UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Χ

- - - - - - - - - - - -

CAMPANELLO et al,

16-CV-1892 (SJF)

Plaintiffs,

-against-

United States Courthouse

1

Central Islip, New York

NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF

ELECTIONS, et al

April 19, 2016

Defendants. : 2:00 p.m.

- - - - - - - X

TRANSCRIPT OF ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOANNA SEYBERT UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: BY: BLAIRE FELLOWS, ESQ.

JONATHAN C. CLARKE, ESQ.

140 Gazza Boulevard

Farmingdale, New York 11735

For the Defendant: STATE OF NEW YORK

Office of the Attorney General

200 Old Country Road Mineola, New York 11501 BY: RALPH PERNICK, ESQ. Assistant Attorney General

Court Reporter: Perry Auerbach

100 Federal Plaza

Central Islip, New York 11722

(631) 712-6103

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography.

Transcript produced by computer.

2 THE CLERK: Order To Show Cause, Campanello 1 2 et al versus New York State Board of Elections et al. 3 Please state your appearance for the record. MS. FELLOWS: Your Honor, Blaire Fellows, 4 attorney for Leonard Joseph Campanello et al, 140 Gazza 5 Boulevard, Farmingdale, New York 11735. 6 7 THE COURT: And seated next to you. MR. CLARKE: I'm Jonathan Clarke, co-counsel 8 9 with Blaire Fellows. I'm not admitted in this court, but 10 I am an attorney. 11 THE COURT: And for the State of New York. 12 MR. PERNICK: Assistant Attorney General Ralph 13 Pernick for all defendants, 200 Old Country Road, Mineola 14 New York, 11501. 15 THE COURT: All right. We're here today because 16 an Order To Show Cause in support of a complaint providing 17 me with the specifics, were served by Ms. Fellows at about five to five yesterday, and this court, being on 18 19 miscellaneous duty, was notified of the service around 20 nine o'clock. I've had an opportunity to look at some of 21 the papers here, and I understand that when Judge 22 Feuerstein's clerk -- it was originally filed with Judge 23 Feuerstein and she'll retain the case, but for today I 24 have full authority to act on it. 25 In any event, I understand you went to Judge

Feuerstein's chambers, courtroom rather, and waited there, and if you want to stay in business you really have to get a receptionist or an answering machine that can take the volume of calls you got, because we notified you, we wanted to speak to you, see if the parties were served, see what time you could be here, and process this as early as possible. So we were trying to get it on for 11:00, and finally were able to get in touch with you, I guess it was around 11 o'clock.

MS. FELLOWS: Your Honor, we apologize. Our firm is currently on sabbatical. My partner here is running for Congress. So we are right now just we've handed in our election signatures and we're just trying to --

THE COURT: I'm just telling you what the Court is faced with.

So I did some research today, and one of the things we did do was review what's available to these voters. And I'm not going to be the one to make a determination in terms of the final, whether there's going to be a TRO granted today, I'll make that determination, or more likely I will put it over for a hearing next week before Judge Feuerstein. But let me just ask you a simple question. Were any of these folks, did they go down and attempt to vote? Because under New York State law,

there's a pretty simple process to get it done. One is to show up early in the morning and you say to the people in the polling place "I want to vote." They go through their list and they say you're not registered. And then they say you can go over to the Supreme Court, there's a bank of election law lawyers generally, at least in my recollection of the area, and you can talk to them. And they'll present your issue to a judge and generally get an affidavit or court order that directs the polling place to let you vote. Isn't that the way this works?

MS. FELLOWS: Your Honor, our allegations are that there were voters purged from the roll, and under the National Voter Reg Act, enacted in 1993 by then President Bill Clinton, the registration roll, purged roll are supposed to be readily available for two years, and this morning Bill DiBlasio went to the media and verified that over a hundred thousand residents in Brooklyn have been purged from the rolls and the New York City Board of Elections had stated that they have not updated the roll since November, which is a violation of New York election law where multiple boards of elections must keep records or purged voters updated once a month and keep the records of purged voters in alphabetical order on readily available computer database.

THE COURT: Okay. But you have several groups

5 1 of plaintiffs here. Some of them are registration, they 2 allege, switched without their knowledge, they were 3 republican or rather, democrat and someone switched it an awhile ago, or an untimely switch or registration or first 4 time registration. Then you have purged registrants, at 5 least one person from the Bronx, then you have a variety 6 7 of miscellaneous issues. So my first question is, I don't know if the 8 9 National Voting Rights Registration Act is the vehicle you 10 need to get accomplished what these variety of plaintiffs 11 want. 12 I also really would find it a lot more 13 convenient for your group of voters who want to vote today 14 if they went or at least have this action brought in 15 Brooklyn, because they're appear to be a number of people 16 in Brooklyn. The Eastern District covers Staten Island, 17 Brooklyn, Queens, Nassau and Suffolk. You have people 18 from the Bronx, you have them all over the state. 19 Let me just ask Mr. Pernick, what, if any, 20 response do you have on this. 21 MR. PERNICK: I have several, your Honor. First of all, one of these voters can go to the 22 23 polls and if the party registration information is

incorrect they can file an affidavit ballot and part of

that process includes filing an affidavit under oath --

24

25

and I'm reading one that I took this morning from the State Board of Elections website, and one of the categories is box checked off for primary elections only, I am enrolled in the political party stated in the section above, but the poll book does not reflect my correct enrollment. That seems to be the situation of these particular plaintiffs, four of them by my count knew in March what the situation was with respect to their -- the records concerning them.

In addition, the purging is not done at the state level. It's done by county boards, none of whom are named as parties here. And in addition, one of the things that they asked for is for the Court to rewrite the state election law by changing the primaries so they're older primaries, I'm a member of party A, I can vote in the primary for the candidate from some other party.

The parties are not -- the political parties are not parties to the lawsuit either. Here we are, this was filed a day before the primary. I'm informed that the election is underway, I voted this morning, there are 5,300 polling sites administered by 3500 poll workers in the state, and that indicated, that is one indication of how late minute'ish this eleventh hour application is.

The Court already stated that there are various state remedies that are available.

7 1 And I would also indicate for the Court's 2 benefit that the complaint appears to cite to the 3 incorrect section of the election law. They refer to 8-330. 4 THE COURT: It's 302. 5 MR. PERNICK: And it's 302, correct, your Honor. 6 7 With respect to the federal statute they refer to, that deals with military ballots and none of these people 8 9 allege that he fall within that category. 10 THE COURT: The one about notice and the right 11 to bring the lawsuit is 205.10. 12 MR. PERNICK: And the statute also says -- I'm 13 told the statute is Section 16-206 subdivision 2, which 14 authorizes anybody to sue over the canvas of their ballot. 15 I think when you add up all the infirmities here that this 16 case, whatever its ultimate merits may be determined to 17 be, certainly should not be the subject of any stay at 18 this point. It would simply be impossible to comply today 19 with only a few more hours left when the polls are still 20 open to accomplish anything without mass confusion. 21 So my bottom line is that no stay should be 22 issued today and the Order to Show Cause itself should be 23 made returnable with no stay at a date convenient to Judge 24 Feuerstein. 25 THE COURT: Yes.

8 1 MS. FELLOWS: Your Honor, our position is that 2 the right to do that, to get a court order is not affected. A lot of the disenfranchised voters are working 3 families, some of them are minorities and under 1983 their 4 5 rights are being violated. And under New York Election Law 8-302 2 subsection B, we are asking for simple remedy, 6 7 and that remedy comes with evidence with why they are not going to count the provisional ballot, rather than doing 8 it behind the closed doors tonight, violating the voters 9 10 rights to due process. 11 THE COURT: Has any of your voters consulted 12 like the New York State Women's League of Voters, with the 13 variety of remedies that are set out simply, have any of 14 them contacted their respective Board of Elections to 15 see -- let me ask you the first question, anyone review 16 what's on the website, New York State Women's League of 17 Voters or any of the other multiple Web sites with respect 18 to counties or Board of Election. 19 MS. FELLOWS: Your Honor, a substantial number 20 of our -- well, 15 of our plaintiffs and the unsworn 21 affidavit --22 THE COURT: I'm not looking at unsworn 23 affidavits. 24 MS. FELLOWS: This case overlaps on Saturday,

25

which why we --

THE COURT: How did you gather up the customers.

MS. FELLOWS: Working with the group of people on social media and they took down names and numbers of individuals, they vetted them, and all of the people in our lawsuit have filed before, switched parties before the October 19, 2015 deadline or were nearly registered voters befor the March 25, 2016 deadline.

We have reports coming in to people in my social media group suggesting that 450 people had to vote by provisional ballot who are in fact registered democrats who have been purged.

THE COURT: You don't have a problem with the provisional ballot, do you? I mean, essentially if it happened, you know --

MS. FELLOWS: Our position is that, they don't get counted, they're purged. Our solution is that rather than denying these voters of their right to due process, that we determine on a later date what votes should be counted. And we don't think that this is an undue hardship on the Board of Elections considering they should have purged rolls for the past few years. And I just, I did do the New York State Board of Elections and in their official capacity and I presented all commissioners of the county Board of Elections New York State, it would have been far too onerous to name every single Board of

10 1 Elections county in all of New York State. 2 THE COURT: But you're asking me to take 3 jurisdiction and take whatever votes you find should be That's a little bit onerous on the Boards of 4 taken. Election, isn't it, at 2:35? 5 MS. FELLOWS: Well, under Carpenter -- upon 6 7 information and belief, they are the ones that have purged the voters, the New York State Board of Elections. 8 9 MR. PERNICK: Frankly, the statute indicates 10 that is simply incorrect. That is done at the county 11 level. 12 THE COURT: What does the statute say, 13 Ms. Fellows? 14 MS. FELLOWS: What statute are you referring to? 15 THE COURT: It's in the state statute, isn't it, 16 Mr. Pernick? 17 MR. PERNICK: Yes, your Honor. First of all, 18 under election law 5-614 sub 4, only the local board that 19 can make changes to the voter registration records, and 20 the state board does not canvas those results as provided 21 under 9-209. 22 The fact that it may be difficult for the 23 plaintiffs to have named all of the county boards of 24 elections, frankly, is their problem. They are seeking 25 relief that affects them with respect to a task that the

statute assigns the counties, they should be named and served. And simply stating that complaint and I see in the caption that 2 -- the 2 co-executive directors of the state board are named in official capacity, capacities as co-executive directors of the state board and representative all commissioners of the county boards of elections in New York State. That doesn't make it so.

County boards certainly have the right to come in here and be heard. As do the political parties with respect to this claim that the Court should rewrite the statute and declare that New York today should have an open primary.

In terms of due process, the statute gives them the process their due. Everything that I hear at this point is upon information and belief. I don't know what the information is. I don't know what the belief is. I have to presume that there's a basis for it, just as I have to presume that government, at a minimum government entities are presumed to do the right thing in terms of obeying the law.

I don't subscribe to any social media, but I did pull up on the Web and he see statements to the effect that the Court was having a hearing today at nine a.m.

Your Honor, I don't know where that information comes from and there's certainly nothing here that indicates this is

upon information and belief. This is a blatant attempt, giving the Court no real opportunity to get into this technical area of the law at a moment's notice. It's simply unfair, it's unfair to the Court, it's unfair to the defendants, who were named, and it's unfair to nonparties. There shouldn't be any stay granted.

THE COURT: As you know, Mr. Pernick, life can be unfair at times.

However, I'm a court of law and I'm trying to ascertain the appropriate jurisdiction, and I have the parties that should be included in the lawsuit, and the ultimate relief that you're seeking is what Mr. Pernick is saying, Ms. Fellows, and that is an open primary.

MS. FELLOWS: Your Honor, that was one of our alternative forms of relief.

However, if our primary form of relief we are asking is that the votes of purged democrats be counted. That is the relief that we are requesting. That was an alternative relief. And we're asking for an equitable remedy so we would hope that --

THE COURT: Let's suggest for a moment that I say okay, all purged democrats, whether they're plaintiffs or not, they should have the opportunity to vote today. That's what you're telling me you ask for. What if some of these people no longer live here, changed their

addresses, could care less about voting, and they become ardent republicans or independents. There has to be some orderly process.

MS. FELLOWS: Okay. Your Honor, what we were asking is that the Board of Elections show proof of provisional ballots that they are rejecting at a hearing at a later date. I don't know where this nine a.m. circulation of a hearing at nine a.m. and an open primary came about, I did not -- that happened on social media. Our lawsuit is about the disenfranchised voters who were turned around at the ballot, some of them, who do not have time to seek a Court order. In fact, I don't see how the Court order today is in effect a solution considering the judge would be looking at the roll, the same roll that they got purged from. And I spoke to someone today and they registered Democrat in 2012 and they have not changed address and they were denied a court order.

THE COURT: That may be. But there's a study you referred to Mayor DiBlasio making a statement concerning the disenfranchised voters, there's another study that shows something like all the investigations so far have indicated voter error with respect to motor vehicle law that permits you to register to vote and people inadvertently checked off the American party independents is another section that you can vote, in

California.

But I mean there's a variety of errors. My reading of the National Voter Registration Act is that it requires the state to do -- the states and, therefore, the counties Board of Elections to do a number of things.

So I'm going to deny your TRO and your stay because I do not believe that there's really any likely success on the merits.

However, I will allow the stay and if you want to amend your complaint and bring in the counties you can do that, Judge Feuerstein said that she had available any day next week to hear this case, and I would suggest perhaps Thursday of next week. Does that work for Judge Feuerstein? I'll put it down for that time and when are you getting in your responsive papers?

MS. FELLOWS: Your Honor, can I request an order that the Board of Elections preserves their provisional ballots and not --

MR. PERNICK: That's the role of the counties.

THE COURT: You don't have the right person here for me to give that order to. I mean if you had at least included the counties involved and their respective boards of elections, then I could understand. And many of these folks claimed -- this is some people that showed up at the polls today and find out they're not properly registered

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

15 to the party that may want to vote in this election but many of these people knew they were not eligible to vote weeks ago, months ago, and they didn't do anything about it. I mean there is a process. There are judges that sit in New York Supreme to issue these orders and people are advised to go to the judges, sometimes you have not only the Board of Elections being represented by counsel but you have independent counsel that advises voters what they can to get these court orders and allow people to vote. And none of that is included in here. Ι don't have the ability to issue those kind of orders, because the responsible parties aren't before me. have they been notified of anything. So that's your dilemma. Perhaps you can resolve some of these issues with Judge Feuerstein if there's a basis. I'm going put the matter over until Thursday, let me just double-check with her law clerk. Mr. Pernick, do you know if any of the Board of Elections are required to keep the ballots that voters are attempting to seek? MR. PERNICK: My understanding is that that's the responsibility of --THE COURT: The question is do you know.

MR. PERNICK: No, I do not.

	16
1	THE COURT: And do you know?
2	MS. FELLOWS: No.
3	THE COURT: All right. I just communicated with
4	Judge Feuerstein and she decided that she doesn't want a
5	hearing at this time. She believes that she can resolve
6	it on papers. So responsive papers I'll give you until
7	not next week, but the following week to get those in and
8	if she needs oral argument it's got to be simultaneous
9	submission of papers, and if she needs oral argument,
10	she'll let you know.
11	MS. FELLOWS: Can we amend our complaint?
12	THE COURT: Sure.
13	MS. FELLOWS: Okay.
14	THE COURT: I would amend it to include the
15	proper parties. Get those down.
16	MS. FELLOWS: Anyone have idea how many counties
17	there are in New York?
18	THE COURT: I think something like 68.
19	THE CLERK: 62.
20	MS. FELLOWS: So we have that time to
21	MR. PERNICK: To handle the counties in which
22	the plaintiffs are all within the metropolitan area.
23	THE COURT: You don't know what's going to turn
24	up on their social media website.
25	MS. FELLOWS: It's not my social media website.

17 1 It's groups that are disbursing information online, not to 2 the advice of me. I'm not including any information or 3 making any statement. THE COURT: Okay. But if you're going to rely 4 on, it get plaintiffs from it, I'm sure you have been 5 6 vetting the plaintiffs. 7 MS. FELLOWS: Yes, I have vetted all 15 of my plaintiffs. 8 MR. PERNICK: Point of information. Did Judge 9 10 Feuerstein indicate a due date for our responsive papers. 11 THE COURT: I think what she wants is a 12 simultaneous exchange of papers and if she needs oral 13 argument, she'll have that. 14 THE LAW CLERK: The opposition is filed 15 simultaneously. 16 THE COURT: So next week is the 25th and if I 17 make it the following week that will be May 2nd. Thursday 18 of that week would be May 5th. 19 MS. FELLOWS: Is there any way to advance the 20 date? 21 MR. PERNICK: Your Honor, I will be out of town 22 on vacation from the 26th. 23 THE COURT: Folks, this isn't my case. 24 MS. FELLOWS: Okay. 25 MR. PERNICK: Okay.

18 1 THE COURT: I'm trying to make it as simple as 2 possible. How much time do you need to amend your 3 complaint, get these parties served, and make an argument as to why you're entitled to a Preliminary Injunction or 4 an injunction, period. 5 6 MS. FELLOWS: A week, a week from today. 7 THE COURT: You can do that by April the 26th, 8 that is what you're saying. 9 MS. FELLOWS: Yes. 10 THE COURT: Getting all of that done and your 11 papers, too. 12 MS. FELLOWS: Yes. 13 THE COURT: That's before your vacation. 14 THE COURT: Let's go with the bundle procedure. 15 You get with yours in on the 26th and you get with your 16 response in before you leave on vacation, so it should be 17 the 29th. And then if she wants oral argument she'll let 18 you know. 19 File everything on the 29th. Judge Feuerstein 20 does hers differently than I do mine. I let you do what 21 you want, get it in, and that's why I get all the motions 22 on my list. 23 The amended complaint you have to get in by the 24 26th along with your papers. 25 MS. FELLOWS: Okay.

```
19
                 THE COURT: And good luck to you, sir.
 1
                 MR. CLARKE: Thank you.
 2
                 MS. FELLOWS:
 3
                                Thank you.
 4
                 (Matter concluded.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```