

REC'D & FILED
2022 FEB 18 PM 1:01
AUDREY ROWLATT
CLERK
BY C. COO
DEPUTY

1 BRADLEY S. SCHRAGER, ESQ. (NSB 10217)
JOHN SAMBERG, ESQ. (NSB 10828)
2 DANIEL BRAVO, ESQ. (NSB 13078)
WOLF, RIFKIN, SHAPIRO, SCHULMAN & RABKIN, LLP
3 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 590 South
Las Vegas, NV 89169
4 (702) 341-5200/Fax: (702) 341-5300
bschrager@wrslawyers.com
5 jsamberg@wrslawyers.com
dbravo@wrslawyers.com

6
7 ELISABETH C. FROST, ESQ. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
SPENCER MCCANDLESS, ESQ. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
8 10 G St. NE Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002
9 (202) 968-4490/Fax: (202) 968-4498
efrost@elias.law
10 smccandless@elias.law

11 LINDSAY MCALEER, ESQ. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
12 1700 Seventh Ave, Suite 2100
Seattle, WA 98101
13 (206) 656-0235/Fax: (202) 968-4498
lmcaleer@elias.law

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

15 **IN THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT**
16 **OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN AND FOR CARSON CITY**

18 EMILY PERSAUD-ZAMORA, an individual,
19
20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 BARBARA CEGAVSKE, in her official
23 capacity as NEVADA SECRETARY OF
STATE,
24 Defendant.

Case No.: 220000022 B
Dept. No.: F

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
CHALLENGING INITIATIVE
PETITION C-03-2022**

**Priority Matter, Pursuant to
NRS 295.061(1)**

Arbitration Exemption: Declaratory and
Injunctive Relief

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

1 Plaintiff Emily Persaud-Zamora, an individual registered to vote in Nevada, files this
2 Complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief against Barbara Cegavske, in her official capacity
3 as the Nevada Secretary of State, pursuant to NRS 295.061, 30.030 and 33.010. Plaintiff alleges
4 and complains as follows:

5 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6 1. This Court has jurisdiction to hear Plaintiff's claims pursuant to NRS 295.061 and
7 to grant declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to NRS 30.030, 30.040, and 33.010.

8 2. Venue is proper under NRS 13.020 and 13.040 because this action is against a
9 public officer for acting in her official capacity, and also pursuant to NRS 295.061(1).

10 PARTIES

11 3. Plaintiff Emily Persaud-Zamora is a resident of and a registered voter in Clark
12 County, Nevada.

13 4. Defendant Barbara Cegavske is Nevada Secretary of State and is sued in her official
14 capacity. As the Secretary of State, Ms. Cegavske is the Chief Officer of Elections for Nevada and
15 is responsible for the execution, administration, and enforcement of the state's election laws. *See*
16 NRS 293.124. Ms. Cegavske's duties also include qualifying initiatives for submission to the
17 Nevada Legislature and/or the Nevada electorate and disqualifying initiatives that are determined
18 to be invalid.

19 GENERAL FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20 5. On or about January 28, 2022, David G. Gibbs, on behalf of the Repair the Vote
21 political action committee, filed Initiative Petition C-03-2022 (the "Petition") with the Nevada
22 Secretary of State. *See Exhibit 1*, a true and accurate copy of the Notice of Intent to Circulate
23 Statewide Initiative or Referendum Petition associated with Initiative Petition C-03-2022.

24 6. The Petition seeks to amend the Nevada Constitution to impose two significant
25 changes to the state's electoral system. To make these changes, the Petition would enact two new
26 sections within Article II of the Nevada Constitution. *See Ex. 1 at 2*, a true and accurate copy of
27 the filed Petition.

28

1 7. The first change that the Petition would require would be to impose a strict voter
2 identification requirement on in-person voting, mandating that voters present an acceptable form
3 of government-issued photo identification to be given a ballot. Acceptable forms of identification
4 would include a Nevada driver's license, U.S. passport, or Nevada concealed firearms permit,
5 among others. The Petition would not provide for free identification cards for those who cannot
6 afford them. It would also establish differing rules for voters using expired identification cards
7 depending on the individual voter's age: while most voters would be prohibited from using
8 identification that is more than four years expired, voters over 70 would be permitted to use cards
9 that have been expired for any length of time.

10 8. The second change that the Petition would make would be to revise the vote by
11 mail process to require Nevadans who vote by mail to include an identifying number from one of
12 several specified government-issued documents with their mail-in ballots. *See* Ex. 1 at 2. Voters
13 who possess a Nevada driver's license would be required to list the last four digits of their license
14 numbers, those who lack a qualifying license would list the last four digits of their Social Security
15 numbers, and those that have neither a qualifying license nor a Social Security number would list
16 a special number provided for this purpose by the county clerk when they registered to vote. Ex. 1
17 at 2.

18 9. Implementation of a similar law in Texas recently required an expensive redesign
19 of carrier envelopes to accommodate the new requirements, as well as an extensive training
20 program for county officials.¹ The Petition does not provide any means for raising any revenue for
21 implementing either of these changes to Nevada's in-person or vote by mail processes.

22 10. The Petition's description of effect reads, in full:

23 If passed, this initiative would amend the State Constitution to require that
24 all persons voting in person present an approved photo identification before
25 being provided a ballot. It also requires that voters submitting a mail-in
 ballot provide additional verification of their identity when completing their

26 ¹ *See* Taylor Goldenstein, *Texas Secretary of State scrambles to address mail ballot*
27 *application problems as deadline looms*, Houston Chronicle (Jan. 19, 2022),
28 <https://www.houstonchronicle.com/politics/texas/article/Texas-Secretary-of-State-scrambles-to-address-16786098.php>.

1 mail-in ballot using the number provided on their voter registration form
2 when they registered to vote. This amendment will increase voter integrity
3 by ensuring that any person casting a ballot in Nevada is, in fact, the duly
4 registered voter. It will also improve and speed up the mail-in ballot
5 verification process by providing a second, more secure means of verifying
6 that the mail-in ballot was completed by the registered voter. Nevadans
7 want confidence that all ballots submitted during an election are cast only
8 by eligible voters.

9 Ex. 1 at 3, 4.

10 11. In short, the measure is being characterized and justified to voters in the description
11 of effect as a “voter integrity” measure, to “ensure[]” that all ballots cast in Nevada “are cast only
12 by eligible voters.” Ex. 1 at 3, 4. At the same time, the description of effect is utterly silent on the
13 impact that the measure would have on eligible Nevada voters’ ability to successfully exercise
14 their right to vote, should it be enacted.

15 12. In reality, the negative effects of strict voter identification laws like those the
16 Petition proposes are well documented, and the need for such measures to safeguard “voter
17 integrity” and prevent voter fraud has been widely debunked and discredited. One widely-cited
18 study found that as many as 11% of U.S. citizens—or more than 21 million Americans—do not
19 have government-issued photo identification. The shortfall does not fall evenly across all
20 demographics: Black, Hispanic, young, and low-income voters are many times more likely to lack
21 these forms of identification than their respective white, non-Hispanic, older, and higher-income
22 counterparts. And the combined cost of document fees, travel expenses, and waiting time needed
23 to obtain even ostensibly “free” identification cards is has been estimated to range from \$75 to
24 \$175, making it cost prohibitive for many eligible voters to rectify their lack of identification.
25 Consequently, the U.S. Government Accountability Office estimates that strict voter identification
26 requirements reduce turnout by two to three percent, translating to thousands of fewer voters
27 casting their ballots every election cycle. In Nevada, this suppressive effect is likely to be even
28 greater, as identification cards are not free for the vast majority of voters regardless of income—
for individuals over 25, the State currently provides only a “one-time fee exemption” only to

1 unhoused individuals and only for “a *duplicate* Nevada License or ID Card.”² As noted, the
2 Petition would do nothing to expand this access.

3 13. Likewise, so-called “verification” procedures like those the Petition proposes for
4 Nevada’s vote-by-mail voters have caused large scale disenfranchisement and election
5 administration problems in other states that have attempted to impose similar processes. In Texas,
6 a similar newly instituted requirement has already resulted in thousands of vote by mail
7 applications and hundreds of returned ballots being rejected.³ In Harris County, Texas, a full 40%
8 of mail-in ballots returned since the new law took effect have been flagged for rejection because
9 they lacked an identifying number or contained one that differed from the one the voters provided
10 when registering, sometimes decades before.⁴ As noted above, implementation of the law was also
11 costly, both in terms of mechanics and election worker training, not to mention the significant
12 voter education efforts that would have to be undertaken to attempt to minimize the number of
13 voters who would be disenfranchised as a result of these significant changes to the methods by
14 which Nevadans vote.

15 14. The costs and problems associated with the Petition at issue here are likely to be
16 much worse, given that reliance on voting by mail in Nevada is far more prevalent than in Texas.
17 Indeed, Nevada has been increasingly moving to a near-all-mail voting system, and under current
18 law all voters receive mail-in ballots unless they opt out. *See* A.B. 321, § 3(1), 2021 Reg. Sess.
19 (Nev. 2021).

22 ² Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles, *Nevada Identification Cards*,
23 <https://dmvnev.com/idcards.htm> (last visited Feb. 16, 2022) (emphases in original).

24 ³ Gabriel C. Pérez, *Election officials say Texas’ new ID rules for voting by mail could cause*
25 *more ballots to get rejected*, Austin Monitor (Feb. 8, 2022),
<https://www.austinmonitor.com/stories/2022/02/election-officials-say-texas-new-id-rules-for-voting-by-mail-could-cause-more-ballots-to-get-rejected/>.

26 ⁴ Alexa Ura, *Hundreds of mail-in ballots are being returned to Texas voters because they*
27 *don’t comply with new voting law*, Texas Tribune (Feb. 10, 2022),
28 <https://www.texastribune.org/2022/02/10/texas-mail-voting-rejections/>.

1 15. At the same time, study after study has found that the incidence of voter-
2 impersonation fraud that voter identification laws purportedly aim to prevent is so negligible as to
3 be nearly nonexistent.⁵ Despite the highly charged partisan rhetoric to the contrary, an estimated
4 one person for every *ten million* votes cast faced voter fraud charges stemming from the 2020
5 election.

6 16. Nevada was no exception. Here, fewer than twenty-five out of the state's over 1.3
7 million ballots were even *flagged for further review* in an audit by the Secretary of State's office.⁶
8 The sole guilty plea to have emerged was by a Nevada man who himself cast his deceased wife's
9 absentee ballot *in order to create the appearance of voter fraud* for political reasons.

10 17. In sum, the Petition's claim in the description of effect that the amendments "will
11 increase voter integrity" and address purported concerns by Nevadans about "confidence that all
12 ballots submitted during an election are cast only by eligible voters" assumes as truth baseless
13 propaganda that has been propagated for partisan gain.

14 18. All credible evidence suggests that voter identification laws are a solution in search
15 of a problem that do far more harm than good, making it unnecessarily harder for lawful eligible
16 voters to cast their ballots (and far more likely that their ballots will be rejected) while adding little
17 if anything in the way of election security.

18 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

19 **Violation of Description of Effect Requirement, NRS 295.009(1)(b)**

20 19. The foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint are realleged and fully incorporated as
21 if set forth in full herein.

22
23
24 ⁵ See, e.g., Brennan Center for Justice, *Debunking the Voter Fraud Myth* 1-4 (2020)
25 [https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/analysis/Briefing_Memo_Debunking_Voter_Fr
aud_Myth.pdf](https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/analysis/Briefing_Memo_Debunking_Voter_Fraud_Myth.pdf) (collecting sources).

26 ⁶ David Charms, *I-Team: A year and one guilty plea later, Republicans remain quiet on*
27 *false allegations of voter fraud*, 8 News Now Las Vegas (Dec. 3, 2021)
28 [https://www.8newsnow.com/i-team/i-team-year-and-guilty-plea-later-republicans-remain-quiet-
on-false-allegations-of-voter-fraud-nevada-las-vegas/](https://www.8newsnow.com/i-team/i-team-year-and-guilty-plea-later-republicans-remain-quiet-on-false-allegations-of-voter-fraud-nevada-las-vegas/).

1 20. NRS 295.009(1)(b) requires that initiative petitions “set forth, in not more than 200
2 words, a description of the effect of the initiative or referendum if the initiative or referendum is
3 approved by the voters.”

4 21. “[A] description of effect must identify what the law proposes and how it intends
5 to achieve that proposal.” *Educ. Initiative PAC v. Comm. to Protect Nev. Jobs*, 129 Nev. 35, 42,
6 293 P.3d 874, 879 (2013). In doing so, the description of effect “must be straightforward, succinct,
7 and nonargumentative, and it must not be deceptive or misleading.” *Id.* at 42 (internal quotation
8 marks and citation omitted). A description of effect must also sufficiently “explain the[]
9 ramifications of the proposed amendment” to allow voters to make an informed decision. *Nev.*
10 *Judges Ass’n v. Lau*, 112 Nev. 51, 59, 910 P.2d 898, 903 (1996).

11 22. Here, the description of effect is legally deficient because it is argumentative,
12 confusing, deceptive, and misleading. Most obviously, it contains multiple subjective, normative
13 judgments regarding the new voter identification requirements the Petition would enact that are
14 quintessentially “argumentative”.

15 23. The entire second half of the description—three out of its five sentences—contains
16 only blatant advocacy for the Petition’s enactment and provides no objective information to
17 “inform [voters] at the time of signing of the nature and effect of that which is proposed.” *Stumpf*
18 *v. Lau*, 108 Nev. 826, 833, 839 P.2d 120, 124 (1992). This misplaced self-promotion renders the
19 description invalid. *See No Solar Tax PAC v. Citizens for Solar & Energy Fairness*, No. 70146,
20 2016 WL 4182739 at *2 (Nev. 2016) (invalidating an “argumentative” referendum description that
21 claimed charges under existing law were “unaffordable and cost-prohibitive” and that repeal of the
22 law would result in rates that were more “reasonable”).

23 24. First, the description asserts that the proposed measure will “increase voter integrity
24 by ensuring that any person casting a ballot in Nevada is, in fact, the duly registered voter.”
25 Nowhere does the Petition explain what “voter integrity” means. *Cf. id.* at *2 (invalidating a
26 description that “us[ed] terms that are not in the statutory language, such as ‘green energy’”).
27 “Integrity” is commonly defined as “the quality of being honest and fair” or “the state of being
28 complete or whole.” Integrity, Merriam-Webster (2022), <https://www.merriam->

1 webster.com/dictionary/integrity. Assuming the term “voter integrity” refers to the integrity of the
2 voters, the claim that voter identification will increase voters’ integrity is self-evidently inaccurate.
3 Requiring voters to show identification when they vote will not make them more honest or fair, as
4 these are ethical qualities that depend solely on the personal character of the individual. Moreover,
5 asserting that the policy would make voters more honest necessarily implies that they are currently
6 *dishonest* to some significant degree, and there is no evidence that this is the case.

7 25. For similar reasons, this sentence would be argumentative and misleading even if
8 “voter integrity” were interpreted to mean the integrity of Nevada’s electoral processes. There is
9 no evidence that elections in Nevada are not currently conducted in a way that is honest, fair, and
10 provides for a complete accounting of legal votes. Further, the assertion that the new voter
11 identification requirement will make elections more honest, fair, or complete is contrary to most
12 studies on the subject. If anything, arbitrarily precluding large numbers of legal, eligible voters
13 from casting their ballots will make elections *less* fair and their results a *less* complete and honest
14 reflection of the sentiments of the electorate.

15 26. Next, the description claims that it would “also improve and speed up the mail-in
16 ballot verification process by providing a second, more secure means of verifying that the mail-in
17 ballot was completed by the registered voter.” Ex. 1 at 3, 4. The assertion that the amendment
18 would “improve” the current mail-in ballot verification process is a normative value judgement
19 that is inherently argumentative—“a catch-all that is subject to shifting and imprecise meanings,
20 not a neutral, descriptive phrase” as Nevada law requires. *Prevent Sanctuary Cities v. Haley*, No.
21 74966, 2018 WL 2272955 at *4 (Nev. 2018). Nor is there any evidence that new procedure would
22 be faster or more secure than Nevada’s current processes; in fact, election officials currently use
23 automated signature verification machines, and adding an additional step requiring a cross-
24 reference to information in the voter’s file would likely slow down the process, not speed it up.
25 And, again, the implication that the current system is insecure is rank speculation with no basis in
26 fact.

27 27. The description additionally states that “Nevadans want confidence that all ballots
28 submitted during an election are cast only by eligible voters.” Ex. 1 at 3, 4. If the description is

1 asserting that Nevadans currently lack confidence or have good reason to doubt that only eligible
2 ballots are being counted in the state’s elections, this claim has no basis in objective fact. And if
3 the description is audaciously claiming that Nevadans support the measures it would enact, the
4 statement is at best premature and at worst objectively false. The Petition obviously cannot speak
5 on behalf of all Nevadans, who hold a diverse range of viewpoints and policy preferences, and
6 attempts to garner signatures through peer pressure have no place in the description of effect NRS
7 295.009(1)(b) requires.

8 28. These argumentative statements alone are sufficient to render the Petition’s
9 description legally invalid. *See No Solar Tax PAC*, 2016 WL 4182739 at *2. But the description
10 of effect is also misleading because it fails to give a complete and accurate accounting of the
11 Petition’s effects. It does not, for example, specify any of the documents that would constitute “an
12 approved photo identification” for purposes of in-person voting. Nor does it mention that the
13 Petition would set differing rules for voters’ use of expired identification cards depending on the
14 individual voter’s age. And it does not explain which “number provided on [a] voter registration
15 form” voters will be required to use to “provide additional verification of their identity” when
16 casting a mail-in ballot. As a result of this requirement, many *eligible* voters could have their mail-
17 in ballots rejected because the form of verification they provide on their ballot may not be the same
18 form of verification they provided when they registered to vote—a fact that is highly relevant to
19 prospective signatories’ decision. Because it does not include these important details, the
20 description does not fully “identify what the law proposes and how it intends to achieve that
21 proposal.” *Educ. Initiative PAC*, 129 Nev. at 42, 293 P.3d at 879.

22 29. The description also falsely claims that, if enacted, “all persons voting in person
23 [must] present an approved photo identification before being provided a ballot.” Ex. 1 at 3, 4.
24 Federal law requires that election officials give voters who assert their eligibility at least a
25 provisional ballot. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 21082. The Petition cannot abrogate or circumvent this
26 mandate, and the amendments it propose would be preempted to the extent they conflict with this
27 requirement. *Rolf Jensen & Associates v. Dist. Ct.*, 128 Nev. 441, 445, 282 P.3d 743, 746 (2012).
28 The description therefore misleadingly claims that the Petition would have an outcome that it is

1 powerless to achieve.

2 30. Finally, the description of effect's reference to a number entered on a voter
3 registration form is confusing and misleading because the Petition does not mention voter
4 registration forms at all. One of the new constitutional amendments the Petition proposes would
5 require that voters include with their mail-in ballots the last four digits of their drivers' licenses,
6 Social Security numbers, or a unique number provided to them by the county clerk when they
7 registered to vote, but nowhere does it indicate that these numbers must also be provided on the
8 voters' initial registration forms. And while the current Nevada voter registration form requests
9 this information, Nevada voters who registered before this form may have provided different
10 information, and nothing in the Petition would prevent the form from being changed, meaning the
11 description is wrong to claim that the new amendment would "require[]" voters to verify their
12 identity with information provided on their registration form. Ex. 1 at 3, 4. The description of effect
13 therefore misleadingly includes a requirement that does not appear in the actual amendments the
14 Petition would enact.

15 31. Collectively, these argumentative statements, omissions, and misstatements render
16 the Petition's description of effect legally deficient.

17 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **Violation of Unfunded Expenditure Prohibition, Nev. Const. Art. 19, Sec. 6**

19 32. The foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint are realleged and fully incorporated as
20 if set forth in full herein.

21 33. Nevada Constitution Article 19, Section 6 prohibits any initiative that "makes an
22 appropriation or otherwise requires the expenditure of money, unless such statute or amendment
23 also imposes a sufficient tax, not prohibited by the Constitution, or otherwise constitutionally
24 provides for raising the necessary revenue." Nev. Const. art. 19, § 6.

25 34. "Section 6 applies to *all* proposed initiatives, without exception, and *does not*
26 *permit* any initiative that fails to comply with the stated conditions." *Rogers v. Heller*, 117 Nev.
27 169, 173, 18 P.3d 1034, 1036 (2001) (emphases in original). When an initiative violates this
28 "threshold content restriction" by mandating unfunded expenditures, it is void ab initio, and pre-

1 election intervention by Nevada courts is warranted. *Herbst Gaming, Inc. v. Heller*, 122 Nev. 877,
2 891, 141 P.3d 1224, 1233 (2006) (quoting *Rogers*, 117 Nev. at 173, 18 P.3d at 1036).

3 35. The new restrictions the Petition proposes would come only with significant public
4 expense, as has been the case elsewhere. See National Conference of State Legislatures, *Costs of*
5 *Voter Identification*, (June 2014), [https://www.ncsl.org/documents/legismgt/elect/Voter_ID_Cos](https://www.ncsl.org/documents/legismgt/elect/Voter_ID_Costs_June2014.pdf)
6 [ts_June2014.pdf](https://www.ncsl.org/documents/legismgt/elect/Voter_ID_Costs_June2014.pdf). The new in-person voter ID requirements alone would necessitate an extensive
7 voter education and public outreach campaign, revised and additional election materials, and
8 expanded poll worker training and wages, which have cost hundreds of thousands of dollars in
9 states that have adopted similar laws. See *id.* at 2-3. Nevada would also likely have to expand
10 access to free identification cards in order for the new scheme to be constitutional, which would
11 come with additional associated costs. *Id.* at 2 (citing *Crawford v. Marion Cnty. Election Bd.*, 553
12 U.S. 181, 196-97 (2008)).

13 36. The new mail-in ballot identification requirements would mandate that the State
14 spend even more funds. Mail ballots and envelopes would have to be redesigned, see Goldenstein,
15 *supra* n.1, and automated signature verification machines would need to be recalibrated to
16 accommodate the extra verification digits added to the signature line. A process for conducting the
17 verification would also need to be developed, with election officials trained on the new procedures
18 and, if the verification is to be automated, new software and equipment purchased. And, to the
19 extent election officials currently lack the information required to perform the verification for
20 many voters—including those who registered to vote using a previous version of the registration
21 form and those who acquired or canceled their Nevada driver’s licenses in the interim since they
22 registered to vote—the new verification requirement would necessitate an expensive information
23 gathering campaign on the part of the State.

24 37. Each of these expenditures is inherently required by the Petition, whose measures
25 cannot be achieved without them. By commanding Nevada officials to implement and maintain
26 the new identification requirements, the Petition leaves “budgeting officials no discretion in
27 appropriating or expending the money mandated by the initiative—the budgeting official must
28 approve the appropriation or expenditure” to comply with its provisions. *Herbst Gaming*, 122 Nev.

1 at 890, 141 P.3d at 1233. The Petition thus requires an appropriation and expenditure. And, because
2 no portion of the Petition “provides for raising the necessary revenue,” as Article 19, Section 6
3 requires, it is void *ab initio*. *Rogers*, 117 Nev. at 173, 18 P.3d at 1036.

4 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

5 **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff asks this Court to enter an order:

6 1. Declaring that the Petition’s description of effect does not comply with NRS
7 295.009(1)(b) because it is argumentative, confusing, deceptive, and misleading, and does not
8 sufficiently explain the ramifications of the Petition, and therefore invalid;

9 2. Declaring that the Petition does not comply with Article 19, Section 6 of the Nevada
10 Constitution because it impermissibly mandates an unfunded expenditure;

11 3. Enjoining and prohibiting the Nevada Secretary of State from placing the Petition
12 on the 2022 general election ballot, or from taking further action upon it;

13 4. Awarding Plaintiff her reasonable costs and attorneys’ fees; and

14 5. Granting such other relief as the Court deems appropriate.

15
16 ///

17 ///

18 ///

19 ///

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **AFFIRMATION**

2 The undersigned hereby affirm that the foregoing document does not contain the social
3 security number of any person.

4 DATED this 18th day of February, 2022.

5 **WOLF, RIFKIN, SHAPIRO,**
6 **SCHULMAN & RABKIN, LLP**

7 By: 

8 BRADLEY S. SCHRAGER, ESQ. (NSB 10217)
9 JOHN SAMBERG, ESQ. (NSB 10828)
10 DANIEL BRAVO, ESQ. (NSB 13078)
11 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 590 South
12 Las Vegas, NV 89169
13 (702) 341-5200/Fax: (702) 341-5300
14 bschrager@wrslawyers.com
15 jsamberg@wrslawyers.com
16 dbravo@wrslawyers.com

17 ELISABETH C. FROST, ESQ. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)
18 SPENCER MCCANDLESS, ESQ. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)

19 **ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP**

20 10 G St. NE Suite 600
21 Washington, DC 20002
22 (202) 968-4490/Fax: (202) 968-4498
23 efrost@elias.law
24 smccandless@elias.law

25 LINDSAY MCALEER, ESQ. (*pro hac vice forthcoming*)

26 **ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP**

27 1700 Seventh Ave, Suite 2100
28 Seattle, WA 98101
(206) 656-0235/Fax: (202) 968-4498
lmcaleer@elias.law

Attorneys for Plaintiff

EXHIBIT 1

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

EXHIBIT 1

received
Jan. 28, 2002

NOTICE OF INTENT TO CIRCULATE STATEWIDE INITIATIVE OR REFERENDUM PETITION

State of Nevada



Secretary of State Barbara K. Cegavske

Pursuant to NRS 295.015, before a petition for initiative or referendum may be presented to registered voters for signatures, the person who intends to circulate the petition must provide the following information:

NAME OF PERSON FILING THE PETITION

David G. Gibbs

NAME(S) OF PERSON(S) AUTHORIZED TO WITHDRAW OR AMEND THE PETITION (provide up to three)

1. David G. Gibbs
- 2.
- 3.

NAME OF THE POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE (PAC) ADVOCATING FOR THE PASSAGE OF THE INITIATIVE OR REFERENDUM (if none, leave blank)

Repair the Vote

Please note, if you are creating a Political Action Committee for the purpose of advocating for the passage of the initiative or referendum, you must complete a separate PAC registration form.

Additionally, a copy of the initiative or referendum, including the description of effect, must be filed with the Secretary of State's office at the time you submit this form.

X

Signature of Petition Filer

Jan 22

Date

State of Nevada - Initiative Petition – Constitutional Amendment

The People of the State of Nevada do enact as follows:

FULL TEXT OF THE PROPOSED MEASURE

Article 2 of the Nevada Constitution is hereby amended by adding thereto new sections to be designated as Section 1B and Section 1C, to read as follows:

Sec 1B. Photo Identification. Each voter in Nevada shall present photo identification to verify their identity when voting in person at a polling place during early voting or on election day before being provided a ballot. To be considered valid, the photo identification must be current or expired for no more than four years. If the voter is 70 years old or more, the identification can be expired for any length of time, so long as it is otherwise valid. Acceptable forms of identification include:

1. Nevada driver's license.
2. Identification card issued by the State of Nevada, any other State, or the US Government.
3. Employee photo identification card issued by the US government, Nevada government, or any county, municipality, board, authority, or other Nevada government entity.
4. US passport.
5. US military identification card.
6. Student photo identification card issued by a Nevada public college, university, or technical school.
7. Tribal photo identification.
8. Nevada concealed firearms permit.
9. Other form of government-issued photo identification that the Legislature may approve.

Sec 1C. Voter Verification. Each voter in Nevada who votes by mail-in ballot shall enter one of the following in the block provided next to the voter's signature for election officials to use in verifying the voter's identity:

1. The last four digits of their Nevada driver's license number.
2. If the voter does not possess a Nevada driver's license, the last four digits of their Social Security number.
3. If the voter has neither a Nevada driver's license or a Social Security number, the number provided by the county clerk when the voter registered to vote.

The remainder of this page intentionally left blank.

DESCRIPTION OF EFFECT

If passed, this initiative would amend the State Constitution to require that all persons voting in person present an approved photo identification before being provided a ballot. It also requires that voters submitting a mail-in ballot provide additional verification of their identity when completing their mail-in ballot using the number provided on their voter registration form when they registered to vote. This amendment will increase voter integrity by ensuring that any person casting a ballot in Nevada is, in fact, the duly registered voter. It will also improve and speed up the mail-in ballot verification process by providing a second, more secure means of verifying that the mail-in ballot was completed by the registered voter. Nevadans want confidence that all ballots submitted during an election are cast only by eligible voters.

County of _____ (**Only registered voters of this county may sign below**)
 Petition District _____ (**Only registered voters of this petition district may sign below**)

This Space For
Office Use Only

1	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____ / /	CITY _____	COUNTY _____
2	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____ / /	CITY _____	COUNTY _____
3	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____ / /	CITY _____	COUNTY _____
4	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____ / /	CITY _____	COUNTY _____
5	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____ / /	CITY _____	COUNTY _____
6	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____ / /	CITY _____	COUNTY _____

DESCRIPTION OF EFFECT

If passed, this initiative would amend the State Constitution to require that all persons voting in person present an approved photo identification before being provided a ballot. It also requires that voters submitting a mail-in ballot provide additional verification of their identity when completing their mail-in ballot using the number provided on their voter registration form when they registered to vote. This amendment will increase voter integrity by ensuring that any person casting a ballot in Nevada is, in fact, the duly registered voter. It will also improve and speed up the mail-in ballot verification process by providing a second, more secure means of verifying that the mail-in ballot was completed by the registered voter. Nevadans want confidence that all ballots submitted during an election are cast only by eligible voters.

County of _____ **(Only registered voters of this county may sign below)**
 Petition District _____ **(Only registered voters of this petition district may sign below)**

This Space For
Office Use Only

7	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE DATE / /	CITY	COUNTY
8	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE DATE / /	CITY	COUNTY
9	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE DATE / /	CITY	COUNTY
10	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE DATE / /	CITY	COUNTY
11	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE DATE / /	CITY	COUNTY
12	PRINT YOUR NAME (first name, initial, last name)	RESIDENCE ADDRESS ONLY	
	YOUR SIGNATURE DATE / /	CITY	COUNTY

THE FOLLOWING AFFIDAVIT MUST BE COMPLETED AND SIGNED:

AFFIDAVIT OF CIRCULATOR
(TO BE SIGNED BY CIRCULATOR)

STATE OF NEVADA)
)
COUNTY OF _____)

I, _____, (print name), being first duly sworn under penalty of perjury, depose and say: (1) that

I reside at _____

(print street, city and state); (2) that I am 18 years of age or older; (3) that I personally circulated this document; (4) that all signatures were affixed in my presence; (5) that the number of signatures affixed thereon is _____; and (6) that each person who signed had an opportunity before signing to read the full text of the act or resolution on which the initiative or referendum is demanded.

Subscribed and sworn to or affirmed before me this
_____ day of _____, _____, by _____.

Signature of Circulator

Notary Public or person authorized to administer oath

EL501C
Revised 8/2019

Page 4 of 4

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM