

**State of Wisconsin  
Before the Wisconsin Elections Commission**

**The Verified Complaint of**

1. Jay Stone  
10501 82nd St.  
Pleasant Prairie, WI 53158

**Against Complaint Respondent**

1. Meagan Wolfe  
Wisconsin Elections Commission  
212 East Washington Avenue, Third Floor  
P.O. Box 7984  
Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7984

This complaint is made under Wisconsin Statutes § 5.06 and is a response to Respondent Wolfe's response.

**Administrator Wolfe's Failure to Act Allowed \$1.07 Million of CTCL's \$6.3 Million  
Election Grants to be Unlawfully Based on Race**

"The Wisconsin Safe Voting Plan" (WSVP) press release was the first exhibit Complainant submitted in his August 28, 2020 complaint. The WSVP second recommendation stated, "Total For All Strategies to Dramatically Expand Strategic Voter Education and Outreach Efforts, Particularly to Historically Disenfranchised Residents: \$1,065,000.00." The WSVP specifically sought to provide \$1.07 million to help historically disenfranchised voters, especially "voters of color." However, the WSVP doesn't state that the historically disenfranchised voters were having their voting rights violated at the time the WI 5 cities received \$1.07 million to help only disenfranchised voters of color. CTCL and the WI 5 cities used "historically disenfranchised voters" as an excuse to get out the African American vote because African Americans vote 90% in favor of Democrats.

The Biden Administration sought to to provide loan relief to Black and other minority farmers who historically faced discrimination. U.S. District Judge Marcia Morales Howard said that the race-based plan violated the white plaintiff's constitutional equal-protection rights. As with the misguided race-based agricultural grant program, CTCL's election administration race-based grant of \$1.07 million violated Wisconsin voters equal protection rights.

Administrator Wolfe's inaction when Complainant submitted his August 28, 2020 Complaint allowed the WI 5 cities to unlawfully use CTCL's \$1.07 million election administration grant that was solely based on race. When Complainant filed his August 28, 2020 complaint, Administrator Wolfe should have stopped the WI cities from unlawfully using CTCL's \$1.07 million election grant to only help disenfranchised "voters of color."

#### **Administrator Wolfe's Inaction Allowed \$2.57 Million of CTCL's \$6.3 Million Election Grants to Go Towards the WI 5 Cities' Get Out the Vote Campaigns**

The WSVP first recommendation said, "Total for All Strategies to Encourage and Increase Absentee Voting by Mail and Early, In-Person: \$2,572,839.00." Because CTCL's \$2.57 million grant specifically went to "encourage and increase" early voting, this \$2.57 million portion of CTCL's \$6.3 million election administration grant supported the WI 5's mayors, election commissioners and clerk's get out the vote campaigns (GOTV).

The WI 5's mayor's, clerks and Milwaukee election commissioners' GOTV campaigns exceeded their authority and duty to remain impartial election officials. Traditionally, candidates and political parties carry out GOTV campaigns. Election officials deliberately avoid engaging in GOTV campaigns because they don't want to be accused of helping a candidate or political party. Because of CTCL's grant money and undue influence, the WI 5 mayors, clerks and Milwaukee election commissioners improperly partook in GOTV campaigns. Moreover, the WI mayors, clerks and election commissioners who used CTCL's grant to fund their GOTV campaigns were all Democrats conducting elections in Democratic strongholds.

The impropriety of CTCL's \$2.57 million GOTV election is obvious when compared to WEC's \$4.1 million subgrant program. WEC's authorized uses of its election subgrants reveal how WEC was anticipating increases in absentee and early voters. WEC allowed its subgrant to be used for printing and postage costs for higher level of absentee and vote by mail, additional staffing to process higher level of absentee ballots, and additional equipment to to process a higher volume of absentee ballots. However, the WEC subgrant did not authorize the use of its grant to increase and encourage absentee and early voting as the CTCL grant did.

CTCL's \$2.57 million grant to encourage and increase absentee and early voting obviously went too far; it is especially obvious when CTCL's grant is compared to WEC's subgrant. WEC anticipated increases in absentee and early voting for the November 3, 2020 election. It's one thing for WEC to provide grants to increase spending for election workers, equipment, postage, etc. to help process absentee and early voting ballots, but it's quite another use of CTCL's election grants for the WI 5 cities to use the grant money to encourage and increase absentee and early voting.

The table below summarizes the differences between CTCL and WEC's subgrants.

#### **WEC and CTCL Election Grant Comparison**

	<b>WEC Cares Act Election Administration Subgrants</b>	<b>CTCL Election Administration Grants</b>
Grant Enrollment Announcement	June 17, 2020 WEC sent public notice for election grants to all 1,922 Wisconsin election jurisdictions	No public announcement offering grants to all 1,922 Wisconsin jurisdictions
Grant Amount	\$4.10 Million	\$6.32 Million

	<b>WEC Cares Act Election Administration Subgrants</b>	<b>CTCL Election Administration Grants</b>
Grantee Administrators	WEC worked only with certified election officials from the beginning to the end of its election grant process	The WI 5 mayors who have no legal authority to supervise elections held four secret meetings to lay the foundation for the WI 5's election grants
Grant Recipients	From the start WEC's grants were available to all WI election jurisdictions	CTCL's initial grants were only available to the five largest Wisconsin cities.
Grant Distribution	WEC used a simple formula to distribute a fair share of money to all WI municipalities who applied for its grant	CTCL arbitrarily distributed its grants to only the WI 5 cities and then later to other election jurisdictions after a WEC complaint and lawsuit
Grant Payment	WEC gave grant money to the WI municipalities upon receipt of an agreement and certification form. Election officials did <i>not</i> submit an election administration budget to WEC for pre-approval. Each municipality was free to spend WEC's grant money on the seven uses listed below. Municipalities provided proof of proper grant expenditures after they already spent the grant funds.	CTCL required the WI 5 cities to submit a budget for pre-approval. If a WI 5 city did not spend CTCL's money as was stated in its CTCL agreement, the city was required to return the grant money to CTCL. By CTCL requiring the WI 5 cities to submit election budgets before issuing grant checks, CTCL imposed its will of how to administer elections upon the WI 5 cities

	<b>WEC Cares Act Election Administration Subgrants</b>	<b>CTCL Election Administration Grants</b>
Grant Uses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additional supplies to accommodate more absentee voters</li> <li>2. Additional cleaning supplies and protective equipment</li> <li>3. Additional staffing to distribute and process ballots</li> <li>4. Additional mailings for public communication</li> <li>5. Additional drop boxes</li> <li>6. Additional space leasing</li> <li>7. Additional equipment</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. “Encourage and increase absentee voting by mail or early in-person voting”</li> <li>2. “Dramatically expand strategic voter education and outreach efforts, particularly to historically disenfranchised voters”</li> <li>3. “Launch poll worker recruitment, training and safety efforts”</li> <li>4. “Ensure safe and efficient election day admin.”</li> </ol>
CTCL’s Questionable Election Grant Expenditures	WEC did not allow expenses “to encourage and increase absentee and early in-person voting.” Election officials leave GOTV campaigns to candidates and political parties.	\$2,572,839 or 41% of CTCL’s \$6.32 million grant went to “encourage and increase absentee and early in-person voting.” This was the WI 5 cities’ GOTV drive
CTCL’s Questionable Election Grant Expenditures	Federal and Wisconsin laws do not allow local governments to provide favorable treatment to a specific group of voters. CTCL, the WI 5 cities and the WSVP provided no proof that there was disenfranchised 2020 voters in need of CTCL’s election grants for disenfranchised voters	\$1,065,000 or 17% of CTCL’s \$6.32 million grant went to “dramatically expand strategic voter education and outreach efforts, particularly to historically disenfranchised residents.” This was another WI 5 cities GOTV drive
Cleaning supplies and PPE	The State supplied cleaning supplies and PPEs to all municipalities before the Aug. and Nov. 2020 elections	CTCL paid WI 5’s cleaning supplies and PPE. Did the WI 5 cities double bill WEC and CTCL for the same cleaning supplies and PPE expenses?

214 of 1,922 or 11% of WI's election jurisdictions received CTCL grant money. The exact number of Wisconsin election jurisdictions that received WEC Cares Act subgrants is unknown, but Complainant maintains the percentage of WI jurisdictions receiving WEC Cares Act subgrants is a lot closer to 100% than it is to 11%.

Administrator Wolfe's failure to act when Complainant filed his August 28, 2020 complaint enabled the WI 5 cities to use \$2.57 million of CTCL's \$6.3 million election grants for the ill-gotten purpose of government sponsored GOTV drives. Had Administrator Wolfe compared WEC's Cares Act Subgrants with CTCL's election administration grants, she would have immediately realized the WI 5's cities were improperly using CTCL election grants for GOTV campaigns.

#### **CTCL Executive Director Johnson's Stated GOTV Goal Before Awarding the WI 5 Grants**

CTCL Director Tiana Epps Johnson completed her two year Obama Foundation fellowship less than one month before CTCL started negotiating the WI 5 election grants. Johnson said there are the problems with American elections (click [here](#)). "U.S. voter turnout is lower than in most developed countries, with fewer than 60% of adults casting a ballot in 2016. Nonvoters are younger, more racially diverse, lower-income, and less educated than their voting counterparts, and their absence at the polls keeps government from representing the whole nation. Suppression is one cause of the problem, but so are outdated elections offices that are ill-equipped to communicate with voters and elections information that is difficult for voters to access."

Johnson said CTCL boosts voter turnout in two ways (click [here](#)): one, train local election officials to run more modern, inclusive elections, and two, use data to reach voters. The Johnson webpage headline stated, "Improving voter turnout by training elections officials to better communicate with voters and providing civic information through digital platforms." (click [here](#))

CTCL Director Johnson made it abundantly clear that the CTCL's main goal is to increase voter turnout, especially among younger, lower income, less educated and voters of color. Johnson and CTCL used COVID as a ruse to provide WI 5 cities with election administration grants that spent more money for GOTV campaigns than it did to protect voters and election workers from COVID.

The cost of WSVP Recommendation 1 that encouraged and increased absentee and early voting was \$2,572,839 or 41% of the total of CTCL's \$6,324,567 election grant. The cost of WSVP Recommendation 2 that aided previously disenfranchised voters of color was \$1,065,000 or 17% of the total of CTCL's \$6,324,567 election grant. WSVP Recommendations 1 and 2 combined represents 58% of CTCL's grant. Thus, \$3,637,839 or 58% of CTCL's grants went to fulfill Johnson and CTCL's goal of increasing voter turnout.

Johnson used CTCL and its WI 5 election grants to achieve her preordained goal of boosting voter turnout for the November 3, 2020 presidential election. When Complainant filed his initial August 28, 2020 complaint, he submitted exhibits that showed Johnson was a hardcore Democrat from the time she interned in college at the Young Democrats of America to the pro-Democratic tweets Johnson posted while distributing election grants to the WI 5 cities. If Administrator Wolfe bothered to review Johnson's political history, Administrator Wolfe would have learned of Johnson's deep Democratic roots and her unyielding support of Democratic candidates and causes.

### **Did Administrator Wolfe Read the Wisconsin Safe Voting Plan?**

During a Spring, 2021 Wisconsin House of Representative's Committee on Campaigns and Elections meeting, Administrator Wolfe said she could find nothing illegal about CTCL's election administration grants. When Administrator Wolfe declared CTCL's election grants legal, did she consider the legality of CTCL's \$1.07 million grant for the specific purpose of helping previously disenfranchised voters of color? When Administrator Wolfe declared CTCL's election grants

legal, did she consider the legality of CTCL's \$2.57 million grant for the specific purpose of encouraging and increasing absentee and early voting?

In order for Administrator Wolfe to truly know whether or not CTCL's election grants were legal, she would have had to read each individual grant listed in the WSVP. Administrator Wolfe's declaration that CTCL's election administration grants were legal begs the following questions:

1. Did Administrator Wolfe read the WSVP?
2. If Administrator Wolfe read the WSVP, when did she read it?
3. Did Administrator Wolfe read the WSVP before she declared CTCL's election grants were legal?
4. Is Administrator Wolfe aware of any election grant prior to 2020 that provided financial resources to help previously disenfranchised voters of color?
5. Did Administrator Wolfe determine that CTCL's \$1.07 million grant to help only previously disenfranchised voters of color was constitutional or unconstitutional?
6. Is Administrator Wolfe aware of any Wisconsin municipal clerk or election commissioner who used private or public funds prior to 2020 to encourage and increase absentee and early voting?
7. Is it Administrator Wolfe's opinion that CTCL's \$2.57 million grant to encourage and increase absentee and early voting is permissible according to Wisconsin election law or WEC's best practices?

### **Administrator Wolfe's Response Failed to Address Complainant's Probable Causes**

Administrator Wolfe's response did not address any of probable causes that were in Complainant's original complaint. Administrator Wolfe's response provided no explanation as to why the Federal Election Commission (FEC) agreed to review Complainant's FEC complaint though Administrator Wolfe rejected his WEC complaint.



The probable causes for a WEC Compliance Review that Administrator Wolfe has failed to respond to are as follows:

- CTCL's unequal distribution of its \$6.3 million election administration grants to only the WI 5 cities were alleged violations of the Constitution's First and Fourteen Amendments
- The WI 5 mayors admitted their election administration involvement in their Wisconsin Safe Voting Plan and press release though the WI 5 mayors have no statutory authority for election administration (Stone v. Genrich et al, Exhibit 1)
- CTCL chose the WI 5 cities over the Wisconsin counties to receive grants because more Democrats live and vote in the WI 5 cities than the counties
- CTCL Executive Director Tiana Epps Johnson completed her Obama Foundation Fellowship less than one month before she contacted Racine Mayor Cory Mason to start the WI 5 grant process.
- Democratic President Barrack and Michelle Obama provided contacts and money to CTCL and its Executive Director Johnson
- CTCL granted \$6.3 million to cities that only had Democratic mayors
- CTCL Directors Johnson and May were biased Democrats and anti-Republican as evidenced by Johnson and May's 125 social media posts that the Complainant submitted as exhibits with his complaint
- CTCL election administration grants deviated from the mission CTCL stated on its IRS tax forms
- CTCL had no employee, board or advisory member who was medical doctor or infectious disease expert at the time CTCL awarded its WI 5 election administration grants to protect against COVID 19
- CTCL used COVID 19 as a ruse to distribute partisan political grants to the WI 5 cities
- CTCL's grant process was allegedly fraudulent and deviated from the norm
- CTCL also awarded its election administration grants to only heavily Democratic cities and counties outside the state of Wisconsin at the time Complainant filed his complaint

- The WI 5 mayors failed to perform their due diligence before they applied and accepted CTCL's \$6.3 million grant
- The WI 5 mayors held their WI 5 mayors meetings to plan their CTCL grant application in secret (compare the WI 5's secret grant application to Administrator Wolfe's grant announcement that she sent to all Wisconsin election commissioners, municipal, and county clerks)
- The WI 5 mayors submitted one election administration plan for all the WI 5 cities though the first line of the Wisconsin Election Administration Manual states, "Elections in Wisconsin are conducted at a local level"

**Administrator Wolfe's Response Did Not Respond to How the Words and Phrases She Added to Wisconsin Statute § 5.06(1) Changed the Meaning of the Statute**

Administrator Wolfe used the word "municipalities" when she denied Complainant's standing in his complaint against the mayors, clerks, and Milwaukee election commissioners. Wisconsin Statute § 5.06(1) does not contain the word "municipalities." Administrator Wolfe also stated that "Complaints filed under Section 5.06 are filed by individuals that are served by local election officials ...." Wisconsin Statute § 5.06(1) does not state complaints are restricted to "local election officials" as Wolfe falsely claimed. Administrator Wolfe's response contained no explanation to her changing Wisconsin Statute § 5.06(1) by adding the terms "local municipalities" or "local election officials."

Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) starts with the words, "Whenever any elector of a jurisdiction or district served by an election official ...". The meaning of Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) is made more clear by reviewing Wis. Statute § 5.52. "Multi-candidate elections. If more than one individual is to be elected to the same office from the same jurisdiction or district, the ballot shall provide at the top of the column or to the right of the row for that office: "Vote for not more than .... candidates."

Wis. Statute § 5.52 concerns itself with more than one candidate running for an office in same jurisdiction and district. When Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) starts with the words, “Whenever any elector of a jurisdiction or district served by an election official ...” it means that the elector is voting for a candidate or referendum in his or her jurisdiction or district. Electors can file a Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) complaint against any election official who serves the electors’ jurisdiction or district. Administrator Wolfe incorrectly restricted Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) complaint to local election officials though the statute doesn’t state that. To file a Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) complaint, the only geographical restriction is that an elector must vote in the jurisdiction or district when the elector files a complaint against an election official. An elector can file a Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) complaint against an election official as long as the election official is in the elector’s jurisdiction or district. Wis. Statute § 5.06(1) does not restrict complaints to only local election officials that the elector resides in as Administrator Wolfe incorrectly stated.

### **Administrator Wolfe’s Denial Letter Did Not Include Deadline Notification**

In Administrator Wolfe’s response, she wrote, “If Mr. Stone’s complaint is proper, it was not filed promptly, and it is therefore untimely and should be dismissed.” Administrator Wolfe’s September 11, 2020 denial letter to the Complainant did not include a time in which the Complainant must file a complaint over her decision. If Complainant faced a deadline to file a complaint regarding Administrator Wolfe’s decision, why didn’t Administrator Wolfe include it in her letter to the Complainant?

Wis. Statute § 5.06(3) states, “A complaint under this section shall be filed promptly so as not to prejudice the rights of any other party.” In Administrator Wolfe’s response she wrote, “A filing is understood to be “prompt” if it is done at once and without unreasonable delay.” Hence, there is not an exact time limit for a prompt filing. The reason why Complainant did not file his complaint against Administrator Wolfe is because he researched, wrote, and filed four distinct Federal Election Commission complaints and four unique WEC complaints. Some of the Complainant’s complaints took two or three months to research and write. Because

Complainant's time and energy were consumed by filing FEC and WEC complaints prior to his complaint against Administrator Wolfe, his complaint against Administrator Wolfe was prompt.

When Complainant received Administrator Wolfe's letter rejecting his complaint, he immediately began to research and write his FEC complaint against CTCL, Mark Zuckerberg, etc. Note, the FEC is still investigating Complainant's federal complaint. Furthermore, Complainant did not carefully scrutinize Administrator Wolfe's September 11, 2020 rejection letter until after he completed researching, writing, and filing his eight additional FEC and WEC complaints. It wasn't until after Complainant finished writing and filing his FEC and WEC complaints that the Complainant carefully studied Administrator Wolfe's September 11, 2020 letter and realized she had made an abundance of mistakes. Had Administrator Wolfe's September 11, 2020 letter informed Complainant about promptly filing a complaint, Complainant would have filed his complaint against Administrator Wolfe within Administrator Wolfe's prescribed time limits.

Wis. Statute § 5.06(3) states, "A complaint under this section shall be filed promptly so as not to prejudice the rights of any other party." Administrator Wolfe's response fails to state how the Complainant's date of filing has prejudiced her. In order for Administrator Wolfe to prove Complainant did not file promptly, Administrator Wolfe must also explain how Complainant's alleged non-prompt filing prejudiced her rights.

One would expect the Administrator Wolfe who is in charge of the Wisconsin Election Commission would welcome a review of work. Instead Administrator Wolfe is using a prompt filing statute to stop a review of her previous decision. Administrator Wolfe using a technicality to stop a review of her decision is very sad for Wisconsin voters. What has Administrator Wolfe done wrong that Administrator Wolfe will go to any lengths to prevent a review of her discretion?

**Administrator Wolfe Admitted She Made a Mistake**

In Administrator Wolfe's response she wrote, "Mr. Stone is correct that he made a mistake and filed a Section 506 complaint against the mayors of Green Bay, Milwaukee, Madison, Racine and Kenosha because they are not election officials." ... "That was an oversight and not deliberate."

Administrator Wolfe admitted that she missed Complainant improperly filing a Section 506 complaint against the WI 5 mayors because they are not election officials. Administrator Wolfe's "oversight" admission alone is enough to warrant a review of her discretion of whether to investigate CTCL's grants. The WI 5 mayors who are not election officials took it upon themselves to hold at least four secret meetings that were most likely in violation of Wisconsin's Open Meetings laws. During the WI 5 mayors' secret meetings, the WI 5 mayors determined how to spend CTCL's election administration grants though the Wisconsin statutes did not provide the WI 5 mayors with any legal authority to administer elections. Had Administrator's Wolfe inquired further into the WI 5 mayors unlawful involvement in CTCL's grants when Complainant filed his August 28, 2020 complaint, Administrator Wolfe would have been duty bound to investigate.

In Administrator Wolfe response she wrote, "It is unclear why I would deliberately omit an additional reason why Mr. Stone's complaint was properly dismissed and returned to him." There are at least two possible reasons why Administrator Wolfe deliberately omitted the WI 5 mayors involvement in CTCL's election administration grants. 1. Given that Administrator Wolfe ignored a dozen or more other probable causes to conduct a review, Administrator Wolfe sought only ways to dismiss the Complainant's complaint instead of objectively reviewing Complainant's complaint for legitimate reasons to review the CTCL's grants to the WI 5 cities. 2. A few hours before Administrator Wolfe sent Complainant a rejection letter, Attorney Eric Kaardal asked Administrator Wolfe to enjoin his client's complaint with the Complainant's. Administrator Wolfe rejection of Complainant's complaint, also put an end to Attorney Eric Kaardal's client enjoining Complainant's complaint. Had Administrator Wolfe recognized the WI 5 mayors' unlawful election administration as stated in the Complainant's Complaint, Complainant's

complaint would have triggered a WEC review and the possibility of other complainants joining this Complainant's complaint.

### **Administrator Wolfe's Did Not Inform Complainant that the Next Step is Circuit Court**

In Administrator Wolfe's September 11, 2020 rejection letter to the Complainant, Administrator Wolfe did not inform Complainant that he must file an appeal in circuit court in order to challenge her decision. According to EL 20.04 (2), Administrator Wolfe was supposed to provide the cures for Complainant's complaint. Administrator Wolfe failure to provide notice of appealing to circuit court eliminates Complainant's obligation (if there was one, see paragraphs below) to file a circuit court appeal.

EL 20.04 (1) states, "Any matter brought to the commission shall be reviewed by the administrator who shall determine within 10 business days whether the complaint is timely, is sufficient as to form and states probable cause." EL 20.04 (2) states, "If the complaint does not meet the standards under sub. (1), the administrator shall promptly return the complaint to the complainant, without prejudice unless otherwise provided by law, specifying both the defect in the complaint and the information appropriate to cure the defect."

When Administrator Wolfe returned Complainant's complaint, she was following EL 20.04 (1) and (2). The EL 20.04 statutes have no requirement that a complainant must appeal the administrator's decision to circuit court. Since Wis. Statute § 5.06(8) does not apply when the WEC administrator returns a complaint, Complainant was under no obligation to file a circuit court appeal.

Wis. Statute § 5.06(8) requirement for an appeal within 30 days only applies to complaints that the WEC administrator has accepted and investigated. Since Administrator Wolfe returned Complainant's complaint under EL 20.04 (1) and (2), Wis. Statute § 5.06(8) was not applicable to Complainant.

This complaint against Administrator Wolfe is separate and distinct from his original complaint. This complaint's prayer for relief doesn't request a review of the WI 5's election officials or commissioners' discretion who were named in his original August 28, 2020 complaint. This complaint only asked for review of Administrator Wolfe's discretion.

### **WEC Changed Complaint Webpage as a Coverup for Administrator Wolfe**

Complainant previously emailed the WEC Commissioners because WEC staff attorney Nathan Judnic had not posted to the WEC complaint webpage the Complainant's complaint against Administrator Wolfe. Within 8 hours of Complainant emailing the WEC Commissioners, complainant's complaint against Administrator Wolfe was posted to WEC's complaint webpage.

Previously the WEC complaint webpage listed complaints in chronological order. The top of the webpage started with the most recent WEC complaint, followed by the second most recent WEC complaint and so and so forth. Because Complainant's complaint against Megan Wolfe was the most recent, the Stone v. Wolfe complaint appeared at the top of WEC's complaint webpage. The second complaint on WEC's complaint webpage was Complainant's Stone v. Judnic complaint.

WEC recently reversed the chronological order on its complaint webpage so that the Stone v. Wolfe and Stone v. Judnic cases appear at the bottom of WEC's complaint webpage. A new complaint, Mertig v. Koch, Butternut School District is the most recent WEC complaint and has been added to WEC complaint webpage.

WEC deliberately reversed the order of complaints on its complaints webpage so that the Stone v. Wolfe and Stone v. Judnic's complaint appear at the bottom instead of the top. As with the failure to post the Stone v. Wolfe complaint, using the WEC complaint webpage to coverup the complaint against WEC Administrator Wolfe is the best proof that she and her WEC allies have something to hide.

### **WEC's Significant Conflicts of Interest in Stone v. Wolfe**

Complainant filed a WEC complaint against WEC staff attorney Nathan Judnic. Complainant alleged that Mr. Judnic failed to timely post the Stone v. Wolfe complaint on WEC's complaint page, failed to give Complainant proper notice on three WEC complaints, and WEC employee Judnic deciding the Stone v. Wolfe complaint is a conflict of interest because Administrator Wolfe is Mr. Judnic's boss. Mr. Judnic's conflict of interest stems from his desire to appease his boss Administrator Wolfe which conflicts with Judnic being a fair and objective arbiter in the Stone v. Wolfe complaint.

Mr. Judnic's failure to timely post the Stone v. Wolfe on WEC's webpage and to properly notify Complainant of WEC receiving Complainant's complaint three times revealed Mr. Judnic's bias and animus towards the Complainant. For these reasons alone Mr. Judnic should have been removed from deciding the Stone v. Wolfe complaint.

WEC staff attorney James Witecha decided Complainant's complaint against Mr. Judnic. Once again a WEC employee is deciding a complaint against another WEC employee. WEC has a small number of employees who know each other well because they all work closely together. WEC attorney Witecha involvement in the Stone v. Judnic case is a conflict of interest because attorney Witecha has to protect his boss Administrator Wolfe, his co-worker Mr. Judnic and WEC's integrity which conflicts with him acting as an independent arbiter in a complaint that can harm his boss Administrator Wolfe, Mr. Judnic and WEC's reputations.

Attorney Witecha knows about WEC staff recusing themselves from WEC complaints involving Administrator Wolfe. In a May 25, 2021 notice, Mr. Witecha wrote, "Each of the above-referenced complaints have been assigned to outside legal counsel due to staff recusal from the process." The complaints Mr. Witecha referred to are EL 21-24: Richard Carlstedt et al. v.



Meagan Wolfe et al. EL 21-29: Martin Prujansky et al. v. Meagan Wolfe et al. EL 21-30: Brian Thomas et al. v. Meagan Wolfe et al. EL 21-31: Cynthia Werner et al. v. Meagan Wolfe et al.

If the WEC staff recused themselves in five cases in which Administrator Wolfe was named as a respondent, why didn't the WEC staff, especially staff attorneys Judnic and Witecha, recuse themselves in the Stone v. Wolfe complaint? As with the five other complaints against Administrator Wolfe, WEC staff attorneys Judnic and Witecha should recuse themselves from the Stone v. Wolfe complaint.

### **Conclusion**

To protect WEC's reputation, the Commission has both the authority and need to order a review of Administrator Wolfe's discretion when she rejected Complainant's August 28, 2020 complaint. Administrator Wolfe made a quick predetermination that she is rejecting Complainant's complaint, and then she only sought reasons to support her initial predetermination. Administrator Wolfe ignored all of Complainant's 27 page complaint and 167 Exhibits. Complainant submitted 16 probable causes to conduct a review of CTCL's grants (For probable causes, see pages 9-10 above. Administrator Wolfe's conclusion that there wasn't one valid probable cause out of 16 is absurd.

Administrator Wolfe is relying on her subordinates, WEC staff attorneys Nathan Judnic and James Witecha, to stop a review of her work. All of WEC's staff reused themselves in the previous five complaints filed against Administrator Wolfe. As with the previous five complaints against Administrator Wolfe, all of WEC's staff should also recuse themselves from Stone v. Wolfe.

There is a growing lack of confidence and mistrust in the administration of WEC. Some people are calling for replacing WEC with another form of election administration. The lack of confidence and mistrust in WEC starts at the top with Administrator Wolfe. To *not* conduct a

review of Administrator Wolfe's CTCL grant discretion will only lead to more suspicion and more distrust of WEC.

**Sworn and Notarized Statement**

I, Jay Stone, who resides at 10501 82nd St. Pleasant Prairie, WI 53158 submit my Sworn Wisconsin Election Commission Complaint under the Penalty of Perjury.

I, Jay Stone, being first duly sworn, on oath, state that I personally read my complaint, and that my allegations are true based on my personal knowledge and, as to those stated on information and belief, I believe them to be true.

*Jay Stone*

Complainant Jay Stone's Signature

ELIZABETH A BENITEZ  
NOTARY PUBLIC  
STATE OF WISCONSIN

STATE OF WISCONSIN )

) ss.

County of Kenosha,

(county of notarization)

Sworn to before me this day of 11/29, 2021.

*Elizabeth Benitez*

(Signature of person authorized to administer oaths)

My commission expires 01/16/2023, or is permanent.

Notary Public or N/A

(official title if not notary)