

Election Certification

How to Strengthen State Frameworks

By Lauren Miller Karalunas JUNE 17, 2025

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
I. State Certification Disputes During the 2024 Election Cycle	5
Georgia	5
Colorado	6
Virginia	7
Utah	7
Michigan	8
II. Principles for Reform	10
Conclusion	12
Endnotes	13

Highlights

- >> Since the 2020 election, the election denial movement has led rogue local officials to refuse to fulfill their mandatory duty to certify election results.
- >> Efforts to interfere with certification persisted throughout the 2024 election cycle, becoming untethered from the presidential election outcome and focused instead on local disagreements over downballot races.
- >> States should strengthen their statutory frameworks ahead of the 2026 midterms to prevent and more efficiently resolve future certification disputes.

ABOUT THE BRENNAN CENTER

The Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law is a nonpartisan law and policy institute that works to reform and revitalize — and when necessary defend — our country’s systems of democracy and justice. The Brennan Center is dedicated to protecting the rule of law and the values of constitutional democracy. We focus on voting rights, campaign finance reform, ending mass incarceration, and preserving our liberties while also maintaining our national security. Part think tank, part advocacy group, part cutting-edge communications hub, we start with rigorous research. We craft innovative policies. And we fight for them — in Congress and the states, in the courts, and in the court of public opinion.

© 2025. This paper is covered by the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](#) license. It may be reproduced in its entirety as long as the Brennan Center for Justice at NYU School of Law is credited, a link to the Brennan Center’s website is provided, and no charge is imposed. The paper may not be reproduced in part or in altered form, or if a fee is charged, without the Brennan Center’s permission. Please let the Brennan Center know if you reprint.

Introduction

When the commissioners of Washoe County, Nevada, met in July 2024 to certify the results of several primary election recounts, their sign-off should have been perfunctory. Instead, a volatile mix of election denialism, confusion, and faulty legal advice led the commission to vote 3–2 against certifying the results — an unprecedented scenario in the state’s 160-year history, even in Nevada’s “swingiest” county. In a bizarre turn of events, one of the refusing commissioners even voted against certifying her own victory.¹

Certification — the statutory step that marks the end of the vote-counting process — has historically served as a mandatory and uneventful formality after the excitement of an election winds down. In the weeks after Election Day, local officials (typically a local election board or canvassing board) complete a series of checks to make sure that all votes are counted, resolve any discrepancies in the vote totals, and verify that the results are accurate — a process known as the canvass. Once the canvass has concluded, they must formally “certify,” or sign off on, the completion of that process by a specific date set by state law. They then deliver the results to state officials, who conduct their own canvass and certify the results for statewide elections.² Certification is thus procedurally important but substantively narrow: It confirms that all the necessary steps in the postelection process have taken place.

For more than a century, state courts around the country have affirmed that once vote totals are final, certification is not optional.³ It is not the time to investigate the results or weigh in on legal issues. Instead, state laws create clear processes to ensure that any challenges to an election are resolved impartially and with procedural safeguards in place to protect the vote.⁴ But in Washoe County, a multiyear movement to upend that status quo created a perfect storm.

In 2020, Washoe County’s longest-serving commissioner, Jeanne Herman, became one of the first officials in the election denial movement to vote against certification, rejecting the results of President Joe Biden’s win because, she claimed, “the election was improper.”⁵ At the time, the four other commissioners outvoted Herman. Undeterred, she later voted against certifying both the 2022 primary and general elections.⁶

In 2022, a second member who had expressed doubts about the 2020 presidential election, Mark Clark, was elected to the commission.⁷ Clark’s candidacy was financed by a growing movement of election deniers, including local millionaire Robert Beadles.⁸ Together, Herman and Clark voted against certifying the county’s 2024 primary results on the basis of ballot printing errors — even though the county and court system properly addressed them outside the certification process.⁹ Once again, the other three commissioners outvoted them.¹⁰

The commission’s 2–3 split flipped, however, after Beadles financed recounts of several local primary races (none of which were affected by the ballot printing errors). Those recounts forced a second certification of the 2024 primary results, including for the primary race of County Commissioner Clara Andriola.¹¹ Andriola won her primary by nearly 19 points, and the recount confirmed the initial result.¹² But at the public hearing to certify the recounts, an angry crowd spent several hours raising allegations about the primaries that ranged from small administrative errors to outlandish claims about Serbian efforts to manipulate voting machines.¹³ At one point, Beadles himself offered an unsubstantiated data analysis that he claimed proved election interference.¹⁴

Andriola, who was new to her role (the governor had appointed her to the commission in 2023 to fill a Republican vacancy), grew concerned.¹⁵ Did she and the other commissioners have the discretion to reject the election’s outcome in light of the crowd’s complaints, or did they have a mandatory duty to certify the results?¹⁶ Her position was further complicated by sustained harassment from election skeptics.¹⁷ Beadles, for example, disparaged her as “Clara the Clown” on his blog.¹⁸

The commissioners turned to the county’s assistant district attorney, Nate Edwards, for an answer. As legal counsel for the commission, Edwards should have provided them with a simple, clear instruction: Certifying the final vote totals is a mandatory duty, and refusing to do so could result in criminal charges under state law.¹⁹ Edwards, however, did the opposite. “You don’t have to vote yes on that, you don’t have to vote no,” he said. “You vote your conscience.”²⁰

By her own account, Andriola genuinely wanted to provide a platform for her constituents, and the state’s certification deadline meant that she had limited time to confirm whether Edwards’s advice was correct. Acting on his instructions, she cast the decisive vote with Clark and Herman against certification.²¹

That evening, however, after doing additional research, Andriola realized the error in Edwards’s advice.²² It would take another full week — and a lawsuit filed by Nevada’s secretary of state — before the county commission could meet to reverse its mistake.²³ And when it did, the vote

remained contested. Andriola and Clark changed their votes, although Clark acknowledged that he did so “with a heavy heart” and only after the district attorney, Edwards’s boss, sent him a letter explaining that refusing to certify could result in criminal charges. Herman persisted in her no vote, reasoning that “there are hills to climb and there are hills to die on and this might be one of those.”²⁴

Washoe County was hardly alone in its certification dispute. Since 2020, more than 30 rogue local officials in Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Michigan, New Mexico, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Virginia have refused to certify election results.²⁵ In many of these cases, the refusing officials cited claims rooted in election denialism — the false idea that the 2020 presidential election was stolen and that widespread fraud persists in U.S. election systems. In other cases, officials such as Andriola appeared to act in response to pressure or incorrect legal advice.

Fortunately, courts and state officials intervened in each of these instances to compel certification.²⁶ But as Washoe County illustrates, that intervention came at the cost of significant time, effort, and scarce government resources during an already busy election season. Local certification delays threatened to disrupt important state and federal certification deadlines. And with each day that they went unresolved, the disputes stoked misinformation and conspiracy theories, fueling distrust in elections and the people who run them.²⁷

Over the last several years, many of the states affected by certification disputes have been forced into an untenable position, grappling with the sudden and unexpected spike in refusals to certify while also trying to plan for a contentious presidential election. Now that the 2024 cycle has concluded, state legislatures have an opportunity to streamline, clarify, and shore up their statutory frameworks to both prevent and more efficiently resolve future certification disputes.

To be sure, some of the loudest voices against certifying elections have fallen silent since President Donald Trump’s 2024 victory.²⁸ But many have not.²⁹ The volume of certification disputes between 2020 and 2024 demonstrates that they are likely to arise whenever a contentious race emerges — that is, in every election cycle. Indeed, many certification disputes have become untethered from the presidential election outcome altogether, instead serving as a mechanism for expressing disagreement or doubt as to any aspect of an election, including for local and state races.³⁰

This report lays out the steps that state legislatures can take to protect against certification refusals. It begins by walking through several certification disputes that took place during the 2024 election cycle. While it discusses some disputes from prior election cycles, it focuses principally on recent disputes that provide a clearer picture of how future attacks on certification will take shape. It then uses those disputes to identify principles for reform that will provide the strongest safeguards against future attempts to thwart certification.

Although each state’s certification framework differs in its details, these principles fall into four generally applicable categories. First, state legislatures should add to their existing certification statutes language that explicitly clarifies officials’ mandatory duty to certify elections. Second, bodies charged with amending court rules should update those rules to create expedited paths for litigants seeking court orders to compel certification. Third, state legislatures should amend their election laws to grant state officials explicit authority to intervene and complete the certification process if a county refuses to do so. Further, the refusing county should bear any costs associated with that intervention. Finally, state legislatures should create an explicit private right of action for voters to bring legal actions to compel certification.

These simple but effective reforms would protect against the chaos caused by certification refusals, benefiting voters, candidates, and election officials alike.

I. State Certification Disputes

During the 2024 Election Cycle

Disputes from the 2024 election cycle demonstrate that attacks on certification are evolving. What started as a vehicle to protest the 2020 presidential election has shifted to a mechanism for expressing disagreement or doubt over any aspect of an election, regardless of the outcome — including for local and state races.

Georgia

In many ways, Fulton County, Georgia, was the epicenter of certification disputes during the 2024 election cycle. The saga in Georgia’s most populous county — home to most of Atlanta — began in March 2024, when two Republican appointees on the Fulton County Board of Registration and Elections voted against certifying the county’s presidential primary.³¹

Julie Adams and Michael Heekin both argued that they could not certify without reviewing numerous “administrative and operational documents” necessary to show the “chain of custody” of election materials.³² But in Georgia, as elsewhere, certification takes place after poll workers and local election officials have already carried out a rigorous, multistep canvass to tally the votes, check for discrepancies in the vote totals, and ensure that the final results are accurate.³³

The county’s director of registration and elections confirmed that the election went off with no disruptions and even invited Adams to observe part of the postelection process.³⁴ And, in any event, Georgia’s certification statute provides a process to address any truly unresolved issues with the results: Rather than use certification to air their concerns, county board members must certify the results and report any issues to the appropriate district attorney for investigation.³⁵ The three other Fulton County board members followed the law and outvoted Adams and Heekin to certify the presidential primary results.³⁶ But Adams and Heekin were undeterred.

Adams, who at the time served as the regional coordinator for a national election denial activist group, abstained from the vote to certify the county’s downballot (i.e., nonpresidential) May 2024 primary results.³⁷ She then took the remarkable step of filing a lawsuit against the board and the county election director in Fulton County Superior Court, arguing that she could refuse to certify the county’s results until the defendants provided her with troves of data to investigate the election.³⁸ In short, her complaint asked the court to rewrite more than a century of Georgia law to give her unfettered discretion to reject any election results with which she disagreed.³⁹

The court rejected Adams’s request, reasoning that if certifying officials “were, as Plaintiff urges, free to play investigator, prosecutor, jury, and judge and so — because of a unilateral determination of error or fraud — refuse to certify election results, Georgia voters would be silenced.” As the court explained, Georgia’s constitution and election code “do not allow for that to happen.”⁴⁰ Still, Adams’s litigation efforts — three unsuccessful cases in all — forced Fulton County officials to spend valuable time and resources in a busy election year.⁴¹

The intensity with which Adams and the broader election denial movement targeted Fulton County warrants an extra layer of analysis. Although certification itself is a formality, its effect is significant: It serves as the final step in the postelection process, ensuring that every lawfully cast ballot counts in the final vote tally. Adams’s request would have turned this process on its head, risking a situation in which a handful of officials could, by refusing to certify an election, disenfranchise Fulton County’s hundreds of thousands of voters — more than 60 percent of whom are voters of color.⁴² For example, a refusal to certify Fulton County’s May 2024 primary results could have disenfranchised 52,899 Black voters, or nearly 15 percent of all Black voters who turned out to vote in that election statewide.⁴³ Adams’s lawsuits were just the latest attack in an ongoing effort to undermine election processes in the county. Over the last several years, election workers in Fulton County have faced racially charged threats and unfounded accusations of fraud from candidates and activists alike.⁴⁴

As Adams pursued her claims in court, Michael Heekin took aim at certification through the state’s rulemaking process. In March 2024, he proposed a change to Georgia’s election rules that, if successful, would have achieved the same goal as Adams’s lawsuits: rewriting state law to make certification discretionary.⁴⁵ Specifically, Heekin’s proposal would have redefined the act of certifying an election to mean to “attest, after *reasonable inquiry*, that the tabulation and canvassing of the election are complete and accurate and that the election results are a true and accurate accounting of all votes cast in that election.”⁴⁶

Georgia law, however, already creates a clear certification process that does not involve any “reasonable inquiry.” Instead, it creates a rigorous process for examining and verifying the results *before* certification takes place.⁴⁷ Heekin’s proposed rule also failed to define “reasonable inquiry” or set any limits on what that inquiry would have entailed. In a worst-case scenario, a rogue election board might have interpreted the rule’s vague language to let them refuse to certify if they did not like the results of any ambiguous “inquiry” into the election.

On August 3, 2024, several months after Heekin proposed the rule, Trump publicly praised three of the five members of Georgia’s State Election Board as “pit bulls fighting for honesty, transparency and victory.” All three members had previously questioned the 2020 election results.⁴⁸ Days later, those same three members voted to pass Heekin’s proposal.⁴⁹

The rule, however, quickly faced two legal challenges.⁵⁰ And, just like in Adams’s case, the Fulton County Superior Court recognized that the proposed rule posed a threat to the state’s existing certification framework. The court struck down the “reasonable inquiry” provision, finding that it added “an additional and undefined” step into the certification process and was therefore “inconsistent with” Georgia’s certification statute.⁵¹ The Georgia Supreme Court agreed, upholding the finding in a 2025 ruling.⁵²

Although unsuccessful, both Adams and Heekin continued their efforts to make certification discretionary. Adams appealed the rulings in one of her lawsuits.⁵³ And even as she certified the 2024 general election results, Adams stated that “it’s absolutely ridiculous to have a court order saying I have to vote yes.” In response, the Fulton County Board of Commissioners rejected Adams’s reappointment to the Board of Registration and Elections in May 2025.⁵⁴ Heekin has since called on the state legislature to give local election boards the discretion to vote against certifying results in future elections.⁵⁵

Adams and Heekin were not alone in their attempts to undermine Georgia certification law. According to *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, at least 19 local election board members in counties including Cobb, DeKalb, Gwinnett, and Spalding refused to certify results between 2020 and 2024.⁵⁶ Those board members did not muster enough votes to succeed, but the fact remains that an alarming number of local officials in the state have attempted to abuse the certification process at voters’ expense.

Colorado

In November 2023, the Colorado Republican Party made headlines when the chair of its Ballot and Election Security Committee, Ron Hanks, circulated a letter urging counties to refuse to certify that month’s local election results. The statement cited unsupported allegations of

a “rigged system” and framed the 2023 elections as a practice round for the “epic battle” that would come during the 2024 cycle.⁵⁷ Although attempts to refuse certification were not new in Colorado, the letter undoubtedly influenced county canvass board members.⁵⁸ In the November 2023 election alone, board members in five Colorado counties voted against certifying local city council and school board races.⁵⁹

Several of those attempts involved repeat refusers who doubled down on their efforts in 2024. In Boulder County, for example, county canvass board member Theresa Watson voted against certification in 2023, citing “vulnerabilities in the Boulder County Elections, drop boxes and the signature verification process” and “a lack of proficient training for signature verification judges.”⁶⁰ Notably, a 2021 *Colorado Times Recorder* report detailed Watson’s contributions to an online chat room affiliated with the so-called U.S. Election Integrity Plan, a “QAnon-linked election fraud conspiracy group.” According to the report, Watson posted about weapons that could be “carr[ie]d in a crowd” ahead of the January 6 attack on the U.S. Capitol.⁶¹

Watson subsequently refused to certify the March 2024 presidential primary results, noting her personal objection to mail-in ballots and a desire for increased drop box surveillance. A Boulder County press release explained that Watson’s concerns were “completely outside the scope of the duty of the Canvass Board.”⁶² In the June 2024 downballot primary, Watson’s successor, John Barrett, also voted against certification, alleging “vulnerabilities” in the election system.⁶³

In El Paso County, Republican canvass board member Candice Stutzriem not only refused to certify the 2023 general election, but also released a “minority report” replete with unsupported theories about fraudulent ballots “created in the wild” and “stuffed into obscure drop boxes.”⁶⁴ Stutzriem subsequently refused to certify both the 2024 presidential and downballot primaries, reasoning that “there’s no way to prove there is a single, verified, legal voter behind each ballot cast.”⁶⁵

In Jefferson County, home to a portion of the Denver metro area, board member Nancy Pallozzi refused to certify the 2023 general election, also releasing a “minority report” that detailed changes she hoped to see in the county’s election administration process.⁶⁶ Like Stutzriem, Pallozzi subsequently refused to certify both 2024 primary elections, telling *USA Today* that she had questions about the chain of custody of ballots and “paper ballot encryption,” among other things. A spokesperson for the Jefferson County Clerk and Recorder’s Office responded, “We’ve worked with Nancy many times and every election she sends us a letter with some sort of reason for not certifying the election, and none of it is ever coherent.”⁶⁷

While many certification objectors in other states fell silent after Trump’s victory in the 2024 general election,

refusals persisted in Colorado. Canvass board members in seven counties — Archuleta, Boulder, Eagle, El Paso, Gilpin, Jefferson, and Larimer — refused to certify the November 5 election results, citing a password security breach in the secretary of state’s office. Stutzriem and Pallozzi were among those who refused.⁶⁸ State officials repeatedly clarified that the breach did not expose voting systems, nor was any voting equipment compromised.⁶⁹ Fortunately, each refusing board member was outvoted.⁷⁰

If a Colorado board had voted against certification, legislation passed in 2022 ensures that the secretary of state could have intervened to certify.⁷¹ But the sheer volume of refusals in Colorado sends a dangerous message to the public. As the Boulder County clerk and recorder noted earlier this year, “the real risk is when you have folks that are responsible for helping conduct the election or certify the election who clearly aren’t following their responsibilities. What does that say to the voter?”⁷²

Virginia

On October 4, 2024, Waynesboro, Virginia, Board of Elections Chair Curtis Lilly and Vice Chair Scott Mares filed a lawsuit preemptively announcing their plan to refuse to certify the rural city’s general election results. According to their complaint, Lilly and Mares would certify only if the court permitted them to count ballots by hand.⁷³ In support of their unorthodox request, they argued that a hand count was the only way to guarantee that voting machines were not secretly programmed to rig the election outcome.⁷⁴

In Virginia, election officials ensure that voting machine results are accurate by following tried-and-true processes, including running test ballots through each machine to confirm that they are working correctly before voting takes place.⁷⁵ Hand counts, by contrast, are slow and error-prone — the very reasons why states such as Virginia prohibit the practice and use vote-tabulation machines instead. Across the country, only a few jurisdictions with more than 1,000 voters count ballots by hand.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, Lilly and Mares sought to revive the practice in Waynesboro, which has approximately 16,000 registered voters.⁷⁷

On October 21, 2024, five Waynesboro voters responded by filing a lawsuit of their own against Lilly and Mares. The voters, seeking to prevent the board from discounting their future votes, requested a writ of mandamus — a court order compelling an official to perform a ministerial (i.e., mandatory and nondiscretionary) duty required by law.⁷⁸ Courts have long acknowledged that certification qualifies as a ministerial duty for mandamus purposes.⁷⁹ In recent years, for example, courts in both Arizona and New Mexico have granted writs of mandamus against county boards of election that voted against certification.⁸⁰

The Waynesboro Circuit Court issued an order in the voters’ lawsuit on November 4, finding that the board members have a ministerial duty to certify the election and granting the voters’ request for a writ of mandamus. The order did not mince words, explaining, “The personal beliefs of members of a local board of elections cannot derail the electoral process for the entire Commonwealth.”⁸¹ The decision, however, came at the expense of extensive time and judicial resources. The court held a full evidentiary hearing before resolving the case, leaving the fate of Waynesboro’s votes uncertain until just one day before the general election. Ultimately, Lilly and Mares both complied. But as a final protest, they noted their disagreement by writing “certified but objected to” and “certified but with objections,” respectively, beside their names.⁸²

In January 2025, the Virginia Board of Elections voted 5–0 to petition the Waynesboro Circuit Court to remove Lilly from the board.⁸³ The recommendation cited various derelictions of duty under state law, including Lilly’s objection to the final certification.⁸⁴ Lilly subsequently resigned before the court could act on the petition,⁸⁵ while Mares’s term on the board has since expired, making proceedings against him moot.⁸⁶

In a statement supporting the petition to remove Lilly, Waynesboro’s registrar and director of elections discussed the toll that Lilly and Mares’s lawsuit took on herself and the county: “Once the public learned of the lawsuit, I began to receive hate emails about the lawsuit.” She explained that “the public thought it was me, the Director of Elections, that was suing the state. It took time to reassure the voters that their vote was safe, secure and would be certified.”⁸⁷

Utah

While many counties have faced certification disputes rooted in false claims of fraud or conspiracy theories, a 2024 incident in Iron County, Utah, stemmed from a less sensational source: a postal service delay. Mail from Iron County travels more than 170 miles southwest to a processing center in Las Vegas before it is postmarked.⁸⁸ That time-intensive journey meant that approximately 400 mail ballots from the primary election were mailed from Iron County on or before the state’s mail ballot deadline of June 24 but postmarked in Las Vegas after midnight on the 25th.⁸⁹ According to Utah law, all ballots with a postmark of June 25 had missed the deadline and could not be counted.

As one member of Iron County’s commission summed up the situation: “This sucks.”⁹⁰ The commissioners postponed certification to speak with state election officials, hoping to find a way to include the ballots.⁹¹ But state officials were unanimous: Although the postal delay was unacceptable, there was no way to include those ballots under state law.⁹²

The commissioners turned to the Iron County attorney, Chad Dotson, for legal advice. Fortunately, Dotson had done his homework. He advised that “the law is clear. . . . The commission has no choice but to certify this election.”⁹³ If the commissioners refused to certify, he said, “the likely outcome is that the Attorney General’s Office sues to enforce and compel the board of canvassers to follow the [state] statute and certify the election.”⁹⁴ Regardless of what the commissioners thought of Utah’s mail ballot deadline, they had no choice but to certify the election and leave any challenges up to the courts.

Ultimately, the commissioners voted 2–1 to certify the primary results.⁹⁵ Commissioner Paul Cozzens voted no, reasoning that “in matters like these, what is legal isn’t always right.”⁹⁶ Commissioner Mike Bleak, who voted to certify, countered that “at the end of the day, we’re a nation of rules that is governed by the rule of law, and in this particular case, the rule of law is very clear and there is no wiggle room.”⁹⁷ Bleak, who had encountered statutory language in previous public service positions, pointed to the language of Utah’s certification statute: “A board of canvassers *shall* . . . certify the vote totals.”⁹⁸ He correctly reasoned that the “shall” language meant that the commissioners could not “pick and choose” whether to certify the results. Bleak also recommended that the commission, rather than refuse to certify the results, instead focus on implementing drop boxes before the general election to avoid future mail delays, which the county did.⁹⁹

Iron County’s certification dispute serves as a cautionary tale. In some instances, an unfair outcome may tempt officials to refuse to certify an election. But throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries, state courts and legislatures faced with similar considerations rejected the idea that such discretion should rest with certifying officials. Recognizing that leaving room for discretion in certification would create opportunities for rogue officials to manipulate or interfere with election outcomes, they instead vested the authority to investigate elections and decide legal issues in specifically designated court processes, such as election contests — a process by which a candidate can challenge the outcome of their race on legal grounds.¹⁰⁰ In the prescient words of the 1909 Oklahoma Supreme Court, allowing local certifying officials “who are generally without training in the law” to look beyond the final vote totals and investigate an election itself “would afford temptation and great opportunity for the commission of fraud.”¹⁰¹

Michigan

Michigan faced two certification disputes during the 2024 election cycle: one in Delta County in the Upper Peninsula and one in Kalamazoo County in western Michigan. The disputes, however, are notable not for the chaos they

caused but for the ease with which they were resolved, thanks to the state’s prior certification reform efforts.

In the days after the November 2020 presidential election, Michigan saw the nation’s first instance of officials refusing to certify results on the basis of claims rooted in election denialism. The controversy began in Wayne County, the state’s largest county and home to Detroit. In a confusing back-and-forth, two Republican members of the Wayne County Board of Canvassers, Monica Palmer and William Hartmann, voted against certifying the county’s general election results but then voted to approve certification later in the same meeting.¹⁰² Phone recordings have revealed that following the vote to certify, Trump personally pressured Palmer and Hartmann to refuse to sign the official statement of votes for Wayne County. Palmer and Hartmann subsequently left the meeting without signing the official statement and attempted to rescind their votes to certify the following day, but state law prevented them from doing so.¹⁰³

When the Board of State Canvassers later met to certify the 2020 results, their vote, for the first time in Michigan history, was not unanimous.¹⁰⁴ Republican board member Norm Shinkle abstained from the vote, citing unfounded claims of election fraud.¹⁰⁵

In response to the 2020 dispute, Michigan voters and legislators took action. Voters amended the state constitution to expressly clarify state and local officials’ legal obligations:

It shall be the ministerial, clerical, nondiscretionary duty of a board of canvassers, and of each individual member thereof, to certify election results based solely on: (1) certified statements of votes from counties; or (2) in the case of boards of county canvassers, statements of returns from the precincts and absent voter counting boards in the county and any corrected returns.¹⁰⁶

Michigan’s legislature, in turn, created a new mechanism for enforcing certification. If a board of county canvassers fails to certify the results of an election, state law now requires the board to immediately deliver “all records and other information pertaining to the election” to the secretary of the Board of State Canvassers.¹⁰⁷ The state board must then “meet immediately and make the necessary determinations and certify the results.”¹⁰⁸ Importantly, the new law requires all costs associated with the state canvass, including those for transportation, lodging, and meals, and all those incurred by state agencies, to be borne by the county that failed to certify.¹⁰⁹ As an added disincentive, the entire county board, along with all other “necessary” county staff, must be present at all times while the state board completes the canvass.¹¹⁰ Finally, the legislature reaffirmed the language of the state constitutional amendment, expressly clarifying that county boards of canvassers,

the state board of canvassers, and individual board members have a “ministerial, clerical, and nondiscretionary duty” to certify election results.¹¹¹

These provisions proved prescient. On May 14, 2024, two Republican members of the Delta County Board of Canvassers, Bonnie Hakkola and LeeAnne Oman, refused to certify the results of a recall election in a 2–2 vote.¹¹² In the election, voters recalled three of Delta County’s five commissioners by overwhelming margins: 72, 72, and 73 percent, respectively.¹¹³ Both Hakkola and Oman argued that the similar margins pointed to voting machine irregularities that justified a hand count of all 4,500 ballots cast.¹¹⁴ In response, the county clerk confirmed that she and her staff had tested the machines several times to ensure that they worked correctly.¹¹⁵ Rather, the similar margins likely stemmed from the circumstances motivating the recall: Residents organized the election after the three commissioners voted to fire a former county administrator.¹¹⁶

The deadlock generated significant press coverage as a potential harbinger for the general election, but state officials stepped in quickly to resolve the impasse. Within two days, the Michigan Department of State sent the Delta County board members a letter detailing their duties under the newly amended Michigan Constitution and Michigan election law, advising them of the consequences of failing to certify and explaining the processes in place to confirm the accuracy of the results.¹¹⁷ The letter

proved effective: Just one day after receiving it, the Delta County board met to certify the results in a 4–0 vote.¹¹⁸ Michigan’s attorney general and secretary of state circulated the letter in a press release, further ensuring that canvassing board members across the state — more than 50 percent of whom had not served as canvassers in the previous presidential election — knew of their duty to certify and the repercussions of a refusal.¹¹⁹

Several months after the Delta County deadlock, a member of the Kalamazoo County Board of Canvassers, Robert Froman, sparked concerns of another certification refusal during the general election. In an August 2024 interview with a local reporter, Froman said he believed that the 2020 election had “most definitely” been stolen from Trump. When asked whether he would vote to certify the 2024 election if it unfolded the same way, he responded, “No. And that’s why I’m there [on the Kalamazoo County Board].”¹²⁰

In response to Froman’s statements, the ACLU of Michigan and two Kalamazoo voters filed an action for declaratory judgment, asking a state court to clarify that county canvassers may not refuse to certify election results on the basis of extrinsic information, including any allegations of fraud.¹²¹ The court did not have an opportunity to weigh in; one week later, the plaintiffs agreed to dismiss the suit after Froman signed a sworn affidavit stating that he would certify the November election results consistent with Michigan law.¹²²

II. Principles for Reform

As the 2026 midterm elections approach, state actors have an important opportunity to strengthen and streamline their certification frameworks to contend with future refusals. While each state’s framework differs in its precise language,¹²³ the principles for reform detailed below are generally applicable across all states.

>> Legislatures should add language to state certification statutes that explicitly clarifies officials’ ministerial, nondiscretionary duty to certify elections.

State certification statutes are consistent. They generally state that local and state officials “shall” certify the returns. *Shall* serves an important legal purpose: It signals to courts that legislatures intend certification to be a mandatory duty.¹²⁴ Once the canvass is complete and vote totals are final, that duty becomes “ministerial” — that is, an obligation that “is absolute, certain and imperative, involving merely the execution of a set task” and for which “the law . . . prescribes and defines the time, mode [and] occasion for its performance with such certainty that nothing remains for judgment or discretion.”¹²⁵ In other words, there is nothing for officials to do but certify the results. And because certification is a ministerial duty, courts can issue writs of mandamus compelling officials to certify the results.¹²⁶

But as Clara Andriola’s experience in Washoe County, Nevada, demonstrates, certifying officials may struggle to interpret statutory language, particularly when they are new to their roles or unfamiliar with the certification process. And when that struggle (whether genuine or in bad faith) leads to certification refusals, courts must spend valuable time and resources hearing and resolving cases within an election cycle’s tight deadlines.

For these reasons, state legislatures should amend state certification statutes to add language that is unmistakably clear: Once the vote totals are final, “it is the ministerial and nondiscretionary duty of each election board, and each of the members of the election board, to certify” the results. For one, such language would leave little cover for certifying officials to claim that they did not know certification is nondiscretionary — an important factor in the many states that allow for removing or imposing penalties against officials who knowingly fail to perform their duty or interfere with election processes.¹²⁷ It would also foreclose future efforts to use the courts and rulemaking processes to insert discretionary decision-making into certification, as Julie Adams and Michael Heekin attempted to do in Fulton County, Georgia.

Similarly, this added language may benefit state courts confronted with certification disputes. In Virginia, for

example, the Waynesboro Circuit Court conducted a full evidentiary hearing before concluding that the Waynesboro Board of Elections members had a ministerial duty to certify elections, issuing a writ of mandamus just one day before the general election.¹²⁸ While state certification statutes, as written, already allow courts to issue writs of mandamus,¹²⁹ the additional clarification that certification is a “ministerial” duty may eliminate any confusion or ambiguity such that courts can issue orders quickly and without conducting lengthy hearings.

Further, statutory language should emphasize that election boards must “proceed without delay” to certify by the deadline provided under state law. Delaying certification by even a few days, as officials did in Washoe, Iron, and Delta Counties, can interfere with state and federal certification deadlines, particularly in a presidential election year. Under the Electoral Count Reform Act, state executives must certify their state’s slate of presidential electors by a set date in December; delaying certification by even a few days could place a state’s presidential electors at risk.¹³⁰

>> Judicial bodies should create expedited paths and timelines for certification cases.

Litigation takes time. But in the condensed postelection period, parties litigating mandamus actions may have just weeks, or even days, to meet statutory certification deadlines. That timeline may be even further compressed if a party appeals an order compelling certification.

For that reason, the bodies charged with updating court rules — typically state supreme courts, court administrators, or commissions — should amend court rules to create expedited paths for litigants seeking orders to compel certification and necessary precursors, such as ballot reconciliation or other elements of the canvass. They might, for example, allow state supreme courts to hear certification-related cases in the first instance. In Nevada, Rule of Appellate Procedure 17(a)(2) allows the state supreme court to presumptively retain cases involving ballot or election questions rather than requiring litigants to go through the lower courts.¹³¹

Alternatively, courts could amend their appellate and briefing timelines in certification-related cases. In Pennsylvania, which has seen several certification disputes since 2020, the supreme court issued an order temporar-

ily reducing the appellate timeline and briefing schedule for any matter arising under the state’s election code ahead of the 2024 presidential election.¹³² Both types of rule changes achieve the same, important goal: ensuring that votes are counted and certified on time.

>> Legislatures should grant state officials explicit authority to intervene and complete the certification process if a county refuses to certify an election.

Writs of mandamus, though effective, often come at a cost. They drain valuable judicial resources at a time when courts may be barraged with postelection proceedings and force state officials to divert limited state resources away from administering elections.¹³³ As the Waynesboro County dispute illustrates, they can also take considerable time to resolve — time that both increases the chance that counties will miss state and federal certification deadlines and creates opportunities for bad actors to intimidate election officials and spread false claims of election fraud.¹³⁴

For these reasons, legislators should follow the example of states such as Michigan and Colorado by amending their election laws to grant the officials who certify at the state level (most often the secretary of state or a state board of canvassers) explicit authority to intervene and complete the certification process if a county refuses to certify final vote totals by the statutory deadline.¹³⁵ State intervention provides two critical benefits: First, it creates an efficient, streamlined process for certification without the need to wait for litigation to resolve a dispute. Second, it acts as a disincentive against refusing to certify in the first place. If a county official knows that refusing to certify will be met with immediate certification by the state, it renders baseless objections all the more meaningless.

Importantly, any state intervention provision should follow Michigan’s example by including a cost-bearing clause.¹³⁶ Specifically, statutory language should clarify that “all costs associated with” state intervention — everything from transportation and lodging to any overtime incurred by state employees — “must be borne by the county that failed to certify.” In states that have seen significant numbers of votes against certification, the concerns of frustrated taxpayers will force refusing officials to think twice about their votes. As an added disincentive, states can also require county boards and staff to be present while the state board completes the certification process.¹³⁷

Certainly, situations may arise wherein delays caused by courts or other actors prevent a board from certifying on time through no fault of its own; intervention should be reserved for those instances in which a county board has the means to certify by the statutory deadline but refuses to do so. Further, state law should clarify that those state officials authorized to intervene, like county

officials, have a “ministerial and nondiscretionary” duty to certify the final vote totals.¹³⁸ If any challenges to the results themselves arise, the same remedies, including election contests and other court proceedings, will remain available to affected parties.

>> Legislatures should create a private right of action for voters to bring certification cases.

A party seeking mandamus relief must generally establish a “clear legal right” to the requested relief, meaning that several different types of parties can file a mandamus action in a given state. Most often, state officials responsible for certifying statewide election results seek mandamus relief if a county refuses to certify, as the county’s refusal interferes with their statutory duty to certify the election.¹³⁹ Candidates whose races are affected by a refusal can also generally obtain mandamus relief.¹⁴⁰

By the same logic, voters who stand to be disenfranchised by a refusal should also be able to obtain mandamus relief. But few courts have had the opportunity to decide that question. In fact, the court in the Waynesboro dispute — which found that the voters who brought the suit would be “directly affected by . . . the [board’s] failure to certify” — is one of just a few courts that have considered whether voters can sue to compel certification.¹⁴¹

To ensure that voters can sue to have their votes counted, legislators should consider the example of states such as New Mexico, which allows its trial courts, “upon petition of any voter,” to “issue a writ of mandamus to the county canvassing board to compel it to approve the report of the county canvass and certify the election returns.”¹⁴² Ensuring that voters have a private right of action serves as an important safeguard if, for example, a rogue state official refuses to certify, or if a state sees so many certification disputes that state officials and candidates struggle to enforce certification on their own — a very real possibility in a close and contentious presidential or statewide election.¹⁴³

Further, actions brought by voters may be particularly important when officials announce their intention to refuse to certify before an election has taken place, as was the case in Kalamazoo County, Delta County, and Waynesboro. Whereas candidates may not want to expend limited campaign resources on a lawsuit so close to the election (particularly before they know the outcome), voters will always have a strong incentive to ensure that their votes are counted and certified on time. Indeed, it was voters, not candidates, who filed suit in both the Waynesboro and Kalamazoo County actions.¹⁴⁴ Relatedly, legislators may consider adding a fee-shifting provision to guarantee that the cost of bringing a mandamus action does not deter voters or candidates from filing a suit.

Conclusion

Between 2020 and 2024, states faced an unprecedented spike in election certification threats. State officials, voters, and advocates responded to the challenge, filing lawsuits, issuing guidance to certifying officials, and educating the public about the certification process and their rights. But certification refusals still caused harm.

By basing their actions on false claims of fraud and conspiracy theories, many of the local officials who refused to certify validated and encouraged the broader election denial movement. Refusals also sowed disorder in the election administration process, interfering with postelection deadlines and alarming voters who worried that their ballots might not be counted.

Though the 2024 presidential election outcome quieted many of the loudest voices against certification, the sharp

increase in refusals since 2020 suggests that attacks on certification are not over yet. And going forward, the 2024 cycle demonstrates that states may see more refusals rooted in local disagreements, downballot races, and doubts about the election process. Now that the presidential election has concluded, states must seize the opportunity to shore up their certification frameworks to meet this new challenge. Any one of these simple but significant reforms could make the difference between a smooth and a disputed election.

Endnotes

- 1 Jim Rutenberg, "The Army of Election Officials Ready to Reject the Vote," *The New York Times*, updated November 6, 2024, <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/10/25/magazine/far-right-election-results.html>; and Lucien Bruggeman et al., "Protecting Your Vote: Nevada's 'Swingiest' County Emerges as Key Battleground in Election Certification Fight," ABC News, October 20, 2024, <https://abcnews.go.com/US/protecting-vote-nevadas-swingiest-county-emerges-key-battleground/story?id=114928056>.
- 2 Edgardo Cortés, Elizabeth Howard, and Derek Tisler, "Roadmap to the Official Count in the 2024 Election," Brennan Center for Justice, updated September 24, 2024, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/roadmap-official-count-2024-election>. For more information on how certification works at the local and state level, see All Voting is Local, Brennan Center for Justice, Campaign Legal Center, and Protect Democracy, *Election Certification Processes and Guardrails*, September 18, 2024, <https://www.brennancenter.org/series/election-certification-processes-and-guardrails>.
- 3 Lauren Miller and Will Wilder, "Certification and Non-Discretion: A Guide to Protecting the 2024 Election," *Stanford Law & Policy Review* 35, no. 1 (2024): 29–31, <https://law.stanford.edu/publications/certification-and-non-discretion-a-guide-to-protecting-the-2024-election>.
- 4 Miller and Wilder, "Certification and Non-Discretion," 29–31. See also, e.g., *Adams v. Fulton County*, No. 24CV011584, 2024 WL 4592443, at *5, 5n15 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Oct. 14, 2024) (explaining that while local certifying officials in Georgia may not "refuse to certify or abstain from certifying election results under any circumstance," that prohibition "does not leave the [official] without recourse or the means to voice substantive concerns about an election outcome," because Georgia's "election code has a tested mechanism for addressing alleged fraud and abuse: election contests"); and *Hall v. Stuart*, 198 Va. 315, 323 (1956) (explaining that in relation to local electoral boards' duties, "questions of illegal voting, and fraudulent practices, are to be passed upon by another tribunal").
- 5 Rutenberg, "Army of Election Officials." Herman has served on the commission since 2014. Washoe County, NV, "Vice Chair Jeanne Herman," Board of County Commissioners, accessed June 9, 2025, https://www.washoecounty.gov/bcc/profile/5-herman_jeanne.php.
- 6 Carly Sauvageau, Jannelle Calderon, and Naoka Foreman, "County Leaders Vote to Certify Results of Primary Election After Skeptics Push Back," *The Nevada Independent*, June 24, 2024, <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/county-leaders-vote-to-certify-results-of-primary-election-after-skeptics-push-back>; and Ben Margiott, "Washoe County Certifies 2022 Midterm Election Results," KRN News 4 (Reno, NV), November 18, 2022, <https://mynews4.com/news/local/washoe-county-nevada-certifies-2022-midterm-general-election-voting-results>.
- 7 Rutenberg, "Army of Election Officials."
- 8 Rutenberg, "Army of Election Officials"; Tabitha Mueller et al., "GOP Donor Trying to Reshape Nevada Politics Pushes Radical Conspiracy Theories, Repeatedly Cites Antisemitic Propaganda," *The Nevada Independent*, updated November 15, 2022, <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/gop-donor-trying-to-reshape-nevada-politics-pushes-radical-conspiracy-theories-repeatedly-cites-antisemitic-propaganda>; and April Corbin Gurnus, "Refusal to Certify Washoe County Election Results Meant to Sow Distrust, Advocates Warn," *This Is Reno*, July 11, 2024, <https://thisisreno.com/2024/07/refusal-to-certify-washoe-county-election-results-meant-to-sow-distrust-advocates-warn>.
- 9 Ben Margiott, "Washoe Commission Narrowly Certifies Election Results, Registrar Vows Fixes After Errors," KRN News 4 (Reno, NV), June 21, 2024, <https://mynews4.com/news/local/washoe-commission-narrowly-certifies-election-results-registrar-vows-fixes-after-errors>. The county saw two printing errors. First, ballots sent to voters who lived south of Rancho San Rafael Park in Reno did not show candidates for Assembly District 27 and Senate District 15. The 265 voters affected by the error were notified by letter and received new ballots by mail. News 4 and Fox 11 Digital Staff, "Washoe County Voters Living South of Rancho San Rafael Park Missing Races on Ballot," KRN News 4 (Reno, NV), May 22, 2024, <https://mynews4.com/news/local/washoe-county-voters-living-south-of-rancho-san-rafael-park-missing-races-on-ballot>. Second, sample ballots omitted the Republican primary for Assembly District 40. Losing candidate Drew Ribar brought a legal action that went up to the state supreme court, which rejected his challenge in part because Ribar raised "no concerns with either the District 40 race or his name being omitted from the ballots voted in the primary election." *Ribar v. Washoe County*, No. 88901, 2024 WL 3665320, at *2 (Nev. Aug. 5, 2024).
- 10 Margiott, "Washoe Commission Narrowly Certifies Election Results."
- 11 News 4 and Fox 11 Digital Staff, "Washoe County Slated to Finish Recount for 3 Local Races by End of Monday," KRXI Fox 11 (Reno, NV), July 2, 2024, <https://foxreno.com/news/local/washoe-county-slated-to-have-election-recount-done-for-3-local-races-by-end-of-monday>.
- 12 Madeleine May, "Fears Grow About Election Deniers' Influence After Bizarre Decision in Nevada Race," CBS News, July 13, 2024, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/nevada-election-deniers-influence-reno>.
- 13 Rutenberg, "Army of Election Officials."
- 14 Rutenberg, "Army of Election Officials"; Tabitha Mueller, "After Washoe Recount and Revote, Experts Say Commission's Action Undermined Democracy," *The Nevada Independent*, July 21, 2024, <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/after-washoe-recount-and-revote-experts-say-commissions-action-undermined-democracy>; and Carly Sauvageau, "Politicians Are Reporting More Harassment. Just Ask Candidates in Washoe County Races," *The Nevada Independent*, May 26, 2024, <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/politicians-are-reporting-more-harassment-just-ask-candidates-in-washoe-county-races>.
- 15 Office of the Nevada Governor, "Governor Lombardo Appoints Clara Andriola to District 4 Seat on Washoe County Commission," press release, April 5, 2023, https://gov.nv.gov/Newsroom/PRs/2023/2023-04-05_WashoeCountyCommission.
- 16 "Nevada's Washoe County Votes Against Certifying Recount Results of 2 Local Primaries," CBS News, July 10, 2024, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/nevada-county-refuses-to-certify-recount-election-results>; and Rutenberg, "Army of Election Officials."
- 17 Sauvageau, "Politicians Are Reporting More Harassment." Andriola was not alone; another Washoe County commissioner faced harassment so severe that she was forced to move. And in 2023, one commissioner discovered that a private investigator had tracked her for seven months by installing a GPS device on her family's car. Mark Robison, "Lawsuit: Secret GPS Device Used to Track Washoe Commissioner Hartung, Family," *Reno Gazette Journal*, February 24, 2023, <https://www.rgj.com/story/news/2023/02/24/lawsuit-gps-device-used-to-track-washoe-commissioner-hartung-family-vaughn/69941004007>. See also Linda So, Joseph Tanfani, and Jason Szep, "Pro-Trump Conspiracy Theorists Hound Election Officials Out of Office," Reuters, October 19, 2022, <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-election-nevada-washoe>.
- 18 Sauvageau, "Politicians Are Reporting More Harassment."
- 19 Brennan Center for Justice et al., "Nevada Election Certification

Processes and Guardrails,” September 18, 2024, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/nevada-election-certification-processes-and-guardrails>.

20 Mark Robison, “Washoe County Commission Votes 3–2 Against Certifying Results in Primary Election Recount,” *Reno Gazette Journal*, July 9, 2024, <https://www.rgi.com/story/news/politics/elections/2024/07/09/washoe-county-commission-primary-recount/74344823007>.

21 Robison, “Washoe County Commission Votes 3–2 Against Certifying Results”; and Rutenberg, “Army of Election Officials.”

22 Rutenberg, “Army of Election Officials.”

23 April Corbin Girnus, “Washoe County Commission Reverses Course, Acknowledges Election Certification Mandatory,” *Nevada Current*, July 17, 2024, <https://nevadacurrent.com/2024/07/17/washoe-county-commission-reverses-course-acknowledges-election-certification-mandatory>. Following the county’s vote against certification, the secretary of state, represented by the attorney general, filed a mandamus petition against the commission with the state supreme court. *Petition, Aguilar v. Washoe County Board of County Commissioners*, No. 88965 (Nev. July 11, 2024). After the secretary of state filed the petition but before the court could decide the case, the Washoe County commission reversed course and certified the canvass in a 4–1 vote. In response, the state supreme court dismissed the petition as moot. *Aguilar*, No. 88965, 553 P.3d 1002 (Table) (Nev. 2024).

24 Girnus, “Washoe County Commission Reverses Course.”

25 Miller and Wilder, “Certification and Non-Discretion,” 14–23; Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington (CREW), *Election Certification Under Threat*, August 12, 2024, <https://www.citizensforethics.org/reports-investigations/crew-investigations/election-certification-under-threat>; and Emily Rodriguez et al., *Election Certification Is Not Optional*, Protect Democracy, March 2024, https://protectdemocracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/PD_County-Cert-WP_v03.1.pdf.

26 Miller and Wilder, “Certification and Non-Discretion,” 14–23; CREW, *Election Certification Under Threat*; and Rodriguez et al., *Election Certification Is Not Optional*.

27 See, e.g., Girnus, “Refusal to Certify Washoe County Election Results.” See also, e.g., JoAnna Suriani, “Local Officials Cannot Block Election Certification. But They Can Fuel Disinformation,” *Just Security*, October 28, 2024, <https://www.justsecurity.org/104249/local-officials-election-certification-disinformation>.

28 Stuart A. Thompson, Jim Rutenberg, and Steven Lee Myers, “After Trump Took the Lead, Election Deniers Went Suddenly Silent,” *The New York Times*, November 6, 2024, <https://www.nytimes.com/2024/11/06/technology/trump-election-denial.html>.

29 Sam Gringlas, “Georgia Counties Certify the Election, as Fraud Claims Dissipate After Trump Win,” NPR, November 12, 2024, <https://www.npr.org/2024/11/12/nx-sl-5187043/georgia-election-certification-trump-results> (“While concerns about irregularities and certification have fallen off, they have not disappeared entirely.”).

30 See, e.g., Beth LeBlanc, “In Delta County, Canvassers Decline to Certify Election, Delay Start for New Commissioners,” *The Detroit News*, May 16, 2024, <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2024/05/16/delta-county-canvassers-reject-certification-of-recall-election/73716383007>; and Sara Wilson, “Canvass Board Members in 7 Colorado Counties Vote Against Election Certification,” *Colorado Newsline*, December 4, 2024, <https://coloradonewsline.com/2024/12/04/canvass-colorado-election-certification>.

31 Fulton County Board of Registration and Elections, “Board of Registration and Elections Approved Minutes,” March 18, 2024, <https://fultoncountyga.gov/-/media/BRE31824-Approved-Minutes.pdf>.

32 George Chidi, “Will a Perfect Election in Fulton County Make a Difference to Republicans?,” *The Guardian*, March 21, 2024, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2024/mar/21/fulton-county-perfect-election>; and Fulton County Board of Registration and Elections, “Board of Registration and Elections Approved Minutes.”

www.theguardian.com/us-news/2024/mar/21/fulton-county-perfect-election; and Fulton County Board of Registration and Elections, “Board of Registration and Elections Approved Minutes.”

33 See Ga. Code Ann. §§ 21-2-70(9), 21-2-70(15), 21-2-493, and 21-2-498.

34 Chidi, “Will a Perfect Election in Fulton County Make a Difference to Republicans?” See also Defendant Fulton County, Georgia’s Motion to Dismiss and Trial Brief, *Adams v. Fulton County*, No. 24CV011584, at 23 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Sept. 30, 2024) (explaining that “the Director invited Plaintiff to observe the reconciliation process in a good faith attempt to address her concerns and maintain utmost transparency”).

35 Ga. Code Ann. § 21-2-493(i).

36 Fulton County Board of Registration and Elections, “Board of Registration and Elections Approved Minutes.”

37 George Chidi and Sam Levine, “Republican Who Refused to Certify Georgia Primary a Member of Election Denialist Group,” *The Guardian*, June 4, 2024, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/article/2024/jun/04/republican-julie-adams-georgia-election-integrity-network>; and Jeff Amy, “Election Board Member in Georgia’s Fulton County Abstains from Certifying Primary Election,” Associated Press, May 29, 2024, <https://apnews.com/article/georgia-elections-fulton-county-julie-adams-79c93a5820eb8a9ecf6856171db72c10>.

38 Verified Complaint for Declaratory Relief, Interlocutory Injunctive Relief, and Permanent Injunctive Relief, *Adams v. Fulton County Board of Elections and Registration*, No. 24CV006566 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. May 22, 2024). Several months after she filed her complaint, the court dismissed Adams’s case on procedural grounds. See Order on Plaintiff’s Motion to Correct Misnomer et al., *Adams v. Fulton County Board of Elections and Registration*, No. 24CV006566 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Sept. 9, 2024). Several days later, she filed a second iteration of her suit. See Verified Complaint for Declaratory Relief, *Adams v. Fulton County*, 24CV011584 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Sept. 12, 2024).

39 See, e.g., *Tanner v. Deen*, 33 S.E. 832, 835 (Ga. 1899) (explaining that local certifying officials “were not selected for their knowledge of the law,” and for this reason their discretion in the certification process was limited to referring any alleged defect to the appropriate election tribunal to decide; refusing to certify warranted a writ of mandamus); and *Bacon v. Black*, 133 S.E. 251, 253–54 (Ga. 1926) (explaining that certification is a “ministerial” — as in mandatory — duty and that certifying officials have no discretion to adjudicate alleged fraud).

40 *Adams v. Fulton County*, No. 24CV011584, 2024 WL 4592443, at *6 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Oct. 14, 2024) (dismissing the second iteration of the lawsuit).

41 *Adams v. Fulton County Board of Elections and Registration*, No. 24CV006566 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. May 22, 2024); *Adams v. Fulton County*, No. 24CV011584 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Sept. 12, 2024); and *Adams v. Williams*, No. 24CV013884 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Oct. 31, 2024). For a summary of the three cases and their procedural history, see Courtney Cohn, “Georgia Judge Rejects Third Lawsuit from GOP Fulton County Election Official,” *Democracy Docket*, November 4, 2024, <https://www.democracydocket.com/news-alerts/georgia-judge-rejects-third-lawsuit-from-gop-fulton-county-election-official>.

42 See United States Census Bureau, “Quick Facts, Fulton County, Georgia,” accessed June 9, 2025, <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fultoncountygeorgia>.

43 According to data from the Georgia secretary of state’s office, in the May 2024 primary, 52,899 Black voters voted in Fulton County and 360,438 Black voters voted across the state. See Election Data Hub, “Data Hub — Voter Registration,” Georgia Secretary of State, accessed June 9, 2025, <https://sos.ga.gov/election-data-hub>.

44 Johnny Kauffman, “Inside the Battle for Fulton County’s Votes,” *Atlanta*, February 3, 2021, <https://www.atlantamagazine.com/>

[great-reads/inside-the-battle-for-fulton-countys-votes](#); Linda So, “Trump-Inspired Death Threats Are Terrorizing Election Workers,” Reuters, June 11, 2021, <https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/usa-trump-georgia-threats>; and Kayla Epstein, “Georgia Election Worker Feared for Her Life After Rudy Giuliani’s Election Fraud Claims,” BBC, December 12, 2023, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-67696511>. In one of the cases Adams brought, the Brennan Center, along with co-counsel from Protect Democracy, the Lawyers’ Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, and Krevolin & Horst, LLC, filed an amicus brief on behalf of civil rights organizations setting forth these arguments in greater detail. Brief of Amici Curiae in Support of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, *Adams v. Fulton County Board of Elections and Registration*, No. 24CV006566 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. July 29, 2024).

45 Mark Niesse, “Georgia Election Board Proposes an ‘Inquiry’ Before Certifying Results,” *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, May 9, 2024, <https://www.ajc.com/politics/georgia-election-board-proposes-a-new-rule-before-certifying-results/TW3BLX7EQAQ7I4OD43IF6SSZ4>.

46 Michael Heekin, “Petition to Amend Rule 183-1-2-.02,” March 26, 2024, https://sos.ga.gov/sites/default/files/forms/Rule%20Petition%20-%20Heekin_redacted.pdf [emphasis added]. For a detailed discussion of the proposed rule, see Gowri Ramachandran and Marino Pino, “Comment to the Georgia State Election Board: Reject a Rule Re-Defining Election Certification,” Brennan Center for Justice, July 2, 2024, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/comment-georgia-state-election-board-reject-rule-re-defining-election>.

47 Ga. Code Ann. §§ 21-2-483, 21-2-498, 21-2-495(a).

48 Erin Mansfield and Aysha Bagchi, “Trump Says GA Election Board Members Are ‘Pit Bulls’ for ‘Victory,’ but Is That Their Job?,” *USA TODAY*, August 6, 2024, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2024/08/05/trump-praises-georgia-election-board/74674946007>.

49 George Chidi, “New Georgia Rules Let Local Boards Withhold Election Certification,” *The Guardian*, August 6, 2024, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/article/2024/aug/06/georgia-local-election-boards-allowed-withhold-vote-certification>.

50 *Abhiraman v. State Election Board*, No. 24CV010786 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Aug. 26, 2024); and *Eternal Vigilance Action v. State of Georgia*, No. 24CV011558 (Fulton Cnty. Super. Ct. Sept. 11, 2024).

51 Order Granting Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, *Eternal Vigilance Action*, No. 24CV011558 (Fulton County Super. Ct. Oct. 16, 2024). The order has since been appealed and, as of this publication, is awaiting a decision before the Supreme Court of Georgia. *State of Georgia v. Eternal Vigilance Action*, Nos. S25A0362 and S25A0490 (Ga. 2025).

52 *Republican National Committee v. Eternal Vigilance Action*, No. S25A0362, 2025 WL 1633792, at *24 (Ga. June 10, 2025).

53 On October 25, 2024, the Georgia Court of Appeals issued a ruling denying Adams’s motion for emergency relief. Order, *Adams v. Fulton County*, No. A25E0033 (Ga. Ct. App. Oct. 25, 2024).

54 Matt Cohen, “Fulton County Rejects Election Deniers to Local Board of Elections,” *Democracy Docket*, May 23, 2025, <https://www.democracydocket.com/news-alerts/fulton-county-rejects-electiondeniers-to-local-board-of-elections>.

55 Gringlas, “Georgia Counties Certify the Election.”

56 Mark Niesse, Caleb Groves, and David Wickert, “Georgia Republicans Lay Groundwork to Oppose Certifying Presidential Election,” *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, August 16, 2024, <https://www.ajc.com/politics/georgia-republicans-pursue-power-over-certifying-election-results/JXEh2QC43JCIBJ7QEPXOLSK5SY>.

57 Ron Hanks (chair, Colorado GOP Ballot and Election Security Committee) to 2023 Colorado election canvass boards, Re: Statement to 2023 Election Canvass Boards, July 23, 2024, <https://www.documentcloud.org/documents/24955894-cogop-ballot-and-election-security-chairman-letter-to-canvass-boards>.

www.documentcloud.org/documents/24955894-cogop-ballot-and-election-security-chairman-letter-to-canvass-boards.

58 Erin Mansfield and Natasha Lovato, “With Eyes on November, Colorado Republicans Keep Voting Against Certifying Elections,” *USA TODAY*, August 27, 2024, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/elections/2024/08/25/colorado-republicans-election-certification-2024/74872375007>.

59 Erik Maulbetsch, “Five GOP County Chairs Refuse to Certify Election Results at Direction of Party Leader Who Calls Sec. of State Hitler,” *Colorado Times Recorder*, December 5, 2023, <https://coloradotimesrecorder.com/2023/12/five-gop-county-chairs-refuse-to-certify-election-results-at-direction-of-party-leader-who-calls-sec-of-state-hitler/58294>.

60 Boulder County Republicans, “Boulder County Republicans Decline to Certify the 2023 Coordinated Election,” press release, December 5, 2023, <https://bocogop.org/press-release-boulder-county-republicans-decline-to-certify-the-2023-coordinated-election>.

61 Erik Maulbetsch, “CO GOP Selects Member of QAnon-Linked Conspiracy Group That Organized Jan 6 Caravan as Its ‘Election Integrity’ Chair,” *Colorado Times Recorder*, August 11, 2021, <https://coloradotimesrecorder.com/2021/08/co-gop-selects-member-of-qanon-linked-conspiracy-group-that-organized-jan-6-caravan-as-its-election-integrity-chair/38507>.

62 Boulder County, “Official Results for 2024 Presidential Primary Election Posted Following Successful Risk-Limiting Audit,” press release, March 22, 2024, <https://bouldercounty.gov/news/official-results-for-2024-presidential-primary-election-posted-following-successful-risk-limiting-audit>.

63 Philip Armour, “GOP Votes Against Certification of Boulder County Primary Results, Boulder County Receives Grant to Combat Climate Change,” *KGUN Community Radio* (Boulder, CO), July 12, 2024, <https://kgun.org/gop-votes-against-certification-boulder-county-primary-results-boulder-county-receives-grant-to-combat-climate-change>.

64 Candice Stutzriem (Republican canvass board member, El Paso County, CO) to Steve Schleiker (county clerk and recorder, El Paso County, CO), Re: Minority Report: El Paso County Canvass Board, December 5, 2023, <https://gopelpaso.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/12/Minority-Report-November-2023.pdf>.

65 Candice Stutzriem, “Guest Column: Secretary of State Exceeded the Authority of Her Position,” *The Gazette* (Colorado Springs, CO), April 14, 2024, https://gazette.com/opinion/guest-column-secretary-of-state-exceeded-the-authority-of-her-position/article_245f0908-f8d7-11ee-be3d-878c149afd45.html; and Mansfield and Lovato, “With Eyes on November.”

66 Nancy Pallozzi (Jefferson County Republicans chair and canvass board member, Jefferson County, CO) et al. to Amanda Gonzales (county clerk and recorder, Jefferson County, CO), Re: Jefferson County GOP Refuses to Certify 2023, December 6, 2023, <https://www.mycoloradogop.org/index.php/mygop-articles/446-jefferson-county-gop-refuses-to-certify-2023>.

67 Mansfield and Lovato, “With Eyes on November.”

68 Wilson, “Canvass Board Members in 7 Colorado Counties Vote Against Election Certification.”

69 Office of the Colorado Secretary of State, “Department of State Updates Coloradans on Election Security, Password Disclosure,” press release, November 4, 2024, <https://www.coloradosos.gov/pubs/newsRoom/pressReleases/2024/PR20241104Passwords.html>.

70 In Colorado, canvass boards consist of a Democrat and a Republican appointed by county party chairs and the local county clerk. (Some counties also include an unaffiliated voter on the board.) Colo. Rev. Stat. § 1-10-101(1)(a); and 8 Colo. Code Regs. § 1505-1:10.2.

- 71 Internal Election Security Measures, SB22-153, 75th General Assembly (Colo. 2022), <https://leg.colorado.gov/bills/SB22-153>.
- 72 Sara Wilson, "Vote Tally Certification Refusals Could Undermine 2024 Election, Experts Warn," *Colorado Newsline*, September 15, 2024, <https://coloradonewsline.com/2024/09/15/vote-tally-certification-refusals>.
- 73 Complaint, *Lilly v. Beals*, No. CL24000417-00 (Va. Cir. Ct. Oct. 4, 2024). Waynesboro is an independent city that operates outside of any county government.
- 74 Complaint, *Lilly*, No. CL24000417-00. See also Laura Vozzella, "Waynesboro, Va., Election Officials Sue to Require Hand Count of Ballots," *The Washington Post*, October 15, 2024, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/dc-md-va/2024/10/15/hand-counting-ballots-lawsuit-waynesboro-virginia>.
- 75 See e.g., Virginia Department of Elections, "What ELECT Does Before You Vote," accessed June 9, 2025, <https://www.elections.virginia.gov/elect-backgrounders/what-elect-does-before-you-vote>.
- 76 Alice Clapman and Ben Goldstein, "Hand-Counting Votes: A Proven Bad Idea," Brennan Center for Justice, November 23, 2022, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/analysis-opinion/hand-counting-votes-proven-bad-idea>.
- 77 Virginia Department of Elections, "2024 Registration Statistics," accessed June 9, 2025, <https://www.elections.virginia.gov/resultsreports/registration-statistics/2024-registration-statistics>.
- 78 Complaint for Declaratory Judgment and Injunctive Relief and Verified Petition for Writ of Mandamus, *Lewis v. Lilly*, No. CL24000440-00 (Va. Cir. Ct. Oct. 21, 2024).
- 79 Miller and Wilder, "Certification and Non-Discretion," 29–31.
- 80 Order, *Arizona Alliance of Retired Americans v. Crosby*, No. S0200CV202200552 (Ariz. Sup. Ct. Dec. 1, 2022); and Writ of Mandamus, *Oliver v. Otero County Commission*, No. S-1-SC-39426 (N.M. June 15, 2022).
- 81 Order, *Lewis*, No. CL24000440-00 (Va. Cir. Ct. Nov. 4, 2024).
- 82 Lyra Bordelon, "Waynesboro Board of Elections Certifies 2024 General Election," *The News Leader*, November 12, 2024, <https://www.newsleader.com/story/news/local/elections/2024/11/12/waynesboro-board-of-elections-certifies-2024-general-election/76231330007>; and Virginia State Board of Elections (BOE), "State Board of Elections Agenda," board meeting, January 15, 2025, <https://townhall.virginia.gov/L/GetFile.cfm?File=Meeting\151\41102\Agenda ELECT 41102 v2.pdf>.
- 83 Virginia Department of Elections, "January 15, 2025 — State Board of Elections Meeting," YouTube, 2:14:31, January 15, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BSsJzAo9Oo8>.
- 84 Virginia Department of Elections, "January 15, 2025 — State Board of Elections Meeting"; and Virginia State BOE, "State Board of Elections Agenda," 95–97.
- 85 Chris Graham, "Election-Denier Under Fire from State Body Resigns Seat on Waynesboro Electoral Board," *Augusta Free Press*, February 26, 2025, <https://augustafreepress.com/news/election-denier-under-fire-from-state-body-resigns-seat-on-waynesboro-electoral-board>.
- 86 Virginia State BOE, "State Board of Elections Agenda," 95.
- 87 Virginia State BOE, "State Board of Elections Agenda," 98–102.
- 88 Bryan Schott, "9,800 Southern Utah Ballots in Limbo amid Mail-in Ballot Dispute in Iron County," *The Salt Lake Tribune*, July 8, 2024, <https://www.sltrib.com/news/politics/2024/07/08/9800-southern-utah-ballots-limbo>.
- 89 Schott, "9,800 Southern Utah Ballots in Limbo"; and Jordan Tracy, "Here's Why More than 400 Mail-In Ballots Won't Count in Iron County," ABC4 (Salt Lake City, UT), July 9, 2024, <https://www.abc4.com/news/politics/iron-county-ballots>.
- 90 Bryan Schott, "Iron County Certifies 2024 Primary Election Results Despite Controversy over Ballot Postmarks," *The Salt Lake Tribune*, July 9, 2024, <https://www.sltrib.com/news/politics/2024/07/09/iron-county-certifies-2024-primary>.
- 91 Schott, "9,800 Southern Utah Ballots in Limbo."
- 92 Tracie Sullivan, "Iron County Commission Vote to Certify Election, Ballot Issue Sparks Proposed Legislative Change," *Iron County Today*, July 9, 2024, <https://ironcountytoday.com/2024/07/09/iron-county-commission-vote-to-certify-election-ballot-issue-sparks-proposed-legislative-change>.
- 93 Sullivan, "Iron County Commission Vote to Certify Election."
- 94 Lindsay Aerts, "Iron County Delays Primary Certification Vote Because of Ballot Postmarking Issue," KSLTV (Salt Lake City, UT), July 9, 2024, <https://ksltv.com/659422/iron-county-delays-primary-certification-vote-because-of-ballot-postmarking-issue>.
- 95 Schott, "Iron County Certifies 2024 Primary Election Results"; and Minutes of the Special Iron County Commission Meeting, Re: Canvass of the Iron County June 25, 2024 Primary Election, July 9, 2024, <https://www.utah.gov/pmn/files/1158811.pdf>.
- 96 Sullivan, "Iron County Commission Vote to Certify Election."
- 97 Schott, "Iron County Certifies 2024 Primary Election Results"; Minutes of the Special Iron County Commission Meeting.
- 98 Minutes of the Special Iron County Commission Meeting; and Utah Code Ann. § 20A-4-304(1)(d) [emphasis added].
- 99 Minutes of the Special Iron County Commission Meeting.
- 100 Miller and Wilder, "Certification and Non-Discretion," 29–31. See also National Conference of State Legislatures, "Contested Election Deadlines," last updated November 5, 2024, <https://www.ncsl.org/elections-and-campaigns/contested-election-deadlines>.
- 101 Stearns v. State ex rel. Biggers, 100 P. 909, 911 (Okla. 1909).
- 102 Beth LeBlanc, Francis X. Donnelly, and Craig Mauger, "Wayne Co. Canvassers Certify Election Results After Initial Deadlock," *The Detroit News*, November 18, 2020, <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2020/11/17/wayne-county-canvassers-deadlock-certifying-november-3-election-results/6324274002>.
- 103 Craig Mauger, "Trump Recorded Pressuring Wayne County Canvassers to Not Certify 2020 Vote," *The Detroit News*, December 22, 2023, <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2023/12/21/donald-trump-recorded-pressuring-wayne-canvassers-not-to-certify-2020-vote-michigan/72004514007>.
- 104 Beth Reinhard, Alice Crites, and Dalton Bennett, "Obscure Michigan Board Thrust into Fracas over Electoral Results," *The Washington Post*, November 21, 2020, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obscure-michigan-board-thrust-into-fracas-over-electoral-results/2020/11/21/340d9e9a-2ad2-11eb-b847-66c66ace1afb_story.html.
- 105 Dave Boucher, "Michigan Board Votes to Certify Results Despite GOP Calls to Delay," *Detroit Free Press*, November 23, 2020, <https://www.freep.com/story/news/politics/elections/2020/11/23/did-michigan-certify-election-results-board-canvassers/6388768002>.
- 106 Mich. Const. art. II, § 7, cl. 3.
- 107 Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(2).
- 108 Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(2).
- 109 Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(2). See also Jonathan Brater (director of elections, State of Michigan) to Nancy Przewrocki (county clerk, Delta County, MI), May 16, 2024, 2–3, <https://www.michigan.gov/ag/-/media/Project/Websites/AG/releases/2024/May/Delta-County-Canvassers-Letter-05-16-2024.pdf>.
- 110 Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(2).

- 111** Mich. Comp. Laws §§ 168.822(3), 168.842(4).
- 112** Arpan Lobo, “After Initial Deadlock, Delta County Board Votes to Certify Recall Election Results,” *Detroit Free Press*, May 20, 2024, <https://www.freep.com/story/news/politics/elections/2024/05/20/michigan-delta-county-certifies-election-results/73731427007>.
- 113** ElectionReporting.org, “May 2024 Special Election: Unofficial Results — Delta County Interactive Results Map,” last updated May 7, 2024, <https://electionreporting.com/county/75a2895a-7a1d-4b9d-ac4c-ac355c98ab53>; and Jon King, “Delta County Canvassers Switch Gears, Vote to Certify Recall Election Results,” *Michigan Advance*, May 17, 2024, <https://michiganadvance.com/2024/05/17/delta-county-canvassers-switch-gears-vote-to-certify-recall-election-results>.
- 114** King, “Delta County Canvassers Switch Gears, Vote to Certify Recall Election Results.”
- 115** Lobo, “After Initial Deadlock, Delta County Board Votes to Certify Recall Election Results.”
- 116** Jon King, “Republicans Ousted from Delta County Board After Firing County Administrator,” *Michigan Advance*, May 9, 2024, <https://michiganadvance.com/2024/05/09/republicans-ousted-from-delta-county-board-after-firing-county-administrator>.
- 117** Brater to Przewrocki, May 16, 2024.
- 118** King, “Delta County Canvassers Switch Gears, Vote to Certify Recall Election Results.”
- 119** Brater to Przewrocki, May 16, 2024; Craig Mauger, “Most Election Officials Who Certified Michigan’s 2020 Race Are Gone. Expert Sees Trouble,” *The Detroit News*, August 5, 2025, <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2024/08/05/michigan-election-county-canvassers-boards-vote-certification-donald-trump-kamala-harris/74610733007>; King, “Delta County Canvassers Switch Gears, Vote to Certify Recall Election Results.”
- 120** Mauger, “Most Election Officials Who Certified Michigan’s 2020 Race Are Gone.”
- 121** Complaint for Declaratory Relief, *ACLU of Michigan v. Froman*, No. 2024-0533-CZ (Mich. Cir. Ct. Sept. 3, 2024).
- 122** Stipulated Dismissal Order, *Froman*, No. 2024-0533-CZ (Mich. Cir. Ct. Sept. 10, 2024).
- 123** For example, some state statutes explicitly set forth certification as a distinct, post-canvass step. See, e.g., Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(3), (4). Other state statutes contemplate certification as the final step in the canvass. See, e.g., Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 16-646.
- 124** See generally Miller and Wilder, “Certification and Non-Discretion,” 32–47.
- 125** *Meyers v. Schultz*, 690 N.W.2d 873, 877n6 (Wis. Ct. App. 2004) (quoting *Meyer v. Carman*, 73 N.W.2d 514, 515 (Wis. 1955)); and Miller and Wilder, “Certification and Non-Discretion,” 32–47.
- 126** See, e.g., *City of Hampton v. Williamson*, 887 S.E.2d 555, 557 (Va. 2023) (“Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy employed to compel a public official to perform a purely ministerial duty imposed upon him by law.”) (quoting *Richlands Med. Ass’n v. Commonwealth*, 337 S.E.2d 737, 739 (Va. 1985)).
- 127** See, e.g., Ariz. Rev. Stat. §§ 16-1004(A), 16-1009; and Colo. Rev. Stat. § 18-8-404(1). In Arizona, the attorney general’s office has prosecuted two county officials who voted against certifying the 2022 election results for two offenses: interference with an election officer and conspiracy. Office of the Arizona Attorney General, “Attorney General Mayes Announces Grand Jury Indictment,” press release, November 29, 2023, <https://www.azag.gov/press-release/attorney-general-mayes-announces-grand-jury-indictment>.
- 128** Order, *Lewis*, No. CL24000440-00 (Va. Cir. Ct. Nov. 4, 2024).
- 129** See, e.g., Order, *Crosby*, No. S0200CV202200552 (Ariz. Sup. Ct. Dec. 1, 2022); and Writ of Mandamus, *Oliver*, No. S-1-SC-39426 (N.M. June 15, 2022). For more details on enforcing certification
- through the writ of mandamus, see All Voting is Local et al., *Election Certification Processes and Guardrails*; CREW, *Election Certification Under Threat*; and Derek T. Muller, “Election Subversion and the Writ of Mandamus,” *William & Mary Law Review* 65, no. 2 (2023): 327–87, <https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmlr/vol65/iss2/3>.
- 130** 3 U.S.C. §§ 5(a)(1), 7; Protect Democracy, “Understanding the Electoral Count Reform Act of 2022,” September 18, 2024, <https://protectdemocracy.org/work/understanding-the-electoral-count-reform-act-of-2022>; and Campaign Legal Center, “FAQs on State Implementation of the Electoral Count Reform Act (ECRA),” accessed June 9, 2025, <https://campaignlegal.org/sites/default/files/2024-09/ECRA%20State%20Implementation%20FAQs.pdf>.
- 131** This rule allowed the Nevada secretary of state’s office to file its petition for writ of mandamus directly with the state supreme court in the Washoe County dispute. Petition, *Aguilar*, No. 88965 (Nev. July 11, 2024).
- 132** Order, *In Re: Temporary Modification and Suspension of the Rules of Appellate Procedure and Judicial Administration for Appeals Arising Under the Pennsylvania Election Code*, No. 622 (Pa. Aug. 27, 2024), <https://www.pacourts.us/assets/opinions/Supreme/out/Order%20Entered%20-%20106052097278965811.pdf>. For a discussion of Pennsylvania certification disputes, see Miller and Wilder, “Certification and Non-Discretion,” 20–23; and CREW, *Election Certification Under Threat*, 81–89.
- 133** The Leadership Conference on Civil Human Rights, “National and State Organizations and Local Elected Officials Support Federal Funding for Election Administration,” September 28, 2023, <https://civilrights.org/resource/national-and-state-organizations-and-local-elected-officials-support-federal-funding-for-election-administration> (letter to Congress that highlights “urgent gaps in equipment, personnel, and facilities” and explains that “when election administration is not adequately resourced, the core functions of our elections and the democratic process are threatened”).
- 134** See, e.g., Suriani, “Local Officials Cannot Block Election Certification.”
- 135** See Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(2); and Colo. Rev. Stat. §§ 1-10-101.5(1)(c), 1-10-104(3).
- 136** Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(2). See also Brater to Przewrocki, May 16, 2024, 2–3.
- 137** Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.822(2).
- 138** See, e.g., Mich. Comp. Laws § 168.842(4).
- 139** See, e.g., Petition, *Aguilar*, No. 88965 (Nev. July 11, 2024); Order, *Crosby*, No. S0200CV202200552 (Ariz. Sup. Ct. Dec. 1, 2022); and Writ of Mandamus, *Oliver*, No. S-1-SC-39426 (N.M. June 15, 2022).
- 140** See, e.g., Complaint in Mandamus and for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, *Cartwright v. Luzerne County Board of Elections*, No. 202210782 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Nov. 29, 2022).
- 141** Order, *Lewis*, No. CL240004400-00 (Va. Cir. Ct. Nov. 4, 2024). See also, e.g., *ACLU of Nevada v. County of Nye*, 519 P.3d 36, 36n3 (Nev. 2022) (rejecting the argument that the American Civil Liberties Union could not enforce election laws in a mandamus action).
- 142** N.M. Stat. Ann. § 1–13–1(C). The New Mexico Constitution also grants the New Mexico Supreme Court original jurisdiction over mandamus proceedings, meaning that a litigant could also file an action directly with the state supreme court. N.M. Const. art. VI, § 3.
- 143** Norman Eisen and Clare Boone, “The Counties That May Try Not to Certify the 2024 Election,” Brookings Institution, October 25, 2024, <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/the-counties-that-may-try-not-to-certify-the-2024-election>.
- 144** Complaint for Declaratory Relief, *Froman*, No. 2024-0533-CZ (Mich. Cir. Ct. Sept. 3, 2024) (complaint filed on behalf of the ACLU, its members who vote in Kalamazoo County, and two individual voters); and Complaint, *Lilly*, No. CL24000417-00 (Va. Cir. Ct. Oct. 4, 2024).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

► **Lauren Miller Karalunas** is counsel in the Brennan Center’s Democracy Program, where she litigates voting rights, election interference, and constitutional law cases; advises lawmakers and administrators on legislation and policy; and testifies before state legislatures. Prior to joining the Brennan Center, Miller Karalunas was a Public Rights Project Fellow and special assistant state’s attorney in the Cook County (Illinois) State’s Attorney’s Office, where she worked in the affirmative and impact litigation section. Miller Karalunas has commented on voting and election issues for a variety of media outlets, including the Associated Press, NPR, and *Rolling Stone*. In 2024, she coauthored “Certification and Non-Discretion: A Guide to Protecting the 2024 Election” in the *Stanford Law & Policy Review*. Miller Karalunas has a BA with honors and distinction from Stanford University and earned her JD from Yale Law School. She clerked for Judge John R. Blakey of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Brennan Center extends deep gratitude to our supporters, who make this report and all our work possible. See them at brennancenter.org/supporters.

The author is grateful to colleagues Marcelo Agudo, Rodas Beyene, Veronica Degraffenreid, Zachary Laub, Sean Morales-Doyle, Larry Norden, Eileen O’Connor, Gowri Ramachandran, Janet Romero-Bahari, Catherine Silvestri, Derek Tisler, Kendall Verhovek, Wendy Weiser, and Connie Wu for their contributions, as well as to former clinical student Sam Ozer-Staton and copy editor Stephanie Sykes. The author is also grateful to the Brennan Center’s long-standing partners at All Voting is Local, Campaign Legal Center, and Protect Democracy for their thoughtful collaboration and guidance on the issue of certification.

**BRENNAN
CENTER**

FOR JUSTICE

Brennan Center for Justice at New York University School of Law
120 Broadway // 17th Floor // New York, NY 10271
brennancenter.org