try to get your voting rights back in 2020?

MS. JORDAN: Object to the form. Go ahead.

THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes, I did try. MS. BOWIE: Okay. That's all I have.

MS. JORDAN: And then one point of clarification, Mr. Gray.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. JORDAN:
Q. The only efforts you have made have been through this lawsuit; is that correct?
A. (No response.)
Q. The only efforfs you've made to get your voting rights restored has been through this lawsuit; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And you never reached out to the county clerk's Office to see if you owed any fines or costs; is that correct?
A. No.
Q. Am I correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. It was not a very good question. I
apologize for that.
Am I correct in saying that you did not reach out to the probation office to make sure you did not owe any court costs or fines?
A. No.
Q. Am I correct about that?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have any of your paperwork for your conviction?
A. No.
Q. Were you provided any paperwork relating to your conviction?
A. I can't remember. Been so long ago.
Q. I assume that you pled guilty?
A. Yes.
Q. And then you were placed on probation for three years?
A. Yes.
Q. And, as part of that, there was a hearing in front of the judge; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. And the judge sentenced you to three years of probation; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you have an attorney with you at
that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Did the attorney explain the details of your probation to you?
A. I can't remember, but I'm sure she did.
Q. And the Court would have explained the details of your probation to you; is that correct?
A. Yes.

MS. JORDAN: That's all I've got.
Thank you.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. BOWIE:
Q. Mr. Gray, that initial outreach that you did with the persori who was helping you try to get your voting rights restored in 2020, do you remember when in the year that was?
A. No, I don't. I can't remember.
Q. Was it before the election?
A. Yes, it was.
Q. Okay. Is that because you wanted to vote in the presidential election?
A. Yes. Yes.
Q. And was that -- you were asked if that was
in the context of a lawsuit. Was there a lawsuit happening at that time?
A. No.
Q. Did anyone say anything about a lawsuit at that time, at the initial outreach?
A. No.
Q. So that wasn't part of the lawsuit?
A. No.
Q. Okay. That was a separate effort to get your voting rights restored with the help of a person who was working with you; is that correct? A. Yes.

MS. BOWIE: That's all. Thank you. MS. JORDAN: Nhat's all I have. Thank you, Mr. Gray, and I wish you the best with your issues, and I hope you're able to get back to work if that's what you want to do. Good luck to you in general.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Fine.
(WHEREUPON, the reporter requested orders on the record.)

THE REPORTER: Ms. Jordan, would you like this written up?

MS. JORDAN: Yes.
THE REPORTER: Ms. Bowie, would you

MS. BOWIE: Yes.
FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT
(WHEREUPON, the deposition was concluded at 8:00 a.m.)
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## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

TENNESSEE CONFERENCE of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION for the ADVANCEMENT of COLORED PEOPLE, on behalf of itself and its members, et al.,

> Plaintiffs,
v.

WILLIAM LEE, in his official capacity as
Governor of the State of Tennessee, et al.,
Defendants.

Civil No. 3:20-cv-01039

JUDGE CAMPBELL
MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRENSLEY
[Class Action]

# PLAINTIFF TENNESSEE CONPERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANTS' FIRST SET OF IN'IRROGATORIES 

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Tennessee Conference er the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (TN NAACP) hereby responds and objects to Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories (the "Interrogatories"). In preparing these responses, Plaintiff TN NAACP has relied on the information presently available to Plaintiff TN NAACP. If further information or documents are discovered during this phase of the litigation, Plaintiff TN NAACP will supplement its responses based on any such information
and produce any such documents to the extent required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26.

## GENERAL STATEMENT

Plaintiff TN NAACP provides these objections and answers based upon the investigation conducted in the time available since service of the Interrogatories. These objections and answers are made to the best of Plaintiff TN NAACP's present knowledge, information and belief. In the future, Plaintiff TN NAACP may discover or acquire additional information, documents, or facts bearing on the Interrogatories and its objections and answers thereto. Plaintiff TN NAACP reserves the right: (a) to make subsequent revisions or amendments to its objections or these answers based upon information, evidence, documents, facts, or other things that hereafter may be discovered, or the relevance of which may hereafter be discovered; and (b) to introduce or rely upon additional or subsequently acquired or discovered writings, evidence, and information in any proceedings or at any trial held hereafter.

Further, any answer by Plaintiff TN NAACP to a particular Interrogatory is not intended, and shail not be construed, as an admission of the existence of any fact, assertion, or other matter expressed or implied in the Interrogatory. Plaintiff TN NAACP's objection to, or failure to object to, any particular Interrogatory is not, and shall not be construed as, an admission that responsive information exists. Moreover, Plaintiff TN NAACP's decision to answer any specific Interrogatory, notwithstanding its objectionable nature or its related definitions or instructions, also should not be construed as an admission to the relevancy or materiality of the information
requested, or an agreement that future similar Interrogatories will be treated in a similar manner. With these answers and objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP does not in any way waive, or intend to waive, the right to object on any and all grounds to (a) the evidentiary use of the information contained herein or (b) discovery requests relating to these objections and answers.

Defendants' Second Set of Requests for Production included a general request in Request for Production No. 1 that Plaintiff TN NAACP produce all documents supporting its responses to Defendants' Interrogatories. Subject to the below objections, Documents relevant to this case that are supportive of Plaintiff TN NAACP's résponses to each Interrogatory will be produced to Defendants concurrently with Plaintiff TN NAACP's resporises to Defendants' Requests for Production.

## GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they impose obligations, seek aniswers, or use instructions or definitions other than those permitted under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, the Local Rules of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, any Order of this Court, and any prior agreement of the parties.
2. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information or documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege,
exemption, immunity, principle, doctrine, or rule of confidentiality. If any protected information or material is disclosed, such disclosure is not intentional and shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege or protection.
3. To the extent the Interrogatories require the disclosure of confidential or sensitive private information implicating the privacy interests of Plaintiff TN NAACP or other individuals, including other Plaintiffs, Plaintiff TN NAACP agrees to provide such information subject to a protective order agreed upon by the parties.
4. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information already in the possession, custody, or control of the Defendant, or otherwise equally avaiiable to the Defendant.
5. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek materials not in Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects to the Interrogatories as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent that they impose an obligation to survey third parties.
6. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories insofar as they seek information that is publicly available or otherwise equally available and/or uniquely available from third parties.
7. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek answers or information neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence to any party's claim or defense.
8. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they seek documents that are unreasonably cumulative or duplicative.
9. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent that they are unclear, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and/or not proportional to the needs of this case.
10.Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent that they assume facts that do not exist or are incorrect.
10. By answering these Interrogatories, Plaintiff TN NAACP does not concede the relevance or materiality of any of the information requested, nor of the subject matter to which any particuiar Interrogatory refers. Rather, these responses are made expressly subject to, and without in any way waiving or intending to waive any question or objection as to the competency, relevance, privilege, or admissibility of any of the matters referred to in these responses as evidence.
12.Plaintiff TN NAACP expressly reserves:
a. The right to object, on grounds of competency, relevance, materiality, privilege, or any other applicable ground, to the use of responses provided to these Interrogatories or the subject matter thereof, in any subsequent filing, proceeding, or hearing in this or any other action;
b. The right to object on any ground to any additional Interrogatories or other discovery proceedings involving or relating to the subject matter of these Interrogatories; and
c. The right to amend, withdraw, or supplement its responses should further investigation or discovery disclose additional information.

## SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

In addition to the foregoing general objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP asserts the following specific responses and objections to each Interrogatory:

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Identify all persons who assisted you in answering these interrogatories and describe theassistance provided.

RESPONSE: Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 1 seelis information protected by attorney-client privilege and work-product doctrine. Without waiver of the above objections, TN NAACP responds that the foilowing officers of the Tennessee NAACP and its local chapters provided information or documents to help answering these interrogatories: Gloria Sweet-Love, President of TN NAACP; Marilyn Brown, Vice President; Loretta Morris, Vice President Montgomery-Clarksville Chapter; Jimmie Garland, Vice President Middle; Tiffany Boyd, President Dyersburg NAACP.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Identify all documents relating to Your answers to each of these Interrogatories, including all documents that were relied upon in answering Defendants' Second Set of Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: Subject to the above objections, Documents responsive to Interrogatory No. 2, if any exist, will be produced to Defendants concurrently with Plaintiff's responses to the Request for Production 2.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: To Your knowledge, please identify any potential class member, including name, their felony convictions, other identifying information, documentation that such person is not subject to a disqualifying conviction as defined in Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-29-204, and other documentation supporting that each potential class member has satisfied the requirements of Tenn. Code Ann. §40-29-202 as described in paragraph 122 of Your First Amended Complaint (DE 102).

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff further objects that Interrogatory No. 3 seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege. Moreover, Plaintiff objects to Interrogatory No. 3 on the grounds that it seeks documents or information outside of Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control, insofar as they seek documents or information in the possession of Plaintiff's attorneys that was not obtained in conjunction with this litigation. Plaintiff asserts that Interrogatory No. 3 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks him to identify circumstances around any potential class member. Plaintiff also objects that Interrogatory No. 3 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible to Defendants, including but not limited to lists of Tennessee residents who have been convicted of felonies in the possession of Defendant Helton, information on payment of court cost and restitution in the possession of county
clerks, information on child support payments from the Department of Human Services, files notating requests for Certificates of Restoration in the possession of Defendant Helton, and records of requests for Certificates of Restoration in the possession of Defendant Goins. Plaintiff objects that Interrogatory No 3. requires conclusions of law regarding interpretations of eligibility under Tenn. Code Ann. 40-29-202 that are at issue in this litigation. Finally, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 3 misstates the putative class definition as provided in the First Amended Complaint and therefore is based on improper assumptions.

Without waiving any of the above objections, Plaintifin ${ }^{\circ}$ NAACP responds as follows with respect to its individual claims:

In addition to the lists already produced by TN NAACP in response to Defendants' first set of interrogatories, Praintiff TN NAACP has attached a list of individuals it has since identified as potential members of the putative class: individuals who have lost the right to vote because of a felony conviction and who have requested or attempted to request Certificates of Restoration but to date have not received a COR sifficient to restore their voting rights (Attachment A). However, the TN NAACP again objects that describing the circumstances around each individual in the putative class's efforts to obtain a Certificate of Restoration is overburdensome and may be information that is in the possession, control, or equally accessible to Defendants: Moreover, Plaintiff asserts that any underlying documents, records, and notes describing such would be protected by attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product.

Date:
Name:
Title: 11/17/22

Gloria J. Sweet-Love

President/Director-TN State Conference NAACP

## ATTACHMENT A

| Name | DOB |
| :--- | :--- |
| Abernathy, Minard | $09 / 09 / 65$ |
| Amos, Tiffany L. | $05 / 08 / 78$ |
| Anderson, Angela | $02 / 07 / 75$ |
| Anderson, Steven | $10 / 19 / 72$ |
| Anderson, Tyrone L. | $11 / 02 / 90$ |
| Andre, Brandon | $04 / 12 / 83$ |
| Awad, Guirguis K | $03 / 04 / 62$ |
| Ayers, Evolve T. | $05 / 30 / 53$ |
| Aylward, Robert J | $12 / 28 / 56$ |
| Baker, Antonio C | $03 / 07 / 82$ |
| Ballard, Ebony Q. | $03 / 19 / 82$ |
| Barbee, Frederick | $03 / 08 / 61$ |
| Batey, Coreatha | $02 / 14 / 62$ |
| Batey, Shirley L. | $12 / 19 / 71$ |
| Battle, Thomas K. | $10 / 03 / 55$ |
| Baungardner, Matthew R | $07 / 16 / 82$ |
| Beach, Steve L. | $07 / 10 / 83$ |
| Beard, Carlos E | $11 / 01 / 74$ |
| Bell, Edwin L. | $06 / 12 / 56$ |
| Bell, Lekisha A. | $07 / 04 / 74$ |
| Bender, Tamika R | $08 / 02 / 83$ |
| Bennett, Roman H. | $03 / 31 / 66$ |
| Bennett, Susan N. | $06 / 26 / 64$ |
| Benson, Bridgette | $09 / 03 / 82$ |
| Berry, Donyon S | $06 / 05 / 73$ |
| Black, Pernell T. | $11 / 13 / 97$ |
| Blair, Kevin E | $05 / 06 / 70$ |
| Blockman, Deborah D. | $09 / 29 / 78$ |
| Bobbit, Robert E. | $05 / 03 / 66$ |
| Bodenhamer, David | $08 / 14 / 78$ |
| Boles, Calvin J | $06 / 03 / 52$ |
| Bonillas-Arias, Raul | $06 / 04 / 52$ |
| Bonner, Hullen | $03 / 12 / 57$ |
| Booker, Antonio L. | $01 / 05 / 95$ |
| Booker, Cherita L | $06 / 10 / 46$ |
| Booker, Mary O | $10 / 11 / 76$ |
| Booker, Thomas Jr. | $01 / 01 / 81$ |
| Bowman, Travis C | $09 / 25 / 69$ |
| Boyd, Cherita D | $02 / 07 / 69$ |
| Boyd, Michael A. Jr., | $05 / 22 / 89$ |
| Boyd, Theron Lamont | $07 / 16 / 77$ |
| Boynton, Christopher D | 028 |


| Braden, Reginald D. | $01 / 06 / 82$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Breedlove, Randy E | $12 / 05 / 64$ |
| Brewer, April D. | $11 / 04 / 71$ |
| Briggs, Billy Ray | $11 / 15 / 85$ |
| Britton, Darryl B | $01 / 28 / 80$ |
| Brooks, Lamont D. | $12 / 05 / 84$ |
| Brooks, Robert C. | $09 / 17 / 59$ |
| Brown, Carla A (Whitaker | $11 / 13 / 74$ |
| Brown, Kelvin D | $02 / 24 / 73$ |
| Brown, Kevin F. | $07 / 17 / 68$ |
| Brown, Mark E | $06 / 12 / 63$ |
| Brown, Octavious S. | $04 / 18 / 77$ |
| Brown, Peter D. | $07 / 06 / 73$ |
| Brown, Roger D | $05 / 17 / 55$ |
| Brown, Ronald O. | $08 / 01 / 80$ |
| Broyles, Jakimberly Y. | $12 / 25 / 79$ |
| Buchanan, Jimmie | $05 / 26 / 56$ |
| Buckley, Mark E | $06 / 22 / 81$ |
| Buckner, Bruce Q. | $11 / 11 / 85$ |
| Buford, Ivan L, jr | $07 / 14 / 70$ |
| Burke, Justin E. | $09 / 09 / 86$ |
| Burns, Courtavious | $12 / 18 / 97$ |
| Butler, Amilcar C. | $05 / 18 / 74$ |
| Butler, Danti L. | $07 / 16 / 80$ |
| Byas, Brenda | $08 / 30 / 5$ P |
| Bybee, Julie | $08 / 14 / 57$ |
| Byrd, Ann M. | $10 / 31 / 64$ |
| Cain, Khalfani | $07 / 07 / 75$ |
| Calloway, Delliano Q. | $08 / 221963$ |
| Campbell, Teresita Y. | $10 / 19 / 61$ |
| Cannon, Lakeisha A. | $01 / 10 / 78$ |
| Carpenter, Deneika L | $06 / 02 / 89$ |
| Carter, Amanda L. | $06 / 18 / 91$ |
| Carter, Basil F | $10 / 15 / 82$ |
| Carter, William I | $10 / 18 / 78$ |
| Carter-Hall, Latonya | $11 / 06 / 55$ |
| Castille, Carlton M. | $07 / 19 / 55$ |
| Caudle, Joel P. | $01 / 26 / 74$ |
| Cheeks, Alonzo | $06 / 07 / 76$ |
| Christian, Calvin D | $09 / 21 / 63$ |
| Clay, Bennie E. | $08 / 06 / 70$ |
| Cobbins, Timothy A. | Pochrane, James T |


| Coffey, Donald J. | $02 / 14 / 92$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Colley, Andrew E. | $11 / 01 / 79$ |
| Collins, Daniel M. | $06 / 14 / 90$ |
| Collins, Shawn D. | $11 / 22 / 74$ |
| Conner, Derrick J | $08 / 07 / 81$ |
| Connor, Anthony | $07 / 03 / 90$ |
| Conway, DeShai T. | $08 / 24 / 97$ |
| Copeland, Claude D. | $12 / 01 / 58$ |
| Covington, Askia E | $02 / 03 / 73$ |
| Covington, Chesare L. | $03 / 18 / 95$ |
| Cozart-Mazwell, Bradley | $07 / 20 / 90$ |
| Crawley, Michael D. | $04 / 21 / 71$ |
| Crockett, Walter E. | $06 / 25 / 46$ |
| Crowler, Donnell B | $04 / 09 / 68$ |
| Crump, Angel | $03 / 17 / 84$ |
| Crump, Latnisha N. | $01 / 02 / 85$ |
| Crutcher, Robert L. | $05 / 03 / 51$ |
| Curry, Thomas D. Jr. | $04 / 14 / 91$ |
| Dardy, Geneva | $05 / 12 / 65$ |
| Davis, Christopher | $09 / 01 / 92$ |
| Davis, George W. | $05 / 11 / 68$ |
| Davis, Josiah M | $08 / 09 / 90$ |
| Davis, Marcus A. | $10 / 08 / 71$ |
| Dennis, Michelle Y. | $02 / 26 / 67$ |
| Diel, Rachel M. | $03 / 22 / 81$ |
| Dixon, Clark R | $03 / 03 / 75$ |
| Dobson, Andrew | $01 / 31 / 95$ |
| Dobson, Gregory E. | $03 / 18 / 83$ |
| Dunaway, Gregory | $09 / 1 / 71$ |
| Duncan, Lawrence S. | $08 / 86$ |
| Duncan, Leslie K | $08 / 05 / 67$ |
| Duncan, Thomas D. | $07 / 26 / 96$ |
| Eason, Brian | $07 / 13 / 69$ |
| Eddy, Buddy L. | $05 / 12 / 62$ |
| Edwards, Angela D (OweI | $09 / 07 / 68$ |
| Elam, Charles B | $09 / 01 / 79$ |
| Elliot, Lebrendon | $08 / 07 / 68$ |
| Ellison, Clifton | $07 / 02 / 73$ |
| Ellison, Rycine R | $05 / 19 / 91$ |
| Everett, Jeffrey L. | $1 / 01 / 70$ |
| Everson, Stephanie E. | William John |
| Fanning, Charles A | $01 / 20 / 73$ |


| Farmer, Walter | 10/07/92 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Finney, Patrick J. | 11/21/94 |
| Fisher, Michelle | 11/16/68 |
| Fisher, Tony | 10/30/59 |
| Fizer, Thomas J. | 04/08/74 |
| Flenoy, Kenneth M | 09/13/75 |
| Fletcher, Roneshia M. | 11/02/96 |
| Flood, Richard E II | 07/17/70 |
| Foley, Shannon | 01/05/84 |
| Forrest, Jaquail J. | 04/17/95 |
| Fortner, Derrick T. | 11/05/64 |
| Foster, James A. | 01/26/65 |
| Foxx, Robbie D | 02/05/84 |
| Frazier, Trevarius M | 12/09/93 |
| Frison, Tierney S | 08/06/93 |
| Frost, Brandi N | 04/01/82 |
| Fuqua, Alexander | 05/18/86 |
| Garner, Daryl L | 04/12/82 |
| Garrison, Mitchell | 10/21/71 |
| Gebrhiwot, Addis B. | 05/22/82 |
| Gibbons, Laura L | 07/08/70 |
| Goldsmith, Kenretha R | 06/30/71 |
| Gonzalez, Efrain D. | 01/10/91 |
| Gooch, John A. | 09/10/70 |
| Gooch, Joseph E. | 09/05/70 |
| Goodwin, David | 12/11/70 |
| Gordon, Claudia J | 11/66/49 |
| Gordon, Ronald S | -4/09/72 |
| Gordon, Tierra | 11/12/22 |
| Grady, Reginald | 08/10/58 |
| Graves, Steven T | 06/13/76 |
| Gray, Randy C | 05/19/60 |
| Green, Darell L | 01/12/73 |
| Grimes, Alvin N. | 02/11/90 |
| Guinn, Anthony G | 10/07/76 |
| Gwynne, Dannielle M. | 10/01/75 |
| Hague, Michael E. Jr. | 01/21/94 |
| Haire, Brian E Jr | 09/16/74 |
| Hall, Vincent | 07/27/88 |
| Hall, William J | 03/09/78 |
| Hambrick, Samuel Jr. | 11/12/61 |
| Hamer, Deontaye | 06/11/82 |
| Hamilton, Tommy T. | 11/03/78 |
| Hanna, Christopher | 03/18/91 |


| Hardiman, Patricia L | $11 / 03 / 81$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Harleston, Quintin R. | $04 / 05 / 88$ |
| Harris, Charles J. | $08 / 04 / 74$ |
| Harris, David Jr., | $04 / 12 / 82$ |
| Harris, Jimmie R | $01 / 13 / 55$ |
| Harris, Justin D. | $07 / 11 / 86$ |
| Harris, Marcus T. | $09 / 13 / 76$ |
| Harris, William B. | $07 / 21 / 81$ |
| Harris, William M Jr | $04 / 28 / 71$ |
| Harvey, Brandon | $05 / 15 / 71$ |
| Harvey, Darrin A | $08 / 24 / 78$ |
| Hawkins, Tamichael S. | $07 / 17 / 91$ |
| Hawkins, Timothy | $01 / 24 / 66$ |
| Hayes, Carey | $08 / 31 / 50$ |
| Haynes, William A. | $09 / 01 / 75$ |
| Hebb, William H | $08 / 15 / 55$ |
| Henderson, Dalen C. | $12 / 07 / 78$ |
| Hendrix, Reginald Lamar | $08 / 20 / 61$ |
| Henry, Ardail Jr., | $05 / 15 / 41$ |
| Henry, Johnathan C. | $08 / 02 / 84$ |
| Hereford, Ronald E. | $06 / 27 / 54$ |
| Higgs, Gregory W. | $09 / 03 / 67$ |
| Hill, Namon E | $12 / 17 / 75$ |
| Hindieh, Mohamed S. | $05 / 13 / 85$ |
| Hoang, Dien D | $06 / 30 / 71$ |
| Holbrooks, Larry A. Jr. | $07 / 16 / 76$ |
| Holder, Felece R | $11 / 20 / 55$ |
| Holman, Bobby T | $12 / 28 / 64$ |
| Holmes, Paul Jr | $11 / 29 / 59$ |
| Holt-Rogers, Gwendolyn | $06 / 20 / 54$ |
| Hooten, Tevin L. | $10 / 11 / 92$ |
| Hornsby, Orlando L. | $11 / 06 / 71$ |
| Horton, Recardo A. | $12 / 05 / 74$ |
| Houston, Henry D. | $8 / 12 / 630$ |
| Howard, Kalvin | $01 / 13 / 76$ |
| Howse, Vickie Lynn | $08 / 20 / 55$ |
| Juey, Karen D | $02 / 02 / 59$ |
| Hutchins, Eric L. | $08 / 30 / 82$ |
| Hyler, Jemane H. | $03 / 28 / 82$ |
| Hyler, Jenarus D | $04 / 09 / 85$ |
| Jsaacs, Travis W. | 030 |
|  | Jackson, Eric L. |


| Jackson, Raymond O | 06/15/53 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Jackson, Shamille N. | 01/12/81 |
| James, Lawrence E. | 12/14/46 |
| Jamieson, Christopher C. | 04/15/82 |
| Jarmon, John L | 07/31/49 |
| Jenkins, Daniel | 07/18/73 |
| Jenkins, Roydell A. | 01/16/71 |
| Jenkins, Tiffany N | 02/10/73 |
| Jenkins, William R | 04/21/73 |
| Jennings, Shemika | 01/15/77 |
| Jeter, Kathryn D. | 03/28/59 |
| Johnson, Angel A | 07/04/85 |
| Johnson, Antonio R. | 02/27/79 |
| Johnson, Gregory C. | 01/21/76 |
| Johnson, Jimmy A. | 11/21/75 |
| Johnson, Kenneth M. | 04/19/91 |
| Johnson, LeMarvin | 01/01/66 |
| Johnson, Patrick D. | 02/05/87 |
| Johnson, Tarsha N | 12/12/78 |
| Jones, Kenny M. | 10/22/73 |
| Jones, Tawana D. | 07/27/69 |
| Jordan, Alex H. | 01/24/67 |
| Jordan, Rico L. | 04/28/81 |
| Jordan, Trevonda Y. | 04/11/77 |
| Joseph, Paul S | 03/12/41 |
| Joyce, Derek L. | 02/13/84 |
| Joyce, Kenneth C. | 03'12/57 |
| Junker, Steven Clifford | -8/31/69 |
| Kain, Khalfani G |  |
| Kaylor, Richard A. Jr. | 02/04/76 |
| Kendall, Eric | 09/08/83 |
| Kendrick, David A. | 05/16/64 |
| Kerley, Tomaz P. | 02/11/75 |
| Key, Glennis A. | 06/13/60 |
| Kilpatrick, Marco | 09/28/78 |
| Kimbro, Rodney E. | 04/06/65 |
| King, Donald | 05/01/79 |
| Kinnard, Gregory D | 03/15/86 |
| Kirk, Taj T. | 05/27/78 |
| Knight, Troy L. | 05/22/71 |
| Kwatelai-Quartley, Dean | 11/02/77 |
| Lackey, Casandra L | 08/06/76 |
| Langston, Michael L. | 03/18/58 |
| Latimer, Ashley N. | 09/06/88 |


| Leal, Seneca C | 12/10/80 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Legget, Rodney D. Sr., | 01/02/73 |
| Leggett, Kervin K. | 03/09/74 |
| Lesley, Neal A. | 12/18/22 |
| Lewis, Donald R. | 05/20/75 |
| Lewis, Lamont M. | 02/03/74 |
| Lewis, Sabrina | 05/28/64 |
| Lewis, Wedell L. | 02/18/78 |
| Lockett, Crystal C | 08/20/75 |
| London, Wilkes III | 07/12/90 |
| Lopez, Luis P | 08/25/47 |
| Mack, James | 07/11/53 |
| Majors, Latanya | 11/07/81 |
| Marthel, Eric L. | 08/22/69 |
| Martin, Denise A. | 01/21/94 |
| Martin, Emani C. | 10/12/83 |
| Martin, Janis | 03/26/67 |
| Martin, Keylon | 07/16/86 |
| Martin, Pamela E. | 06/30/71 |
| Martin, William L. | 08/20/91 |
| Maryland, Jeffrey D. | 11/03/59 |
| Mason, Alfred N. | 07/08/52 |
| Massey, Alethia A | 05/28/66 |
| Matheny, Jerry W. Jr., | 06/16/64 |
| Mathis, David E. | 03/01/65 |
| Mayfield, Chance D | 08/01,88 |
| Mays, Alexis L. | 01/17/52 |
| McAdoo, Darryl W | 06/11/67 |
| McClinton, Shatika K. | 07/25/71 |
| McComb, Melissa J. | 04/05/72 |
| McCoy, Stanley D. | 05/19/79 |
| McCrary, Quentin | 07/20/83 |
| McCullough, Rachel | 12/09/82 |
| McDonald-Horton, Danie | 12/09/85 |
| McDowell, Danny T. | 04/06/54 |
| McEIrath-Campbell, Katri | 05/20/67 |
| McEwen, Robert B. III | 11/07/78 |
| McGee, James | 05/20/54 |
| McGee, William P. Jr., | 08/11/61 |
| McGlother, Ronnie D | 05/01/79 |
| McNeil, James R | 04/03/55 |
| Middleton, Takiyah S. | 11/04/77 |
| Miles, Brian | 09/11/88 |
| Miles, Lucy A. | 09/14/46 |


| Miller, Ricky | 05/11/59 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Mingua, Thomas Y | 11/27/79 |
| Mitchell, Rickey D. | 02/04/55 |
| Moore, Clarence L. | 08/17/59 |
| Moore, Donna | 09/14/59 |
| Moore, Jamonta J. | 07/25/91 |
| Moore, Michael Angelo | 05/18/75 |
| Morris, Lester | 11/29/60 |
| Morsette, Victor | 08/21/41 |
| Morton, Ronquez D | 02/06/86 |
| Morton, Simmie W | 03/16/89 |
| Moseley, Robert L. | 12/03/78 |
| Mosley, Charles | 05/01/76 |
| Myah, Cliffton M. | 10/24/82 |
| Nance, Lamont A. | 01/25/66 |
| Nelson, Ricky R. | 02/21/60 |
| Newby, Landon A. | 05/23/85 |
| Newsome, Frank III | 06/10/86 |
| Norris, Leroy Jr. | 10/27/56 |
| Northcutt, Cortez D. | 10/13/90 |
| Odom, Cortez L. | 03/03/80 |
| Oneal, Neacole M. | 07/21/72 |
| Ortiz, Damacio | 07/23/67 |
| Osborne, Corey M. | 05/19/87 |
| Owens, Angela D. | 08/07/68 |
| Owens, Christopher D. | 06/10/74 |
| Parris, Paul A III | 03'07/65 |
| Parrish, Eddie | 09/05/80 |
| Peebles, Santonio D. | 07/12/93 |
| Perry, Gregory W | 06/18/72 |
| Peterson, Eugina D | 08/12/81 |
| Petway, Antonio R. | 05/11/79 |
| Phelps, Dedrick L. | 07/05/69 |
| Pitts, William A. | 04/27/59 |
| Pointer, Harold | 05/06/54 |
| Pollard, Greeko C. | 11/05/79 |
| Pollock, RIchard L. | 02/28/63 |
| Posey, Frank P. | 01/22/69 |
| Powell, Quinetta L. | 06/08/92 |
| Pryor, Theodroe E. | 12/02/69 |
| Pucket, Keontay I. | 08/18/93 |
| Puckett, Steven W | 08/01/62 |
| Randolph, Jason C | 07/06/90 |
| Rash, Lindsey | 10/14/83 |


| Redmond, Connie J | $01 / 01 / 49$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reid, Nigel | $12 / 06 / 59$ |
| Richbourg, Edward B | $11 / 23 / 52$ |
| Rickman, Emily K. | $02 / 07 / 82$ |
| Rigsby, Michael | $09 / 13 / 57$ |
| Robbins, Torey A. | $05 / 19 / 71$ |
| Roberts, Victor | $10 / 22 / 68$ |
| Roberts, William C | $11 / 06 / 68$ |
| Robertson, Jaron L. | $07 / 27 / 87$ |
| Robinson, Bruce A. | $09 / 10 / 55$ |
| Robinson, John P | $07 / 22 / 59$ |
| Robinson, Kenneth | $10 / 28 / 74$ |
| Robinson, Topeka/Tapice | $08 / 23 / 78$ |
| Rodgers, Corey Q. | $11 / 21 / 79$ |
| Rodgers, Joshua Q. | $10 / 05 / 87$ |
| Rolin, Lewis | $05 / 06 / 58$ |
| Ross, Kevin J. | $02 / 15 / 78$ |
| Rust, David M. | $03 / 29 / 62$ |
| Sales, Travis | $02 / 02 / 81$ |
| Sambat, Byron | $04 / 08 / 76$ |
| Samuels, Jonath D. | $12 / 26 / 81$ |
| Santana, Travis | $03 / 31 / 85$ |
| Sayre, Robert | $05 / 26 / 89$ |
| Schield, John | $08 / 14 / 84$ |
| Scott (Glenn), Mildred) | $08 / 31 / 53$ |
| Sherrill, Antonio D. | $04 / 15 / 74$ |
| Shook, Andre L. | $01 / 11 / 77$ |
| Shropshire, Daasher M. | $09 / 22 / 82$ |
| Simmons, Fready Jr | $09 / 11 / 77$ |
| Simpson, Chanz D | $09 / 23 / 69$ |
| Skidmore, Steven D | $01 / 11 / 81$ |
| Smith, Camille L. | $03 / 24 / 65$ |
| Smith, James E. III | $01 / 21 / 83$ |
| Smith, Kontreal T. | $12 / 08 / 95$ |
| Smith, Mary M | $10 / 02 / 79$ |
| Sneed, Kim A | $02 / 01 / 67$ |
| Snyder, Christopher O | $03 / 07 / 68$ |
| Sobel, Richard A III | $01 / 23 / 76$ |
| Southall, Eric N | $01 / 12 / 76$ |
| Spann, Douglas T | $07 / 24 / 69$ |
| Sparkman, Jennifer | $11 / 21 / 62$ |
| Sparkman, Melvin E. | $08 / 22$ |
| Stafford, Carlton | 09 |


| Starks, Ivy C. | 12/19/67 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Steinruck, Steven E. | 08/19/77 |
| Stewart, Donald E. | 03/08/64 |
| Stewart, Michael W. | 07/10/58 |
| Striplin, Nelson N. | 08/02/78 |
| Sullivan, Debbie D. | 02/18/74 |
| Sutton, Donnie J | 03/22/75 |
| Sweeney, Franklin D | 10/25/62 |
| Talley, Oscar L. | 04/26/22 |
| Tant, Stephen | 05/27/79 |
| Taylor, Anthony T | 04/11/62 |
| Taylor, Gladys | 02/05/64 |
| Taylor, Herman | 09/28/64 |
| Taylor, Jeffrey A. | 07/10/59 |
| Taylor, Marcus B. | 03/22/75 |
| Taylor, Tavarius N | 06/16/82 |
| Teague, Darlene | 04/27/58 |
| Terrell, Aguirre L. | 09/13/66 |
| Thomas, Dorothy | 03/31/54 |
| Thomas, Robert L. | 04/26/53 |
| Tipton, Robert | 05/22/82 |
| Towns, Charles W | 12/25/62 |
| Travierso, Joseph T. | 05/02/64 |
| Truitt, Keshaun D. | 03/04/88 |
| Tung, David | 08/22/60 |
| Turner, Alaina H | 07/20/76 |
| Turner, Denise L. | 11/22/69 |
| Tyler, Frank | 09/04/55 |
| Tyus, Steven | 06/08/63 |
| Valentine, Larry E. | 08/19/67 |
| Wade, George A. Jr., | 09/14/67 |
| Wade, Michael L. | 01/14/69 |
| Walker, Joshua L. | 01/03/95 |
| Walker, Ricky A. | 04/03/61 |
| Ward, Dequandre | 11/25/89 |
| Ward, Shanna K. | 11/13/81 |
| Watkins, Kennda J. | 04/26/78 |
| Webb, Crystal C. | 06/10/68 |
| Webb, Fred D. | 07/18/22 |
| West, Robert Thomas | 02/06/52 |
| Whitaker, Eric T | 06/01/65 |
| Whitaker, Reco T | 04/01/79 |
| White, David L | 08/01/55 |
| Whittaker, Kristie | 09/26/69 |


| Wiley, Devon E. | $08 / 30 / 62$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Williams, Aspen K. | $07 / 25 / 97$ |
| Williams, Calvin F | $05 / 13 / 58$ |
| Williams, Cedric L. | $11 / 25 / 67$ |
| Williams, Frederick L. | $06 / 27 / 87$ |
| Williams, Kevin L. | $05 / 26 / 85$ |
| Williams, Linda F | $03 / 14 / 72$ |
| Williams, Robert T. | $10 / 01 / 86$ |
| Williams, Verdell L | $09 / 17 / 64$ |
| Wilson, Patrick L. | $08 / 31 / 71$ |
| Winfrey, Richard L. | $03 / 11 / 82$ |
| Wisdom, Michael L | $07 / 13 / 77$ |
| Woods, David T III | $12 / 02 / 75$ |
| Woods, Kerry D. | $02 / 18 / 67$ |
| Woods, Larry J. | $07 / 03 / 80$ |
| Woods, Nikitha S. | $09 / 03 / 74$ |
| Woodton, David J. | $05 / 05 / 22$ |
| Word, Denotrice N. | $07 / 04 / 85$ |
| Wright, Jarrell D | $03 / 24 / 87$ |
| Wright, Keyona S. | $12 / 08 / 83$ |
| Wright, Travis D. | $10 / 16 / 82$ |
| Wyatt, Alton R. | $05 / 04 / 56$ |
| Yarbro, JK Jr., | $01 / 02 / 60$ |

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on November 18_, 2022 via email on the following:

JANET M. KLEINFELTER (BPR<br>\#13889)<br>Deputy Attorney General<br>Janet.kleinfelter@ag.tn.gov

ALEXANDER S. RIEGER (BPR
\#29362)
Assistant Attorney General
Alex.rieger@ag.tn.gov
PABLO A. VARELA (BPR \#29436)
Assistant Attorney General
Pablo.varela@ag.tn.gov
Office of the Tennessee Attorney
General
Public Interest Division
P.O. Box 20207

Nashville, TN 37202
Attorneys for State Defendants

Blair Bowre
Blair Bowie

| Attachment A |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First | Last | Phone | County of Residence |
| Adarius | Kershaw | 865-661-7876 | Knox |
| Ahemiah Jynell | Clark | 931-272-6272 | Montgomery |
| Alton Brooks | Sullivan | 901-643-1791 | Shelby |
| Amius Jawan | Smith | 931-241-7521 | Montgomery |
| Andre | Glenn | 615-475-3883 | Davidson |
| Andrew | Downey | 901-210-1780 | Shelby |
| Andrew | Wade | 615-750-2203 | Davidson |
| Andy | White Jr. | 865-406-8129 | Blount |
| Angel | Romero | 865-936-2315 | Knox |
| Angelo | Mcghee | 901-652-1959 | Shelby |
| Angelo | Frye | 901-340-7337 | Shelby |
| Anthony | Williams | 931-538-2586 | Montgomery |
| Anthony | Scott | 901-304-7978 | Shelby |
| Anthony | Albright | 901-364-2141 | Shelby |
| Antonia | Albury | 931-378-2901 | Montgomery |
| Antonio Dwayne | Peoples | 931-217-9764 | Montgornery |
| April | Westbrooks | 901-833-7875 | Shelty |
| Aqueelah | Shereef | 865-393-1200 | Kno: |
| Arthur | Jamison | 615-475-3692 | Savidson |
| Ashlee | Sellars | 615-779-8042 | Davidson |
| Asia Laporshe | Camell | 931-255-3445 | Montgomery |
| Auburn | Hunter | 270-348-8278 | Montgomery |
| Augusta | Robinson | 865-403-6105 | Knox |
| Aundrenetta | Cartmell | 615-2\%-2702 | Davidson |
| Author | Church | 615-512-8189 | Davidson |
| Barbara | Mills | 1865-455-9247 | Knox |
| Betty | Davenport | 865-443-2894 | Knox |
| Bill | Davidson | 865-896-8157 | Knox |
| Brian | Tillman | 901-503-2981 | shelby |
| Calvin | McGee | 615-586-4029 | Davidson |
| Carlos | Osby | 901-502-1523 | Shelby |
| Carlos | Adams | 901-299-3342 | Shelby |
| Cataluna Felicia | Legardy | 931-302-1506 | Montgomery |
| Catherine | Hellerd | 865-318-2778 | Knox |
| Cecil | Campbell Whitmon | 615-753-5902 | Davidson |
| Charles | Matthews | 865-275-6571 | Knox |
| Charles | Vanhook | 901-327-5964 | Shelby |
| Charles Wayne | Childress Jr | 931-272-1862 | Montgomery |
| Chris | Fistunenko | 6155430596 | Montgomery |
| Christopher | Taylor | 901-433-9092 | Shelby |
| Christopher Lynn | Hoosier Jr | 931-302-1150 | Montgomery |
| Clarissa | Red | 865-282-9192 | Knox |
| Claudell | Whitfield | 901-505-9550 | Shelby |
| Cynthia | Thomas | 901-440-6971 | Shelby |


| Damon E. | Williams | 931-999-5865 | Montgomery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Danny | Jones | 901-900-6988 | Shelby |
| Danny | Adams | 901-518-2996 | Shelby |
| Danny | Breeden | 865-242-8690 | Knox |
| Darrell | Banks | 901-430-7272 | Madison, Shelby |
| David | Dowell | 629-200-4701 | Davidson |
| David | Wicks | 901-628-3912 | Shelby |
| DeAngelo | Freeman | 865-308-3720 | Knox |
| Deb | Taylor | 6158043727 | Montgomery |
| Delvin | Davis | 9312913266 | Montgomery |
| Denise | Hall | 9312915891 | Montgomery |
| Derek Andre | Willis | 931-291-1215 | Montgomery |
| Derrick | Patterson | 615-423-1894 | Davidson |
| Dominique Lauert | Lee | 615-715-3452 | Montgomery |
| Donna | Baugher | 865-280-9784 | Knox |
| Dwayne | Oatneal | 615-900-8293 | Davidson |
| Elton Lee | Bell | 865-203-4240 | Knox |
| Eric Von | Brandt II | 931-263-3012 | Montgomery |
| Ernest | Moore | 901-578-5268 | Shelby |
| Eulonda | Malone | 9015707884 | Shelby |
| Felisha | Sanders | 9312184501 | Moritgomery |
| Frank | Johnson | 901-721-5613 | Shelby |
| Frankie | Osbourne | 865-973-2731 | Knox |
| Frederick | Whitson | 615-881-8697 | Davidson |
| Gordon "Shane" | Johnson | 865-466-7446 | Knox |
| Harv | Smith | 731-27기 8350 | Knox |
| Hope | Moore | 901-282-3582 | Shelby |
| Hubert | Hurt | 901-502-9675 | Shelby |
| Hunter Paige | Neel | 270-839-2578 | Montgomery |
| Idonnis Renee | Stevenson | 615-414-3527 | Montgomery |
| Irmon | Jones | 901-930-3944 | Shelby |
| Isaiah Andrew | Garuin | 931-302-3487 | Montgomery |
| James | Oliver | 865-963-6382 | Knox |
| James | Newsom | 615-429-3792 | Davidson |
| James | Robinson | 615-569-2647 | Davidson |
| James Timothy | McCullen | 931-444-9789 | Montgomery |
| Jamyca Tajana | McCullen | 931-218-9646 | Montgomery |
| Jannie | Williams | 901-406-4833 | Shelby |
| JaQuette | Wilson | 9015007048 | Montgomery |
| Jatai H. | Garland | 931-218-0467 | Montgomery |
| Jeffery | Penson Jr | 865-566-1958 | Blount |
| Jennifer | Miller | 931-216-4885 | Montgomery |
| Jerome | Lee | 865-338-6951 | Knox |
| Jo | Rittenberry | 931-444-6074 | Davidson |
| Johnnie Leallen | Cummings | 931-472-4700 | Montgomery |
| Johnny | Asberry | 619-236-1139 | Shelby |


| Jomyra | Green | 901-643-3017 | Shelby |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Jordon Xavier | Lofton | 931-771-6536 | Montgomery |
| Joseph | Brown | 865-384-3206 | Knox |
| Josh | Beach | 901-293-4098 | Knox |
| Juan | Salvana | 9315053894 | Montgomery |
| Juston | Cathey | 9318204777 | Montgomery |
| Kaleb | McClanahan | 865-275-1123 | Knox |
| Kanicka | Gadson | 931-346-9364 | Montgomery |
| Kayahja | Rias | 615-901-4911 | Knox |
| Kelly | Hulsey | 901-453-9624 | Shelby, Sebast |
| Kenneth | Cooper | 901-612-4757 | Shelby |
| Korey | Johnson | 901-237-9220 | Shelby |
| Kristi | Goodman | 423-920-7626 | Knox |
| Kristina | Griffin | 865-804-3691 | Knox |
| Larry | Elrod | 9312663258 | Montgomery |
| Larry | Wilson | 901-826-5941 | Shelby |
| Larry | Craig | 615-589-6964 | Davidson |
| Latashua Raye | Coleman | 931-218-0967 | Montgomery |
| Latisha | Green | 850-293-6508 | Davidsor: |
| Latoya | Slater | 901-605-3174 | Shelby |
| Lavon Terrell | Garrett | 910-442-5313 | Maritgomery |
| Lejuene | Franklin | 901-461-5178 | Madison |
| Leslie | Alexander | 615-763-5546 | Davidson |
| Lister | Wallace | 865-548-1582 | Knox |
| Lonnie | Burnett | 901-801-1986 | Shelby |
| Lori | Olson | 865-337-3963 | Knox |
| Louvella | Davis | 901-308-9200 | Shelby |
| Lue | Holcomb | 901-205-7323 | Shelby |
| Lynora | Davis | 301-671-3741 | Shelby |
| Marcus | Miles | 901-691-0746 | Shelby, Obion |
| Mario | Coleman | 901-490-0958 | Shelby |
| Mark | Needham | 9312062681 | Montgomery |
| Marlos | Shields | 901-708-9834 | Shelby |
| Mary | Green | 731-487-5633 | Madison |
| Mattie | Sweeney | 615-720-4416 | Davidson |
| Megan | Jones | 865-221-5283 | Knox |
| Melvin | Linton | 615-779-3641 | Davidson |
| Michael | Smith | 4439554421 | Montgomery |
| Michael | Taylor III | 615-554-8161 | Davidson |
| Michael | Tyler Jr. | 901-600-0386 | Shelby |
| Michael | Hamer | 901-364-7650 | Shelby |
| Michael Anthony | Miner | 931-503-0257 | Montgomery |
| Michael W. | Jones | 901-297-7064 | Shelby |
| Michelle | Cherry | 865-438-2826 | Knox |
| Mildred | LaRue | 615-417-8684 | Williamson |
| Nelson | Armstrong | 901-864-5446 | Shelby |


| Nena Rae | Bailey | 931-249-6624 | Montgomery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Otis | Swanson | 270-560-8515 | Davidson |
| Paris Devonte | Bush | 931-980-2093 | Montgomery |
| Parnell | Williams | 901-283-5201 | Shelby |
| Phillip | Cobb | 9314366596 | Montgomery |
| Phynes | Holden | 9313026732 | Montgomery |
| Ramon | Stewart III | 719-799-0302 | Knox |
| Randy | Sadler | 865-279-3927 | Knox |
| Raven | Harris | 901-315-9978 | Shelby |
| Ricky | Burks | 901-691-4497 | shelby |
| Rico | Gurley | 615-473-3984 | Davidson |
| Rita | Shaw | 615-906-2409 | Davidson |
| Robert | Coats | 901-425-8650 | Shelby |
| Robert Darnell | Ward | 615-707-5797 | Montgomery |
| Robert Lee | Wooten | 931-648-1430 | Montgomery |
| Ronald F. | Turner | 931-255-3278 | Montgomery |
| Ronnie | Brooks | 615-403-6491 | Davidson |
| Royal | Schaap | 865-415-9219 | Knox |
| Samantha Lynn | Harvey | 931-218-4785 | Montgornery |
| Samuel | Galloway | 901-502-3863 | Shelty |
| Sean | Murray | 615-525-6147 | Davidson |
| Shana Alexander | Bennett | 931-220-2253 | iviontgomery |
| Shaneka Anjel | Long | 931-561-5894 | Montgomery |
| Shantel LaJune | Denshore | 931-218-5892 | Montgomery |
| Shateka | Long | 9316145828 | Montgomery |
| Shelia | Landrum | 270-990-7426 | Shelby |
| Steven | Owens | 901,3\%4-4767 | Shelby |
| Tafaria | Townsend | 911-399-4811 | Shelby |
| Taheera | DaCosta | 578-622-4605 | Knox |
| Tahjanekia | Elliot | 931-266-1718 | Montgomery |
| Tamarcus | Carter | 901-426-0394 | Shelby |
| Tamica | Gibson | 615-207-3396 | Davidson |
| Tamica | Henderson | 901-502-9367 | Shelby |
| Tashia | Griffin | 865-200-7682 | Knox |
| Te'a Bennie | Lagardy | 931-302-1506 | Montgomery |
| Terrance | Lundy | 865-679-2959 | Knox |
| Terrius | Patton | 901-619-6363 | Shelby |
| Thomas | Moore | 865-280-1307 | Monroe |
| Tirsi Vailanie | Woodson | 931-771-6477 | Montgomery |
| TJ Deshun | Shields | 901-801-1506 | Shelby |
| Tracy Lynn | Savage | 615-336-4551 | Davidson |
| Troyan | Gentry | 901-526-8403 | Criaghead |
| Tyesha Nicholle | Anderson | 931-302-5714 | Montgomery |
| Tyler | Hurst | 856-972-6124 | Knox |
| Tyrone | Johnson | 901-690-4642 | Shelby |
| Vonez | Williams | 931-561-3357 | Montgomery |
| Wayne | Traylor | 9312494749 | Montgomery |


| William | Gardner | $615-593-8425$ | Davidson |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| William | Clark | $865-321-0228$ | Knox |
| William | Mitchell | $901-830-2024$ | Knox |


| Attachment B |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First | Last | Phone | County of Residence |
| Adarius | Kershaw | 865-661-7876 | Knox |
| Alton Broo | Sullivan | 901-643-1791 | Shelby |
| Andrew | Downey | 901-210-1780 | Shelby |
| Angel | Romero | 865-936-2315 | Knox |
| Angelo | Mcghee | 901-652-1959 | Shelby |
| Anthony | Scott | 901-304-7978 | Shelby |
| Anthony | Albright | 901-364-2141 | Shelby |
| April | Westbrool | 901-833-7875 | Shelby |
| Arthur | Jamison | 615-475-3692 | Davidson |
| Ashlee | Sellars | 615-779-8042 | Davidson |
| Augusta | Robinson | 865-403-0105 | Knox |
| Betty | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Davenpor } \\ & \mathrm{t} \end{aligned}$ | 865-443-2894 | Knox |
| Brian | Tillman | 901-503-2981 | shelby |
| Calvin | McGee | 615-586-4029 | Davidson |
| Carlos | Osby | 901-502-1523 | Shelby |
| Carlos | Adams | 901-299-3342 | Shelby |
| Charles | Vanhook | 901-327-5964 | Shelby |
| Cynthia | Thomas | 901-440-6971 | Shelby |
| Danny | Jones | 901-900-6988 | Shelby |
| Danny | Adams | 901-518-2996 | Shelby |
| Darrell | Banks | 901-430-7272 | Madison, Sheliby |
| David | Wicks | 901-628-3912 | Shelby |
| David | Dobson | 615-582-1988 | Davidson |
| Dawn | Harringto <br> n | 323-706-7731 | Davidson |
| Denise | Hall | 9312915897 | Montgomery |
| Elton Lee | Bell | 865-203-4\% | Knox |
| Ernest | Moore | 901-578-5268 | Shelby |
| Eugene | Peele | 208-830-7002 | Davidson |
| Frank | Johnson | 901-721-5613 | Shelby |
| Frankie | Osbourne | 865-973-2731 | Knox |
| Hope | Moore | 901-282-3582 | Shelby |
| Hubert | Hurt | 901-502-9675 | Shelby |
| Irmon | Jones | 901-930-3944 | Shelby |
| Jeffery | Penson Jr | 865-566-1958 | Blount |
| Jerome | Lee | 865-338-6951 | Knox |
| John | Contreras | 916-396-7492 | Blount |
| Johnny | Asberry | 619-236-1139 | Shelby |
| Jomyra | Green | 901-643-3017 | Shelby |
| Joseph | Brown | 865-384-3206 | Knox |
| Juan | Salvana | 9315053894 | Montgomery |


| Kaleb | McClanah <br> an | $865-275-1123$ | Knox |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Kenneth | Cooper | $901-612-4757$ | Shelby |
| Korey | Johnson | $901-237-9220$ | Shelby |
| Kristina | Griffin | $865-804-3691$ | Knox |
| Larry | Wilson | $901-826-5941$ | Shelby |
| Latoya | Slater | $901-605-3174$ | Shelby |
| Lue | Holcomb | $901-205-7323$ | Shelby |
| Marcus | Miles | $901-691-0746$ | Shelby, Obion |
| Mario | Coleman | $901-490-0958$ | Shelby |
| Michael | Tyler Jr. | $901-600-0386$ | Shelby |
| Michael | Hamer | $901-364-7650$ | Shelby |
| Milton | Thomas | $615-573-0831$ | Davidson |
| Randy | Sadler | $865-279-3927$ | Knox |
| Raven | Harris | $901-315-9978$ | Shelby |
| Ricky | Burks | $901-691-4497$ | shelby |
| Royal | Schaap | $865-415-9219$ | Knox |
| Sean | Murray | $615-525-6147$ | Davidson |
| Steven | Owens | $901-364-4767$ | Shelby |
| Tafaria | Townsend | $901-399-4811$ | Shelby |
| Tamarcus | Carter | $901-426-0394$ | Shelby |
| Terrius | Patton | $901-619-6363$ | Shelby |
| Thomas | Moore | $865-280-1307$ | Monroe |
| Tyler | Hurst | $856-972-6124$ | Knox |
| Tyrone | Johnson | $901-690-4642$ | Shelby |
| William | Clark | $865-321-0228$ | Knox |
| William | Mitchell | $901-830-2024$ | Kno |
|  |  |  |  |


| Attachment C |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| First | Last | Phone | County of Residence |  |  |  |
| Adarius | Kershaw | $865-661-7876$ | Knox |  |  |  |
| Anthony | Scott | $901-304-7978$ | Shelby |  |  |  |
| Arthur | Jamison | $615-475-3692$ | Davidson |  |  |  |
| Ashlee | Sellars | $615-779-8042$ | Davidson |  |  |  |
| Calvin | McGee | $615-586-4029$ | Davidson |  |  |  |
| David | Wicks | $901-628-3912$ | Shelby |  |  |  |
| Dawn | Harrington | $323-706-7731$ | Davidson |  |  |  |
| Denise | Hall | 9312915891 |  |  |  |  |
| Eugene | Peele | $208-830-7002$ | Montgomery |  |  |  |
| Hubert | Hurt | $901-502-9675$ | Sheldson |  |  |  |
| Irmon | Jones | $901-930-3944$ | Shelby |  |  |  |
| Jeffery | Penson Jr | $865-566-1958$ | Blount |  |  |  |
| John | Contreras | $916-396-7492$ | Blount |  |  |  |
| Juan | Salvana | 9315053894 |  |  |  | Montgomery |
| Louvella | Davis | $901-308-9200$ | Shelby |  |  |  |
| Milton | Thomas | $615-573-0831$ | Davidson |  |  |  |
| Sean | Murray | $615-525-6147$ | Davidson |  |  |  |

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT <br> FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE <br> NASHVILLE DIVISION

```
TENNESSEE CONFERENCE of the NATIONAL
ASSOCIATION for the ADVANCEMENT of
COLORED PEOPLE, on behalf of itself and its
members, et al.,
    Plaintiffs,
v.
WILLIAM LEE, in his official capacity as Governor of
the State of Tennessee, et al.,
Defendants.
```

Civil No. 3:20-cv-01039
JUDGE CAMPBELL
MAGISTRATE JUDGE FRENSLEY
[Class Action]

## PLAINTIFF TENNESSEE CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANTS' THIRD SET OF INTERRMGATORIES AND THIRD REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Pursuant to Rules 26, 33, and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People ("Plaintiff TN NAACP") heréby responds and objects to Defendants’ Third Set of Interrogatories (the "Interrogatories") and Third Request for Production of Documents. In preparing these responses, Plaintiff TN NAACP has relied on the information and documents presently available to it. If further information or documents are discovered during this phase of litigation, Plaintiff TN NAACP will supplement its responses based on any such information and produce any such documents to the extent required under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26.

## GENERAL STATEMENT

Plaintiff TN NAACP provides these objections and responses based upon the investigation conducted in the time available since service of the Interrogatories and Request for Production of

Documents. These objections and responses are made to the best of Plaintiff TN NAACP 's present knowledge, information, and belief. In the future, Plaintiff TN NAACP may discover or acquire additional information, documents, or facts bearing on the Interrogatories and Request for Production of Documents and its objections and responses thereto. Plaintiff TN NAACP reserves the right: (a) to make subsequent revisions or amendments to its objection or these answers based upon information, evidence, documents, facts, or other things that hereafter may be discovered, or the relevance of which may hereafter be discovered; and (b) to introduce or rely upon additional or subsequently acquired or discovered writings, evidence, and information in any proceedings or at any trial held hereafter.

Further, any answer by Plaintiff TN NAACP to a particular Interrogatory or Request for Production of Documents is not intended, and shall not be construed, as an admission of the existence of any fact, assertion, or other matter expressed or implied in the Interrogatory or Request for Production of Documents. Plaintiff TNNAACP's objection to, or failure to object to, any particular Interrogatory or Request for Production of Documents is not, and shall not be construed as, an admission that responsive irformation exists. Moreover, Plaintiff TN NAACP's decision to answer any specific Intetrogatory or Request for Production of Documents, notwithstanding its objectionable nature or its related definitions or instructions, also should not be construed as an admission to the relevancy or materiality of the information or documents requested, or an agreement that future similar Interrogatories or Requests for Production of Documents will be treated in a similar manner. With these responses and objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP does not in any way waive, or intend to waive, the right to object on any and all grounds to (a) the evidentiary use of the information contained herein or (b) discovery requests relating to these objections and answers.

## GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the Interrogatories to the extent they impose obligations, seek answers, or use instructions or definitions other than those permitted under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, the Local Rules of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, any Order of this Court, and any prior agreement of the parties.
2. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information or documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privijege, exemption, immunity, principle, doctrine, or rule of confidentiality. If any protected information or material is disclosed, such disclosure is not intentional and shall not be deemed a waiver of any privilege or protection.
3. To the extent the Interrogatories require the disclosure of confidential or sensitive private information implicating the privacy interests of Plaintiff TN NAACP or other individuals, including other Plaintiffs, Plaintiff TN NAACP agrees to provide such information subiect to the protective order agreed upon by the parties.
4. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information already in the possession, custody, or control of the Defendant, or otherwise equally available to the Defendant.
5. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek materials not in Plaintiff's possession, custody, or control. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects to the Interrogatories as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent that they impose an obligation to survey third parties.
6. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories insofar as they seek information that is publicly available or otherwise equally available and/or uniquely available from third parties.
7. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the Interrogatories to the extent these seek answers or information neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence to any party's claim or defense.
8. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the Interrogatories insofar as they seek documents that are unreasonably cumulative or duplicative.
9. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the interrogatories to the extent that they are unclear, ambiguous, overly broad, unduly burdensome, and/or not proportional to the needs of this case.
10. Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to each and every one of the Interrogatories to the extent that they assume facts that do notexist or are incorrect.
11. By answering these Interiggatories, Plaintiff TN NAACP does not concede the relevance or materiality of any of the information requested, nor of the subject matter to which any particular Interrogatory refers. Rather, these responses are made expressly subject to, and without in any way waiving or intending to waive any question or objection as to the competency, relevance, privilege, or admissibility of any of the matters referred to in these responses as evidence.
12. Plaintiff TN NAACP expressly reserves:
a. The right to object, on grounds of competency, relevance, materiality, privilege, or any other applicable ground, to the use of responses provided to these

Interrogatories or the subject matter thereof, in any subsequent filing, proceeding, or hearing in this or any other action;
b. The right to object on any ground to any additional Interrogatories or other discovery proceedings involving or relating to the subject matter of these Interrogatories; and
c. The right to amend, withdraw, or supplement its responses should further investigation or discovery disclose additional information.

## SPECIFIC RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS

In addition to the foregoing general objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP asserts the following specific responses and objections to each Interrogatory:

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: What have You done to verify the statistics claimed by You in paragraphs 33 and 34 of the First Amended Complaint?

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects to the extent Interrogatory No. 1 seeks documents or information outside of Plaintiff TN NAACP's possession, custody, or control, insofar as they seek documents or information in the possession of Plaintiff TN NAACP's attorneys that was not obtained in conjunction with this litigation. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 1 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks about Plaintiff TN NAACP or Plaintiff TN NAACP's counsel work outside of this litigation.

Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP asserts that the statistics in paragraphs 33 and 34 of the First Amended Complaint were produced by scholars with more than "20 years of work chronicling the scope and distribution of felony disenfranchisement in the

United States." Christopher Uggen et al., Locked Out 2022: Estimates of People Denied Voting Rights, The SENTENCING Project (Oct. 25, 2022), https://www.sentencingproject.org/reports/locked-out-2022-estimates-of-people-denied-votingrights/. This work has been widely cited by numerous other scholars and news outlets. See, e.g., The Sentencing Project, Criminal Justice Experts and Formerly Incarcerated People Discuss New Report on Felony Disenfranchisement, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human RIGHTS (Oct. 14, 2020), https://civilrights.org/2020/10/14/the-sentencing-project-criminal-justice-experts-and-formerly-incarcerated-people-discuss-new-report-on-felony-
disenfranchisement/; Ashley Lopez, In the U.S., some 4.6 million perple are disenfranchised due to a felony conviction, NPR (Oct. 25, 2022), https://www.nproig/2022/10/25/1130622918/felon-voting-state-laws-disenfranchisement-rates. Further, Plaintiffs in this case have introduced an independent expert report which includes similar findings regarding the disparate impact of felony disenfranchisement on Black Tennesseans. See Expert Report of Dr. Traci Burch ("Burch Expert Rep."), Feb. 13, 2023, at 13.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: State all facts and identify all persons and documents which support Your claim in paragraph 109 of the Amended Complaint that " $[\mathrm{t}]$ he Election Division instructs the County Administrators of Elections not to place on the voter rolls any registrants who affirm on the new voter registration form that their only felony conviction(s) occurred between January 15, 1973 and May 17, 1981 unless and until those registrants provide additional documentation proving the date of their conviction." (emphasis in original).

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 2 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible to Defendants, including but not limited to documents produced by Defendants Goins and Hargett,
as well as deposition testimony provided by Defendant Goins' $30(\mathrm{~b})(6)$ designee. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 2 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks Plaintiff TN NAACP to state "all facts" and identify "all persons and documents."

Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP identifies testimony of Ms. Jessica Lim, Elections Attorney for the Tennessee Secretary of State Elections Division office in support of Amended Complaint paragraph 109. Ms. Lim answered in the affirmative when asked "[individuals with convictions from January 5, 1973 to May 17, 1981] won't be registered to vote until you have that verification." See Oct. 29, 2021 Dep. of Jessica Cunningham-Lim ("Lim Tr.") at 175:2-176:25. This is consistent with the training guidance provided by the Elections Division to the administrative offices of elections. See, e.g., Elections Division Production, DEF000122; TP008676 - TP008677. Additionally, the record contains numerous examples of individuals with convictions between January 5, 1973 and May 11 1981 who have been denied registration by the Elections Division and Offices of Elections for not providing additional documentation. E.g., Dawes_Hickman_May_2020, Elections Division "Flash Drive 3" production on July 6, 2022; Richardson Shelby June 2021, Elections Division "Flash Drive 3" production on July 6, 2022; Reece Cocke County Ocrober 2020, Elections Division "Flash Drive 3" production on July 6, 2022; Carter Davidson County October 2020, Elections Division "Flash Drive 3" production on July 6, 2022; Strand Union County September 2020, Elections Division "Flash Drive 3" production on July 6, 2022. See also, e.g., Kearley Cumberland July 2019, Elections Division "Flash Drive 3" production on July 6, 2022; Kirby Sumner October 2019, Elections Division "Flash Drive 3" production on July 6, 2022 (requiring documentation before verifying eligibility).

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: State all facts and identify all persons and documents which support Your allegation in paragraph 110 of the Amended Complaint that, " $[t]$ he Election Division also instructs the County Administrators of Elections not to place on the voter rolls any registrants who affirm on the new voter registration form that their only felony conviction(s) were prior to January 15, 1973 unless and until those registrants provide additional documentation proving the date of their conviction and that their judgement (sic) did not render them infamous." (emphasis in original).

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 3 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible to Defendants, including but not limited to documents produeed by Defendants Goins and Hargett, as well as deposition testimony provided by Defendant Goins' 30(b)(6) designee. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 3 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks Plaintiff TN NAACP to state "all facts" and identify "all persons and documents."

Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP identifies Ms. Lim's testimony that the Elections Division "would have to get some type of verifying documentation confirming" eligibility for any individual with a pre-January 15,1973 conviction in support of Amended Complaint paragraph 110. See Lim Tr. at 179:10-180:22.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: State all facts and identify all documents and persons which support Your allegation in paragraph 154 of the Amended Complaint that "[ $[$ ]he State Form fails to fully inform applicants with felony convictions of their eligibility under Tennessee law," including a clarification of what the "State Form" is.

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 4 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible to Defendants, including but not limited to documents produced by Defendants Goins and Hargett, as well as deposition testimony provided by Defendant Goins' F.R.C.P. 30(b)(6) designee. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 4 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks Plaintiff TN NAACP to state "all facts" and identify "all documents and persons."

Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP asserts that the Tennessee Mail-In Application for Voter Registration is the State Form. A copy of that form was attached as Exhibit B to the originally filed complaint in this case and Exhibit 10 to the October 29, 2021 deposition of Jessica Cunningham-Lim is a copy of the since-updated version of the State Form. The updated form states that "if you have had a felony conviction, vour eligibility to register and vote depends upon the crime you were convicted of and the dateof your conviction. To assist in processing your application, provide the required information in box 4 and any responsive documents you have," and directs individuals to the Secretary of State's website. The form does not explain that felony convictions between May 18, 1981 and January 15, 1973 are not disqualifying. It also does not explain that felony convictions prior to January 15, 1973 are not disqualifying unless there was a specific judgment rendering the person infamous. It also does not explain what documentation the state requires to register when an individual has a felony during those periods or what documentation a person with an out-of-state conviction would need to submit to register to vote under the current policies of the Elections Division. The Secretary of State website informs applicants how certain felony convictions before January 15, 1973, between January 15, 1973 and May 18, 1981, and after May 18, 1981 affect an individual's eligibility to register to vote and states, "the Division of Elections will need to verify you were convicted during this time period."

Tennessee Secretary of State Restoration of Voting Rights, https://sos.tn.gov/elections/guides/restoration-of-voting-rights (last visited 3/14/2023). Neither version of the State Form includes the complete eligibility information and instructions for registration. See Compl. Ex. B (ECF 1-2); Lim Tr., Ex. 10. For example, neither version of the form informs applicants that felony convictions between January 15, 1973 and May 18, 1981 are not disqualifying. The version of the form in use at the time of the filing of this complaint did not explain that individuals whose convictions have been expunged should answer "No" on the voter registration form when asked if they have a felony conviction. Id.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: State all facts and identify all documents and persons which support Your allegation in paragraph 154 of the Amended Somplaint that, " $[t]$ o the contrary, it plainly misinforms voters of the eligibility requirements by stating that no individual with a felony conviction may register to vote unless she has undergone the restoration or rights process."

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 5 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible to Defendants, including but not limited to documents produced by Defendants Goins and Hargett, as well as deposition testimony provided by Defendant Goins' 30(b)(6) designee. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 5 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks Plaintiff to state "all facts" and identify "all documents and persons."

Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff asserts that the quoted language from the Amended Complaint refers specifically to the older version of the State Form, which is still the operative form provided on some official county election websites throughout the state. See, e.g., Knox County Tennessee, Elections, https://www.knoxcounty.org/election/pdfs/registration.pdf (last visited Mar. 27, 2023); Chester County Election Commission, Voters,
https://votechestercountytn.gov/wheretovote/\#register (last visited Mar. 27, 2023); DeKalb County Election Commission, Voter Registration Information, https://www.dekalbelections.com/voter-registration-information/(last visited Mar. 27, 2023). Even when the newer version of the State Form is provided, it fails to fully inform applicants of their eligibility, as described in response to Interrogatory 4.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: State all facts and identify all documents and persons which support Your allegation in paragraph 163 of the Amended Complaint that Defendants Goins and Hargett have a "policy of rejecting all registration forms on which the applicant affirmed that they have a felony conviction...." (emphasis in original).

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 6 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible to Defendants, including but not limited to documents produced by Defendants Goins and Hargett, as well as deposition testimony provided by Defendant Goins' 30(b)(6) designee. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 6 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks Plaintiff TN NAACP to state "all facts" and identify "all documents and persons."

Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP identifies Ms. Lim's testimony in support of Amended Complaint paragraph 163. See Lim Tr. at 101:5-11. This is consistent with the instructions on the Secretary of State's website which states that "[a]ny conviction for a crime that is a felony in Tennessee . . causes you to lose your voting rights." See Tennessee Secretary of State, Restoration of Voting Rights, https://sos.tn.gov/elections/guides/restoration-of-votingrights (last visited 3/14/2023). Additionally, the record contains numerous examples of the Elections Division instructing Tennessee registrars to reject voter registration forms where an
individual has indicated they have a felony conviction. See, e.g., Elections Division Production, DEF000122, DEF000339.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Provide the full name, address, and date of birth of the person referred to in paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint who was prosecuted for a felony for submitting a COR.

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 7 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible to Defendants, several of whom were directly involved in the prosecution referred to in paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 7 is overboard to the extent that the individual's address and dare of birth are confidential information and unrelated to this litigation.

Subject to the above objections, Plaintif TN NAACP identifies State v. Pamela Moses, No. 19-06482 (Shelby Cnty Crim. Ct. 2019), as the prosecution referenced in paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint. See also Sophe Kasakove and Eduardo Medina, Charges Dropped Against Tennessee Woman Who Was failed Over Voter Fraud, N.Y. Times (April 23, 2022).

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: State all facts and identify all documents and persons which support your allegation in paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint that " $[t]$ he implementation failures of the rights restoration process create an unequal, scattershot system across Tennessee's ninety-five counties, causing disparate results for similarly situated individuals, in violation of the Equal Protection Clause."

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects that Interrogatory No. 8 seeks information that is in the possession of, control of, or equally accessible
to Defendants, including but not limited to documents produced by Defendants Goins and Hargett, as well as deposition testimony provided by Defendant Goins' 30(b)(6) designee. Plaintiff TN NAACP further objects that Interrogatory No. 8 is overbroad and overburdensome to the extent that it asks Plaintiff TN NAACP to state "all facts" and identify "all documents and persons."

Subject to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP identifies the expert reports of Dr. Traci Burch and Dr. Jennifer Selin in support of paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint. See Burch Expert Rep.; Expert Report of Dr. Jennifer Selin, Feb. 13, 2023.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: Describe in detail how You compiled Exhibit A to Your responses to the First Set of Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the extent that Interrogatory No. 9 seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and workproduct doctrine.

Without waiver of the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP asserts that Exhibit A, compiled in response to Interrogatory 4 in State Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories, was created by counsel combining individuals assisted in the COR process by the Tennessee Conference of the NAACP and by the Restore Your Vote project. Interrogatory 4 asked, "To Your knowledge, please identify any potential class member, including name, their felony convictions, other identifying information, documentation that such person is not subject to a disqualifying conviction as defined in Tenn. Code Ann. § 40-29-204, and other documentation supporting that each potential class member has satisfied the requirements of Tenn. Code Ann. §40-29-202 as described in paragraph 104 of Your Complaint (DE 1)." The persons listed in Exhibit A, to the best of theirs and Plaintiff TN NAACP's knowledge all (1) are Tennessee residents, (2) have at
least one felony conviction after 1981 and (3) have not, or had not at the time of response, been restored their voting rights.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Describe in detail how You compiled Exhibit B to Your responses to the First Set of Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the extent that Interrogatory No. 10 seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and workproduct doctrine.

Without waiver of these objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP asserts that Exhibit B, compiled in response to Interrogatory 5 in State Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories, was created by counsel combining individuals assisted in the COR process by the Tennessee Conference of the NAACP and by the Restore Your Vote project. Interrogatory 5 asked, "To Your knowledge, please identify and describe the events and circumsances around any refusal to issue a certificate of restoration as described in paragraphs $64-66$ of Your Complaint (DE 1)." The persons listed in Exhibit B, to the best of theirs and Plaintiff TN NAACP's knowledge, all (1) are Tennessee residents otherwise qualified to vote, (2) have at least one felony conviction after 1981, (3) have requested a COR or, at their request, an advocate requested one on their behalf from the appropriate officials, and (4) were refused issuance of a COR by at least one appropriate official.

INTERROGARORY NO. 11: Describe in detail how You compiled Exhibit C to Your responses to the First Set of Interrogatories.

RESPONSE: In addition to the above objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP objects to the extent that Interrogatory No. 11 seeks information protected by attorney-client privilege and workproduct doctrine.

Without waiver of these objections, Plaintiff TN NAACP asserts that Exhibit C, compiled in response to Interrogatory 6 in State Defendant's First Set of Interrogatories, was created by counsel combining individuals assisted in the COR process by the Tennessee Conference of the NAACP and by the Restore Your Vote project. Interrogatory 6 asked, "To Your knowledge, please identify and describe any erroneous deprivation allegedly caused by the Certificate of Restoration process, as alleged in paragraphs $84-85$ of Your Complaint (DE 1). Note: this Interrogatory does not ask for documentation of potential risk of erroneous deprivation, but deprivations that actually occurred which You contend were erroneous." The persons listed in Exhibit C, to the best of theirs and Plaintiff TN NAACP's knowledge, all (1) are Tennessee residents otherwise qualified to vote, (2) have at least one felony conviction after 1981, (3) meet the eligibility criteria for voting rights restoration listed under T.C.A. 40-29-202, (4) have requested a COR or, at their request, an advocate requested one on their behalf from the appropriate officials, and (5) have not been restored to the right to vote or, if they have sime received a restoration, missed at least one election after they requested restoration while elgible for such.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Are you claiming attorneys' fees and/or damages separate and apart from fees incered in pursuing this litigation? If so, please provide the following information: (a) The attorneys (and other staff members) who you claim have spent this time; and (b) a detailed accounting of the hours spent by each attorney (and other staff members), hourly rate, a description of the work performed, and the date on which the work was performed.

## RESPONSE: No.

## REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

REQUEST NO. 1: Produce all documents that support your answers to the Interrogatories, above.

RESPONSE: Subject to the foregoing objections, Plaintiff asserts that any documents within its custody or control that were used, referenced, or reviewed during the process of answering State Defendants' Third Set of Interrogatories have already been produced. Any other documents used, referenced, or reviewed during the process of answering State Defendants' Third Set of Interrogatories were either produced by State Defendants and are within State Defendants' custody or control, or are publicly available.

Date: 3/27/2023
Name: Gloria J. Sweet-Love
Title: $\quad$ President/Director-TN State Cenference NAACP
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The $30(b)(6)$ deposition of VICTORIA RICCI was taken by counsel for the Plaintiffs, by Notice, at the offices of Baker Donelson, 1600 West End Avenue, Suite 2000, Nashville, Tennessee, on March 27, 2023, for all purposes under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The formalities as to notice, caption, certificate, transmission, et cetera, are expressly waived.

It is agreed the: GEORGETTE K. ARENA, RPR, Notary Public and Licensed Court Reporter for the state of Tennessee, may swear the witness.


*     *         *             *                 *                     *                         * 

$\square$ the questioning, I just want to say that we raise objections that we raised in our March 30, 2023, email. And we are raising them at all the deposition, and we will just raise those here. And that's all we need to say about it.

And I want to mention to Ms. Bowie and Valencia, that she brought with this her today. Do you want us to make a copy of this for you?

MS. BOWIE: Yes, please.
MS. JORDAN: All right.
MR. STAHL: Do yu want me to?
(An off-the-record discussion was held.)

## VICTORIA RICCI,

 was called as a witness, and after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. BOWIE:
Q. All right. We can go back on.

Good morning.
A. Good morning.
Q. My name is Blair Bowie. I represent the plaintiffs in this case, Tennessee NAACP versus Lee. I'm going to be asking you some questions today, as you know.

Before we get started, I'm going to go over some instructions, but before $I$ get to that, can you please state your name for the record?
A. Victoria Ricci.
Q. Okay.

MS. BOWIE: Do you need that spelled?
THE COURT REPORTER: NO.
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) All right. Ms. Ricci, have you ever taken a deposition before --
A. No.
Q. -- have you ever sat for a deposition?

Okay. So we will talk a little bit more about that in a moment, but, generally, I'm going to be asking you some questions. The court reporter is here to transcribe everything we say. To make things easier on her, we are going to try not to speak over each other, speak at the same time. So I would appreciate it if you can please wait for me to finish asking any question before you give an answer. And I'll try to do the same.

So that the reporter is able to get
everything on the record, please answer out loud with words rather than nodding, shaking your head, saying huh-uh (negative), just to make sure that we have a clear transcript.
A. Okay.
Q. If you don't understand a question, please tell me, and I'll try to clarify it. If you answer a question, I'll assume that you understood it.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. You might hear your attorneys object to a question I ask. That objection will be noted for the record, but you must still answer the question.
A. Okay.
Q. If you need a break at any time, just let us know, and we will we happy to accommodate you. I just ask that if I've asked a question, that you wait to take the break until after you've answered that question.
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. Do you understand that you are under oath today?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is there any reason why you cannot give truthful answers to my questions today?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Are you taking any medications that impair your memory?
A. No.
Q. Do you have any conditions that impair your memory?
A. No.
Q. Okay. I want to talk a little bit about how you prepared for the lawsuit today.

And before I do that, I'm going to introduce Exhibit 1.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhiblt Number 1.) Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Oka厂 Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. What do you understand this document to be?
A. This is the lawsuit against William Lee.
Q. This is the deposition notice.
A. Oh, deposition notice.
Q. Yeah. So it has the same caption. It looks
the same at the top?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. Do you understand that this is the document
that's setting the terms of the deposition today?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. And you have seen this document before?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you understand that even though it says March 27 here, that this deposition is a continuation of one that started on March 27 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you look at any documents in preparation for the deposition today?
A. I looked at a memo that was created by myself on the process. I looked at the policy pertaining to restoration of voters' rights.
Q. Do you remember which policy that is?
A. $\quad 706.05$.
Q. Okay.
A. I looked at our pre-release orientation booklet, so the pre- -- pre-release training manual. I looked at the TEPE spreadsheet, and then various emails that were from Bryce, Brian, Josh, and Thomas.
Q. What were those emails about?
A. They were about -- they included the spreadsheet in there, the information pertaining to how restoration of voters' rights are completed within our facilities. I believe that was it.
Q. Which spreadsheet are you referring to?
A. The TEPE spreadsheet.
Q. Okay. Did you look at any other documents in preparation for the deposition today?
A. I'm trying to remember everything I've looked at. I looked at the restoration of voeers' rights application along with the instructions as well.
Q. Okay.
A. And then reviewed our reentry policy 511.06.
Q. Okay. Anything ense?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. All right. okay. Did you speak to anyone in preparation for today's deposition?
A. I spoke to Jody Kahn, who is one of our reentry specialists that was here before I assumed the position in 2019.
Q. Okay.
A. And I spoke to Jenny Brenner, who is our
general counsel for Tennessee Department of
Correction.
Q. Okay. I'm not going to ask any questions
about conversations you had with attorneys. I'm not going to ask about the content of any of those conversations.

How many times did you meet with Ms. Kahn.
A. We spoke over the phone.
Q. Okay.
A. Talked for about ten -- ten minutes.
Q. Ten minutes, okay. What did you speak about?
A. We spoke about what was the process before I assumed the position on restoration of voters' rights.
Q. How far back did her knowiedge on that go?
A. Approximately 2009.
Q. Okay. And you covered all that in ten minutes?
A. Yeah, it wasn't very much. We just talked about what did she do for restoration of voters' rights.
Q. And she had your position?
A. She did not. She was the reentry specialist. Before me, there was not a position for reentry director.
Q. Okay. Got it.

How many times did you meet with -- and I'm sorry, can you remind me of the name of the second
person?
A. Jen Brenner.
Q. Jen Brenner. And you said she's an attorney at TDOC?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. How many times did you meet with Ms. Brenner?
A. We did not meet. We conversed over email.
Q. Okay. Did you meet with anyone else?
A. Just the attorneys. So, no.
Q. Okay. You mean these attorrieys?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. How many times $\mathrm{aid}^{\text {Q }}$ you meet with these attorneys?
A. Two.
Q. Okay. And ac about how long did you spend in those meetings?
A. Approximately two, two and a half hours.
Q. Each?
A. Yes. Each time.
Q. Each time. Okay. When were those meetings?
A. The first one was on Monday. The second one was on Thurs -- what's today? Yesterday. So Wednesday.
Q. Wednesday. Okay. Was there anyone else
present in those meetings?
A. Just myself and the attorneys.
Q. Okay. When were you asked to testify at this deposition?
A. Last Thursday.
Q. Okay. Prior to that, were you aware of this lawsuit?
A. Only a week before that was I aware of this lawsuit.
Q. How did you become aware of the lawsuit?
A. Jen Brenner communicated to myself and my supervisor about the lawsuit.
Q. What did she say abole it?
A. She just asked for anyone that had knowledge of restoration of voters' rights inside the facilities.
Q. Have you ever been asked to produce any documents for this lawsuit?
A. I produced policy 511.06. I produced the pre-release orientation manual. I produced our reentry packet, which is contained in Policy 511.06. Q. Okay. Got it.

And when you said earlier that you reviewed the pre-release training manual, is that the same or different than that packet?
A. That is -- the -- so the packet is the release packet. The manual is the class that the inmates take before they are released. So they are separate.
Q. Okay. Did you produce any materials from that class?
A. It's all in the pre-release orientation manual.
Q. It's all in the manual. Is that the same as that policy?
A. No. The policy is separate from that.
Q. Okay. Did you produce the manual?
A. Yes. I see it right there.
Q. Okay. Great.

And did you help produce the spreadsheet
from the TEPE database?
A. I did not.
Q. Okay. Do you know who produced that?
A. I believe it was Bryce.
Q. Okay. All right. So you learned about this lawsuit, it sounds like, last week; is that correct?
A. I was asked to do the deposition last week.

The week prior, I learned about the lawsuit.
Q. Okay. So two weeks ago.

What is your understanding of what this
lawsuit is about?
A. My understanding is that inmates -- everyone get the opportunity to apply for the restoration of voters' rights.
Q. That's the goal of this lawsuit?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you speak with anyone else in preparation for this deposition?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. I take that back. I talked to my supervisor, Carissa Miniard, just letting her know that I was doing this deposition.
Q. Okay. So not about any of the content?
A. Not about any of the content, no.
Q. Okay. So aside from what we've already discussed, did you do anything else to prepare for this deposition?
A. I read over the documents that were provided to me.
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative). And those were the ones that we've already talked about?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. All right. Let's look at Exhibit 1 again. So this is the deposition notice?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. If you turn to Page 4, please, and then continuing on through Page 8, these are the topics for today's deposition. Do you understand that?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. And you've looked through these before?
A. I briefly looked through them, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you feel prepared to testify on all
these topics?
A. I'm prepared to testify the best I can.
Q. Okay. Are there any limitations on what you are prepared to testify on today?
A. I cannot testify as to what they do in community supervision
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative).
A. I can only testify to what our process is inside the facilities, and our reentry counselors. Q. Okay.
A. I also cannot testify to what they do at the election boards' offices.
Q. Sure. And you understand that you are a representative of TDOC for purposes of this deposition -A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. -- is that correct?

Okay. All right. Let's turn to your professional and educational background.
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. Could you please start by describing or summarize your educational background?
A. Yes. So I received my bachelor's degree at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in Manhattan. And then $I$ am currently enrolled in my master's of public administration at Tennessee State University. Q. Okay. And can you please describe your work history?
A. Yes. So I started as a case manager at Trousdale Turner Correctional facility in 2016.
Q. Sorry. Is that-Tennessee?
A. Yes. Trouscale Turner Correctional facility in Hartsville, Tennessee.
Q. In Hartsville, okay.
A. From there, I became the risk needs assessment quality assurance for Middle Tennessee. Q. That's also with TDOC?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Is that in a central office for --
A. It's in -- we were located at -- Day Reporting Center is where our office was, but we
would do quality assurance of risk needs assessments for the entire state.
Q. Okay.
A. And then from there, I obtained the case manager coordinator position within TDOC, overseeing the case management process. And now I am currently the director of reentry services for Tennessee Department of Correction.
Q. Okay. When you were a case manager at the Trousdale facility, what did your work involve? A. It involved handling day-to-ciay activities of the offenders within the unit, classifying them to their custody level, doing pris assessments -Q. Sorry. What does that mean? A. PREA, Prison Rape Elimination Act. Q. Okay.
A. You woulid have to do assessments to make sure that they don't qualify as an aggressor or as a victim. So you would just go over their history with them. And then we did risk needs assessments starting in 2016.
Q. What does that entail?
A. Risk needs assessment, it has a guide -interview guide, and there's approximately 40 questions that you go through with them. You input
it into our software. And then it comes out with their risks and their needs. And then you complete a case plan for them, so which program we would put them in.
Q. Okay. And this is for when people are exiting the facility or --
A. No. This is for when people are inside the facility.
Q. Okay. When they are entering or just at some point while they are inside?
A. So they get it as they are entering and every year.
Q. Okay.
A. Once a year.
Q. Okay. Got it

And then your next position was risk needs assessment for the -- the entire division --
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. -- is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And what does that position entail?
A. We would collect approximately 10 to 15 assessments throughout the state at random and go through each questionnaire and make sure that the information was accurate compared to what was
provided to us in the OMS system. Q. Okay. So you were sort of getting the underlying documents and then checking that against what was put in the OMS system --
A. Yes.
Q. -- is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. And that would be a random sample for across the division?
A. Exactly, yes.
Q. And what did you do if you found that those did not match what was in the OMS system?
A. We had to request that they would update the information into the OMS system to match what we had found.
Q. Okay. What were some common errors that you might see?
A. I would see a lot of alcohol and drug use. They would mark that they didn't have a problem, but they would have charges from out of state and such that did involve drugs.
Q. So they may have missed those out-of-state charges?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. But you were able to see that?
A. Yes.
Q. How do you find the out-of-state charges?
A. We would have to look at their judgment orders or their NCSCs.
Q. Were the officers who were doing that initial
risk assessment supposed to do that as well?
A. Sometimes they do not have access to that.
Q. Okay. If you found that there were inconsistencies or problems with the risk assessments, would you recommend retrainings for the officers?
A. Yeah. So if they scored below an 80 , they were at that point in time I don't know what the process is now -- but they did have to go through a retraining process if they scored under 80.
Q. What does twat mean, score under 80?
A. So there's ten different sections. And then if they miss two sections, it would equal them to be 80. If they ever scored 80 and below, they would have to go back through retraining or kind of like a coaching session.
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative). Got it.

And how big were the random samples,
typically?
A.
Approximately 10 to 15.
Q. $\quad 10$ to 15. And how often did you review them?
A. Monthly.
Q. Monthly. Okay.
A. But $I$ was not the only one.
Q. Right. Okay.

How many risk needs assessments would be
done on a monthly basis?
A. Throughout the state?
Q. Throughout the division.
A. I'm not positive.
Q. Because you were only looking at the division, right?
A. I was only looking at this division, and I was one of two people.
Q. Okay. Yeah. If was just sort of asking.

Do you know what percentage of the total
that 10 to 15 might represent?
A. I think it was 5 percent, to the best of my knowledge.
Q. Okay. Got it.

All right. And remind how long were you in
that position?
A. I was only in that position for seven months.
Q. Seven months?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. Okay. And what years were those or --
A. That was 2018.
Q. Okay. And then you moved into the role of case manager coordinator; is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. And is that also based in the middle division?
A. That is based at our central office division.
Q. So were you covering the whole state then?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you were in that position from 2018 until when?
A. Until 2021.
Q. Okay. And that's when you became the director of reentry?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. As case manager coordinator, can you tell me what your responsibilities were?
A. I overseen the correctional counselor initial training for new employees coming in. Correctional counselor booster, which is a yearly training that each counselor receives on any updates that may have occurred within the year. I oversaw -- I did oversee the reentry process during that time because my position was reclassified to the director of
reentry services.
Q. Where was it before that?
A. What was that?
Q. You said it was reclassified. Where was it?
A. Yeah. So the case manager coordinator was reclassified to the director of reentry because there was never a director of reentry before me. Q. So that job became the director of reentry?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. Yes. However, the duties have now been more aligned to just focus on reentry.
Q. Okay.
A. I did oversee the reentry process. I oversaw Policy 511.06, 508.04
Q. I'm not familiar with that one.
A. 508.04 is counseling services.
Q. Okay.
A. I oversaw Policy 511.05 and Policy 511.08.
Q. And what are those policies about?
A. $\quad 511.05$ is the driver's license issuance process.
Q. What is that?
A. So inside our facilities our -- every
eligible offender that is being released is provided
a driver's license or ID inside the facility. We have kiosks inside there. And our reentry counselors or the issuance staff issue them a driver's license free of charge --
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative).
A. -- before they are released.
Q. Okay. And then 511.08?
A. $\quad 511.08$ is driver's license and Social Security card issuance. So every offender that is being released also receives a birth certificate and a Social Security card if they request it or if they are eligible.
Q. Okay. Any other responsibilities in that position as case manager coordinator?
A. The reentry precess, I mentioned that.
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative).
A. I was facilitating CBIP, C-B-I-P training,
which is our Cognitive Behavioral Intervention Program training. So anyone that was going to facilitate that class, I would prep them to facilitate that class.
Q. Okay. And what did that consist of?
A. That consists of training them on group facilitation skills and understanding the CBIP material.
Q. Okay. Did you produce materials in that role as well?
A. We had a PowerPoint that was used, and we trained through Teams.
Q. Okay. And you didn't make that PowerPoint? A. That PowerPoint was made in conjunction with the staff that oversees CBIP training. Q. Got it. Okay. And then your current role as director of reentry, can you describe your responsibilities, please?
A. Yeah. So I oversee 22 different reentry counselors that are spread throughout our state. There's at least one reentry counselor in each facility. So at this point now I keep track of the reentry applications that are completed. I keep track of the driver's license, and issuance, who gets those and the amount of -- that are issued, along with the financial report that comes in monthly that we pay to Department of Safety. I oversee the birth certificate process, the Social Security card process, all the policies listed previously in the case management coordinator position. The restoration of voters' rights, I oversee that process for our reentry team. And then anything pertaining to an inmate that is being
released falls under my purview.
Q. Okay. And what month in 2021 did you start that position?
A. I cannot tell you an exact date.
Q. That's okay. Do you remember the season?
A. I remember -- yeah, it was summertime.
Q. Okay.
A. It was about summertime when it got reclassified.
Q. Got it. Okay.

Are there any other roles or jobs that you you've had that we haven't talked about yet?
A. Previously, in New Yock I worked with DHS, the child support division.
Q. Okay. Was that while you were in school?
A. That was when I graduated college, and I was only there for about four months before we relocated here.
Q. Okay. Then you started at Trousdale?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MS. BOWIE: Before we move on, $I$ want to introduce this document into evidence as well. These are your notes.

THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah, yeah.

MS. BOWIE: So this is going to be
Exhibit 2.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 2.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Can you say for the record what that is?
A. These are my notes that I made last night while $I$ was preparing.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

All right. I would like to ask you some questions about the structure of TDOC.
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. And, apologies, if these questions are -- you know, reveal my limited knowledge of how it's structured. But can fou sort of give me an outline of the basic structure of the organization?
A. So at the top is the Commissioner of Tennessee Department of Correction. From there, there is a deputy commissioner. And then it falls down to the assistant commissioners, one that covers prison operations, one that covers rehabilitative services, one that covers community supervision, and then one that covers project management. And then from there, underneath there, they have direct support staff, which would include correctional
administrators and directors.
Falling into community supervision, what $I$ do know is that they have a district director, a manager, and then probation/parole officers.

At the facility level, they have a warden, at least two assistant wardens, one for security, one for treatment. Then they have a chief counselor, correctional counselors. And within the correctional counselors, they have specific roles. So whether it be reentry specialist, classification specialist, or orientation specialists, or a unit counselor.
Q. I'm sorry. This is you are -- that is a lot. That was under rehabilitative services or prison operations?
A. So the priscons fall with -- all three have services and prison operations. So AC of Rehab Services covers the counselor side.
Q. Okay.
A. Along with education and medical -- well, they do not cover medical anymore. There is an assistant commissioner, if $I$ can go back, of medical services now.
Q. Okay.
A. And then on the security side, I believe
there's a major, a corporal, a lieutenant, and then correctional officers.
Q. Okay. And reentry falls under which part?
A. Rehab services.
Q. Rehab services.
A. So it's the reentry counselor. Their direct supervisor is the chief counselor, and then it goes up to assistant warden of treatment, and then to the warden.
Q. Okay. And reentry deals with people who are being released from prison; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is that always the case?
A. What do you mean, that always the case?
Q. Is it only people who are being released from prison that go intco the reentry programs?
A. So it's not, per se, a program. It's more like case management.
Q. Okay.
A. So, yes, it's anyone that is either paroling or expiring that meets with the reentry specialist. Q. Okay. And so folks who are expiring, that just means they are being released from prison and their sentence is over; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And if they're paroling, they are now on community supervision, but they still also have a reentry case manager; am I understanding that correctly?
A. So, yeah, the people that are releasing on parole will still meet with our reentry specialists to prepare them for the free world. When they are released on parole, they will have to do parole intake and meet with their parole officer.
Q. And then is that case transferred --
A. The case is transferred --
Q. -- to supervision?
A. -- yes.
Q. So that's sort of the interim stuff there?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Can You describe the structure of the reentry side one more time?
A. So the staff, or what the reentry counselors do?
Q. The staff.
A. Okay. So it starts with the reentry specialist, is overseen by the chief counselor. The chief counselor is then overseen by the AWT, which is the assistant warden of treatment -Q. Okay.
A. -- who then is overseen by the warden.
Q. And is that divided by region, or how does that --
A. So each facility has their own warden and their own team.
Q. So each of them are associated with an incarcerating facility?
A. Yes.
Q. How many incarcerating facilities are there in the state?
A. I believe there's 16 facilitjes to include the CoreCivic facilities.
Q. Okay. What are the GeceCivic facilities?
A. Our Trousdale Turner Correctional facility in Hartsville, Tennessee Whiteville Correctional facility in Whiteville, Tennessee. Hardeman Correctional facility in Whiteville. And then South Central facility in Clifton, Tennessee. Q. And the CoreCivic prisons are run by a private company; is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. That they are contracting with TDOC?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Okay. I think I understand. But if I have to come back to it later, I apologize.
A. Yeah.
Q. I think you have here in your notes something about the numbers of people expiring their sentences as of March 2023. Do you know what that -- what does that number mean?
A. Yeah. So approximately 1400 inmates expired as of March 2023. That data also included expiring for various reasons. So that's why I cannot give you an exact number of the actual inmates that expired, but I can give you an approximate number. Q. And does that mean that that's how many people expired their sentence in March --
A. No.
Q. -- or so far --

THE COURT KEPORTER: One at a time, please.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Can you repeat your question, please? Q (BY MS. BOWIE) What time period does that number cover?
A. That covers from July 2022 to March 2023. Q. Okay. And you anticipated my question because I was trying to get a handle on the number of folks who are expiring directly from prison.

Can we make this Exhibit 3, please?
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 3.) Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Have you seven this report before?
A. I have.
Q. Okay. Is this where you got that number?
A. Let me review it real quick because there's multiple reports.

This is not where I got that number.
Q. Okay. Where did you get that number?
A. I got this number off our current data that is tracked in our TDOC web page, statistical data.
Q. Okay.
A. That's updated monithly.
Q. And is it your understanding that that will be what populates rext year's report?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So this is from last year?
A. Correct.
Q. Can you point me to which column corresponds with the number you gave me for this year?
A. If you go to the first table, go over to expiration and others.
Q. Okay.
A. And fall down to March, it would have all of
those expiration and others in that column. And down below in the total section, it would give me the total of the 1468.
Q. Got it.

So the corresponding number from last year was 2,422 for the year; is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. So the number is about the same this year, if we are thinking about how many months have passed, is that -- would you say that you are seeing about the same number of folks beirig released?
A. I would say that there is less --
Q. Okay.
A. -- this year than what it looks like last year.
Q. In your experience is there roughly an average number per year?
A. I would say the average -- I can give you monthly. The average monthly is about 175 -Q. Okay.
A. -- from the data that I looked at this year. Q. Got it.

And do you know what these other tables are referring to? Do you know what TDOC backup is?
A. I do not know what TDOC backup is.
Q. Okay. How about locally sentenced?
A. Those are the individuals that will -- were locally sentenced at the county jails that now obtained a TDOC sentence.
Q. Okay. So if those folks were released from --
A. The county.
Q. -- county jail, that would be that column, that same column there?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And are they now under TDOC supervision?
A. If they are on parole, yes. If they have expired, no.
Q. Okay. So is the right figure to look at for everyone who has been released, or who has expired their sentence, cat it be that top one, TDOC, or System Total, from your understanding?
A. Since I cannot speak to the TDOC backup, I can't -- I cannot answer if that would be the system total.
Q. Okay.
A. The number that $I$ focus on is the felon inmates released in Tennessee, that first table. Q. That first table. So the one that just says, TDOC?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. And do you know if that includes the CoreCivic facilities?
A. It does.
Q. Okay. So, just to make sure I'm understanding, those folks who are expiring, does that mean that they are being released, or might some of those folks be headed to parole?
A. That number includes the people that are expiring their sentence. They are not going to parole. However, they can have a cietainer in another county for another charge or another state for another charge. So that number doesn't reflect those who have a detainer
Q. And if they have a detainer, does that mean that they are goins to be transferred into someone else's custody?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But for TDOC's purposes, they've been fully released and completed their sentence?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Okay. Let's talk a little bit about the voting rights restoration process. What is TDOC's role in the restoration of voting rights for people with past felony convictions?
A. So on my side, the reentry specialist will review anyone that is eligible. So that means that they have expired. They do not have a detainer. We can verify all their court costs and fees and fines have been paid off. And they fall within the purview of not having the specific crimes allowed.

If they know that they are eligible, or the offender asks to be reviewed to be eligible, our reentry specialists are then going to complete Section 1 of that application, and then Section 2, which is the court fines and fees. They can only fill out the court fines and fees, though, if they can verify from the county gierk, or that the offender has paperwork stating that these fines and fees have been paid off.

Once they are done completing that application, we are going to keep a copy in the inmate's file, and we are going to put a copy in the reentry release packet.

The reentry release packet will then be given to them upon release. And they are to bring it to the county's election office. And then they would determine their eligibility further by checking the information that they need to.

Every offender is given the opportunity of
completing a COR. And we ensure that by talking about it at their milestone assessments. We talk about it in their pre-release orientation class. And we provide an application in the release packet and instruct them, if they are going out on parole, or they just didn't fill it out during expiration, they can go to the local probation/parole office and have that process completed.
Q. It's a thorough summary.

We are going to talk about some of the pieces --
A. Okay.
Q. -- of that a little bit more.

But is it your uncerstanding that that -that policy that you gust described has always been how the reentry services handle voting rights restoration?
A. $\quad$ So voters' restoration is not listed in Policy 511.06 yet. We are working on getting that inside our policy.

However, there was a memo sent out. I don't have the memo in front of me, so I can't tell you the exact date.

But prior to my position in 2019, the COR paperwork was just provided in the reentry packets
and instructed to be filled out by the parole offices.
Q. Okay. So the reentry specialists at that time would not fill out any of it?
A. They did not. They were instructed to give it to the parole offices to fill out.
Q. Okay. And that was prior to?
A. $\quad 2019$.
Q. 2019. Not prior to when you sent that memo?
A. No. Because I started instructing them in 2019 to start on the voters' restoration process. Q. Okay. All right. So we talked -- you mentioned a few policies. I want to look at those in some detail. The two policies that you've mentioned a few times are 705.06.
A. $\quad 706.05$.
Q. Is this the correct policy? And this is an older one. We are going mark this as Exhibit 4.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 4.) Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Actually, I gave you one that I had written on. I'll give you this.

Okay. I just wanted to give you that.
All right. So what's your understanding of this policy?
A. This is the community supervision's policy that covers restoration of voters' rights. Q. Okay. And we are looking at an old version of this, this one. Do you see effective date there? A. I do.
Q. Can you say what it is?
A. May 15, 2013.
Q. Okay. And you said this is just for community supervision; is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. So this would not apoly to reentry at all?
A. No. We are not covered in this policy. Q. Okay. Got it. Do you think that there's ever been any confusion about that?
A. Not to my ktiowledge.
Q. Okay. So it's your understanding that reentry officers have never used this policy?
A. I cannot say whether they have or have not used this document policy prior to me coming in 2019 .
Q. But it's your understanding that this has not applied to reentry services?
A. They have not had to directly be part of this policy, no.
Q. Okay. I'm going go ahead and set those aside.

And the other policy that you mentioned a couple times is 511.06; is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. This is Exhibit 5.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 5.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) And what is this policy?
A. This is the reentry services poilicy.
Q. Okay. And we are looking at an older version of this, right? Do you see the effective date?
A. Yes. August 15, 2014.
Q. Okay. And so just. so we are on the same page about language, is thes policy the pre-release training manual?
A. No.
Q. That's a different document. Okay.

Does this policy include the pre-release packet?
A. This contains the packet checklist of what is printed on the manila envelope. However, this one is very outdated.
Q. Okay. All right. And this one, in 2014, I think you said earlier that this policy does not
include voting rights; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And that you are trying to get voting rights included in this policy; is that right?
A. Correct. We have a newer version of this policy that was released in 2021. And since then, we have gone back and now added voters' rights restoration, and it's way, in the process. So it's in the queue.
Q. So this older policy wouldn't have it?
A. No.
Q. Okay.
A. And this is very outdated.
Q. Yeah. But it's your understanding at this point it's still not on the policy?
A. No, it's not.
Q. Okay.
A. The only it thing that is in the policy related to restoration of voters' rights is that it be on the reentry packet checklist. Q. Okay. Got it. So that's all matching. So let's look at that, the most recent version of this policy.

This is Exhibit 6.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 6.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Is this the correct version of this policy?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is the effective date on this is --
A. Okay.
Q. Sorry, go ahead.
A. June 1st, 2022.
Q. Okay. I suspect you may know already because you may have reviewed this, but do you know where it mentions voting rights in here?
A. Page 7 (i), It describes what will be in
their release packet.
Q. Okay.
A. And it says that the restoration of voters' rights information will be in that packet.
Q. What does that refer to?
A. That refers to the information -- so on the COR, it's two pages, of my understanding, and on the backside, it has the instructions with it, and then the information pertaining to who is eligible and who is not.
Q. Is this part of it?
A. Yes.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. So let's just go
ahead and bring that in now. This is Exhibit 7.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 7.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) And then the other part is the COR itself?
A. Yes, ma'am.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. So let's go ahead and bring that in as eight.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number, 8.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) So when it says voting rights information here, it's referring to these two documents; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Anything else?
A. These are tile two documents provided in the reentry release packet.
Q. Okay. Do you see where else it mentions voting rights in here?
A. It mentions it again on Page $7(b)$.
Q. Okay.
A. That they'll receive the application.
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative).
A. So what is Exhibit 8?
Q. $\quad 7(\mathrm{~b})$. And does it say here that they will
fill out the application?
A. It does not.
Q. Okay. I think there's also mention on Page 11?
A. Correct. So Page 11, Section N, No. 16. Again, it's just stating that we will put the restoration of voters' rights information/application into their reentry release packet.
Q. Okay. And Page 12 there, do you see the expiration date?
A. Expiration date is June ist, 2025.
Q. Thank you. And now ace the attachments here -- is this the packei, the reentry packet? A. Yes. And, agasn, that's printed on a manila envelope, which is a packet, and the paperwork is put inside that packet.
Q. Got it. So this reentry packet checklist envelope, that's what's printed on it?
A. Yes.
Q. And it does mention restoration of voting rights there at the bottom?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And, again, it just says, information and application, so these -- these two documents

Exhibit 7 and 8?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So would you agree nowhere in here does it say that the certificate of restoration should be filled out?
A. Not to my memory.
Q. Okay. And is there any requirement in here that the officers who are discharging someone verify whether or not the individual is eligible to have their voting rights restored?
A. So do you mean parole officers?
Q. I think that this applies to anyone being discharged. Is that right?
A. So this policy is just for reentry specialists, which is the counselors, so... Q. Okay. So tiere's nothing in here requiring reentry speciaiists to determine whether or not somebody is eligible for voting rights restoration; is that right?
A. Again, not to my memory. I would have to read this. Q. Yeah. It's a long document, and that's fair.

But it sounds like you are working on trying to get that included in an updated version of this policy; is that correct?
A. Correct. I already have that written out and everything.
Q. What would you like to see in that updated version of this policy?
A. That every eligible offender that is leaving our custody have a completed COR with their verified information.
Q. Okay. Is there anything else you would like to see in an updated version of that policy?
A. Pertaining to the voters' rights restoration?
Q. Yeah.
A. That they would have to chen bring it to the local county elections office --
Q. Okay.
A. -- to completetheir steps of regaining their voters' rights.
Q. That the reentry officers would do that?
A. No. The inmate could have to do that themselves.
Q. So there would be instructions --
A. Yes.
Q. -- to that end?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you think that the current instructions are helpful on that?
A. Not on this piece of paper because it doesn't list out where the county elections office is. But I do know that we do have a list in our reentry offices of where those county elections offices are. Q. Right.
A. That can be provided to the inmate that is bringing the completed application. Q. Okay. Does this Exhibit 7, does this describe the voting rights restoration process? A. This describes the people that are eligible to regain their voters' restoratior process. Q. Does it describe people who are eligible to regain their voting rights of people who are eligible to vote despite having a felony conviction? A. Let me reread this. Q. Okay.
A. So my understanding is that this describes the people that are eligible at the top. So this page also describes those that are not eligible based on the crimes that were committed and the charges that they have. Q. Okay. So it describes people who may have the right to vote despite having a felony conviction, like people who are convicted between January 15, 1973 and May 17th, 1981, right?
A. So my understanding would be that these people are not eligible to vote that have, for example, voter fraud, treason, first-degree murder, aggravated rape.
Q. Those people are not eligible to restore their right to vote --
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. -- right?
A. Yes. Sorry.
Q. So it describes one of the eligibility factors -- taking just that sectior at the top, Conviction on or after May 18, 1981, it describes one of the eligibility factofs for rights restoration, which is not having been conviction of one of these specificfelonies; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But it doesn't describe the other
eligibility criteria, right?
A. It does not.
Q. Okay. So it doesn't say anything about court costs, restitution, child support --
A. It does not.
Q. -- completion of sentence?

Okay. When you started in your role, in your current role, which, I guess we can say is a
continuation of case manager coordinator, if that's fair?
A. Yes.
Q. You said earlier that you started instructing the reentry officers to help with voting rights restoration in 2019; is that right?
A. I did. But they are reentry specialists.
Q. Okay. Thank you.

What made you do that?
A. So we have been noticing a trend of offenders asking us information on restoration of voters' rights. So we knew that we could fill it out at the parole offices. But after reviewing the documentation, it just says that it needs to be an agent or officer of the incarcerating authority. And upon my research, I learned that the reentry specialists are able to fill out that paperwork representing TDOC.
Q. Okay. So to summarize, you felt that there was no policy currently covering reentry specialists regarding voting rights restoration at that time?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. How did it come to your attention that that was missing from the policies?
A. Upon speaking with our reentry counselors,
they informed me that that was a need that the inmates were asking a lot of.
Q. Okay. So inmates had been asking to get
their voting rights restored?
A. Yes.
Q. And had they not been completing the forms because there was no policy?
A. I'm not sure prior -- about any other policies prior to mine. But at that time, there was no policy covering reentry specialists to complete the voters' rights restoration or instructions. Q. Okay. So do you have a sense of how that was playing out? Were the specialists filling out the paperwork or not filling out the paperwork?
A. They were -- sorry. They were not filling out the paperwork.
Q. Okay. Up until 2019?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know if they ever wrote down or otherwise recorded any of those requests for a certificate of restoration?
A. Not at that time, no.
Q. Okay. So let's look at the policy that you wrote.

Mark that as No. 9.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 9.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Have you seen this document before?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Can you describe what it is, please?
A. This is not policy. This is a memo to
instruct the reentry specialists on what the procedure needs to be in order to help restore the voting rights of our incarcerated individuals.
Q. Okay. And what's the date on this?
A. This is June 14, 2022.
Q. And just so it's cleac for the record, who wrote this?
A. Victoria Ricci So myself.
Q. Yeah, okay so prior to this, was there any written document instructing the reentry specialists to help with certificates of restoration?
A. No, there was not.
Q. You are saying it was part of your oral
instructions to them; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Was it included in any trainings at that time?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. Okay. So what was the reason for putting that instruction down in writing?
A. To have record of me instructing them to begin the restoration of voters' rights.
Q. Is there any particular reason why you did this at this time, in 2022?
A. Not that I can recall. First -- if I had to remember something, it would be because we had a larger number of newer reentry specialists. So I thought it was important to make sure that they had clear instructions.
Q. Okay. All right. I'll come back to this in a few minutes.

You mentioned that you reviewed some emails when you were preparifg for today's deposition? A. Yes.

MS. BOWIE: This is going to be Exhibit 10.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 10.) Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Are these the emails that you were talking about? You can take a moment...
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. All right. If you turn to the third page, please, do you see who this email was from?
A. Yes. It's from Sharon N. Rose.
Q. Okay. Who is she?
A. To my understanding, she's the warden.
Q. Okay.
A. Associate warden of security at The Women's Therapeutic Residential Center.
Q. Okay. So here she says that the reentry packet is given to the offender, and within the packet is SS-3041. Is that the certificate of restoration form?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then she says If the offender chooses to request restoration of their voting rights, the reentry counselor must fill out Box 1 and signed by the appeinting authority providing this information. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. So here if the person being discharged asks for the certificate to fill out, they will fill it out; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. But they won't, on their own, do an eligibility assessment and fill it out without that request; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. So they fill out Box 1 and then send it to the inmate records department for Box 2. Is that what it says?
A. That is what she states in her email, yes.
Q. Okay. What is the inmate records department?
A. That is the department that has contact with our county courts and clerks.
Q. Okay.
A. And they keep files for all individual inmates.
Q. Is there one of those in each facility?
A. There is.
Q. Okay. So if the person requests it, it sounds like Box 1 and 2 would be filled out, and then the form would begiven to the person being released; is that correct, based on this email?
A. Let me fead the bottom of the email.

That is what she states in the email, yes.
Q. Okay. So this facility was not filling out Box 3 or 4 at the time of this email; is that correct?
A. That's what it states in the email, yes.
Q. Okay. So at this facility, it doesn't appear that they would assess the person being discharged eligibility for voting rights restoration before
filling out Box 1 or 2 either; is that right?
A. By the email, that's the way it looks.
Q. Okay. And do you see in the second to the last sentence here it says, It will be the ex-offender's responsibility to take it to the courts or proper authorities for Box 3 and 4 to be filled out regarding offender's restitution, court fines, and signed by the appointing authority providing this information. Did I read that correctly?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is it your underscanding that court
fines impact the right to vole?
A. To my understanding, it does.
Q. Okay. All right. If you wouldn't mind flipping over to the page that has some highlighting on it. I think it's about three pages further. Do you see who this email was from?
A. This is from Melinda K. Shell.
Q. Who is that?
A. I am not positive who that is.
Q. What is NWCX?
A. Northwest Correctional Complex.
Q. Okay. So is it your understanding that this email is describing, according to the NWCX's records
department their process regarding restoration of voting rights?
A. Give me one second.

That is what Melinda Shell describes in her email.
Q. Okay. And it says, When we sign them out to go home, inmates have to sign that they received a copy of the restoration of citizenship rights, and it's kept in his file after inmate leaves.

Did I read that correctly?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. So is it doesn't say here that they would fill it out; is that right?
A. It does not say that in her instructions, no.
Q. Okay. And it Goesn't say here that they would check the person's eligibility for voting rights restoracion, right?
A. It does not say that in that email. Q. Okay. And when they say that they have to sign that they received it, is it your understanding that that's checking to make sure that everything on the outside of the envelope is included the packet, and then signing that it's all there?
A. That would have to be an assumption because it doesn't necessarily state that in the email what
they are signing.
Q. Is that part of the process when someone is being discharged?
A. They do not sign the packet.
Q. Okay.
A. I would have to review the packet.
Q. Is there anything that they sign that says
that they received the packet?
A. I know they sign some release forms when they
leave the prison.
Q. Okay.
A. So it may be included incthat.
Q. Okay.
A. But I would have to review that
documentation.
Q. Okay. When chey sign that form, is that kept in the a file?
A. Yes.
Q. Yeah. Okay.
A. So they do not have to sign the reentry packet checklist envelope, no. Q. Okay. Yeah. I am making an assumption, and I figured that you have more insight into the process and would know what that means.
A. Yeah. I am not sure what she's referring to
that they are signing.
Q. Okay. All right. And if we could jump ahead
a couple of pages to where there's an email from James W. Bowman, and this one has the stamp at the bottom, and it's 000093.
A. Got it.
Q. Okay. Do you see here that -- we are going to look at the email from James W. Bowman. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. On Wednesday, June 1, 2022?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Who is James W. Bowman?
A. He is my reentry specialist at Northeast

Correctional Complex
Q. Okay. So tinat's NECX, correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Okay. Can you take a moment to read this email and let me know when you looked it through?
A. Okay.

I completed it.
Q. Okay. Can you summarize what he says here was their process at the time?
A. So in summary of this email, he explains that
at that point in time, they were discussing the voters' -- restoration of voters' rights in the Planning for Your Success handbook, which is the pre-release orientation class. And that they provide the application in the release packets upon release.
Q. Okay. And he says here, we are only instructed to discuss the form, logistics therein; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And then he goes on to say, The offender has to appear before the judge following their release and petition to have their rights restored; is that right?
A. That's what he says in the email.
Q. Right. Is that your understanding of how the process is supposed to work?
A. Not to my knowledge.
Q. Okay. So according to this would they fill
out the certificate of restoration?
A. Not according to this email.
Q. Okay. It seems like they would instruct them to take it to the county election commission; is that correct?
A. That's what it looks like in this email.
Q. Okay. And then it says at the bottom, Outside of this, not much we can do?
A. That is what he states in the email.
Q. Okay. And you see that that email was sent at 8:33 a.m.?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then if you go to the one that's stamped 97 at the bottom, please. Okay. Do you see that this is another email from James W. Bowman? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And this one sent later that same day; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. All right. So in this one he says that -- again, that tirey go through the certificate of restoration of roting rights at the pre-release orientation class; is that right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And then offer the opportunity to ask any further questions they may have concerning the materials discussed including assistance in any form presented in the class; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. But he says, I have not received any handwritten requests for assistance in completing
the form, nor have I completed one in the classroom setting; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Do you know why he would need a handwritten request to complete the form?
A. Inside the facilities they use an inmate request form. And that is my assumption of what he is referring to. So an inmate can request assistance through the inmate request form. Q. Okay.
A. And that's how they communicate if they are not able to see their staff in person.
Q. Got it. Okay. And so here the reentry specialist wouldn't fill out a form unless there is a request; is that yoar understanding of what he is saying here?
A. That is my understanding of the email.
Q. Okay.

THE WITNESS: Could I take a break to
use the bathroom?
MS. BOWIE: Why don't we take a
15-minute break.
(Short break.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Back on the record.
Okay. So before we took a break, we were
looking at these emails, and $I$ was just about to ask you to you turn to the one that says, 102, at the bottom, please?
A. Okay.
Q. Okay. So we are looking at an email here from Ashlee Wheeler; is that right?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. Okay. Who is Ashlee Wheeler?
A. Ashlee Wheeler is the chief correctional counselor at the special needs facility in Nashville.
Q. Okay. And here she says that they provide the same booklet for reentry is that what we were talking about before? Is that your understanding of that? Which would be the booklet including the information on voting rights restoration and the certificate of restoration; is that what she means? A. To my understanding, if $I$ had to guess off of the email, I believe she would be talking about the pre-release orientation booklet. Q. The pre-release orientation booklet?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. Okay. On here it says, It provides detailed information to the offender on how to restore voting rights. What is she referring to there?
A. That would include the information that we had talked about previously, the application instructions.
Q. Okay. So that's Exhibits 7 and 8, I believe, the certificate itself with the instructions and then the eligibility to vote after a felony Conviction document from the Secretary of state; is that correct?
A. Correct, Exhibits 7 and 8.
Q. Okay. All right. And then she says, According to Policy 705.06, community supervision are the only staff designated to assist with the process; is that correct? Did I read that right?
A. That's what she says in her email.
Q. And that also eomports with your
understanding, rigit?
A. At that time or currently?
Q. Both.
A. They are not the only staff that can complete that process, no.
Q. Who else can complete that process?
A. The reentry specialists.
Q. We are talking about the exhibit that we
looked at earlier, Policy 705.06, right?
A. Okay. Yeah. If you are talking about
705.06?
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative).
A. Yes. That is for community supervision.
Q. I see. So you are saying Policy 705.06 only covers community supervision staff, but you disagree with her conclusion that community supervision is the only staff that can assist with the process?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. I understand.

And then she says that according to reentry policy 511.06, voting rights are not covered. Is that your understanding as well?
A. According to her emair, yes.
Q. Okay. And would $\sim$ in terms of the substance of what she says thers, would your potential only disagreement with what be that it does talk about including the paperwork, but it doesn't talk about filling out the paperwork, right, according to what we just went through?
A. It does not include it, no.
Q. Okay. All right. That's all that of the emails.

And you see that the dates on these emails sort of range from May 31 to June 1st, 2022; is that right?
A. From May 31 to June 1st is where I see the emails ranging from.
Q. Okay. Yeah.

So going back to your memo, which you issued on June 14th, did these emails have anything to do with the timing of your memo?
A. I do not remember seeing these emails prior to writing my email -- or writing my memo. I apologize.

What $I$ do remember from that tine, as I'm sitting here talking about it, is that upper management was talking more about restoration of voters' rights. And that's find of my understanding of it. And that's where I came up with this memo. But do not recall ever seeing these emails prior co writing my memo. Q. Okay. Well, it looks like your memo was needed.
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Let's look at your memo a little bit more closely.

So you say, Article 4.2 of the Tennessee Constitution provides that the Tennessee legislature may deny the right to vote to persons convicted of infamous crimes. Pursuant to this
provision in the Tennessee Constitution, the Tennessee legislature has excluded individuals convicted of various felonies from the right of suffrage. What do you mean by various felonies there?
A. I did not write that article, so I can't come to a conclusion of that. That is directly pulled from statute.
Q. This first section?
A. Article 4.
Q. So I'm asking about various felonies, not infamous crimes.
A. Okay. Give me one second. Are you still in the first paragraph there?
Q. Yeah. I'm in the first paragraph there.
A. Again, I dia not write that paragraph.
Q. Okay.
A. That is an excerpt from that Article 2.

That's in Tennessee law.
Q. An excerpt from Article 2?
A. From Article 4.
Q. From Article 4, Section 2. An excerpt from?
A. Tennessee law.
Q. That this is what Article 4, Section 2 says?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this like a summary of Article 4, Section 2 that was pulled from somewhere?
A. It's not a summary. That is verbatim what it says in Article 4, Section 2. That's available on the Tennessee Secretary of State's website.
Q. So this is a summary from the Tennessee Secretary of State of Article 4, Section 2?
A. Again, it's not a summary. It's exactly pulled from there. So $I$ can't come to a conclusion of what they mean by that.
Q. Okay. I think Article 4, Section 2 does say that the legislation -- Tennessee legislature may deny the right to vote to pecions convicted infamous crimes, but that this is not its exact wording. MS. JORDAN: I'll object to the form. Go ahead and answer if you can. THE WITNESS: Yeah. I'm not positive unless $I$ can pull it up in front of me. Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Okay. But you think that you got this whole paragraph from the statute? MS. JORDAN: Object to the form. Go ahead. THE WITNESS: I believe that it came from the website of the Tennessee Secretary of State.

Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Okay. That sounds right to me.

Okay. Do you -- when it says, Various felonies, does that mean all felonies or just some felonies?
A. To my understanding, it would mean the list of felonies that are found on Exhibit 7. Q. Okay. So those are the felonies that take away the right to vote?
A. Yes, to my understanding.
Q. Okay. Or are those the felonies for which you can't get the right to vote restored?
A. Repeat your previous question, please.
Q. Okay. Is it your understanding that any felony conviction takes away the right to vote in Tennessee, or just chese?
A. No. Just certain felonies take away the right to vote.
Q. Okay. Okay. And then once somebody has lost their right to vote, can anyone get their voting rights restored?
A. To my understanding, no.
Q. Okay. Who cannot get their voting rights restored?
A. Those who have infamous crimes.
Q. And what are the infamous crimes?
A. Infamous crimes. I'm going to have to review this document to answer you.
Q. Okay. No worries.
A. So according to the document and my understanding, you're never eligible to register to vote if you were convicted of specific felonies, and they have different date ranges.

So voter fraud, treason, first-degree murder, aggravated rape -- any degree 0 firder, rape, certain felonies involving bribery, misconduct involving public officials or employees, sexual offenses, violent sexual offenses. And, again, they have differemi date ranges on them. Q. Okay. So if you are convicted of one of those, you're never eligible to register to vote?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. Meaning you can never get your voting rights restored; is that right?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. Okay. But are those the only felony convictions that take away the right to vote to begin with?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Do all felony convictions take away
the right to vote to begin with?
A. To my knowledge.
Q. Okay. All right. So anyone who is coming through reentry who has served time for a felony conviction has lost the right to vote; is that correct?
A. To my knowledge, yes.
Q. Okay. All right. So then you go on to say, It's the responsibility of the reentry specialist to offer eligible offenders an application to restore their voting rights. Am I reading that correctly?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. And that they shall follow the following procedure?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. First, offer any eligible offender that will be releasing from TDOC custody the opportunity to complete a restoration of voting rights application? A. Yes.
Q. So this is just an offer to complete the form, right? You wouldn't fill it out for anyone unless they say that they want it?
A. Correct. We would not force it upon them.
Q. Okay. And you say to offer any eligible offender. How do you know if they were eligible?
A. According to the COR application, which is Exhibit 8 and Exhibit 7, they would follow the instructions on those.
Q. Okay. So you use the criteria on the certificate of restoration to determine if they are eligible?
A. Correct.
Q. Before or after you ask them if they want their voting rights restored?
A. To my understanding, they should review their charges beforehand.
Q. Before they ask?
A. Before they ask.
Q. Okay. And if they are -- if they determine that they are not eligible, they are not going to ask them?
A. No. They would not ask them, but the inmates would be able to request it still.
Q. Is there anything that they would say to them about their voting rights if they are not eligible?
A. They discuss it during the pre-release orientation class.
Q. Okay. But with any specificity to that person's situation, is there something that they would say?

A. If they are eligible?

Q. If they are not eligible.

A. If they are not eligible?
Q. Yeah.
A. If they had asked, they would instruct them to go to the parole office upon release because they may be ineligible due to still owing court fines and fees or still being on supervision.
Q. Okay. And if they don't ask and they are determined to not be eligible, there's just not going to be a conversation about it at all?
A. Can you repeat that?
Q. Yeah. Let me give a better question.
A. Okay.
Q. Do they -- wild the officers review the eligibility for everyone that they are releasing, per your memo?
A. So the reentry specialists --
Q. Yes.
A. -- not officers?
Q. Yes. Sorry.
A. I just don't want to get it confused with the parole officers.

Yes, they discuss the eligibility with every inmate in the pre-release orientation class because
every inmate takes that pre-release orientation class unless they have refused that class. Q. Right. And that is a general discussion of voting rights restoration, not sort of reviewing each person taking the class's circumstances; is that right?
A. Correct. That's like going to go through the overview of what the eligibility is and -Q. Okay.
A. -- such.
Q. Got it.

And then after that, wili the specialist, when they are preparing to rolease an individual, review their eligibility for voting rights restoration?
A. Yes. To my knowledge, yes.
Q. Well, I am asking about what you are directing people to --
A. Oh, yes. Yes. Sorry.
Q. For every person that's being released, you're directing them to review their eligibility?
A. I am directing them.
Q. Okay. And then if they determine that they are eligible, they will offer to fill out the certificate of restoration; is that right?
A. According to my memo, yes.
Q. Okay. And if they determine they are not eligible, does your memo direct them to do anything?
A. This memo does not cover if they are ineligible.
Q. Okay. So if they are ineligible, they won't necessarily be told that?
A. I can't say on a firsthand, like what each specialist tells the inmates. So I'm not positive. Q. But pursuant to your memo --
A. Pursuant to my memo, it doesn't not state that they would tell them.
Q. And it wouldn't requice them to say in writing, You're not eligible, and here's why? A. There is not arything. Q. Okay.

So, and to determine eligibility, they would need to look at the certificate of restoration and verify that they meet the eligibility criteria; is that correct?
A. To my understanding, yes.
Q. And that's effectively the same thing as filling it out; is that correct, because they will be walking through it and filling it out like a worksheet; is that correct?
A. Yeah. They would follow the worksheet and fill it out.
Q. Okay.
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. And who -- what kind of training do they receive on how to fill out the certificate of restoration?
A. There has not been any training, just besides the directives that have been sent out.
Q. Okay. And I think we talked a 1ittle bit -you may have mention this document earlier, but is this a training that the reentry specialists receive?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Have yoQ seen this before?
A. I have not.
Q. Okay. So reentry specialists don't receive that training.

And, to your knowledge, there's no training on how to fill out a certificate of restoration that reentry specialists receive?
A. Not on our reentry specialists side, no.
Q. Okay.
A. What they do is, obviously, they look at this memo. But they -- I instruct them to follow the
instructions on this certificate of restoration of voting rights and to read the information that is included on the website that's provided on the Tennessee Secretary of State.
Q. Okay. If they had a question about how to fill this out, who would they ask?

MS. JORDAN: Object the form. Who is they?

MS. BOWIE: Thank you.
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) If the reentry specialist had a question about how to fill this civt, who would they ask?
A. That would be myself.
Q. Okay. So let's walk through the form a little bit then.
A. Can I go back one second?
Q. Sure.
A. That would also -- they would ask their supervisors, which is the chief counselors.
Q. Okay. So they might ask you, or they might ask their supervisors; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. And if the supervisors didn't know, would they ask you?
A. Correct.
Q. $\quad$ So all roads lead back to you?
A. Yes.
Q. All right. Okay. So Section 1 here has some basic information about the individual; is that correct?
A. Are you on Exhibit 8?
Q. Yes. We are looking at the certificate.

Thank you.
So Section 1 has some basic information
about the individual; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Is this all information chat the reentry specialist would have on hara for a person that they are discharging?
A. They would have that information for Tennessee sentences, yes.
Q. Do reencry specialists know if someone that they are -- managing, I guess would be right word -has an out-of-state conviction?
A. If it's available in our OMS system, they would be able to tell that way. Or they would need to communicate with our records office.
Q. Okay. And this was an issue that you
mentioned earlier, it came up when you were reviewing -- sorry, help me out with the word.
A. It's the risk --
Q. Quality control?
A. The risk needs assessment.
Q. Right. For the risk needs assessment, that sometimes the -- the specialist wouldn't know about out-of-state convictions; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. What about federal convictions, would they know about federal convictions?
A. If they are available on the OMS system.
Q. Okay. And are they -- would they be able -what would make them available on the OMS system? A. I am not sure how they are put into the OMS system. That is a different department that I've not dived into.
Q. And when you are talking about that, are you talking about, like, the case notes?
A. No. So there has to be someone that inputs the judgment orders into the OMS system --
Q. Okay.
A. -- and different charges.
Q. Would the records department have records of each person being released with felony convictions from other jurisdictions?
A. Only if it was included in the NCIC that was
pulled for them.
Q. Okay. And the NCIC is a statewide -- that -the NCIC only covers people whose sentences were transferred to Tennessee; is that correct?
A. I am unsure.
Q. Okay. Would they ask the person who they are releasing if they had any felony convictions from out of state or federal court?
A. We can ask them.
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative).
A. But we need to be able to verify that.
Q. Okay. And if the person volunteers that information or is asked that information, would the reentry specialist then research that conviction and fill out a certificate of restoration for them?
A. Yes. They would have to verify that.
Q. Is that in your memo anywhere?
A. That particular step, no.
Q. Okay. Do you think it would be helpful to include that in writing somewhere for the specialists?
A. Yes, it's something to take into account. Q. Okay. And do they need a certificate for -let's say, they are being released from one felony conviction, but they have priors in Tennessee.

Would the reentry specialist see those convictions? A. Yes, they could see prior convictions of Tennessee.
Q. And would they fill out a certificate for those convictions as well?
A. Yes. Because Exhibit 8 states that a separate form must be completed for each felony conviction from within different docket case numbers.
Q. And are they required to check to see if that person has prior felony convictions?
A. They are. That's part of the collateral.
Q. Okay. Would it be helpful to have that written down somewhere for the reentry specialists? A. It would be herpful to take into account. Q. Okay. All right. Let's go to Section 2 here. If someloody is being released from prison and going -- and working with a reentry specialist, is there a particular box in this section that would always be checked, or could it be any one of these four?
A. Let me review it real quick.

Okay. Can you repeat the question now that I've read it?
Q. Yeah. If a person is being released from a

Tennessee facility and is working with a reentry specialist, which of these boxes would be checked?
A. The one that matches to that individual.
Q. So it could be any of the four?
A. It could be any of the four.
Q. What's your understanding of the difference between check box 2 and check box 3 here?
A. So the maximum sentence imposed for such infamous crime has expired. The maximum sentence imposed for such infamous crime has been served by the above individual; or the maximum sentence imposed for such infamous crime has expired.

To me, in my understanding, they mean the same thing.
Q. Okay. So if af officer asked you which one of those to check, what would you say?
A. Both of them because they both served and expired.
Q. How about that last one there, what's the different there?
A. I would also check that one if I'm filling it out for an eligible inmate because they are finally being released.
Q. Okay. And this has come up as a confusing part of this form in many different contexts, but do
you see it -- at the top of this section it says, Check one?

MS. JORDAN: Object to the form of the question.

But go ahead and answer.
THE WITNESS: I do see that.
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Okay. But to your understanding, that may be a flaw with the form? A. That could be a flaw with the form. Q. Okay. All right. Let's go to the next box 3 here. This box relates to restitutjon; is that right, this section?
A. To my understanding, yes.
Q. Okay. How will a specialist know whether or not the person they are releasing has paid or owes restitution?
A. The first step is going to be to review the OMS system to see if there's anything listed on there. They can be provided paperwork from the individual or contact the county clerk. Q. So if OMS doesn't say anything about restitution, is that enough information to sign off on this box?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So in that case, they would either
rely on the person to present documentation, or they would call the county clerk; is that correct?
A. Correct.
Q. All right. Do you direct them to do one or the other of those two things?
A. They need to have some way to verify. Q. Are they required to call the county clerk?
A. If the inmate cannot provide verification that there is no restitution.
Q. So first they would ask the person being released to provide it?
A. Correct.
Q. And then if they don have it, are they required to call the counity clerk?
A. Yes.
Q. Does it say chat in your memo?
A. It does not.
Q. Okay. Do you think that would be helpful to
spell out?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Now, did you say earlier that specialists would only be filling out a certificate of restoration if the person being released is eligible for voting rights restoration?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.
A. I believe so.
Q. So is there any situation in which you would ever check the fourth box in this section?
A. That I would -- that the reentry specialist would ever check one?
Q. Right. Do you see what that last box says?
A. Are you on Section 4?
Q. No. Sorry. I'm on Section 3 still. So the
last box that says, Restitution ordered by the court is owed. Do you see that?
A. To my understanding, if restitution is owed, they would not be eligible then.
Q. Okay. So in that case they wouldn't be filling out or receiving this form, right?
A. They would rot receive a completed form.
Q. Okay.
A. They would be instructed to go to the parole office when they can --
Q. Okay.
A. -- provide the right paperwork.
Q. So that box doesn't really serve much
purpose, does it?
A. Not for our reentry specialists, no.
Q. Okay. All right. Let's go to the last
section here, Section 4. This is about court costs. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. Would the reentry specialists have information to verify whether or not someone owes court costs?
A. Again, it would be the same process as the restitution.
Q. Okay. So they would check the OMS notes
first; is that correct?
A. Yes.
Q. But if the OMS notes jusc don't say anything about court costs, that's not enough to verify that they don't owe any; is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. At that point they would ask the person being released if they have documents showing they don't owe court costs?
A. Correct.
Q. How often would a person being released have that kind of documentation from the court when they are being released from prison?
A. They have the opportunity to contact the court via mail to request that paperwork.
Q. So sometimes they request the judgments or
whatever they need?
A. They can.
Q. And then if they don't have it, the officer will call the court?
A. The reentry specialists will call the court.
Q. Thank you. The reentry specialists with call the court.

But that's not laid out in any written
instructions anywhere?
A. Not at this time, no.
Q. Okay. How will the officer know -- strike that.

Are all legal debts tfacked by courts considered court costs?
A. I do not know
Q. Okay. Are You familiar with the terms fines, fees, court costs?
A. They sound familiar, yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know of any difference between those different terms?
A. I do not know the different between each of those terms.
Q. Okay. So if an officer came to you and said somebody owes fines, should I check -- what should I check on this court costs section, would you know
the answer to that question?
A. In our OMS system it just lists it as fees, fines, et cetera.
Q. Okay.
A. So to my knowledge, they would be the same thing. That's why I don't know what the difference would be --
Q. Got it.
A. -- between them.
Q. So if you saw that somebody owed fines in OMS, you would say that they are not eligible for a certificate of restoration?
A. To my understanding.
Q. Okay. And if any of the specialists had confusion about that they might ask you or they might ask their managers to comment on it; is that right?
A. Can you repeat that? I got distracted. Q. Sorry. If any of the specialists had questions about this, while they were filling it out, they would either ask you or their supervisors; is that right?
A. They could. And then if I did not know the answer, I would do research to obtain the answer for them.
Q. And if the supervisor didn't know, they would also ask you, right?
A. Correct.
Q. Has this question come up before?
A. It has not.
Q. Okay. So based on what you said before, you would consider fines part of court costs; is that right?
A. To my understanding, yes.
Q. Okay. So it probably wouldn't have elevated to the level of something that you might research?
A. It has not yet, no.
Q. Okay.
A. The question has not come up.
Q. Got. Got it. Okay.

Next in No. 2 here, you ask the specialists to confer with your assigned child support coordinator to ensure there is no hold, correct? A. Correct.
Q. Can you say what that means? A. So there is child support coordinators within DHS that have access to know if someone owes child support. And then I have asked them to do the extra due diligence of checking with them to see if they have any child support holds.
Q. Okay. And what does it mean to have a child support hold?
A. That the individual owes money in arrears to child support.
Q. Okay. If they have an ongoing child support obligation, would that be a hold?
A. To my understanding, yes.
Q. Okay.
A. If it's in arrears.
Q. If it's in arrears?
A. Yes.
Q. Not if they have been paying on it?
A. No.
Q. Are people who are incarcerated often able to pay on their child support debts or do they typically fall behind?
A. I cannot tell you the most accurate answer to that because $I$ don't have the data on that.
Q. Okay.
A. So I'm not sure.
Q. Do people rack up arrears while they are incarcerated?
A. I am sure they do. Again, I don't have the data to support an answer on that.
Q. So as far as you know, there's no law or
policy that stops in the position of child support when somebody is incarcerated?
A. The Tennessee law that has taken effect July of 2021 states that anyone that is incarcerated more than 180 days will have their child support case modified down to $\$ 100$ at minimum.
Q. $\$ 100$ month?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative). Yes, ma'am.
Q. So they can still be racking up arrears while they are incarcerated?
A. They can.
Q. There's just a maximum on it if they're in for 100 days or more; is that right?
A. $\quad 180$ days or more.
Q. $\quad 180$ days. Okas. Thank you.

Okay. So if the specialist hears from the child support ooordinator that the individual does have arrears, what should they do with this form? A. They will not be able to complete this form. They will have to instruct the individual to take care of their child support holds and have the parole office complete this form when they are eligible.
Q. Okay. At that point they are not going to get the partially filled out certificate of
restoration, right?
A. Not necessarily.
Q. Not necessarily, can you explain that?
A. They could fill out the part and leave the rest blank for the parole office to fill out, but it also states at the second page, that a person not eligible to apply for a voter's restoration card have their voting rights restored. Before restoring their voting rights of an applicant, the coordinator of elections will also verify with the Department of Human Services that the applicant cioes not have outstanding child support payments or arrears.

So we could still fily this out for them.
But then the county elections will have the ultimate responsibilify of confirming the child support holds.
Q. All right. And you mentioned that they could partially fill out the form. And I think we saw that in the emails earlier, that at least one of the -- one of the facilities that reported in said that they had only been filling out boxes 1 and 2; is that right?
A. That is what it said in the email.
Q. Okay. Is it your directive in this memo that they should fill out the entire form?
A. It does not necessarily say that it needs to be completely filled out. It just says bring the completed application. So the offender will need to fill it out.
Q. Is that your intent, that this memo instruct them to fill out the whole form?
A. No.
Q. No. Why not?
A. Because at some points we can only fill out certain sections.
Q. When are those?
A. When we cannot verify the information of court fines, fees, restitution, and child support. Q. Okay. And you at what point would you say that the specialists made enough of an effort to verify that to jusi say, I'm not filling out this box?
A. When they can verify. So they need to -- if they are not receiving the paperwork from the inmate, they need to take the initiative to call the county court clerks. If they are unable to receive that information, they are going to contact, now, everything. So from there, they've made enough effort in my understanding.
Q. Right. Do you think that you'll revise this
memo to spell that out?
A. I can.
Q. Are you planning on doing that?
A. I would have to confer with my supervisor.
Q. Okay. Are you planning to confer with your supervisor?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. At what point in filling out this form -- well, let me back up.

Is there anything else that the specialists should do to verify that somebody is eligible for voting rights restoration besides what we walked through on the form?
A. To my understanding, not anything else that we have not gone throigh.
Q. Do they need to make sure that the person doesn't have one of the convictions listed on this form, on Exhibit 7?
A. Yes. But I believe we went through that.
Q. When did we -- at what point did they do that in this process?
A. They would need to do that before even knowing that someone is eligible.
Q. Okay. Is that in your memo somewhere?
A. Within Article 4, Section 2 at the top of the
page, it lists that they could not be convicted of those infamous crimes, so --
Q. So -- sorry.
A. No. Go ahead.
Q. No. You can finish.
A. To my understanding, that would be enough of an instruction. However, $I$ can include it more into the memo.
Q. Okay. So it's your understanding that these are the infamous crimes, this list?
A. That is my understanding.
Q. Okay. And would you use the list on

Exhibit 7, this Secretary of State's instructions, to determine whether or not somebody has been convicted of one thess permanently disqualifying crimes?
A. That is the list that I would use.
Q. Okay. How would you know if a given felony conviction involves bribery, misconduct involving public officials and employees, or interference with government operations?
A. I believe they would be felonies, to my understanding, or it would be listed in their judgment order. But I am not positive. Q. When you say it would be listed in their
judgment order, what do you mean?
A. Their judgment order is the order from the --
that we received from the court that has the judgment instructions in it.
Q. So it says the name of the conviction?
A. It says the name of the conviction and describes the conviction --
Q. Okay.
A. -- to my knowledge.
Q. So you would base that on the name and description of the conviction from the judgment order?
A. To my understanding, yes.
Q. Okay. And that question hasn't come up to you, has it?
A. It has not come up to me, no.
Q. Okay. If you look at a certificate of restoration form on the second page --
A. What are you -- oh.
Q. On the Exhibit 8, on the second page on instructions, there's a section that says, Persons convicted of any of the following cannot have his or her voting rights restored. Do you see that?
A. Yes, ma'am.
Q. So this section, when we are talking about
the corresponding after July 1st, 2006, do you see that this lists statute numbers?
A. Neither paper lists statute numbers that I can see.
Q. Are you looking at the second page of the instructions there?
A. Yes. I see it now.
Q. Okay.
A. I apologize.
Q. So could you compare the statute numbers to determine whether it's one of those permanently disqualifying convictions?
A. Yes, you can use those statute numbers.
Q. Okay. And do the reentry specialists have access to the statute numbers?
A. They do.
Q. Okay. The top two time periods for the permanently disqualifying convictions also list voter fraud as one of the convictions. Do you see that?
A. I do.
Q. That one doesn't have any statute numbers associated with it; is that right?
A. Not that I'm aware of.
Q. Okay. How would you know if a conviction is
considered voter fraud?
A. To my understanding, it would be a felony, so the sentence itself would be voter fraud, and that would be listed in our OMS system.
Q. Do you think it would be helpful to you if this form included more instructions on those questions?
A. It could prove helpful.
Q. All right. So No. 3 here, you say, Place a copy of the application in the offender sile, a copy in their reentry release packet. The offender will need to bring the completed application to the proper county election commigsions office. Is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. And so it strould be the specialist who directs the person to take it to the county elections office?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And you say that the list is in the reentry drive. When you say that, are you instructing the officer to find the correct office and tell the person the address?
A. Again, the reentry specialist should give the list -- should be looking at the list to give the
instruction to the offender, yes.
Q. Okay. No. 4, you say, Place a contact note in OMS under contact note with code RESP, with a comment notifying that the restoration of voting rights application was completed. Who came up with that particular code?
A. That code has been in existence before I had come over to the state.
Q. What does it stand for?
A. Reentry -- I'm trying to remember exactly. I apologize. It it's a reentry contact that -- so the reentry specialist had contact with the offender -Q. Okay.
A. -- in summary.
Q. Got it. But trat code in and of itself doesn't refer to voiing rights?
A. It does not.
Q. That would have to be in the content of the note?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Would they make a note if they are not going to issue a certificate of restoration because the person is not eligible?
A. That has not been instructed to do.
Q. Okay. Would they make a note if they've
offered the restoration, but the person said that they didn't want?
A. They have not been instructed to do that.
Q. Okay. Do they need to include in the note -strike that.

I'm going to introduce Exhibit 11.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 11.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Have you seen this before?
A. I've briefly seen this when we were going over all the paperwork that was provided to me. Q. Okay. So this memo is directed to Community Supervision Staff; is that fight?
A. That's what it stares in the memo.
Q. So this wouldne apply to your department?
A. It would not.
Q. Okay. I want you to look here under PPO Responsibilities, that first big paragraph, the second to the last bullet point. It says, The supervising officer will enter the VRRE or VRRI code indicating whether the offender is eligible or ineligible. Is that correct?
A. That's what it states in the memo.

Okay. Were you aware that the supervision side has these codes?
A. Not until last week.
Q. Okay. Do you think that having similar codes would be helpful?
A. We will not be having similar codes. We are going to have facility-specific codes that I'm actually working on.
Q. What does that mean, facility-specific codes?
A. So we are working on creating a contact code where I would be able to pull the amount of voters' restoration applications that were completed by the reentry specialist. So we will sevarate that. Q. Can you give an example of what that might look like?
A. So it could be, like, VRRF, or something. Just a different contact code. We would not keep the same contact codes as community supervision.
Q. Okay. What would be VRRF mean?
A. That was just an example, so...
Q. But the $F$ is the facility --
A. Facility.
Q. -- type thing that you are changing?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative).
Q. Okay. But that wouldn't indicate whether or not the person has been deemed eligible or ineligible; is that right?
A. To my understanding right now, we have not come up with a clear solution to that, so $I$ don't have an answer to that.
Q. Okay. What is your goal with the new contact codes?
A. To be able to pull data to know how many people have filled out a voters' restoration application.
Q. Only to know how many people have filled them out?
A. As of right now, yes.
Q. Would it also be useful co be able to know how many people had requested but been denied? A. It would be helpfu, but I have to take that into consideration of their workload.
Q. Okay. What is spurring creating new contact codes?
A. Last week when I realized that we did not have a specific contact code where I could pull data. Q. Okay. Right. Because this contact code only indicates that the entry was being made by a reentry specialist, not anything about the subject matter of the entry; is that right?
A.
Exactly.
Q. Okay. So you want to create a new code that indicates something about voting rights. But so far you're only considering making one where the form was issued; is that correct?
A. At this point, yes.
Q. Will there be a code to say that the form was issued but only partially filled out?
A. I am unsure.
Q. Okay. And will there be a code to show that the form was not issued because the person was ineligible?
A. I am unsure at this poinc.
Q. Okay. Why do you want to be able to pull data on voting rights restoration?
A. For me I want to be able to track the amount of applications thac my reentry specialists have completed.
Q. Okay. How do you track that now?
A. Currently, they fill out facility spreadsheets, but it's not proved to be effective. Q. Okay. Why not?
A. Because they have not been completing them the way they should be.
Q. Okay. How long have they been -- supposed to fill those out?
A. Since this memo was issued June 14th, 2022. Q. Okay. And that's No. 5 here, Update your respective facility's spreadsheet located in the reentry drive?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. You said earlier that you can't have the same codes as community supervision. Why is that?
A. Not that we can't have the same codes, but if

I want to be able to pull my data, I need to be able to make a different contact code - -
Q. Okay.
A. -- to get my specific data.
Q. Okay. Got it.

And just to back up, one thing that we
talked about earlier is that if someone is not eligible for the certificate of restoration, that they won't be offered the opportunity to have one completed for them; is that right?
A. Not by the reentry specialist. They will be instructed to have the parole office complete it when they are eligible.
Q. Through the class that they take when they are being discharged, correct?
A. Correct. That is the -- the main place that
they would receive that information.
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative).
A. They could receive it possibly during their reentry meetings that they have with them.
Q. Right. But there's -- there's no requirement that that one-on-one conversation will occur?
A. It's not a requirement, no.
Q. Okay.
A. But I can't track what's said in each office at each time.
Q. Sure. Okay.

When I asked you a couple questions earlier about whether you'd update the memo, you said you would need to confer with your supervisor; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. Who is chat that you needed to confer with?
A. Carissa Miniard.
Q. And does that person have decision-making authority on what could go in an updated memo? A. She would also have to confer with her supervisor, which is assistant commissioner Rachel Riley Coe.
Q. Okay. How often do you issue memos like this?
A. This is probably one of the only memos that I ever issued.
Q. Okay. What's the purpose of a memo?
A. When we cannot get it into policy in an efficient time. We wrote this memo so we can get that directive out there before policy could be published.
Q. Okay. How long did it take you to get this approved?
A. I am unsure. I don't remember how long it took me to get it approved.
Q. It is like days, weeks?
A. I believe it was -- if had to make my best educational guess, it would probably be about a week.
Q. How long dic it take for policies to get approved?
A. Months.
Q. Uh-huh (affirmative). What's the chain of approval for policies?
A. It starts with the policy writer. It then goes through an edit process by one of our admin assistants that's assigned to that job duty. It goes through our chain of command, which in my case would be the correctional administrator, the AC. It
would have to go through legal. And then go through finally to the commissioner to be approved. Q. Would you have an opportunity to provide input towards what should go in a policy?
A. Yes.
Q. At what point in the process?
A. When I'm writing the policy.
Q. Okay. So you could be the person who writes the policy?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Are you aware of efforts to write any new voting rights restoration poiicies?
A. Not that I'm aware of Not specific to restoration of voter's rights.
Q. Okay. But you mentioned earlier that you would like to see riore about restoration of voting rights in the discharge policies, correct?
A. He reentry policy 511.06, yes.
Q. Okay. Yeah.

And is that in process?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. How far along is that?
A. It's been sitting in policy for about three months now, in the queue.
Q. Okay. Do you know what started that process?
A. Once I started going through and knowing that people were not doing the facility spreadsheets the way they need to be and after we wrote this memo, the next time we edited the policy, we were putting it into the policy.
Q. Got it. So you started the process?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay.

MS. BOWIE: All right. We can take a quick break because I'm going to pull up some of those spreadsheets.
(Short break.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Back on the record.
We are going to look at some of the recordkeeping that yoi were talking about.
A. Okay.
Q. So do you see this document?
A. I do.
Q. Okay. What is this?
A. This is the spreadsheet from -- it looks like South Central -- who they completed a voters' restoration application for.
Q. Okay. And what are they tracking here?
A. The people that they completed applications for.
Q. And the categories that they got here are: Name, conviction, application date, TDOC number. That's all they are tracking?
A. That is all that is included in that spreadsheet, yes.
Q. Did you make the format of this spreadsheet?
A. I did.
Q. Okay. Is that all you wanted them to track?
A. That's all I needed at that time.
Q. Why do you need these pieces of information?
A. I need to know their names so I know who's getting the application. The TDOC number kind of correlates with their name in our department. The conviction, because I know they have to fill out a different form for eah conviction. So if they've listed multiple cotivictions, I know they've completed multiple forms. And then the date that the application was completed on.
Q. Okay. And have you looked at the -- do they keep copies of the certificates that they issue?
A. They are supposed to.
Q. Okay. And have you looked at any of these?

Do you know if they did?
A. I have not looked at any of them, no.
Q. You said before they weren't doing a good job
with this recordkeeping. What did you mean by that? A. As you can see after -- if you scroll down, they stopped completing them on $7 / 10 / 2020$. So our -- at least over there, it lasted about two months.
Q. Okay. And do you think that's a record keeping problem, or do you think they are not issuing them?
A. It is a record keeping problem.
Q. How do you know that they are still issuing them?
A. Because we talk about it on our monthly reentry calls.
Q. Why did they stop Feeping records?
A. Staff turnover.
Q. Okay. Look at the next one, the one with the HCCL?

MS. RICHARDSON: Do you want to mark this one as an exhibit?

MS. BOWIE: Yeah, let's mark this as Exhibit 12.

MS. RICHARDSON: What's the document name for it, for Exhibit 12?

MS. BOWIE: SCCF, Exhibit 12.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 12.) MS. BOWIE: HCCF is going to be Exhibit 13.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 13.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Have you seen this before?
A. I have.
Q. Can you describe what it is, please?
A. It is the same spreadsheet as South Central; however, now this is Hardeman County's information that they have provided.
Q. Okay. Any flaws you see here?
A. Yeah. They stopped eonpleting the record keeping after 3/4/2020.
Q. All right. Sothey just it on one day?
A. It looks thac way.
Q. Okay. Iet's go to the next one, Exhibit 14, MLCC .
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned document was marked as Exhibit Number 14.) Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Can you describe what this is?
A. This is, as well, the spreadsheet that tracked the data for voters' restoration applications that were completed at Mark Luttrell. Q. And this is the same format as the other

## ones?

A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And any problems with this one?
A. Can you scroll down?
Q. Yep.
A. They stopped completing it on 11/23/2020.
Q. Okay. And this is the last one that was produced to us, BCCX. Can you describe that one, please?
A. That is the spreadsheet that tracks the restoration of voter's rights application at Bledsoe Correctional Complex.
Q. Okay.

MS. RICHARDSOIN: And this is going to be 15.

MS. BCWIE: This is going to be
Exhibit 15.
(WHEREUPON, the above-mentioned
document was marked as Exhibit Number 15.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Any deficiencies with this one?
A. They stopped completing it on September 30, 2022. At least, they have done it a little bit further ahead. Q. Is this also what you wanted? Did you want
them to list the date under conviction or the name under the conviction?
A. They supposed to list the name of conviction.
Q. Okay. Why did you create this tracking system?
A. To try to track the amount of applications that were being completed by our reentry specialists.
Q. Why do you want to know that?
A. It is numbers that we do need to report of, or at least have a knowledge of.
Q. According to who?
A. At that time I don't femember who was asking for it specifically. But. for us, in our department, it's important to track data and keep records of the things that we are doing.
Q. Was there some point in time where people said, We need to start tracking these?
A. I believe in 2019 after I did that big push of wanting more people to have the application completed, in 2020 that assistant commissioner at the time was asking for the numbers.
Q. So in 2020 they were asking for the numbers?
A. Uh-huh (affirmative). I believe so.
Q. Do you remember around when?
A. I don't.
Q. Okay. Are these the only four of these trackers that you have?
A. That I have knowledge of, yes.
Q. Okay. Did you send it to all the facilities?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. But they haven't reported it back to you?
A. They have not.
Q. I'm sorry. We talked a little bit before, much earlier in the deposition, about the quality checks you did when you worked on risk needs assessment, right?
A. Yes.
Q. And there you said that when you doing qualifying checks. that you would pull the underlying documents associated with the determinations that were being made by the specialists; is that right?
A. For the risk needs assessment, yes. Q. Right. Do you think this would be useful to have more information here to be able to assess whether these were properly issued? A. I am not sure what other information I could put in there.
Q. Okay. Well, knowing that they have a certain number of convictions may tell you how many certificates they should have issued, but does it necessarily tell you how many they did issue? A. No. You would have to make an assumption. Q. Okay. Would it be good to have them have to write down, yes, I did issue four CORs?
A. I can do that.
Q. Okay. Have you considered tracking determinations of ineligibility, so certificates that are not issued?
A. I have not at this time because I need to take into account their worksoad that they already have.
Q. Well, if they are making that determination -- you said they have to make it for everyone, right?
A. They do.
Q. So would it take much more time to track it?
A. It would take much more time for them.
Q. Do you think that there's a possibility they might be making errors when they are assisting whether or not somebody is ineligible?
A. I cannot assume that they are making errors.
Q. Can you assume that they are not making
errors?
A. I cannot assume either one.
Q. As somebody who's worked specifically on
assessing the quality of a certain service within
reentry, did you see a decent number of errors in
your assessments?
MS. JORDAN: I'll object to the form.
But go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So that was risk needs
assessment. I've never done quality assurance on
this particular document, so I canriot speak to that.
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Right. Is there any quality
assurance that happens on these documents?
A. Not at this time.
Q. Are they completed by the same officers that
do the risk needs aissessments?
A. No.
Q. Who does the risk needs assessments?
A. That is unit counselors.
Q. Okay. Did you see a decent number of errors
on risk needs assessment?
MS. JORDAN: I'll object to the form.
But go ahead.
THE WITNESS: At that time it was a
newer process. So I've seen a few but not a lot.

Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Why is there a whole department that does assessments -- that does quality checks on risk needs assessments?
A. I am not sure.
Q. Was there a mandate, do you think, to create that?
A. I do not know.
Q. Do you think it was necessary?
A. I do not have the data to support that answer, so I do not know.
Q. Do you think that your job we.s useful at that time?
A. Yes.
Q. Do you think it was helping reentry achieve its goals?
A. That was not so much reentry as it was the day-to-day activity assessments of the individuals.
Q. Do you think it was helping TDOC achieve its goals?
A. What goals would you specifically be pointing to?
Q. What goals does TDOC have?
A. Well, the mission is to operate safe and secure prisons.
Q. Okay.
A. So is that what you are referring to?
Q. Yeah, sure.
A. Yes. I believe it was because we are double-checking the work of that assessment at that time, yes.
Q. Okay. And, to your knowledge, is there any quality check that goes into assessments of eligibility or ineligibility in the certificate of restoration process for reentry?
A. For the reentry side, at this tirne, no.
Q. Okay.
A. However, it should be reviewed by the election board.
Q. The ones that are completed?
A. Correct.
Q. But nobody reviews the ones that are not completed?
A. Not at this time.
Q. Okay. You want to create some new TEPEs -or some new OMS contact notes to show when somebody is issued a certificate; is that right?
A. Correct.
Q. And are you hoping that that system will replace this system?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. If you are only going to track certificates that are issued, that will help you -what is the purpose of that?
A. To track the amount of applications that we have completed on the TDOC side for -- pertaining to reentry specialists.
Q. So quantity?
A. Quantity.
Q. But not quality?
A. That report would not show quality.
Q. Is there a way to assess qual.ity through those notes?
A. Not through those notes, no.
Q. Have you thought about creating a way to assess quality?
A. At this time, no.
Q. Do you chink that leaving this deposition you might think about that?
A. Possibly.
Q. Okay. But at this time, there's no way to assess the quality of the determinations of eligibility?
A. At this time, no.
Q. Okay. Do you think having a quality check on assessments of eligibility would be helpful?
A. It could be helpful.
Q. Okay. Why would you say that?
A. Any work that is double-checked is useful inside of any kind of work setting.
Q. That makes good sense to me.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. I think we can take another short break, and I think I'm almost done.
(Short break.)
Q (BY MS. BOWIE) Okay. In your preparation notes, you say, Bryce put together a large PDF in conjunction with district directors What does that mean?
A. From my memory --
Q. Sorry. That is Exinibit 2, I think.
A. Yeah, let me look back. You put so many papers in front of ine, Blair.
Q. I think it's the yellow piece of paper there.
A. Oh, that's -- okay.

In the emails that $I$ had seen during my preparation, $I$ had seen that Bryce and the district directors had put together, like, the TEPEs, spreadsheets, and the different amounts of paperwork that was previously provided to y'all. Q. Okay. So the large PDF is things that were already produced?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay. Because I see you have the TEPE spreadsheet also written down here?
A. Yeah. I wrote out what it was --
Q. Okay.
A. -- just so I understood from my knowledge.
Q. Okay. Got it.

And then you referred back to your conversation with Ms. Kahn, and we touched on that briefly earlier. But she effectively held your position before you, right, even though your position didn't exist?
A. She did not effectively hold my position, no.
Q. Can you remind who she is?
A. She is the reertry specialist for Riverbend special -- Riverberd Maximum facility.
Q. And what did she tell you when you spoke?
A. That prior to 2019, that they were putting the application and the instructions into the pre-release orientation -- or sorry -- into the reentry release packet.
Q. Okay. But not filling them out?
A. Correct.
Q. Okay.
A. They were instructed --
Q. Go ahead.
A. I'm sorry. They were instructing them to go to the parole office to have it completed.
Q. And then you say here, Jen Brenner assistance in process of $\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$. None that are aware. What does that mean?
A. Assistance in any prosecutions for, I believe -- voter fraud we were talking about.
Q. Oh, okay. Did you learn anything else about that?
A. I did not. She said she is unaware of any at this time.
Q. Okay.

MS. BOWIE: All right those are all my questions?

MS. JCEDAN: No questions. Thank you.
FTRTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

STATE OF TENNESSEE
COUNTY OF WILLIAMSON

I, Georgette K. Arena, RPR, Licensed
Court Reporter, with offices in Franklin,
Tennessee, hereby certify that I reported the foregoing deposition of VICTORIA RICCI by machine shorthand to the best of my skills and abilities, and thereafter the same was reduced Eo typewritten form by me. I am not related to any of the parties named herein, nor their counsel, and have no interest, financial or otnerwise, in the outcome of the proceedings.

I further certify that in order for this document to be considered a true and correct copy, it must bear my original signature, and that any unauthorized reproduction in whole or in part and/or transfer of this document is not authorized, will not be considered authentic, and will be in violation of Tennessee Code Annotated 39-14-7, 1 OHTllil
Theft of Services.


Georgette K. Arena, RPR, LCR Notary Public State of Tennessee
 My Notary Public Commission Expires: 2/22/26 LCR \# 091 - Expires: 6/30/24 $E R R A T A P A G E$

I, VICTORIA RICCI, having read the foregoing deposition, do hereby certify said testimony is a true and accurate transcript, with the following changes (if any):
PAGE LINE SHOULD HAVE BEEN
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$


$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$


$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

VICTORIA RICCI

Notary Public
My Commission Expires: $\qquad$

Reported by: Georgette K. Arena, RPR, LCR

accurate 20:25 92:17
achieve 119:14,18
Act 19:15
activities 19:11
activity 119:17
actual 34:9
added 44:7
address 100:23
admin 108:22
administration 18:10
administrator 108:25
administrators 30:1
affirmative 9:24 16:21
17:1,16 18:4 20:18 21:24 22:22 23:25 26:5,16 29:12 38:1 46:23 51:7 65:22 67:2 78:4 82:10 93:8 103:22 107:2 108:19 115:24
agent 52:15
aggravated 51:4 72:10
aggressor 19:18
agree 48:3
ahead 43:1 45:7 46:1,7 61:2 70:16,22 85:5 97:4 114:24 118:8,23 124:1
alcohol 21:18
aligned 25:12
allowed 39:6
amount 27:17 103:9
105:15 115:6 121:4
amounts 122:22
answers 8:25
anticipated 34:22
anymore 30:21
apologies 29:13
apologize 33:25 68:9 99:9 101:11
applicant 94:9,11
application 11:11 39:10,

17 40:4 46:22 47:1,25 50:7 62:5 66:2 73:10,18 74:1 95:3 100:10,12 101:5 104:8 110:22 111:2,12,18 114:11 115:20 123:19
applications 27:15
103:10 105:16 110:24 113:24 115:6 121:4
applied 42:23
applies 48:12
apply 16:3 42:11 94:7 102:15
appointing 56:15 58:8
approval 108:20
approved 108:9,11,17 109:2
approximate $34: 10$
approximately 12:13
13:18 19:24 20:22 22:25 34:6
arrears 92:3,9,10,21 93:9,18 94:12
article 68:22 69:6,10,48, 20,21,22,24 70:1,4,7, 11 96:25
Ashlee 65:6.0,9
asks 39.9 56:19
assess 57:24 116:22
i<1:11,15,21
assessing 118:4
assessment 18:20 19:23
20:17 22:6 56:23 81:3,4 116:13,20 118:10,21 120:4
assessments 19:1,13, 17,20 20:23 22:10 23:6 40:2 118:6,16,18 119:2,3, 17 120:7 121:25
assigned 91:17 108:23
assist 66:12 67:7
assistance 63:21,25 64:9 124:4,7
assistant 29:20 30:6,22 31:8 32:24 107:22 115:21
assistants 108:23
assisting 117:22
Associate 56:5
assume 8:8 117:24,25 118:2
assumed 11:19 12:10
assumption 59:24 60:22 64:7 117:5
assurance 18:20 19:1
118:10,13
attachments 47:13
attention 52:23
attorney 13:3
attorneys 8:10 12:1 13:10,11,14 14:?

August $43: 13$
autherities 58:6
authurity 52:15 56:15 58:8 107:20
average 36:17,18,19
aware 14:6,8,10 99:24
102:24 109:11,13 124:5
AWT 32:23

## B

bachelor's 18:7
back 6:23 12:12 16:11 22:20 30:22 33:25 44:7 55:12 64:24 68:4 79:16 80:1 96:9 106:15 110:13 116:7 122:15 123:8
background 18:3,6
backside 45:20
backup 36:24,25 37:18
base 98:10
based 24:6,8 50:20 57:16 91:6
basic 29:16 80:4,9
basis 23:7
bathroom 64:20

BCCX 114:8
begin 55:4 72:23 73:1
Behavioral 26:18
big 22:23 102:18 115:19
birth 26:10 27:20
bit 7:16 9:8 38:22 40:13
68:21 78:10 79:15 114:23 116:10
Blair 7:1 122:16
blank 94:5
Bledsoe 114:11
board 120:13
boards' 17:21
booklet 10:21 65:13,15, 20,21
booster 24:21
bottom 47:22 57:17 61:5 63:1,8 65:3
Bowie 6:8,11,22 7:1,10, 12 9:14 28:22 29:1,5 34:19 35:3 41:21 43:9 45:2,25 46:4,7,11 54:3 55:17,21 64:21,24 70:19 71:1 79:9,10 85:7 102:9 110:9,13 112:20,24 113:2, 6,21 114:16,20 118:12 119:1 122:6,9 124:14

Bowman 61:4,8,13 63:9
box 56:14 57:1,2,14,20
58:1,6 83:19 84:7 85:10, 11,23 87:4,7,10,22 95:17
boxes 84:2 94:21
break 8:15,18 64:19,22,
23,25 110:10,12 122:7,8
Brenner 11:22 13:2,3,7 14:11 124:4

Brian 10:23
bribery 72:11 97:19
briefly 17:8 102:10 123:10
bring 39:21 46:1,8 49:12 95:2 100:12
bringing 50:7
brought 6:9
Bryce 10:23 15:19 122:10,20
bullet 102:19
C

C-B-I-P 26:17
call 86:2,7,14 89:4,5,6 95:20
called 6:18
calls 112:13
caption 9:22
card 26:9,11 27:21 94:7
care 93:21
Carissa 16:12 107:18
case 7:2 18:13 19:4,6,9 20:3 24:4,17 25:5 26:14 27:22 31:13,14,18 32:3, 10,11 52:1 81:17 83:8 85:25 87:14 93:6 108:24
categories 111:1
CBIP 26:17,24 27:7
Center 18:25 56:6
central 18:23 24:8 33:18 110:21 113:9
certificate 26:10 27:20 48:4 53:21 56:9,19 62:20 63:15 65:17 66:5 74:5 76:25 77:18 78:6,20 79:1 80:7 82:15,23 83:4 86:22 90:12 93:25 98:17 101:22 106:17 120:8,21
certificates 54:18 111:20 117:3,10 121:2
cetera 90:3
chain 108:19,24
changing 103:21
charge 26:4 38:12,13
charges 21:20,23 22:2 50:21 74:11 81:21
check 59:16 83:10 84:7, 16,21 85:2 87:4,6 88:9 89:24,25 120:7 121:24
checked 83:20 84:2
checking 21:3 39:24 59:21 91:24
checklist 43:21 44:20 47:18 60:21
checks 116:12,16 119:3
chief 30:7 31:7 32:22,23 65:9 79:19
child 28:14 51:21 91:17, 21,22,25 92:1,4,5,15 93:1, 5,17,21 94:12,15 95:13
chooses 56:13
circumstances 76:5
citizenship 59:8
clarify $8: 7$
class 15:2,6 26:20,21 40:3 62:4 63:17,22 74:22 75:25 76:2 106:23
class's 76:5
classification 30 .15
classifying 19.12
classrooni 64:1
clear $8: 4$ 54:13 55:11 104.2
cierk 39:13 85:20 86:2,7, 14
clerks 57:7 95:21
Clifton 33:18
closely 68:21
coaching 22:21
code 101:3,6,7,15 102:20 103:8,15 104:19,21 105:1, 6,9 106:11
codes 102:25 103:2,4,5, 7,16 104:5,17 106:7,9
Coe 107:23
Cognitive 26:18
collateral 83:12
collect 20:22
college 18:8 28:16
column 35:20 36:1 37:8,9 command 108:24
comment 90:16 101:4
commission 62:23
commissioner 29:17,19 30:22 107:22 109:2 115:21
commissioners 29:20
commissions 100:13
committed 50:20
common 21:16
communicate 64:11 80:22
communicated 14:11
community 17:15 29:22
30:2 32:2 42:1,9 66:11 st:3,5,6 102:12 103:16 106:7
company 33:20
compare 99:10
compared 20:25
complete 20:2 $39: 9$
49:15 53:10 64:5 66:19,21
73:18,20 93:19,22 106:21
completed 11:327:15
38:20 40:8 49:6 50:7 61:22 64:1 83:7 87:16 95:3 100:12 101:5 103:10 105:17 106:19 110:21,24 111:17,18 113:24 115:7, 21 118:15 120:14,17 121:5 124:3
completely 95:2
completing 39:16 40:1 53:6 63:25 105:22 112:3 113:13 114:6,22
completion 51:23
Complex 58:23 61:15 114:12
comports 66:15
conclusion 67:6 69:7 70:9
conditions 9:5
confer 91:17 96:4,5
107:14,17,21
confirming 94:15
confused 75:22
confusing 84:24
confusion 42:15 90:15
conjunction 27:6 122:11
consideration 104:15
considered 89:14 100:1 117:9
consist 26:22
consists 26:23
Constitution 68:23 69:1
contact 57:6 85:20 88:23
95:22 101:2,3,11,12 103:8,15,16 104:4,16,19, 21 106:11 120:20
contained 14:21
content 12:2 16:14,15 101:18
contexts 84:25
continuation 10:8 52:1
continuing 17:3
contracting 33:22
control 81:2
conversation 75:11 107:6 123:9
conversations 12:1,3
conversed 13:8
convicted 50:24 68:25 69:3 70:13 72:7,15 97:1, 15 98:22
conviction 50:14,24 51:12,14 66:7 71:15 73:5 80:19 82:14,25 83:8 97:19 98:5,6,7,11 99:25 111:2, 14,15 115:1,2,3
convictions 38:25 72:22, 25 81:6,8,9,23 82:7 83:1,

2,5,11 96:17 99:12,18,19 111:16 117:2
coordinator 19:5 24:4,17 25:5 26:14 27:22 52:1 91:18 93:17 94:9
coordinators 91:21
copies 111:20
copy 6:10 39:17,18 59:8 100:10,11

COR 40:1,24 45:19 46:5 49:6 74:1

Corecivic 33:12,13,19 38:3
corporal 31:1
correct 15:21 16:23 18:1 20:20 31:11,24,25 35:19 41:17 44:2,5 45:2 47:5 48:25 49:1 52:22 53:18 54:21,22 56:21,24,25 57:16,21 59:11 61:16 62:10,24 63:13,22,23 64:2,3 66:8,9,13 67:8 73:6,23 74:7 76:7 77:20, 23,25 79:22,25 80:5,10 81:7 82:4 86:2,3,12 88:10, 14,15,19 91:3,18,19 100:15,22 102:22 105:4 106:5,24,25 107:16 109:10,17 114:2 120:15, 22,25 123:1,23

Correction 11:24 19:8 29:18
correctional 18:14,16 24:19,20 29:25 30:8,9 31:2 33:14,15,17 58:23 61:15 65:9 108:25 114:12
correctly 32:4 56:16 58:10 59:10 73:11
correlates 111:13
corresponds 35:20
CORS 117:7
costs 39:4 51:21 88:1,6, 13,18 89:14,17,25 91:7
counsel 11:23
counseling 25:17
counselor 24:19,21,22
27:13 30:8,12,18 31:6,7 32:22,23 56:14 65:10
counselors 17:18 26:3 27:12 30:8,9 32:18 48:15 52:25 79:19 118:19
county 37:3,7,8 38:12 39:13 49:13 50:2,4 57:7 62:23 85:20 86:2,7,14 94:14 95:21 100:13,17
county's 39:22 113:10 couple 43:4 61:3 107:12
court 7:11,18 34:15 39:4, 11,12 51:20 58:7,12 75:7 82:8 87:10 88:1,6,13,18, 21,24 89:4,5,7,14,17,25 91:7 95:13,21 98:3
courts 57:7 58:6 89:13
cover 30:21 34:20 77:4
covered 12:14 42:13 67:11
covering 24:9 52:20 53:10
covers 29:20,21,22,23 30:18 34:21 42:2 67.5 82:3
create $10 \leqslant 1115: 4$ 119:5 120:19
created 10:14
creating 103:8 104:16 121:14
crime $84: 9,10,12$
crimes 39:6 50:20 68:25 69:12 70:14 71:25 72:1,2 97:2,10,16
Criminal 18:8
criteria 51:18 74:4 77:19
current 27:8 35:11 49:24 51:25
custody 19:13 38:17 49:6 73:17
$\frac{D}{\text { data 34:7 35:11,12 36:21 }}$

92:18,24 104:6,20 105:14 106:10,13 113:23 115:15 119:9
database 15:16
date 28:4 40:23 42:4 43:12 45:5 47:11,12 54:11 72:8,14 111:2,17 115:1
dates 67:23
day 18:24 63:11 113:15
day-to-day 19:11 119:17
days $93: 5,13,14,15$
108:12
deals 31:10
debts 89:13 92:15
decent 118:5,20
decision-máaking 107:19
deemed 103:24
deficiencies 114:20
degree 18:7 72:10
denied 104:13
deny 68:24 70:13
department 11:23 19:8
27:19 29:18 57:2,5,6 59:1 81:14,22 94:10 102:15 111:13 115:14 119:2

DEPONENT 124:17
deposition 6:6 7:13,15 9:20,21 10:1,7,13 11:8,17 14:4 15:22 16:8,13,18,25 17:4,24 55:15 116:11 121:17
deputy 29:19
describe 18:1127:9 32:16 50:9,12 51:17 54:6 113:8,21 114:8
describes 45:12 50:10, 17,19,22 51:10,12 59:4 98:7
describing 18:5 58:25
description 98:11
designated 66:12
detail 41:14
detailed 65:23
detainer 38:11,14,15 39:3
determination 117:16
determinations 116:18 117:10 121:21
determine 39:23 48:17 74:5,14 76:23 77:2,17 97:14 99:11
determined 75:10
DHS 28:13 91:22
difference 84:6 89:19 90:6
diligence 91:24
direct 29:24 31:6 77:3 86:4
directed 102:12
directing 76:18,21,22
directive 94:24 108:6
directives 78:9
directly 34:24 42:24 69:7
director 12:22 19:7
24:15,25 25:6,7,8 $27: 9$ 30:3
directors 30:1 122:11,21
directs 100:17
disagree 67:5
disagreement 67:16
discharge 109:17
discharged 48:13 56:18 57:24 60:3 106:24
discharging 48:8 80:14
discuss 62:8 74:21 75:24
discussed 16:17 63:21
discussing 62:1
discussion 6:14 76:3
disqualifying 97:15
99:12,18
distracted 90:18
district 30:3 122:11,20
dived 81:15
divided 33:2
division 20:17 21:9 23:9, 12,13 24:7,8 28:14
docket 83:8
document 9:13,15,17,25 10:3 28:23 29:4 35:2 41:20 42:20 43:8,18 45:1 46:3,10 48:22 54:2,3,17 55:20 66:7 72:3,5 78:11 102:8 110:17 112:22 113:1,5,20 114:19 118:11
documentation 52:14 60:15 86:1 88:21
documents 10:12 11:7 14:18 16:19 21:3 46:13,16 47:25 88:17 116:17 118:13
double-checked 122:3
double-checking 120:4
drive 100:21 106:4
driver's 25:21 26:1,4,8 27:16
drug 21:18
drugs 21:21
due 75:7 91:24
duly 6:18
duties 25:11
duty 108:23

## E

earlier 14:23 43:25 52:4 66:24 78:11 80:24 86:21 94:19 106:6,16 107:12 109:15 116:11 123:10
easier 7:20
edit 108:22
edited 110:4
education 30:20
educational 18:3,6 108:14
effect 93:3
effective 42:4 43:12 45:5 105:20
effectively 77:22 123:10, 13
efficient 108:5
effort 95:15,24
efforts 109:11
election 17:21 39:22 62:23 100:13 120:13
elections 49:13 50:2,4
94:10,14 100:18
elevated 91:10
eligibility $39: 23$ 51:10,13, 18 56:23 57:25 59:16 66:6 75:16,24 76:8,14,21 77:17,19 120:8 121:22,25
eligible 25:25 26:12 39:2, 7,8 45:21 48:9,18 49:5 50:10,12,14,18,19 51:2,5 72:6,16 73:10,16,24,25 74:6,15,20 75:1,2,3,10 76:24 77:3,14 84:22 86:24 87:13 90:11 93:23 91.7 96:11,23 101:23 102:21 103:24 106:17,22

Eliminatior 19:15
else's 38:17
emaï 6:5 13:8 55:25 57:4, 16,17,18,20,22 58:2,18,25 59:5,18,25 61:3,8,19,25 62:15,21,25 63:3,4,9 64:17 65:5,19 66:14 67:13 68:8 94:23
emails 10:23,25 55:14,21 65:1 67:22,23 68:2,5,7,16 94:19 122:19
employees 24:20 72:12 97:20
end 49:22
enrolled 18:9
ensure 40:191:18
entail 19:22 20:21
enter 102:20
entering 20:9,11
entire 19:2 20:17 94:25
entry 104:22,24
envelope 43:22 47:16,19 59:22 60:21
equal 22:18
errors 21:16 117:22,24
118:1,5,20
evidence 28:23
ex-offender's 58:5
exact 28:4 34:9 40:23 70:14
EXAMINATION 6:21
excerpt 69:18,20,29
excluded 69:2
exhibit 9:11,13 16:24
29:2.434:25 35:2 41:18, 20 4.3:6,8 44:24 45:1 46:1, 3,10,24 48:1 50:8 54:2 55:18,20 66:23 71:7 74:2 80:6 83:6 96:18 97:13 98:20 102:6,8 112:19,21, 23,24 113:1,3,5,17,20 114:17,19 122:14
Exhibits 66:4,9
exist 123:12
existence 101:7
exiting 20:6
experience $36: 16$
expiration 35:23 36:1
40:6 47:11,12
expired 34:6,10,12 37:13, 15 39:3 84:9,12,18
expiring 31:21,22 34:3,7, 24 38:6,10
explain 94:3
explains 61:25
extra 91:23

## F

facilitate $\mathbf{2 6 : 2 0 , 2 1}$
facilitating 26:17
facilitation 26:24
facilities 11:4 14:16 17:18 25:24 33:9,11,12,13 38:3 64:6 94:20 116:5
facility 18:14,16 19:10 20:6,8 26:1 27:14 30:5 33:4,7,14,16,17,18 57:11, 19,23 65:10 84:1 103:19, 20 105:19 110:2 123:16
facility's 106:3
facility-specific 103:5,7
factors 51:11,13
fair 48:22 52:2
fall 30:16 35:25 39:5 92:16

Falling 30:2
falls 28:1 29:19 31:3
familiar 25:16 89:16,18
federal 81:8,9 82:8
feel 17:9
fees $39: 4,11,12,1575: 8$ 89:17 90:2 95:13
felon 37:22
felonies $51: 15$ 69:3,4,11 71:4,5,7,8,11,17 72:7,11 97:22
felony 38:25 50:14,23
66:6 71:15 72:21,25 73:4 81:23 82:7,24 83:7,11 97:18 100:2
felt 52:19
figure $\mathbf{3 7}: 14$
figured 60:23
file $39: 18$ 59:9 60:17 100:10

## files $57: 9$

fill 39:12 40:6 41:4,6 47:1
52:12,17 56:14,19,23 57:1 59:13 62:19 64:14 73:21
76:24 78:2,6,20 79:6,11
82:15 83:4 94:4,5,13,18, 25 95:4,6,9 105:19,25


means 31:23 39:2 60:24 65:17 91:20
medical 30:20,21,22
medications 9:2
meet 12:4,24 13:6,8,9,13 32:6,9 77:19
meetings 13:17,21 14:1 107:4
meets 31:21
Melinda 58:19 59:4
memo 10:14 40:21,22 41:9 54:7 68:4,6,8,15,16, 17,20 75:17 77:1,3,4,10, 11 78:25 82:17 86:16 94:24 95:5 96:1,24 97:8 102:12,14,23 106:1 107:13,20 108:3,5 110:3
memory 9:3,6 48:6,20 122:13
memos 107:24 108:1
mention 6:8 47:3,21 78:11
mentioned 26:15 41:13, 15 43:3 55:14 80:24 94:17 109:15
mentions 45:11 46:18,20
middle 18:20 24:6
milestone 40:2
mind 58:15
mine 53:9
Miniard 16:12 107:18
minimum 93:6
minutes 12:7,8,15 55:13
misconduct 72:12 97:19
missed 21:22
missing 52:24
mission 119:23
MLCC 113:18
modified 93:6
moment 7:17 55:22 61:18

Monday $13: 22$
money 92:3
month 28:2 93:7
monthly 23:2,3,7 27:19 35:14 36:19 112:12
months 23:23,24 28:17 36:9 108:18 109:24 112:5
morning 6:24,25
move 28:22
moved 24:3
multiple 35:8 111:16,17
murder 51:3 72:10
$\mathbf{N}$

NAACP 7:2
names 111:11
Nashville 65:11
NCIC 81:25 82:2,3
NCSCS 22:4
necessarily 59:25 77,1 94:2,3 95:1 117:4

NECX 61:16
needed S8.18 107:17
111:9
nestrive 8:3
newer 44:5 55:9 118:25
night 29:7
nodding 8:2
Northeast 61:14
Northwest 58:23
note 101:2,3,19,21,25
102:4
noted 8:11
notes 28:24 29:7 34:2
81:17 88:9,12 120:20
121:12,13 122:10
notice 9:20,21 16:25
noticing 52:10
notifying 101:4
number 9:13 29:4 34:5,9, 10,20,23 35:2,6,9,10,11, 21 36:5,8,11,17 37:22 38:9,13 41:20 43:8 45:1 46:3,10 54:2 55:9,20 102:8 111:2,12 113:1,5,20 114:19 117:2 118:5,20
numbers 34:3 83:9 99:2, 3,10,13,15,22 115:10,22, 23

NWCX 58:22
NWCX's 58:25
0
oath 8:22
object 8:10 70:15,21 79:7
85:3 118:7,22
objection 8:11
cbjections 6:4
obligation 92:6
obtain 90:24
obtained 19:4 37:4
occur 107:6
occurred 24:23
off-the-record 6:14
offender 25:25 26:9 39:8, 14,25 49:5 56:8, 12 62:11
65:24 73:16,25 95:3
100:11 101:1,12 102:21
offender's 58:7 100:10
offenders 19:12 52:10 73:10
offenses 72:13
offer 63:19 73:10,16,20, 24 76:24
offered 102:1 106:18
office 18:23,25 24:8
39:22 40:7 49:13 50:2
75:6 80:22 87:19 93:22
94:5 100:13,18,22 106:21
107:9 124:3
officer 32:9 52:15 84:15 89:3,11,23 100:22 102:20
officers 22:5,11 30:4 31:2
42:18 48:8,11 49:17 52:5
75:15,20,23 118:15
offices 17:21 41:2,6 50:4 52:13
officials 72:12 97:20
older 41:18 43:11 44:10
OMS 21:1,4,12,14 80:20 81:10,12,13,19 85:18,21 88:9,12 90:2,11 100:4 101:3 120:20
one-on-one 107:6
ongoing 92:5
operate 119:23
operations 29:21 30:15, 17 97:21
opportunity 16:3 39:25 63:19 73:17 88:23 106:18 109:3
oral 54:20
order 54:9 97:24 98:1,2, 12
ordered 87:10
orders 22:4 81:19
organization 29:16
orientation 10:20 14:20 15:7 30:11 40:3 62:4
63:17 65:20,21 74:22
75:25 76:1 123:20
out-of-state 21:22 22:2 80:19 81:6
outdated 43:23 44:13
outline 29:15
outstanding 94:12
oversaw 24:23 25:14, 19
oversee 24:24 25:14
27:11,20,24
overseeing 19:5
overseen 24:19 32:22,23 33:1
oversees 27:7
overview 76:8
owe 88:14,18
owed 87:11,12 90:10
owes 85:15 88:5 89:24 91:22 92:3
owing 75:7

| $\mathbf{P}$ |
| :--- |

P-O-S 124:5
packet 14:21,25 15:1,2 39:19,20 40:4 43:20,21 44:20 45:13,16 46:17 47:9,14,16,17,18 56:8,9 59:22 60:4,6,8,21 100:11 123:21
packets 40:25 62:5
pages 45:19 58:17 61:3
paid 39:5,15 85:15
paper 50:199:3 122:17
papers 122:16
paperwork 39:14 40:25
47:16 52:17 53:14,16
67:17,18 85:19 87:21
88:24 95:19 102:11 122:23
paragraph 69:14,15,16 70:20 102:18
parole 32:6,8,9 37:12 38:8,11 40:5 41:1,6 48:11 52:13 75:6,23 87:18 93:22 94:5 106:21 124:3
paroling 31:20 32:1
part 31:3 42:24 45:23
46:4 54:20 60:2 83:12
84:25 91:7 94:4
partially 93:25 94:18 105:7
passed 36:10
past 38:25
pay 27:19 92:15
paying 92:12
payments 94:12
PDF 122:10,24
people 20:5,7 23:14 31:10,15 32:5 34:3,12 38:9,25 50:10,12,13,18, 22,24 51:2,5 76:18 82:3 92:14,21 104:7,9,13 110:2,24 115:17,20
percent 23:18
percentage 23:16
period 34:19
periods 99:17
permanently 97:15 99:11,18
person 13:1 56:18 57:13, 15,24 64:12 76:5,20 80:13 81:23 82:6,12 83:11,25 85:15 86:1,10,23 88:17,20 94:6 96:16 100:17,23 101:23 102:1 103:24 105:10 107:19 109:8
person's 59:16 74:24
persons 68:24 70:13
98:21
pertaining 10:45:11:2 27:25 45:21 13:10 121:5
petition 82.13
phone 12:5
riece 50:1 122:17
pieces 40:11 111:10
place 100:9 101:2 106:25 plaintiffs 7:2
plan 20:3
planning 62:3 96:3,5
playing 53:13
point 20:10 22:13 27:14 35:20 44:15 62:1 88:16 93:24 95:14 96:8,20 102:19 105:5,12 109:6 115:17
pointing 119:20
points 95:9
policies 25:20 27:21
41:13,14 52:24 53:9 108:16,20 109:12,17
policy 10:15,17 11:13 14:19,21 15:10,11 25:15, 19 40:15,19,20 41:17,25 42:1,13,18,20,25 43:3,9, 10,15,19,25 44:4,6,10,15, 18,23 45:3 48:14,25 49:4, 9 52:20 53:7,10,23 54:7 66:11,24 67:4,11 93:1 108:4,6,21 109:4,7,9,18, 23 110:4,5
populates 35:16
position 11:20 12:10,19, 21 19:5 20:16,21 23:22,23 24:11,25 26:14 27:23 28:3 40:24 93:1 123:11,12,13
positive 22.10 58:21 70:17 77:9 97:24
possibiiity 117:21
possibly 107:3 121:19
potential 67:15
Powerpoint 27:3,5,6
PPO 102:17
pre- 10:21
pre-release 10:20,21
14:20,24 15:7 40:3 43:15, 19 62:4 63:16 65:20,21 74:21 75:25 76:1 123:20

PREA 19:13,15
prep 26:20
preparation 10:12 11:8, 17 16:8 122:9,20
prepare 16:17 32:7
prepared 9:9 17:9,11,13
preparing 29:8 55:15 76:13
present 14:1 86:1
presented 63:22
previous 71:13
previously 27:22 28:13 66:2 122:23
printed 43:22 47:15,19
prior 14:6 15:23 40:24
41:7,9 42:20 53:8,9 54:16
68:7,16 83:2,11 123:18
priors 82:25
prison 19:15 29:21 30:15, 17 31:11,16,23 34:24 60:10 83:17 88:22
prisons 30:16 33:19 119:24
private 33:20
probation/parole 30:4 40:7
problem 21:19 112:7,9
problems 22:9 114:3
procedure 54:9 73:14
process 10:15 12:9 17:17
19:6 22:14,15 24:24 25:14,22 26:15 27:20,21, 24 38:23 40:8 41:11 44:8 50:9,11 59:1 60:2,24 61:24 62:17 66:13,20,21
67:7 88:7 96:21 108:22 109:6,20,25 110:6 118:25 120:9 124:5
produce 14:17 15:5,12, 15 27:1
produced 14:19,20 15:18 114:8 122:25
professional 18:3
program 20:3 26:19 31:17
programs 31:16
project 29:23
proper 58:6 100:13
properly 116:23
prosecutions 124:7
prove 100:8
proved 105:20
provide 40:4 62:5 65:12 86:8,11 87:21 109:3
provided 16:19 21:1 25:25 40:25 46:16 50:6


RESP 101:3
respective 106:3
responsibilities 24:18 26:13 27:10 102:18
responsibility 58:5 73:9 94:15
rest 94:5
restitution 51:21 58:7 85:11,16,22 86:9 87:10,12 88:895:13
restoration 10:16 11:3, 10 12:10,17 14:15 16:3 27:23 38:23,24 40:17,18 41:11 42:2 44:8, 19 45:15 47:7,21 48:4,18 49:10 50:9,11 51:14 52:6,11,21 53:11,21 54:18 55:4 56:10,13 57:25 59:1,8,17 62:2,20 63:16 65:16,17 68:12 73:18 74:5 76:4,15, 25 77:18 78:7,20 79:1 82:15 86:23,24 90:12 94:1,7 96:12 98:18 101:4, 22 102:1 103:10 104:7 105:14 106:17 109:12,14, 16 110:22 113:23 114:11 120:9
restore 51:5 54:9 65:24 73:10
restored 48:10 53:4 62:13 71:12,21,24 72:19 74:9 94:8 98:23
restoring 94:8
retraining 22:15,20
retrainings 22:10
reveal 29:14
review 23:1 35:7 39:2 60:6,14 72:2 74:10 75:15 76:14,21 83:22 85:17
reviewed 11:13 14:23 39:8 45:10 55:14 120:12
reviewing 52:13 76:4 80:25
reviews 120:16
revise 95:25

Ricci 6:17 7:8,12 54:15
RICHARDSON 112:18, 22 114:14
rights 10:16 11:3,10 12:11,18 14:15 16:4 27:23 38:23,24 40:16 42:2 44:1, 3,7,19 45:11,16 46:11,19 47:7,22 48:10,18 49:10,16 50:9,13 51:13 52:5,12,21 53:4,11 54:10 55:4 56:14 57:25 59:2,8,17 62:2,13 63:16 65:16,25 67:11 68:13 71:21,23 72:18 73:11,18 74:9,20 76:4,14 79:2 86:24 94:8,9 96:12 98:23 101:5,16 105:2,14 109:12,14,17 114:11

Riley 107:23
risk 18:19 19:1,20,23 20:16 22:6,9 23:6 81:1,3,4 116:12,20 118:9,16,18,21 119:3
risks 20:2
Riverbend 123:15,16
roads 80:1
role 24:3 27:1,8 38:24 51:24,25
roles 28:11 $30: 9$
Rose Eo: 1
ro:ighly 36:16
run 33:19

## S

safe 119:23
Safety 27:19
SAITH 124:17
sample 21:8
samples 22:23
sat 7:15
SCCF 112:24
school 28:15
score 22:16
scored 22:12,15,19
scroll 112:2 114:4

## season 28:5

Secretary 66:7 70:5,7,24 79:4 97:13
section 36:2 39:10 47:5 51:11 69:9,22,24 70:1,4,7, 11 80:3,9 83:16,19 85:1, 12 87:4,8,9 88:1 89:25 96:25 98:21,25
sections 22:17,18 95:10
secure 119:24
security 26:9,11 27:21 30:6,25 56:5
send 57:1 116:5
sense 53:12.122:5
sentence 31:24 34:12 37:4 1: 38:10,20 51:23 58:4 84:8,9,11 100:3
sentenced $37: 1,3$
sentences 34:3 80:16 82:3
separate 15:4,11 83:7 103:11
September 114:22
serve 87:22
served 73:4 84:10,17
service 118:4
services 19:7 25:1,17
29:22 30:14,17,18,23
31:4,5 40:16 42:23 43:10 94:11
session 22:21
set 43:1
setting 10:1 64:2 122:4
sexual 72:13
shaking 8:2
Sharon 56:1
Shell 58:19 59:4
short 64:23 110:12 122:7, 8
show 105:9 120:20 121:10
showing 88:17
side 30:18,25 32:17 39:1
78:22 102:25 120:10 121:5
sign 59:6,7,20 60:4,7,9, 16,20 85:22
signed 56:15 58:8
signing 59:23 60:1 61:1
similar 103:2,4
sitting 68:11 109:23
situation 74:24 87:3
skills 26:24
Social 26:8,11 27:20
software 20:1
solution 104:2
sort 21:2 23:15 29:15 32:14 67:24 76:4
sound 89:18
sounds 15:21 48:23 57:14 71:1

South 33:17 110:21 113:9
speak 7:21 11:16 12:8 16:7 37:18 118:11
speaking 52:25
special 65:10 123:16
specialist 12:20 30:10,11 31:21 32:22 39:1 61:14 64:14 73:9 76:12 77:9 79:10 80:13 81:5 82:14 83:1,18 84:2 85:14 87:5 93:16 100:16,24 101:12 103:11 104:23 106:20 123:15
specialists 11:19 30:11 32:6 39:9 41:3 48:15,17 52:7,17,20 53:10,13 54:8, 17 55:9 66:22 75:18 78:12,17,21,22 80:17 82:21 83:14 86:22 87:24 88:4 89:5,6 90:14,19 91:16 95:15 96:10 99:14 105:16 115:8 116:19

121:6
specific 30:9 39:6 51:15 72:7 104:19 106:13 109:13
specifically 115:14 118:3 119:20
specificity 74:23
spell 86:19 96:1
spelled 7:10
spend 13:16
spoke 11:18,22 12:5,9 123:17
spread 27:12
spreadsheet 10:22 11:2, 5,6 15:15 106:3 110:20 111:5,6 113:9,22 114:10
spreadsheet also 123:3
spreadsheets 105:20 110:2,11 122:22
spurring 104:16
SS-3041 56:9
staff 26:3 27:7 29:25 32:18,20 64:12 66:12,19 67:5,7 102:13 112:15
STAHL 6:13
stamp 61:4
stamped 63:8
stand 101:9
start 18:5 28:2 41:11 115:18
started 6:2 7:5 10:8 18:13 28:19 41:10 51:24 52:4 109:25 110:1,6
starting 19:21
starts 32:21 108:21
state 7:7 18:10 19:2 20:23 21:20 23:8 24:9 27:12 33:10 38:12 59:25 66:7 70:7,25 77:11 79:4 82:8 101:8

State's 70:5 97:13
states 57:4,18,22 63:3

83:6 93:4 94:6 102:14,23
statewide 82:2
stating 39:14 47:6
statistical 35:12
statute 69:8 70:20 99:2,3, 10,13,15,22
step 82:18 85:17
steps 49:15
stop 112:14
stopped 112:3 113:13 114:6,22
stops 93:1
strike 89:11 102:5
structure 29:11,16 32:16
structured 29:15
stuff 32:14
subject 104:23
substance 67:14
Success 62:3
suffrage 69:4
summarize 18:6 52:19 61:23
summary 40:9 61:25 70:1,2.6.5 101:14
sumimertime 28:6,8
Supervising 102:20
supervision 17:15 29:22
30:2 32:2,12 37:11 42:9 66:11 67:3,5,6 75:8 102:13,24 103:16 106:7

## supervision's 42:1

supervisor 14:12 16:11 31:7 91:1 96:4,6 107:14, 22
supervisors 79:19,21,23 90:21
support 28:14 29:25
51:21 91:17,21,23,25
92:2,4,5,15,24 93:1,5,17, 21 94:12,16 95:13 119:9
supposed 22:6 62:17

105:24 111:21 115:3
suspect 45:9
sworn 6:19
system 21:1,4,12,14 37:17,19 80:20 81:10,12, 14,19 85:18 90:2 100:4 115:5 120:23,24
$T$
table 35:22 37:23,24
tables 36:23
takes 71:15 76:1
taking 9:2 51:11 76:5
talk 7:16 9:8 38:2: 40:2, 10 67:16,17 112:12
talked 12:-16 16:11,22 28:12 41:12 66:2 78:10 10€: 5 116:10
talking 40:1 55:22 65:14, 19 66:23,25 68:11,12 81:16,17 98:25 110:15 124:8

TDOC 13:4 17:23 18:21 19:5 29:11 33:22 35:12 36:24,25 37:4,11,16,18,25 52:18 73:17 111:2,12 119:18,22 121:5

TDOC's 38:19,24
team 27:24 33:5
Teams 27:4
tells $77: 9$
ten 12:7,8,14 22:17
Tennessee 7:2 11:23 18:10,15,17,20 19:7 29:18 33:15,16,18 37:23 68:22, 23 69:1,2,19,23 70:5,6,12, 24 71:16 79:4 80:16 82:4, 25 83:3 84:1 93:3

TEPE 10:22 11:6 15:16 123:2

TEPES 120:19 122:21
terms 10:1 67:14 89:16, 20,22
testified 6:19
testify 14:3 17:9,11,13, 14,17,20
Therapeutic 56:6
thing 44:18 77:22 84:14 90:6 103:21 106:15
things 7:20 86:5 115:16 122:24
thinking 36:9
Thomas 10:24
thought 55:10 121:14
Thurs 13:23
Thursday $14: 5$
time 7:22 8:15 13:20,21
22:13 24:24 32:17 34:15, 19 41:4 52:21 53:9,22 54:24 55:6 57:20 61:24
62:1 66:17 68:10 73:4 89:10 99:17 107:10 108:5 110:4 111:9 115:13,17,22 117:12,19,20 118:14,24 119:12 120:5,10,18 121:16,20,23 124:12
times 12:4,24 13:6,13 41:15 43:4
timing 68:6
today 6:97:38:22,25 9:9 10:1,13 11:8 13:23 17:13
today's 11:17 17:4 55:15
told $77: 7$
top 9:23 29:17 37:16 50:18 51:11 85:1 96:25 99:17
topics 17:3,10
total 23:16 36:2,3 37:17, 20
touched 123:9
track 27:14,16 105:15,18 107:9 111:8 115:6,15 117:19 121:1,4
tracked 35:12 89:13 113:23
trackers 116:3
tracking 110:23 111:3 115:4,18 117:9
tracks 114:10
trained 27:4
training 10:21 14:24 24:20,21 26:17,19,23 27:7 43:16 78:5,8,12,18,19
trainings 54:23
transcribe 7:19
transcript 8:4
transferred 32:10,11 38:16 82:4
treason 51:372:9
treatment 30:7 31:8 32:24
trend 52:10
Trousdale 18:14,16 19:10 28:19 33:14
truthful 8:25
turn 17:2 18:2 55:24 65:2
Turner 18:14,16 33:14
turnover 112:15
type 103:21
typically 22:24 92:16

| $\mathbf{U}$ |
| :--- |

Uh-huh 9:24 16:21 17:1, 16 18:4 20:18 21:24 22:22 23:25 26:5,16 29:12 38:1 46:23 51:7 65:22 67:2 78:4 82:10 93:8 103:22 107:2 108:19 115:24
ultimate 94:15
unable 95:21
unaware 124:11
underlying 21:3 116:17
underneath 29:24
understand 8:6,219:17, 25 10:6 17:4,22 33:24 67:9
understanding 15:25

> 16:2 26:24 32:3 35:15
> 37:17 38:6 40:14 41:24
> 42:17,22 44:14 45:19
> 50:17 51:1 56:3 58:12,14, 24 59:20 62:16 64:15,17 65:14,18 66:16 67:12 68:14 71:6,10,14,22 72:6, 17,20 74:10 77:21 84:6,13 85:8,13 87:12 90:13 91:9 92:7 95:24 96:14 97:6,9, 11,23 98:13 100:2 104:1
understood 8:8 123:6
unit 19:12 30:11 118:19
University $\mathbf{1 8 : 1 0}$
unsure 82:5 105:8,12 108:10
update 21:13 106:2 107:13
updated 35:14 48:24 49:3,9 107:20
updates 24:22
upper 68:11
$\mathbf{v}$

Valencia 6:9
verbatim 70:3
verificetion 86:8
verifisd 49:6
verify 39:4,13 48:8 77:19 82:11,16 86:6 88:5,13 94:10 95:12,16,18 96:11
version 42:3 43:11 44:5, 22 45:2 48:24 49:4,9
versus 7:2
victim 19:19
Victoria 6:17 7:8 54:15
violent 72:13
volunteers 82:12
vote $50: 14,23$ 51:2,6 58:13 66:6 68:24 70:13 71:9,12,15,18,20 72:7,16, 22 73:1,5
voter 51:3 72:9 99:19

100:1,3 124:8
voter's 94:7 109:14 114:11
voters' 10:16 11:3,10 12:10,17 14:15 16:4 27:23 40:18 41:11 42:2 44:7,19
45:15 47:7 49:10,16 50:11
52:11 53:11 55:4 62:2 68:13 103:9 104:7 110:21 113:23
voting 38:23,24 40:16 44:1,3 45:11 46:11,19 47:21 48:10,18 50:9,13 52:5,21 53:4 54:10 56:13 57:25 59:2,16 63:16 65:16,24 67:11 71:20,23 72:18 73:11,18 74:9,20 76:4,14 79:2 86:24 94:8,9 96:12 98:23 101:4,16 105:2,14 109:12,16
VRRE 102:20
VRK: 103:14,17
B'RRI 102:20

## w

wait 7:23 8:18
walk 79:14
walked 96:12
walking 77:24
wanted 41:23 111:8
114:25
wanting 115:20
warden $30: 531: 8,932: 24$
33:1,4 56:3,5
wardens 30:6
web 35:12
website 70:5,24 79:3
Wednesday 13:24,25 61:11
week 14:8 15:21,22,23
103:1 104:18 108:15
weeks 15:24 108:12
Wheeler 65:6,8,9

Whiteville 33:15,16,17
William 9:19
Women's 56:5
word 80:18,25
wording 70:14
words 8:2
work 18:11 19:10 62:17 120:4 122:3,4
worked 28:13 116:12 118:3
working 40:19 48:23
83:18 84:1 103:6,8
workload 104:15 117:13
worksheet 77:25 78:1
world 32:7
worries 72:4
write 69:6,16 109:11 117:7
writer 108:21
writes 109:8
writing 55:2 68:8,16 77:14 82:20 109:7
written 41:22 49:1 54:17 83:14 89:8 123:3
wrote 53:19,24 54:14 108:5 110:3 123:4

| $\mathbf{Y}$ |
| :--- |

y'all 122:23
year 20:12,14 24:23
35:18,21 36:5,6,9,14,15, 17,21
year's 35:16
yearly 24:21
years 24:1
yellow 122:17
Yesterday 13:23
York 28:13

|  | Kistrical - | \# 70 | (8-15-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES <br> AND PROCEDURES <br> State of Tennessee <br> Department of Correction | Index \#: 705.06 | Page 1 of |
|  |  | Effective Date: May 15, 2013 |  |
|  |  | Distribution: C |  |
|  |  | Supersedes: BOPP $705.06(6 / 15 / 07)$ <br>  BOPP PCN 008-01 (6/1/11) |  |
| Approved by: <br> Subject: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

I. AUTHORITY: TCA 4-3-603; 4-3-606; TCA 40-20-112; 40-29-101 through 105; TCA 40-29-202;

TCA 40-29-204; TCA 40-39-202 (20); 40-39-202 (28), and TCA 40-20-112.
II. PURPOSE: To establish procedures for the issuance of voting rights.
III. APPLICATION: Deputy Commissioner of Operations, Assistant Commissioner of Community Supervision, all Tennessee Department of Correction (TDOC) Field Gervices staff, and probationers or parolees.
IV. DEFINITIONS:
A. Executive Clemency: An act of mercy or leniency providing relief from certain consequences of a criminal conviction. The power, including pardon, exoneration, and commutation, is exercised by the Governor in the State of Tennessee
B. Exoneration: An act of clemency deciaring innocence. It differs from a pardon by eradicating the existence of a conviction and expunging all records of the person's arrest, indictment, and conviction. It automatically restores all rights of citizenship to the person.
C. Pardon: An act of clemency forgiving a crime. It does not eradicate the existence of a conviction but remits any penalty or civil disability suffered as a result.
D. Suffrage: The right or privilege of voting and the exercise of that right.
V. POLICY: The TDOC requires that all offender requests for restoration of voting rights be dealt with according to statute and mandates of the State of Tennessee Division of Elections.

## VI. PROCEDURES:

A. Criteria to have voting rights restored

1. Upon completion of probation or parole supervision, the officer will assess whether the offender meets the criteria to have voting rights restored under TCA 40-29-202.
2. Pursuant to TCA 40-29-204, the offender is disqualified from having his or her voting rights restored if the offender has at any time been convicted of one of the following offenses during the specified time period:
a. Between July, 1986, and June 30, 1996 - first degree murder, aggravated rape, treason, or voter fraud
b. Between July 1, 1996, and June 30, 2006 - murder, rape, treason, or voter fraud.
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## Subject: RESTORATION OF OFFENDER VOTING RIGHTS

c. On or after July 1, 2006 - any of the above, or any degree of murder or rape or any felony offense under TCA Title 39 , Chapter 16 , parts 1,4 , or 5 ; or any sexual offense under TCA 40-39-202 (20) or any violent sexual offense under TCA 40-39202 (28) designated as a felony where the victim of such offense was a minor.
d. The offender will be advised by the officer if any of the disqualifying crimes apply.
(1) It is possible that offenders whose supervision expired in the past might make application under the new code. TDOC staff will fill out the form only if TDOC (or the predecessor agencies), was the supervising agency.
(2) The Deputy Director will ensure that a list of those offenses is available on the network drive, which should be identified as N -drive for Field Services Staff.
3. The officer will also confirm that the offender was convicted after May 18, 1981.
a. If convicted on or before that date the affenders' voting rights either were not lost and thus do not have to be restored, or
b. The offender will have to seek a court order to have his or her voting rights restored.

## B. Use of Certificate of Restoration (of voing rights) Form

1. Certificate of Restoration $S S-3041$ (Rev. 8/11), is provided by the Department of State, Division of Elections.
2. Officers should copy the form to their pc or laptop and save it for copies.
a. The computer can be used to type directly onto the form and print it.
(1) The form must be typed or computer-printed except for the signature and each section must be completed.
(2) Any items left blank will mean the form will not be accepted.
b. If the offender completing supervision is eligible under TCA 40-29-202, the officer will complete Sectionsl-4 of the form.
c. It is important that all known conviction offenses for which the offender is or was supervised be listed on 1. c. and d. of the form.
d. The only box under Section 3 that an officer will check is the fourth and final box.
(1) Any other boxes would have to be done by the pardoning authority, or
(2) The releasing authority in the event an offender served a sentence in full.
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3. The offender must take the form to the Court Clerk for certification that restitution has been paid. The Secretary of State's office will confirm child support payments with the Department of Human Services.
C. Completion of Process
4. After the officer has completed Sections I through 4, he/she will give the original form to the offender.
5. In order to register to vote, the offender must take the original SS-3041 to the Administrator of Elections in the offender's count of residence.
6. The officer will mail a completed copy of the SS-3041 to:

Secretary of State
Division of Elections
312 Eighth Avenue North; $9^{\text {th }}$ Floor
William Snodgrass Tower
Nashville, TN 37243.
VII. ACA STANDARDS: 3-3010.
VIII. EXPIRATION DATE: May $15,2016$.
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The videoconference deposition of TRACI BURCH, Ph.D., was taken by counsel for the Defendants, by Notice, with all participants appearing at their respective locations, on May 12 , 2023, for all purposes under the Tennessee Rules of Civil Procedure.

All objections, except as to the form of the question, are reserved to the hearing, and said deposition may be read and usea in evidence in said cause of action in any tria? thereon or any proceeding herein.

It is agreed that Deborah H. Honeycutt, Notary Public and I icensed Court Reporter for the State of Tennessee, may swear the witness remotely, and that the reading and signing of the completed deposition by the witness is not waived.

THE REPORTER: Good morning. My name is Deborah Honeycutt. I am a stenographic reporter with Elite-Brentwood Reporting Services. My license number is 472.

Today's date is May 12, 2023, and the time is approximately 10:14 a.m. Central time.

This is the deposition of Traci Burch, Ph.D. in the matter of Tennessee Conference of the National Association for the Advancerient of Colored People, et al., vs. William Lee, et al., filed in the United States District Conrt, Middle District of Tennessee, Nashville District. The case number is 3:20-cv-01039.

This deposition is being taken by videoconference, and the oath will be administered remotely by me. Any digital exhibits marked during this deposition will be deemed as "original" for purposes of said deposition.

At this time, I will ask counsel to identify yourselves and state whom you represent. If you have any objections with the procedures I've outlined, please state so when you introduce yourself. We will start with the noticing attorney.

MR. RIEGER: My name is Alex Rieger with the Attorney General's Office, and I'm joined by Zachary Barker, also with my office.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: I'm Charles Grant, here on behalf of the plaintiffs. And I'll ask my co-counsel to also identify themselves.

MS. BOWIE: Blair Bowie with the plaintiffs.

MS. RICHARDSON: Vanessa Richardson with the plaintiffs.

MS. HULING: Alice Huling with the plaintiffs.

MR. MULJI: Aseem Mulji with the plaintiffs.

MS. BOETTCHER: Ellen Boettcher with the plaintiffs.
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /
/ /

TRACI BURCH, Ph.D.,
was called as a witness, and after having been duly sworn, testified as follows:

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Good morning. My name is Alex Rieger, and I am with the Attorney General's Office, I'm representing the defendants in this riatter, accompanied on this Zoom by my co-counsel, Zachary Barker.

Dr. Burch, could you start by introducing yourself for the record please.
A. Yes. I am Traci Burch.
Q. And could you spell your last name, please.
A. $\quad B-U-R-O-H$.
Q. Before we start, there are always a series of preliminary questions. I note in your expert report that you've been an expert witness multiple times so I bet you're familiar with a lot of these but we need to go over them for the record.

Have you been deposed before?
A. Yes.
Q. How many times?
A. In several cases. I'd say about -- sorry. If I might refer to my $C V$ just to make sure $I$ have an accurate count here? Seven times before this. Q. Did any of those depositions have any relation to this case?
A. No.
Q. Have you ever testified at a trial before?
A. Yes.
Q. How many times?
A. Sorry, I'm referencing my CV to be accurate. Four times.
Q. Did your testimony in any of those instances have any relation to this case?
A. No.
Q. So even though you seem like you're an experienced hand at deposition testifying, I do still want to go over a couple of ground rules if that's all right.

Start, if you don't understand a question that I ask, either because you can't hear me, which seems to be a problem today, it's all on me, or because the question is just unintelligible, please ask me to repeat or rephrase the question and I'll do my best to rephrase or re-ask for you. Is that
all right?
A. Yes.
Q. If your attorney objects to any question that I ask, please don't answer until your attorney has fully stated their objection and, if necessary, they and I finish discussing it. Then I'll either ask you to answer the question or I may try to rephrase to address the objection or your attorney may just simply tell you not to answer. But, if you could, please try to let the objection process work out before you start talking. Is that all right? A. Yes.
Q. Please don't guess at any answer that I ask. If you don't recall specifically the information, it's fine to say that you don't recall or if you want to provide a reasonable estimate of anything that I might ask at the time but please no guesswork. Is that all right?
A. That's fine.
Q. If during the deposition, if at any point you recall information that relates to a previous question that I asked, that you might not have remembered at the time but maybe another question jogs your memory, would you please let me know if that happens so we can make sure the record is
complete?
A. Yes.
Q. We're also going to try to make the court reporter's job as easy as we can. There will be crosstalk at times. But, ideally, only one of us should be speaking at a time so that the court reporter can have an easier job reporting what's being said.

If I talk over you or cut into you while you were answering a question, please let me know that you weren't done and I'll apologize and certainly give you the opportunity to finish your answer. If it's all right with you, if you could try not to interrupt me if I'm asking a question, even if you think you know where it s going, that way we don't have crosstalk; is that all right?
A. Yes.
Q. One of my deposition rules is that $I$ don't believe a deposition should be endurance sports. So if at any time -- I usually try to take a break once an hour for at least five minutes for a comfort break. If you want a break besides that, all you have to do is let me know.

If there's a question pending, I may ask you to answer the question, and then we can go on break,
but I'm not going to be rude about that. If you need to take a break for whatever reason, that's fine. Please just let me know and I'll make sure to accommodate it.
A. Okay.
Q. And do you have any questions regarding the conduct of the deposition itself or anything that we talked about?
A. No.
Q. Is there anything that you're aware that would prevent you from testifying truthfully and accurately this morning?
A. No.
Q. No alcohol, no druģs, no medications, nothing like that?
A. No.
Q. I'm sorry I always have to ask those questions to rake sure that the deposition is valid. Sometimes they can come across as a little bit rude. I just asked and I appreciate your answer. Sorry, actually.
A. I know. It's always great to get asked that at ten in the morning.
Q. Some people start early, I suppose. If we could, I'd like to talk a little bit about your --
if I could, I'd like to talk about your preparation for the deposition. What, if any, documents did you review in preparation for this deposition?
A. Just my report.
Q. Anything besides your report that you can recall?
A. No.
Q. Did you speak with anyone about this deposition? And if -- did you speak with anyone about this deposition?
A. Just the -- some of the attorneys who are present today.
Q. Other than reviewing your expert report and speaking to counsel, did you do anything else to prepare for this deposition?
A. No.
Q. I'm going tio start with your expert report and I'm going to attempt to share it and we'll see how this goes. All right.

MR. RIEGER: Ms. Honeycutt, these are not premarked. So at this time, hopefully everyone has got what I'd like to call deposition Exhibit 1 which is the expert report. If you'll let me know whenever you have that and have it up, opened up.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Counselor, I see the
link. Are you going to open it at this time? MR. RIEGER: Yes.

THE WITNESS: And if it's okay, I also have a clean copy of it here in front of me as well. BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Are you familiar with this document,

Dr. Burch?
A. I can't see it. Do I need to open it?
Q. Yes, please.
A. Oh, okay. I'm sorry, I don't know where it went on my computer. Let me see. Open file. All right. Yes. This appears to be a copy of my report.

MR. RIEGER: At this time, Ms. Honeycutt, if I could introduce this as deposition Exhibit Number 1.

MR. CharLes GRANT: No objection.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 1.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. And, Dr. Burch, if I could, I'd like to start with Exhibit A to deposition Exhibit 1, which is your CV which I believe starts on page 43 of the PDF. If I could, could I get you to turn to Exhibit A?
A. Yes. I have it.
Q. Can you identify this for me?
A. It appears to be a copy of my CV.
Q. Do you recall at what date this CV was created?
A. I don't but probably sometime in February.
Q. Do you have any updates to your CV since?
A. Yes. I believe I provided an updated $C V$ to my attorneys earlier this week.
Q. I'd like to upload another document into the chat. And if everyone could open that for me.

And, Dr. Burch, are you faniliar with this document?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. It is the upaated CV that I provided earlier this week.

MP. RIEGER: At this time, I'd like to introduce the updated CV as deposition Exhibit 2.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: No objection.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 2.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Are there any further updates to this CV that aren't mentioned in here?
A. I don't believe so.
Q. If I could, I'd like to start with your educational background.

Would you mind giving me a brief description of it?
A. Yes. I finished my undergraduate work at Princeton in politics, which is what they call political science, and a minor in African-American studies. And then my Ph.D. is in government, which is what they call political science an social policy, which is a separate field, a separate department at Harvard University Q. I note that your CV dores not include a date that you received your Ph . Do you know what that is off the top of your head?
A. 2007 .
Q. 2007. Did any of your Ph.D. education at Harvard include -- did any of your Ph.D. education at Harvard involve voting rights?
A. Yes. We studied all aspects of elections and participation.
Q. Did that include felon voter
re-enfranchisement?
A. Yes.
Q. When I talk about felon voter
re-enfranchisement, I may use them interchangeably, felon voter restoration.

Am I right to say those -- do you understand those terms are synonymous?
A. Yes, that's fine.
Q. Did any part of your Ph.D. education at Harvard involve any aspect of Tennessee's either voter rights process or felon voter re-enfranchisement process?
A. No.
Q. Did any part of your Ph.D. edícation at Harvard involve procedural due process politics?
A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that?
Q. Did any part of your Harvard Ph.D. education include the concepts of procedural due process?
A. Yes.
Q. $\quad$ Can you elaborate for me?
A. We studied and read articles, for instance, related to, just off the top of my head, the impact of professions of procedural due process on beliefs about the justice system.
Q. And do you recall the names or any more specifics about those articles?
A. Some of them were by Tom Tyler.
Q. Anything else that you remember?
A. Not off the top of my head.
Q. And who is -- is it Mr. or Dr. Tyler?
A. Dr. Tyler.
Q. Can you tell me about him, please.
A. Tell you about Dr. Tyler, who -- his
articles?
Q. Yes, ma'am.
A. He is a professor who is at -- for some reason $I$ think he's at Yale, but I could be wrong about that, and does experimental work on perceptions of due process and procedural justice, fairly well known in modern society circles. Q. Do you recall if any ca Dr. Tyler's works regarding the perceptions of due process involve the voting context?
A. I don't know. There -- a lot of them are related to crimiaal justice so -- and processes more generally, but there are dozens of articles.
Q. Could you describe your Ph.D. dissertation for me, please?
A. Yes. The dissertation titled Punishment and Participation looked at several aspects of voting among people with felony convictions including, measuring whether people in several different states re-registered to vote after a felony conviction, as
well as looking at some of the -- some state regulations and trying to predict what factors led to the certain states adopting the restrictions as they did on felony voting and, finally, a more -- a spatial analysis of removals from communities and the effect of those removals on the voting participation of people who are left behind.
Q. Do you recall if your dissertation discussed or evaluated Tennessee's restoration process?
A. It did not.
Q. Did it discuss Tennessee at all?
A. It did not.
Q. Could you tell me about your undergraduate education, please?
A. I'm sorry, what aspect?
Q. Just describe it generally, please.
A. I'm sorry I'm having a really hard time answering that question.
Q. I could certainly rephrase.
A. Okay, thank you.
Q. Where did you go to school for undergraduate education?
A. At Princeton.
Q. What did you get your degree in?
A. In politics, which is what they call
political science.
Q. During your undergraduate education, did you receive any education regarding voting rights?
A. Yes. I took classes on political
participation and behavior and American politics generally.
Q. Did any of those classes involve felon
restoration?
A. No.
Q. Did any of those classes discuss voting rights in Tennessee?
A. Not that I can recall.
Q. What do you mean by not exactly?
A. Not that I can recail. It was 20 years ago, so it may have happened but I don't know.
Q. Okay. Is there any other education that you have that isn't reflected in the CV?
A. I may have done some summer coursework at Duke when $I$ was an undergraduate for credit but not for a degree.
Q. Do you recall if some of those reports had anything to do with voting rights?
A. We did discuss voting rights in two -- in a couple of those courses, yes.
Q. Did any of those courses discuss felon
restoration?
A. No.
Q. Did any of those courses discuss Tennessee at all?
A. No.
Q. If I could move up to your employment on the CV. I'll start from the earliest. What was your first job after receiving this Ph.D.?
A. So I was hired jointly as a research professor at the American Bar Foundation, as well as at an assistant professor in political science at Northwestern.
Q. Did you teach any classes while you were an assistant professor at Northwestern?
A. Yes.
Q. What were those classes?
A. I taught intro to American politics for undergraduates. I taught a course on the welfare state and redistribution for both undergraduates and graduate and separately for graduate students. I taught undergraduate course Law in the Political Arena. Another course, let's see, I taught Race and Public Policy for undergraduates. I taught Criminal Justice Politics and Policy as well.
Q. Did any of those courses involve felon
restoration?
A. Yes. I did occasionally cover topics related to voting after a felony conviction and sometimes restoration too.
Q. Do you recall the substance of what you would teach on those subjects?
A. For undergraduate, typically we would talk about the existence of laws, as well as some of the -- we just discussed some of the patterns of percentages of people who were disenfranchised, as well as some discussion about barriers to reentry and re-enfranchisement generally For graduate students, it was more involved. Sometimes we would discuss both -- graduate seminars tend to be studying both topics but also methods of how to study something.

So we would talk about -- I would either use the methodology from some of my own work as an example or we'd talk about -- for instance, if we were talking about something like a barrier to voting, we might talk about how to -- how certain -how people in past studies might have covered or tried to get at measurement issues, for instance. Q. Do you recall any of the barriers that you would teach about in those courses?
A.

Yes. So in a course that I taught later as an associate professor in political behavior, we would talk about all kinds of barriers. So I remember doing a week where we talked about moving polling places, for instance, or voter ID. So there would be -- we would cover a lot of different kinds of barriers, not just the barriers posed by a felony conviction.
Q. Did any of the courses involve a discussion of Tennessee?
A. I can't recall. I'm trying $-\cdots$ I can't recall. I may have assigned one of the pieces that I cite in my report, the Meredith and Morse piece, that covers both Alabama and Tennessee as some examples but I -- it was several years ago so I can't recall specifically which article I assigned. Q. In your $-\underset{\text { I believe earlier you mentioned }}{\text { I }}$ you were a research professor for the American Bar Foundation?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe that for me?
A. So they buy out half of my appointments, my teaching and service and the like at Northwestern, and it basically gives me enough -- the time to do the research I would do similar to what I would do
at Northwestern, but also under the auspices of ABF. Q. Thank you. Did any part of your work at the American Bar Foundation deal with Tennessee or felon restoration in Tennessee?
A. No.
Q. Thank you. If I could, I'd like to now turn to the publications portion of your CV, please. And rather than go through them one at a time and line by line, would you mind telling me which of these publications involve in any way felon restoration? A. Yes. That would be -- I'm scrolling down to page -- I think this is page two, the 2014 article, the effects of imprisonment and community supervision on political participation. My 2013 book Trading Democracy for Justice. I skipped something. I'm sory.

My 2012 puolication, Did Disenfranchisement Laws Help Eleet President Bush? 2011, Turnout and Party Registration Among Criminal Offenders in the 2008 general election. And I think that's it. The other ones deal with voting is but not necessarily related to people with felony convictions.
Q. If I could go back to your -- now, if I could go back to the first one you mentioned, which was 2014, The Effects of Imprisonment and Community

Supervision on Political Participation, can you describe that for me?
A. Yes. That article is focused on North Carolina and looks at both -- it looks at the spatial distribution of people who have been imprisoned in North Carolina, as well as those who are serving sentences under community supervision. So all of those people who are disenfranchised, and both look at -- and looks at the effects of convictions and punishment on voter turnout in those neighborhoods, those communities where the people are under just supervision or hate been removed and are in prison.
Q. Does that article by chance happen to have anything to do with your testimony in Community Success Initiatives, et al. versus Timothy J. Moore out of Wake County, North Carolina?
A. I reference the article in my testimony but I'm not sure what you mean by have anything to do with.
Q. So the article was written before your testimony?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. If I could go to the next one on the list, which is 2013, Trading Democracy for

Justice, Criminal Convictions and the Decline of Neighborhood Political Participation. Could you describe that for me, please?
A. Yes. So that book is similar to the 2014 article but on a larger scale. So it measures, again, the spatial, the community impact of incarceration in Georgia, North Carolina, I have a couple footnotes in Florida, in order to see how the concentration of people with felony convictions into certain communities affect voter turnout in those communities.
Q. Did either the article tifled The Effects of Imprisonment and Community Supervision on Political Participation or Trading Eemocracy for Justice, Criminal Convictions and the Decline of Neighborhood Political Participation reference or discuss Tennessee at all?
A. No.
Q. Did the states at issue in those two articles have a felon restoration process where you fail and had to affirmatively request for re-enfranchisement?
A. No.
Q. What were the processes like in states at issue in those two articles?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q.

What were the felon restoration processes in the states at issue in those two articles?
A. So they are -- the processes are sort of labeled as automatic, although there still may be some question, for instance, as to whether a person has paid all their fines and fees.
Q. When you say automatic, can you describe that for me?
A. So they just say there's automatic restoration. But I think that it's not necessarily clear that that means that a person has to do nothing in order to get their voting right back. Q. When you say automatic, what's the triggering event that makes the process automatic?
A. So it's supposed to be at the end -- the completion of the sentence.
Q. Do those etates at issue have requirements that court costs or fees or child support or anything like that be current or paid in order to be re-enfranchised?
A. Yes. So with -- so with respect to Georgia, yes with respect to court costs and fees. And in North Carolina, it has -- for some people who are on probation, in order to exit probation you have to have paid all of your court costs and fees.
Q.

How do those states that are the subject of those two articles confirm in compliance with the requirements that court costs, child support, or what have you be current or paid?
A. It varies. So I don't -- I haven't seen any routinized process by which that happens.
Q. Could you elaborate a little more on that?
A. I was just saying I think it -- it -- as far as I know, that there's no -- it could vary by county. And, again, like I said, even $\ddagger$ or North Carolina there are some probationers for whom it's not clear how that process works out. I think the individual probation officer may have to sign off on whether the person is finished.

And I should also note that right now in North Carolina, that sort of part of what got litigated in Comunity Success Initiative in terms of the need for paying fines and fees with respect to people who are still on probation in order to be removed from probation. I'm not quite sure where that decision is right now, the status of what the courts have ruled on that. But that may no longer be a requirement as of 2020 or 2021 when they made that ruling, but then I don't know if they've reversed it or not. So that part for North Carolina
is up in the air.
Q. Do you know whether or not the states at issue in those two articles had decentralized processes for felon restoration?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. I'm sorry. Do you know whether or not the states at issue in those two articles had decentralized processes for felon restoration?
A. It depends on what you mean by decentralized.

I know that probation officers played a role but they all work for the state so I'm not -- so it's kind of hard to characterize it as centralized or decentralized.
Q. Earlier you referenced that some determination of court costs or other payables was done at a county level. Can you describe that a little bit more?
A. I think that that was by probation officers.
Q. Okay. I just wanted to clarify that we are talking about the same thing. Thank you.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Did either of the states at issue in those two articles have either an appeal or a judicial process that allowed a felon who is denied restoration to go to courts to, essentially, appeal
an adverse decision?
A. I didn't examine that.
Q. If I could move on to the next article you referenced, which is the 2012, Did dis- -- dis- --
A. Disfranchisement, yes. That's old. The technically correct word for it.
Q. Just to clarify, do you understand
disfranchisement to be the same concept as disenfranchisement?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. Just want to make sure we're all talking about the same thing. So for that article, can you describe it for me?
A. So that article takes my estimate of the likelihood of casting ballots in multiple elections of people with felony convictions by race and gender and uses those estimates to predict what would have happened in Fiorida had people with felony convictions had the right to vote in the 2000 general election.
Q. Do you recall what Florida's restoration process looked like back then?
A. It was changing. So from my understanding, it was based on pardons. And then I think in 2006 Governor Crist opened up re-enfranchisement and it
may have been an application process. And then I think that changed again when a new governor was elected. So it -- it changed quite -- it was shifting over -- back and forth over the period of time that $I$ was studying.
Q. Did that article discuss Tennessee at all?
A. No.
Q. Did that article discuss whether or not there were errors in Florida's felon restoration process at that time?
A. No.
Q. Moving on to the next artacle, which is the 2011 Turnout and Party Regist Cation Among Criminal Offenders in the 2008 General Election, would you describe that for me?
A. That is an arcicle that estimates voter turnout in 2008 but I think also in 2000 and 2004 for people with felony convictions in several states by race and age and gender, crime type, I think, and other demographics characteristics.
Q. Did that article discuss Tennessee at all?
A. Could you repeat the last little bit of that?
Q. Sorry. Did that article discuss Tennessee at all?
A. No.
Q. Did it discuss any state-specific felon restoration process?
A. It probably describes them just as -- just for the -- briefly for the reader.
Q. Do you recall whether or not -- do you recall whether or not that article discussed the difference between a centralized and a decentralized felon restoration process?
A. It did not.
Q. And I may have asked this alreajy. Did that article discuss or identify any potential errors in any felon restoration process?
A. It did not.
Q. Thank you. To your knowledge, did any of the -- anything in your publications section of your CV discuss or identify errors in a -- simple errors in the -- in a felon restoration process?
A. So the paper here, the 2011 paper, Fixing the Broken System of Financial Sanction actually talks about errors and difficulties with LFO records nationally. And I have referenced -- and that work, for instance, $I$ discuss a little bit in my report on Florida's restoration process in the case Jones versus DeSantis.
Q. Can you describe what Florida's restoration
process was at that time?
A. So for the case that I'm talking about here, that was the case that took place after Florida passed legislation that required people to complete -- pay all of their assessed fines and court costs at the time -- before they could be restored to vote.
Q. Do you recall what your conclusions of that article were?
A. In which article?
Q. The 2011 article?
A. Oh, yes. Fixing the Broken System of

Financial Sanction. That there needed to be an investment in technology to centralize and upgrade databases of keeping legal financial obligations, along with some other changes.
Q. Did any of the articles in your publications section discuss how states that have -- sorry, strike that.

Can you explain to me what you mean by the term LFO?
A. Legal financial obligation.
Q. And what do those include?
A. They can include everything from traffic tickets to child support to court costs and jail
costs. There's actually a wide variety of them. Q. If I use the term LFO, can we agree that it is what you just described?
A. Yes.
Q. In states that have LFO requirements -- I'm sorry, strike that.

In any of your publications, do you discuss at all how states with LFO requirements for felon restoration handle LFOs that may exist from out-of-state convictions?
A. I don't think so.
Q. If -- if -- do any of your publications besides the ones we already discussed deal with LFOs?
A. No.
Q. Do any of your publications discuss -- do any of your articles ciiscuss whether or not -- strike that.

Do any of the articles discuss your personal opinion about LFOs?
A. What do you mean by personal opinion?
Q. Let me rephrase. Do you have a position on whether LFOs should be a requirement for felon re-enfranchisement?
A. I don't.
Q. Do you have an opinion on it?
A. I just think that it -- my -- my opinion, basically, is that most states don't have good enough records to be able to implement such a -those kinds of LFO requirements. So that's what I think the point of the financial sanctions piece is. Q. Which states?
A. In general, both the literature, as well as the states that I have studied for cases, for instance, don't keep records that are complete enough to be able to always be sure that they can use LFO or even calculate how much people owe or make it clear how much people owe for LFOs.
Q. Can you recall any state specifically? A. Yes. So I belicve that there's a multi-state study by Beckett and Harris and some others that talk about this in relation to Washington State and several others, as well as my work in Florida. I also saw some examples of this in my work on this case.
Q. Any others that you can recall?
A. No.
Q. Do you believe that any process -- sorry.

Do you believe than any recordkeeping process would be sufficient to permit LFOs as a requirement
for felon re-enfranchisement?
A. Can you say that again?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Counselor, can you
repeat your question, please?
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Certainly. Do you believe that any
recordkeeping process -- strike that.
Do you believe that any recordkeeping process would be sufficient to completely eliminate any sort of errors regarding LFOs as a requirement for felon re-enfranchisement?
A. I think it's possible.
Q. What would that look like?
A. The record would be complete, which seems like a low bar but it's actually not, a bar that I think is really difficult to meet. It would be complete. And it would contain information both about -- and elarity about what's out and also some indication of what's been paid and how much is still owed.
Q. Is any state process what you consider a model of acceptable recordkeeping to justify LFOs as a condition for felon re-enfranchisement?
A. I haven't studied all of them.
Q. Do you have a belief as to whether or not it
would even be possible to implement a system given that certain records and convictions have already occurred?
A. Well, again, that depends on the states and the quality of their records. So if the state is trying to implement a system that requires documents that they don't have, $I$ think that is difficult in practice. But, like I said, it's theoretically possible that if there are good records that you could implement such a system.
Q. What is your -- what is your standard for an effective enough recordkeeping spstem in terms of an error? Does it need to be 100 percent accurate to be acceptable or is that your belief that is what needs to be a requirement?

MR. CHARIES GRANT: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: So I think my standard would be that there should be accuracy and -- but -and if there is a known problem with accuracy, then there should at least be an appeal process or some other kind of process by which you could ascertain the information of eligibility that you need, rather than relying on the standard -- the underlying documents that are problematic.
Q.

Can you describe what you mean by problems in recordkeeping?
A. Records that don't exist because they were either destroyed or archived. Records that are incomplete such that if someone has made a payment but there's no record of that payment.

Typographical or other errors.
Q. Anything other than those?
A. There could be other kinds of errors that I'm not recalling right now, but those are just some examples of what I mean.
Q. I may have asked ask it before but I'll ask it in a different way.

Do you believe that any state has a sufficient enough recordkeeping process to justify LFOs as a condition for felon restoration?
A. Again, I don't -- I haven't studied all of the states, $s=1$ don't know the answer to that. Q. Do you recall if the -- I understand you haven't studied all of the states.

But do you recall a single one that in your view would be sufficient -- as sufficient recordkeeping to justify LFOs as a condition for felon re-enfranchisement?
A. Again, I don't know the answer to that. It's
entirely possible that there are.
Q. But you're not aware of any?
A. No. I haven't studied all of them so I don't know.
Q. How many have you studied?
A. I have personally studied three and recall reading about, maybe off of the top of my head, maybe four more, so a minority.
Q. So up to seven. Do you recall which states they were?
A. So I have done -- like I said, I have done work in North Carolina, Florida, and here in Tennessee. I have read about Washington State, Alabama, and I think California and sorry I'm blanking on one of the other -- on any of the others.
Q. And of those six states that you recall, North Carolina, Florida, Tennessee, Washington, Alabama, and California, is it your view that none of them have sufficient recordkeeping systems to justify using LFOs as a condition for a felon restoration?
A. I am only comfortable speaking right now about the three that $I$ have studied personally. And I would say that no, the records -- there are
definitely problems with the records.
MR. RIEGER: I'm about to move on to another section of the CV. I notice we've been on the record for about an hour. I can press on if you'd like or if anyone would like a break, that's fine me by me.

THE WITNESS: I'm fine with pressing on, but I'm willing to defer to others.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: If we have a comfort break.

MR. RIEGER: We can have a coffee break.
MR. CHARLES GRANT: m a little older
than Dr. Burch.
MR. RIEGER: Say ten minutes?
MR. CHARLES GRANT: That's fine.
(Recess observed.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Dr. Burch, you understand that you're still under oath?
A. Yes.
Q. Thank you. If I could, I would like to scroll down to the next topic on your CV, grants. And can you describe the entry that begins co-principal investigator?
A. Yes. I have an NSF grant that is used at the
$A B F$ to fund fellowship for doctoral and post-doctoral fellows who study law and inequality. Q. Does that grant have anything to do with felon restoration?
A. No.
Q. Does it have anything to do with Tennessee?
A. No. Those are -- there may be students who studied those things on the grant but they are private and not my own.
Q. If I could move down to honors and fellowships. I won't go through these line by line but do any of those honors and fellowships besides the first three which indicate they're for Trading Democracy for Justice which we've previously discussed, do any of the other of these awards and honors and fellowships deal with felon restorations? A. Yes. So I think the -- I might have received the Stanford enter for Poverty and Inequality Grant for work that I completed either for the book or for the article that I talk about. The Trade and Democracy for Justice of the article afterwards. And -- one, two, three -- the next four dissertation prizes, my dissertation was about the restoration and voting of people with felony convictions, as was the IQSS Research Fellowship. Oh, also the
sentencing project fellowship.
Q. Could you describe the sentencing project fellowship for me?
A. Yes. I was working on a -- paper is part of my dissertation and $I$ think the report that the small excerpt of that is on this sentencing project website as a report that $I$ wrote back in 2005, 2006, that time frame. But it was not residential.
Q. Can you explain for the record what you mean by residential?
A. I didn't go and work at the sentencing project.
Q. And if I could get you to scroll down to professional service, please. Did any of these items on your CV under professional service relate to felon restoration?
A. As part of some of these committee assignments J may have read or reviewed articles or research projects related to that topic.
Q. Which ones?
A. So the Best Paper Award Committee for Law and Court. The Kammerer Prize Committee. Associate Editor of Political Behavior. Kalven Prize Committee. Dissertation Prize Committee for Urban Politics. Associate editor, Law and Social Inquiry.

Urban Politics Section Book Prize Committee. And as a journal article reviewer.
Q. All right. If I could get you to discuss those one at time in a little more detail. You can start where you would like.
A. Okay. So, for instance, the top, the APSA Law and Court Section, Best Paper Award Committee, people submit papers on topics related to law and court, and some of those may have dealt with the restoration of voting rights or voting by people with felony convictions.

Similarly, my work on the Kammera Prize Committee, I may have -- I may have had to review either an individual work or bodies of work that were related to restoration of voting right.

As associate editor of political behavior, I typically review several articles a year and some of those articles were related to felony voting right or voting right people with felony convictions.

Similarly, with the Kalven Prize Committee, I may have reviewed a submission that was related to felony voting rights. The Urban Politics Section Dissertation Prize Committee, one of the dissertations we reviewed may have dealt with felony voting rights.

As associate editor of Law and Social
Inquiry, I made decisions on articles and also read and reviewed the articles related to felony voting right along with other topics.

Urban Politics Section Book Prize Committee may have had books submitted that were about voting among people with felony convictions. And I'm often -- for the last, I'm often asked to review for journals -- and this is not an exhaustive list -most of the research that comes through about felony voting rights or voting among people with felony convictions.
Q. Do you recall if any $a^{s}$ the articles reviewed as part of your professional service dealt with Tennessee?
A. I can't recali.
Q. Do you know if any of the articles dealt with LFO recordkeeping?
A. It's likely but $I$ can't recall specifically.
Q. Do you know if any of the articles that you reviewed as part of your professional service items discussed errors in the felon restoration process anywhere?
A. It's likely but $I$ can't recall. These are -this is probably like hundreds of -- yeah. This is
dozens, if not more than a hundred, different publications by this point.
Q. I apologize. I just stepped on you. I'm so sorry. Please continue.
A. That's okay. I was going to say for instance even for one like book prize committee there may have been 20 books submitted.
Q. Did you rely on -- did you rely on any article or book that you reviewed or edited or anything like that in the professional Service? Did you rely on any of those in forming your expert opinion that you didn't cite in Tour expert opinion?
A. That I didn't cite in my expert opinion? I don't believe so.
Q. Okay. Thank you If I could move down to presentations and body of talks on receiving. A. Okay.
Q. Did any of these presentations and invited talks concern or address felon restoration?
A. Yes.
Q. Which ones, please?
A. Let's see. I may have discussed it in Barriers to Voting on page six at Northwestern, January 2018. My testimony before the US Commission on Civil Rights. The Lateral Consequences of Mass

Incarceration. Political Effects of Mass Incarceration before the National Bar Association. Inequalities and Equalities in Cities at Harvard. Saint Olaf, The Collateral Consequence of Mass Incarceration. Texas A\&M University, Trading Democracy for Justice.

University of Kentucky, Reversing Trajectories conference. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard, Trading Democracy for Justice. University of Michigan, Trading Democracy for Justice.

Yale, Trading Democracy for Justice. National Bar Association in Miami in 2013. Loyola University, Mass Imprisonment and Neighborhood Voter Turnouts. Marquette, Collateral Consequence of Mass Imprisonment.

The Yale's Obtaining Democracy conference. The Brown Uni The American Bar Association national meeting on mass imprisonment consequences. University of Madison, Wisconsin, Spatial Concentration of Imprisonment.

American Political Science Association Annual Meeting, theme panel. University of Pennsylvania, Democracy Citizenship and Constitutionalism

Conference. University of Chicago School of Law, Effective Neighborhood Incarceration Rates. Pomona College with a panel on Incarceration Nation. University of Washington, Using Government Data to Study Current and Former Felons. American Bar Foundation, Effective Neighborhood Incarceration Rates. Northwestern, Trading Democracy for Justice.

Law and Society annual meeting. Neighborhood Criminal Justice Involvement and Voter Turnout. Southern Political Science Association - no, I'm sorry. Not that one. University ofllinois at Chicago, Turnout and Party Registration Among Convicted Offenders.

Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association in Toronto. I Wanted to Vote for History. Harris School of Public Policy. Trading Democracy for Justice at the University of Chicago.

Northwestern University School of Law. Did Disfranchisement Laws Help Elect President Bush? University of California at Berkeley. Trading Democracy for Justice. Law and Society Association annual meeting in Montreal. Did Disfranchisement Laws Help Elect President Bush? Law and Society annual meeting.

Trading Democracy for Justice. Midwest Political Science Association. Concentrated Incarceration and How Neighborhood Incarceration Decreases Voter Registration.
Q. Would I be correct in assuming that where a topic references one of the articles listed in your publications, that whatever presentation you gave would be substantially similar to the publication? A. Usually.
Q. Do you recall whether or not any of the presentations and vital talks discussed errors in the felon restoration process an TNhere?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you recall whether or not any of these presentations or invited talks discussed Tennessee or Tennessee's process for felon voter restoration?
A. They -- I cion't recall discussing Tennessee in those talks.
Q. Did any of these talks discuss LFO recordkeeping?
A. Let me just take a quick look. I may have discussed it in Barriers to Voting in 2018 at Northwestern and some of the other more general talks, but $I$ don't recall specifically. Q. Can you describe the Barriers to Voting
presentation for Northwestern University in January of 2018?
A. I can't recall anything about it other than the topic, so that's why I'm saying that it may have discussed those things.
Q. Did any of these presentations and invited talks that aren't already cited in your expert opinion form the basis of any of your expert opinion?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Moving on to working papers Mrder review, does that working paper under resiew, the only item listed, does that concern felon restoration?
A. Sorry. I'm scrolling, still scrolling to -no.
Q. Does that involve voter rights at all?
A. No.
Q. If I could, I'd like now to move to the additional activities portion. And as we discussed, you're an expert witness in Kelvin Jones versus Ron DeSantis. Do you recall what that case was about?
A. Yes. That case was about Florida's requirements of completing all aspects of the sentence before a person was eligible to have their voting rights restored.
Q.

Can you define what you mean by all aspects of the sentence?
A. So the state defines that as prison, probation, parole, as well as fines and fees assessed at sentencing.
Q. Was that case about the process or just about the requirements?
A. I don't know the technical answer to that.
Q. Can you give me a brief description of your expert opinion in that case?
A. Yes. So my expert opinion was about, really to look at the question of how difficult it was to determine whether a person -- how much a person owed in LFOs, as well as what the process was for payment.
Q. Did your expert opinion address errors in the felon voting rescoration process in Florida?
A. Yes.
Q. What were your conclusions on that?
A. So looking at different places in which one might find information about LFOs, most of the time those sources didn't agree. So the clerks' online databases versus what happens if you call the clerk versus information provided by the Florida -- the Florida -- basically, like the -- it's not the

Florida Bureau of Investigation, but I can't remember the exact name of it right now.

Those data sources typically had different amounts due and were missing important information, such as payment information or even just had incorrect totals. So the entries that were listed in the files didn't add up to what the file said the person owed.

Records were just missing or unavailable for some period of time. So yeah. So there were -- and part of the information was just unavailable because it was collected by private entities like collection agencies.
Q. What was your methociology in reaching your expert opinion in that case?
A. So I conducted a random sample of people who had finished serving the supervision portion of their sentences and then began to explore their -so the trying to collect the records and comparing what different sources said that they owed across all of their cases.
Q. How large was your sample size?
A. I think it wound up being over 700 cases for about 150 people.
Q. I want to jump back for a second.

Do you have -- do you have a background in statistics?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe that for me?
A. I took several courses on research
methodology while $I$ was in graduate school, as well as have used various statistical methodologies in my published work, as well as in some of the cases that I have testified in.

And currently I review articles and books. I advise graduate students who are doing complex statistical work. I'm on the board of a national survey and continue to use all kinds of statistical techniques in my work currently.
Q. If I discuss the concept of $P$ value for confidence intervals, I may refer to it as CI, are you familiar with those concepts?
A. Yes.
Q. Can you describe what they are for the record?
A. So $P$ value is a way that some people might think -- it really is referring to the likelihood that a measure or a point could occur by chance and a confidence interview is usually two and a half percent higher or lower than a fine estimate. So
it's usually the 95 confidence interval that you meet. I'm trying to think of a best technical way to put this. But, basically, the most likely range in which the true population estimate would be. Q. Did you perform -- in Jones versus DeSantis, did you perform a statistical analysis through random sampling?
A. I don't recall exactly what analysis I conducted for that case.
Q. Do you know whether or not it was quantitative or qualitative?
A. The -- do you mean -- part of it was quantitative. Part of it was qualitative. So part of the work involved the random sample and part of the work also involved things like calling county clerk's offices to see and, you know, documenting what they said, the answers to some of our questions about what their hours were and the like. So it was both.
Q. Was Florida's process at the time you gave -felon restoration process at the time you made your expert opinion, would you characterize it as automatic?
A. I think it was difficult -- I wouldn't characterize it as automatic because I think there
still had to be quite a few people, a process by which they had to determine eligibility. And I think that was the point, was that it was difficult to determine eligibility.
Q. What was Florida's process at that time?
A. So in my understanding, people were supposed to register and then check $a \operatorname{box}$ and then -- but I think it wasn't -- but from my understanding, I'm not quite sure if then checking the box meant that people in the county were then supposed to determine eligibility and by what basis they vould determine that eligibility. I think that part was unclear in the case.
Q. How did Florida at that time handle out-of-state LFOs as part of their felon voter restoration process?
A. I only stadied the in-state ones.
Q. In your expert opinion in that case, did you make any recommendations as to what Florida's process should look like?
A. I don't know if $I$-- I don't recall doing so in my report, but I do recall having conversations when asked by the opposing attorneys about things like the process should include asking -- some way of incorporating the data from private collection
agencies in order to figure out how much people had actually paid.

They were -- they were talking about going to first dollar mechanism, which I think referred to everything anyone had paid regardless of how it was allocated should count toward the determination of whether a person had paid all their LFOs.

And so I was making recommendations, you know, and questioning about things like well, you also need to then get the records from the private companies which would have the actual information about how much people paid.
Q. Do you recall whether or not at that time Alabama had an appeal option or other legal mechanism for someone to challenge the denial of their felon restoration?
A. Alabama?
Q. Sorry Florida.
A. Florida? I -- so what I recall at that -what I recall is that there was a year-long backlog so I'm not sure -- I think part of the issue in the case was the difficulty in getting a determination in a reasonable amount of time.
Q. What in your opinion is a reasonable amount of time?
A. I think that the calculation in the case was something like it would take years to clear the backlog, so that people would definitely miss several elections.
Q. So years is unreasonable. What in your opinion is reasonable?
A. I don't have an opinion.
Q. Moving on to the next additional activity on your CV, Community Success Initiative versus Moore. We briefly touched upon it earlier, but can you describe that case for me?
A. So that case was about whether the North

Carolina Constitution permittred people serving active sentences in the community to vote or not. Q. So would it be a fair characterization to say that that case challenged North Carolina's requirement that someone complete their probation before they were eligible for felon voting restoration?
A. Yes.
Q. Did that touch upon any part of -- I'm sorry. Strike that.

Did the plaintiff in that case challenge the process at all for felon voting restoration or just the requirement that all aspects of the sentence be
completed?
A. I think that there was some discussion about the issue about people being on probation indefinitely until they paid all of their LFOs and I think -- so that part of the case was discussed and I think that the court ruled first on the issue of that -- that particular group of people and that was considered differently from overall people who were still serving active probation sentences. Q. What was your expert opinion in that case? A. So my expert opinion was to $\cdots$ involved calculating the size of the population, as well as the likely voter turnout, and to do a literature review relevant to some of the state interests in the case. So my conclusions -- I don't recall the exact number of peopie that I said, the size of the population or the percentage that I said would vote.

And then I also found that the literature on restoration didn't support the claims made on behalf of the state, that the state was making on behalf of the law.
Q. What was your methodology in that case?
A. So to determine the eligibility, the size of the eligible population, that involved working with the North Carolina Department of Corrections [sic]
file and then merging those files with the North Carolina voter files.
Q. Do you recall either your $P$ value your CI as to your numbers?
A. No.
Q. Was North Carolina's -- can you describe for me how North Carolina would determine whether or not someone has paid all of their LFOs?
A. My understanding is that the Department of Correction would keep those data. Specifically the -- and I think the probation officer or parole officer was involved in that determination. Q. Was that for both in-state and out-of-state LFOs?
A. I don't know. So I didn't study the specific process in detail, just to kind of, just mostly to know where it was located in terms of the discussion of probation $6 f f i c e r s$ having some discretion in terms of how they would -- how they treated those LFOs which would lead to inequality.
Q. Can you expand on some of the ways that LFOs could be treated differently that would lead to inequality?
A. So say someone is -- someone could get, for instance, early release if they paid off all of
their LFOs early and sometimes that was at the discretion of the officer.
Q. What if someone had paid their LFOs and was off probation, was their restoration of voting rights automatic?
A. Yes. They were supposed to receive a certificate, a packet of information from the Department of Corrections.
Q. In that case, did you identify any errors in the LFO recordkeeping?
A. No. I did not get involved in that aspect of the case.
Q. Did you make any recommendations in your expert opinion as to what the process should be?
A. I don't think sc.
Q. And if $I$ could go -- I'm done with Community Success Initiatise, but I do want to ask additional questions about Jones versus DeSantis.
A. Okay.
Q. In that case, did you identify any errors in their felon voter restoration process?
A. To the extent that I found, like I said, cases with discrepancies, yes.
Q. What types of discrepancies?
A. So, as I said before, cases where when you
look at the records held by the counties, they would have several entries, credits and debits that didn't add up to the number that they said they did.

Or if you look at the record that they would have online, it would say something different from the record that you would get if you called the office. I believe in a couple of instances, for instance, the clerk literally said that's not right, we're going to have to fix that, and then would edit records as we asked about them.

Or records that where the person may have paid $\$ 100$ but only $\$ 60$ would show up on the record because the collection agency took 40 percent off the top and only reported $\$ 60$ to the county. So lots of different kinds of errors. There were also just documents that were missing, so we would have clerks we would sall and they couldn't find any record.
Q. If I could draw your attention to the third item, additional activities. People First of Alabama versus Merrill. Can you describe that for me?
A. That was about voting in -- COVID accommodations for voting.
Q. Did that implicate the felon restoration
process at all?
A. No.
Q. Moving on to Florida State Conference of the NAACP versus Lee, in the Northern District of Florida, can you describe that for me?
A. That case was about some changes that were made to early voting and drop boxes and other provisions of casting ballots in the state. Q. Did that case or your expertise in that case address felon voting restoration?
A. No. No.
Q. Moving on to One Wisconsin Institute, Incorporated versus Jacobs out of the Western District of Wisconsin, car you describe that for me? A. That case -- in that case, it was -- overall it was about voter 15. And my part of it was about analyzing the specific process by which Wisconsin was giving people the free voter ID for people who had problems getting the documents.
Q. Did that have anything to do with felon voting restoration?
A. No.
Q. Moving on to Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity versus Raffensperger, can you describe that for me? A. That case is a state redistricting -- state
legislative redistricting case.
Q. What was your expert opinion in that case about?
A. I think I covered Senate Factors 5 and 8.
Q. Which were?
A. Senate Factor 5 is about the extent that the minority group experiences discrimination in areas such as health, employment, criminal justice, socioeconomic status that would affect voting. And Factor 8 is about responsiveness of public officials to minority voters.
Q. Does that have any reference to felon voting restoration?
A. I think I discussed briefly
disenfranchisement in the part of Senate Factor 5.
Q. Could you expand on that a little bit?
A. Just in a general discussion of criminal justice in Georgia, inequality in terms of arrests, conviction, sentencing, and felony
disenfranchisement.
Q. Did you discuss the -- did you discuss Georgia's specific felon re-enfranchisement process? A. No.
Q. Did you discuss LFO obligations in that case?
A. No. I don't think so.
Q. Did you attempt to identify any errors in either LFO recordkeeping or felon restoration process?
A. No.
Q. Moving on to the Robertson versus Ardoin.

Did I pronounce that correctly?
A. I think so.
Q. Okay. And I see there are two on your CV.

So this is the one that is docketed Number
22-cv-00211. Can you describe that for me?
A. That is I think the congressional
redistricting case in Louisiana.
Q. And what was the count in that case?
A. That of the enacted district's
underrepresent -- caused minorities to be underrepresented.
Q. Would you - so was that a Section 2 Voting Rights Act case?
A. Yes.
Q. And did your expert opinion in that case discuss felon restoration at all?
A. No. Only to the extent that I discussed disenfranchisement as part of the Senate Factor 5 discussion.
Q. Okay. Did you discuss the direct LFO
obligations or recordkeeping?
A. No.
Q. Did your expert opinion in that case discuss errors in either the LFO process or felon restoration process?
A. No.
Q. The next one -- Louisiana always has the hard names to pronounce -- Nairne, et al. versus Ardoin?
A. I think that's right. That's a state
legislative case. I think kind of -- and I did similar work, Senate Factors 5 throllgh 9.
Q. Okay. Were those -- would you consider those sister cases?
A. I don't know. I don t think they're considered -- they are considered -- they -- I'm testifying in them separately. They haven't been combined. But I cion't know the ins and outs of how that works legally.
Q. Okay. Did that case involve anything concerning felon restoration?
A. Again, similar to the other case -- the other cases, just to the extent that $I$ have discussed it as far as Senate Factor 5.
Q. Did it discuss any LFO obligations or LFO recordkeeping?
A. No.
Q. As part of your expert opinion in that case, did you identify any errors as part of the either LFO recordkeeping or felon restoration process? A. No.
Q. And then, lastly, White, et al. versus State Board of Election Commissioners. Can you describe that for me?
A. That is a redistricting case for $I$ think the State Supreme Court in Mississippi. And I completed a Senate Factor 5 analysis for that Ease.
Q. I think I know what the answer to this is going to be but I do need to ask.

Did that case involve felon voting restoration at all?
A. Only to the extent that $I$ discussed it as part of Senate Factor 5, disenfranchisement.
Q. Did it discuss LFO obligations or LFO recordkeeping at all?
A. No.
Q. Did your expert opinion address errors in either the LFO recordkeeping or felon voter restoration process?
A. No.

MR. RIEGER: All right. Moving away
from the CV. If I could get you to go to the beginning of your expert report, please. Is this a -- since we're about to deal directly with the report, how is everyone doing in terms of food? A. I can -- I am -- I can wait but it's up to everyone else in terms of -- I'm not sure how -what your next natural break will be.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Are you going to have lunch, Alex?

MR. RIEGER: I think so. At least a -I think 30 to 35 .

MR. CHARLES GRANT: What do you think would be a good time for lunch given that it's 12:21?

MR. RIEGER: Well, I think if we break at 12:30 and come back at 1:15 I can create a break point in the next ten minutes, if that works.

MP. CHARLES GRANT: If it's all right with you, Dr. Burch, let's proceed.

THE WITNESS: All right.
MR. RIEGER: All right.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. So, Dr. Burch, when were you contacted to provide expert services in this matter?
A. I believe in the spring or summer of 2021.
Q. What exactly were you asked to do?
A. So I was asked to evaluate the number of people who would be -- who had been, basically, affected by Tennessee's disenfranchisement processes and who would then be eligible to restore their voting rights with the COR. And also to determine whether there were aspects of the process that made it difficult for people to have their right restored that might make it so that eligible people either weren't getting their right restored, either because they couldn't make it through the process or were denied erroneously. And also to look into whether the process treated people urequally, similarly situated people unequally.
Q. What do you believe that you are an expert in?
A. Could you repeat the last part?
Q. Sure. Jhat do you believe you're an expert in?
A. I would say in political behavior and barriers to voting, criminal justice, and race and ethnic politics.
Q. Have you previously opined in writing or otherwise about Tennessee's certificate of restoration process?
A. No.
Q. Have you done any work regarding Tennessee's certificate of restoration process that is not reflected or cited to in your expert report?
A. No.
Q. You've given a number of expert opinions in prior cases.

Have you ever given an expert opinion supporting a state's position?
A. In terms of what do you mean by supporting?
Q. In litigation, have you ever given an expert opinion on the state's behalf?
A. Oh, no. I have never been asked to.
Q. In your expert opinions throughout the
various litigations you have testified in, have you ever found a state's process, either in redistricting or voter restoration, LFO recordkeeping, acceptable?
A. I don't think I have ever actually opined about acceptability either way.
Q. So would it be fair to characterize each of your expert opinions as being in opposition to a state's position?
A. No. I don't think that's fair.
Q. Okay. How would you characterize it, then,
please?
A. Usually I'm just asking a specific -answering a specific question that $I$ was asked but not necessarily contra or for or against any particular side.
Q. Well, I may need to go back to your CV for a second. If I can get you to go to the back where it says: Additional activities, which would be PDF 51 out of 55 and page nine of Exhibit A to deposition Exhibit 1 .
A. Okay.
Q. We'll start at the bottom. White, et al.
versus State Board of Election Commissioners, you testified that you performed a Senate Factor 5 analysis; is that right
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. What did your analysis find?
A. That there were historical disparities in between the racial groups that $I$ was studying with respect to housing or socioeconomic status or health that were a result of discrimination.
Q. Do you believe that that opinion supported or did not support the redistricting map of Mississippi?
A. I didn't evaluate the redistricting map.

Just that particular aspect.
Q. Was your expert opinion used by plaintiffs to challenge the redistricting map in Mississippi?
A. Well, it's -- I haven't been deposed or anything like that so $I$ don't -- in that particular case so I don't know yet how they plan to use it. Q. So is it your opinion that an expert opinion finding that there is substantial discrimination in the redistricting map is not opposing a redistricting map?
A. I think that part is up to a judge to decide.

I just answered the one question 1 was asked to answer.
Q. And you found that the redistricting map had discriminatory elements?
A. No. That's not what I said.
Q. Okay. Can you describe it for me?
A. Yes. Shat the -- again, there were disparities in the situation of the racial groups in the state and in the district that was at issue, the central district, in terms of socioeconomic status and race -- socioeconomic status, education, employment, criminal justice, health, et cetera. And those were the result -- partly the result of discrimination.
Q.

Do you believe that either those disparities or discrimination were a positive or negative attribute of the redistricting map?
A. I don't think I have discussed the redistricting -- part of the redistricting map. Q. Do you believe that's -- do you believe that in that case the disparities and the discriminatory effects that you referenced were a positive or a negative?
A. For what?
Q. Just in general?
A. I just think they were facts. I didn't have a -- I didn't make a value judgment about them. Q. Okay. So you make no value judgment as to whether or not discrimination was made in the context of the White, et al. case?
A. No. I jusi said that it -- that the disparities erist and they were the result of discrimination.
Q. Do you have any expectation as to how the plaintiffs are going to use your expert opinion in that case?
A. Again, I don't know whether or how they plan to use the expert opinion.
Q. If I asked you those same questions about all
of the redistricting cases in your additional activities would I expect similar answers?
A. No. Those I do -- those cases I have been deposed and everything else, so I actually know that they plan to use my report.
Q. And how do they plan to use your report in each of those redistricting cases?
A. To go toward the totality of the circumstances for the consideration of the Senate Factors.
Q. In support or in opposition to the map?
A. I don't know if it's in support or opposition to the map, but I think it is for the discussion of the totality of the circumstances.
Q. Explain to me hoty Senate Factor 5 works in a VRN analysis.

MR. CharLes GRANT: Objection to the form of the guestion.

THE WITNESS: So I don't really know how like judges and lawyers consider it. But my part is just to answer the particular question with respect to Senate Factor 5. Other Senate factors I think are specifically analyzing questions about the math itself, such as whether you can draw additional districts and the like, majority, minority districts
and the like.
And my opinion in Senate Factor 5 is just about those other questions that are asked about, that judges may consider when formulating an opinion about what to do about the map. BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Describe for me your understanding of the totality of the circumstances.
A. So in addition --

MR. CHARLES GRANT: I'm soxry,
Dr. Burch, let me have my objection I apologize. Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: So my understanding is that the other part of the Senate factor with respect to the map have to be met and then additional factors that the judge or judges may consider would be those totality of the circumstances BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Do you believe that your expert opinions in those cases made it more or less likely that the court would find that the redistricting map was unconstitutional under the totality of the circumstances?
A. I actually don't know the answer to that
because I think they're all still pending.
Q. What do you think the impact of your expert opinions in those cases would be? What did you expect it to be?
A. I don't know.
Q. So you have no opinion on whether or not expert opinions finding disparities and discrimination would make it more or less likely for the court to find the totality of the circumstances that a map is unconstitutional?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't have an opinion.
I don't know.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. In Jones versus DeSantis, one of the non-redistricting cases, was your expert report used on behalf of plaintiffs or on behalf of defendants?
A. On behalf of the plaintiffs.
Q. What was your expectation about what your expert opinion would demonstrate?
A. My findings were just about discrepancies and disparities in terms of how records were kept.
Q. Did you anticipate that your expert report would be used to challenge the process in Florida?
A.

When I started out, I didn't know what I was going to find. I was just answering the question about whether there were discrepancies and what the process looked like.
Q. Well, I'm not asking about what you found. I was asking you what your expectation of your ultimate opinion would be used for? Do you have an expectation as to how it would be used?
A. Right. So I'm saying when I started out, I actually didn't have an expectation about what $I$ would find so I didn't know it would be used. Q. Did you have an expectation that your expert report would be used by plairtiffs or used by defendants?
A. I had an expectation -- again, I wasn't sure what I would find, so I didn't know whether the plaintiff would ase it or not when I started out.
Q. Have you ever been retained by defendants in a case to provide an expert opinion?
A. Again, I have never been asked by defendants to serve as an expert.
Q. Have you ever asked by a court to serve as any sort of special master or expert?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So your only work in your expert
witness roles has been on behalf of plaintiffs? A. Yes.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Object to the form of the question. BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. And would you say that in -- is it fair to characterize that in each of your additional activities, that in those cases some form of state or local government has always been, or state official or local official, has always been the defendant?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you have any expectation in this case after engagement but befors starting the work, did you have any expectatich as to what your expert report would be used for?
A. No.
Q. None at all?
A. Again, when $I$ started the report $I$ didn't know what $I$ was going to find.
Q. Did you have any guess at that time as to what you would find?
A. Not really.
Q. What do you mean by not really?
A. To the extent that $I$ have done this kind of
work before, I might have expected that there would be -- based on other states, there could be some issues with respect to calculating LFOs, but I wasn't sure, you know, for instance, what Tennessee's process looked like or whether there would be problems. So I didn't really -- so I designed my study as I always do, such that if, you know, I'm conducting random samples and stuff like that, I'm setting not out specifically to prove any particular outcome.
Q. Were you paid for working on this matter?
A. Yes.
Q. Who paid you?
A. Campaign Legal Center.
Q. Do you understand that they represent the plaintiffs in this matter?
A. Yes.
Q. In all of your occasions where you served as an expert witness, were you always paid by plaintiffs or their counsel?
A. Yes.
Q. What's your rate?
A. It varies between three and $\$ 400$ an hour.
Q. How many hours did you spend working on this matter?

I'm not -- I haven't sat down and added it up, but probably well over a hundred.
Q. More than 150?
A. I don't know. Yeah, I don't know the answer to that.
Q. Was there any limitation on the hours that you spent on this report?
A. No.
Q. Who drafted the first draft of this report?
A. I did.
Q. Was any part of it taken fron a prior expert opinion?
A. I may have used some similar citation or something like that from geher expert opinions.
Q. From which expert opinions?
A. So let me find a specific example. I think I cite -- one examole might be I cite -- sorry. I'm trying to -- 50 on page 27, for instance, I cite White, Nathan, and Faller quite a bit across several reports because they have a -- they're looking at some administrative barriers to voting generally so that might appear in this report. I think I might have also cited it in the One Wisconsin report.
Q. Did anyone edit this report?
A. Yes. There may have been definitely some
questions or like point out typos and things of that nature by the attorneys.
Q. Anyone besides the attorneys?
A. No.
Q. Was anything substantively added during the editing process?
A. No.
Q. Were you assisted in this report, not
necessarily the drafting, but in your work as an expert witness, were you assisted by other individuals?
A. Yes.
Q. And can you describe that for me?
A. Yes. I hired some graduate and undergraduate students to help with the collection of data.
Q. And who are those graduate students?
A. Let's see Justin Zimmerman. Andreen
(phonetic) Wright. Dara (phonetic) Gaines. And Arturo Chang-Quinonos (phonetic.)
Q. I'm probably going to get the names very wrong on this, but I think I missed the second person. Was it Andrew?
A. Andreen.
Q. Andreen. And what was his last name, Wright?
A. Wright.
Q. And I did not have Arturo's last name.
A. Chang-Quinones.
Q. Chang-Quinones. Okay, thank you. And who is -- let's start at the top. Who is Justin Zimmerman?
A. Justin Zimmerman is a newly minted Ph.D. as of two weeks ago in political science.
Q. Where did he graduate from?
A. Northwestern.
Q. And what exactly -- what role did he perform for you?
A. So all four of them were part of the shadowing that $I$ described ir Footnote 79, as well also helping me review some of the -- collect some of the legal financial obligation data and helping me review some of the files that were provided to us by the state.
Q. For Mr -- for all four of these individuals, did they primarily perform the same duties as Mr. Zimmerman?
A. Yes.
Q. Are all of them from Northwestern?
A. Yes.
Q. Are all of them either newly minted Ph.D.s or Ph.D. candidates?
A. Yes.

MR. RIEGER: I think now might a good break time. If we want to come back at -- is 1:30 okay?

THE WITNESS: That works for me.
MR. CHARLES GRANT: Sure.
MR. RIEGER: Thank you.
(Lunch recess observed.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Hi, Dr. Burch. You understand that you are still under oath?
A. Yes.
Q. Were you provided anything by anyone when you were in the process of making your expert report? A. Yes.
Q. What were those items?
A. Several Excel spreadsheets that I reference in my report, as well as pdf files of applications for the documentation and the emails for people who had filed for certificate of restoration, as well as other emails, training manuals, policy documents from Tennessee Department of Corrections, and a couple of depositions that $I$ also reference in my report.
Q. And just to start and hopefully make this
process go a little easier, I'm going to go ahead and start asking you questions about some of the documents referenced in your expert report and get those on the record all at once so that way -- so that way we can move beyond that and get to something else. So I am going to share an Excel spreadsheet entitled: All COR Data Carlatina Cedric Aloha. And can you open that up for me?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: That sounds
familiar. Where was it referenced in the report?
THE WITNESS: It was attached in the One
Drive. It was attached in the One Drive. Let me pull up the footnote. Footncte 53.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Okay.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Dr. Burch, are you familiar with this
document?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. I believe it's a list of the -- it's the tracking sheet that the clerk's office in Davidson County uses for people who are -- who they are helping with certificates of restoration.

MR. RIEGER: At this point I would like to have this introduced as deposition Exhibit 3.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Subject to confirmation, Counselor.

MR. RIEGER: I'm sorry, what was that, Charles?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: I don't have my copy of this report in front of me. I said subject to confirmation. You can proceed.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 3.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Okay. I'm going to now post in chat a document entitled: 2022.07.13, © letter from Craig Garrett, the Blount County Ciccuit Court Clerk. It is a pdf if you want to open that. And as referenced in Footnote 59, 60, and 53.

And are you familiar with this document,
Dr. Burch?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. It appears to be a letter issued in response to the subpoena from the plaintiffs asking questions of the Blount County Circuit Court Clerk.

MR. RIEGER: At this time I'd like to move this in as deposition Exhibit Number 4.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as

Exhibit Number 4.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. I'm now going to upload a document entitled: 2022.07.26, a letter from W. Timothy Harvey. If everybody could open that for me, please.

And, Dr. Burch, are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes. I believe I cite it in my report.
Q. Is this the letter that is referenced in Footnote 52 in your expert report?
A. Yes. But I believe I have a Eypo here and I say Marvey instead of Harvey. Serange.
Q. Is the letter identified in Footnote 52 the same as the letter identified in Footnote 50? The one that reflects letter from W. Timothy Harvey the same as letter from $\mathbb{N}$. Timothy Marvey?
A. Yes.

MP. RIEGER: At this time I'd like to introduce that as deposition Exhibit 5, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 5.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. I'm now posting what is marked as 20220725123028938_20220725_13222410756. If everyone could open that up for me.

And, Dr. Burch, is that the document that you referenced in the last line of Footnote Number 50 in your expert report?
A. Yes.
Q. And what is it?
A. It's the response to a subpoena from the Sullivan County Circuit Court Clerk.

MR. RIEGER: At this time I would like to introduce this document as Exhibit 6, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 6.)

MR. CHARLES GRANT: hold on a second. Exhibit 6 is what again?

MR. RIEGER: 20 -- the Sullivan County subpoena response and it's 202207251. It's very long. We haven't changed the file names from when we were provided them along with the expert report. But it is the Sullivan County subpoena responses from --

MR. CHARLES GRANT: And which footnote is referenced?

MR. RIEGER: It is referenced in Footnote Number 50 and in Footnote Number 52.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Well, I thought the report, the footnote that's referenced in the report
concerns Blount County, Blount County and Montgomery County.

MR. RIEGER: In Footnote 50, so it's the letter from Craig Garrett, Blount, from Harvey is Montgomery, and responsive documents reproduced in 3:20-cv-01039, in page ten of that. That document, when you pull it up, is the subpoena responses from Sullivan County Circuit Court Clerk. Looks like all three are the same footnote and it's also referenced in 52 and 57.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Okay.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. I think we're done int coducing documents but we may have more later, depending on how this goes. Need to get in and get started.

So, Dr. Burch, if we could start, what is your understanding of Tennessee's felon restoration process?
A. So specifically with respect to the certificate of restoration process, so people who were convicted of felonies on or after May 18th who fit certain criteria are able to request a certificate of restoration in order to be able to have their voting rights restored and register to vote.
Q.

To your knowledge, is there a legal method, a legal mechanism, to compel a state official to provide a COR for someone who is qualified for one? A. I don't know of one.
Q. If there was, would that impact your expert report?
A. I don't know what you mean by a legal method to compel so I don't -- I don't know.
Q. If there existed a way, for example, say that I am a felon who is free of LFOs, free of child support (inaudible) --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I'm unable to hear.

BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. So I'll start from the beginning. If I were a felon and I had -- and I was free of LFOs, of child support, and had expired my sentence, if I had a legal mecharism to compel a state official to provide me a COR would that change any portion of your expert report?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. If I had the ability to appeal the denial of
a COR, would that -- if $I$ were able -- strike that. If I were able to appeal the denial of my felon voter restoration, would that materially impact any portion of your expert report?
A. It depends.
Q. How would it depend?
A. It would depend on that appeals process and what it would look like, so $I$ don't have enough information.
Q. In Tennessee is the process for getting a COR to your knowledge automatic?
A. No.
Q. How is -- explain that for me.
A. So in some cases, the person has to initiate the process by contacting officials, either a TDOC official or going to the county clerk's office in order to request the certificate of restoration and that starts the process.
Q. Are persons in Tennessee who are eligible for a COR required to seek one out?
A. No.
Q. Have you done any estimation or analysis on how many people are eligible for a COR but have not pursued one?
A. We tried, but that information is impossible
to determine.
Q. So is it your -- so what you're telling me is that it's impossible to determine how many people are eligible for a COR but just have not chosen to take the steps to get one?
A. Right. No one has any records of the people who have chosen to try to start the process, so I don't know who hasn't tried to start the process. Q. If I could get -- if I could get you to look at page seven of deposition Exhibit 1, which is your expert report.
A. Okay.
Q. And these are all still in chat, so if you need to pull it up that's perfectly fine. But if I could draw your attention to your summary of opinions on page four, please?
A. I have ite
Q. Please explain your sentence: Far fewer people in Tennessee have their voting rights restored than are eligible, even relative to restoration and registration rates in other states. A. So that point is referring to the discussion in my report that the number of people that I have calculated to have had their rights restored is smaller than the number of people who are eligible
by either the strictest measures, which is fulfilling all of the criteria with respect to child support, payment of legal financial obligations and the like, and that I have some discussion in my report about relative to other states, including Iowa which has a process that requires an application, Tennessee's rate is still lower than what you see in that state and in other states too. Q. Compare, if you would for me, Tennessee's COR process to Iowa's.
A. Basically, Iowa also requires people to apply for restoration, and so they have to initiate a process and it's not guarantered that they will receive it. But they must meet certain criteria as well.
Q. What LFOs are required in Iowa?
A. I don't recall off of the top of my head.
Q. Do you know if they're the same as Tennessee?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you know the percentage of persons in Iowa who are felons?
A. I don't.
Q. Do you know anything regarding the demographics in Iowa compared to the demographics in Tennessee?
A. I don't.
Q. Did you evaluate any of that when comparing Tennessee to Iowa in your expert report?
A. No. I relied on an article that I cite in my report.
Q. And that article is from 2015?
A. Yes. There may also be -- yes, I believe it's primarily a 2015 article by Meredith and Morse.
Q. Did you compare Tennessee to any other states other than Iowa?
A. Yes. Here on page 18 of my report, I also compare Tennessee to Rhode Island, and Rhode Island and Iowa here I think are the only two that I compared.
Q. Compare Tennessee voter restoration to Rhode Island's, if you wouidn't mind.
A. So here $I$ talk about the fact that voting rights are automatically restored upon completion of the sentence in Rhode Island and that restoration rate was 43.3 percent.
Q. And that's automatic?
A. Yes.
Q. Does that involve any LFOs?
A. I'm not sure.
Q. So you think that Tennessee which has LFOs
and is not an automatic process is mathematically comparable to Rhode Island?
A. I didn't say that Rhode Island doesn't consider LFOs. I just don't recall.
Q. Did you evaluate any differences in felon percentages between Rhode Island and Tennessee in terms of the population?
A. Do you mean in terms of the percent of the population who has a felony?
Q. Yes.
A. No.
Q. Did you look at any demographic differences between Tennessee and Rhode Island?
A. No.
Q. Did either Rhode Island or Iowa have any ability to determine now many -- sorry, strike that.

Did Iowa have any indication of how many people were eligible for CORs but simply does not take the affirmative step of trying to get one?
A. I don't know if that was part of the study, just the estimate of who had received one.
Q. And by the study, are you referring to that Meredith and Morse 2015 study?
A. Yes.
Q. Would you describe that study for me?
A. Yes. So that study looked at the process of restoration in Iowa. Iowa had a change in which there was a short period of time in which there was automatic restoration and then they switched back to requiring an application process. And the study looks at both how many people registered when the application wasn't required and then subsequently what participation and registration was like after the application requirements were reimposed. Q. Did that study do any statistical analyses of estimates?
A. Yes.
Q. What was their methodology?
A. I can't quite recall all of it because it was rather complicated. But I believe there was matching of similarly situated individuals.
Q. Did their statistical analysis -- I'm sorry, strike that.

Was their statistical analysis and the steps and methodology they underwent similar to the one that you perform here?
A. It may have been in some respects.
Q. Elaborate on that. How could it have been?
A. I believe they, like I did, used Department of Correction's data to estimate sizes of eligible
population but then they attempted to match people with voter files to see if they registered. So I didn't take -- conduct that step because I had -- I was looking at the certificate of restoration process, not the process of whether they then went to register afterwards. And I also didn't look at voter turnout, which they do.
Q. So is it say fair to say that they were looking to match people with voter files to identify individuals, whereas you were using the TDOC data here to create an estimate?
A. Of the eligible -- size of the eligible population, yes, who had -- kased on each of the criteria for the COR. And then I matched to the data file that was provided to me for people who had received a COR. Not to the voter file.
Q. Okay. If could point you to page ten, please.
A. I have it.
Q. Can you walk me through how you came up with your eligibility estimate?
A. Yes. So as I note here, I received a document as a text file from the Tennessee Department of Correction that contained records, 439,566 cases, which were instances of supervision.

And those case records contained identifying information. In particular, each person in the file has a unique identifier and that person may appear in that original file multiple times, depending on how many times they were supervised or convicted.

And I then took those records and combined them into records that reflect individual people, as opposed to in the cases, so I collapsed the cases under each person. And so once I did that, there are I believe 326,000 -- I'm sorry, it's easier for me to refer to Figure 2 on page 17.

So there were 326,459 unique individuals in the file that I received from TDOC. 324,919 of those individuals had at least one felony conviction after May 18th, 1981 and were thus eligible to participate -- to receive a certificate of restoration.

Then Twoc -- the file contained information about the status of each of the cases. And if an individual had a status other than inactive, I excluded them from consideration. So those would be people -- if people had any case with a status of pending, deceased, probation, parole, or incarcerated, I excluded them from the data, which leaves 213,329 individuals that had finished serving
their sentences and were no longer under TDOC supervision, at least in that file.

Next, I used the list of disqualifying crimes as defined on page 11 to map the TDOC descriptions of each person's crimes to one of those disqualifying crimes. And those that had been convicted of any of those disqualifying crimes based on the date of that conviction $I$ then excluded from the data.

That was about, I believe, 7,728 people who had finished serving felony sentence for disqualifying crimes based on the time period of conviction. And that left 205,601 individuals who were no longer being supervised and had only non-disqualifying felory convictions.
Q. So that is -- so those steps are all derived from the TDOC texi file?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Was there any math or statistics done, any estimating done in getting that far?
A. No.
Q. Next tell me how you estimated the number of individuals who are not deceased.
A. So I weighted each individual based on the likelihood that they were still alive based on their
age at the time that $I$ was doing the calculation so last summer, and using weight -- information from the Social Security Actuarial Tables by age and gender.

And so for each person age one to a hundred, for men and women, the Social Security

Administration publishes data on the percent of that birth cohort that's still alive, and I could weigh each individual in the file based on their numerical age and gender according to that likelihood whether they were still alive.
Q. So tell me about a little about that Social Security Actuarial Table, please.
A. I'm not sure what you mean.
Q. What are they?
A. So the Social Security Administration publishes these data periodically, I think annually, but there's adrays a little bit of a lag because of the math but, basically, because they have -- they use vital statistics records and also reports of death because, again, they collect this information from the CDC but also from their own records they are able to publish these tables that the government uses for various purposes.
Q. Do you know whether or not the actuarial
tables are nationwide or whether or not they are state by state?
A. They should be nationwide.
Q. So there's no -- so the actuarial tables don't account for demographic and life expectancy differences in people in Tennessee versus elsewhere? A. No.
Q. What about -- does the Social Security

Actuarial Table take into account the effects of incarceration upon life expectancy?
A. No.
Q. What are those effects?
A. It depends on the person. In some cases incarceration may have detrimental effects on life expectancy to the extert that maybe it affects socioeconomic status after.

But in sone cases it may be helpful to the extent that a person either stops dangerous behaviors or ages out of crime during their period of incarceration.
Q. Are you familiar with any articles that reference incarceration and its effects upon life expectancy?
A. There are several in criminology but I can't off the top of my head tell you the exact titles of
them.
Q. Would it surprise you to know that -- strike that.

Would it surprise you if there were an article out there from Prison Policy Initiative that estimates that each year in prison takes two years off of someone's life expectancy?
A. Like I said, something like that wouldn't surprise me.
Q. Would it surprise you to -- would it surprise you if there were an article entitlea, The Consequences of Incarceration for Mortality in the United States that Discusses the Detrimental Impact on Life Expectancy that ircarceration can have? A. The existence of those articles wouldn't surprise me.
Q. Would it surprise you if there was -- would it surprise you if there is an article referenced in JAMA that discusses how incarceration creates substantial long-lasting harms upon life expectancy of Black Americans?
A. That wouldn't surprise me.
Q. Is any of that included in your -- or weighted in your estimate in Figure -- in 6.3 of your report?
A.

No. Again, as I said before, incarceration can have sometimes negative and sometimes positive effects on life expectancy, so $I$ would have to not just incorporate those articles but think about the body of work.
Q. Well, as an expert in criminal justice and ethnic policy, ethnic politics rather, do you -- do you have an opinion as to whether as a whole incarceration has a positive or a negative impact on life expectancy?
A. I haven't studied it myself so no. All I can tell you is that it could be for a given individual either positive or negative.
Q. Regardless of your expert -- regardless of not having an expert opinion, do you have a personal inkling as to whether or not you would expect a finding that incarceration has an overall negative impact on life expectancy?
A. Again, it can have a positive or a negative impact. I can think of scenarios that would support both.
Q. Do you think it's more likely that one side of your scenarios happens more often than the other side of your scenarios?
A. I don't know. I don't -- I don't -- right
now I don't have any basis for judging which one is more likely. Again, $I$ can think of a scenario in which someone's life was prolonged because they were incarcerated rather than being on the street, continuing to do drugs, or engage in violent activities, for instance.
Q. Would it surprise you if there were a United States Census Bureau study that determined that the latest recession had a greater negative impact upon persons with criminal histories?
A. That wouldn't surprise me.
Q. Is the socioeconomic -- is having a positive socioeconomic status linked to a higher life expectancy on average?
A. Typically.

MR. CHARTJES GRANT: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: Typically.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Do you have a -- in terms of the number of 6.3 by using the actuarial tables, one, do you know what the $P$ value or confidence interval is on the actuarial table data?
A. I don't know specifically, but I think it's relatively small because the sample size is large.
Q. Do you know what -- after applying the actuarial tables to reach your number of 184,142 , do you have any idea of the $P$ value or confidence interval is to that?
A. I wasn't doing any hypothesis testing there so there is no P value.
Q. Is there any way to know how close that 184,142 number is to reality?
A. You could contact all of the people to try to figure out if they're still alive or dead.
Q. Do you think that 184,142 is the number?
A. I think it's a reasonable estimate of the number. It could be off by a few hundred here or there but I don't think it s wildly inaccurate. I think it's within the again, because the point estimates are on the Social Security Actuarial Table they're actually pretty small because the sample sizes are so itarge. I think it's a good estimate. Q. So your estimate is entirely dependent then on the Social Security Actuarial Table being a match or a close tool to represent felons in the State of Tennessee?
A. Not entirely. Because remember, if people died under supervision, which is actually a good number of people, they're already removed from the
data.
Q. Would that skew it high or low? Would that skew the -- if it did not include those persons, would it skew the 184,142 higher or lower?
A. I don't know. So I think what -- so I -- so if -- I'm sorry, I don't understand what you're asking.
Q. Let me rephrase and ask it a different way.
A. Okay.
Q. Did you do any analysis to determine whether or not the persons who passed away in custody is consistent with the Social Securs.ty Actuarial Tables?
A. No.
Q. All right. Let's move on and can you explain to me how you got that number at the end of 6.4 . A. Yes. So I did a -- took a sample of the people in the TDOC file, a random sample, in order to see how many of them owed legal financial obligations, which $I$ discuss here as depending on how it was listed in the records for the different counties. If it said court costs, then restitution I would see if people owed what was called court costs and restitution. Or in other counties where it wasn't clear of what those legal financial
obligations, which ones counted as court cost and which ones didn't, $I$ was advised by Plaintiffs' counsel to look at certain categories.

But I can at least say that in my experience, most of the time when people owed some of those that I counted, they also owed other kinds of like jail fees and the like as well. So I -- for the counties where I could get the data online or occasionally through phone calls to clerk's offices, I was able to then calculate by race, age, and gender how many of those people still owed legal financial
obligations and I weighted the sample based on those counts.
Q. So would I be fair to characterize that you used the circumstances of 612 individuals and applied the percentages associated with them to the number of 184,142 discussed in 6.3?
A. To the circumstances of everyone in the file, so all 200 -- I believe it's actually all 205,000 people.
Q. So that sample size is less than . 3 percent; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. Do you have $P$ value or confidence interval for that?
A. No.
Q. When you were creating your sample, did you find individuals from every county in the state of Tennessee?
A. No. There were some counties that I list here that were -- I was unavailable to research. But it -- but for the other counties, if they came up in the sample, we were able to look up people.
Q. Was there an attempt of the 612 sample to ensure representation from every county?
A. No. Because it was a random sample. So in that sense, we wanted -- it needea to be representative of the state $a s$ a whole.
Q. Did you have any concerns about the size of your sample, compared to the --
A. No.
Q. -- compared to the 205,000 group that it was going to be applied to?
A. Not at all.
Q. Did it concern you when your sample revealed that 100 percent of people in the sample owed court costs and restitution?
A. No. Because, again, it's a small number of people but I thought it was -- it might be the difference between something like 90 and a hundred,

90 percent and a hundred percent, and so the problem is that there just aren't that many Latino people in the data period, not that my sample didn't reflect them accurately.
Q. So how did you calculate the weights then?
A. So the weights are basically, the likelihood based on all of the estimates that $I$ have for each criterion that a person of that age and gender and for LFOs also of race owes an LFO is alive is in arrears on child support. And the final weight is the joint probability of all three of those things, of the person fitting all three of those criteria. Q. But what tells you -- where do you get your -- where do you get your information on how to assign weights to different populations?
A. So based on the sample of people that I looked at, the likelihood that that group of people is still alive is the weight. So the percentage of those people who are still alive or the percentage of those people who owe LFOs.
Q. So apply that same reasoning and analysis to Latino voters. What would that tell you?
A. So for Latino voters?
Q. Sorry, sorry, Latino people. Apply the -walk me through how you would apply the 100 percent
of Latino people in the sample to the 205,000 number. How would you weight that? Would we just assume that every Latino person in the 205,000 owes court costs or restitution?
A. Yes. But I think -- let me see if $I$ handled this differently just to see. Yes. So I believe for some of the other group, Asian and Native American as well are incredibly small. So for those few people, it might be like a handful, like a hundred or so people. And I also want to point out that for some of -- for some of them also don't have accurate citizenship information. So for Latino and Asian groups, becanse they are so small, it was really hard for me to estimate weights for them for the LFOs.

So I'm not even -- so they are included in the overall data But then because they are so small, they tend to drop out of the other analyses because, like I say, a hundred percent of Latino people were found to owe or because, again, the population is so small that it could be that if part of the population was particularly elderly so that combination of things tends to drop them out of the sample.
Q. So how many Latino people are in samples?
A. Originally, I don't know if I have those data listed here. Yeah. I don't see that I have those data listed here, but $I$ will keep flipping to see if I do. I don't recall off the top of my head. Yeah, I don't have it listed here in the report.
Q. I'm sorry, do you know if it was more than ten?
A. It was probably more than ten but I don't know -- but for other groups I actually don't know how many more overall there was.
Q. Do you think it was more than 50?
A. I don't recall.
Q. Do you think it was mace than 75?
A. I don't recall.
Q. I'm looking for a ballpark. Do you think it was more than a hunared?

MR. CharLes GRANT: Objection to the form of the guestion.

THE WITNESS: I don't recall.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. At what point are you comfortable that the sample size is large enough to apply it to the 205,000?
A. At what point of what sample?
Q. So when do you have enough individuals in a
category, for example, race or gender or age, at what point do you have enough people in that sample for whatever you're looking at, in that subgroup of a sample to determine -- to feel comfortable in applying it to the 205,000?
A. So part of the problem is that my sample is representative of the state. But if the sample can be representative of the state but still if there are some populations that are very small, it's difficult for me to draw inferences about them based on their representation in the sample that I drew.

So I'm comfortable making claims overall about the eligible population but only when there's enough people in the sample do I feel comfortable going below that and characterizing the group.

MR. RIEGER: At this point I'd like to take a -- we've been on the record for about a hour. I would like to take a quick five-minute comfort break if that's all right?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Sure.
(Recess observed.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Let's go back on the record. Dr. Burch, you understand that are you still under oath?
A. Yes.
Q.

Would it be fair to characterize what has occurred in 6.4 of your expert report as using a sample to make inferences about a larger group? A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Could, if you used a different 612 individuals, could that change the inferences that you would apply to the large group?
A. It depends on how you select those 612 people.
Q. Assuming it was a random sampling. So it's a random sampling. You get different people. Could it change the inferences that yow would apply to the 205,000 number?
A. It should not.
Q. It should not. fiow do you know that?
A. So that's the point of a random sampling. It should be representative and estimates calculated from it shoula be unbiased. Estimators are the true population parameters.
Q. How do you know whether or not you've pulled a large enough sample size?
A. You can actually calculate that. So, typically, the need for -- the efficiency of a larger sample decreases, one should get to a certain number of -- so, you know, you're really not
increasing efficiency that much if you -- once you get over a certain number of people, you know, typically over 500 people, depending on the population size, even if you're trying to estimate a population of a million. It depends on several factors.
Q. What are those factors?
A. The size of the effect that you're trying to measure, the variance, like the spread of people in the population, how accurate you're trying to be, and things like that.

So typically we take accuracy to be a given like you're trying -- you kncw, you're trying to get -- either do a certain plus or minus spread that's not too much more than 2 to 5 percent. And then it really just depends on the variance and the size of the effect.

But, again, over a certain size, which you're getting over into the hundreds of people in your sample, those things tend to not matter as much. Q. Are you familiar with the concept of population standard deviation?
A. Yes.
Q. What is it?
A. The square root of the variance.
Q. And how does it apply in a typical analysis?
A. How does it apply in my analysis?
Q. Just in general, please. We'll get to yours in a second.
A. So, typically, the standard deviation is used in several ways.
Q. And those ways are?
A. You could use the standard deviation to calculate confidence intervals or it could also be used in tests of statistical significance, or it could be used if you're doing regressions to look at the size of an effect.
Q. What does a confidence interval demonstrate?
A. Typically, a confidence interval is going to demonstrate whether an estimate is kind of the range in which if you took a random sample, a different random sample of that population, the point estimates of what you calculate should be within -95 percent of the confidence intervals -- sorry -of the parameters you calculate, so if you're looking at a means, 95 percent of the means that you get if you take different random samples should fall within that confidence interval.
Q. So if you were to make an inference about a population and using a sample and say there's a
range, if you took another random sampling and there was a confidence interval of 95 percent, you could be 95 percent sure they would fall within that range that you derived from your first sample; is that right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Okay. You didn't do a confidence interval analysis here, did you?
A. No. I don't report them here.
Q. Did you at all?
A. I looked at the, you know, the descriptive statistics when I was calculating, you know, the means and the like but...
Q. What's your confidence interval?
A. I don't know. I don't recall.
Q. Would you agree that confidence intervals help you determioe how accurate your inference is from this first sample?
A. They can be helpful.
Q. Did you apply the population standard deviation to this analysis?
A. No.
Q. Did you evaluate it, your analysis, to attempt to find a $P$ value, a $T$ score, or a $Z$ score? A. No. I'm not sure why I would.
Q.

What is your authority for the concept that once you reach a thousand people in the sample or 500 people or whatever you said the sample, it's no longer effective to increase the sample size along with the population that's being used to represent? A. I think that's just known in -- like, you know, there's multiple textbooks on statistical power analysis that would tell you that.
Q. Which ones did you use here?
A. I didn't cite any here.
Q. Did you use any here?
A. It's just part of my general knowledge. Q. Where did you acquire that general knowledge?
A. Over years of reading or looking at statistical power analysis. In fact, I think, I discuss it specifically in a test of it in a recent paper, Not All Black Lives Matter. I think I have some footnotes about statistical power analysis and effect sizes and the like there.
Q. How much of a confidence interval do you need to avoid a false assurance?
A. So it depends on what you're trying to do.
Q. At what point does the confidence interval reach a percentage where you can be reasonably assured that it's causal and not random chance?
A. I am not sure that question makes sense. Q. Let me ask it this way. Is 80 percent confidence interval the point you need to reach to be assured that you're not receiving a false assurance in your inference?
A. I'm not sure $I$ understand what you're asking.
Q. So I'll scale it back then. A confidence interval, would I be correct in characterizing a confidence interval is saying that as the confidence interval grows, you can be more assureothat there is a causal connection and that the event is not simply random chance, that it's reputable with other random samples?
A. What do you mean by as the confidence interval grows?
Q. As it moves cioser to 100 percent. For example, as the confidence interval moves from 50 percent to 55 percent, you can be assured that it is now more likely when you compare a 55 to 50,55 is more likely to not to be caused by random selection and that there's actually something causal pending what's going on?
A. You've -- you've kind of lost me. Yeah, you've lost me here in terms -- yeah. I'm sorry, I'm just not --
Q. Okay. Let's go back. What's a power analysis?
A. So a statistical power analysis would look at, like I said, several factors in order to figure out how much power you have to be able to -- if there is an effect, to be able to reject the null hypothesis.
Q. Why do we use power intervals -- power -- I'm sorry -- I lost my train of thought there.

Why do we conduct power analyses?
A. So that if we are trying to dó things like estimate -- so, for instance, if $I^{\prime} m$ trying to compare two entities, I want to have a large enough sample size to be able to know if the estimate that I get for those two intervals are statistically different.
Q. Did you perform any sort of power analysis here?
A. Well, other than making sure that my sample size, again, is large enough to be able to make inferences, I'm not making comparisons across. So I'm not -- for instance, I'm not comparing black males to black females and things like that, so I'm not doing that kind of analysis.
Q. Do you have -- did you perform any sort of
margin of error analysis in your percentages from the sample?
A. I'm not sure what a margin of error analysis is.
Q. So we know that, for instance, if we look at -- if we skip ahead to 6.4.1, you found that 55.3 percent of white people were rendered ineligible because of LFOs. When we apply that to the 205 number, that can't be exact, right?
A. What do you mean it can't be exactly right?
Q. Well, it's not likely to be the perfect -the absolute correct number when broken down on an individual-by-individual basis?
A. No. I don't estimate that for individuals by individuals.
Q. Okay. Okay. So it's an estimate, right?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Did you conduct any sort of margin of error to determine whether or not when you applied the 55.3 percent to the 205 , what the range was that you may have been off by?
A. I don't recall what it is, but it's actually fair and small. It's not going to be more than plus or minus 2 or 3 percent, I think. I don't know the exact number. But it's going to be fair and small.
Q. And how did you come up with that margin of error?
A. Again, just because of the sample size.
Q. Let's move on to walk me through 6.4.1, please.
A. So this statement -- this section is just looking at the sample that -- the random sample and gives the statistics about the random sample and the percent of people in that sample who, by race and age and gender, who still owed legal financial obligations.
Q. Can you give me an estimate as to how many -can you give me an estimate $\mathrm{c}^{\text {c }}$ the breakdowns of the sample, starting first with gender.
A. Let me see if I have it here. I don't think I discussed that or have that listed here.
Q. What about can you give me the breakdown of the sample in terms of age?
A. I don't know that I have that listed here. I'm checking my notes to see if I reference it or provided that information here. I don't think that I did.
Q. Do you know it?
A. Off the top of my head, I don't.
Q. What about race?
A. I don't know the demographic breakdowns here. Q. Well, let me try to -- out of the 612 , do you believe that more than a hundred of those individuals were white?
A. Probably.
Q. What about 200?
A. That I -- I don't know.
Q. What about 150?
A. I don't know.
Q. What about -- were more than a hundred people in the sample black?
A. Yes.
Q. Two hundred?
A. I don't know.
Q. So you're comfortable saying for both white and black population above a hundred, but you're not comfortable sayiag above 200?
A. I'm just saying I don't -- I don't recall.
Q. Could you -- I won't hold you to it but a ballpark guess?
A. I don't want to guess.
Q. Moving on, can you explain this one notation here, any rules, 2,904 for me?
A. I'm sorry, I'm just reading this paragraph.
Q. That's fine.
A. That equals 2,904 is the number of black people that $I$ estimate finished serving sentences for non-disqualifying crimes, between the ages of 18 and 29.
Q. Okay, okay. Move over to 6.4.2 -- oh, I'm sorry, strike that. I think go back to 6.4.1.

Did you rely on -- for 6.4 and 6.4.1, did you rely on anything to get those estimates other than that sample group?
A. I don't see anything listed here.
Q. So is that a no?
A. No.
Q. Okay. Okay. Now we can move to 6.4.2. I want to start with Footnote 13.
A. Okay.
Q. And I'm going to put something in the file chat and if you gould open that for me, please. It's entitled 12-2022-GLANE1 and I believe -- and if you could open that for me. It's Footnote 13 I'm going off of.
A. Okay.
Q. Do you know what this is?
A. That appears to be the list that was provided to me from Shelby County Clerk's Office through the Plaintiff attorneys.

MR. RIEGER: At this point, I'd like to admit it as deposition Exhibit 7. That's 12-2022-GLANE1.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 7.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. If I could direct your attention to Footnote 14, where you reference Gray, Cassaundra, email.pdf. I have posted in the chat a file entitled Gray, Cassaundra, email. If you could open that up for me?
A. Okay.
Q. Are you familiar with this document?
A. Yes. This appears to be the email that I referenced in my report
Q. Is this the same Gray, Cassaundra, email.pdf that you reference in Footnote 14?
A. I think so.

MR. RIEGER: At this point, I'd like to enter this as depo Exhibit 8, please.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 8.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. If I could direct you as well to Footnote 14. You reference a document entitled Gray
financials.pdf. I'm putting a document entitled Gray financials.pdf into the chat. Could you take a look at this and let me know if you know what this is?
A. Yes. This appears to be the Gray financial document that $I$ referenced in my report.

MR. RIEGER: At this point, I'd like to introduce Gray financials pdf as deposition Exhibit Number 9.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 9.)

BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Do you also see in Foctnote 14 where you reference Perry Financials pdf?
A. Yes.
Q. I'm putting that in the meeting chat as well.

If you could oper that up and let me know if you know what that is?
A. Yes. I believe this is the statement that $I$ reference in my report.

MR. RIEGER: Okay. At this point, I would like to introduce this Perry Financials.pdf as deposition Exhibit 10.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 10.)

BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. And at this point, I'd like to direct your attention to Footnote 15 in the section, where it says Davidson County Criminal Court Clerk letter.pdf I'm putting in the chat a document entitled Davidson County Criminal Court Clerk letter.pdf. If you would open that for me, please? Do you know what that document is?
A. That looks like the correspondence back and forth about how Davidson County counts - what they consider to be court costs and restifution. MR. RIEGER: Thank you. I would like to introduce the document entitled Davidson County Criminal Court Clerk letter.pdf as deposition Exhibit 11.
(WHEREUFON, a document was marked as
Exhibit Number 11.)
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. If I could direct you to Footnote 15 again, where it references Davidson County Criminal Court Clerk email thread. I'm posting a document in the meeting chat entitled Davidson County Criminal Court Clerk email thread. If you could open that up for me and tell me if you recognize it and what it is? A. Yes. This is the email thread that I
reference in my report.
MR. RIEGER: At this time, I would like to introduce the document entitled Davidson County Criminal Court Clerk Email thread as Deposition Exhibit 12.
(WHEREUPON, a document was marked as Exhibit Number 12.) BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. I think we are finally done with the exhibits for this section. If $I$ could get you to walk me through 6.4.2, please.
A. 6.4.2 is really an analysis of the Shelby County data that they provided, just with looking at overall how many people ote legal financial obligations according to the court clerk's office and what the amounts are by race and age. And also what -- it says mainly the discussion that $I$ have there.
Q. What's the significance of the selection of the Shelby County Criminal Court in this section?
A. It's the biggest I think. If I remember correctly, Shelby County has the most people in the file. I think Davidson might be second.
Q. Are you applying the Shelby County Court costs to the State of Tennessee as a whole?
A. No.
Q. Okay. So Shelby County is just speaking here to Shelby County?
A. Yes. And it's also because the Shelby County data that they provided are also for the same people that are the random sample -- that came up in the random sample in my report, so I was also able to use it to compare how I was counting Shelby County versus how they count Shelby County, in terms of like whether they count all the fees that are listed or if they only count certain ones.
Q. In the penalty paragraph, page 14, you identify that the -- am I reading this correctly, the Shelby County sample size white population was 11?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do we know what the black population, sorry -- what the Shelby County black population within the 612 sample was?
A. I'm not sure it was the full 85 people but most of the sample was black. And that just reflects who gets convicted in Shelby County. Q. So the Shelby County sample size -- sorry. The portion of the 612 that's attributable to Shelby County is 85?
A. Ninety-five, I believe.
Q. So Shelby County takes up -- Shelby County takes up roughly a sixth of the 612 sample size?
A. That should be right, give or take.
Q. Do you know if the demographics in Shelby County are similar to other urban counties in the state of Tennessee?
A. They may be different so I wouldn't -- I'm not making any inferences about other urban counties.
Q. Do you know what percentage of the population of the state of Tennessee Shelby County is?
A. Off of the top of my head, no.
Q. Did you do any work regarding the demographics to determine whether or not the percentage of persons from Shelby County in the 612 sample is appropriate and representative?
A. It is representative of the inactive population, the 205,000 .
Q. And how did you determine that?
A. Just by, again, the rankings of who is in -by county who is in the sample. So, like I said, the biggest in the sample are, you know, Davidson -sorry, Shelby and Davidson. I think Knox has quite a few people. So yes. The number of people in
terms of the sample do match up to the representation in the 205,000 .
Q. Anything particular about Hamilton County?
A. Yes. There are some people from Hamilton County who should be in the sample, but let me see for a second. Let me just review something in my --yeah. Hamilton County I believe is not one of the counties that was in and we weren't able to look up legal financial obligations so -- and I do believe there are people from the sample in Hamilton County.
Q. So you weren't able to look up LFO data from Hamilton County but Hamilton County persons were part of the 612 or was Hamilton County entirely excluded from the 612?
A. I was saying I don't see them in -- I don't see Hamilton County in the list of counties that I have here that we were not able to look up legal financial obligations for. So Hamilton County I think should be in the 612, should be represented in the 612.
Q. So if you couldn't get -- if you could not get LFO data, did you include persons from those counties in the 612?
A. No. So the original sample, I had to exclude
those counties where we couldn't look up the LFO data and I have here in Footnote 8 that represents about 22 percent of -- those counties represent about 22 percent of the overall Tennessee population but most of them tend to be smaller counties in general, except for $I$ think some of the larger ones I think were -- Knox was one of the larger ones. Q. So anybody who you might have pulled in the 986?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Who lived in a county identi=fed in

Footnote 8, they would not be part of the 612?
A. They may be because we may have been able to get partial data. So some we were able to get some data online where -- but they may have required in-person visits for, I don't know, cases before 1999 or something to that effect.
Q. So there may be some folks who would live in counties in Footnote 8 who were a part of the 612 but only if you could get their documents?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. All right. And if you could walk me through 6.5, please.
A. Yes. So I was provided with a list of -- I provided a random sample of people through DHS who
then sent me a list back of those people from that list who owed arrears on their child support. And then I calculated the percent of each of those groups by race, age, and gender who were in arrears. Q. Was it a different random sample than the 612?
A. I think it was the same. It might have been a half of that sample because DHS balked at providing the larger number. So I think I actually wanted to send the 986 but then took a random sample of that sample so I think $I$ only sent half. It ended up being 400 and something people to that. Q. So for child support, let me make sure I can follow the math here.
A. Uh-huh.
Q. You did a random sample of folks that you think it's the same 612?
A. I think it's the same as the -- it might be the same as the 986. I would have to look at my notes.
Q. Okay. So you think it's the same of the 986?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Did you include -- did you excise -- sorry, let me strike all that.

Did you exclude anybody out of the random
sampling of the 986 for whom you couldn't get LFO data?
A. I don't think so.
Q. Okay. So it's of the -- a random sampling of the 986 but not necessarily in the 612 group?
A. I think that's right.
Q. So you're using two different random samples from two different, the 986 source and the 612 source, to make an inference about the 205 population?
A. So I took a sample of 986 peoble from the 205,000 population. And for those people, I tried to get information on both child support arrears and LFOs. For the LFOs, I was only able to get that information fully from certain counties. For child support, DHS was only going to provide me, from my understanding of they didn't want to provide that many. So I gut that 986 in half, so it's still representative. It's just a smaller sample size. It's just the 400 -and-some-odd people instead of the full 986.
Q. So you're taking child support information on 400 people and applying it to 205,000 people?
A. Yes.
Q. Did you do any sort of confidence interval,
anything that we talked about before, in depth, did you do any sort of analysis like to your 400-odd sample size?
A. No. Again, once you get past a certain point, it's kind of overkill so it's not really going to get you much in terms of, you know, narrowing the margin of error or anything like that. So it's not really making like a huge difference in the estimates overall in terms of reducing the entire population or your ability to make inferences about the entire population.
Q. Right. We're under 500 now, right?
A. Uh-huh. Yes.
Q. Did the data that pos provided include out-of-state child support data?
A. I only asked about people serving felony convictions under Tennessee authority. I am not sure exactly how -- to the extent that they knew about arrears for people in Tennessee, you know, if they were working with other states or anything like that. I don't know for the individual cases whether that's true or not.
Q. Did DHS -- strike that. Is the data from DHS limited to only those persons who are receiving Title 4B services?
A. I don't know.
Q. Are you aware that in Tennessee someone could be in arrears but not be receiving Title 4B services?
A. I don't know. I just asked for the, basically, the same kind of analysis that $I$ would do for whatever they're doing for the COE.
Q. So walk me through 6.6, please.
A. So 6.6 is taking all of those weights that were calculated for individuals in the sample, the final rate is the joint probability that a person is alive, has paid all their LFOs, and is not in arrears on child support. Ard once you multiply all of that out, I estimate that 61,158 people meet all of the COR eligibility criteria.
Q. I want to make sure that I've got this right. So the estimate starts when you attempt to estimate using Social Aecurity Actuarial Tables how many people are still alive?
A. That's right.
Q. Then the next estimates start with 986 , of which you random sampled 612 for determination of LFOs, and then you take a separate sample out of the 986 and estimate child support; is that right?
A. No. LFOs are -- I look up LFOs for the 612
people for whom I could find data in that random sample. And then I used that to calculate the likelihood that people of a certain age, race, and gender owe LFOs. And then separately I used the data from DHS for that same sample but half of that sample, half of that 986, a random half of that 986, to be able to figure out how many people are in arrears on child support. And once I calculate all of those separately, the joint probability is the final weight.
Q. But the 612 is a different sample than half of the 986, right? They're not the same sample; is that right?
A. They overlap.
Q. Okay. But they're not -- they're not identical?
A. Right. Because one has 612. The other has 400 .
Q. And there can be people in the 400 who weren't in the 612 , right?
A. There may be.
Q. So the final estimate is an estimate followed by two not identical but overlapping samples, two estimates deriving one for each of those samples, and then we put it all together and get the final
estimate?
A. Could you repeat that?
Q. Sure. So we start with an estimate of people who are alive. That's estimate number one?
A. Yes.
Q. We pull the first sample group out of that, which is 986 , and we use it to create two smaller sample groups, one of half of 986 , which we think is 400 for child support purposes, and one with 612 that may overlap but aren't identical, and we make an estimate for each one of those and then we use all that for a final estimate?
A. Yes.
Q. And do you have a gonfidence interval or anything like that on the final estimate?
A. No.

MR. RIEGER: If we could take a five-minute break, I think I have about an hour and change left. If we could take a break that might let me avoid taking another break. Is that fine, Charles?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: That's fine.
MR. RIEGER: Okay. Thank you, sir. Five minutes, everybody.
(Recess observed.)

BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Dr. Burch, you understand that you are still under oath?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, thank you. If you could turn to page 19 of your expert report.
A. Yes.
Q. And if you could walk me through 7.1, please.
A. Yes. So I was provided a file from -- that I'm calling the elections division restoration database, which the file title is Inrate Redacted and it's an Excel file. And I looked at -- in that file, there are 16,790 entries that are not blank and that have unique last, I irst, and middle name combinations.

But not all of those entries represent individuals who have had their voting right restored through the $C O R$ process. So I tried to drill down just by the people who had felony convictions under Tennessee authority who had their rights restored through the COR process, or at least during the time frame that would have been the COR process.

So I was able to identify 5,549 people that had Tennessee identification numbers that $I$ could match to the TDOC database, the main database that
we've been talking about before, where those records match that database and they may have had a felony conviction in Tennessee.

And I only matched people who had any felony convictions after May 17th, 1981. And this is my estimate of the number of people who had other rights restored since the inception of the COR system who were eligible for CORs.

The remaining people in the file, 864 of them, didn't have any felony convictions after May 17 th, 1981. 1,242 were restored before the COR process was in effect on July 1sf, 2006.

There were 3,396 people who were labeled as out-of-state or federal convictions or they could be matched to the interstate compact database or the federal purge database file.

And they were either marked that way or I was able to match them to other files provided to me by TDOC that they -- that I understood either had people who were serving felony convictions from other states than Tennessee and/or information about federal convictions.

There were some -- 1,554 people in the file who were noted as not -- either having some other process other than a COR or as having no felony
conviction so they were expungement through judicial diversions or they said no charge -- no felony.

And then there were 4,085 people in the restoration database that $I$ couldn't match to any of the files that I was given and there were no notations in the file that would allow me to understand who these people were or how they came to be -- came to be in the file. And they could fall into several different categories.
Q. What are those categories?
A. They -- for instance, they were not matched to TDOC. They were a little less likely to be people with Tennessee state frlony convictions. But my understanding of the ont-of-state conviction file is that it only contaired people who were somehow supervised under Tennessee authority.

So there inay have been other out-of-state convictions that either the file doesn't make a note that they had an out-of-state conviction or they could have been a person with a federal felony conviction who, again, weren't in that data file because those data files weren't comprehensive.

They may also have been people who didn't have felony convictions. Again, there were no -- I didn't have a comprehensive list of people in those
particular categories. But, again, those 4,085 people I couldn't match to the TDOC file, so it's unlikely that they were in that group but they could have been in one of those other groups. Q. Could they have also been persons who had convictions from before 1973 that specifically noted in the judgment they were rendered infamous?
A. So I do have a group of people. Let me see here. So I say here that the notations in the restoration data file didn't provide any information for categorizing them further and I Eouldn't match them to TDOC. So they could have been. There are 864 people that I could match to a TDOC or that had TOMIS numbers but they had felony convictions before 1981.

So I do have some information on that group. But if there are veople who might be in that group who have out- $\sigma f-s t a t e$ convictions that, for instance, they could be that group of people as well.
Q. So I want to clarify something. So the 864 you referenced, that's after May 17 th , 1981?
A. That had no state felony convictions after May 17th, 1981.
Q. So those 864 and 4,085 in the last bullet
point could include people who had criminal convictions prior to 1973 that was typically rendered infamous but later they were restored? A. That's -- the 864 could. I'm not sure that the 485 -- 4,085 could.
Q. So in the 4,085 , you say that you cannot reasonably conclude that these individuals have had their rights restored through the COR process?
A. That's right.
Q. Can you reasonably conclude these individuals have not had their rights restored tirough the COR process?
A. So I have no information on these individuals at all in terms of how they are -- what the notation is.

So some so them -- I don't -- for instance, I can't find them in any of the databases or lists of people who hare felony convictions so I'm not even sure that this group even has felony convictions because there's no information about whether they have felony convictions in the file and I couldn't match them to any of the files that $I$ was provided. Q. Okay. So am I right to characterize that the 4,085, no one knows either way?
A. I mean, the election -- the coordinator of
elections may know but I don't have -- I wasn't provided with information about them. Q. Okay. In terms of the demographic breakdown of voting rights restoration in 7.2?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. Is it your conclusion that there is a small variance based on race?
A. Yes. It's relative to the size of the population of people who are eligible. I think I have here that 59.2 percent are white and -- but 57.7 percent of the people who restored were white. So it's a very small variance.
Q. The Tennessee COR process works the same way regardless of race or age or gender in terms of the mechanics, right?
A. No.
Q. Do you miad elaborating on that for me?
A. So depending on certain issues related to -some of the other ways that the process might vary kind of overlay on race. So if, you know -- so, for instance, Shelby County is mostly African-American, and so that means that African-Americans in the process may have a different outcome because they're mostly in Shelby County than someone in a different county that's mostly white.

Similarly, people who are older tend to have a different experience with either the amounts of LFOs they're charged or also because the paperwork is much older may have a harder time getting access to that paperwork. Or may have had a different -may have experienced different changes in policies over time.

So if -- so just to give you an example off the top of my head, I think I referenced that there is some people who have federal convictions where I think they sometimes turn in an old form because they receive a form, you know, from several years ago. And so those kinds of those kinds of changes can overlay with the demographic differences in the file. So they may not have the same experience based on the time in which they were convicted or the county.
Q. If I talk to you about the concept, your criminal justice background, if I talk to you about the concepts of the disparate impact versus disparate treatment, you understand what I am meaning with both of those?
A. You could -- it would help me if you would explain what you mean.
Q. Sure, sure, sure. So if I refer to something
as disparate treatment, then I'm referring to something where whatever process is going on, specifically says something like treat people differently based on $X, Y$, or $Z$, based on race, age, gender.

If I'm talking about disparate impact, I'm talking about a process that is neutral but just the outcomes are skewed. And taking aside -- is that understandable to you?
A. I don't -- I understand what you just articulated, yes.
Q. Okay. So in terms of the process and taking out how Shelby County uses it and how LFOs may have been different in decades past, is there anything, a part of the process, ary directive that you have seen in your research and in creating your expert opinion, is there anything that you have seen that says explicity treat people in the COR process different by race, age, gender?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Objection to the form of the question.

THE WITNESS: No.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Okay. Okay. And is there anything besides -- because I do want to make sure I get to
the bottom of this line. So you've testified about Shelby County and that process there. You've talked about LFOs being more difficult in prior decades, being larger.

Are there any other sources that you can identify of disparate treatment that you think would need to be resolved?
A. It's just off the top of my head and I don't want to be -- say that this is all. But just as another example of what $I$ just mentioned, it's also the case that it's harder to access older files in most counties. So a lot of the older files for convictions going further back are either archived or missing or not available electronically.

So that information is to -- to the extent that those kinds of problems will be for people who are alive and around to be convicted in the '80s and '90s is going to affect older is people more than it's going to affect younger people. But, again, I don't want to -- but sometimes those, you know -even into the 2000 s and 20 -teens that could be an issue too.
Q. I understand what you're saying. I'm just trying to flush it out. In terms of the 7.2 tables, those are all based off of 5,549 number in 7.1 ,
correct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Is there any estimation or sampling going on in taking that 5,549 into to end up creating the 7.2 tables?
A. Only to the extent that -- for instance, in

Table 6, the column completed no LFOs or child support relies on the data from the previous section, the eligibility data. That was the denominator.
Q. And the previous section you re talking about, are you talking about 6.5?
A. Those -- basically, that's the 61,158 number
that I calculated as the eligible population.
Q. Okay.
A. Broken down by race. So that's the only place where -- so that reappears here as the denominator for the restoration.
Q. Okay. And is that the same for -- in Table 7, the two columns on the right, does that also include the math from Section 6?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Okay. All right. If I could get you to -- and I think we're almost -- I think we are getting there. I promise I won't keep you too late.

If I could get you to skip to page 27.
A. Okay.
Q. And if you could walk me through 9.1.
A. Yes. So in 9.1, I have talked about the ways in which people are to start the process to get their rights restored. And as I say here, it requires the cooperation of multiple actors across different kinds of bureaucracies both inside and outside of Tennessee.

I cite literature that talks about that the help that people are provided by agents in the bureaucracies is voluntary and depends on just their willingness to help, especially if there's no mandate that they do so.

And so I also ge through the files and emails that I was provided to talk about some specific instances in which people had difficulty and evidence that people have difficulty starting the process because, again, they can't fill out this paperwork themselves. They need an authorized agent of the state or county or federal authorities to do so.
Q. So let me try to make sure I've got this. So this section is not talking about an error in the process; it's talking about how the process could
better facilitate people to get their voting right restored; is that right?
A. Well, I do have an example on page 28,

Person D, whose right was not restored in Henry County because she didn't have a parole officer to complete section two and the court clerk refused to do so. And so there was paperwork in the file that indicated that based on the judgment that he fit the criteria but he just couldn't find anyone to check those boxes.
Q. If he had a -- if Person $D$ had a legal option to go to the court and compel eifher the -- to compel in this situation the dounty court clerk to complete section two of the COR, do you think that would be a good thing?
A. It depends. It would just depend on how that process worked, if it was expensive, if he needed a lawyer. So I don't -- I just don't have enough information to know.
Q. Okay. What if the process were so simple he could just go and file a handwritten piece of paper with the court that says, I need this, I'm entitled to this, and they're not doing this, please order them to do so, would that help Person D?
A. Again, it could. I just don't know if a
process like that, would they charge for the paperwork, other kinds of things. I'd need to see the process in action.
Q. Okay. That is fair. When -- in the last paragraph of page 27, you say: There is evidence that some court clerks and probation officers hesitate or refuse to help with filling out certificates of restoration. You reference Juanita Shaw's deposition in Footnote 70, and then that seems to be the same circumstances as person $D$ who you discuss in the next page.

Are you aware of anyone else besides Person D who has had a refusal by someone to fill out a COR? Are you aware of anyone besides Person D?
A. I do have -- I have the -- also have the notes here from the coordinator of elections, where they basically say that they have trouble finding people to complete the paperwork. And also later in the report, for instance, on page -- give me a second -- so on page 39, Person EE, for instance, who is where I have the block code above about how she is talking about how she was frustrated. She had to work really had to find someone in Cook County, Illinois to complete her COR. But, again, that took her a lot of time and effort.
Q. For Person EE, that was out of state, right?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. I want to talk -- I want to focus on in state.
A. Okay.
Q. So are you aware of any other -- where all the information is in state, any other person besides Person D where there was just a refusal to fill out the COR paperwork?
A. Let me look at one more instance in my report to see if in state or out of state. Q. Sure.
A. I'm sorry I'm looking sor a specific person and I can't --
Q. You're fine. Take as much time as you need.
A. I'm sorry, I can't find an example I was looking for.
Q. Okay. So in your expert report, the only in-state refusal is identified as Person D?
A. The only one that I have evidence for that I included in my report. But I'm not going to say that's the only instance.
Q. Okay. Do you know of anyone else who is in the same circumstance as Person D?
A. Based on a particular person in a file, I
can't recall.
Q. For 9.1.2, am I correct in characterizing those as, essentially, the expense and -- I'm sorry. If you could just talk to me about 9.1.2, that would be great.
A. So those -- so in 9.1.2, this is talking specifically about some of the legwork that people have had to do in order to get the submission to the -- before they are even able to submit to the AOE, to then get to the COE.

And so these require multiple visits to the clerk's office or multiple times to go to the clerk's office or, like I said, even we encountered that some records you couldin't access unless you went in person to the county office to access the records.

So it's jast a description of the fact that it's not just issues that we can see in the files based on emails but also there's other kinds of barriers even before those files get to the COE's office.
Q. Would I be correct in characterizing these as socioeconomic pressures that fall hardest upon the lower economic socioeconomic classes?
A. Yes. Typically, it's much harder for, you
know, like hourly workers to take time off from work because they most likely lose wages if they have to go to an office multiple times, for instance. Q. So in 9.1.2, we're not identifying -- you weren't identifying errors? You were demonstrating how barriers can stop people from continuing on with the process or even starting the process?
A. I would say -- I would characterize what I was doing there as saying people who were otherwise eligible are prevented from completing the process because of the way that the process set up. So their lack of restoration is not aue to ineligibility but to barriers, such as having to go back and forth to different offices and try to get people to fill out forms or finding someone to help. Q. So is it your opinion that every time somebody is eligijole but doesn't go either start or finish the COF process, that that is an error?
A. I'm not -- the opinion that I'm expressing that is that the ability of people to start and complete the process is sometimes a function of eligibility in terms of reaching that determination, but it's also a function of the process itself.

So some processes can make it more difficult for eligible people to receive the benefit that they
are eligible for just by virtue of how the process is designed.
Q. So what I'm looking at is, if I point you to the first sentence under 9.1.2, you used the phrase, erroneous denials often at earlier stages even before COR form submissions reach the state? A. Yes.
Q. And then you talk about the reasons for not completing the process that aren't related to eligibility. And I'm wondering if somebody -- if someone picked up a COR from Davidson County Clerk's Office and then doesn't follow through on it due to socioeconomic reasons involving time and money, do you consider that an erroreous denial?
A. I don't know. I would have to go on a case-by-case basis. But the example I provide here is the person in Shelby County who had to make repeated trips to the office because they couldn't resolve his problem on the first try. To the extent that he's eligible but can't get them to fill out his form without him expending a large number -- a large amount of personal like resources such as time and money or in the form of lost wages, that is a denial because it's his contact in trying to complete this process that is stopping him.

So in that instance you would consider that not only a denial but an erroneous denial?
A. To the extent that that person is -- fits the eligibility criteria.
Q. Okay. What's the point of which it stops -what's the point at which we -- let me strike that and try to couch it a little differently.

At what point does it become a denial? So at what point does the hassle, the time and money involved, escalate from ideal to a denial?
A. I don't know. The processes in different counties are so different that's hard to say. Q. So is it also fair to say that Davidson County is more or less a part from the complex of that depending on the person's individual circumstances, if they can determine whether or not in your opinion eomething is a hassle (inaudible) -THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I was unable to hear fully.

BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. I'm sorry. I'll re-ask it. Taking the counties out of it, am I correct that it would be a person-by-person determination as to whether or not the time and money that it took to get a COR would escalate from merely an inconvenience to a denial?
A. I don't know that $I$ would agree with that. Q. So let me ask you this. So say I had a -say I live five minutes away from my county clerk and I had to go three times in the middle of the day but my job is kind enough to be flexible enough for something like that.

Is the fact that I would have to go three or four times and it's a denial and would that change if $I$ was in a situation where $I$ live 30 minutes away from my county clerk and my job would not let me off during ordinary hours?
A. So my general way of thinking about this is as a political scientist. Costs are the same. Some people have more resources to bear those costs than others. And that is up to them how, you know -with respect to whether people have resources to bear those costs or not. So -- so the cost of going downtown in terms of time, to spend time looking up files, you know, is markedly similar but some people will experience those costs differently based on their personal circumstances and other factors. Q. So let me make sure I'm right on this. So it's not the cost or the time. It's the effect that that cost or time has on my circumstances and whether or not that's something I can bear?
A.

No. So it's both the fact that there is a cost that has to be borne that goes into the calculus of whether you're going to do something. So the imposition of the cost is one thing.

And then certain people have a different tolerance based on resources whether they can overcome or bear those costs. That's a separate factor, and both are important for thinking about whether a person will be able to pursue the process going forward.

So there could be a rich person, for instance, who, for whatever reason, the documents just don't exist that they wanld need. So that person may also not be able to overcome their costs because the documents don't exist for them to be able to.

Similarly there may be a person who -- so there are different -- so there are different kinds of costs that are imposed that can pose barriers for lots of different people but also the ability of people to overcome certain kinds of costs does depend on factors such as socioeconomic status. Q. And I'm sorry I'm spending a lot of time on this. I want to make sure I've got it right.

So what could be a denial for someone might
not be a denial for someone else?
A. The process may pose costs on people that some people may be able to bear and some people may not be able to bear.
Q. Do you have a recommendation as to how that would be navigated? Do you have a -- assuming that there would be a set of neutral criteria, how would we navigate the issues that for some folks it isn't as problematic as for other folks? Do you have a solution for that?
A. Perhaps some of the work in reducing the legwork of having to go to multipie -- back and forth to multiple offices is the example or to visit an office multiple times is the example that I have here but by centralizing or reducing the number of bureaucracies that are involved.
Q. So I'm going to skip ahead a little bit. Since you referenced centralization, I think now might a time to talk about it.

Would you characterize Tennessee's process as centralized?
A. I would say it's decentralized to the extent that there are multiple offices that are engaged or involved or their involvement is required for the process but they are not all under one authority.
Q.

Okay. The criminal courts in the various counties, the criminal courts are the repository for criminal judgments and orders and cost barriers? A. That's my understanding.
Q. Okay. How does that -- do you have a recommendation as to how that gets centralized? A. In terms of the logistics of that, I don't. But I would say at least there needs to be -- I couldn't find any rules or documentation or information as to -- or guidance that was communicated that the clerks or the courts, for instance, that they understood was their -- or even which LFOs to count, for instance. So I think that even a basic understanding or attempt to standardize across counties is important.
Q. So is it your opinion that providing the -A. Sorry. I think my email must have gone off but I don't have it visible.
Q. That is fine. You're fine.

So is it your opinion that issuing guidance to county court clerks instructing them of their obligation to complete CORs and as to what LFOs would stop a restoration would help reduce error? A. I would hope. But, again, some of the information that $I$ cite in my report suggests that
they don't think they have that obligation, so I don't -- I don't -- I'm not sure that it would. Q. Let me skip ahead to page 36.
A. Okay.

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Did you say 36?
MR. RIEGER: Thirty-six, yes, sir.
THE WITNESS: I've got it.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. Can you walk me through 10.12, please?
A. Yes. So I was provided a denial data -- what I'm calling the denial database, the spreadsheet, and that was the file called the denial, restore, and redacted, in which and it had a number of entries that seem to be - each application had an entry in the denial restore database.

There were 1,774 entries in that database that had unique Iast, first, and middle name combinations ancause some people appear in a database multiple times. And some people also appear in both the restoration and the denial database. And so the 1,774 people are unique entries in the denial database that don't also appear in the restored database.
Q. Okay. And if you could walk me through 10.2, please.
A. Yes. So I tried -- I compared the 1,774 people in the denial database with the 16,790 unique people in the restoration database and calculated an overall denial rate of 9.5 percent.

And so if we also look at people who are in both files, meaning that they were denied and then restored, then the initial denial rate is 14.8 percent but that may be low to the extent that the way that they keep their records is to try to delete people from the denial folder once they are in the restored folder.

It could be those 974 people were just the ones they failed to delete after they were then restored.
Q. For 10.1 and 10.2 , you're not using any of the eligibility estinates in Section 6 of your report, are you?
A. No. This is -- I was able to match 249 of 471 records for which I had the COR paperwork to the Tennessee Department of Correction's file in order to get their race, age, and gender, and other information so that I could make that second paragraph in 10.2. So it comes from trying to match people in the denial database to the TDOC file. Q. So moving on to 10.3 , am I right that the
point of that section is that there needs to be followup after denial because the denial is for reasons that can be cured that need to be followed up on?
A. So the point there is that there are people who, even if you look at approvals, the universe of approvals that took place up to I think it was June or July of ' 22 when I had the data for that year, some of those people who had been approved actually had to submit more than one time in oras to be approved. And those submissions, 21 of the 22 people were approved not because they did something to change their eligibility kut because of paperwork or correcting an error in database or in the way an entry was submitted.

And so we don t know where the 131 other people who were denied, where I haven't seen the -the time of the follow-up hasn't either happened or played out. There could be more people in that group as well. We just don't know. And there's no systematic way in which this curing happens.

It's just either sometimes the county $A O E$ will follow up. Sometimes the clerk will follow up. Sometimes the person, the individual who is trying to get their rights restored will follow up. But
there's no routine process for communicating the reason for denial to the person who is denied, whose rights restoration is denied, and also how they might go about fixing whatever issues caused the denial.
Q. Could you -- in Footnote 130, I'd like to walk through those. So you start with: Eight were denied initially because TDOC missed a Tennessee conviction.

Is that a circumstance where the person is eligible and is denied because they Gidn't have the missing conviction listed or is one where everything got signed off on, they submitted it, and then it was discovered that they had an extra conviction and were not?
A. So all of these people were eligible. So these were all in the approved folder. Q. So of the eight here, in the first part, all of those folks needed to get the missing conviction put on the COR?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. The next one I'd like -- it says two were denied initially because of a coordinator of elections error. Can you explain that to me?
A. I can't recall exactly what errors they may
have made. Yeah, I'm sorry. I can't recall specifically what those errors were.
Q. Five were denied initially because of problems with out-of-state or federal convictions. Is that the same as the eight for TDOC out of state instead of TDOC?
A. Not necessarily. It may have been something related to costs. So not just missing conviction but it could have been some information -- a mistake about costs or unable to find paperworl about costs. Q. Okay. Four were denied becallse of data errors as far as job support or felony records. What are those?
A. It could be that ths person was listed as having arrears and they weren't and then they had to go back and have those records corrected. Or that they had a felony when they didn't have a felony or --
Q. Okay. Okay. And it says one was denied because of a clerk error and one for an AOE error? A. I'm not -- I don't exactly recall what those two were.
Q. Okay. Every one in that footnote was restored?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. Do you know if those -- do you know if that group required the now voter to take additional steps or whether or not it was something that -- was correcting the things in Footnote 130 something that resulted in a person's expenditure of time and money?
A. In some cases, yes.
Q. In some cases. Do you know which -- do you know about how many of those?
A. I don't know exactly how many. But, for instance, I recall I think the child support one took some intervention on behalf of the voter. Q. Is that $D D$ that you're talking about, Person DD?
A. I can't remember if it's -- I can look for -Q. It's on page 38 .
A. Yes. Yes DD. So let me see something real quick about Dis. So I don't think it was only because Person DD is listed in the February 2021 document and all of these people were from 2022. Q. Okay. Okay. In terms of your expert report, I know you've listed a number of anonymous people who are identified by person, followed by the initial.

Did you rely on the individual circumstances
of any person not listed in here as making this expert report, or in every situation where you relied on somebody's individual story did you cite to them?
A. I believe I tried to. But there may be other examples of which I'm aware but maybe didn't type. But everyone here I believe I referenced if I talk about a specific case. I do -- I was going to say, I do note in a couple of places in my report that this isn't an exhaustive list of what $\Theta$ these aren't exhaustive lists of whatever Ghenomenon I'm -- I'm referencing.
Q. So in terms of the exhaustive versus inexhaustive list, how many -- strike that.

How many people's individual circumstances do you think you relied on in making this expert report that aren't cited or identified in this expert report that aren't identified by a person or letter? A. I'm not sure that I relied on any of them. I was just providing examples of phenomena when I was listing something. But, again, I don't -- the reason I note that I don't want to say this is exhaustive is both because there may be multiple other people where there's evidence in the record that suggests they may fit into some of the
categories that $I$ identify here, but also I wasn't provided with the full set of records for every person who was approved or denied.

Sometimes I may only have a COR. Sometimes there may be a longer record with documents and email exchanges and the like. And so, because I don't have those data, I don't want to foreclose the possibility that there are other people in those files who also fit these categories.
Q. So is it fair that there may be other illustrative examples out there and in the record but for the purposes of your expert opinion you did not rely on those circumstances even though you believe they exist?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, okay, okay. So for the last little bit, I want to ge to your summary and it starts on page 39. And what $I$ want to ask you is for status confusion, what is your recommendation?
A. I don't believe I make a particular recommendation. But to the extent that a centralized state-run system that helps to clarify certain categories and can officially make those determinations, I have here -- yeah.

So I have here that that centralized process
would help cut down on some of the confusion in creating one set of expectations and definitions, of one set of people who are determining eligibility. Q. So in terms of steps, I just want to talk to you about the last little part, failure to seek restoration altogether because of fear. What do you mean by that?
A. So, in particular --

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Excuse me, Doctor.
I'm sorry. You faded off on me. I'm glad everyone else may have heard you.

BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. I'm sorry. I was asking her to explain the last sentence, which ends: The failure to seek restoration altogether because of fear. I'm trying to understand what that means.
A. So, in pariicular, like the best example in the instance of this I can say is on page 30. The coordinator of elections discusses this idea specifically with respect to whether a person has a felony or not.

And they say here in the middle: For people who reach out to see whether they have a felony conviction who are not sure if they have a felony, I say: We looked at all of our databases and did not
find anything but I cannot tell them what to mark to the felony question under penalty of perjury. That is their truth and they will have to face consequences if it's not true. (Of course, I highly doubt to be able to prosecute a person who tried to find their conviction through us and didn't find anything.)

For people who are still nervous, I tell them they can do a TBI/FBI background check and refer them to the website about background checks.

For people in category two who know they have a felony but need more information, I tell them, unfortunately, we could not give them more information. I explained that they don't necessarily not have a felony but that our data can be missing stuff. they should go look at their old documents, ask friends or family for help, or do a TBI/FBI background check.

And so here I'm talking about the fact that that lack of certainty, even the COE, they're saying people are -- they've encountered people who that makes them nervous, about going through this process because they don't -- because of fear. And specifically here it's talking about fear of prosecution.
Q.

So do you have any sort of suggestion as to how you would centralize the criminal judgments that are held across Tennessee, 95 counties and has been for the past 200 years?
A. Well, I don't think it would be cheap. But, again, $I$ think that it -- even if there is some kind of way that it seems like the COE is trying to do this research but thinking about that fear that they're saying I can't guarantee anything. They're even hesitant to make a blanket statement. So I think it's just -- it's just an indication that it's really hard, even for state agents to determine and reassure potential registrants to their status. Q. Have you ever seen states try to centralize something like that when it started off decentralized?
A. A great example of this is that states have centralized voter registration when it used to be decentralized. So it used to be at a county level but now states maintain databases of registered voters.
Q. I'm sorry. I'm simply talking about the criminal court clerks and their possession of the criminal judgments and the LFOs are derived from.

Have you ever seen a state try to centralize
that from a decentralized posture?
A. I don't know. But I will say I have some people have reached out to me as a result of the article that $I$ wrote about the decentralization of LFOs and my article. So I think that there's been some discussion of it, but $I$ don't know in terms of following through on it with respect to legal financial obligations, especially in order to be able to streamline payment and the garnishing of wages.
Q. How else do you think this transition would be? Do you think that there would be an impact on folks trying to get their voting rights restored if the criminal court system, which is county based, were to centralize its criminal judgments?
A. I don't know the answer to that. It depends -- again, it deperids on how well it's done and how quickly it's done. I could just say that I think that there are -- there could be benefits beyond just this process for having that information available but I'm not a -- I'm not a -- for instance, I'm not an IT specialist so I can't tell you, again, about the logistics or difficulty in doing that.
Q. Would it surprise you if a lot of -- some of
these 95 counties say you (inaudible) --
THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear.
BY MR. RIEGER:
Q. I'm sorry. Would it surprise you if 95 counties in Tennessee still use paper?
A. That wouldn't surprise me, but they are making advances in data scraping and cataloging all the time so -- again, I'm a researcher who is -- who has seen the digitization of things that $I$ never would have expected so I -- it's not outside of the realm of possibility.
Q. The documentary disenfranchisement, that's the next one. Do you have suggestions or possible solutions for that for us?
A. So I think that part of the issue might be -might involve thinking about work-around or for situations in which documents aren't available or don't exist or are inaccurate. Because, again, there's just no way -- as I said, I cite several examples of people who were just at a dead end because the state says we don't have this information and we can't help you.
Q. What would a work-around look like?
A. Either -- I don't know of -- either an exemption or -- yeah. There that may be an
exemption for if you call the county and they don't know, the benefit of the doubt goes to the person trying to get their rights restored.
Q. And centralization wouldn't help us in a situation where the documents just either don't exist or aren't available? Is that fair? We need something else?
A. You may be able to, instead of relying on the -- giving the authority to make that determination to that outside office, your office is able to -- the COE or whomever is able to make those determinations when the other people say they're not able to. So then you -- so then the authority is not with them. It's with the centralized office. Q. I'd like to skip down to the clerical errors, the next in line. Do you have any suggestions there?
A. I said here on page 40: A centralized process might also lessen the impact of clerical errors as the job of ascertaining eligibility would be left to a smaller number of people who are trained by the State rather than to untrained clerks, probation officers, and agents throughout Tennessee and other states.
Q. Would an appeals process help that?
A. To the extent that the authority would be to make judgments where if, say, a clerk refuses to check a box, but there is documentation and evidence that says that the person satisfies the criteria. Q. Okay. And would it be better for that process to conclude with a hey, we force you to do what you are supposed to do for the documentation that you should have checked that box, County Clerk? Or would it be better for the person if they're able to submit everything for it to end witho you're restored? Like we're not going to give you your form. You're restored. Is one of those better than the other? Are both a step up? Or what are your thoughts on that?
A. I'd need more information. The first one, the way you phrased the first one sounds antagonistic but don't -- so, but other than that, I don't have any -- I don't really have enough information to evaluate that.
Q. I'm sorry if it came off as antagonistic.
A. Not to me but the interaction would sound as if it was antagonistic, which is generally a bad thing to build into any process.
Q. All right. And then you say these errors may take a lot of time and effort to correct and may
require a person -- if they be corrected, it may require a person to do rights restoration to undertake several rounds of submissions in order to succeed?
A. Yes.
Q. I wanted to ask, are you aware of any situation in Tennessee where that has occurred and it took so long that someone didn't get done in time to vote in the next election?
A. Yes. I would have to go through and look specifically to see if I make a refecence to that in my report or recall.
Q. Yeah. I would -- feel free to take the time to do that right now becanse that was something I -I'd like to know if that's happened in a way that has taken so long that someone missed an election. A. Okay. It s possible that Person $Y$ might be one of those people just because their -- it looks like their file is dated October 2016. So that's just one example I would look into. But there may be others.

Person V it looks like they were denied restoration multiple times. And here I'm on page 35, Note 113. It looks like their file was in September 2020. I'm not sure if they were ever
restored.
There was one person in here, I'm trying to find the file, but that person was in -- hang on. I will give you the example. Person E. Person E. So Person $E$ on page 31 received a letter that he was being purged from the Rutherford County voter rolls in 2014 for a felony conviction and was required to submit a COR form or other paperwork in order to re-register. And so he submitted documents from Florida showing his conviction was a judicial diversion, and he was allowed to re-register in September of 2020 .

There was a six-year gap between when he was purged for that judicial diversion and then when he re-registered.
Q. Do you know if Person $E$ had attempted to submit a -- well strike that. I'll strike that. Moving on back to page 39 .
A. Okay.
Q. Lack of information about the process. Do you have any suggestions there?
A. There are -- I think that the public instruction on county websites, as well as on the Secretary of State's website, doesn't provide full information about the options for people who restore
their voting rights or even how to -- who to go to to start the process for the COR. And so even here on page -- let me see if $I$ can find it quickly.

So here on page 28, the instructions for -the internal instructions or the COE say that if the applicant insists that the appropriate agents will not complete the COR, the applicant should be advised to seek a court order. And so I think that even the option for the court order is not -- I couldn't find that information in the public instruction for completing a COR.
Q. So you believe that the COR should include a notation that if the approvirg authority won't fill it out for you, they should seek a court order? A. I'm just saying that there are -- that's just an example of several work-arounds in the process or alternatives to the process of just having -- I think it's --I think the terminology is appropriate state agents fill out the COR. There are actually other ways and even other things that they'll accept that aren't publicly known.
Q. Can you walk me through those? If you were in charge of the form, what would it say?
A. So even -- there's additional information here that the COE writes. Oh. So as an example, on
page 23, although the -- I write: Although the instructions do not explicitly state it, individuals with felony federal convictions must first submit their COR to federal authorities for completion and then internal documents for the COE state that the proper authority is an officer from the U.S. Probation or Parole Office. These agents are supposed to verify completion of the sentence, as well as payments of costs and restitution.

So that extra information about even an officer from probation and parole is just a lack of information in terms of where people can go to get these forms completed.
Q. Is there anything eise that you would add to that, to the form, that s the issues that you identify in the actual report?
A. To the extent that $I$ have seen some examples in the some counties where like the clerk's office, they'd put on their website issue COR the AOE. And the county may put on the website you should contact X at the clerk's office or you should contact, you know, just giving people further information is what I meant by that statement.
Q. Okay. So you suggest that the counties and the Secretary of State's office could put a
step-by-step, just follow-the-lines process and that would remedy those issues?
A. Not entirely. So just looking at that section, I also talk about for the actual agents themselves who are tasked with filling out these forms, they also don't have information about what probation officers and clerks should consider court costs or what to do next after something is denied.

So I think that there's just not just on behalf of people seeking rights restoration but of many actors in the process who have a lack of information.
Q. So not only a website giving individuals a step by step down the line, but also guidance to the officers filling out the form and the court clerks filling out the form as to their obligations and instructions, as well as to the court clerks what would be incluable in the applicable LFOs? A. Well, and, alternatively, so I have here centralizing would mean that this is left to a smaller number of people who are trained by the state and under state -- under authority of the COE or whomever would be involved in this centralized process, rather than to untrained clerks and officers and agents throughout Tennessee and other
states over which the COE says they have no authority and can't force them to fill out the form in any given way.

So I think part of the problem is lack of information but also if you're in a bureaucracy, ensuring compliance as well.
Q. Is it your belief that centralization is the exclusive remedy, or is there a way to address all of these without centralizing through better forms, better websites, better guidance, better training, better policies?
A. Those might help with everything but the compliance problem.
Q. Would an inexpensive and easy to access legal process help with the compliance problem?
A. On behalf of?
Q. The individual seeking restoration?
A. I don't know.

MR. RIEGER: If I could take a two- or three-minute break, I may be done, but I want to check with zach first.
(Recess observed.)
MR. RIEGER: I pass. Thank you.
MR. CHARLES GRANT: Co-counsel, Blair Bowie, will ask a couple of questions.

## EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MS. BOWIE:
Q. All right. I won't be long.

Dr. Burch, can I bring you back to page 29 , please.
A. Sure. I have it.
Q. Okay. So we're looking -- in case your page numbers are different, we're looking at

Section 9.12.
A. Okay.
Q. So on the line that has Footnote 78 there, you are talking about reviewing the data set from Davidson County on requests for CORs; is that right?
A. That is correct.
Q. Okay. And that's the All COR Data Carlatina Cedric Aloha file, correct?
A. That's right.
Q. And there you say that of the 611 cases in that file, 342 people were not issued CORs; is that right?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. So Davidson County, between the probation office in Davidson County and the county court clerk's office, refused to issue CORs to 342
people there; is that correct?
A. I don't know that they -- I don't know if it's that they refused. They -- the people were not -- they might have had notations in the file that the people were either still in the process or had to do other things to be -- so they owed money, for instance, so they couldn't check the eligibility box.
Q. And if they don't do that, they didn't issue them a COR and as you refer to it here the completed packet was never sent to the coordinator of elections; is that right?
A. Right.
Q. Okay. So there you actually found that the rate -- can we call that a refusal rate? Is that fair here?
A. Yes. So the people who start the process, 56 percent of them had no completed packet ever sent to the COE.
Q. And that's just in that Davidson County dataset?
A. That's right.
Q. And you mentioned earlier that you haven't seen other counties keep as thorough records as Davidson County did there; is that correct?
A. That's right.
Q. Okay. So there you did identify 342 people who were not issued CORs after requesting them? A. Yes, that's right.
Q. Okay. Mr. Rieger also introduced into evidence and I'm sorry, I don't remember the exhibit numbers, email threads related to Mr . Gray and Mr. Perry. Do you recall seeing those earlier today?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And in those cases, Cassaundra Horton from the Shelby County Criminal Clerk's Office refused to issue certificates of restoration to those two individuals; is that right?
A. I would have to review the emails to recall exactly what happened here. Yes. So looking at Mr. Gray, the fuli balance of $\$ 779.00$ must be paid for him to be eligible for $a \operatorname{COR}$ and it includes a $\$ 500.00$ fine.
Q. Okay. So she didn't issue a certificate to Mr. Gray, correct?
A. Not at that time.
Q. Okay. And do you see the Perry one as well? That one is sort of a longer thread.
A. Perry financials. Let me see if $I$ can find
the email. I don't see -- I see the Perry financials but I've got to find -- I can't find the email here.
Q. Okay. Maybe that one wasn't placed on the record for this one. But you do cite it in Footnote 105 on page 34. If you wouldn't mind looking at that.
A. Yes. I see where I cite it.
Q. Okay. And do you recall what was said in that email or that document?
A. I don't recall specifically what was said in that document.
Q. Okay. But for Mr. Gray, it's fair to say that that's also an instaree you identified where the official refused to issue a COR?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay. And to be clear, if a person is not issued a COR, they wouldn't end up in the dataset of folks that you look at in Section 10; is that correct?
A. That's right. There is never a COR submitted to the coordinator of elections. I wouldn't see those -- their file in the data.

MS. BOWIE: Okay. Thank you. That is all I have.

MR. RIEGER: Nothing further from me.
THE REPORTER: Mr. Rieger, would you like to order this transcribed?

MR. RIEGER: Yes, please, I would.
MR. CHARLES GRANT: We'll read and sign, Ms. Honeycutt.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Grant, are you also ordering a copy?

MR. CHARLES GRANT: Yes.
FURTHER DEPONENT SAITH NOT (Proceedings concluded at 5:21 p.m.)
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[^0]:    1 While John Weare had his citizenship rights restored with regard to one of his convictions, he has not had his citizenship rights restored for both of his convictions. (Ex. 8, Weare Dep., at 50.)

[^1]:    2 "The pardoning authority" also has authority to issue restoration certificates, Tenn. Code § 40-29-203(a)(1), but most applications are handled by agents of the supervising or incarcerating authority.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Insofar as the NAACP argues that " $[t]$ he state-specific instructions for Tennessee on the Federal Form" "do not fully inform registrants of state law," that argument fails as a matter of law for the same reasons. The Federal Form is subject to the same requirements as the State Form. See 52 U.S.C. § 20508(a)(2), (b)(2).

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ To the extent Count Five purports to bring claims on behalf of disenfranchised felons who have not had their right to vote restored, summary judgment is appropriate because they have no constitutional right to vote. See supra Argument III.
    ${ }^{5}$ Felons whose voting rights have been restored must so indicate on the voter registration form. They must also provide a copy of their restoration document. Tennessee Mail-In Application for Voter Registration, Tennessee Secretary of State, https://sos-tn-gov-files.tnsosfiles.com/forms/ss-3010.pdf (last visited August 1, 2023). Although Plaintiffs have not challenged this as an undue burden on the right to vote under Count Five, this minimal burden is easily justified by Tennessee's interest in combatting voter fraud and safeguarding voter confidence. See Crawford v. Marion County Election Bd., 553 U.S. 181, 196-97 (2008).

