BEFORE THE 1. 2 FRANKLIN COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS 3 OF THE STATE OF OHIO 4 5 IN RE: 6 Board Meeting 7 8 9 Proceedings before Chairman William A. 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17

Anthony, Jr., Board Members Michael F. Colley, Carolyn C. Petree, Kimberly E. Marinello, Deputy Director Dennis L. White, and Executive Director Matthew Damschroder, taken at the Franklin County Board of Elections, 280 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, on Wednesday, June 21, 2006, at 3:20 o'clock p.m.

23

18

19

20

21

1.	INDEX	Page 2
2	Agenda Item Page No.	
3	Approval of Minutes 3	
4	City of Westerville Election Issue 3	
5	Charles Morrison Protest Hearing 4	
6	Employee Full-Time Status 74	
7		
8		
; '9	,	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17	·	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24 -		

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: I'd like to call the Franklin County Board of Elections meeting

(Role call vote taken.)

MR. DAMSCHRODER: All members are present, Mr. Chairman. The first item of business is to quickly approve the minutes of the board meetings of May 1, May 17, and May 22 of this year.

CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Do we have a

MS. PETREE: Mr. Chairman, I would

move that the minutes of the May 1st, 2006, May 17th, 2006, and May 22nd, 2006 meetings of the Franklin County Board of Elections be

approved as submitted.

CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Is there a

21 second?

20

22

23

MS. MARINELLO: Second.

CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: All those in

24 favor, say aye.

1.	(A vote was taken.)	Page 4
2	MR. DAMSCHRODER: And motion	
3	carries.	
4	The next item, Mr. Chairman, is just	-
5	to enter into the record of the Board that the	
6	special election to be held in August for the	
7	city of Westerville was pulled by the city of	
8	Westerville; they're going to refile that for	
9	the November election instead of having a	
10	special election. They wanted to change some	
11	of the aspects of the tax they're proposing,	
12	so that issue has been withdrawn and will be	
13	resubmitted to the Board for certification for	•
14	the fall election. I wanted to let you know,	
15	so the only August special will be city of	
16	Reynoldsburg.	
17	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Thank you.	
18	MR. DAMSCHRODER: And the next item	
19	on the agenda, Mr. Chairman and Board members,	
20	is the protest hearing on the candidacy of Mr.	,
21	Morrison, who filed petitions seeking to be an	
22	independent candidate for Congress of the 15th	
23	Congressional District.	
24	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Okay. I guess we	

1.	have folks representing both sides?	Page !
2	MR. DAMSCHRODER: That's correct.	
3	Maria Armstrong is present representing the	
4	committee of protesters, and David Langdon is	
5	present representing Mr. Morrison.	
6	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Okay. So I guess	
7	we should call Mrs. Armstrong.	
8	MS. ARMSTRONG: Thank you, Mr.	
9	Chairman and Members of the Board. On behalf	
10	of the protesters, we appreciate the	
11	opportunity to be here today to address you.	
12	The facts here are very	
13	straightforward. They're uncontroverted. We	
14	believe at the end of the testimony hearing	
15	today that there will be no dispute as to the	
16	factual basis before you. This basically	
17	turns into a point of law.	
18	The record here, much of which is	
19	already before this Commission, shows that	
20	Mr. Morrison has a long history of affiliation	
21	with the Republican Party, and, most	
22	specifically, in the months and days leading	
23	to and following May 1st, when he filed the	
24	petitions that are challenged here before you,	

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

So the facts, I think, will be fairly straightforward. This will boil down to a legal issue. I trust that I'll have an opportunity to address the legal issues a little bit later on in the proceedings so I won't go into great detail here, but we would respectfully request that this Board keep several things in mind on the legalities as we

COURT REPORTING...WE'VE MADE A SCIENCE OF IT!

listen to the testimony and consider the 1 2 evidence that you're about to see. 3 First is that the Ohio General 4 Assembly established a very clear pathway for 5 Independent candidates to get to the ballot. 6 It is a faster, less expensive, less cumbersome pathway than a contested primary 7 8 is, certainly. There was one catch: The 9 General Assembly required that in order to 10 avail oneself of that process, of that 11 pathway, that one be an Independent candidate. 12 Contrary to what Mr. Morrison suggests in his brief, that definition of 13 14 Independent candidate is not some lifeless 15 lamp looking for a plug; rather, the plain language of Revised Code 3513.257 relies upon 16 17 that language, incorporates it, and that definition of Independent candidate actually 18 controls the application of that statute. 19 20 Mr. Morrison, who does not meet, and 21 we would respectfully ask this Board to find 22 that he does not meet, that statutory 23 definition, simply cannot avail himself of that procedure that's reserved for Independent 24

. 1.	candidates in 3513.257.	, ugc
2	Second, I would ask this Board to	,
3	simply listen to the facts that are presented	
4	here and apply those to the laws, as it does	
5	in every other situation. In his brief, Mr.	
6	Morrison suggested that it was either the	
7	protesters' burden or perhaps the Board's duty	
8	to set some sort of a test or a standard or	
9	formula for measuring independence. That is	
10	simply not the law, it's not your duty, nor	
11	ours; rather, we would ask that this Board	
12	simply apply the facts as you're about to hear	
13	them to the law that's before it.	
1.4	With that, I understand that Mr.	
15	Langdon does not have an opening. I'd like to	
L 6	call Mr. Kitchen to the stand.	
L7		
L 8	CHARLES KITCHEN	
L 9	being first duly sworn, testifies	
20	and says as follows:	
21		
22	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
23	BY MS. ARMSTRONG:	
: 4	Q. Mr. Kitchen, if you would, please,	

And those are both in Madison

Yes, ma'am.

22

23

24

Ο.

County?

1.	Q. And is that the Republican Central	Page 10
2	Committee?	
3	A. Yes, ma'am.	
4	Q. In Madison County. Can you explain	
5	let's turn first to your role with the	
6	Republican Party in Madison County. What are	
7	just briefly some of the duties that that	
8	party operates under?	
9	A. Handle all the business of the	
10	Republican Party in the county. I'm chairman	
11	of the Executive and the Central Committee.	
12 .	Q. And can you explain to me what the	
13	role of the Central Committee is in Madison	
14	County?	
15	A. We appoint people to positions when	
16	there's a death or a resignation or someone	
. 17	that moves out the county or moves out of	
18	their precinct.	
19	Q. Would it be fair to say that the	
20	Central Committee is the governing body for	
21	the Republican Party in Madison County?	
22 ·	A. Yes, ma'am.	
23	Q. And is responsible for its operation	
24	and policies?	

	1.	Page 12 Q. Were you familiar or did you see Mr.
	2	Morrison's current campaign prior to May 2nd?
•	3	A. Yes, ma'am, I saw it in the
	4	newspaper.
	5	Q. Okay. Let's turn to some of the
	6	exhibits, if we could. And once again, I
	7	understand that will be no objection at least
	8	to the first several exhibits. I'll move
	9	rather quickly but count on Mr. Langdon to
	10	stop me if there's some objection or concern.
	11	I'd like to have this marked as
	12	Exhibit A, please.
	13	
	14	Thereupon, Exhibit A was marked
	15	for purposes of identification.
•	16	
	17	MS. ARMSTRONG: And I have copies
	18	for the Board.
	19	Q. Will you please take a look at
	20	Exhibit A, Mr. Kitchen, and explain for the
	21	Board what that is.
	22	A. It's a certificate of registration
	23	for Mr. Charles Morrison, 581 Markley Road,
	24	London, Ohio.
		i e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

And does that show Mr. Morrison as a

representative of Congress for the 15th

1	document?	Page 17
2		
	A. Yes, ma'am, it is.	
3	Q. And the top of that document or	
4	maybe about a third of the way down, there is	,
5	an affirmation for the candidate to sign. Can	
6	you tell me, based on that document, who is	
7	the candidate?	
8	A. Charles Morrison.	
9	Q. And would you please read into the	
10	record that affirmation starting with "I,	
11	Charles Morrison."	
12	A. "I, Charles Morrison, the	
13	undersigned, hereby declare under penalty of	
14	election falsification that my voting	
15	residence is in Somerford Precinct of the	
16	township, that my voting residence address on	
17	file with my county board of elections is 581	
18	Markley Road, London, Ohio, 43140, and I am a	
19	qualified elector in my precinct.	
20	"I hereby declare that I desire to	
21	be a candidate for election to the office of	
22	Member of the County of Central Committee as a	
23	member of the Republican Party from Somerford	,
	-	

Township at the primary election to be held on

		Dago 10
1.	the 2nd day of May, 2006.	Page 18
2	"I further declare that, if elected	
3	to this office, I will qualify therefor.	
4	"Dated this 14th day of December,	
5	2005. Signature, Charles R. Morrison."	
6	Q. Thank you. Further down that	
7	petition, underneath petition for candidate,	
8	where people start to sign, there is a	
9	statement on that form in parentheses. Can	
10	can you please read that into the record.	
11	A. "This petition shall be circulated	
12	only by a member of the same political party	
13	as stated above by the candidate."	
14	Q. And on the back, is there a place	
15	for the circulator to sign that petition?	
16	A. Yes, there is.	
17	Q. Who is the circulator?	
18	A. Charles Morrison.	
19	Q. And once again, did the circulator	
20	declare under penalty of election	
21	falsification that they were qualified and	,
22	that they were a member of the Republican	
23	Party?	
24	A. Yes, he did say that.	

Page 20

1	7\	77	1 1	
1.	Α.	res,	there	ls.

- 2 Q. And once again, is that circulator
- 3 | Charles Morrison?
- 4 A. Yes, it is.
- 5 Q. And once again, did he sign under
- 6 penalty of election falsification that he is a
- 7 member of the Republican Party?
- 8 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 9 Q. And do you see on the bottom there
- 10 | the Greene County Board of Elections' stamp
- 11 | that this is a certified document?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. I'm going to ask you, Mr. Kitchen,
- 14 to please turn back to Exhibit A. I'm going
- 15 to talk a little bit about what happened in
- 16 | the recent days leading up to the May 2nd
- 17 election. I think you mentioned earlier on
- 18 that you were aware of Mr. Morrison running
- 19 | some ads?
- 20 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 21 Q. Can you please explain for the Board
- 22 | what those ads for?
- 23 A. They were ads for the race of the
- 24 | Central Committee.

1 (Q.	For	county	or	state	or	both?
-------	----	-----	--------	----	-------	----	-------

- A. For the state, and for the county is
- 3 the same too.
- 4 Q. And where did you see those ads?
- 5 A. In the Madison Press.
- 6 Q. Did they declare to the reader that
- 7 Mr. Morrison was a Republican?
- 8 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 9 Q. Seeking office for that position?
- 10 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 11 Q. And when did those ads run?
- 12 A. I believe three weeks before the
- 13 | election.
- 14 Q. So through the end of April, end of
- 15 May, very end of May?
- 16 A. Actually, I'm not sure whether it
- 17 | was the 2nd day of May, I don't whether it was
- 18 | there on the 1st or not, but I believe for
- 19 three weeks it was in the paper.
- 20 Q. On May 2nd, can you please turn to
- 21 | Exhibit A and tell the Board what that exhibit
- 22 | tells us about how Mr. Morrison voted on
- 23 May 2nd.
- 24 A. On 5-2-06, he voted as a Republican

		Page 22
1.	in the primary election.	. 450 ==
2	MS. ARMSTRONG: I have no further	
3	questions for Mr. Kitchen at this point. I	
. 4	would move to admit Exhibits A through G.	
5	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Mr. Langdon, do	
6	you have any cross?	
7	MR. LANGDON: I don't have any	
. 8	questions.	
9	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Does the Board	
10	have any questions?	
11		
12	EXAMINATION	
13	BY MS. PETREE:	
14	Q. Mr. Kitchen, on voting history, it	
15	says on 5-2 of '06 he voted Republican. And	
16	then below that there are Xs. Does that mean	•
17	in your county that he voted each time, or is	
18	that an X that he did not vote?	
19	A. Well, he voted. That means he	
20	voted, but you only have to give your politics	
21	in the primary election.	
22	Q. Right. But the Xs below, does that	
23	mean that's a vote or he did not vote?	
24	A. He voted.	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

MS. PETREE: He voted, thank you.	1.
CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Any other	2
questions for Mr. Kitchen? I don't have	3
anything either. Thank you, sir.	4
MS. ARMSTRONG: I have no other	5
witnesses at this time.	6
MR. LANGDON: Mr. Chairman, Members	7
of the Board, my name is David Langdon; I'm	. 8
here today on behalf of Charlie Morrison.	9
The way I'd like to, with your	10
permission, structure my argument is to break	11
it into two parts. The first part of my	12
argument is solely based on legal issues. I	13
do have one witness to call, that's Mr.	14
Morrison, for a very limited purpose, but	15
frankly, it's secondary to my argument on the	16
question of whether or not he claims to not be	17
affiliated with a particular political party.	18
So what I'd like to do is go ahead	19
and present to you my legal arguments and then	20
I will call Mr. Morrison to testify, if that's	21
acceptable.	22
CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: That's	23
acceptable.	24

1. MR. LANGDON: Mr. Chairman, Members 2 of the Board, today you are entrusted with a 3 very difficult decision, as you are every time 4 a proposed candidate submits a nominating 5 petition, whether it be for party nomination 6 or for Independent candidate nomination. You 7 are the gatekeeper's to determine whether or 8 not candidates have met the qualifications 9 that are set forth in the Ohio Revised Code to 10 be candidates for a particular election. 11 Today, we are here as the as a 12 result of a protest that has been filed 13 against the proposed candidacy of Mr. 14 Morrison. Mr. Morrison has submitted 15 petitions to this Board to be a candidate for 16 election to United States House of 17 Representatives for the 15th Congressional 18 District. 19 I believe that there is no dispute 20 from a factual standpoint that Mr. Morrison's 21 petitions comply with the applicable statutes. 22 The only question, as has been presented by

the protesters, i's whether or not he is an

Independent candidate, and certainly the

23

1. question for you to decide is whether that 2 matters or not. But from the standpoint of 3 did his petitions meet all the various 4 technical requirements, I don't believe that 5 that is in dispute. Certainly if the 6 protesters dispute that, they'd let you know. 7 Mr. Morrison obviously obtained 8 petitions from the -- prescribed by the 9 Secretary of State. Perhaps he got them from 10 here or directly from the Ohio Secretary of 11 State. He completed those petitions, the 12 statement of candidacy. He circulated those 13 petitions, both himself and others, and he 14 submitted those petitions to the Board. 15 In doing so, he was following Ohio 16 law. Revised Code 3513.257, in particular, 17 sets forth in very detailed fashion the 18 requirements for one to become an Independent 19 candidate. 20 Now, the language of 3513.257 is 21 very important, and there might be a tendency 22 to get lost in all of this discussion about 23 Independent candidate, but if you look

carefully, and as we pointed out in our memo,

at the language, it says: Each person desiring to become an Independent candidate shall do X, Y, and Z: File their petitions and follow the various requirements.

1.0

Of course, some of those requirements include complying with the statute that sets forth in great detail the form for the petition. That statute is 3513.261, which sets forth the minimum qualifications.

Mr. Morrison is required to desire to be a candidate for the office, and to be an elector and qualified to serve in that particular position. He has to meet the constitutional requirements for a congressman, be a certain age, so on and so forth. Again, there is no dispute that he meets all of those requirements.

But getting back to the specific language of 3513.257, each person desiring to become an Independent candidate must meet the following specifications. Nowhere after that language do we see any requirement in 3513.257 that this person has to claim not to be

1 affiliated with a political party.

That is simply not a requirement set forth in the statute. Rather, what the protesters would have you do here is to pull the definition from a different statute and plug it into the point in 3513.257 where Independent candidate is used, so it would then read: Each person desiring to become a candidate who has claimed, and so forth. You would superimpose that definition into there.

Whether it's the two words or the definition, it doesn't matter. What matters is what follows that: Someone who desires to become this must do X, Y, and Z.

There is no question that Mr.

Morrison complied to the letter with X, Y, and
Z, and, therefore, by operation of law, is an
Independent candidate, regardless of whether
or not he meets this so-called definition of
an Independent candidate.

So there is no need -- all of the discussion about Mr. Morrison's past voting record and having been on the ballot for this and having been on the ballot for that is

completely irrelevant, because there is no requirement in order to satisfy 3513.257 that one meet the definition of Independent candidate, because it's not used in that way.

In essence, it is lifeless. It is merely a descriptive term used to describe someone that has met the qualifications set forth in 3513.257.

Now, the protesters argue,
otherwise, obviously, and they -- granted,
they don't give you the entire definition, but
they point to part of the definition of
Independent candidate.

But I think it's very important, and, as a side note, the protesters have actually urged you in their memorandum, they've presented to you a fundamental rule of statutory construction that you're to examine all of the words in a particular statute, not just some words. And yet, in their brief, we don't get the full definition of Independent candidate, in their Writ of Protest or in their memorandum; they conveniently excluded a very important part of the definition, and we

don't ever see it in any of the papers. You
do see the full definition in my papers. It's
a two-part requirement.

Now, of course, all of this assumes that it's even relevant, which it's not, but assuming for the sake of argument that it is, if we examine the definition, what it says is, an Independent candidate means a candidate who claims not to be affiliated with a political party and — this is part two — has been certified to be an Independent candidate; in other words, has been certified pursuant to Revised Code 3513.257.

What the protesters are suggesting is that Mr. Morrison can't be an Independent candidate because he's not an Independent candidate at the time he sets out to comply with 3513.257, if that makes sense.

It becomes somewhat circular, and frankly, the more you look at it, the more your brain starts to hurt. It really does happen; I can attest to that. Because it's a vicious circle that you get in, and it's very incoherent.

But ultimately one cannot become an 1. 2 Independent candidate until one is certified 3 as an Independent candidate. Yet, the 4 protesters would have you, in essence, create 5 this dichotomy in the definition that says, 6 you first have to meet this first part, the 7 part that works in our favor, the part of 8 claiming not to be affiliated with a political 9 party, but you don't have to meet the second 10 part. And then if you do that, then you're 11 eligible to go to 3513.257 and follow the 12 various requirements that are in there, and, 13 by the way, if you meet all of those, then 14 you're an Independent candidate. 15 So it's very confusing as to what 16 they're suggesting. Are you an Independent 17 before? Or are you an Independent candidate 18 afterwards? 19 The statute also has tense issues. 20 If you notice, looking very carefully at the 21 definition, it says a candidate who claims not 22 to be affiliated. Well, that is present

tense, which leaves us in a quandary: Well,

when must they claim that?

23

And then the second part says, who 1. 2 has been certified. Past tense. Again 3 putting us back in this sort of vicious circle where we don't know which comes first. 4 5 Ultimately, I point you back to my 6 initial argument, and that is that it's 7 irrelevant, because it has no meaning within 8 3513.257 other than merely describing someone 9 who has complied with the various requirements 1.0 in there. But the standard, and I realize it's 11 12 been suggested to you that you're not being 13 asked to create a standard, but, in essence, 14. you are. You are being asked to apply the 15 law, and they're asking you to come up with a 16 very novel, brand new interpretation of the 17 law on this particular issue, which means, by 18 default, you are required to establish a 19 standard of what it means. Okay? 20 So let's now address this question 21 of someone claiming not to be affiliated with 22 a political party. What does that mean? 23 If you follow the protesters' line 24 of thought, it means that, if a particular

person who desires to be a candidate has done
a number of things in connection with a

particular party -- they've voted in that

party's primary, they've appeared on the

ballot as a candidate for election to the

Central Committee, and so on and so forth -
that apparently by law, they then are deemed

to be affiliated with a political party.

Now, of course, there's nothing in

1.

Now, of course, there's nothing in the Revised Code or any case that will suggest that that is the case. There's nothing there.

It's a fabrication.

So we are also left with the question, in addition to what does it mean to be affiliated with a political party, of when — as you're coming up with this standard, when does one need to be claiming not to be affiliated, or at what point in time do you apply this standard?

They argue in their motion -- excuse me, in their memorandum, that he would have to meet this test when he files his petitions.

Now, they also, however, point to things that happened after his petitions were filed the

next day, May 2nd, when he voted in the Republican Party primary, as being relevant. So that sends at least a confusing message to me: Well, which is it? Is it the day he turned them in? Or is it afterwards? Is it today?

1.

We're going to apply this definition, which is again extratextual, it's not -- you can't find any support or basis to apply to this definition, but assuming we do, it would seem to me that the reasonable test to apply would be, is that, at any point prior to certification, i.e., a protest hearing of this nature, if this proposed candidate says, "I hereby claim not to be affiliated with a political party," then he's not affiliated with a political party.

The same way that a person who is desiring to run as a party candidate is required, by law, mind you, this is specific to a statute, someone who wants to be a party candidate is required to specify in their petition papers, "I am a member of the

		Page 34
1.	Republican Party." They declare it. It	, age 5 ,
2	doesn't matter that they may have been a	
3	lifelong Democrat, or a Republican; and	
4	they're wanting to run for the opposite party.	
5	Ohio law allows you to do that.	
6	One can be a one can have gone to	
7	every Republican club event in their entire	
8	life, have not missed one single Lincoln Day	
9	dinner their entire life, voted in every	
10	single Republican primary, even in the same	
11	year they can vote in a Republican Party	
12	primary, and yet, they can pick up a party	
13	candidate petition to be nominated and	
14	self-declare, "I am a Democrat," and the law	
15	allows them to run as a Democrat.	
16	It's now being suggested that Mr.	
17	Morrison can't claim to be an Independent	
18	candidate? It's rather absurd, really, when	
19	you think about it.	
20	So, point number one is, is that the	
21	definition is inoperable. It's not giving any	
22	force and effect in any language, any	
23	operative statute. Like 3513.257 gives it no	
24	force and effect and, therefore, the	
	i de la companya de	

definition is wholly irrelevant. That's point number one.

1.

Point number two is, assuming that you find that one must meet this definitional standard, we have to decide, okay, what are the rules, what is one required to do.

Clearly, the form, which is prescribed by the Secretary of State, which in turn complies to the letter with the form that's set forth in the Revised Code, the form leaves no blanks to say, "I claim not to be affiliated with a political party." There's no such blank space on the form for that.

Arguably, if somebody were to handwrite that in, then the challenge would be that you've gone outside the rules for what the form is supposed to say. So it's neither required nor, arguably, allowed to do something like that.

So when does this claim have to be made? You have to look at this outside of just the context of Mr. Morrison and realize that there are -- even this year, there are a number of proposed candidates out there that

1 | want to run as Independent candidates.

.3

You received fairly recently from
the Secretary of State a number of directives
for closing petitions for candidates that want
to be Independent candidates to run for
Governor and Secretary of State and so on and
so forth. Same test applies. Is this Board
going to be required to investigate whether or
not these folks are claiming not to be
affiliated with a particular political party?
And if so, how are you going to go about doing
that? When are you going to go about doing
that? Is it when they file their petition?

Mr. Morrison, when he filed his petitions, the woman at the desk, or the man at the desk or whoever it was, didn't say, "Raise your hand and claim not to be affiliated with a political party," nothing of the sort.

Now, as kind of a side note, I think this is sort of ironic, he was asked, when he submitted his petitions, how he wanted his name to appear on the ballot. They asked him, "Do you want your name to appear with the

1.	designation 'nonparty,' 'other party,' or
2	blank?" And the comedy here is the other
3	party.
4	You have the protesters who are
5	asserting that in order to be an Independent
6	candidate, you have to disclaim affiliation
7	with any political party Republican,
8	Democrats there's no other group out there
9	that meets the definition of a political
10	party.
11	Yet, he could, arguably, have next
12	to his name on the ballot keep in mind the
13	definition here, you're disaffiliating
14	yourself from any political party; he could
15	have on the ballot next to his name "other
16	party." It's inherently contradictory, which,
17	of course, is the nature of the way this
18	entire statutory scheme is written.
19	But, nonetheless, when he submitted
20	his petitions, he was asked that question. In
21	this particular instance, he said no
22	designation whatsoever.
23	Now, if you would permit me, I would
24	like to call Mr. Morrison to the stand and ask

		Page 38
1.	him a few questions.	rage 30
2		
3	CHARLES MORRISON	
4	being first duly sworn, testifies	Y
5	and says as follows:	
6		
7	DIRECT EXAMINATION	
8	BY MR. LANGDON:	
9	Q. Good afternoon.	
10	A. Good afternoon. I'm Charlie	
11	Morrison.	
12	Q. Could you spell your name for the	
13	record, Mr. Morrison.	
14	A. Morrison, M-o-r-r-i-s-o-n.	
15	Q. Mr. Morrison, today we're here,	
16	you're obviously aware your petitions are at	
17	issue. If you could very briefly describe for	
18	the Board the conversations that you had with	
19	people when you were circulating your	
20	candidate petitions to be an Independent	
21	candidate for Congress.	
22	A. Certainly. I collected about 2,316	
23	signatures, and those 2,316 signatures, I	
24	needed 1,422 to qualify for an Independent.	

1.	Now, that's not compared to Republics or	Page 39
2	Democrats, but I did 2,316 signatures.	
3	About 2,000 of those I did on my	
4	own. I had other circulators, some Democrats	
5	and some Independents and some Republicans	
6	helping me collect these signatures.	
7	But the 2,000, approximately 2,000	
8	that I had, I explicitly walked up to each one	
9	of them, stuck out my hand, shook their hand,	
10	and in the processed say, "Hi. I'm Charlie	
11	Morrison. I'm running as an Independent for	
12	Congress. I need about 2,000 signatures to	
13	get my name on the ballot, and I wonder if you	
14	could help me out and sign my petition."	
15	And that is the phrase that I used	
16	at virtually all of the 2,000 signatures that	
17	I collected.	
18	Q. Mr. Morrison, did you hand-deliver,	
19	hand-file your petitions with the Board of	
20	Elections?	
21	A. Yes. I personally hand-delivered	
22	and hand-filed those petitions.	
23	Q. And can you explain to the Board the	
24	conversation that you had with the person that	

Page 40

1	1	<i></i> 1	+1	+h つ
1.	j you	riiea	those	WICH:

- 2 A. Yes. I believe her name is Marlene,
- 3 asked me if I wanted to have my name put on as
- 4 | non, other, or blank, and I thought about it
- 5 | for a moment and chose blank.
- 6 Q. When you turned these in, did they
- 7 ask you if you claimed not to be affiliated
- 8 | with any particular political party?
- 9 A. No. That question was never asked.
- 10 Q. Okay. And there was no blank on the
- 11 | form for you to put anything like that in; is
- 12 | that correct?
- 13 A. That's correct. The forms they use
- 14 explicitly do not have the word "Independent"
- on them at all. I did not have to solemnly
- 16 | swear that I was an Independent candidate at
- 17 | any time.
- 18 Q. Mr. Morrison, are you affiliated
- 19 | with any particular political party as you sit
- 20 | here today?
- 21 A. No. As of May 3rd, I have no party
- 22 affiliation.
- 23 Q. And would that include Republican
- 24 | Party and/or Democratic Party?

24

Α.

Yes.

1.	Q. Based on petitions that are on file	Page 42
2	here, I believe that you were circulating that	
3	petition from roughly	
4	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Excuse me, sir.	
5	Excuse me, sir.	
6	Go ahead, please.	
7	BY MR. DAMSCHRODER:	
8	Q. You were circulating as an	
9	Independent candidate from roughly December	
10	31st through April 28th, and then you filed	
11	your petition on May 1st?	
12	A. That's correct.	
13	Q. So during that time frame, you were	
14	approaching people saying, "I'm an	•
15	Independent; please sign my petition." During	
16	that time frame, is it also correct that you	
17	were circulating for county party seat as a	
18	Republican?	
19	A. Yes.	
20	Q. And that would have been from	
21	roughly December 14th through January, also	
22	approaching people and also asking them to	
23	sign a petition stating that you were a	

Republican?

Page 43

1.	Α.	That's	correct.

- 2 Q. And during that same time frame, you
- 3 | were also running for state party for longer,
- 4 | an extra week on there, asking people to sign
- 5 | the petition, saying that you were a
- 6 Republican?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. And then towards the end of that
- 9 time frame, you were advertising and
- 10 | campaigning and holding yourself out as a
- 11 Republican to many of those same individuals
- 12 and advertising in the newspaper claiming you
- were a Republican?
- 14 A. Yes. And each person who did sign
- 15 | both of those forms, because I carried them
- 16 | around together, most of them knew me
- 17 | personally, and I explained exactly why I was
- doing what I was doing. They all understood.
- 19 Q. So you were asking people to sign,
- 20 representing yourself as a Republican and as
- 21 | an Independent at the same time?
- 22 A. You can't run on a Republican
- 23 | Central Committee without being a Republican,
- 24 | and that's the way I typically voted.

	•			_
_	1.	a look at	Exhibit H and identify that for the	Page 45
	2	Board.		
	3	Α.	Statement of organization, FEC	
	4	Form 1.		
	5	Q.	And is that the statement of	
	6	organizat	ion for your campaign committee?	
	7	Α.	Appears to be, yes.	
	8	Q.	The campaign committee that you're	
	.9	operating	under today?	
	10	Α.	Yes.	
	11	Q.	And would you go to page 2 of that?	
	12	Α.	Yes.	
	13	Q.	And do you see there where it says	
	14	party affi	liation?	
	15	A •	Yes.	
	16	Q.	And what does the party affiliation	
	17	say?		
	18	Α.	Republican.	
	19	Q.	Have you ever changed that	
	20	affiliatio	on?	
	21	Α.	No.	
	22	Q.	So you are currently operating your	
	23	campaign o	committee for federal office as a	
	24	Republicar	1?	
	i			

MS. ARMSTRONG: No, I have no

further questions, thank you.

23

Have you ever revised that statement

it was brought up to me about 15 minutes ago.

23

	1.	Q. Okay. But something was filed this	age 50
	2	year?	
	3	A. I'm sure it was, yes.	
	4	Q. Prior to the primary?	
	5	A. Couldn't tell you.	
	6	·	
	7	EXAMINATION	
•	8	BY MS. PETREE:	
	9	Q. Mr. Morrison?	
	10	A. Yes.	
	11	Q. I understand that you passed your	
	12	petition the Independent candidate starting	
	13	January 7th of this year?	
	14	A. That's about right, yes.	
	15	Q. And then am I correct that you voted	
	16	in the primary as a Republican in May of this	
	17	year?	
	18	A. Yes, that's correct. I had to vote	
	19	for myself.	
	20	MS. PETREE: Okay. Thank you.	
	21	THE WITNESS: Any other questions?	
	22	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: That's it. Thank	
	23	you very much.	
	24	Do you guys have a closing?	
		1	

1.	MS. ARMSTRONG: Yes, I would like	Page 51
2	the opportunity.	
3.	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Okay.	
4	MS. ARMSTRONG: As expected, the	
5	facts were fairly cut and dry here. There was	
6	no dispute as to the factual basis here, I	
7	won't reiterate them again, the protest letter	
8	certainly and all the exhibits before this	
9	Board, but I would like to address some of the	
10	legal issues that are involved here.	
11	First, Mr. Morrison claims that this	
12	Board should only look to the parameters of	
13	3513.257, that it need not go outside of the	
14	confines of that law, and that since	
15	Mr. Morrison complied with that law, this	,
16	Board must certify it. That is absolutely	
17	erroneous.	
18	This Board has a duty and an	
19	authority to look beyond the confines of that	
20	law, that's given to them by the very section	
21	that gives foundation to this protest.	
22	3513.262, which is the section on which the	
23	protesters filed their protest letter, allows	
24	this Board to determine all other matters	

1 affecting validity.

In the Foster versus Cuyahoga County
Board of Elections case, in the Herdman versus
Franklin County Boards of Elections case, in
the Kelly versus Cuyahoga County Board of
Elections case, and numerous others, courts
have upheld that authority and that duty by
this Board to look beyond the four corners of
the very statute which gives rise to this
particular challenge to make sure that all
legal requirements are met.

Taking Mr. Morrison's argument at its face, if he were not 25 years old, he would be eligible to run, because there's nothing in 3513.257 which says you have to be 25 years old to run for Congress. That's in another section, but that section is as equally applicable to him and to his candidacy as is the definition of an Independent candidate.

In addition, Section 3501.39(A) allows this Board to reject petitions if the candidacy or the petition violates the requirements of this chapter, referring to

1. 3501, Chapter 3513, or any other requirements 2 established by law. 3 Coincidentally, the definition of an 4 Independent candidate is found in Chapter 5 3501; the particular section which governs 6 Independent candidacy is found in 3513.257. 7 So that section also gives this Board the 8 authority and the duty to examine this issue 9 and to go beyond the four corners of 3513.257. 10 Mr. Morrison argues that, since there was no clear test, there is a circular 11 12 argument that's ambiguous or confusing, that 13 there's no way that he can not be found to be 14 an Independent or that particular statute 15 could be applied to him. He asks, what does 16 it mean not to be affiliated? 17 The protesters aren't asking this 18 Board to define what does it mean not to be 19 affiliated. We're asking this Board to find 20 that under the facts that are presented here, 21 which are the facts before you, that Mr. 22 Morrison has not proven that he's not 23 affiliated. 24

We're not asking this Board to set a

test or a standard that will convey some sort of information on hypothetical situations that may be presented to this Board at sometime in the future. We're asking this Board to look at the facts that are before us here and to find that he did not meet the definition of Independent candidate.

We believe that the no test needs to be set. This Board needs to only apply the facts to the law. However, since Mr. Morrison seems to advocate a test, I would note just briefly that the four-point test that he sets out in his own brief, every single point of those fails.

There are also other tests in the code that apply to other portions of -- to other ways to tell if someone is partisan or unaffiliated.

As far as circulating and signing,
Revised Code 3513.05 sets forth the test and
it tells you that if you voted in the party's
primary within the two preceding calendar
years, you are considered to be affiliated -considered to be a member of that party.

1.

1.4

2.2

As for voting, that same test is applied, in Revised Code 3516.19. And most

1.

2

8

3 specifically here, as to voting in a primary,

4 | 3503.011 sets forth the qualifications to vote

5 in a primary. As Mr. Morrison did on May 2nd

6 when he had to file his petitions. I'd like

7 | to read that definition to you.

3503.01 provides: "At a primary

9 | election, every qualified elector who is or

10 | will be on the day of the next general

11 | election 18 or more years of age and who is a

12 member of or is affiliated with a party, a

political party, whose primary election ballot

14 he desires to vote, shall be entitled to vote

15 at that primary election."

When Mr. Morrison went to his

polling place in Madison County on May 2nd and

he voted a primary ballot, he absolutely

19 | complied with this section of law, and he

declared thereby he's a member and affiliated

21 | with the political party whose ballot he

voted. He didn't deny that. He very

definitely affiliated himself in that manner

24 on May 2nd.

Page 56 1. And we are not claiming or 2 suggesting that Mr. Morrison cannot be an 3 Independent. We're just saying that he doesn't meet the tests here. He didn't meet 4 5 the test this time. 6 Given all the facts that are before this Commission, it's difficult to see how he 7 8 could have possibly done more to affiliate 9 himself with the Republican Party. 10 Given that, if this Board were to find that he is unaffiliated or that he does 11 12 not meet the test of an Independent candidate, 13 that would essentially gut the purpose of the 14 statute. 15 Another question asked by Mr. 16 Morrison was, when does he need to claim 17 Independence? Is it okay for him to claim it 18 now? Can he claim it at some point after he 19 refiles his FEC election, or after he refiles 20 his FEC statement of organization? Is it on 21 general election day? 22 Fortunately for us, 3513.257 answers 23 that question for us. The General Assembly

took the rare step in that section of telling

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

us what the purpose for that entire law was. And that is articulated in that language:

The purpose for establishing a filing deadline for Independent candidates prior to the primary election is to avoid fractionalization, party fragmentation, to maintain the integrity of the ballot -there's a long paragraph there, which is cited in our brief, which tells you exactly why the cutoff point, the timing of this needs to be claimed as the day before the election in filing petitions.

Now, certainly this Board is not limited to those factors; this Board can look at any number of factors. But we would ask this Board to consider what was Mr. Morrison's status on the filing of petitions. And you can certainly look at the day before, the day after, the months before, the months after.

Here, the overwhelming weight of the evidence, in fact I would submit all the evidence, was that he never stated that he was unaffiliated, he never claimed, not by words or deeds, not explicitly, not implicitly,

1 there was nothing that he did or said that he 2 would lead him to be unaffiliated with a 3 party. 4 At times, perhaps, he walked up to 5 someone and said, "I'm running as an 6 Independent candidate," and on the same day he 7 turned to another person and said, "I'm running as a Republican." Or he ran an ad. 8 9 Any such claim was certainly dispelled by not 10 only his actions at the time, but his actions, 11 his numerous actions before and after any such 12 circulation of the petitions. 13 Finally, I'd ask this Board to 14 consider the argument that the Independent 15 candidate definition is a passive one, that it 16 has no force or effect or meaning. 17 As is set forth in our memorandum, 18 the Moss case ran into exactly that problem. 19 In that situation, which was factually similar 20 to this, the Moss court found that the 21 definition of an Independent candidate, which 22 did not exist in law at that point, was merely 23 meant that a person was seeking election to an office as an Independent candidate. In Moss, 24

that definition had no meaning. Since Moss, the General Assembly has put it into the code and referred to it in .257. Now, that type of problem, that type of argument is completely dispelled by the General Assembly's adoption of the definition there.

1.

Second, the definitions control the statute, not the other way around. Mr.

Morrison would ask this body to find that one just trips through the .257 process and automatically some nebulous title of Independent candidate is bestowed upon him.

That's not the case.

On the contrary, one can only go
through that process if one meets the
definition of an Independent candidate. The
term "Independent candidate' is used in the
title, it's used in the first sentence, it's
used throughout that code. That Independent
candidate definition is found elsewhere in the
code. Numerous cases in Ohio have all held
that where there's a definition in the
statute, that it's that definition that
controls the application of the statute; it's

1 not the other way around.

In a number of cases, I'll just read you one quote that has been repeated over and over again by the Supreme Court: Where a statute defines terms used therein, which are applicable to the subject matter affected by legislation, such definition controls in the application of the statute.

In other words, here the statute sets forth the definition of an Independent candidate. That definition controls the application of the statute. If you don't meet the definition, you don't get to .257. And that is exactly what has happened here.

Mr. Langdon is right, there is a two-part test set forth in the definition of Independent candidate. You need to declare, claim you're not affiliated, and you need to be certified. Mr. Morrison's claim to not to be affiliated, to the extent he made one at all, is disingenuous, is over shadowed by his numerous, numerous claims, both public and repeated and under penalty of election falsification, that he's a Republican.

1 The second portion of that statute 2 is that if you are certainly unaffiliated, you 3 can be certified. Mr. Morrison is not 4 affiliated. We asked this Board not to 5 certify him. As such, he was not properly 6 available to avail himself of the 2.57 7 processes and is not properly an Independent 8 candidate for this Board's consideration. 9 We would ask that you reject his 10 candidacy at this time. 11 CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Thank you. 12 13 MR. LANGDON: Thank you. 14 I want to pick up on one thing that 15 she just finished saying as the words are 16 hanging out there. She suggested that Mr. Morrison's claim not to be affiliated with any 17 18 political party was disingenuous. And so my 19 arguments here were going to be addressed to 20 the second set or what I call my second tier 21 of arguments playing in this world where the 22 definition actually means something in this 23 statute, which it doesn't.

But, nonetheless, in that paradigm,

what she's suggesting to you as a Board, and notwithstanding the suggestion that you should only be focused on this case, you do have to think about this in the context of there are lots of other folks out there that file petitions and, in fact, they are before you presently for statewide office and so forth, where this very issue will come up.

What they're suggesting is that you play the role of determining whether or not's claim not to be affiliated with a political party is genuine. How do you go about doing that? I have no idea. I honestly have no idea, and I can't imagine any of you do either.

You're just to bring these candidates in and pepper them with questions about what they have done over the last umpteen years in connection with a particular political party so that you can determine whether or not their claim not to be affiliated with a political party is genuine. That certainly cannot be the test.

Now let me step back. Assuming that

there is ambiguity, and it's probably a fair assumption. The statutory scheme is so miserably written that I think we would all agree it's ambiguous.

Being ambiguous, the Board is obligated to apply a particular principle of construction that has been announced many, many years ago by the Supreme Court of Ohio and has been reiterated year after year after year after year, and I'll quote from a 1992 case, and I quote: Words limiting the right of a person to hold office are to be given a liberal construction in favor of those seeking to hold office, in order that the public may have the benefit of choice from all those who are in fact qualified.

There is no dispute that Mr.

Morrison meets all of the qualifications. He filed the petitions, he did all that. You've heard him here today claim not to be affiliated with a political party. So, even assuming that is a political party, which I won't concede, but assuming for the sake of argument that it is, he's now satisfied that

1 requirement.

And what this principle of law is saying, that you have to make all of your decisions, being guided by the principle that he should be on the ballot, that he should be on the ballot, all -- to the extent you're doing this, it needs to tip this way in favor of him getting on the ballot. That is the nature of our system.

It is the nature of a free and constitutional republic that we be given choice in terms of who we can select as candidates and not just the two big party nominated candidates, but we need to have a choice. The voters in the 15th Congressional District deserve, in fact have a constitutional right, to have a choice for an additional candidate. That would be Mr. Morrison here today.

I want to respond to a couple of other points that the protesters have made.

It was suggested that, if Mr.

Morrison wasn't 25 years of age, that you

wouldn't be able to certify him to the ballot.

Without getting into a debate about whether or not that's true, I will suggest to you that if Mr. Morrison turned 25 today, after filing his petitions, he would absolutely be qualified to be on the ballot.

In fact, case law interpreting the constitutional provision, this is a U.S. Constitutional provision, says as long as he turns 25 by the day of the election he's qualified. Well, that's something objective, certainly, that we know. We would know that he's going to turn 25 on such-and-such a date.

The point is, is that he doesn't have to turn 25 as of the day he turns in his petition. That is clearly not the standard that he must satisfy all these requirements by the date he turns in his petitions.

In fact, the Ohio Supreme Court has specifically rejected the suggestion that candidate qualifications must be satisfied as of the date that petitions are submitted. They did this in the Walsh case. In the Walsh case, they drew a distinction, in fact they pointed to a statute, Revised Code 3501.38(A),

1. which sets forth the requirement that the 2 qualification of signers of a petition are to 3 be determined as of the date the petitions are 4 filed. 5 But there is no similar requirement 6 in Ohio law that says that the qualification 7 of a candidate must be established as of the 8 date the petitions are filed, and so what the 9 Supreme Court says is, we have one statute 10 that says signers must be qualified, the 11 Revised Code is silent on these other issues, 12 so we assume from that that they can be 13 qualified in at any time up to the point of 14 being certified, which would include today. 15 So again, operating in the paradigm where this definition actually has teeth, 16 17 he's not qualified even under their 18 interpretation. He has sat before you, under 19 oath, and claimed not to be affiliated with a 20 political party. 21 Now, I want to make one final point 22 and then I'll put an exclamation point on it 23 and be done.

Mr. Morrison's integrity, perhaps,

has been questioned here in terms of when he's submitting -- or circulating his petitions.

There is a distinction, clearly, in Ohio law between being a member of and being affiliated with a political party.

1.

,14

The very statute that the protesters' counsel read to you, 3503.011, which is the statute that delineates the qualifications to be able to vote in a primary, I'm paraphrasing here, but it says, in order to be able to vote in a primary you have to either be a member of or affiliated with a political party.

And all counsel that are in here will agree that when the legislature uses the term "or," you can't ignore it, you can't turn it into an "and." You can't make those two terms have the same meaning. Proper rules of statutory construction say that that "or" has to be given meaning. That means "member of" is different than "affiliated with."

Now, I've spent years on these types of issues and can't figure out what "member of" is and what "affiliated with" is. But

that's beside the point. The point is, there is a difference, by law there is a difference between "member of" or "affiliated with," so one can be a member of a political party, but by doing so he's not necessarily affiliated with. And as Mr. Morrison testified, he's never stated that he's affiliated with the Republican Party.

Now, that may be a technical distinction without a difference to all of you on a point like this, but in light of the protesters' argument, they're telling you you have to pay attention to every single word in these statutes. That's the argument they're making, and I'm saying, yes, that I agree. And by the way, there's a number of other provisions in the Revised Code where you can find "member of or affiliated with." So it's not that one isolated instance; it appears in numerous contexts.

So it is a consistent statement to say that one may be a member of the Republican Party, and that perhaps comes about by operation of law. For example, if I voted in

1.	the last Republican primary, I may, by	Page 69
2	operation of law, be a member of the	
3	Republican Party. That doesn't necessarily	
4	mean by law I am affiliated with the	
5	Republican Party.	
6	So it is consistent for him to say,	
7	yeah, I'm a member of the Republican Party, by	
8	virtue of having gotten the Republican ballot,	
9	on May 2nd, 2006. But it doesn't necessarily	
10	mean on May 2nd, 2006, that he was affiliated	÷
11	with the Republican Party.	
12	And, more importantly, as we sit	
13	here today, as he's testified to today, he is	
14	disclaiming any affiliations with the	
15	Republican Party, and thereby, again,	
16	according to their interpretation, that makes	
17	him eligible to be a candidate pursuant to	
18	3513.257, and I would ask that you would deny	
19	the protest. Thank you.	
20	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Thank you very	÷
21	much. Any questions?	
22	Thank you, sir. So I guess the next	
23	question is, what's our legal, their	
24	recommendations?	
	1	

MR. PICCININNI: This is an issue -it is the opinion of the prosecutor's office
that this is an issue that transcends parts
and politics. It cuts across all aspects of
the spectrum, whether you're a Republican,
whether you're a Democrat, whether you're any
of the minor parties that may have status in
Ohio.

If you claim affiliation and you do

that by voting in the primary, one can be a member and affiliated with. One does not -- a member by operation subsumes the word "affiliation." Affiliation does not incorporate the word membership. Which is a reasonable way to take Mr. Langdon's argument. He's trying to say they're not necessarily one and the same.

One can be affiliated and not be a member of a party, saying, "I want to be a registered Republican, Democrat, Green Party candidate, Reformed Party candidate.

When he went in on May 2nd and said,
"I want a Republican ballot," he became
affiliated with the Republican Party. He

1.

1.4

1. continues his affiliation with the Republican 2 Party, in addition to continuing his membership with the Republican Party, because 3 4 he said, I was a member of the Republican Party all before that." Based on the 5 6 testimony here on May 3rd, he says, "I am no 7 longer a Republican." 8 Well, finding a deadline to claim 9 that you're not affiliated with is -- was May 10 1st this year. If he wants to claim that he's an Independent candidate, he can do that in 11 12 2008. 13 But at this point, it is our opinion 14 that based on the definitional section of 3501.01(I), that he claims not be affiliated 15 16 with a political party, his actions and his deeds up until and including today, I mean 17 18 federally he's got a Republican -- a 19 Republican congressional committee going on, 20 he's got a congressional committee that's a 21 registered Republican, that operates under the 22 Republican Party auspices, based on his own 23 filings, as of -- I believe the FEC Web site

indicated the last filing in this matter was

1.	April 14th.	Page 72
2	Two weeks, eighteen days before the	
3	primary, he was still holding himself as a	
4	Republican, and that committee is still	
5	soliciting donations as a committee for a	
6	Republican candidate.	
7	The opinion that we submitted to the	
8	Members of the Board based on the information	
9	that was presented has not changed based on	
10	the testimony here. He does not meet the	
11	definition of Independent candidate. It is	
12	the opinion of the prosecutor's office that	
13	his candidacy should not be certified at this	
14	point, and that is the status it is our	
15	opinion that is the status of the law in the	
16	state of Ohio at this time.	
17	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Any questions of	
18	our legal person?	
19	So what's the next step? Any	
20	discussion among ourselves about this?	
21	MR. DAMSCHRODER: Certification	
22	requires an appropriate motion.	
23	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Before I do that,	
24	I do have something I want to add to this, my	

thoughts.

1.

After listening to everybody speak, both sides speak, I'm kind of compelled to think that we must give a liberal instruction on the certification in order to give voters an opportunity to decide who they want to vote for, as opposed us on the Board deciding that person is with one party or another party.

And I just think that, as a Board member, I would hate to have -- hate to have folks not be able to vote for who they'd like to vote for. And he did have a number of people fill out a petition as an Independent candidate, and I'm just saying that that's outside of our realm to deny that opportunity to people to vote for an Independent ballot.

That's the way I feel about it, so.

Any other Board members' feeling?

If not, then I will make a motion that it be certified to the ballot of the 2006 general election the Independent candidacy of Charles Morrison for the United States

Congress from the 15th District. Is there a second?

		Dogo 74
1	MS. MARINELLO: Second.	Page 74
2	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Could we have a	
3	roll call vote.	
4	MR. DAMSCHRODER: Chairman Anthony?	
5	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Yes.	
6	MR. DAMSCHRODER: Mr. Colley?	
7	MR. COLLEY: I would like to vote	,
8	yes, but I have to vote no, based on law.	
9	MR. DAMSCHRODER: Ms. Marinello?	
10	MS. MARINELLO: Yes.	
11	MR. DAMSCHRODER: Ms. Petree?	
12	MS. PETREE: No.	
13	MR. DAMSCHRODER: Okay. And the	
14	motion results in a tie, and pursuant to	
15	statute, we'll submit a letter from those	
16	members voting yes, those members voting no,	
17	to the Secretary of State along with a copy of	
18	the briefs done by both sides and a copy of	
19	today's record.	
20	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: Thank you. So	
21	what's the other matter of business?	
22	MR. DAMSCHRODER: The last item on	
23	the agenda, Mr. Chairman, is a personnel	
24	related administrative matter that we	

	ruge / s
1.	discussed a couple weeks ago following the
2	election.
3	The question had to do with some
4	employees who worked during the day, some who
5	did not. The prosecuting attorney's office
6	thought that for purposes of this election
7	going back retroactively, that it would be
8	appropriate to do what the Board had planned
9	on doing, so that people who worked a portion
10	of the day would be granted a full day's pay
11	since they worked the entire night.
12	MR. WHITE: Is this going to be
13	retractive to
14	MR. DAMSCHRODER: Yeah, to the May
15	2nd, 2006 election. And then we'll work
16	forward in a future board meeting of policy so
17	we don't have to do this retroactively in the
18	future.
19	CHAIRMAN ANTHONY: I will entertain
20	a motion.
21	MS. MARINELLO: Mr. Chairman, I move
22	that any and all full-time employees having
23	worked at any time during the normal business
24	hours of 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.

The undersigned do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were digitally recorded, electronically transmitted, and transcribed via audible playback, and that the foregoing transcript of such proceedings is a full, true and correct transcript of the proceedings as so recorded.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at Columbus, Ohio, on this 23 day of

JUNL, 2006.

14

15

16

17

1.8

19.

20

21

22

2324

ELEGRA R. DAVIS

Certified Digital Reporter

Notary Public - State of Ohio.

My commission expires October 2, 2009.

DONNA J. BELLOUS

Certified Digital Transcriber