



STATE OF MICHIGAN
BUREAU OF ELECTIONS
LANSING

May 24, 2024

REVIEW OF NOMINATING PETITIONS

Anil Kumar
Democratic Candidate for U.S. Representative in Congress, 10th District

NUMBER OF VALID SIGNATURES REQUIRED: 1,000 signatures.

TOTAL FILING: 1,901 signatures.

RESULT OF FACE REVIEW: 950 facially valid signatures, 951 invalid signatures.

Total number of signatures filed		1,901
Not registered	<i>Less:</i>	152
Invalid signature (signature is omitted or does not sufficiently agree with the signature on file)	<i>Less:</i>	781
Invalid address (address is blank, missing house number or street name, or PO Box listed)	<i>Less:</i>	1
Invalid city or township (no city or township by that name located within the county listed at the top of the petition sheet or the city/township field was left blank)	<i>Less:</i>	10
Invalid date (signature is dated before the first date signatures may be circulated; signer’s signature is dated after the circulator dated their signature; date is incomplete, illegible, or missing)	<i>Less:</i>	7
Total number of facially valid signatures or signatures by registered voters		950

During face review, staff identified at least 47 petition sheets showing clear indications of fraud and containing signatures of dubious authenticity. In this instance, staff followed the procedure outlined in the staff memo on petition sheets showing clear indications of fraud. Staff first identified every signature that needed to be compared against the Qualified Voter File to determine whether the signature matched or was otherwise invalid. The signatures that did not match are coded in the table as invalid signatures. Identified signatures that could not be located in QVF are coded as not registered. Signatures that were a match were considered registered.

CHALLENGE: Kayli McTague filed a challenge to Kumar’s nominating petitions, alleging that Kumar’s petitions should be rejected because the signatures included all of the following:

- 1,623 signatures submitted by allegedly fraudulent-petition circulators.
- 22 miscellaneous errors (out-of-district signatures, jurisdictional errors, etc.)

In sum, McTague challenged 1,645 signatures.

McTague first listed 10 circulators and 1,623 signatures she argues are invalid due to alleged fraud. To support this allegation, McTague cited repeated characteristics throughout the petitions, such as jurisdictional errors, near-identical lettering on multiple rows, and misspellings. McTague also points to the fact that Kumar's nominating petition sheets had an unusually high completion rate, with 14 of the 15 circulators having a completion rate of more than 94%. Additionally, she notes that the signatures contained few commonly-occurring errors and little evidence of wear and tear. McTague argued all 1,623 signatures collected by the 10 identified circulators should be declared invalid.

Kumar responded to the challenge, asserting that while petitions with confirmed evidence of fraud should not be considered as valid, all petitions circulated by an individual circulator should not be declared invalid based on a single case of fraud by the circulator. Kumar argued that the 50 specifically challenged petitions circulated by the 10 circulators should be the only petitions entirely invalidated for claims of fraud. Kumar argued that if using this approach, he has surpassed the 1,000 signatures required. Additionally, Kumar asserted that McTague's theory that a high petition completion rate indicates fraud is unfounded and should not be used to declare the petition sheets fraudulent and invalid.

Because staff's review of the petition determined that Kumar did not have the minimum number of valid signatures, staff did not process the challenge or Kumar's response.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Determine petition insufficient.