

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

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 RESPONDENT SNOHOMISH COUNTY

["Secretary of State's Discovery Requests To Snohomish County"] **AND ANSWERS AND OBJECTIONS THERETO**

TO: Respondent Snohomish County,

AND TO: Gordon Sivley, Michael C. Held, Snohomish County Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys, its attorney.

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 Snohomish County.

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 party to this proceeding. Snohomish County has remained a party to this litigation
2 solely to maintain the ability to seek protection of its interests, fiscal or otherwise, from
3 the adverse affects of the actions of other parties and/or from any ruling issued by the
4 Court. Accordingly, Snohomish County shall continue its role as an interested and
5 potentially affected party, but will not, barring an unforeseeable turn of events, be an
6 active litigant regarding the central issues of the election contest.
7

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

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

15 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
16

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

21 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
22

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

26 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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 failed 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.*

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

3 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
4

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

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

16 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
17

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

22 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
23

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

ANSWER: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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

Alleged Error In The Secretary Of State’s Certification

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

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9:** In this suit, do you claim the respondent Secretary of
2 State committed any error in his certification of the election returns for the 2004 Governor’s
3 election?

4 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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

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

15 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 9 above was
17 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please identify every person with any knowledge
18 concerning your answer to Interrogatory Nos. 9-10 above, along with a brief description of the
19 subject matter of that person’s knowledge.

20 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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

25 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

1 **Illegal Votes Apparently Given To Gregoire And Rossi**

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

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

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

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

19 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

20 **INTERROGATORY NO. 14:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 13 above is
21 anything other than an unequivocal “no”, then please:

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

26 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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

- (a) identify the voters in whose name you claim illegitimate, invalid, or illegal votes were cast in the 2004 election – including each such voter’s full name and, to the extent available to you, that voter’s residence address, telephone number, voter ID or registration number, county voting precinct, and date of birth;
- (b) for each voter you identify, briefly state the reason you claim their vote was illegitimate, invalid, or illegal (e.g., felon, deceased, voted twice, cast by person other than the registered voter, etc.);
- (c) for each voter you identify, state the candidate for whom you claim that voter’s vote was apparently cast in the 2004 Governor’s election;
- (d) for each voter you identify, state every type of direct or circumstantial evidence you rely upon for your claim concerning the gubernatorial candidate for whom that voter’s 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: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

	(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
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

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

ANSWER: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17: If your answer to Interrogatory No. 13 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. 13-15 above.

ANSWER: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

1 **Errors, Etc. Causing Fewer Lawful Votes To Be Counted For Rossi Than Gregoire**

2 *The Election Contest Petition states that “As a result of Respondents’ errors, omissions,*
3 *misconduct, neglect, and other wrongful acts, Respondents failed to count more lawful votes for*
4 *Candidate Rossi than the number of votes separating the candidates” (Sec. VI.C), that “The*
5 *number of individuals who state that they voted for Mr. Rossi but their ballots were wrongfully*
6 *rejected by Respondents exceeds the number of votes certified by the Secretary of State as*
separating the two candidates by more than double” (Sec. VI.C), and that “the votes of lawfully
registered voters were not counted, and the failure of the Respondents to count them, when
presented with evidence of Respondents’ errors, was arbitrary, capricious, wrongful, and a
violation of their obligations under Washington’s election laws” (5th para., Sec. VI).

7 *In addition to the statements Petitioners refer to by individuals whose votes for*
8 *Mr. Rossi were rejected, their February 22 answers to the intervenor Democrats’ discovery*
9 *requests indicate that Petitioners base their contentions in this case concerning the candidate*
10 *for whom 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 the
Petitioner Rossi Campaign’s February 22 answers to the Democrats’ Interrogatory Nos. 3, 5, 7,
9, 14, & 16.

11 *The following Interrogatories ask you to fully disclose your facts concerning the errors,*
12 *omissions, misconduct, neglect, and other wrongful acts of elections officials alleged in this*
election contest.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 18:** In this suit, do you contend that errors, omissions,
14 misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts, irregularities, or improper conduct of elections officials
15 caused Ms. Gregoire to be declared duly elected although she did not receive the highest
16 number of legal votes?

17 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 19:** If your answer to Interrogatory No. 18 above is
2 anything other 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
governor’s election.;

10 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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

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

19 **ANSWER:** See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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

- (a) for each lawful vote you claim was cast in the 2004 election but not counted as a result of errors, omissions, misconduct, neglect, wrongful acts, irregularities, or improper conduct of elections officials, identify the voter in whose name you claim that lawful vote was cast – including each such voter’s full name and, to the extent available to you, 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 lawful vote to not be counted (e.g., late issuance of military ballot, refusal to correct 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 lawful votes you claim were not counted in the 2004 Governor’s election, please provide your answers in the matrix format illustrated below.

ANSWER: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

	(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	error, etc. you claim caused lawful vote to not be counted	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								

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: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)
	full name of unlawful voter [or other identification of vote if name not available]	residence address [if voter name available]	phone [if voter name available]	voter ID / registration number [if voter name available]	date of birth [if applies]	county & precinct of that vote	error, etc. you claim caused that unlawful vote to be counted	candidate for whom you claim that unlawful vote was apparently counted	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								

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

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: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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: See answer to Interrogatory No. 1.

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: Snohomish County does not intend to call any witnesses, expert or lay, to submit any testimony, or present any evidence at time of trial.

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

RESPONSE: See answer to Interrogatory No. 25.

1
2
3 **Other Persons With Knowledge**

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

7 (a) your responses and answers to these discovery requests;

8 (b) any of the documents requested in these discovery requests; or

9 (c) matters alleged in the Election Contest Petition or your pleadings in this case.

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

12 **ANSWER:** See answers to Interrogatories No. 1 and No. 25.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

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: See answers to Interrogatories No. 1 and No. 25.

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: N/A

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: N/A

1 **Persons Responding To These Discovery Requests**

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

6 **ANSWER:** For all answers and responses: Snohomish County Council Chair,
7 Gary Nelson; Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys Michael Held and Gordon Sivley.
8

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

14 **ANSWER:** Please see Snohomish County’s General Objections above.
15 Without waiving the stated objection each of the persons identified in the preceding
16 Interrogatory reviewed the Introduction, Five General Reminders, and Seven
17 Definitions at the beginning of these discovery requests
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 DATED March 16, 2005.

2
3 **ROB McKENNA**
4 **WASHINGTON ATTORNEY GENERAL**

5 Maureen Hart, Solicitor General

6
7 _____
8 Jeffrey T. Even, WSBA No. 20237
9 Attorneys for Respondent Secretary of State
10 Sam Reed

Foster Pepper & Shefelman PLLC
SPECIAL ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL

11
12 _____
13 Thomas F. Ahearne, WSBA No. 14844
14 Jeffery A. Richard, WSBA No. 28219
15 Hugh D. Spitzer, WSBA No. 5827
16 Marco J. Magnano, WSBA No. 1293
17 Attorneys for Respondent Secretary of State
18 Sam Reed

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
Objections and Responses submitted this ____ day of April, 2005.

SNOHOMISH COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY

27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

RESPONDENT SECRETARY OF STATE'S DISCOVERY
REQUESTS TO SNOHOMISH COUNTY - 24

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

