BCCOFF-ALD

BOARD OF ELECTION COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO AS A DULY CONSTITUTED ELECTORAL BOARD

Objections of: Yvette Major and Dwayne Burgess	)	
To the Nomination Papers of: Karen Jackson	)	No.: 11-EB-ALD-087
	)	Related Cases: 11-EB-ALD-261, 11-EB-ALD-271
Candidate for the office of Alderman of the 16th Ward, City of Chicago	)	

FINDINGS AND DECISION

The duly constituted Electoral Board, consisting of Board of Election Commissioners of the City of Chicago Commissioners Langdon D. Neal, Richard A. Cowen, and Marisel A. Hernandez, organized by law in response to a Call issued by Langdon D. Neal, Chairman of said Electoral Board, for the purpose of hearing and passing upon objections ("Objections") of Yvette Major and Dwayne Burgess ("Objectors") to the nomination papers ("Nomination Papers") of Karen Jackson, candidate for the office of Alderman of the 16th Ward in the City of Chicago ("Candidate") to be elected at the Municipal General Election to be held on February 22, 2011, having convened on December 6, 2010 at 9:00 a.m., in Room 800, 69 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois, and having heard and determined the Objections to the Nomination Papers in the above-entitled matter, finds that:

1. Objections to the Nomination Papers of the Candidate herein were duly and timely filed.

2. The said Electoral Board has been legally constituted according to the laws of the State of Illinois.

3. A Call to the hearing on said Objections was duly issued by the Chairman of the Electoral Board and served upon the members of the Electoral Board, the Objectors and the Candidate, by registered or certified mail and by Sheriff's service, as provided by statute.

4. A public hearing held on these Objections commenced on December 6, 2010 and was continued from time to time.

5. The Electoral Board assigned this matter to Hearing Officer Yolanda Sayre for further hearings and proceedings.

6. The Objectors and the Candidate were directed by the Electoral Board to appear before the Hearing Officer on the date and at the time designated in the Hearing Schedule. The following persons, among others, were present at such hearing: the Objectors, Yvette Major and Dwayne Burgess, pro se; and the Candidate, Karen Jackson, pro se.

7. The Hearing Officer ordered that an examination of the voter registration records be conducted by clerks and agents under the Board's direction and supervision, in accordance with the laws of Illinois and the rules of the Board.

8. The Hearing Officer directed all parties to appear and be present, either personally and/or by their authorized representatives, during this records examination.

9. The Candidate and/or her duly authorized representative was present during the examination of the registration records.

10. The Objectors and/or their duly authorized representative was present during the examination of the registration records.

11. The examination of the registration records was completed and the Electoral Board hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the results of the records examination conducted by its clerks and agents. The written report of the result of the registration records

examination is contained in the Electoral Board's file in this case and a copy has been provided or made available to the parties.

12. The results of the records examination indicate that:

A. The minimum number of valid signatures required by law for placement on the ballot for the office in question is 123;

B. The number of purportedly valid signatures appearing on the nominating petition filed by the Candidate total 300;

C. The number of signatures deemed invalid because of objections sustained as a result of the records examination total 199;

D. The remaining number of signatures deemed valid as a result of the records examination total 101.

13. The Electoral Board finds that the number of valid signatures appearing on the Candidate's nominating petition following completion of the records examination was less than the minimum number of valid signatures required by law to be placed upon the official ballot as a candidate for election to the office of Alderman of the 16th Ward of the City of Chicago.

14. The Hearing Officer conducted a hearing to allow the Candidate an opportunity to present evidence in support of her Rule 8 motion objecting to the Board's clerk's findings during the records examination.

15. The Hearing Officer has tendered to the Electoral Board a report and recommended decision. Based upon the evidence presented, the Hearing Officer found that the Candidate's Nomination Papers contained only 117 valid signatures, which is less than the minimum number of valid signatures required by law to be placed upon the official ballot as a

candidate for election to the office of Alderman of the 16th Ward of the City of Chicago, and that the Candidate's Nomination Papers should be found invalid.

16. The Electoral Board, having considered the evidence and arguments tendered by the parties and the Hearing Officer's report of recommended findings and conclusions of law, hereby adopts the Hearing Officer's recommended findings and conclusions of law. A copy of the Hearing Officer's report and recommendations is attached hereto and is incorporated herein as part of the Electoral Board's decision.

17. For the reasons stated above, the Electoral Board finds that the Candidate has an insufficient number of valid signatures on her nominating petitions and that the Nomination Papers of Karen Jackson are, therefore, invalid.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the Objections of Yvette MajorDwayne Burgess to the Nomination Papers of Karen Jackson, candidate for election to the office of Alderman of the 16th Ward of the City of Chicago are hereby SUSTAINED and said Nomination Papers are hereby declared INVALID and the name of Karen Jackson, candidate for election to the office of Alderman of the 16th Ward of the City of Chicago, SHALL NOT be printed on the official ballot for the Municipal General Election to be held on February 22, 2011.

Dated: Chicago, Illinois, on January 7, 2011.

Langdon D. Neal, Chairman

Richard A. Cowen, Commissioner

Marisel Hernandez, Commissioner

NOTICE: Pursuant to Section 10-10.1 of the Election Code (10 ILCS 5/10-10.1) a party aggrieved of this decision and seeking judicial review of this decision must file a petition for judicial review with the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County within 5 days after service of the decision of the Electoral Board.

BOARD OF ELECTION COMMISSIONERS OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO
AS THE DULY CONSTITUTED ELECTORAL BOARD

BOARD OF ELECTIONS
2011 JAN -3 P 5:08

YVETTE MAJOR	)	
DWAYNE BURGESS	)	
Objectors	)	
	)	
-v-	)	**11-EB-ALD-087**
	)	
KAREN JACKSON	)	**Yolanda H. Sayre**
Candidate	)	**Hearing Officer**

RECOMMENDED FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

This matter having come before the duly constituted Chicago Board of Election Commissioners ("CBEC" or "the Board"), and before the undersigned Hearing Officer on December 6, 2010; the Hearing Officer hereby makes the following report and recommended findings:

1. The Candidate filed Nomination Papers for the Alderman of the 16th Ward in the City of Chicago. Such Nomination Papers consisted of: a) a Statement of Candidacy; b) a Receipt for Statement of Economic Interests; c) a Loyalty Oath; and d) Nominating Petition Sheets numbered one (1) through fifteen (15). Without objection, the Candidate's Nomination Papers were admitted into evidence and marked as Group Exhibit A.
2. The Verified Objectors' Petition was timely filed on November 30, 2010. Such Petition was admitted into evidence and marked as Group Exhibit B.
3. A Call to the hearing on said objections was duly issued by the Chairman of the CBEC and served upon all parties. The Call and proof of service thereof were admitted into evidence and marked Group Exhibit C.
4. The initial hearing on these Objections was called on December 6, 2010, at which time the Objectors and the Candidate filed appearances *pro se*. Such appearances were admitted into evidence and marked Group Exhibit D.

5. At the initial hearing, the Candidate and the Objectors in this matter as well as two other related matters—11-EB-ALD-261 and 11-EB-ALD-271 opted to have the three matters heard together, as the issues raised in all of the Objectors' Petitions were almost identical.
6. The Candidate opted to file Motions to Dismiss the Objectors' Petitions. The Objectors indicated their intent to file Responses. A briefing schedule was set.
7. The Candidate filed three Motions to Dismiss on December 7, 2010 arguing in essence that she filed a "Statement of Economic Interest" which was stamped on November 22, 2010, that the three hundred (300) signatures she submitted were valid, and various other defenses to the allegations that her signatures were invalid.
8. The Objectors were not served with copies of the Motions and therefore did not file Responses. Despite the fact that none of the Objectors filed Responses, the Candidate then filed Replies reiterating that the submitted signatures were valid and that she filed an "SIE." The Objectors were not served with the Replies either.
9. All parties reconvened on December 10, 2010 for a hearing on the Candidate's Motion to Dismiss the Objector's Petition wherein it was discovered and noted on the record that none of the Objectors were served with a copy of the Candidate's Motions or Replies. The Hearing Officer explained to the Candidate that because she hadn't served the other parties, the Motion would not be heard. The Hearing Officer explained that even if the Motion had been properly served on the parties, it would have been denied because the purpose of a Motion to Dismiss is to challenge the legal sufficiency of the Objectors' Petition. The Hearing Officer explained to the Candidate that her Motion did not make any arguments regarding legal sufficiency but rather put forth her defenses some of which were not responsive to the Objectors' Petition. After explaining this to the Candidate, the Hearing Officer decided, and all parties agreed, to proceed with the scheduled Records Examination.
10. During the December 10, 2010 Hearing, the Hearing Officer redistributed copies of the appearances forms and re-explained how the parties must be served to avoid future service issues. In addition, the Hearing Officer explained the Board's Rules of Procedure Rule 6 and Rule 8 and their significance to the future proceedings. At that time, all parties agreed again on the record to hear the three related matters together for purposes of expedience.

11. The Records Examination began at 10:30 on the morning of December 13, 2010.
12. At approximately 5:00 p.m. on the afternoon of December 13, 2010, the Hearing Officer received a filing via email that had been file-stamped by the Board at 12:21 p.m. from the Candidate requesting a continuance on two of the three matters. When the Records Examination was initially scheduled, the Board's employee apparently told the Candidate that she would only need one "watcher" because the cases were consolidated. When she arrived at the Records Examination, there were three stations and she had no one to raise objections at the other two stations: 11-EB-ALD-261 and 11-EB-ALD-271. The Objectors each had a representative present at their respective stations.
13. Upon receiving the filing requesting the continuance, the Hearing Officer contacted the Board and spoke to Mr. Jeff Fedderke regarding the miscommunication and resulting situation. Mr. Fedderke determined the appropriate remedy would be to allow the Candidate "automatic objections" to the rulings that went against her at the stations for which she had no representation. The Hearing Officer agreed that Mr. Fedderke's solution was fair. Moreover, we agreed that since the Board's Handwriting Expert (the "Board's Expert") would not have the opportunity to review the "automatic objections" prior to the Evidentiary Hearing that those in dispute could be submitted for his review after the Hearing. Mr. Fedderke then found the parties and the Board's employees who were conducting the Records Examination and explained the procedure to remedy the Candidate's lack of representation at two of the stations.
14. At the Status Hearing held on December 16, 2010, the Hearing Officer again explained the solution reached by the Board to all of the parties. At that time, the Candidate and the Objectors for the two affected matters agreed it was a fair solution, despite Objector Keith Harris later voicing his objection.
15. In addition, during the Status Hearing, the parties received the results of the Records Examination, and the Hearing Officer again explained the procedures as described in Rule 8 of the Board's Rules of Procedure. Furthermore, the Hearing Officer reminded all parties to look at the Index of Electoral Board Decisions online for guidance and additional explanation. The parties were given time during the Hearing to read Rule 8 and ask any questions they had.

16. The following results of the Records Examination were admitted into evidence, but with modifications due to the remedy afforded the Candidate of automatic objections (requests for review) on the stations for which she had no representation:

	11-EB-ALD-087	11-EB-ALD-271	11-EB-ALD-261
Signatures on Petitions	300	300	300
Total Objections	263	209	212
Objections Overruled	63	21	54
Objections Sustained	199	188	158
For Review – Candidate	196	Auto	Auto
For Review – Objector	13	16	13
Number of Valid Signatures	101	112	142
Min. Signatures Required	123	123	123
Number Below Minimum	22	11	19 **above**

17. The Candidate timely filed a Rule 8 Motion indicating she wished to submit sixty-eight (68) affidavits to rehabilitate signatures, the objections to which were sustained in matters 11-EB-ALD-087 and 11-EB-ALD-271. The Objector (Harris) in 11-EB-ALD-271 filed a Rule 8 Motion as well. The Objectors (Burgess and Major) in matter 11-EB-ALD-087 did not file Rule 8 Motions. Neither did the Objector (Brown) in 11-EB-ALD-261.
18. The Evidentiary Hearing was held on December 21, 2010, wherein the parties had the opportunity to put forth evidence pertaining to the results of the Records Examination including all objections and defenses thereto. The three matters were called together. However, the Petition Summary Report for 11-EB-ALD-261 revealed that the Candidate had nineteen (19) signatures greater than the required minimum; and the Objector only requested review of thirteen (13) signatures. The Objector stated that she didn't intend to pursue the matter further. Therefore, the Hearing Officer concluded the matter of DENISE BROWN v. KAREN JACKSON, 11-EB-ALD-261, and told the parties a written recommended decision would be issued. Said recommended decision will be issued separately.
19. The Hearing Officer proceeded with the other two matters-- 11-EB-ALD-087 and 11-EB-ALD-271. All parties agreed to proceed with the matter DWAYNE BURGESS and YVETTE MAJOR v. KAREN JACKSON, 11-EB-ALD-087 first because there were more signatures at issue so this matter required more affidavits, and the Candidate said she was more prepared to proceed with that matter. The Hearing Officer agreed because this was the matter for which she had full representation at the Records Examination; and

therefore, the Board's handwriting expert had reviewed and ruled on the contested signatures prior to the hearing. Thus, we proceeded with the signatures at issue in 11-EB-ALD-087-- the matter on which this recommended decision is based.

20. The Candidate presented affidavits in support of her contention that the signatures she sought to rehabilitate were in fact valid. Some of the affidavits she presented were not included in the Rule 8 Motion she filed. The Candidate was then reminded that according to the Board's Rules of Procedure, any affidavits not included in her Rule 8 Motion would not be heard.
21. The Candidate indicated before we started that she left half of the affidavits identified in her Rule 8 Motion at home because her father had told her "not to turn this into a circus." The Hearing Officer informed her that she had the right to introduce as much evidence as she wanted or needed to and that because we would be unable to conclude the matters in one day, she could bring the other affidavits (identified in her Motion) to the next hearing. There were no objections.
22. The examination of disputed signatures and affidavits began with the first affidavit presented. After a somewhat chaotic start, we began with the affidavit for the signature on Page 1 Line 8. While the results of the examination of each affidavit considered will be summarized below, it is important to note that Objector Harris voiced his objection regarding the insufficiency of some of the affidavits. Shortly thereafter, Objector Burgess objected as well.
23. A big debate ensued among the Objectors and the Hearing Officer regarding the validity of affidavits in general and the Board's procedure regarding their acceptance. The Hearing Officer reiterated the explanation given to the parties at prior hearings regarding the ability to use affidavits. The Hearing Officer also briefly discussed and recommended the parties read the case of *Fritchey v. Romanelli*, in order to help the parties better understand the process. 08-EB-WC-37, CBEC, December 16, 2007, affirmed, Cir. Ct. Cook Cty, No. 2007 COEL 0065, affirmed, Appellate Court of Illinois, First Judicial District, No. 1-08-0031 (Feb. 11, 2008).
24. In *Fritchey,* the Board held, and the Appellate Courts subsequently affirmed, that a hearing officer can accept affidavits to overrule the ruling of the Board's staff and handwriting expert, "unless it is clear from the face of the affidavit that the requisite

particularity required by the Supreme Court Rule 191 is not present, the facts shown are not within the personal knowledge of the person, or a reasonable person could not believe the truth of the statements."

25. Here, the lack of requisite particularity in the affidavit explaining the difference in the signatures was the reason the Hearing Officer sustained some of the objections. The Candidate explained that she didn't understand the form or content needed for a valid affidavit and asked if she could redo some of the affidavits so as to provide an adequate explanation. After consulting with the Board's General Counsel, the Hearing Officer informed the Candidate that she could, since there would be extra time between hearings, provide evidence, if any, of the verbal explanations she was attempting to offer along with her affidavits. For example, the Candidate claimed that one gentleman in particular had a stroke and that is why his signature appeared so different from what the Board had on file.
26. The Hearing Officer and the parties then continued to examine each signature that the Candidate sought to rehabilitate. There were eleven (11) affidavits examined during the December 21, 2010 hearing, the summary of which will be provided below.
27. The Hearing was then adjourned until December 23, 2010 for several reasons. First, the Hearing Officer needed time to conduct further research and consult with the Board's General Counsel to ensure she was evaluating the affidavits properly. Second, the Hearing Officer had another hearing scheduled the same day. Finally, the Hearing Officer and all of the parties agreed on the record, at the beginning of the hearing, that we would be unable to evaluate all of the evidence that day because of another subsequently scheduled hearing. Thus, over the objection of Objector Burgess, the matters were continued and the Candidate had the benefit of the continuance.
28. The Evidentiary Hearing continued on December 23, 2010. The Candidate presented her remaining affidavits, all of which had been identified in her original Rule 8 Motion. The Hearing Officer admitted the affidavits into evidence and noted on the record that this was a step she had inadvertently failed to complete on the record during the December 21, 2010 Hearing. The Hearing Officer and the parties then began to examine each additional signature that the Candidate sought to rehabilitate and its supporting affidavit.

29. The Candidate submitted a total of thirty-four (34) affidavits out of the sixty-eight (68) she requested in her Rule 8 Motion. This was despite having additional time in between the two hearings of December 21, and December 23, 2010 to gather additional affidavits and supporting evidence.
30. The Hearing Officer ruled on eleven (11) affidavits during the December 21, 2010 Hearing, with the understanding that if the Candidate could supply additional affidavits or evidence to support rehabilitation, that the Hearing Officer would reevaluate those signatures as long as they were specified in her original Rule 8 Motion.
31. At the commencement of the December 23, 2010 hearing, the Candidate submitted additional information for three (3) of the signatures previously ruled upon, two (2) of which remained sustained and one (1) of which was rehabilitated.
32. The Hearing then continued with the examination of the remaining twenty-three (23) affidavits. Of the thirty-four (34) affidavits submitted, the Candidate was only successful in rehabilitating sixteen (16) signatures. The Board had found the Candidate to be twenty-two (22) signatures below the required minimum to be placed on the ballot. At the conclusion of the Evidentiary Hearing and after consideration of all evidence submitted by the parties, the Candidate was left with one hundred seventeen (117) valid signatures—six (6) below the statutory required minimum.
33. The following is a summary of the Hearing Officer's findings regarding each affidavit in the order presented by the Candidate:

    a) **Page 1 Line 8** – Affidavit of *E. Lane* – Objection was sustained by the Board and it's hand writing expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the petition, the affidavit and the voter registration card ("registration card") to be similar. – **objection overruled.**

    b) **Page 1 Line 13** – Affidavit of *L. Robbins* – Objection was sustained by the Board and it's hand writing expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signer printed her name on the petition; the print on the petition, is similar to the print on the affidavit; the signature on the affidavit and that on registration card are similar. – **objection overruled.**

c) **Page 1 Line 15** – Affidavit of *M. Gillespie* – Objection was sustained by the Board as a registration objection. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds, after reviewing a registration card on file, that signer is registered to vote at the specified address. – **objection overruled.**

d) **Page 3 Line 18** – Affidavit of *A. Torrence*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the petition, the affidavit and the registration card to be dissimilar. The Candidate explained that the signer had just been released from the hospital, but those facts were not in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

e) **Page 8 Line 11** – Affidavit of *S. Buckhalter*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar; but the petition signature is dissimilar. The Candidate explained that the signer had given a family member permission to sign on their behalf, but those facts are not in the affidavit. In fact, the affidavit says the opposite. – **objection sustained.**

f) **Page 10 Line 5** – Affidavit of *B. Owens*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the petition, the affidavit and the registration card to be dissimilar. The signer printed on the petition but the print was dissimilar to that on the affidavit. There is no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

g) **Page 11 Line 8** – Affidavit of *D. Lane*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

h) **Page 13 Line 10** – Affidavit of *M. Davis*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the

signature on the affidavit, the registration card, and the petition to be similar. – **objection overruled.**

i) **Page 15 Line 7** – Affidavit of *S. Washington*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the petition, the affidavit and the registration card to be dissimilar. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. The Candidate submitted an additional written statement purportedly from the signer saying that his sight is bad and providing a phone number; but that signature didn't match any of the others and the statement was not sworn. – **objection sustained.**

j) **Page 15 Line 8** – Affidavit of *A. Washington*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

k) **Page 2 Line 9** – Affidavit of *E. Walker*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the petition to be similar. The signature on the registration card is dissimilar, but it appears that there is some type of glitch or problem with the image of the registration card signature. – **objection overruled.**

l) **Page 2 Line 11** – Affidavit of *C. Nowell*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but the signer printed on the petition. – **objection overruled.**

m) **Page 6 Line 3** – Affidavit of E. Linwood– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. The petition signature appears to be somewhat shaky. The signer wrote the word "stroke" on the bottom of the affidavit. – **objection overruled.**

n) **Page 6 Line 4** – Affidavit of *M. Johnson*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signer printed on the petition in all lower case letters; whereas, the print on the affidavit is in all capital letters. However, the signature on the affidavit and the registration card are similar. – **objection overruled.**

o) **Page 6 Line 10** – Affidavit of *J. Shipp*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar. The print on the petition is similar to the print on the affidavit. – **objection overruled.**

p) **Page 6 Line 18** – Affidavit of *S. Brooks*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signatures on the affidavit and the registration card to be dissimilar, and the print on the petition is dissimilar to the print on the affidavit. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

q) **Page 7 Line 2** – Affidavit of *G. Daniel*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the petition to be similar, but dissimilar to the registration card. The registration card was signed in 1988 when the signer had just turned eighteen, making the evolution of his signature highly likely. – **objection overruled.**

r) **Page 7 Line 6** – Affidavit of *J. Brooks*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature of the first name on the affidavit, and the registration card to be similar, but somewhat less similar to the petition. The signature of the last name is completely dissimilar on the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

s) **Page 7 Line 13** – Affidavit of *K. Edwards*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn

affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but slightly less similar to the petition. However, the petition signature is still similar – **objection overruled.**

t) **Page 7 Line 14** – Affidavit of *G. Wrenn*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

u) **Page 8 Line 4** – Affidavit of *C. Johnson*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. The Candidate provided a copy of both a current Illinois Drivers License and a current State Identification Card for the signer. Each had a dissimilar signature; but one matched the affidavit and one matched the petition. The Hearing Officer found this evidence adequately supported the fact that the signer uses both signatures interchangeably– **objection overruled.**

v) **Page 8 Line 15** – Affidavit of *D. Craig*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

w) **Page 8 Line 16** – Affidavit of *D. Glenn*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

x) **Page 8 Line 17** – Affidavit of *Q. Britton*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the

signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be somewhat similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

y) **Page 10 Line 1** – Affidavit of *E. Schwert*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the print on the affidavit and the print on petition to be similar; and the signature on the affidavit is similar to the registration card. – **objection overruled.**

z) **Page 10 Line 3** – Affidavit of *G. Mejia*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signer's print is similar to the print on the affidavit; and the signature on the affidavit is similar to that of the registration card. – **objection overruled.**

aa) **Page 10 Line 15** – Affidavit of *T. Rufus*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

bb) **Page 12 Line 4** – Affidavit of *S. Howard*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit, the registration card and the petition to be dissimilar. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

cc) **Page 12 Line 18** – Affidavit of *M. Scott*– Objection was sustained by the Board. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the Board has no record of registration for the signer. – **objection sustained.**

dd) **Page 14 Line 6** – Affidavit of *L. Tobias*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but

dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

ee) **Page 15 Line 14** – Affidavit of *R. Sturdivant*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit, the registration card and the petition to be dissimilar. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

ff) **Page 15 Line 13** – Affidavit of *L. Stokes*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit and the registration card to be similar, but dissimilar to the petition. There was no explanation of the difference in the affidavit. – **objection sustained.**

gg) **Page 15 Line 17** – Affidavit of *C. Hollis*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds the signature on the affidavit, the petition, and the registration card to be similar. --**objection overruled.**

hh) **Page 10 Line 4** – Affidavit of *E. Washington*– Objection was sustained by the Board and it's handwriting expert. Candidate submitted a sworn affidavit that the signer is a registered voter at the address on the petition and that they signed their own proper name. The Hearing Officer finds that the signer printed his first name on the petition and signed his last name. The print is similar to that on the affidavit, and the signed portion is similar to the signature on the affidavit and the voter registration card. – **objection overruled.**

34. The Hearing Officer finds that the Candidate only rehabilitated sixteen (16) of the signatures objected to, and is still six (6) signatures short of meeting the minimum requirement to have her name placed on the ballot.

35. Because the Candidate has an insufficient number of signatures to be placed on the ballot, the other objection raised in the Objector's Petition for matter number 11-EB-ALD-087 regarding the insufficiency of the Candidate's Statement of Economic Interests is hereby rendered moot. In addition, the Objections raised by KIETH HARRIS in matter

number 11-EB-ALD-271 are hereby rendered moot (a recommended decision on it and related matter 11-EB-ALD-261 will be issued separately.)

36. For the reasons stated above, the Hearing Officer recommends that the Board deny the petition of KAREN JACKSON to be placed on the ballot for Alderman of the Sixteenth (16^{th}) Ward of the City of Chicago.

37. In light of the recommended findings specified above, the Hearing Officer further recommends that the OBJECTIONS of YVETTE MAJOR AND DWAYNE BURGESS be SUSTAINED in part and that the NOMINATION PAPERS of KAREN JACKSON be deemed INVALID.

Respectfully Submitted,

Yolanda M. Sayre
Hearing Officer