



STATE OF MICHIGAN
BUREAU OF ELECTIONS
LANSING

May 24, 2024

REVIEW OF NOMINATING PETITIONS

Nikki Snyder
Republican Candidate for U.S. Representative in Congress, 8th District

NUMBER OF VALID SIGNATURES REQUIRED: 1,000 signatures.

TOTAL FILING: 1,079 signatures.

RESULT OF FACE REVIEW: 1,055 facially valid signatures, 24 invalid signatures.

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Total number of signatures filed | 1,079 |
| Invalid date (no date given by signer, date of birth entered, or date given by signer is later than circulator’s date of signing) | <i>Less:</i> 23 |
| Circulator information missing (circulator did not sign or date petition, etc.) | <i>Less:</i> 1 |
| Total number of facially valid signatures after face review | 1,055 |

Staff’s face review of Nikki Snyder’s petition sheets identified 24 invalid signatures and 1,055 facially valid signatures.

CHALLENGE: Jayden Rittenbury filed a challenge to Snyder’s nominating petitions, alleging that 179 of Snyder’s petition signatures should be rejected because the signatures included all of the following:

- Signatures by individuals who also submitted signatures to Mary Draves or Paul Junge.¹
- Signatures by individuals who were not registered at the address indicated on the petition.
- Illegible signatures.

In sum, Rittenbury challenged 179 signatures.

¹ An individual may not sign more nominating petitions for the same office than there are persons to be elected to the office. If an individual signs the same candidate’s nominating petitions more than once, all signatures by that individual to that petition are invalid. If the signatures are to two or more candidates for the same office when there is only one position available, the signature dated first is valid and any others are invalid; if those signatures are dated the same day, both are invalid.

Staff determined that 4 of the challenged signatures had already been found invalid during face review and began processing the remaining challenged signatures because the 175 remaining challenged signatures exceeded Snyder’s “cushion” of excess signatures.

| | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| Total number of facially valid signatures after face review | | 1,055 |
| Not registered | <i>Less:</i> | 30 |
| Invalid signature (signature is omitted or does not sufficiently agree with signature on file) | <i>Less:</i> | 11 |
| Duplicate signature (voter signed petition multiple times, or signed nominating petitions for more candidates than there are persons to be elected to the office) | <i>Less:</i> | 28 |
| Invalid city or township (no city or township by that name located within the county listed at the top or the city or township field was left blank) | <i>Less:</i> | 4 |
| Outside district (address given is located within the city or township listed, but outside of the electoral district for the office sought) | <i>Less:</i> | 1 |
| Illegible | <i>Less:</i> | 1 |
| Total facially valid after processing challenge | | 980 |

After staff had processed 130 challenged signatures (accepting 75, rejecting 51, and noting the 4 challenges that overlapped with staff’s initial determinations), Snyder was left with 980 face valid signatures. Staff did not process the remaining 49 challenges because their outcome was unnecessary to determine whether Snyder was eligible to qualify for the ballot.

Snyder responded to the challenge, attempting to rehabilitate all 179 of the signatures.

Regarding the 42 DUP (duplicate) signatures alleged by Rittenbury, Snyder argued that in many cases they “are not duplicates and in others are dated prior to those that have been turned in by candidate Draves or candidate Junge.” Snyder included an Exhibit A that included a response to each signature challenge. For 2 of the alleged duplicate signatures, she replied “not a duplicate;” to the others, she asked “BoE staff to review.”

Snyder also asked staff to review the 67 signatures Rittenbury coded NR (not registered in jurisdiction). She argued that any apparent discrepancies, or inability by Rittenbury to locate the signers, are likely the result of a signer moving within the city or township, which does not render the signature invalid.

Additionally, Snyder submitted as Exhibit B an affidavit from a signer indicating that his printed name as provided on the petition is his typical signature and matches his signature on file. While the exhibit is itemized in Exhibit A as pertaining to page 125, line 9 and page 127, line 6, staff believes it was provided to rehabilitate the signature on page 13, line 8. The challenged signature was verified against the Qualified Voter File as the challenge was processed and the challenge to the signature was rejected.

Finally, Snyder argued that Rittenbury used an “unidentified BoE code” to identify 4 challenged signatures. This code, IC (invalid city or township),² describes instances where there is no city or township by the name indicated located within the county listed at the top of the petition sheet, or

² Included in Appendix H of staff’s [Petition Manual](#).

when the city or township field was left blank. In Snyder's petitions, the city or township identified by 4 challenged signers falls outside of the county listed at the top of the petition sheets. For example, the signer on sheet 22, line 9 indicated a Birch Run address but signed on a Genesee County petition sheet; Birch Run is in Saginaw County.

As indicated above, staff reviewed 130 of the signatures challenged. 39 of those signatures were determined to be by voters registered in the city or township indicated on the petition sheet, and which were not rendered invalid for another reason. 14 of the 42 "DUP" challenges were rejected, as the signatures were not duplicates or the signature in the Snyder petition was the earliest signature, rendering it valid. Likewise, as Snyder indicates, in 22 cases signatures that Rittenbury alleged were "NR" were submitted by individuals who were registered at another address in the city or township; these challenges were also rejected.

However, staff accepted 75 of the 130 challenges processed. This number, when combined with the 24 signatures determined to be invalid on face review, dropped her below the 1,000-signature threshold and rendered her ineligible for the ballot.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Determine petition insufficient.