

**BEFORE THE ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS
SITTING EX-OFFICIO AS THE STATE OFFICERS ELECTORAL BOARD**

STEVEN DANIEL ANDERSON, CHARLES J.)	
HOLLEY, JACK L. HICKMAN, RALPH E.)	
CINTRON, AND DARRYL P. BAKER,)	
)	
Petitioners-Objectors,)	No. 24 SOEB GP 517
v.)	
)	
DONALD J. TRUMP,)	
)	
Respondent-Candidate.)	

HEARING OFFICER REPORT AND RECOMMENDED DECISION

Background of the Case

This matter commenced with the Objector’s filing of a Petition to Remove the Candidate, Donald J. Trump from the ballot on January 4, 2024. In summary, the Objector’s Petition, and the corresponding voluminous exhibits in support thereof, seek a hearing and determination that Candidate Trump’s Nomination Papers are legally and factually insufficient based on Section 3 of the 14th Amendment and based on 10 ILCS 5/7-10 of the Illinois Election Code. The crux of these allegations center around the violent incidents of January 6, 2021 at the United States Capitol building in Washington D.C. and what Candidate Trump’s involvement and/or participation in those violent events was. The Petition alleges “Candidate's nomination papers are not valid because when he swore in his Statement of Candidacy that he is "qualified" for the office of the presidency as required by 10 ILCS 5/7-10, he did so falsely” based on his participation in the January 6, 2021, events. [See Page 2, Paragraph 8 of Objector’s Petition].

The Petition further asks this Board to determine that President Trump is disqualified under Article 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment which states in relevant part that “No person shall . . . hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, . . . who, having previously taken an oath, . . . as an officer of the United States, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof.”

The factual determination before the Board therefore is first, whether those January 6, 2021, events amount to an insurrection. Next, if those events do constitute an insurrection, the question that requires addressing is whether the Candidate’s actions leading up to, and on January 6, 2021, amounts to having “engaged” or “given aid” or “comfort” as delineated under Section 3 of the 14th Amendment. However, before the Hearing Officer addresses the factual

determination on the merits, the procedural issues, including the Motions that were filed, must be addressed.

Procedural History

Following the filing of the Petition on January 4, 2024, an Initial Case Management Conference was conducted on January 17, 2024. At the Initial Case Management Conference, the Parties were provided an Initial Case Management Order with corresponding deadlines for certain motions. As part of these proceedings, and in compliance with the Case Management Order, the Candidate filed a timely Motion to Dismiss on January 19, 2024. The Objectors also filed a timely Motion for Summary Judgment. Responses to those Motions were timely filed by the parties on January 23, 2024. Replies to the respective Motions were filed by the parties. Candidate sought a brief extension to file his Reply. The extension was unopposed by the Objectors. The extension was granted without objection and is considered timely. A link to the filings and exhibits is found here for the Board's convenience.

https://1drv.ms/f/s!AiUfM7KmKopbifBCDf_deqdCAMAgrg?e=xhUj5i

The Hearing Officer heard argument on the matter on January 26, 2024. Each party was provided with one hour for their argument. The Hearing Officer commends the attorneys for both Objectors and the Candidate for their cooperation and professionalism. Each of these motions, as well as the merits of the case are addressed in turn. For procedural reasons, we first begin with the Motion to Dismiss. The Hearing Officer further notes that the sufficiency, quality, quantify, and nature of the signatures on the Petition is not challenged and therefore the signatures are deemed sufficient.

Candidate's Motion to Dismiss

The Candidate's Motion to Dismiss states it raises five grounds, but in actuality the Hearing Officer, from the Brief, recognizes six separate arguments raised for dismissal. Those grounds argued by Candidate are as follows:

1. Illinois law does not authorize the SOEB to resolve complex factual issues of federal constitutional law like those presented by the Objectors, especially in light of the United States Supreme Court considering the same issues on an expedited basis.
2. Political questions are to be decided by Congress and the electoral process—not courts or administrative agencies.
3. Whether someone is disqualified under Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment, is a question that can be addressed only in procedures prescribed by Congress, not by the SOEB.
4. Whether Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment bars holding office, rather than running for office, and that states cannot constitutionally enlarge the disqualification from the “holding of office stage” to the earlier stage of “running for office.”

5. That “officer of the United States,” under Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment excludes the office of the President.
6. Lastly, even if Section Three of the Fourteenth Amendment applied here and the Board was empowered to apply it, Candidate argues that Objectors have not alleged facts sufficient to find that President Trump “engaged in insurrection.”

Candidate’s First Ground

Candidate first argues that “Illinois law does not authorize the [Illinois State Officer’s Electoral Board] SOEB to resolve complex factual issues of federal constitutional law like those presented by the Objections.” Candidate argues that “[10 ILCS 5] Section 10-10 [Of the Illinois Election Code] (and relevant caselaw) makes clear the SOEB’s role is to evaluate the form, timeliness and genuineness of the nominating papers and that the SOEB is not authorized to conduct a broad-ranging inquiry into a candidate’s qualifications under the U.S. Constitution.” [See Candidate’s Motion to Dismiss, Page 4].

Section 10 ILCS 5/10-10, in relevant part, states as follows:

“The electoral board shall take up the question as to whether or not the certificate of nomination or nomination papers or petitions are in proper form, and whether or not they were filed within the time and under the conditions required by law, and whether or not they are the genuine certificate of nomination or nomination papers or petitions which they purport to be, and whether or not in the case of the certificate of nomination in question it represents accurately the decision of the caucus or convention issuing it, and in general shall decide whether or not the certificate of nomination or nominating papers or petitions on file are valid or whether the objections thereto should be sustained and the decision of a majority of the electoral board shall be final subject to judicial review as provided in Section 10-10.1. The electoral board must state its findings in writing and must state in writing which objections, if any, it has sustained.”

The Candidate argues that the SOEB does not have the authority to reach such complex issues of fact and law. Specifically, he argues that the questions of whether an insurrection happened, and constitutional application of Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment are beyond the purview of the power authorized to the SOEB in Section 10-10. Candidates’ argument is that this is a fact intensive issue, and without proper vehicles of discovery the procedures afforded by the SOEB “are wholly inadequate for the kind of full-scale trial litigation and complex evidentiary presentation.” [See Candidate’s Motion to Dismiss, Pages 5-6].

Objectors, in response to this contention, argue that “There is no authority for the unworkable proposition that the Electoral Board’s authority to hear objections depends on a subjective consideration of where the facts fall on a continuum from simple to complex.” [See Objector’s Response, Page 5]. Objectors also rely on Section 10-10 citing specifically to the language from the statute that the SOEB “shall decide whether or not the certificate of

nomination or nominating papers or petitions on file are valid or whether the objections thereto should be sustained.” Objector further cites to *Goodman v. Ward*, 241 Ill. 2d 398 (2011) claiming that “the Illinois Supreme Court has clearly directed that determinations of the validity of a candidate’s nominating papers include whether the candidate has falsely sworn that they are qualified for the office specified, and candidate qualifications include constitutional qualifications.”

Candidate’s Second Ground

Candidate next argues that this matter is a political question, for which the Courts must decide. The Candidate contends that “the vast weight of authority has held that the Constitution commits to Congress and the electors the responsibility of determining matters of presidential candidates’ qualifications.”

The political question doctrine bars courts from adjudicating issues that are “entrusted to one of the political branches or involve no judicially enforceable rights.” *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 541 U.S. 267, 277 (2004). In *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186, 217 (1962) the Supreme Court described six circumstances that can give rise to a political question:

“[1] a textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department; or [2] a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it; or [3] the impossibility of deciding without an initial policy determination of a kind clearly for nonjudicial discretion; or [4] the impossibility of a court's undertaking independent resolution without expressing lack of the respect due coordinate branches of government; or [5] an unusual need for unquestioning adherence to a political decision already made; or [6] the potentiality of embarrassment from multifarious pronouncements by various departments on one question.” *Id.*

The *Baker* Court held that, “[u]nless one of these formulations is inextricable from the case at bar, there should be no dismissal for non-justiciability on the ground of a political question's presence. *Castro v. New Hampshire Sec'y of State*, 2023 WL 7110390, at *7. The question therefore becomes, whether the issue before the SOEB, falls into one of these six categories. More recent United States Supreme Court precedent has seemingly narrowed this to two factors. See *Zivotofsky ex rel. Zivotofsky v. Clinton*, 566 U.S. 189, 195, 132 S. Ct. 1421, 1427, 182 L. Ed. 2d 423 (2012) holding that “we have explained that a controversy “involves a political question ... where there is ‘a textually demonstrable constitutional commitment of the issue to a coordinate political department; or a lack of judicially discoverable and manageable standards for resolving it.”

Candidate offers precedent that is directly on point. In particular, *Castro*, the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire, presiding over a nomination issue involving the same candidate, and the same claim for insurrection, found that this is a nonjusticiable political question barring the Courts from intervening. In so determining, the *Castro* Court recognized prior precedent from *Grinols v. Electoral Coll.*, 2013 WL 2294885, at

*6 (E.D. Cal. May 23, 2013) that held “the Twelfth Amendment, Twentieth Amendment, Twenty-Fifth Amendment, and the Article I impeachment clauses, “make it clear that the Constitution assigns to Congress, and not the Courts, the responsibility of determining whether a person is qualified to serve as President. As such, the question presented by Plaintiffs in this case... is a political question that the Court may not answer.” *Castro* at 8.

In response to the precedent cited by Candidate, Objectors contend that the cases involved do not involve a section 3 constitutional challenge. In response, Objectors contend that:

1. Section 3, unlike other Constitutional provisions to which the doctrine applies, is not reserved for Congressional action in its text.
2. Section 3 involves judicially manageable standards, as illustrated by courts that have repeatedly applied and interpreted it.
3. Federal circuit court precedent that the Motion fails to cite demonstrates the inapplicability of the doctrine, as does the Colorado Supreme Court decision giving it close analysis.
4. A host of the cases cited in the Motion do not stand for the propositions relied on and do not hold up against the on-point precedent.

In conflict with *Castro*, is the recent Colorado Supreme Court decision, *Anderson v. Griswold*, 2023 WL 8770111 (Cob. Dec. 19, 2023). The *Anderson* Court “perceive[d] no constitutional provision that reflects a textually demonstrable commitment to Congress of the authority to assess presidential candidate qualifications.” Id at ¶ 112. The decision further notes that state legislatures have developed comprehensive and complex election codes involving the selection and qualification of candidates. See also *Storer v. Brown*, 415 U.S. 724, 730, 94 S. Ct. 1274, 1279, 39 L. Ed. 2d 714 (1974). The *Anderson* decision further finds that “Section Three's text is fully consistent with our conclusion that the Constitution has not committed the matter of presidential candidate qualifications to Congress... although Section Three requires a “vote of two-thirds of each House” to remove the disqualification set forth in Section Three, it says nothing about who or which branch should determine disqualification in the first place.”

Candidate's Third Ground

Candidate next argues that the determination of an insurrection can only be made by Congress. In support of this argument, Candidate relies on *In re Griffin*, 11 F Cas 7 (C.C.D. Va. 1869). The *Griffin* Court found that enforcement of Section 3 is limited to Congress. Objectors argue *Anderson v. Griswold* rejected this argument and that the *Griffin* case is wrongly decided.

Candidate's Fourth Ground

Candidate next argues that Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment bars holding office, not running for office. In support of this argument Candidate relies on *Smith v. Moore*, 90 Ind. 294,

303 (1883) which allowed Congress to remove disabilities after they were elected. Candidate further argues the Constitution prohibits States from accelerating qualifications for elected office to an earlier time than the Constitution specifies. Candidate gives the example of *Schaefer v. Townsend*, 215 F.3d 1031, 1038 (9th Cir. 2000). In *Shaefer* California once tried to require congressional candidates to be residents of the state at the time when they were issued their nomination papers—rather than “when elected,” as the Constitution says. Candidate also cites *US Term Limits, Inc v Thornton*, 514 US 779, 827, 115 S Ct 1842, 1866 (1995) (States do not “possess the power to supplement the exclusive qualifications set forth in the text of the Constitution.”).

Objectors argue that the cases relied upon by Candidate are inapplicable. Objectors argue that a Candidate can control and can promise that he or she will be a resident of the state for the position that he is running for in the future.

Candidate’s Fifth Ground

Candidate includes the fifth ground within his fourth ground, but this appears to be a separate challenge. Here Candidate argues that the president is not an officer of the United States under the constitution. The Objectors disagree. Both sides cite a litany of sources, including Judges and the Constitution itself in support of their respective positions. This Hearing Officer has no doubt that given infinite resources, even more sources could be found to support both positions.

Candidate’s Sixth Ground

The Candidate’s final argument is that insufficient facts have been pled to amount to an insurrection. Although the section is not mentioned, this is the functional equivalent of a 735 ILCS 5/2-615 or Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) argument. The Hearing Officer treats it as such. Under this section, Candidate puts forth sub-arguments. First, he contends that an insurrection has not been alleged. Candidate puts forth that “Dictionaries of the time confirm that “insurrection” meant a “rebellion of citizens or subjects of a country against its government,” and “rebellion” as “taking up arms traitorously against the government.

Candidate next argues that he did not engage in the insurrection. Within this argument he says pure speech cannot amount to engaging in an insurrection. Candidate says that incitement alone cannot equal engagement. Both parties concede that Trump himself did not act with violence., The question therefore becomes whether words alone can amount to engaging in an insurrection.

Objectors’ Motion for Summary Judgment

The Hearing Officer now turns his attention to the Motion for Summary Judgment, which also asks for the Petition to be Granted. The request for a ruling on the merits will be addressed separately. First, the Motion for Summary Judgment must be addressed.

In support of the Motion for Summary Judgment, Objectors cite a series of what they claim are undisputed facts. A summary recitation of those facts is warranted. It is clearly undisputed that Candidate Trump took an oath to preserve and protect the Constitution of the United States. It is also clearly undisputed that Candidate Trump ran for re-election. Further, it is alleged that Candidate Trump refused in a September 2020 press conference to acknowledge a peaceful transfer of power if he lost. It is further alleged that Candidate Trump regularly tweeted that if he lost it would be a result of election fraud, and that after he lost, he continued to claim election fraud. It is alleged that Candidate Trump's lawful means of contesting the election results failed. It is alleged that Candidate Trump attempted to convince the Department of Justice to adopt his narrative and failed. It is alleged that Candidate Trump was made aware of plans for violence on January 6, 2021, that despite this information, Trump went ahead with his rally. It is alleged that Candidate Trump had reason to know or believe prior to January 6, that the January 6, 2021, protests would be violent. It is alleged that on January 6, Candidate Trump began to call out Vice-President Pence's name at the demonstration and ask him to reject the election results or that Trump will be "very disappointed in [him]." It is alleged that attacks began on the Capitol, and that Candidate Trump was aware of the attacks taking place on the Capitol. It is alleged that Candidate Trump tweeted, among other things, that "Mike Pence didn't have the courage to do what should have been done to protect our Country and our Constitution." It is alleged that Candidate Trump tweeted this while the attacks were ongoing and knew that the attacks were ongoing, and that this tweet led to increased violence. It is alleged that Candidate Trump subsequently tweeted "Stay peaceful." It is alleged that Candidate Trump did not call the National Guard despite what was happening. Objector's narrative of facts is quite lengthy, and significantly more detailed than what is laid out here. This is not meant to be an exhaustive retelling of the narrative, but rather a quick synopsis.

As Objector's point out, summary judgment is appropriate where "the pleadings, depositions, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." 735 ILCS 5/2-1005(c).

Recommendations on Dispositive Motions

A. Objectors' Motion for Summary Judgment.

The Hearing Officer finds that there are numerous disputed material facts in this case, as well wide range of disagreement on material constitutional interpretations. **Hearing Officer recommends that the Board deny the Objectors' Motion for Summary Judgment.**

B. Candidate's Motion to Dismiss.

Candidate argues in his Motion to Dismiss that the Objector's Petition should be dismissed for several reasons. One of particular interest to the Electoral Board is the argument that "As a creature of statute, the Election Board possesses only those powers conferred upon it by law" and "[a]ny power or authority [the Election Board] exercises must find its source within the law pursuant to which it was created." *Delgado v. Bd. of Election Comm'rs*, 224 Ill. 2d 481,485 (Ill. 2007). Candidate's Motion to Dismiss Objector's Petition, page 5.

In *Delgado*, the Illinois Supreme Court found that the Election Board (City of Chicago) exceeded its authority when it overruled the Hearing Officer's recommendation and concluded that a provision of the Illinois Municipal Code was unconstitutional: "Administrative agencies such as the Election Board have no authority to declare a statute unconstitutional or even to question its validity. (Cites omitted). In ruling as it did, the Election Board therefore clearly exceeded its authority." *Id.*, at 485.

A more recent decision of the Illinois Supreme Court, *Goodman v. Ward*, 241 Ill.2d 398 (2011), further illustrates the limits that the Court places upon an Election Board. In *Goodman*, Chris Ward, an attorney licensed to practice law in Illinois, filed a petition with the Will County Officers electoral board to have his name placed on the primary ballot as a candidate for circuit judge. At the time he filed his petition, Ward was not a resident of the subcircuit he wished to run in. Two of the three officers of the electoral board decided that Ward could appear on the ballot because governing provisions of the Illinois Constitution were "arguably ambiguous and uncertain." The Court affirmed the lower court's reversal of the electoral board, holding, " ... the electoral board overstepped its authority when it undertook this constitutional analysis. It should have confined its inquiry to whether Ward's nominating papers complied with the governing provisions of the Election Code." *Goodman*, at 414-415.

The Illinois Supreme Court in these two decisions has clearly placed a limit upon what an electoral board can consider when ruling on an objection. In *Delgado*, the Court makes it clear that an electoral board may not, in performing its responsibilities in ruling on an objection, go so far as to even question the constitutionality of what it considers to be a relevant statute. The language in *Goodman* extends this prohibition when it uses the language of "constitutional analysis." Thus, an electoral board goes too far not just when it holds a statute unconstitutional but also goes too far when it enters the realm of constitutional analysis. Instead, as the Court wrote, "It should have confined its inquiry to whether Ward's nominating papers complied with the governing provisions of the Election Code." *Id.*, at 414-415.

The question, then, is whether the Board can decide whether candidate Trump is disqualified by Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment, without embarking upon constitutional analysis.

The clear answer is that it cannot.

It is impossible to imagine the Board deciding whether Candidate Trump is disqualified by Section 3 without the Board engaging in significant and sophisticated constitutional analysis.

Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment reads as follows:

Section 3. No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath, as a member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States, or as a member of any State legislature, or as an executive or judicial officer of any State, to support the Constitution of the United States, shall have engaged in insurrection or rebellion against the same, or given aid or comfort to the enemies thereof. But Congress may by a vote of two-thirds of each House, remove such disability.

Much of the language in Section 3, which is part of the United States Constitution, is the subject of great dispute, giving rise to several separate constitutional issues. These issues are being raised in the case now before the Board, even as these issues in dispute are now pending before the United States Supreme Court, Case No.23-719, Donald J. Trump, Petitioner v. Norma Anderson, et al., Respondents.

A breakdown, by issue, makes clear how the issues in dispute in this case are constitutional issues currently before the United States Supreme Court:

Counsel for Candidate in this case, No. 24 SOEB GP 517, argue in their Motion to Dismiss the Objectors' Petition that Section 3 does not bar President Trump running for office. In their petition in support of their position they argue that Section 3 applies to holding office, not running for office.

That very issue is before the United States Supreme Court: "... section 3 cannot be used to deny President Trump (or anyone else) access to the ballot, as section 3 prohibits individuals only from *holding* office, not from *seeking* or *winning election* to office.

Counsel for Candidate in this case, No. 24 SOEB GP 517, argue in their Motion to Dismiss the Objectors' Petition that the constitutional phrase "officers of the United States" excludes the President.

That issue is also before the United States Supreme Court: "The Court should reverse the Colorado decision because President Trump is not even subject to section 3, as the President is not an "officer of the United States" under the Constitution."

Counsel for Candidate in this case, No. 24 SOEB GP 517, argue that Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment Can Be Enforced Only as Prescribed by Congress.

That issue is also before the United States Supreme Court: "...state courts should have regarded congressional enforcement legislation as the exclusive means for enforcing section 3, as Chief Justice Chase held in *In re Griffin*, 11 F. Cas. 7, 26 (C.C.D. Va. 1869) (*Griffin's Case*).

Counsel for Candidate in this case, No. 24 SOEB GP 517, argue that President Trump did not engage in insurrection within the meaning of Section Three.

That issue is also before the United States Supreme Court: "And even if President Trump were subject to section 3 he did not "engage in" anything that qualifies as "insurrection."

There is wisdom in the Illinois Supreme Court fashioning decisions which prohibit electoral boards from engaging in constitutional analysis. As the Candidate argues in his Motion to Dismiss, "The Board can and does resolve disputes about nominations and qualifications on records that are undisputed or (in the Board's estimation) not materially disputed. It does not and cannot hold lengthy and complex evidentiary proceedings of the kind that would be needed to assess objections like these."

The Rules of Procedure adopted by the State Board of Elections provides the following schedule for filing of briefs and motions within a time period between January 19, 2024 and January 25, 2024:

Schedule of Brief and Motion Filing

Candidate's Motion to Strike and/or Dismiss or other similar motion (MTD)

Objector's Motion for Summary Judgment or other similar motion (MSJ)

Must be filed no later than 5:00 p.m. on the second business day, **Friday, January 19, 2024**, following the date of the Initial Meeting of the Board, unless extended by the Board or Hearing Officer for good cause shown.

Objector's Response to Candidate's MTD

Candidate's Response to Objector's MSJ

Must be filed no later than 5:00 p.m. on the second business day following the due date of the Candidate's MTD or Objector's MSJ, **Tuesday, January 23, 2024**, unless extended by the Board or Hearing Officer for good cause shown.

Candidate's Reply to Objector's Response to Candidate's MTD

Objector's Reply to Candidate's Response to Objector's MSJ

Must be filed no later than 5:00 p.m. on the second business day following the due date of the Objector's Response to the Candidate's MTD or the Candidate's Response to the Objector's MSJ, **Thursday, January 25, 2024**, unless extended by the Board or Hearing Officer for good cause shown.

Any memorandum of law in support of any of the above pleadings shall accompany such pleading.

Briefs on any issue(s) shall be filed as directed by the Board or the Hearing Officer.

(APPENDIX A to Rules)

The Rules, as if it were even necessary to do, make it clear to all parties that the hearings are handled in an expedited manner:

1. EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS

a. Timing. On all hearing dates set by the Board or its designated Hearing Officer (other than the Initial Meeting), the objector and the candidate shall be prepared to proceed with the hearing of their case. Due to statutory time constraints, the Board must proceed as expeditiously as possible to resolve the objections. Therefore, there will be no continuances or resetting of the Initial Meeting or future hearings except for good cause shown.

(Rule 1a.)

The Rules provide for very little discovery, although Rule 8 does allow for request of subpoenas:

Rule 8 provides a procedure for subpoenas:

a. Procedure and deadlines for general subpoenas.

1. Any party desiring the issuance of a subpoena shall submit a written request to the Hearing Officer. Such request for subpoena may seek the attendance of witnesses at a deposition (evidentiary or discovery; however, in objection proceedings, all depositions may be used for evidentiary purposes) or hearing and/or subpoenas *duces tecum* requiring the production of such books, papers, records, and documents as may relate to any matter under inquiry before the Board.

2. The request for a subpoena must be filed no later than **5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 19, 2024**, and shall include a copy of the subpoena itself and a detailed basis upon which the request is based. A copy of the request shall be given to the opposing party at the same time it is submitted to the Hearing Officer. The Hearing Officer shall submit the same to the Board (via General Counsel) no later than **5:00 p.m. on Monday, January 22, 2024**. The Chair and Vice Chair shall consider the request and the request shall only be granted by the Chair and Vice Chair.

3. The opposing party may submit a response to the subpoena request; however, any such response shall be given to the Hearing Officer no later than **4:00 p.m. on Monday, January 22, 2024**, who shall then transmit it to the Chair and Vice Chair (through the General Counsel's office) with the subpoena request. The Hearing Officer shall issue a recommendation on whether the subpoena request should be granted no later than **5:00**

p.m. on Wednesday, January 24, 2024. The Chair and Vice Chair may limit or modify the subpoena based on the pleadings of the parties or on their own initiative.

4. Any subpoena request, other than a Rule 9 subpoena request, received subsequent to **5:00 p.m. on Friday, January 19, 2024**, will not be considered without good cause shown.

5. If approved, the party requesting the subpoena shall be responsible for proper service thereof and the payment of any fees required by Illinois Supreme Court Rule or the Circuit Courts Act. *See* 10 ILCS 5/10-10; S. Ct. Rule 204, 208, and 237; 705 ILCS 35/4.3.

This subpoena procedure leaves little time to serve a person. In addition, there is no room for continuances, as the Board rules on the objections on January 30, the Tuesday following the hearing set on January 26.

All in all, attempting to resolve a constitutional issue within the expedited schedule of an election board hearing is somewhat akin to scheduling a two-minute round between heavyweight boxers in a telephone booth.

It is clear from the Election Code and the Rules of Procedure that the intent is for the Board to handle matters quickly and efficiently to resolve ballot objections so that the voting process will not be delayed as a result of protracted litigation. With the rules guaranteeing an expedited handling of cases, the Election Code is simply not suited for issues involving constitutional analysis. Those issues belong in the Courts.

Objectors point to the decision of the Colorado Supreme Court (now before the United States Supreme Court), and the Maine Secretary of State, both of which did resolve the candidate challenges in favor of the objectors and ordered the name of Donald J. Trump removed from the primary ballot.

It is worth taking a closer look at the Colorado opinion. (The Maine decision relied heavily on that opinion, which was announced during its proceeding.)

In *Anderson v Griswold*, 2023 CO 63, the Colorado Supreme Court case which is the subject of the United States Supreme Court appeal, the Colorado Court concluded “that because President Trump is disqualified from holding the office of President under Section Three, it would be a wrongful act under the Election Code for the Secretary to list President Trump as a candidate on the presidential primary ballot.” In doing so, the Court upheld the rulings of the trial court, but reversed the trial court’s decision that Section 3 did not apply to President Trump.

In their brief, the Objectors in 24 SOEB GP 517 argue that the opinion of the Colorado Supreme Court is a well-reasoned 133-page opinion. What the Objectors fail to say is that the opinion is a four to three decision, with three lengthy dissents.

The Colorado Supreme Court (“The Court”) approved the decision by the trial judge to allow into evidence thirty-one findings from the report drafted by the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol (“The Report”). The Court based its ruling on Federal Rule of Evidence 803(8) and its mirror rule in the Colorado Rules of Evidence. The Illinois Rules of Evidence contain the same rule in its own 803(8).

The Court found that the expedited proceedings in an election challenge provided adequate due process for the litigants: “... the district court admirably—and swiftly—discharged its duty to adjudicate this complex section 1-1-113 action, substantially complying with statutory deadlines.” *Anderson*, at 85. (reference is to paragraph, not page). Whether there was substantial compliance is a matter of debate- one dissenting justice wrote that “if there was substantial compliance in this case, then that means substantial compliance includes no compliance.” See discussion below.

On the issue of whether Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment is self-executing, the Court found that it was: “In summary, based on Section Three's plain language; Supreme Court decisions declaring its neighboring, parallel Reconstruction Amendments self-executing; and the absurd results that would flow from Intervenor's reading, we conclude that Section Three is self-executing in the sense that its disqualification provision attaches without congressional action.” *Id.*, at 106.

In arriving at their decision, the Court was required to analyze the *In re Griffin*, 11 F. Cas. 7 (C.C.D. Va. 1869) (No. 5,815) (“*Griffin's Case*”). *Griffin's Case* is a non-binding opinion written by Chief Justice Salmon Chase while he was riding circuit. Caesar Griffin challenged his criminal conviction because the judge who convicted him had previously served in Virginia's Confederate government. Chief Justice Chase concluded that Section 3 could be applied to disqualify only if Congress provided legislation describing who is subject to disqualification as well as the process for removal from office. Thus, Chief Justice Chase concluded that Section Three was not self-executing. *Griffin's Case*, at 26. Caesar Griffin's conviction and sentence were ordered to stand. Nonetheless, the Court concluded that congressional action was only one means of disqualification, and that Colorado's election process provided another, equally valid, method of determining whether a candidate for office was disqualified under Section 3. *Id.* at 105. That alternative to Congressional action is an election challenge hearing.

The Court went on to address each of the Constitutional issues raised by Candidate Trump, deciding each in favor of the objectors.

For example, the Court, found that “the record amply established that the events of January 6 constituted a concerted and public use of force or threat of force by a group of people to hinder or prevent the U.S. government from taking the actions necessary to accomplish the peaceful transfer of power in this country. Under any viable definition, this constituted an insurrection.” *Anderson*, at 189.

The Court concluded that the “record fully supported the district court's finding that President Trump engaged in insurrection within the meaning of Section Three,” *Id.* at 225, and ordered that President Trump's name not be placed on the 2024 presidential primary ballot.

Three justices wrote dissenting opinions.

Justice Boatright described in detail that the complexity of the Electors' claims cannot be squared with section 1-1-113's truncated timeline for adjudication. *Id.* at 264-268. He noted that under Colorado election law, a hearing is to be held within five days; in this case, however, it took nearly two months for a hearing to be held, a fact he argues is proof that the election procedures are inadequate for complex constitutional objections. *Id.* at 266.

Justice Samour argued in his opinion Section 3 was not self-executing; further, that the Colorado procedures dictating expedited proceedings denied President Trump due process.

Hearing Officer's Findings and Recommendation re Candidate's Motion to Dismiss

1. While the timeline for conducting a hearing and issuing findings is similar in both the Illinois election code and the Colorado election code, there are substantial differences, at least in terms of handling identical objections involving Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment;
2. In Colorado a trial judge hears evidence at a hearing while in Illinois, the Board conducts the hearing, typically through an appointed hearing officer;
3. The instant Illinois case, 24 SOEB GP 517, was called on January 18, 2024, the same day a hearing officer was appointed to handle the case. with hearing set on January 26, 2024. As described in Appendix A, above, a mad scramble of motions, responses and replies then took place, between January 19 and January 25. The hearing was held on the 26th, with an opinion expected to be filed by the hearing officer in advance of the Election Board hearing set for January 30th. There was no opportunity for meaningful discovery or subpoena of witnesses;
4. The Colorado hearing did not take place for nearly two months following the initial filing of the objection. The hearing lasted more than a week, with a full week devoted to taking testimony. At the hearing, several witnesses testified, including an expert witness in Constitutional law by each party; thereafter, closing arguments were held and a decision was rendered several days later;
5. Illinois law, including the Supreme Court decisions of *Goodman* and *Delgado* prohibit the Election Board from addressing issues involving constitutional analysis.

Recommendation on Candidate's Motion to Dismiss

The Hearing Officer finds that there is a legal basis for granting the Candidate's Motion to Dismiss the Objectors' Petition and **recommends** to the Board that the Motion to Dismiss be **granted**.

Hearing Officer's Findings and Recommendation Regarding the Objector's Petition

1. It is a unique feature of the Rules of Procedure that the final decision on dispositive motions, such as the Motion to Dismiss, are to be made by the Board. Inasmuch as the Board may decline to follow the Hearing Officer's recommendation, and that evidence has been received on the Objector's Petition, it is incumbent upon the hearing officer that he makes findings on the evidence received at the hearing and make a **recommendation** to the Board regarding a decision based on the evidence.
2. The Hearing Officer has received into evidence for consideration numerous exhibits. This evidence also includes the trial testimony heard in the case of *Anderson v. Griswold*, 2023 Co 63 (2023).
3. The Hearing Officer, pursuant to the Stipulated Order Regarding Trial Transcripts and Exhibits from the Colorado Action, has reviewed the entire transcript, consisting of several hundred pages, and finds while the hearing/trial did not afford all the benefits of a criminal trial, (e.g., right to trial by jury; proponent bearing a burden of beyond a reasonable doubt), the proceedings was conducted in a fashion that guaranteed due process for President Trump: parties had the benefit of competent counsel, the right to subpoena witnesses and the right to cross-examine witnesses. The proceeding was conducted in an open and fair manner, with no undue time restrictions that would effect the length of testimony on direct or cross. The parties clearly took advantage of the fact that they were not constrained by the typical expedited manner in which election challenges are normally carried out in Colorado. In fact, one dissenting justice on the Supreme Court commented on the greatly relaxed time frame, in response to the majority claim that the hearing was held in substantial compliance with the statute, by stating that if what the majority claimed was substantial compliance, then that

meant that substantial compliance included no compliance at all. In comparison to the Illinois procedure, the parties had several weeks to prepare for hearing. The result was that the witnesses included two constitutional law professors, with specialty in the history of the Fourteenth Amendment. Further, the lead investigator for the House Select Committee investigating the January 6 Attack upon the United States Capitol testified. A signed copy of the stipulation regarding testimony taken at the Colorado hearing has been transmitted to the General Counsel.

4. Hearing Officer finds that the January 6 Report, including its findings, may properly be considered as evidence, as it was by the Colorado trial court, based on Illinois Rule of Evidence 803(8), as well as the relaxed rules of evidence at an administrative hearing. Hearing Officer further finds, after reviewing the Report, that it is a trustworthy report, the result of months of investigation conducted by professional investigators and a staff of attorneys, many of whom with substantial experience in federal law enforcement. The findings of the Report are attached to this opinion.
5. Ultimately, even when giving the Candidate the benefit of the doubt wherever possible, in the context of the events and circumstances of January 6, 2024, the Hearing Officer recommends that the Board find in favor of the Objectors on the merits by a preponderance of the evidence. While the Candidate's tweets to stay peaceful may give the candidate plausible deniability, the Hearing Officer does not find that denial credible in light of the circumstances. Dr. Simi's testimony in the Colorado trial court provides a basis for finding that the language used by the candidate was recognizable to elements attending the January 6 rally at the ellipse as a call for violence upon the United States Capitol, the express purpose of the violence being the furtherance of the President's plan to disrupt the electoral count taking place before the joint meeting of Congress.
6. The evidence shows that President Trump understood the divided political climate in the United States. He understood and exploited that climate for his own political gain by falsely and publicly claiming the election was stolen from him, even though every single piece of evidence demonstrated that his claim was demonstrably false. He used these false claims to garner further political support for his own benefit by inflaming the emotions of his supporters to convince them that the election was stolen from him and that American democracy was being undermined. He understood the context of the events of January 6, 2021 because he created the climate. At the same time he engaged in an elaborate plan to provide lists of fraudulent electors to Vice President Pence for the express purpose of disrupting the peaceful transfer of power following an election.
7. Even though the Candidate may not have intended for violence to break out on January 6, 2021, he does not dispute that he received reports that violence was a likely possibility on January 6, 2021. Candidate does not dispute that he knew violence was occurring at the capitol.. He understood that people were there to support him. Which makes one single piece of evidence, in this context, absolutely damning to his denial of his participation: the tweet regarding Mike Pence's lack of courage while Candidate knew the attacks were going on is inexplicable. Candidate knew the attacks were

occurring because the attackers believed the election was stolen, and this tweet could not possibly have had any other intended purpose besides to fan the flames. While it is true that subsequently, but not immediately afterwards, Candidate tweeted calls to peace, he did so only after he had fanned the flames. The Hearing Officer determines that these calls to peace via social media, coming after an inflammatory tweet, are the product of trying to give himself plausible deniability. Perhaps he realized just how far he had gone, and that the effort to steal the election had failed because Vice President Pence had refused to accept the bag of fraudulent electors. It was time to retreat, with a final tweet telling the nation that he loved those who had assembled and attacked the capitol.

CONCLUSION

In the event that the Board decides to not follow the Hearing Officer's recommendation to grant the Candidate's Motion to Dismiss, the Hearing Officer recommends that the Board find that the evidence presented at the hearing on January 26, 2024 proves by a preponderance of the evidence that President Trump engaged in insurrection, within the meaning of Section 3 of the Fourteenth Amendment, and should have his name removed from the March, 2024 primary ballot in Illinois.

Submitted by

Clark Erickson

Hearing Officer

Date _____

FINDINGS OF THE JANUARY 6 HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT

This Report supplies an immense volume of information and testimony assembled through the Select Committee's investigation, including information obtained following litigation in Federal district and appellate courts, as well as in the U.S. Supreme Court. Based upon this assembled evidence, the Committee has reached a series of specific findings,[19](#) including the following:

1. Beginning election night and continuing through January 6th and thereafter, Donald Trump purposely disseminated false allegations of fraud related to the 2020 Presidential election in order to aid his effort to overturn the election and for purposes of soliciting contributions. These false claims provoked his supporters to violence on January 6th.
2. Knowing that he and his supporters had lost dozens of election lawsuits, and despite his own senior advisors refuting his election fraud claims and urging him to concede his election loss, Donald Trump refused to accept the lawful result of the 2020 election. Rather than honor his constitutional obligation to "take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed," President Trump instead plotted to overturn the election outcome.
3. Despite knowing that such an action would be illegal, and that no State had or would submit an altered electoral slate, Donald Trump corruptly pressured Vice President Mike Pence to refuse to count electoral votes during Congress's joint session on January 6th.
4. Donald Trump sought to corrupt the U.S. Department of Justice by attempting to enlist Department officials to make purposely false statements and thereby aid his effort to overturn the Presidential election. After that effort failed, Donald Trump offered the position of Acting Attorney General to Jeff Clark knowing that Clark intended to disseminate false information aimed at overturning the election.
5. Without any evidentiary basis and contrary to State and Federal law, Donald Trump unlawfully pressured State officials and legislators to change the results of the election in their States.
6. Donald Trump oversaw an effort to obtain and transmit false electoral certificates to Congress and the National Archives.
7. Donald Trump pressured Members of Congress to object to valid slates of electors from several States.

8. Donald Trump purposely verified false information filed in Federal court.
9. Based on false allegations that the election was stolen, Donald Trump summoned tens of thousands of supporters to Washington for January 6th. Although these supporters were angry and some were armed, Donald Trump instructed them to march to the Capitol on January 6th to “take back” their country.
10. Knowing that a violent attack on the Capitol was underway and knowing that his words would incite further violence, Donald Trump purposely sent a social media message publicly condemning Vice President Pence at 2:24 p.m. on January 6th.
11. Knowing that violence was underway at the Capitol, and despite his duty to ensure that the laws are faithfully executed, Donald Trump refused repeated requests over a multiple hour period that he instruct his violent supporters to disperse and leave the Capitol, and instead watched the violent attack unfold on television. This failure to act perpetuated the violence at the Capitol and obstructed Congress’s proceeding to count electoral votes.
12. Each of these actions by Donald Trump was taken in support of a multi-part conspiracy to overturn the lawful results of the 2020 Presidential election.
13. The intelligence community and law enforcement agencies did successfully detect the planning for potential violence on January 6th, including planning specifically by the Proud Boys and Oath Keeper militia groups who ultimately led the attack on the Capitol. As January 6th approached, the intelligence specifically identified the potential for violence at the U.S. Capitol. This intelligence was shared within the executive branch, including with the Secret Service and the President’s National Security Council.
14. Intelligence gathered in advance of January 6th did not support a conclusion that Antifa or other left-wing groups would likely engage in a violent counter-demonstration, or attack Trump supporters on January 6th. Indeed, intelligence from January 5th indicated that some left-wing groups were instructing their members to “stay at home” and not attend on January 6th.²⁰ Ultimately, none of these groups was involved to any material extent with the attack on the Capitol on January 6th.
15. Neither the intelligence community nor law enforcement obtained intelligence in advance of January 6th on the full extent of the ongoing planning by President Trump, John Eastman, Rudolph Giuliani and their associates to overturn the certified election results. Such agencies apparently did not (and potentially could not) anticipate the provocation President Trump would offer the crowd in his Ellipse speech, that President Trump would “spontaneously” instruct the crowd to march to the Capitol, that President Trump would exacerbate the violent riot by sending his 2:24 p.m. tweet condemning Vice President Pence, or the full scale of the violence and lawlessness that would ensue. Nor did law enforcement anticipate that

President Trump would refuse to direct his supporters to leave the Capitol once violence began. No intelligence community advance analysis predicted exactly how President Trump would behave; no such analysis recognized the full scale and extent of the threat to the Capitol on January 6th.

16. Hundreds of Capitol and DC Metropolitan police officers performed their duties bravely on January 6th, and America owes those individuals immense gratitude for their courage in the defense of Congress and our Constitution. Without their bravery, January 6th would have been far worse. Although certain members of the Capitol Police leadership regarded their approach to January 6th as “all hands on deck,” the Capitol Police leadership did not have sufficient assets in place to address the violent and lawless crowd.²¹ Capitol Police leadership did not anticipate the scale of the violence that would ensue after President Trump instructed tens of thousands of his supporters in the Ellipse crowd to march to the Capitol, and then tweeted at 2:24 p.m. Although Chief Steven Sund raised the idea of National Guard support, the Capitol Police Board did not request Guard assistance prior to January 6th. The Metropolitan Police took an even more proactive approach to January 6th, and deployed roughly 800 officers, including responding to the emergency calls for help at the Capitol. Rioters still managed to break their line in certain locations, when the crowd surged forward in the immediate aftermath of Donald Trump’s 2:24 p.m. tweet. The Department of Justice readied a group of Federal agents at Quantico and in the District of Columbia, anticipating that January 6th could become violent, and then deployed those agents once it became clear that police at the Capitol were overwhelmed. Agents from the Department of Homeland Security were also deployed to assist.
17. President Trump had authority and responsibility to direct deployment of the National Guard in the District of Columbia, but never gave any order to deploy the National Guard on January 6th or on any other day. Nor did he instruct any Federal law enforcement agency to assist. Because the authority to deploy the National Guard had been delegated to the Department of Defense, the Secretary of Defense could, and ultimately did deploy the Guard. Although evidence identifies a likely miscommunication between members of the civilian leadership in the Department of Defense impacting the timing of deployment, the Committee has found no evidence that the Department of Defense intentionally delayed deployment of the National Guard. The Select Committee recognizes that some at the Department had genuine concerns, counseling caution, that President Trump might give an illegal order to use the military in support of his efforts to overturn the election.

* * *

