

E-Filed
April 18, 2005

Siri A Woods
Chelan County Clerk

SUPERIOR COURT OF WASHINGTON FOR CHELAN COUNTY

Timothy Borders, Thomas Canterbury, Tom Huff, Margie Ferris, Paul Elvig, Edward Monaghan, and Christopher Vance, Washington residents and electors, and the Rossi For Governor Campaign, a candidate committee,

Petitioners,

v.

Chelan County; Klickitat County; Klickitat County Auditor Diana Housden; Lewis County Auditor Gary Zandell; Snohomish County; Sam Reed, in his official capacity as Secretary of State for the State of Washington; Frank Chopp, Speaker of the Washington State House of Representatives; and Lieutenant Governor Brad Owen, President of the Washington State Senate,

Respondents,

v.

Washington State Democratic Central Committee,
Intervenor Respondents,

v.

Libertarian Party of Washington State,
Intervenor Respondents.

Honorable John E. Bridges

No. 05-2-00027-3

RESPONDENT SECRETARY
OF STATE'S

INTERROGATORIES AND
REQUESTS FOR
PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS

**TO OPT-IN RESPONDENT
LEWIS COUNTY AUDITOR**

*["Secretary of State's
Discovery Requests To Lewis
County Auditor"]*

TO: Opt-In Respondent Lewis County Auditor,

AND TO: L. Michael Golden, Lewis County Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, its attorney.

RESPONDENT SECRETARY OF STATE'S DISCOVERY
REQUESTS TO LEWIS COUNTY AUDITOR - 1

FOSTER PEPPER & SHEFELMAN PLLC
1111 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 3400
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-3299 ♦ 206-447-4400

1 INTRODUCTION

2 *The Respondent Secretary of State is serving identical discovery requests on the three*
3 *counties and two county auditors who have chosen to opt back into this election contest*
4 *litigation as a Respondent after having been dismissed by the Court. These discovery requests*
5 *require each of those opt-in Respondents to fully disclose the claims and facts which that*
6 *Respondent will be pursuing (if any), so this suit can proceed to a prompt, orderly, and*
7 *impartial resolution based upon a full consideration of the claims and legally relevant facts*
8 *being contested by the litigants in this case.*

9 *Given the purpose of these discovery requests and the opt-in Respondents' affirmatively*
10 *joining this suit after having been dismissed, the opt-in Respondents should be able to provide*
11 *full and candid answers so this election contest can proceed to an orderly resolution on the*
12 *merits without any unnecessary delays or surprises. (See also, e.g., Civil Rule 11 and*
13 *Washington State Physicians Ins. Exchange & Ass'n v. Fisons Corp., 122 Wn.2d 299, 858 P.2d*
14 *1054 (1993).)*

15 *If counsel for any opt-in Respondent nonetheless has an objection to answering some*
16 *part of these discovery requests, the undersigned counsel for the Secretary of State will gladly*
17 *make themselves available for a discovery conference before these requests' April 15 deadline*
18 *in order to work out a fair resolution to that objection so answers can be timely provided*
19 *without unnecessary delays and expense.*

20 FIVE GENERAL REMINDERS

21 1. Interrogatories: Since the Chelan County Superior Court has ruled that the Civil
22 Rules apply in this case, the Respondent Secretary of State is serving these Interrogatories upon
23 you pursuant to Civil Rule 33. You are reminded that Rule 33 requires you to answer each of
24 these Interrogatories under oath, and to then deliver those sworn answers to the undersigned
25 attorney's Seattle, Washington office on or before Friday, April 15, 2005.

26 These Interrogatories cover and include all information and knowledge available to you.
This includes all information and knowledge available to any person who obtained information
for you or on your behalf— including your agents, investigators, consultants, and
representatives.

2. Production Requests: Since the Chelan County Superior Court has ruled that the
Civil Rules apply in this case, the Respondent Secretary of State is serving these Production
Requests upon you pursuant to Civil Rule 34. You are reminded that Rule 34 requires you to
find the "documents" described in these Production Requests and produce them at the
undersigned attorney's Seattle, Washington office to be inspected and copied at 9:00 a.m. on
Friday, April 15, 2005.

1 These Production Requests cover and include all “documents” of any nature which are
2 or have been within your possession, custody, or control. This includes all the documents of
3 any person who obtained information for you or on your behalf– including your agents,
4 investigators, consultants, and representatives. All “documents” shall be produced in the same
5 folders, files, and form in which they are maintained by the person who holds or maintains those
6 documents. Documents attached to each other shall not be separated.

7 3. Objections: Since the Chelan County Superior Court has ruled that the Civil
8 Rules apply in this case, you are reminded that if you object to producing any of the requested
9 “documents”, or object to answering any part of any Interrogatory, then you must fully state
10 your objection and all the factual and legal reasons supporting your objection. If you object on
11 the ground of privilege, you must fully state the nature and extent of the privilege you claim. If
12 you object to answering only part of a Production Request or Interrogatory, you must identify
13 the specific part to which you object and answer the remainder. **ANY OBJECTION WHICH IS
14 NOT SO ASSERTED OR IS NOT TIMELY SERVED WILL BE DEEMED WAIVED. You
15 are also expressly reminded of your discovery response obligations under *Washington
16 State Physicians Ins. Exchange & Ass’n v. Fisons Corp.*, 122 Wn.2d 299, 858 P.2d 1054
17 (1993), and its progeny.**

18 4. Supplementation: Since the Chelan County Superior Court has ruled that the
19 Civil Rules apply in this case, you are reminded that Rule 26(e) requires you to supplement your
20 Interrogatory answers and Production Request responses after you have served your initial
21 answers and responses.

22 These Production Requests and Interrogatories are continuously renewed to and through
23 the hearing of this case. Therefore, if you ever obtain any information that materially affects
24 any Interrogatory answer or Production Request response so that the affected answer or
25

1 response is no longer true, you are required to promptly correct that answer or response. Your
2 failure to do that will be a knowing concealment of the truth.

3 5. Sanctions. Since the Chelan County Superior Court has ruled that the Civil
4 Rules apply in this case, you are reminded that the Court may severely sanction you if you fail
5 to comply with any of the Civil Rules. For example, Rule 37 authorizes the Court to exclude
6 evidence favorable to you, to strike your pleadings and enter a default judgment against you,
7 and order you to pay the expenses and attorney fees of the party submitting these discovery
8 requests.

9 SEVEN DEFINITIONS

10 The following paragraphs define several of the terms used in these discovery requests so
11 you cannot claim in good faith to have misunderstood what these discovery requests are
12 requesting. Therefore, please read these definitions carefully.

13 (a) “Petitioners” means Timothy Borders, Thomas Canterbury, Tom Huff,
14 Margie Ferris, Paul Elvig, Edward Monaghan, Christopher Vance, and the Rossi For Governor
15 Campaign.

16 (b) “you” & “your” mean Respondent Lewis County Auditor.

17 (c) “person” means humans as well as entities. For example, the term “person”
18 includes any type of candidate committee, political party, company, partnership, association,
19 organization, and non-profit corporation.

20 (d) “document” means any written, typed, graphic, recorded, or electronically
21 stored matter whatsoever. The term “document” accordingly includes emails, letters, telefaxes,
22 pictures, files, summaries, spreadsheets, notes, drafts, and working papers.

23 If any information is on a computer disk, tape, or other memory or storage device, the
24 term “document” means (i) a printout of that information in hard-copy form, or (ii) a CD or
25 DVD with a complete, useable copy of all of that information. Thus, for example, the term
26

1 “document” includes a hard-copy printout, CD, or DVD of all emails responsive to these
2 discovery requests.

3 (e) **“identify”.**

4 (i) When applied to a human, the term “identify” means state their full name and,
5 to the extent reasonably available to you, the phone number, email address, and
6 residence address at which they can most easily be contacted.

7 (ii) When applied to an entity, the term “identify” means state that entity’s full
8 name and, to the extent reasonably available to you, the phone number, email
9 address, and business address at which it can most easily be contacted.

10 (iii) When applied to a document, the term “identify” means state its general
11 description (e.g., letter, handwritten note, report, etc.), its date, its addressee, its
12 author, a brief summary of its general contents and, to the extent reasonably
13 available to you, the persons receiving copies of that document. *Alternatively,*
14 *if that document is being produced with document production numbers on it,*
15 *you may simply state the document production numbers.*

16 (f) **“and” & “or”.** The words “and” and “or” should not be interpreted to
17 exclude any information from any Interrogatory answer or Production Request response. Both
18 words should therefore be interpreted to mean “and/or” when necessary to prevent such
19 exclusion.

20 (g) **Singular/Plural.** The use of the singular or plural form of a word in any
21 Interrogatory or Production Request should not be construed to exclude any information from
22 any Interrogatory answer or Production Request response.

23 **INTERROGATORIES & PRODUCTION REQUESTS**

24 [following pages]

1 **Errors, Etc. Alleged Against The Respondent Secretary Of State**

2 *Without specifying the “respondents” to which it refers, the Election Contest Petition*
3 *alleges that respondents committed “errors”, “omissions”, “mistakes”, “misconduct”,*
4 *“neglect”, and “other wrongful acts” – e.g., that this election is being contested “because of*
5 *the errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, and other wrongful acts of respondent election*
6 *officials” (1st para., Sec. IV), because “Respondents ... have made errors and been negligent,*
7 *and they have committed other wrongful acts” (2nd para., Sec. IV), because “respondents have*
8 *committed errors, omissions, mistakes, neglect, and other wrongful acts” (Sec. VI.A), and*
9 *because of “Respondents’ errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, and other wrongful acts”*
10 *(Sec. VI.B-C). The following Interrogatories ask you to disclose your claims and facts (if any)*
11 *with respect to one of those respondents – i.e., the respondent Secretary of State.*

12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 1:** In this suit, do you claim that the respondent Secretary of
13 State committed any error, omission, mistake, misconduct, neglect, or wrongful act relating to
14 the 2004 Governor’s election?

15 **ANSWER:** No.

16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:** If your answer to the preceding Interrogatory was
17 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then for each error, omission, mistake, misconduct,
18 neglect, or wrongful act you claim the respondent Secretary of State committed, please:

- 19 (a) state what you claim that error, omission, mistake, misconduct, neglect, or wrongful act
20 was;
21 (b) state whether you claim that error, omission, mistake, misconduct, neglect, or wrongful
22 act caused Ms. Gregoire to be declared duly elected even though she did not receive the
23 highest number of legal votes; and
24 (c) if you claim it did, explain exactly how you claim it did.

25 **ANSWER:** Not Applicable.

26 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 1 above was
anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every person with any knowledge
concerning your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 1-2 above, along with a brief description of the
subject matter of that person’s knowledge.

ANSWER: Not Applicable.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 1 above was
anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every document that supports, is
inconsistent with, or otherwise relates to your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 1-2 above.

ANSWER: Not Applicable.

1 **Failure To Perform Obligations Alleged Against The Respondent Secretary Of State**

2 *Without specifying the “respondents” to which it refers, the Election Contest Petition*
3 *states that “Respondents and their agents have filed to perform their obligations under the*
4 *constitutions of the State of Washington and the United States and elections laws” (2nd para.,*
5 *Sec. IV), and that “Respondents ... failed to implement procedures to avoid mistakes, errors,*
6 *and alteration or submission of invalid votes” (3rd para., Sec. IV). The following*
7 *Interrogatories ask you to disclose your claims and facts (if any) with respect to one of those*
8 *respondents – i.e., the respondent Secretary of State.*

9 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5** : In this suit, do you claim the respondent Secretary of
10 State failed to perform any obligation with respect to the 2004 Governor’s election?

11 **ANSWER:** No.

12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:** If your answer to the preceding Interrogatory was
13 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then for each obligation you allege the respondent
14 Secretary of State failed to perform, please:

- 15 (a) identify that obligation;
16 (b) identify the specific constitutional provision or specific law which you claim created
17 that obligation;
18 (c) state how you claim the respondent Secretary of State failed to perform that obligation;
19 (d) state whether you claim that failure by the Secretary of State caused Ms. Gregoire to be
20 declared duly elected even though she did not receive the highest number of legal votes;
21 and
22 (e) if you claim it did, explain exactly how you claim it did.

23 **ANSWER:** Not Applicable.

24 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 5 above was
25 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every person with any knowledge
26 concerning your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 5-6 above, along with a brief description of the
subject matter of that person’s knowledge.

ANSWER: Not Applicable.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 5 above was
anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every document that supports, is
inconsistent with, or otherwise relates to your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 5-6 above.

ANSWER: Not Applicable.

1 **Alleged Error In The Secretary Of State's Certification**

2 *The Election Contest Petition states that "an error has occurred in the Secretary of*
3 *State's certification of the election returns" (Sec. VI.F). The following Interrogatories ask you*
4 *to disclose your claims and facts (if any) with respect to that allegation concerning the*
5 *respondent Secretary of State.*

6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:** In this suit, do you claim the respondent Secretary of
7 State committed any error in his certification of the election returns for the 2004 Governor's
8 election?

9 **ANSWER:** No.

10 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10:** For each error you claim has occurred in the Secretary
11 of State's certification of the election returns for the 2004 Governor's election, please:

- 12 (a) state what you claim that error was;
- 13 (b) state whether you claim the Secretary of State caused or is responsible for that error;
- 14 (c) if you claim the Secretary of State caused or was responsible for that error, please
15 explain exactly how you claim he caused or was responsible for that error;
- 16 (d) state whether you claim that error caused Ms. Gregoire to be declared duly elected even
17 though she did not receive the highest number of legal votes; and
- 18 (e) if you claim if did, explain exactly how you claim it did.

19 **ANSWER:** Not Applicable.

20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 9 above was
21 anything other than an unequivocal "no", then please identify every person with any knowledge
22 concerning your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 9-10 above, along with a brief description of the
23 subject matter of that person's knowledge.

24 **ANSWER:** Not Applicable.

25 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 9 above was
26 anything other than an unequivocal "no", then please identify every document that supports, is
inconsistent with, or otherwise relates to your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 9-10 above.

ANSWER: Not Applicable.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Illegal Votes Apparently Given To Gregoire And Rossi

The Election Contest Petition states that "it appears that a sufficient number of illegitimate, invalid and/or illegal votes has been given to Ms. Gregoire that, if taken from her, would reduce the number of her legal votes below the number of votes given to Mr. Rossi, after deducting therefrom the illegal votes that may be shown to have been given to him. RCW 29A.68.110" (Sec. VI.B.10).

The Petitioners' February 22 answers to the intervenor Democrats' discovery requests further maintain that Petitioners base their contentions as to the candidate for whom those illegal votes were cast on facts such as direct evidence (e.g., "the specific ballots cast illegally" and "testimony from the illegal voters") and circumstantial evidence (e.g., "a proportional analysis", "proportional allocation" by precinct, or "media reports"). See Petitioner Rossi Campaign's February 22 answers to the Democrats' Interrogatory Nos. 3, 5, 7, 9, 14, & 16.

The following Interrogatories ask you to fully disclose your facts concerning every illegal vote alleged in this election contest.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: In this suit, do you contend that it appears a number of illegitimate, invalid and/or illegal votes has been given to Ms. Gregoire that, if taken from her, would reduce the number of her legal votes below the number of votes given to Mr. Rossi, after deducting there from the illegal votes that may be shown to have been given to him?

ANSWER: Yes.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 13 above is anything other than an unequivocal "no", then please:

- (a) state the total number of illegitimate, invalid, or illegal votes you claim were apparently given to Ms. Gregoire in the 2004 Governor's election; and
- (b) state the total number of illegitimate, invalid, or illegal votes you claim were apparently given to Mr. Rossi in the 2004 Governor's election.

ANSWER:

- (a) I cannot quantify exact numbers as those numbers increase periodically according to media reports. However, in addition to ballots and/or signature affidavits collected by third party partisans in King County, an unknown number of illegal votes were cast by inclusion of unverified provisional ballots. Taken together, these two sources of ballots were in a number sufficient to change the result of the Governor's race.

- (b) Unknown.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 15:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 13 above is
 2 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please:

- 3 (a) identify the voters in whose name you claim illegitimate, invalid, or illegal votes were
 4 cast in the 2004 election – including each such voter’s full name and, to the extent
 5 available to you, that voter’s residence address, telephone number, voter ID or
 6 registration number, county voting precinct, and date of birth;
- 7 (b) for each voter you identify, briefly state the reason you claim their vote was
 8 illegitimate, invalid, or illegal (e.g., felon, deceased, voted twice, cast by person other
 9 than the registered voter, etc.);
- 10 (c) for each voter you identify, state the candidate for whom you claim that voter’s vote
 11 was apparently cast in the 2004 Governor’s election;
- 12 (d) for each voter you identify, state every type of direct or circumstantial evidence you
 13 rely upon for your claim concerning the gubernatorial candidate for whom that voter’s
 14 vote was apparently cast (e.g., proportional analysis, voter testimony, etc.).

To facilitate the prompt and orderly evaluation of the illegal votes you claim were cast in the
 2004 Governor’s election, please provide your answers in the matrix format illustrated below.

ANSWER: Unknown.

	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	Voter’s full name	residence address	phone	voter ID / registration number	date of birth	county & precinct	reason you claim vote illegal	candidate for whom you claim vote was apparently cast	type of evidence you rely upon to show candidate for whom vote was apparently cast
1	Voter #1								
2	Voter #2								
3	Voter #3								

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 16:** If your answer to Interrogatory No.13 above is
2 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every person with any knowledge
3 concerning your answer to the Interrogatory Nos. 13-15 above, along with a brief description of
4 the subject matter of that person’s knowledge.

5 **ANSWER:** Unknown.

6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17:** If your answer to Interrogatory No.13 above is
7 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every document that supports, is
8 inconsistent with, or otherwise relates to your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 13-15 above.

9 **ANSWER:** Unspecified reports from all major newspapers and television stations in
10 the State of Washington as well as published documents from King County Elections
11 Department.
12

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 19:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 18 above is anything other
2 than an unequivocal “no”, then please:

- 3 (a) state the total number of lawful votes for **Mr. Rossi** that you claim were not counted as
4 a result of errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts, irregularities, or
5 improper conduct of elections officials;
- 6 (b) state the total number of unlawful votes for **Mr. Rossi** that you claim were counted as a
7 result of errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts, irregularities, or
8 improper conduct of elections officials; and
- 9 (c) state the total number of lawful votes you claim were cast for **Mr. Rossi** in the 2004
10 governor’s election.;

11 **ANSWER:**

- 12 (a) Unknown.
13 (b) Unknown.
14 (c) Unknown.

15 **INTERROGATORY NO. 20:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 18 above is
16 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please:

- 17 (a) state the total number of lawful votes for **Ms. Gregoire** that you claim were not
18 counted as a result of errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts,
19 irregularities, or improper conduct of elections officials;
- 20 (b) state the total number of unlawful votes for **Ms. Gregoire** that you claim were counted
21 as a result of errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts, irregularities, or
22 improper conduct of elections officials; and
- 23 (c) state the total number of lawful votes you claim were cast for **Ms. Gregoire** in the 2004
24 governor’s election.;

25 **ANSWER:**

- 26 (a) Unknown.
(b) Unknown.
(c) Unknown.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 21:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 18 above is
2 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please:

- 3 (a) for each lawful vote you claim was cast in the 2004 election but not counted as a result
4 errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts, irregularities, or improper
5 conduct of elections officials, identify the voter in whose name you claim that lawful
6 vote was cast – including each such voter’s full name and, to the extent available to
7 you, that voter’s residence address, telephone number, voter ID or registration number,
8 county voting precinct, and date of birth;
- 9 (b) for each vote you identify, briefly state the error, omission, misconduct, neglect,
10 wrongful act, irregularity, or improper conduct you claim caused that lawful vote to not
11 be counted (e.g., late issuance of military ballot, refusal to correct error brought to
12 election official’s attention, etc.);
- 13 (c) for each vote you identify, state the candidate for whom you claim that vote was
14 apparently cast in the 2004 Governor’s election; and
- 15 (d) for each vote you identify, state every type of direct or circumstantial evidence you rely
16 upon for your claim concerning the gubernatorial candidate for whom that vote was
17 apparently cast (e.g., proportional analysis, statement by the voter, etc.).

18 To facilitate the prompt and orderly evaluation of the lawful votes you claim were not counted
19 in the 2004 Governor’s election, please provide your answers in the matrix format illustrated
20 below.

21 **ANSWER:**

- 22 (a) Unknown.
23 (b) Not Applicable.
24 (c) Not Applicable.
25 (d) Not Applicable.

	(a) Voter's full name	(a) residence address	(a) phone	(a) voter ID / registration number	(a) date of birth	(a) county & precinct	(b) error, etc. you claim caused lawful vote to not be counted	(c) candidate for whom you claim vote was apparently cast	(d) type of evidence you rely upon to show candidate for whom vote was apparently cast
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7	1	Voter #1							
8	2	Voter #2							
9	3	Voter #3							

INTERROGATORY NO. 22: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 18 above is anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please:

- (a) identify each unlawful vote you claim was cast in the 2004 election but nonetheless was counted as a result errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts, irregularities, or improper conduct of elections officials – including, to the extent available to you, the full name of the voter in whose name you claim that vote unlawful vote was cast, that voter’s residence address, telephone number, voter ID or registration number, county voting precinct, and date of birth;
- (b) for each vote you identify, briefly state the error, omission, misconduct, neglect, wrongful act, irregularity, or improper conduct you claim caused that unlawful vote to be counted (e.g., provisional ballot that was not validated, undervote that was improperly enhanced, ballot that was improperly duplicated, improper correction of error brought to election official’s attention, etc.);
- (c) for each vote you identify, state the candidate for whom you claim that vote was apparently cast in the 2004 Governor’s election; and
- (d) for each vote you identify, state every type of direct or circumstantial evidence you rely upon for your claim concerning the gubernatorial candidate for whom that vote was apparently cast (e.g., proportional analysis, statement by the voter, etc.).

To facilitate the prompt and orderly evaluation of the unlawful votes you claim were counted in the 2004 Governor’s election, please provide your answers in the matrix format illustrated below.

ANSWER:

- (a) Unknown.
- (b) Not Applicable.
- (c) Not Applicable.
- (d) Not Applicable.

	(a) full name of unlawful voter [or other identification of vote if name not available]	(a) residence address [if voter name available]	(a) phone [if voter name available]	(a) voter ID / registration number [if voter name available]	(a) date of birth [if ap- plies]	(a) county & precinct of that vote	(b) error, etc. you claim caused that unlaw- ful vote to be counted	(c) candidate for whom you claim that unlawful vote was apparently counted	(d) type of evidence you rely upon to show candidate for whom that unlawful vote was apparently counted
1	Voter #1								
2	Voter #2								
3	Voter #3								

INTERROGATORY NO. 23: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 18 above is anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every person with any knowledge concerning your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 19-22 above, along with a brief description of the subject matter of that person’s knowledge.

ANSWER: Unknown.

INTERROGATORY NO. 24: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 18 above is anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every document that supports, is inconsistent with, or otherwise relates to your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 19-22 above.

ANSWER: Unknown.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Your Experts

INTERROGATORY NO. 25: Please identify all expert witnesses you intend to call at time of trial or to submit any testimony or evidence you use in this case, and separately state as to each such expert witness:

- (a) the subject matter(s) of that witness's expected testimony and evidence;
- (b) the substance of the facts and opinions to which that witness is expected to submit any testimony or evidence;
- (c) a summary of the grounds and basis for each opinion to which that witness is expected to submit any testimony or evidence; and
- (d) the identity of all documents reviewed or relied upon by that witness in forming the basis for the opinions and facts about which that witness is expected to submit any testimony or evidence.

ANSWER: None.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1: Please produce the documents you were asked to identify in the preceding Interrogatory.

RESPONSE: None.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Other Persons With Knowledge

INTERROGATORY NO. 26: To the extent not done in your answers to the other Interrogatories in this set of discovery requests, please identify all persons with knowledge of any of the following:

- (a) your responses and answers to these discovery requests;
- (b) any of the documents requested in these discovery requests; or
- (c) matters alleged in the Election Contest Petition or your pleadings in this case.

For each person identified, please state the subject matters about which that person has knowledge.

ANSWER:

- (a) None.
- (b) None.
- (c) None.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Documents

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2: To the extent not already done in response to the above Request For Production No. 1, please produce all documents you were asked to identify in the Interrogatories in this set of discovery requests.

RESPONSE: None.

INTERROGATORY NO. 27: If any document requested in these discovery requests was, but no longer is, in existence, in your possession, or subject to your custody or control, please identify that document, explain the circumstances and date of its disposition, and identify all persons with any knowledge about or involvement in that disposition.

ANSWER: None.

INTERROGATORY NO. 28: If you contend that any document responsive to any Request For Production or Interrogatory is privileged, in whole or in part, or otherwise object to its production, then with respect to each such document please:

- (a) state fully the reasons for all objections and privileges you assert;
- (b) identify the persons having knowledge of the factual basis (if any) upon which that privilege or other objection is asserted; and
- (c) identify that document and all persons who have ever seen it, along with all additional information you are willing to disclose with respect to that document in order for the respondent Secretary of State to determine whether or not to file a motion to compel.

ANSWER: None.

1 *Persons Responding To These Discovery Requests*

2 **INTERROGATORY NO. 29:** Please identify each person responsible for supplying
3 any part of your answers or responses to this set of discovery requests, and state the parts for
4 which each such person is responsible.

5 **ANSWER:** None.

6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 30:** Did each of the persons you were asked to identify in
7 the preceding Interrogatory read the Introduction, Five General Reminders, and Seven
8 Definitions at the beginning of these discovery requests? If your answer is “no”, please identify
9 the persons who did not read the Introduction, General Reminders, and Definitions, and state all
10 of that person’s reasons for failing to read them.

11 **ANSWER:** Yes.

12
13 DATED March 16, 2005.

14
15 ROB McKENNA
16 WASHINGTON ATTORNEY GENERAL

17 Maureen Hart, Solicitor General

18 _____
19 Jeffrey T. Even, WSBA No. 20237
20 Attorneys for Respondent Secretary of State
21 Sam Reed

Foster Pepper & Shefelman PLLC
SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL

22 _____
23 Thomas F. Ahearne, WSBA No. 14844
24 Jeffery A. Richard, WSBA No. 28219
25 Hugh D. Spitzer, WSBA No. 5827
26 Marco J. Magnano, WSBA No. 1293
Attorneys for Respondent Secretary of State
Sam Reed

1 STATE OF WASHINGTON)
2 COUNTY OF _____) ss.

3 _____, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says:

4 I am the _____ of opt-in Respondent Lewis County Auditor, and am
5 authorized to make this verification on that Respondent's behalf. I have read the foregoing
6 Answers and Responses to RESPONDENT SECRETARY OF STATE'S
7 INTERROGATORIES AND REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO
8 LEWIS COUNTY AUDITOR, know the contents thereof, and believe the same to be true.

9
10 Signature: _____
Title: _____

11 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this _____ day of April, 2005.

12
13 _____
14 (Signature of Notary)

15 _____
(Legibly Print or Stamp Name of Notary)

16 Notary public in and for the state of Washington,
residing at _____

17 My appointment expires _____
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26