

Wisconsin Elections Commission

201 West Washington Avenue | Second Floor | P.O. Box 7984 | Madison, WI 53707-7984 (608) 266-8005 | elections@wi.gov | elections.wi.gov

February 19, 2024

Ieshuh Griffin 2722A N. Richards Street Milwaukee, WI 53212

Sent via email: eyeforjustice@yahoo.com

Re: Complaint Filed with Wisconsin Elections Commission EL 24-21 (Ieshuh Griffin v. Claire Woodall-Vogg, IV)

Dear Ms. Griffin:

I am in receipt of the complaint filed with the Wisconsin Elections Commission (Commission), received on February 7, 2024, against Claire Woodall, Executive Director of the City of Milwaukee Election Commission. The administrative rules governing the Commission's processing of complaints require that I review the complaint and determine within 10 business days whether the complaint is timely, is sufficient as to form, and states probable cause. Wis. Admin. Code § EL 20.04(1). The complaint makes four allegations concerning the ballot access qualifications of four candidates. All four claims had been considered and dismissed by Executive Director Woodall. No specific Wisconsin elections statutes are cited regarding the allegations, and the complaint fails to argue that the reasons given for the dismissal of your challenges by Executive Director Woodall were incorrect. Additionally, to the extent your complaint involves allegations of ballot access qualifications, it is not timely because it was not submitted within 10 days after the relevant determinations. Therefore, I am returning the complaint to you without prejudice pursuant to Wis. Stat. § 5.06 and Wis. Admin. Code § EL 20.04(1) and (2).

Timeliness

Wis. Stat. $\S 5.06(3)$ states that:

In no case may a complaint relating to nominations, qualifications of candidates or ballot preparation be filed later than 10 days after the complainant knew or should have known that a violation of law or abuse of discretion occurred or was proposed to occur.

On January 9, the Commission received two sworn complaint filings from you including allegations related to candidate qualification and ballot access. The Commission issued a return letter for each complaint naming deficiencies. Those complaints were both received within 10 days of the relevant ballot access decisions, which in this case occurred on January 3, and thus were timely. To the extent that this complaint involves allegations related to candidate qualifications and ballot access, it is not timely because it was not received within 10 days of the ballot access decisions at issue. To the extent this complaint makes other claims against the Respondent, it could be processed by the Commission if the other issues outlined in this letter are addressed.

Wisconsin Elections Commissioners

Don M. Millis, chair | Marge Bostelmann | Ann S. Jacobs | Carrie Riepl | Robert Spindell | Mark L. Thomsen

Sufficiency as to Probable Cause

In a Wis. Stat. § 5.06 complaint, the Commission examines the actions of local election officials. In this case, the Commission must examine whether the actions of Executive Director Woodall in dismissing your complaints were violations of law or abuses of discretion. You do not make any arguments supported by statutory citations that those dismissals were incorrect. Instead, you allege, as you did in the initial challenge submitted to the Executive Director, that Cavelier Johnson and David Kind did not submit proper campaign finance registration statements and that Jonathan Brostoff and Russell Stamper did not submit properly notarized declarations of candidacy. No specific statutory citations are provided for these allegations. The decision of the Executive Director, which was included in your complaint, dismissed these challenges and provided reasons why they were dismissed. Your complaint before the Commission does not attempt to argue that any of these reasons were incorrect. Therefore, there are no arguments included in your complaint that could lead to a finding of probable cause that the decisions to dismiss your challenges were incorrect.

To the extent your compliant makes allegations that Executive Director Woodall is involved in "coverups and collusions" and discriminatory actions, those arguments are not sufficiently developed, and do not contain any citations to election law, and thus could not lead to a finding of probable cause. If you wish to develop these allegations, please cite which statutes govern your allegations, explain how they have been violated, and provide evidence of the violations.

Sufficiency as to Form

As detailed above, the complaint fails to raise specific violations under Wisconsin election law. It is also unclear what the facts were, specifically the decisions or actions that are alleged to be in violation of election laws, in this case the review of the Executive Director of your challenges to the ballot access of other candidates. As such, the complaint is also insufficient as to form.

Conclusion

I am returning the complaint, without prejudice, pursuant to Wis. Admin. Code § EL 20.04(2), as it, at least in part, is not timely and it also fails to state probable cause that a violation of election law has occurred and fails to meet the form requirements of a complaint. I have specified the defects in the complaint (timeliness, probable cause, and form). As to the information which would be appropriate to cure the defect, allegations of an official violating provisions of Wisconsin Statute Chapters 5 to 10 or 12 or Wisconsin Administrative Code Chapters 2–3, 6–7, 9–12, or 20 are under the authority of the Commission and would be necessary for the review of the complaint, if sufficient evidence to support the allegations is also part of that filing.

The Commission now considers this matter closed.

leagan LM. Wolfe

Sincerely,

Meagan Wolfe Administrator Correspondence (Griffin v. Woodall, IV) February 19, 2024 Page 3

Wisconsin Elections Commission

cc: Members, Wisconsin Elections Commission

Enclosure