

ELECTION MATTER

Filed 10/6/2022 11:46:00 PM Supreme Court Middle District
100 MAP 2022

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

No. 100 MAP 2022

Republican National Committee, *et al.*,
Petitioners/Appellants,

v.

Leigh M. Chapman, in her official capacity as Acting Secretary of the
Commonwealth, *et al.*,
Respondents/Appellees,

and

DSCC, *et al.*,
Intervenor-Respondents/Appellees.

**SUPPLEMENTAL REPRODUCED RECORD OF
INTERVENOR-RESPONDENTS/APPELLEES DSCC AND DCCC**

Uzoma N. Nkwonta*
Justin Baxenberg*
Alexander F. Atkins*
Daniela Lorenzo*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G St. NE, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20002
Telephone: (202) 968-4490
unkwonta@elias.law
jbaxenberg@elias.law
aatkins@elias.law
dlorenzo@elias.law

* *Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

Adam C. Bonin
THE LAW OFFICE OF ADAM C. BONIN
121 South Broad Street, Suite 400
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (267) 242-5014
Facsimile: (215) 827-5300
adam@boninlaw.com

Timothy J. Ford (Pa. Id. No. 325290)
Claire Blewitt Ghormoz (Pa. Id. No.
320816)
DILWORTH PAXSON LLP
1500 Market Street, Suite 3500E
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Telephone: (215) 575-7000
Facsimile: (215) 575-7200
tford@dilworthlaw.com
cghormoz@dilworthlaw.com

Counsel for Intervenor-Respondents DSCC & DCCC

Dated October 6, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Application of DSCC and DCCC for Leave to Intervene
(Filed September 9, 2022)001b

Affidavit of Andrea S. Young (Filed September 9, 2022)014b

Affidavit of Pavitra Abraham (Filed September 9, 2022)019b

Uzoma N. Nkwonta*
Justin Baxenberg*
Daniela Lorenzo*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G St. NE, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20002
Telephone: (202) 968-4490
unkwonta@elias.law
jbxaxenberg@elias.law
dlorenzo@elias.law

Adam C. Bonin
THE LAW OFFICE OF ADAM C. BONIN
121 South Broad Street, Suite 400
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (267) 242-5014
Facsimile: (215) 827-5300
adam@boninlaw.com

Timothy J. Ford (Pa. Id. No. 325290)
Claire Blewitt Ghormoz (Pa. Id. No. 320816)
DILWORTH PAXSON LLP
1500 Market Street, Suite 3500E
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Telephone: (215) 575-7000
Facsimile: (215) 575-7200
tford@dilworthlaw.com
cghormoz@dilworthlaw.com

**Motions for Admission Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming
Attorneys for Proposed Intervenors DSCC and DCCC*

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE; *et al.*,
Petitioners,
v.
LEIGH M. CHAPMAN, *et al.*,
Respondents.

Case No. 447 MD 2022

APPLICATION OF DSCC AND DCCC FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

DSCC and DCCC submit this Application for Leave to Intervene in the above-captioned action pursuant to Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure 106, 1517, and 1531(b), and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure Chapter 2320 *et seq.*

INTRODUCTION

1. In 2019, the General Assembly approved amendments to the Election Code to allow all qualified electors to vote by mail. The underlying legislation—Act 77—received unanimous Republican support in the Senate and suffered only two Republican defections in the House. According to the Republican House Majority Leader, Act 77 was written to “lift the voice of every voter in the Commonwealth.”¹ During the 2020 elections, however, Democrats in Pennsylvania were disproportionately more likely than Republicans to cast mail-in and absentee ballots: Democrats cast nearly three times as many mail ballots as Republicans, and more than three out of every five mail-in and absentee ballots were cast by registered Democrats.²

2. Republicans subsequently turned against Act 77 and have devoted themselves to making it more difficult for Pennsylvanians to cast their ballots by mail and to have those ballots counted. In 2020 alone, Republicans (1) challenged Pennsylvania’s three-day extension of its mail-in ballot receipt deadline, *see Bognet v. Boockvar*, No. 3:20-cv-215 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 22, 2022); (2) challenged the right of voters whose mail-in ballots were rejected to exercise their right to vote by casting provisional ballots on election day, *see Hamm v. Boockvar*, No. 600 MD 2020 (Pa. Cmwlth. Nov. 3, 2020); (3) sought to throw out thousands of validly cast mail-in ballots, *see, e.g.,*

¹ House Republican Caucus, *Historic Election Reform*, <https://www.pahousegop.com/electionreform> (last visited Sept. 6, 2022).

² Holly Otterbein, *Democrats return nearly three times as many mail-in ballots as Republicans in Pennsylvania*, POLITICO (Nov. 3, 2020) (hereinafter “Otterbein”), available at <https://www.politico.com/news/2020/11/03/democrats-more-mail-in-ballots-pennsylvania-433951>.

Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Boockvar, No. 2:20-cv-00966-NR (W.D. Pa. June 28, 2020); *In re: Canvass of Absentee and Mail-In Ballots of Nov. 3, 2020 Gen. Election*, No. 2020-18680 (Pa. C.C.P. Montg. Cty. Nov. 5, 2020); *In re: Canvass of Absentee and Mail-In Ballots of Nov. 3, 2020 Gen. Election*, No. 2011-00874 (Pa. C.C.P. Phila. Cty. Nov. 9, 2020); *Zicarelli v. Allegheny Cnty. Bd. of Elections*, No. GD-20-011654 (Pa. C.C.P. Allegheny Cty. Nov. 12, 2020); and (4) moved to exclude mail-in ballots from Pennsylvania and various counties' certification of the presidential election, *see, e.g., Kelly v. Pennsylvania*, No. 620 MD 2020 (Pa. Cmwlth. Nov. 20, 2020); *Zicarelli v. Allegheny Cnty. Bd. of Elections*, No. 2:20-cv-1831-NR (W.D. Pa. Nov. 25, 2020). In 2021, Republicans challenged the *entire* mail-in voting process as unconstitutional, *see McLinko v. Degraffenreid*, 244 MD 2021 (Pa. Cmwlth. July 26, 2021). And just recently, in July, fourteen Republican members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives filed suit to eliminate Act 77 and mail-in voting entirely. *Bonner v. Chapman*, No. 364 MD 2022 (Pa. Cmwlth. July 20, 2022).

3. This lawsuit is just the latest chapter in the Republican committees' relentless attack on mail voting ahead of November's elections, this time targeting efforts of County Boards of Elections ("County Boards") to allow voters to cure easily correctable mail-in ballot defects and ensure that the "regulation of the franchise does not deny the franchise itself." *McCormick for U.S. Senate v. Chapman*, No. 286 MD 2022, 2022 WL 2900112 (Pa. Cmwlth. June 2, 2022), at *13 (quoting *Winston v. Moore*, 91 A. 520, 523 (Pa. 1914)). In fact, it is not even the first time that high profile Republicans have sought to obtain a judgment prohibiting Pennsylvania election officials from providing cure procedures to allow lawful voters to save themselves from disenfranchisement when their mail ballots are flagged for rejection due to a defect not related to their qualifications. In 2020, the campaign of the Republican incumbent President Donald Trump

brought a case in federal court, challenging just that. In affirming the district court’s dismissal of the lawsuit, the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit properly recognized that “[n]ot every voter can be expected to follow [the mail-in vote] process perfectly” and that “the Election Code says nothing about what should happen if a county notices these errors before election day.” *Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Sec’y of Pennsylvania*, 830 F. App’x 377, 384 (3d Cir. 2020).

4. DSCC and DCCC are political committees with the mission to elect Democratic candidates to the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, respectively. Their intervention in this action is imperative to protect the rights of Democratic voters to vote by mail and have those votes counted, to preserve the ability of Democratic candidates to be elected with the support of said votes, and to defend their own interests as political committees. If Petitioners succeed in enjoining County Boards from developing or implementing cure procedures, DSCC and DCCC will have to redirect substantial resources away from other critical initiatives to re-educate Democratic voters and candidates about the changing rules and to minimize the inevitable disenfranchisement that will result. As such, DSCC and DCCC have legally enforceable interests in the Pennsylvania election processes implicated by this lawsuit and have the right to intervene.

PROPOSED INTERVENOR-RESPONDENTS

5. DSCC is the Democratic Party’s national senatorial committee, as defined by 52 U.S.C. § 30101(14). Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party across the country, including in Pennsylvania, to the U.S. Senate. DSCC works to accomplish its mission by, among other things, assisting state parties throughout the country. In 2022, DSCC will provide millions of dollars in contributions and expenditures to persuade and mobilize voters to support U.S. Senate candidates who affiliate with the Democratic Party. For the 2022 election for U.S. Senate in Pennsylvania, DSCC has worked (and will continue to work) to elect the Democratic candidate,

Lt. Gov. John Fetterman, and has made (and will continue to make) substantial contributions and expenditures to support Lt. Gov. Fetterman in his candidacy.

6. DCCC is the Democratic Party’s national congressional committee as defined by 52 U.S.C. § 30101(14). Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party from across the country, including those running in Pennsylvania’s congressional districts, to the U.S. House of Representatives. DCCC works to accomplish its mission by, among other things, assisting state parties throughout the country, including in Pennsylvania. In 2022, DCCC will provide millions of dollars in contributions and expenditures to persuade and mobilize voters to support congressional candidates who affiliate with the Democratic Party.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

7. Under Pennsylvania law, a qualified elector to vote by mail for any reason. 25 P.S. § 3150.11.

8. To be counted, a mail-in or absentee ballot (collectively, “mail ballot”) must be enclosed and sealed in a secrecy envelope and placed into a second envelope. The elector must then complete and sign the form declaration printed on the second envelope and mail or drop off their ballot by 8 pm on election day. *Id.* § 3150.16(a).

9. Prior to the 2020 elections, the Pennsylvania Democratic Party sought an injunction requiring County Boards to provide notice and an opportunity to cure for electors whose mail-in ballots bore certain facial defects. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court concluded in *Pennsylvania Democratic Party v. Boockvar*, 238 A.3d 345, 374 (Pa. 2020), that neither the Pennsylvania Constitution nor the Election Code require boards of election to adopt such a procedure.

10. During the 2020 general election, the Secretary of the Commonwealth encouraged—but did not require—County Boards to provide notice and an opportunity to cure facially defective ballots.

11. Then-President Trump’s campaign brought an unsuccessful challenge in federal court, primarily arguing that allowing County Boards discretion to implement cure procedures violated the United States Constitution’s Equal Protection Clause. *Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Sec’y of Pa.*, 830 F. App’x 377 (3d Cir. 2020).

12. The district court dismissed the lawsuit. In affirming that dismissal, the United States Court of Appeals recognized that “[n]ot every voter can be expected to follow [the mail-in vote] process perfectly” and that “the Election Code says nothing about what should happen if a county notices these errors before election day.” *Id.* at 384. The Third Circuit further observed that “[s]ome counties stay silent and do not count the ballots; others contact the voters and give them a chance to correct their errors.” *Id.* The Third Circuit’s opinion issued on November 27, 2020.

13. Petitioners initiated these proceedings nearly two years later, after two statewide primary elections and the 2021 municipal election, by filing an original jurisdiction Petition for Review on September 1, 2022, seeking (1) a declaration that Boards are prohibited from developing and implementing cure procedures absent explicit authorization from the General Assembly; (2) a declaration that adopting cure procedures for federal elections without express authority from the General Assembly violates the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution; and (3) an injunction prohibiting Boards from developing or implementing cure procedures.

14. For the reasons stated above and herein, DSCC and DCCC file this Application for Leave to Intervene in accordance with Pennsylvania Rules of Appellate Procedure 106, 1517, and 1531(b), and Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure Chapter 2320 *et seq.*

LEGAL STANDARD

15. A person not named as a respondent in an original jurisdiction petition for review can seek leave to intervene in the action by filing an application with the court. Pa. R.A.P. 1531(b).

The practices and procedures for original jurisdiction petitions for review must conform to the Pennsylvania Rules of Civil Procedure. Pa. R.A.P. § 106; Pa. R.A.P. § 1517.

16. Intervenor must satisfy one of four requirements to intervene in an action. Relevant here is the requirement that the intervenor show that “the determination of [the] action may affect any legally enforceable interest of” the intervenor, regardless of whether they “may be bound by a judgment in the action.” Pa. R.C.P. 2327(4).

17. If the intervenor satisfies one of the four requirements, the court *must* grant intervention. Pa. R.C.P. 2327. Courts have discretion to refuse intervention, after a hearing, *only* if (1) the intervenor’s “claim or defense . . . is not in subordination to and in recognition of the propriety of the action;” (2) the intervenor’s interest is adequately represented by the existing parties; or (3) the intervenor unduly delayed in moving to intervene or intervention would unduly delay the action. Pa. R.C.P. § 2329; *see also Allegheny Reprod. Health Ctr. v. Pa. Dep’t of Hum. Servs.*, 225 A.3d 902, 908 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2020); *Larock v. Sugarloaf Twp. Zoning Hearing Bd.*, 740 A.2d 308, 313 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1999).

ARGUMENT

I. DSCC and DCCC satisfy the requirement for intervention under Pennsylvania law.

18. DSCC and DCCC’s interests will be affected by a judgment in this action, warranting intervention. Pa. R.C.P. 2327(4).

19. “[B]ecause a political party, by statutory definition, is an organization representing qualified electors, it maintains the same interest as do its members in” fair and accessible elections. *In re Barlip*, 428 A.2d 1058, 1060 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1981). Courts therefore routinely find that political party committees like DSCC and DCCC are entitled to intervene in cases where election administration practices are being challenged. *See, e.g., In re Appointment of Dist. Att’y*, 756 A.2d 711, 713 n.5 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2000) (granting intervention to Lackawanna County Democratic Party

to intervene in support of board of elections); *Parnell v. Allegheny Bd. of Elections*, No. 20-cv-01570 (W.D. Pa. Oct. 22, 2020), ECF No. 34 (granting intervention to DCCC); *Pa. Democratic Party v. Republican Party of Pa.*, No. 16-5664, 2016 WL 6582659, *3 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 7, 2016) (recognizing Democratic party committee had standing “to protect the interests of both Democratic candidates running for office and Democratic voters”); *Issa v. Newsom*, No. 2:20-cv-01044-MCE-CKD, 2020 WL 3074351, at *3 (E.D. Cal. June 10, 2020) (finding a political party has a “significant protectable interest” in intervening to defend its voters’ interests in vote-by-mail and its own resources spent in support of vote-by-mail).

20. DSCC and DCCC expend substantial resources on educating and assisting voters in navigating the voting process. Abraham Aff. ¶ 4; Young Aff. ¶ 4. This includes the process through which voters submit and cure mail-in ballots. *Id.* Indeed, the majority of mail-in ballots cast in Pennsylvania elections are cast by Democrats. Abraham Aff. ¶ 8; Young Aff. ¶ 5. In the 2020 general election, for example, registered Democrats returned nearly three times as many mail-in ballots as registered Republicans, and more than three out of every five mail and absentee ballots in Pennsylvania were cast by registered Democrats.³ Accordingly, DSCC, DCCC, and their members and constituents have a heightened interest in the procedures surrounding mail-in ballots and in ensuring that votes cast using these ballots are counted.

21. The relief that Petitioners request imperils DSCC’s and DCCC’s significant protectable interests in ensuring their members’ ballots are counted and in “advancing [their candidates’] overall electoral prospects.” *Issa* 2020 WL 3074351, at *3; *Pa. Democratic Party*, 2016 WL 6582659, at *3. Because of the high proportion of registered Democrats who vote using mail-in ballots, DSCC and DCCC have a cognizable interest in protecting the rights of Democratic

³ See Otterbein, *supra* note 2.

voters who have relied on mail-in voting in prior elections. These and other Democratic voters risk disenfranchisement in November's general election if Petitioners' challenge succeeds, which threatens to impede DSCC's and DCCC's missions of electing Democratic candidates to the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives and ensuring that Democrats in Pennsylvania are not unfairly disenfranchised. *See, e.g., Paher v. Cegavske*, No. 3:20-cv-00243-MMD-WGC, 2020 WL 2042365, at *2 (D. Nev. Apr. 28, 2020) (proposed Intervenor, Democratic organizations, had significant protectable interests in ensuring election of Democratic Party candidates).

22. Further, if Petitioners are successful, DSCC and DCCC will have to redirect their limited resources from other programs to address the impacts of the judgment on voters. Abraham Aff. ¶ 9; Young Aff. ¶ 7. This includes diverting additional staff and funds to educating voters about the requirements of the mail voting procedures given the limited opportunities to cure facial defects and developing new programs to mobilize in person voting to minimize potential disenfranchisement. *Id.*

II. None of the exceptions to granting intervention apply.

23. Because DSCC and DCCC satisfy the requirements set forth under Rule 2327(4), intervention is mandatory unless the grounds for denial under Rule 2329 apply—and they do not.

24. *First*, DSCC's and DCCC's claims are "in subordination to and in recognition of the propriety of the action." Pa. R.C.P. No. 2329(1). The purpose of this requirement is to ensure an intervenor takes the suit as they find it, *Commonwealth ex rel. Chidsey v. Keystone Mut. Cas. Co.*, 76 A.2d 867, 870 (Pa. 1950), and to "prevent[] an intervenor from "becom[ing] party to the suit merely to review what the court has done and to require demonstration of the legality and propriety of its action." *Wells Fargo Bank N.A. v. James*, 90 A.3d 813, 822 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2014) (Corvey, J., dissenting) (quoting *Chidsey*, 76 A.2d at 870).

25. The requirement is met. DSCC and DCCC do not challenge the jurisdiction of this Court, nor—because the Court has yet to render any substantive rulings—do they seek to “review what the court has done.” 90 A.3d at 822; *cf. Pierce Junior Coll. v. Schumacker*, 333 A.2d 510, 513 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1975) (finding intervention for purpose of quashing appeal “clearly not in subordination to nor in recognition of the propriety of the appeal”).

26. *Second*, neither DSCC’s nor DCCC’s interests in the rights of Democratic voters, the electoral prospects of Democratic candidates, or the resources they must expend to mobilize voters and enhance turnout are adequately represented by any of the parties to this action. *See, e.g., In re Barlip*, 428 A.2d at 1060 (recognizing interest of political party in preventing “impair[ment of] its effectiveness”); *Issa*, 2020 WL 3074351, at *3 (recognizing political party’s unique interests in “ensuring their party members and the voters they represent have the opportunity to vote in the upcoming federal election, advancing their overall electoral prospects, and allocating their limited resources to inform voters about the election procedures”).

27. Where an original party to the suit is a government entity, whose position is “necessarily colored by its view of the public welfare rather than the more parochial views of a proposed intervenor whose interest is personal to it,” the burden of establishing inadequacy of representation by existing parties is “comparatively light.” *Kleissler v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 157 F.3d 964, 972 (3d Cir. 1998) (citing *Conservation L. Found. v. Mosbacher*, 966 F.2d 39, 44 (1st Cir. 1992), and *Mausolf v. Babbitt*, 85 F.3d 1295, 1303 (8th Cir. 1996)); *see also D.G.A. v. Dep’t of Human Servs.*, No. 1059 C.D. 2018, 2020 WL 283885, at *7 (Pa. Cmwlth. Jan. 21, 2020) (reversing denial of intervention where intervenors were aligned with the government’s litigation position but possessed unique and personal interests not adequately represented by government respondents); *Larock*, 740 A.2d at 314 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1999) (similar).

28. The U.S. Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Berger v. North Carolina State Conference of the NAACP*, 142 S. Ct. 2191, 2203 (2022), confirms the point. In that case, several civil rights groups sued the North Carolina State Board of Elections (“NCSBE”) to challenge a voter-identification law passed by the legislature and adopted over the Governor’s veto. *Id.* at 2198. Although NCSBE was represented by the Attorney General, several state legislators sought to intervene alongside the NCSBE to defend the law. *Id.* The Fourth Circuit concluded *en banc* that the legislators could not intervene because their interests were adequately represented by NCSBE. *Id.* at 2200.

29. The Supreme Court reversed. It explained at the outset that this requirement “presents proposed intervenors with only a minimal challenge.” *Id.* at 2195; *see also Teague v. Bakker*, 931 F.2d 259, 262 (4th Cir. 1991) (explaining the Supreme Court has held that “the burden on the applicant of demonstrating a lack of adequate representation ‘should be treated as minimal.’”) (quoting *Trbovich v. United Mine Workers*, 404 U.S. 528, 538 n.10 (1972)). The Supreme Court explained that while state agents may pursue “related” interests to political actors, those interests are not “identical.” *Berger*, 142 S. Ct. at 2204 (quoting *Trbovich*, 404 U.S. at 538). In particular, the Court noted that state actors must “bear in mind broader public-policy implications” than those with more partisan or private interests. *Id.*

30. The same is true here. Even if Respondents’ position aligns with the DSCC and DCCC—an uncertainty as there have been no filings in this action to indicate what position Respondents will take—their interests will not be “identical.” *Id.* Respondents’, all state actors, “position [will be] defined by the public interest.” *Feller v. Brock*, 802 F.2d 722, 730 (4th Cir. 1986); *accord Letendre v. Currituck Cty.*, 261 N.C. App. 537, 817 S.E.2d 920 (Table), 2018 WL 4440587, *4 (2018) (unpublished). But DSCC and DCCC’s interests are defined by its mission

and the interests of themselves, their members, and their candidates and, as such, DSCC and DCCC's interests are not adequately represented by any of the parties to this action. Abraham Aff. ¶ 11; Young Aff. ¶ 9.

31. *Third*, DSCC and DCCC timely filed their Application to Intervene barely over a week after Petitioners brought this suit. Permitting their intervention will neither delay the resolution of this matter nor prejudice any party, especially since Respondents have yet to file a response or otherwise meaningfully litigate this case. Nor will any party be prejudiced by DSCC's or DCCC's participation, which will aid the Court in understanding the factual and legal issues involved.

32. Because DSCC and DCCC meet the requirement for intervention under Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure 2327 and because none of the exceptions to granting intervention apply, intervention is mandatory. In any event, even if an exception under Rule 2329 applied, the Court retains discretion to grant intervention and should allow DSCC and DCCC to join this action for the reasons set forth in this application.

CONCLUSION

33. For the reasons stated above, the Court should grant DSCC and DCCC's application to intervene in this case.

34. Pursuant to Pennsylvania Rule of Civil Procedure 2328, DSCC and DCCC are attaching a copy of the pleading that they will file in the action if permitted to intervene.

35. DSCC and DCCC request a Hearing on this Application if deemed necessary.

WHEREFORE, DSCC and DCCC respectfully request this Honorable Court to grant their Application to Intervene in this matter, and accept their Preliminary Objections attached hereto as their first filing.

Dated: September 9, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

By: Adam C. Bonin

Adam C. Bonin
THE LAW OFFICE OF ADAM C. BONIN
121 South Broad Street, Suite 400
Philadelphia, PA 19107
Telephone: (267) 242-5014
Facsimile: (215) 827-5300
adam@boninlaw.com

Timothy J. Ford (Pa. Id. No. 325290)
Claire Blewitt Ghormoz (Pa. Id. No. 320816)
DILWORTH PAXSON LLP
1500 Market Street, Suite 3500E
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Telephone: (215) 575-7000
Facsimile: (215) 575-7200
tford@dilworthlaw.com
cghormoz@dilworthlaw.com

Uzoma N. Nkwonta*
Justin Baxenberg*
Daniela Lorenzo*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G St. NE, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20002
Telephone: (202) 968-4490
unkwonta@elias.law
jbaxenberg@elias.law
dlorenzo@elias.law

*Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor-Respondents
DSCC and DCCC*

**Motions for Admission Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming*

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE;
NATIONAL REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL
COMMITTEE; NATIONAL REPUBLICAN
CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE; REPUBLICAN
PARTY OF PENNSYLVANIA; DAVID BALL;
JAMES D. BEE; DEBRA A. BIRO; JESSE D.
DANIEL; GWENDOLYN MAE DELUCA; ROSS
M. FARBER; CONNOR R. GALLAGHER; LYNN
MARIE KALCEVIC; LINDA S. KOZLOVICH;
WILLIAM P. KOZLOVICH; VALLERIE
SICILIANO-BIANCANIELLO; S. MICHAEL
STREIB,

Petitioners,

v.

LEIGH M. CHAPMAN, in her official capacity as
Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth, JESSICA
MATHIS, in her official capacity as Director of the
Pennsylvania Bureau of Election Services and
Notaries; ADAMS COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ALLEGHENY COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ARMSTRONG COUNTY BOARD
OF ELECTIONS; BEAVER COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BEDFORD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BERKS COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BLAIR COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BRADFORD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BUCKS COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BUTLER COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CAMBRIA COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CAMERON COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CARBON COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CENTRE COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CHESTER COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CLARION COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CLEARFIELD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CLINTON COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; COLUMBIA COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CRAWFORD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CUMBERLAND COUNTY BOARD
OF ELECTIONS; DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; DELAWARE COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ELK COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ERIE COUNTY BOARD OF

Case No. 447 MD 2022

ELECTIONS; FAYETTE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; FOREST COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; FULTON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; GREENE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; HUNTINGDON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; INDIANA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; JUNIATA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LACKAWANNA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LANCASTER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LAWRENCE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LEBANON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LEHIGH COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LUZERNE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LYCOMING COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MCKEAN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MERCER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MIFFLIN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MONTOUR COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; NORTHAMPTON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; PERRY COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; PHILADELPHIA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; PIKE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; POTTER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SCHUYLKILL COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SNYDER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SOMERSET COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SULLIVAN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; TIOGA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; UNION COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; VENANGO COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WAYNE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WESTMORELAND COUNTY, BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WYOMING COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; and YORK COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS,

Respondents.

AFFIDAVIT OF ANDREA S. YOUNG

I, Andrea Young, declare and affirm under the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 that:

1. I am over the age of 18. I have personal knowledge of all the facts to which I attest in this declaration, and I affirm that they are true to the best of my knowledge.

2. I am the Voter Protection Advisor for the DSCC, also known as the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

3. DSCC is the national senatorial committee of the Democratic Party. Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party across the country to the U.S. Senate. Thus, DSCC has a vested interest in ensuring that voters can cast ballots for Democratic Senate candidates, including in Pennsylvania, where DSCC is actively working to elect Lt. Gov. John Fetterman to the U.S. Senate.

4. DSCC accomplishes its mission by, among other things, expending substantial resources on educating and assisting voters in navigating the voting process. This includes the process through which voters submit and, where necessary, cure mail-in ballots.

5. In fact, DSCC has made mail voting a central part of its Pennsylvania strategy each election. DSCC's field staff encourage voters to vote by mail, which allows the field staff to organize more efficient and effective turnout campaigns leading up to, and on, Election Day. DSCC staff also assist voters through the process of curing ballots and ensuring their votes are counted. Many of the voters that DSCC seeks to mobilize have already requested a mail-in ballot for this November's general election and even more have used mail-in ballots in prior elections at disproportionately higher rates than voters from other political parties.

6. In preparation for the November election DSCC has and will continue to spend millions of dollars on efforts to persuade and mobilize voters and to support Democratic candidate Lt. Gov. John Fetterman's candidacy for the U.S. Senate in Pennsylvania.

7. If Petitioners are successful, a greater number of mail-in and absentee ballots with easily curable defects will be thrown out, at least some of which would have resulted in votes for Lt. Gov. Fetterman. This will imperil DSCC's ability to achieve its mission and force it to redirect its limited resources from other programs to address the impacts of the judgment on voters, including educating voters, in an effort to prevent any defects given the absence of an opportunity to cure. These efforts will include diverting staff, volunteers, and funds to educating voters and developing new programs to mobilize in person voting to minimize potential disenfranchisement.

8. Petitioners' challenge and requested relief also pose a threat to DSCC's mission because Petitioners waited until the final stretch of the election season to file their claim. If the Court awards such relief, there will be insufficient time for DSCC staff to effectively educate staff and voters or to change its voter mobilization programming.

9. Nor are DSCC's interests represented by any other party to the suit. Its interests are defined by, and are therefore unique to, its mission, as well as the interests of its members and candidates. None of these interests are entirely shared with Respondents in this action.

10. Because Democratic voters in Pennsylvania disproportionately rely on vote-by-mail, the specific changes that Petitioners seek would impair DSCC's ability to achieve its goal of electing Democratic candidates in Pennsylvania to the U.S. Senate in the November election and beyond.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that the facts set forth in this Affidavit are true and correct. I understand that this Affidavit is made subject to the penalties for unsworn falsification to authorities set forth in 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904.

Executed on September 8, 2022.

Andrea S. Young

Andrea S. Young

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE;
NATIONAL REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL
COMMITTEE; NATIONAL REPUBLICAN
CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE; REPUBLICAN
PARTY OF PENNSYLVANIA; DAVID BALL;
JAMES D. BEE; DEBRA A. BIRO; JESSE D.
DANIEL; GWENDOLYN MAE DELUCA; ROSS
M. FARBER; CONNOR R. GALLAGHER; LYNN
MARIE KALCEVIC; LINDA S. KOZLOVICH;
WILLIAM P. KOZLOVICH; VALLERIE
SICILIANO-BIANCANIELLO; S. MICHAEL
STREIB,

Petitioners,

v.

LEIGH M. CHAPMAN, in her official capacity as
Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth, JESSICA
MATHIS, in her official capacity as Director of the
Pennsylvania Bureau of Election Services and
Notaries; ADAMS COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ALLEGHENY COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ARMSTRONG COUNTY BOARD
OF ELECTIONS; BEAVER COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BEDFORD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BERKS COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BLAIR COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BRADFORD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BUCKS COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; BUTLER COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CAMBRIA COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CAMERON COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CARBON COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CENTRE COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CHESTER COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CLARION COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CLEARFIELD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CLINTON COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; COLUMBIA COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CRAWFORD COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; CUMBERLAND COUNTY BOARD
OF ELECTIONS; DAUPHIN COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; DELAWARE COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ELK COUNTY BOARD OF
ELECTIONS; ERIE COUNTY BOARD OF

Case No. 447 MD 2022

ELECTIONS; FAYETTE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; FOREST COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; FULTON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; GREENE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; HUNTINGDON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; INDIANA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; JEFFERSON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; JUNIATA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LACKAWANNA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LANCASTER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LAWRENCE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LEBANON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LEHIGH COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LUZERNE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; LYCOMING COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MCKEAN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MERCER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MIFFLIN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MONROE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MONTGOMERY COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; MONTOUR COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; NORTHAMPTON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; PERRY COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; PHILADELPHIA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; PIKE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; POTTER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SCHUYLKILL COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SNYDER COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SOMERSET COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SULLIVAN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; SUSQUEHANNA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; TIOGA COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; UNION COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; VENANGO COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WAYNE COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WESTMORELAND COUNTY, BOARD OF ELECTIONS; WYOMING COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS; and YORK COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS,

Respondents.

AFFIDAVIT OF PAVITRA ABRAHAM

I, Pavitra Abraham, declare and affirm under the penalties of 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904 that:

1. I am over the age of 18. I have personal knowledge of all the facts to which I attest in this declaration, and I affirm that they are true to the best of my knowledge.

2. I am the National Organizing Director for DCCC, also known as the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

3. DCCC is the Democratic Party's national congressional committee as defined by 52 U.S.C. § 30101(14). Its mission is to elect candidates of the Democratic Party from across the country, including those running in Pennsylvania's congressional districts, to the U.S. House of Representatives.

4. DCCC accomplishes its mission by, among other things, expending substantial resources on educating and assisting voters in navigating the voting process. This includes the process through which voters submit and, where necessary, cure mail-in ballots.

5. In 2022, DCCC will provide hundreds of thousands of dollars in contributions and millions of dollars in expenditures to persuade and mobilize voters to support congressional candidates in Pennsylvania who affiliate with the Democratic Party.

6. DCCC has also hired staff and recruited volunteers to conduct educational and organizing operations in Pennsylvania in advance of the 2022 election. DCCC expects to carry out similar efforts in future elections.

7. DCCC also focuses its efforts on groups that face barriers to participating in the political process and historically have voted at lower rates. This includes voters whose socioeconomic statuses, work schedules, health conditions, family care responsibilities, or lack of

transportation (among many factors) make voting in person difficult or impossible. Many of these voters tend to support Democratic congressional candidates.

8. Relatedly, the majority of mail-in ballots cast in Pennsylvania elections are cast by Democratic voters. Encouraging and assisting these voters to vote by mail, and ensuring that their votes are actually counted, is therefore central to DCCC's mission.

9. If Petitioners are successful, a greater number of mail-in and absentee ballots with easily curable defects will be thrown out, many of which would have resulted in votes for Democratic candidates. DCCC will therefore have to redirect its limited resources from other programs to address the impacts of the judgment on voters. These efforts will include diverting additional staff, volunteers, and funds to voter education in an effort to prevent any defects given the absence of an opportunity to cure and developing new programs to mobilize in person voting to minimize potential disenfranchisement.

10. Adjusting for the November 2022 election would be especially onerous this late in the election season. DCCC has already devoted resources to encouraging and assisting voters in casting mail ballots for the November election, and it has already trained organizing staff on how to support mail voters, taking into account several counties' existing cure procedures. Changing tactics now would be extremely disruptive to DCCC's operations.

11. Nor are DCCC's interests represented by any other party to the suit. Its interests are defined by, and are therefore unique to, its mission, as well as the interests of its members and candidates. None of these interests are entirely shared with Respondents in this action.

12. Petitioners' challenge to the county Boards' cure processes imperils DCCC's interests and mission. DCCC has many members, constituents, and Democratic Party voters who have used mail-in ballots in Pennsylvania and who have benefited from cure procedures, or will

do so in future elections, given the high rates of Democratic voters who use mail-in or absentee ballots. It is therefore almost certain that at least some of DCCC's members, constituents, or voters will be disenfranchised, directly threatening DCCC's mission, if Petitioners' requested relief is granted.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that the facts set forth in this Affidavit are true and correct. I understand that this Affidavit is made subject to the penalties for unsworn falsification to authorities set forth in 18 Pa.C.S. § 4904.

Executed on September 7, 2022.

Pavitra Abraham

Pavitra Abraham

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH P.a. R.A.P. 127

I, Adam C. Bonin, certify that this filing complies with the provisions of the *Case Records Public Access Policy of the Unified Judicial System of Pennsylvania* that require filing confidential information and documents differently than non-confidential information and documents.

Submitted by:

Signature:

Attorney No. (if applicable):

Date:
