

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In re: Nomination Papers of	:	
Andrew Tupone as a Green	:	
Party Candidate for Congress	:	
in the 7 th Congressional District	:	
	:	
Objection of: Joyce Moore,	:	
Susan Baranek, and Louise	:	No. 363 M.D. 2026
Dillensnyder	:	Heard: August 20, 2026

OPINION NOT REPORTED

MEMORANDUM OPINION
BY JUDGE TSAI

FILED: September 5, 2026

Before this Court are Objections filed by Joyce Moore, Susan Baranek, and Louise Dillensnyder (collectively Objectors) to the nomination papers of Andrew Tupone (Candidate) as the Green Party candidate for Representative in Congress from the 7th Congressional District in the November 3, 2026 General Election (Objections). Objectors are qualified and validly registered electors living within Pennsylvania's 7th Congressional District. Objectors set forth a variety of challenges to Candidate's nomination papers, including global challenges based on defects to the Preambles and Circulator's Statements of hundreds of pages of Candidate's nomination papers. Objectors also set forth in excess of 3,000 challenges to individual signature lines. The Court now strikes a total of 1,761 signatures based on these global challenges for the reasons set forth below.

I. BACKGROUND

The Court conducted a hearing on this matter on August 20, 2026. Prior to the hearing, counsel requested that the Court first entertain and dispose of the global

challenges described above and postpone ruling on the challenges to individual signature lines until a later date, anticipating that the necessity of ruling on individual signature challenges may be obviated by the Court's rulings on the global challenges. The Court agreed to move forward as requested by counsel. In so doing, the Court advised counsel that any order as to the global challenges would constitute an unappealable, nonfinal order. With this in mind, the Court proceeds to address Objectors' global challenges.

II. DISCUSSION

Section 977 of the Election Code,¹ 25 P.S. § 2937, provides that “material errors or defects apparent on the face” of nomination petitions or papers are amendable, after hearing, at the discretion of the Court. *See also In re Nomination of Delle Donne*, 779 A.2d 1, 13 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2001), *aff'd*, 777 A.2d 412 (Pa. 2001). This Court requires either testimony or an affidavit in order to correct the defect. *See In re Ford*, 994 A.2d 9, 22-23 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2010) (permitting circulator to testify to correct the defect). The governing standard regarding defects on the face of a nomination paper is whether the defects or alterations misinformed or misled the signer. *See In re Snyder*, 516 A.2d 788, 790 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1986) (“a nomination petition page may be treated as amended . . . if the signers have not been misinformed or misled”). In *Ford*, our Court looked to the fact that the signers “could not have been misled by the mistake into thinking they were somehow signing as electors” of a different county, and that determination aided in its decision to allow an amendment. *Ford*, 994 A.2d at 21. However, an amendment must be requested in order to cure the defect. *Id.* at 22-23.

¹ Pennsylvania Election Code (Election Code), Act of June 3, 1937, P.L. 1333, *as amended*, 25 P.S. §§ 2601-3591

A. CHALLENGES TO PREAMBLE

Initially, Objectors challenged numerous pages of Candidate's nomination papers on the grounds that the Preamble on each of those nomination pages contained incorrect information, some of which was "altered or erased," and requested that the pages be stricken in their entirety. Objections at 5, ¶ 18. Objectors, upon further review, narrowed the challenges they would pursue to those specifically identified in their post-hearing brief, identified below as updated challenges.

The Preamble portion of a nomination paper provides as follows:

A. PREAMBLE

TO THE SECRETARY OF THE COMMONWEALTH:

We, the undersigned, all of whom are qualified electors of Pennsylvania, of the County, and of the electoral district(s) designated below, hereby nominate the persons designated in "B" below as candidates representing the political body named herein, and also appoint the persons designed in "C" below as the committee authorized to fill any vacancy caused by the death or withdrawal of any such candidates.

1. Name of Political Body _____
(no more than 3 words)
2. County of Signers _____

Objectors concede that inaccuracies on the preamble are "amendable defect[s], easily correctable if challenged, with testimony," and "amendments are routinely granted." Objectors' Brief at 33. Objectors categorize their Preamble challenges into two main categories: alterations to the Preamble made after circulation and facial inaccuracies remaining on the Preamble. *Id.* at 34. For some pages that have alterations with initials adjacent thereto, Objectors argue that the circulator "could have just used a different, clean page" and contend that the pages

should be stricken. *Id.* For others, Objectors argue that “[d]ue to the absence of rehabilitative testimony to support an amendment” to the challenged pages, the pages should be stricken. *Id.*

The Court will now consider Objectors’ updated challenges to alterations to the Preamble on the following pages of Candidate’s nomination papers: 116-118, 225, 408-415, 417-418, 420-427, 432-436, 456-457, 461, 463, 465-492, 494-499, 512-514, 517, 519-521, 620, 626-627, and 633-635. Those challenges all relate to alterations regarding the “County of Signers” line in the Preamble portion of the nomination papers. In all instances, the name of the County initially written in the Preamble is crossed-out and another name written on the “County of Signers” line. Sometimes, the alteration is accompanied by initials matching those of the circulator. Other times, no initials accompany the alteration. In some instances, the new name written on the “County of Signers” line is not the proper spelling of a county located within the 7th Congressional District but rather appears to be a misspelling of an appropriate county. In other instances, the altered County name is correct, such that, if the alteration of the Preamble did not violate the Election Code, no amendment is required.

The Court is not persuaded that the defects where circulators corrected the spelling of the name of the County in any way misled signers as to the County of the Signers. Thus, where a nomination paper contains alterations correcting the misspelling of the County name on the Preamble accompanied by initials matching the initials of the circulator (pages 116, and 421), the Court overrules Objectors’ objections to the Preamble, as the defect is cured. Similarly, where the nomination paper contains alterations correcting the misspelling of the County name on the Preamble with no accompanying initials (pages 225, 487, and 620), the Court

overrules Objectors' objections to the Preamble. Page 408 of the nomination papers contains a unique alteration; the name of the County was initially listed as Bethlehem, changed to Lehigh, then changed to Northhampton, the latter of which is misspelled (Northampton contains only one "h"). It is not apparent to the Court when such changes were made and whether the signers were confused as to what County that particular nomination paper related. Thus, we sustain Objectors' objection to page 408. However, regarding the nomination pages with readily apparent defects that remain on the Preamble, such as the misspelling of the name of the County, this Court must require testimony or an affidavit in order to correct the defects through amendment of the nomination papers. Thus, as to the numerous pages where the defect (misspelling of County name) remains, this Court must sustain Objector's objection and strike the page, as Candidate did not seek to amend the Preamble through the presentation of testimony or an affidavit.² Thus, the Court strikes the following pages: 117, 118, 408-415, 417, 418, 420, 422-427, 432-436, 453, 456, 457, 461, 465-486, 488-492, 494, 495-499, 505-508, 512-514, 519-521, 619, 625-628, and 633-635.

B. ALTERATIONS TO CIRCULATOR'S STATEMENTS

In their Objections, Objectors also challenged pages of Candidate's nomination papers on the grounds that the Circulator's Statement on each of those pages was "altered" and requested that the pages be stricken in their entirety. Objections at 8, ¶ 20. Objectors, upon further review, narrowed the challenges they

² The Candidate had little knowledge to offer about the circulation process and the individuals who served as circulators, having deputized his attorneys and others to handle the process for him. Had Candidate wished to correct the spellings of the Counties by amendment, he could have done so, but Candidate did not avail himself of the opportunity.

would pursue to those specifically identified in their post-hearing brief, identified below as updated challenges.

Section 951 of the Election Code, 25 P.S. § 2911, requires each nomination paper to include a statement, where the circulator affirms his or her full address, affirms that the “signers signed with full knowledge of the contents of the nomination paper”; affirms that the signers’ respective residences are “correctly stated”; affirms that the signers all “reside in the county named in the statement”; affirms that each signer “signed on the date set opposite” their name; and affirms that “to the best of the [circulator’s] knowledge and belief, the signers are qualified electors” of the electoral district. This statement must be made “subject to the penalties” of the law relating to unsworn falsification to authorities. *See* 25 P.S. § 2911(d).

Facial defects on the Circulator Statement are amendable by affidavit. *See In re Nader*, 865 A.2d 8, 166 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2004) (permitting “[a]mendment by affidavit” to correct defects). Here, there are several types of defects: alterations made to the “County of Paper Signers’ Residence” line to reflect the correct spelling of the appropriate county, alterations made to the “County of Paper Signers’ Residence” line to reflect a misspelling of the appropriate county, defects to the “Printed Name of Circulator” line, defects to the “Signature” line on the Circulator’s Statement, and alterations to the “Date” line on the Circulator’s Statement.

Objectors similarly acknowledge that “imperfectly executed circulator [Statements] contain amendable defects” but contend that the amendment process is driven by the discretion of the Court. Objectors’ Brief at 9-10 (emphasis omitted). Objectors further argue that some of these challenged pages are “doubly-defective” because of defects to the several aspects of the circulator statement, ranging from

allegations that pages were altered by someone other than the circulator to absence of initials adjacent to an alteration to lack of a full name or signature. *Id.* at 13-32. In all pages challenged under these grounds, Objectors pray this Court to “not exercise its discretion to allow amendment.” *Id.* at 12.

The Court will now consider Objectors’ updated objections to the Circulator’s Statements by category for the convenience of the Court. At the outset, we observe some circulators who provided an address for themselves outside of Pennsylvania appear initially to have misread the line of the Circulator’s Statement for the “County of Paper Signers’ Residence” as if the information requested was the County of the Signer’s Residence, *i.e.*, the circulator’s county of residence, as opposed to the County of the Signers’ Residence, which would be the same County that is identified in the Preamble. As a result, some of the Circulator’s Statements initially had names of counties outside of Pennsylvania listed therein.

The first two categories involve changes to the County of the Circulator’s Statements. Category 1³ consists of objections to the nomination papers where Circulator’s Statements included a County name on the statement that was

³ Objections to the following pages are contained within this category: Pages 12-40; 312-338; 522 (David Melnikov); Pages 41-73; 339-360; 523 (Sanford J. Pankin); Pages 74-100; 361-406; 524-526; 554-555 (Colin McEvers); Pages 101-113; 407-420; 527-528 (Timothy Hale); Pages 116-117; 529-532 (Karen Burch); Pgs. 118; 533 (Maurice Butler); Pgs. 119-122; 534-541 (Travis Napier); Pages 123-128; 542 (Alexis Roubidoux); Pages 129-134; 136-147; 436-455 (Matthew Mitchell); Pages 148-173; 544 (Michael Parado); Pages 174-175; 458-460 (David Owen); Pages 176-182; 300 (Raymond Stocking); Pages 183-208; 468; 470-472; 474; 476; 545-546; 556 (Thai Lam); Pages 209-228; 547-549 (Matthew Kanarick); Pages 231-235; 550 (Nicole Faraco); Pages 236-249; 251-262; 488-489; 550; 557-559; 561 (William Weffer); Pages 263-265; 500 (Rodney Pearson); Pages 266-278; 501-504; 552; 560 (Zyven Sobkowski); Pages 279-281 (Trevor Klett); Pages 282-285; 506 (Alexander Gordon); Pages 287-294 (Gideon Nagel); Pages 562-563; 565-572; 574-579; 588; 590 (Joseph Adamapolis); Pages 580-587; 591-616 (Mary [sic] Brown); Page 617 (Capri Ferguson); Pages 618-619; 621-622 (Matthew Wiley); Pages 623-624 (Angela Strickland); and Pages 625; 627-628; 630-632; 634-635 (Christina Fowler).

crossed-out and replaced with the appropriate County name. Initials appear next to the alterations that correspond to the name of the circulator. All spellings are correct in this category. Category 2⁴ similarly consists of objections to nomination papers where Circulator's Statements included a County name on the statement that was subsequently crossed-out and replaced with the appropriate County name. Initials appear next to the alteration that matches the name of the circulator. The spellings, however, are incorrect here.

The other three categories involve information missing from the Circulator's Statements. Category 3⁵ consists of objections to nomination papers where incomplete names are listed on the line "Printed Name of Circulator." Specifically, on four nomination papers identified in this category, the circulators identified themselves on that line by only their first name. Category 4⁶ consists of objections to nomination papers where the Circulator's Statements are not signed. Category 5⁷

⁴ Objections to the following pages are contained within this category Page 421 (Karen Burch – "North Hampton"); Page 422 (Maurice Butler – "North Hampton"); Pages. 423-427 (Travis Napier – "N Hampton"); Pages 428-435 (Alexis Roubidoux – North Hampton"); Pages 456-457 (Michael Parado – "North Hampton"); Pages 461-467 (David Owen – "North Hampton"); Pages 469; 473; 475; 477 (Thai Lam – "North Hampton"); Pages 478-484 (Matthew Kanarick – "Northhampton"); Pages 486-487 (Nicole Faraco – "Northhampton"); Page 505 (Trevor Klett – "North Hampton"); Pages 507-511 (Alexander Gordon – "North Hampton"); and Page 626 (Christina Fowler – "North Hampton").

⁵ Objections to the following pages are contained within this category: Page 115 – There is no last name listed (just "Timothy"); Page 250 – There is no last name listed (just "Wilmer"); and Pages 452; 543 – There is no last name listed (just "Matthew").

⁶ Objections to the following pages are contained within this category: Pages 209-228; 478-484; 547-549 ("MK" was signed); and Pages 263-265; 500 ("RP" was signed).

⁷ Objections to the following pages are contained within this category: Page 103 (Timothy Hale) (There is no evidence that the date was altered in any way to make it different. It is marked as 7/19/26 and there is nothing that was crossed out); and Page 312 (David Melnikov) (The date was initially marked as "07/26/2" and then was crossed out. "07/21/26" was marked, and the initials DM appear next to it. The signers of the nomination page all signed on 7/18/2026. No

consists of objections to nomination papers based on the date having been altered on the Circulator's Statements.

For the pages that have been already amended to reflect the correct spelling of the appropriate County (category 1) or the correct date (category 5), this Court overrules Objectors' objections because the defects no longer exist. However, for the pages with remaining defects relating to the spelling of the county name (category 2), missing full printed names (category 3), and no signature (category 4), this Court must require testimony or an affidavit in order to correct the defects. In the absence of testimony or an affidavit to correct the defects, the pages must be stricken. Thus, the Court strikes the following pages: 115, 209-228, 250, 263-265, 421-435, 452, 456-457, 461-467, 469, 473, 475, 477-484, 486-487, 500, 505, 507-511, 543, 547-549, and 626.

In reaching this conclusion, the Court notes that the Circulator's Statement is completed after the circulator obtains the signatures, as the circulator signs the statement attesting to certain facts as required by Sections 951 and 909⁸ of the Election Code. The Court cannot perceive how any of the above changes to the Circulator's Statements may have misled or deceived signers of the nomination papers.

C. FALSE ADDRESSES OF CIRCULATOR'S

In their Objections, Objectors also challenged numerous pages of Candidate's nomination papers on the grounds that the Circulator's Statements contained a false address for the circulator. Objections at 11, ¶ 42. Objectors, upon further review,

testimony has been provided to explain the date change. However, even if the Circulator Statement was truthfully signed on 7/26/2026, the signatures would still not be obtained outside the nomination page collection period).

⁸ 25 P.S. § 2869.

narrowed the challenges they would pursue. Specifically, Objectors maintain challenges to nomination pages circulated by Matthew Mitchell (Mitchell), Zyvan Sobkowski (Sobkowski), “Mr. W” (Weffer),⁹ and Raymond Stocking (Stocking). Objectors’ Brief at 35-38. Objectors argue that testimony of a private investigator and TikTok videos submitted to this Court are sufficient to establish that these individuals listed addresses at which they do not actually reside. *Id.* As such, Objectors request that this Court strike the pages that these individuals circulated. *Id.*

As alluded to above, Section 909 of the Election Code, 25 P.S. § 2869, requires circulators to certify, under penalty of law, that the “information set forth in [the Statement of the Circulator] is true and accurate.” Objectors presented the testimony of Daniel Ryan (Ryan), a private investigator who has been “licensed . . . in [the] Commonwealth of Pennsylvania” for the last 30 years. N.T. at 101. After voir dire of Ryan’s technical qualifications, this Court denied a motion to strike the witness for lack of qualification and allowed him to testify. *Id.* at 111. Ryan testified credibly and with much candor, explaining in detail the sources of information available to him and the potential limitations of the information he obtained. He testified that he utilized information on two “proprietary databases” as well as “Open Source Intelligence Information” to conduct a background investigation on some individuals that were listed as circulators for Candidate’s nomination papers. *Id.* at 113-114. Ryan also testified that it varies how fast the information databases update, but “generally it’s 30 to 60 days.” *Id.* at 135. Ryan testified that in his background investigation, he inserted the name and address into his company’s database and

⁹ Objectors’ Brief mentions that Mr. W circulated pages 236-262, 488-499, 551, 557-559, and 561. At trial, the circulator who circulated these pages was referred to as William Weffer, and this Court will refer to “Mr. W” as William Weffer or Weffer.

“develop[ed] a Social Security number.” *Id.* at 129. This, Ryan testified, enabled him to locate “an address history.” *Id.* Ryan testified that these are “generally accepted practices . . . within the private investigative industry.” *Id.* He testified that he utilized the database “IRB Search LLC” and another database backed by LexisNexis. *Id.* at 130.

On cross-examination, Ryan acknowledged that when he finds an address “associated” with a person, it is a point of reference and “there could be a variety of reasons why someone could be associated with an address.” *Id.* at 157. Ryan also affirmed that when his database reveals an association with an address, it doesn’t “conclusively mean . . . that person is living there.” *Id.* A person could show an association with an address even when the person stayed with a sick relative. *Id.* at 158. Ryan testified that an address is reported to a database and “associated” with a person through the application of one or more credit-related transactions. *Id.* at 133.

Circulator Mitchell listed an address on Parker Street in Fort Collins, Colorado, as his address on the Circulator Statement for pages 129-147 and 436-455. Ryan testified that his background investigation revealed “no association for . . . Matthew Mitchell with [the] Parker Street [address] in Fort Collins, Colorado.” *Id.* at 149. Ryan did, however, find an association between Mitchell and a Remington Street address in Fort Collins, Colorado. On cross-examination, he agreed that simply because his research did not show an association between the Parker Street address and Mitchell, it does not mean that Mitchell does not live there. *Id.* at 159. He agreed with Candidate’s counsel that “[i]t just means [Mitchell] did not do anything to associate himself with that address.” *Id.* The Court finds that the Remington Street address was written as an address on page 452, one of the pages

circulated by Mitchell, but it was crossed-out and replaced with the Parker Street address. The fact that the Remington Street address associated with Mitchell (per Ryan's testimony) was listed on Page 452 but then crossed-out suggests to this Court that the person signing the Circulator's Statement on page 452, Mitchell, was the person associated with the Remington Street address. Moreover, it is possible that Mitchell resided at the Remington Street address and has since moved to the Parker Street address, which is why both addresses show up on page 452. It is also possible that Mitchell has not yet engaged in any action that would have resulted in his name being populated in the databases utilized by Ryan or that the databases simply had not yet been updated to reflect the new address. As such, given the connection between the addresses evidenced on page 452, we cannot find that the information provided by Ryan establishes that Mitchell does not reside at the address listed on his nomination papers. Objectors' challenge to pages 129-147 and 436-455 are overruled.

Circulator Stocking listed an address on 62nd Street North, Clearwater, Florida, as his address on the Circulator Statement for pages 176-182, 300 and 461-467. Ryan testified that his background investigation revealed Stocking "was associated with that address during the period of March 2026 through April 2026." N.T. at 152. On cross-examination, Ryan agreed that this "association" does not necessarily mean Stocking stopped living at the address after April 2026. *Id.* at 160. Therefore, there is not sufficient evidence to declare that Stocking made a false statement on his Circulator Statements. Objectors' challenge to pages 176-182, 300 and 461-467 are overruled.

Circulator Weffer listed an address on North 1750 West, Provo, Utah, as his address on the Circulator Statement for pages 236-262, 488-499, 551, 557-559, and

561. Ryan testified that his background investigation revealed Weffer resided at that address “[s]tarting in the period of February 2022 and continuing through January 2026.” N.T. at 148. Mr. Ryan also found association between Weffer and another Utah address (about 16 miles away) between June 2025 and August 2026. *Id.* This Court finds Mr. Ryan’s investigation inconclusive as to determine Weffer’s current residence, and this Court declines to strike pages that Weffer circulated. *See Petition of Thompson*, 516 A.2d 1278, 1283 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1984) (“signatures should not be set aside except in the most clear case”). Objectors’ challenge to pages 236-262, 488-499, 551, 557-559, and 561 are overruled.

Circulator Sobkowski listed 3111 James Bay Court, Jamestown, North Carolina, as his address on the Circulator Statement for pages 266-278, 501-504, 552, and 560. Objectors attempted to introduce TikTok videos purportedly depicting Sobkowski in order to establish that he listed an address at which he does not reside on the Circulator Statements. Candidate’s counsel objected to the admission of the videos. Although Counsel for Candidate agreed that the videos were Tik Tok videos, he objected to their admission on two grounds: (1) authenticity and lack of foundation to establish that the Zyven Sobkowski who signed the Circulator’s Statements was the same person as the person depicted in the Tik Tok videos, purporting to be a person name Zyven Sobkowski; and (2) hearsay because Objectors sought to use a statement made by the person in the video to establish the state in which Circulator Sobkowski resided differed from the address contained on the Circulator’s Statements.

Pennsylvania Rule of Evidence 901 requires authentication of videos prior to admission of evidence, and the proponent of the evidence must introduce “evidence sufficient to support a finding that the item is what the proponent claims it is.” *See*

Pa.R.E. 901(a). The proponent of the evidence must present “direct or circumstantial evidence that tends to corroborate the identity of the author,” such as testimony from the author or receiver of the content or “contextual clues” in the communication. *See Commonwealth v. Mangel*, 181 A.3d 1154, 1162 (Pa. Super. 2018). Just because the video came from a certain person’s named account is not sufficient to authenticate the author. *See Commonwealth v. Koch*, 39 A.3d 996, 1005 (Pa. Super. 2011). In *Commonwealth v. Jackson*, 283 A.3d 814 (Pa. Super. 2022), our Superior Court looked to testimony by the defendant that he owned the account, as well as postings on the account of images and other matching identification of the defendant, to authenticate the social media account. Here, there was no testimony regarding the ownership of the TikTok account that created the videos that Objectors seek to introduce. Similarly, the Circulator Statements do not provide any identifying information regarding the circulator. As such, this Court has no information to link Circulator Sobkowski to the TikTok videos nor to verify that the person portrayed in the video is actually Circulator Sobkowski. Therefore, this Court will not admit the TikTok videos, and Objectors’ challenges to pages 266-278, 501-504, 552, and 560 are overruled.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth below, the Court strikes the following pages: 115 (20 signatures); 117 (4 signatures); 118 (3 signatures); 209 (3 signatures); 210 (18 signatures); 211 (20 signatures); 212 (18 signatures); 213 (18 signatures); 214 (20 signatures); 215 (20 signatures); 216 (20 signatures); 217 (20 signatures); 218 (20 signatures); 219 (20 signatures); 220 (20 signatures); 221 (20 signatures); 222 (18 signatures); 223 (20 signatures); 224 (20 signatures); 225 (20 signatures); 226 (19 signatures); 227 20 signatures); 228 (20 signatures); 250 (20 signatures);

263 (20 signatures); 264 (10 signatures); 265 (20 signatures); 408 (20 signatures);
409 (20 signatures); 410 (19 signatures); 411 (20 signatures); 412 (20 signatures);
413 (12 signatures); 414 (6 signatures); 415 (20 signatures); 417 (20 signatures);
418 (20 signatures); 419 (20 signatures); 420 (20 signatures); 421 (16 signatures);
422 (6 signatures); 423 (5 signatures); 424 (4 signatures); 425 (20 signatures);
426 (20 signatures); 427 (5 signatures); 428 (20 signatures); 429 (20 signatures);
430 (20 signatures); 431 (20 signatures); 432 (6 signatures); 433 (2 signatures);
434 (20 signatures); 435 (20 signatures); 456 (18 signatures); 457 (8 signatures);
461 (8 signatures); 462 (20 signatures); 463 (20 signatures); 464 (20 signatures);
465 (20 signatures); 466 (20 signatures); 467 (20 signatures); 468 (20 signatures);
469 (18 signatures); 470 (20 signatures); 471 (20 signatures); 472 (20 signatures);
473 (20 signatures); 474 (9 signatures); 475 (20 signatures); 476 (14 signatures);
477 (3 signatures); 478 (16 signatures); 479 (13 signatures); 480 (17 signatures);
481 (20 signatures); 482 (20 signatures); 483 (3 signatures); 484 (5 signatures);
485 (7 signatures); 486 (5 signatures); 487 (1 signature) 488 (13 signatures);
489 (20 signatures); 490 (20 signatures); 491 (20 signatures); 492 (20 signatures);
494 (4 signatures); 495 (20 signatures); 496 (20 signatures); 497 (20 signatures);
498 (8 signatures); 499 (20 signatures); 500 (3 signatures); 505 (14 signatures);
506 (20 signatures); 507 (20 signatures); 508 (11 signatures); 509 (20 signatures);
510 (20 signatures); 511 (20 signatures); 512 (16 signatures); 513 (4 signatures);
514 (4 signatures); 519 (20 signatures); 520 (20 signatures); 521 (15 signatures);
543 (7 signatures); 547 (2 signatures); 548 (2 signatures); 549 (1 signature);

619 (2 signatures); 625 (13 signatures); 626 (2 signatures); 627 (8 signatures); 628 (3 signatures); 634 (7 signatures); and 635 (3 signatures). The total number of stricken signatures is 1,761 signatures.

/s/ Stella M. Tsai
STELLA M. TSAI, Judge

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In re: Nomination Papers of :
Andrew Tupone as a Green :
Party Candidate for Congress :
in the 7th Congressional District :
:
Objection of: Joyce Moore, :
Susan Baranek, and Louise :
Dillensnyder : No. 363 M.D. 2026

ORDER

AND NOW, this 5th day of September, 2026, following a hearing on Objections filed by Joyce Moore, Susan Baranek, and Louise Dillensnyder (collectively Objectors) to the nomination papers of Andrew Tupone (Candidate) as the Green Party candidate for Representative in Congress from the 7th Congressional District in the November 3, 2026 General Election, it is hereby ORDERED:

1. The Court strikes the following pages: 115 (20 signatures); 117 (4 signatures); 118 (3 signatures); 209 (3 signatures); 210 (18 signatures); 211 (20 signatures); 212 (18 signatures); 213 (18 signatures); 214 (20 signatures); 215 (20 signatures); 216 (20 signatures); 217 (20 signatures); 218 (20 signatures); 219 (20 signatures); 220 (20 signatures); 221 (20 signatures); 222 (18 signatures); 223 (20 signatures); 224 (20 signatures); 225 (20 signatures); 226 (19 signatures); 227 (20 signatures); 228 (20 signatures); 250 (20 signatures); 263 (20 signatures); 264 (10 signatures); 265 (20 signatures); 408 (20 signatures); 409 (20 signatures); 410 (19 signatures); 411 (20 signatures); 412 (20 signatures); 413 (12 signatures);

414 (6 signatures); 415 (20 signatures); 417 (20 signatures); 418 (20 signatures); 419 (20 signatures); 420 (20 signatures); 421 (16 signatures); 422 (6 signatures); 423 (5 signatures); 424 (4 signatures); 425 (20 signatures); 426 (20 signatures); 427 (5 signatures); 428 (20 signatures); 429 (20 signatures); 430 (20 signatures); 431 (20 signatures); 432 (6 signatures); 433 (2 signatures); 434 (20 signatures); 435 (20 signatures); 456 (18 signatures); 457 (8 signatures); 461 (8 signatures); 462 (20 signatures); 463 (20 signatures); 464 (20 signatures); 465 (20 signatures); 466 (20 signatures); 467 (20 signatures); 468 (20 signatures); 469 (18 signatures); 470 (20 signatures); 471 (20 signatures); 472 (20 signatures); 473 (20 signatures); 474 (9 signatures); 475 (20 signatures); 476 (14 signatures); 477 (3 signatures); 478 (16 signatures); 479 (13 signatures); 480 (17 signatures); 481 (20 signatures); 482 (20 signatures); 483 (3 signatures); 484 (5 signatures); 485 (7 signatures); 486 (5 signatures); 487 (1 signature); 488 (13 signatures); 489 (20 signatures); 490 (20 signatures); 491 (20 signatures); 492 (20 signatures); 494 (4 signatures); 495 (20 signatures); 496 (20 signatures); 497 (20 signatures); 498 (8 signatures); 499 (20 signatures); 500 (3 signatures); 505 (14 signatures); 506 (20 signatures); 507 (20 signatures); 508 (11 signatures); 509 (20 signatures); 510 (20 signatures); 511 (20 signatures); 512 (16 signatures); 513 (4 signatures); 514 (4 signatures); 519 (20 signatures); 520 (20 signatures); 521 (15 signatures); 543 (7 signatures); 547 (2 signatures); 548 (2 signatures); 549 (1 signature); 619 (2 signatures); 625 (13 signatures); 626 (2 signatures); 627 (8 signatures); 628 (3 signatures); 634 (7 signatures); 635 (3 signatures), totaling 1,761 signatures stricken.

2. A Case Management Conference is scheduled for September 8, 2026, at 11:00 a.m. The conference shall be conducted via WebEx video conferencing, and the Court will provide counsel a link for the conference prior to the scheduled time. Counsel shall be prepared to discuss how this matter will proceed to conclusion.
3. This order is NOT a final, appealable order.

/s/ Stella M. Tsai
STELLA M. TSAI, Judge