BOARD OF ELECTIONS IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK

COMMISSIONERS' MEETING

42 Broadway - 6th floor

Commissioners' Hearing Room

New York, NY 10004

June 29, 2021

1:36 p.m. - 1:55 p.m.

PRESENT:

President Frederic Umane Secretary Miguelina Camilo Commissioner Jose Araujo Commissioner Michael Michel

Dawn Sandow, Deputy Executive Director
Hemalee Patel, General Counsel
Raphael Savino, Deputy General Counsel
Tom Sattie, CRU

ALSO PRESENT:

Bernard Alter, Esq.
John Champoli, Esq.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

2 (The meeting commenced at 1:36 p.m.)

MS. DAWN SANDOW: Commissioner Umane?

PRESIDENT FREDERIC UMANE: Hello, my name is Fred Umane. I'm the president of the Board of Elections for the calendar year 2021, and the Republican Commissioner from New York County. I call this hearing by the commissioners of the Board of Elections of the city of New York to order. Today's hearings concern the specification of objection Queens number seven. As you may recall, at the hearings on June 15, 2021, this matter was placed on second call for today. The objection is related to the independent nominating petitions filed for the November 2, 2021 general election on behalf of Vickie Paladino a candidate for City Council in the 19th Council District and the review of three attempted cover sheet cures following notices of non-compliance will also be heard.

The hearing will be conducted in accordance with all applicable rules, provisions of law and the board's independent petition rules. Please note that the emergency procedures

1	June 29, 2021
2	for all hearings was posted on the board's
3	website as well, and referenced in many of the
4	notices send out by the board and communicated to
5	each candidate and objector. All those
6	participating by WebEx video were sent directions
7	on how to participate in this WebEx video
8	conference meeting. I will ask that all
9	participants put their microphones on silent
10	until called upon to speak and then turn off the
11	live stream of the hearing. This will help us all
12	hear what each person is saying and will avoid
13	any blowback on the tape and on the
14	[unintelligible] [00:08:12]. So I'm asking for a
15	roll call of the commissioners consisting of the
16	committee. Commissioner Araujo?
17	COMMISSIONER JOSE ARAUJO: Present, good
18	afternoon.
19	PRESIDENT UMANE: Commissioner Camilo?
20	SECRETARY MIGUELINA CAMILO: Present.
21	PRESIDENT UMANE: And Commissioner
22	Michel?
23	COMMISSIONER MICHAEL MICHEL: Present.
24	PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay. That constitutes

2.3

the executive committee and the two Queens commissioners. I want to remind everyone that only one person should speak at a time so that the audio/video system can accurately record the proceedings. If you are not speaking, please ensure that your microphone is on mute and turn off the live stream.

I also want to advise all present that the board is required by law how each commissioner votes. In the event that the commissioner subcommittee is not unanimous in their determination, I will ask that our counsel conduct a roll call vote for the record. I now call upon deputy general counsel Raphael Savino to call the calendar for today's hearings.

MR. RAPHAEL SAVINO: Good afternoon, commissioners. As you heard, today's first matter relates to the specification of objections QN-7 regarding independent nominating petitions filed for the candidate for City Council in 19th District, Vickie Paladino. Are there any appearances?

MR. SATTIE: Commissioners, there are

1 June 29, 2021 2 appearances for both the objector and the candidate, and Mr. Alter and Mr. Champoli have 3 4 been let into the room. 5 MR. BERNARD ALTER: Okay. 6 PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay, could you 7 identify yourselves for the record, and the side that you're representing? First, Mr. Champoli. 8 9 MR. JOHN CHAMPOLI: John Champoli, 10 Messina Perillo and Hill for the objector. MR. ALTER: Bernard Alter for the 11 candidate, Vickie Paladino, Alter and Barbaro. 12 13 PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay. 14 MR. SAVINO: Is there anything the 15 representative for the candidate would like to 16 add to their prior arguments made on June 15, 17 2021? 18 MR. ALTER: No, except I did bring to 19 the attention of the board the part B, which is 20 the second argument, which is the signatures that 21 were discounted by the clerks' report because 22 they were taken by SW, they took signatures for 2.3 Paladino on the Republican line. The statute was

pretty clear as far as I'm concerned that she

24

1	June 29, 2021
2	could take, she could take signatures on the
3	Republican line and the [unintelligible]
4	[00:10:49] independent line because it's the same
5	candidate. The statute says additional and
6	another candidate. That's the second part of the
7	argument. The other stuff is very I haven't
8	got anything further to add to my letter that I
9	submitted to the board back on I believe it was
10	what, the 30th, whatever date it was, what's the
11	date of the letter, hold on I'll tell you in a
12	second. Hold on, I've got it right in front of me
13	here. Hold on.
14	PRESIDENT UMANE: We have your letter
15	and we have the cases next to it.
16	MR. ALTER: Okay.
17	PRESIDENT UMANE: It was provided to us,
18	just so you know.
19	MR. ALTER: I've got nothing further to
20	add, Mr. Umane. That's it.
21	PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay, thank you.
22	MR. SAVINO: Thank you, Mr. Alter.
23	MR. ALTER: [unintelligible] [00:11:22]
24	to what?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

MR. SAVINO: I said thank you. Is there anything the objector or the representative would like to add to the prior arguments made on June 15, 2021?

MR. CHAMPOLI: Well, just very briefly the cases that have been cited by Mr. Alter are not applicable to the case here. In fact, the fundamental argument is that you must have the election referred to in the certificate so the board knows what to apply the certificate to. There is no first date in the statute for filing a certificate of acceptance. So theoretically, this certificate will jump back to life two years from now because it doesn't specify what election it applies to. You can accept that if it's a twoyear term, every two years, if it's a four-year term, every four years, you can accept a line, an independent line with the same name. And as we know, most people use the same name for independent lines kind of repeatedly.

With regard to the subscribing witness,

I don't think the board will reach that because

of the defect in the certificate, however, the

2.3

chapter that is involved in the Fourth Department case sought to codify a court of appeals case,

McGuire v. Gamache. In McGuire v. Gamache, the question was the qualifications of the witness but not living in the political subdivision. That clearly, the court of appeals has spoken to, that is permissible.

But your, if you look at the case Brock v. Sams [phonetic], which was decided in federal district court by Judge Block, this board was a party to that action and in that case, the court expounded that the right to sign a petition was an extension of your right to vote. So therefore, if you could sign for one candidate, you got to sign witness. If you could sign for three candidates if it was an election at large, you could sign for any three.

This, the, the position posited by the candidate here is, throws out that rule, that your right to sign a petition is an extension of your right to vote. And, if in fact the legislature was codifying McGuire v. Gamache, that position is dead wrong. And that's what the

2.3

2 [unintelligible] [00:14:20] says.

MR. SAVINO: With that, commissioners, I will present the findings of the legal department in the Office of the Board of Elections. The position of the legal department has not changed. And we believe the candidate should be removed from the ballot.

With respect to the cases cited by Mr.

Alter in that regard, they are distinguishable to the matter at hand. One was mayor, which talked about the term of office. It said that putting extra information on the certification of authorization would not make it invalid. It's not required to put the term of office, but that's what they did in that case, again, extra information in that case wouldn't make it invalid.

In the case of Finn v. Sherwood,

Sherwood filed a certificate of acceptance

containing his complete correct name, his

address, the correct political party and the

correct office, also duly acknowledged by a

notary. The certificate made a reference to the

2.3

However, it does matter if you write the primary or general first of all, and also the certificate of authorization in that case must have had the date on it, because the decision is completely silent in that regard. Moreover, one can easily discern the type of election it's for when you look and you see it's a designating petition for

an opportunity to ballot petition, we all know

that's for a primary. An independent nominating

petitions are for a general election.

general election rather than the primary.

Monaco, another case that was cited by
Mr. Alter, discussed that the certificate of
authorization, the title of the office did not
match the petition identically. One way it was
written Suffolk County legislator in the 5th
District and the other way it was written county
legislator, 5th Legislative District. Again, that
has nothing to do with whether or not the date of
the election is on the certificate of acceptance.

There's a couple other cases cited by Mr. Alter, but they talk about substantial compliance with respect to cover sheets and

2.3

2 petitions, and have no relevance here.

I will note that there is a case of

Konklin. It's 36 years old, which does talk about
the date of the primary election, which was not
cited by Mr. Alter. But again, that case is 36
years old. And no doubt, predates the sample form
prescribed by the New York State Board of
Elections, as well as the sample form provided in
the rules by the New York City Board of
Elections. Both samples specifically call for the
date of the election to be entered.

A lot of things have changed in 36 years, as I might have said. As you're all aware, for example, early voting, cures to absentee ballots, ranked-choice voting. More importantly however, I would note, as I believe pointed out by one of the commissioners, and again by, actually it was at the last hearing, two weeks ago, that someone could file an authorization and acceptance well before a particular election.

Again, in spite of the Konklin case, the date of the election should nonetheless be considered an essential part of the certificate

2.3

of acceptance and a lack thereof should invalidate the candidacy. Again, as we are all aware, the board recently had to conduct elections, I think it was five or six elections in about seven months or less than seven months, the general, December 22nd, February 2, February 23rd, and two more in the Bronx in March. You know, under those circumstances, clearly something missing the date would certainly cause confusion.

In addition, last year, we had an election scheduled for borough president in Queens. That election was for the remaining term of office. We then had a primary and that was canceled because of COVID, we acknowledge that. But this is not an uncommon situation. We then had a primary for the exact same office shortly thereafter scheduled, with, you know, some of the same candidates, again, the same public office. I can't imagine how a certificate of acceptance in those situations wouldn't be confusing if it didn't have the date.

In the instant case, it's worth noting

2.3

that the primary is only for the remaining two years, kind of similar to that other situation. I mean I remember a case, or I should say a time when a certificate, an authorization or a certificate of acceptance was filed about eight months before an election, maybe even further back, and certainly caused confusion when I received it.

Also the Reform Party one year did that as well. Well in advance of election, they filed an authorization and a certificate of acceptance, I think trying to make it harder for objectors to address that. So there certainly is no date by which something like that must be filed.

And therefore, and in light of the above, we find that the certificate of acceptance in this case, which does not contain the date of the election, to be invalid and that the candidate should be removed from the ballot.

MR. ALTER: I've got only one comment if I may be heard on that, Mr. Umane.

PRESIDENT UMANE: Go ahead, Mr. Alter, go ahead.

1	June	29,	202	21
2			MR.	ΑI

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

MR. ALTER: There is only one general election. That is it. And there's no confusion as to what the paper says. It says general election without the date of the general election. There is only one general election. Therefore, I think counsel's argument about confusion is totally without merit.

PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay, thank you, sir. Does anybody want to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL: I make a motion to accept the legal department.

COMMISSIONER ARAUJO: Second.

PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay. All in favor?

MULTIPLE: Aye.

16 PRESIDENT UMANE: All opposed? Okay.

It's unanimous. I guess the candidate is off the ballot.

MR. ALTER: Okay. That's it?

PRESIDENT UMANE: Mr. Savino -- yeah,

thank you, Mr. Alter and Mr. Champoli.

MR. CHAMPOLI: Thank you, commissioners.

MR. SAVINO: Commissioners, I will now

24 present the three cover sheets that were

2.3

submitted to the board in response to a notice of non-compliance. The first is by Matthew Morgan, a Libertarian Candidate for City Council, District 39. As you may recall, the cover sheet was not signed. And that was deemed to be a defect consistently by the commissioners. The cure, as you can very well see, is in fact signed at the bottom. So our recommendation on this -- well, actually, I'll do them all three together.

The second is David B. Casavis, and he's running for Libertarian candidate for City

Council, District 4. And then there's also a cover sheet, amended cover sheet, for Stacey

Prussman, Libertarian candidate for mayor and

David Balkind, Libertarian candidate for public advocate. All of them had the same issue, and all of them in our opinion properly cured. And as you can see, on all three cover sheets, at the bottom, there is in fact, a signature. So it's our recommendation that they would be deemed a valid cure.

PRESIDENT UMANE: Is there a motion to accept it? I'll move that we accept them all

1	June 29, 2021
2	three as valid cures as they've now been properly
3	
4	COMMISSIONER ARAUJO: Second.
5	PRESIDENT UMANE: All in favor?
6	MULTIPLE: Aye.
7	PRESIDENT UMANE: All opposed? All
8	abstentions? So that's also unanimous. All three
9	I guess are now candidates.
10	MR. SAVINO: And will appear on the
11	ballot.
12	COMMISSIONER ARAUJO: I apologize. For
13	the record, that's four, it's four candidates.
14	PRESIDENT UMANE: Four.
15	MR. SAVINO: I'm sorry, four candidates,
16	three cover sheets. I apologize.
17	PRESIDENT UMANE: Right.
18	COMMISSIONER ARAUJO: Do you need a
19	motion to authorize to use our initials at the
20	general office or
21	MR. SAVINO: I can certainly do that
22	instead of sending them back and forth, scanned
23	copies and trying to, you know, get everybody's
24	initials, so I'd be happy to do that,

1 June 29, 2021 2 commissioner. Thank you, provided I have authorization from all commissioners. 3 COMMISSIONER MICHEL: Yes. 4 5 PRESIDENT UMANE: So, I think you have that authorization from all of us. 6 7 MR. SAVINO: Thank you. 8 PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay. There are no other matters to come before us at this time, so 9 10 I move that we adjourn the hearing. Is there a 11 second? 12 COMMISSIONER ARAUJO: Second. 13 COMMISSIONER MICHEL: Second. 14 PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay. All in favor? 15 MULTIPLE: Aye. 16 PRESIDENT UMANE: All opposed? All 17 abstentions? I believe our next regular meeting 18 will be next Tuesday, but there may be lots of 19 commissioners on vacation. So those in the 20 public, we're tentatively scheduling the meeting 21 for next Tuesday at 1:30 in the same way as we 22 always do, but please keep an eye out on our 2.3 website in the event that we decide to adjourn or

postpone that meeting.

24

1 June 29, 2021 2 MR. SAVINO: Again, commissioners, thank you for your time, and with there being no 3 further business and there's also been a motion 4 5 to adjourn, we will see you at the next public meeting. 6 7 PRESIDENT UMANE: Okay. Thank you. Have a good week everybody. Happy 4th of July. 8 9 SECRETARY CAMILO: Happy 4th. 10 COMMISSIONER ARAUJO: And to you as 11 well. 12 (The meeting concluded at 1:55 p.m.) 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 2.3 24

CERTIFICATE OF ACCURACY

I, Claudia Marques, certify that the foregoing transcript of the Board of Elections in The City of New York on June 29, 2021 was prepared using the required transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

Certified By

Claudia Marques

Date: December 17, 2021

GENEVAWORLDWIDE, INC

256 West 38th Street - 10th Floor

New York, NY 10018