

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

January 11, 2024

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

Sent via email: eyeforjustice@yahoo.com

Re: Complaint Filed with Wisconsin Elections Commission EL 24-04 (Ieshuh Griffin v. Claire Woodall-Vogg)

Dear Ms. Griffin:

I am in receipt of the complaint filed with the Wisconsin Elections Commission ("WEC" or "Commission"), received on January 9, 2024, against Claire Woodall-Vogg, Executive Director of the Milwaukee Election Commission. The administrative rules governing the WEC'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 alleges unclear violations of law by the Director Woodall-Vogg for "acting outside her sworn duties" and failing to act "in accordance with Challenge Complaint procedures" when dismissing your challenge. No specific violation of Wisconsin elections statutes is cited, and the complaint fails to tie the alleged deficiency to a specific party's obligation under law. 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).

Sufficiency as to Probable Cause

The complaint alleges unspecified violations of law and just generally states violations of ballot access challenge processes occurred. The complaint cites no provisions of Wisconsin Statutes Chapters 5-10, and 12, at least not in a manner that ties them to an actionable complaint. The Commission has the authority to administer and consider those statutes in the context of sworn complaints, but the alleged violation must be clearly detailed. Without citing the statutory provisions alleged to have been violated, or at least detailing a clear statutory obligation a clerk/official had, the complaint fails to raise probable cause that a violation of election law has occurred.

Sufficiency as to Form

As detailed above, the complaint fails to raise specific violations under Wisconsin elections law. It is also unclear what the facts were, specifically the decisions, documents, or actions that are alleged to be in violation of those laws. As such, the complaint is also insufficient as to form. There is no clear, sworn statement or supporting materials as to what exactly transpired, and the relevant facts are not even clear, even beyond the lack of cited laws which are alleged to have been violated.

Wisconsin Elections Commissioners

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

Conclusion

I am returning the complaint, without prejudice, pursuant to Wis. Admin. Code § EL 20.04(2), as it fails to state probable cause that a violation of election law has occurred or meet the form requirements of a complaint. As required by that provision of administrative code, I have specified the defects in the complaint (probable cause and form). As to the information which would be appropriate to cure the defect, allegations of an official violating provisions of Chapters 5 to 10 or 12 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. Since the complaint does not state probable cause as to a violation of law under the authority of the Commission, and it also fails to make clear the facts of those alleged violations, the complaint has not been accepted as proper by the Commission under its administrative rules.

The Commission now considers this matter closed.

Sincerely,

Meagan Wolfe Administrator

Wisconsin Elections Commission

cc: Members, Wisconsin Elections Commission

Enclosure