

**A. The 2020 election suffered from serious irregularities that constitutionally prohibit using the reported results.**

Defendant States' administration of the 2020 election violated several constitutional requirements and, thus, violated the rights that Plaintiff State seeks to protect. "When the state legislature vests the right to vote for President in its people, the *right to vote as the legislature has prescribed is fundamental*; and one source of *its fundamental nature lies in the equal weight accorded to each vote and the equal dignity owed to each voter.*" *Bush II*, 531 U.S. at 104.<sup>8</sup> Even a State legislature vested with authority to regulate election procedures lacks authority to "abridg[e ...] fundamental rights, such as the right to vote." *Tashjian v. Republican Party*, 479 U.S. 208, 217 (1986). As demonstrated in this section, Defendant States' administration of the 2020 election violated the Electors Clause, which renders invalid any appointment of electors based upon those election results, unless the relevant State legislatures review and modify or expressly ratify those results as sufficient to determine the appointment of electors. For example, **even without fraud or nefarious intent, a mail-in vote not subjected to the State legislature's ballot-integrity measures cannot be counted.**

It does not matter that a judicial or executive officer sought to bypass that screening in response to the COVID pandemic: the choice was not theirs to

---

<sup>8</sup> The right to vote is "a fundamental political right, because preservative of all rights." *Reynolds*, 377 U.S. at 561-62 (internal quotations omitted).

make. “Government is not free to disregard the [the Constitution] in times of crisis.” *Roman Catholic Diocese of Brooklyn, New York v. Cuomo*, 592 U.S. \_\_\_ (Nov. 25, 2020) (Gorsuch, J., concurring). With all unlawful votes discounted, the election result is an open question that this Court must address. Under 3 U.S.C. § 2, the State legislatures may answer the question, but the question must be asked here.

**1. Defendant States violated the Electors Clause by modifying their legislatures’ election laws through non-legislative action.**

The Electors Clause grants authority to *state legislatures* under both horizontal and vertical separation of powers. It provides authority to each State—not to federal actors—the authority to dictate the manner of selecting presidential electors. And within each State, it explicitly allocates that authority to a single branch of State government: to the “Legislature thereof.” U.S. CONST. art. II, § 1, cl. 2. State legislatures’ primacy *vis-à-vis* non-legislative actors—whether State or federal—is even more significant than congressional primacy *vis-à-vis* State legislatures.

The State legislatures’ authority is plenary. *Bush II*, 531 U.S. at 104. It “cannot be taken from them or modified” even through “their state constitutions.” *McPherson*, 146 U.S. at 35; *Bush I*, 531 U.S. at 76-77; *Bush II*, 531 U.S. at 104. The Framers allocated election authority to State legislatures as the branch closest—and most accountable—to the People. *See, e.g.*, Robert G. Natelson, *The Original Scope of the Congressional Power to Regulate Elections*, 13 U. PA.