

EDWARD P. MANGANO
County Executive



JOHN CIAMPOLI
County Attorney

**COUNTY OF NASSAU
OFFICE OF THE COUNTY ATTORNEY
Ralph G. Caso Executive and Legislative Building
One West Street
Mineola, New York 11501-4820
516-571-3056
FAX: 516-571-6604**

STATEMENT FROM THE NASSAU COUNTY ATTORNEY

July 22, 2010

“We are pleased to announce that Nassau County and the Nassau County Board of Elections were successful in our motion before the State Supreme Court, Woodard, J., to compel the State to turn over a complete set of software and firm ware, including source codes, design specifications and all relevant documentation and manuals for the new electronic voting machines being deployed in Nassau and other counties throughout New York State”, said John Ciampoli, Nassau County Attorney.

The Supreme Court’s Order handed down late yesterday also gave the Nassau County Board of Elections permission to turn over new voting machines to noted electronic voting systems expert, Dr. Alexander Shvartzman, of Voting System Security, LLC, for testing. Dr. Shvartzman is a Professor and the Associate Head of Computer Science and Engineering at the University of Connecticut.

These voting machines will now be subjected to study and testing which will illustrate the flaws in design and functionality affecting the accuracy of election results. Testing will also expose the vulnerabilities of computerized voting systems to fraud and hacking.

The Supreme Court also rejected an attempt by the Attorney General’s Office to delay this case from moving forward, finding that the discovery ordered in this case was not in contravention of prior orders from the Federal District Court for the Northern District of New York. Previously, Federal District Court Judge Bianco, of the Eastern District of New York rebuffed the State’s attempt to have this case dismissed, and sent the

case back to Supreme Court for adjudication of Nassau County's claims under the New York State Constitution.

"It is time for the Attorney General and the New York State Board of Elections to stop their delaying tactics and allow these voting machines to be tested before we have a train wreck in the middle of an important election this fall. Either these machines work properly and protect the voters or they do not. They must be tested so that they do not become an instrument of disenfranchisement – or worse, fraud.", said Ciampoli.

"It is my firm belief that these new voting machines adversely affect voters including senior citizens, minorities, and members of minor parties in their ability to cast their votes and have them count. In addition, in my opinion, the new voting equipment is an invitation to high tech and low tech fraud. Finally, these voting systems will explode the cost of running elections for the taxpayers by a multiple of as much as ten times the cost of running an election on our reliable lever machines.", he concluded.

"The voters should thank County Executive Mangano for authorizing this litigation to protect our democratic process. I also want to thank the Commissioners of Elections, Bill Biamonte and John DeGrace, for their continued efforts in support of this lawsuit. They are truly fulfilling their obligations to the voters of this County by not blindly trusting technology and merely "hoping" that these machines will work.", said Ciampoli.

"The Supreme Court is to be lauded for standing up for transparency in the election process and protecting the rights of the voters and not capitulating to the bureaucracy that is replacing people with machines.", Ciampoli concluded.

The Nassau County Attorney's Office will continue to aggressively pursue this case which seeks to have the law implementing new computerized voting equipment declared unconstitutional under the New York State Constitution and the New York State Civil Rights Law.

For more information, please contact Nina DeLuca at the County Attorney's Office at 516 571 3076.

**SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF NASSAU**

-----x
COUNTY OF NASSAU, NASSAU COUNTT BOARD
OF ELECTIONS, JOHN A. DEGRACE, in his official
capacity as Nassau County Republican Commissioner
of Elections, and WILLIAM T. BIAMONTE, in his official
capacity as Nassau County Democratic Commissioner
of Elections,

MICHELE M. WOODARD
J.S.C.
TRIAL/IAS Part 12
Index No.: 5821/10
Motion Seq. Nos.: 02 & 04

DECISION AND ORDER

Petitioners-Plaintiffs,

-against-

STATE OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK STATE BOARD
OF ELECTIONS, and JAMES A. WALSH, DOUGLAS A.
KELLNER, EVELYN J. AQUILA, GREGORY P.
PETTERSON as Commissioners constituting the Board,

Respondents-Defendants.

-----x
Papers Read on these Motions:

Petitioner-Plaintiff's County of Nassau Order to Show Cause	02
Defendant-Respondent New York State's Notice of Cross Motion	04
Defendant-Respondent NYS Board of Elections Affirmation in Opposition to Motion for Disclosure	xx
Petitioner-Plaintiff's County of Nassau Affirmation in Opposition to Cross Motion for a Stay	xx
Petitioner-Plaintiff's County of Nassau Reply	xx

The petitioners seek to be able to continue using lever as opposed to electronic voting machines. The petitioners challenge the New York Election Reform and Modernization Act, the legality of the manner in which the New York State Board of Elections ("NYSBOE") has implemented it, and specifically the State's mandate to local boards of elections to replace lever voting machines with computerized electronic machines.

In motion sequence number two, the petitioner's move for an order pursuant to CPLR §408 and §3101 granting immediate disclosure. Specifically, the petitioners seek an order expressly authorizing their experts to conduct testing on the functioning of the ES & S machines, Dominion Optical Scan

System, and EMS system at their Connecticut facility. The respondents oppose the petitioner's application.

The petitioners claim that the new machines proposed by the state are "gravely flawed and subject to technical malfunction and deliberate distortion and manipulation." The petitioners's claim they need the ability to test/examine the machines to highlight how various flaws could negatively impact voter's choices and ultimately undermine their constitutional rights. The petitioners have submitted the affidavit of Dr. Alexander Shvartsman, Principal Analyst for Voting System Security, LLC. Voting System Security LLC employs engineers and scientist who specifically analyze voting machines to test their accuracy and vulnerability. Dr. Shvartsman has outlined in his affidavit the need for and procedures to be utilized in the "white box" and "black box" testing. Said procedures would allow them to provide specific examples of the flaws in the system claimed by the petitioners.

The NYS BOE respondent oppose the petitioner's application indicating that the petitioner's expert has not provided any information to substantiate that the proposed machines have ever presented any issues in any of the other jurisdictions in which they have been used and that the State of New York is the last state of the union to comply with the Federal voting machine requirements and may be the last state using lever voting machines. The NYS BOE further argues that the choice of machines is strictly a question for the legislature and not the Courts to decide.

CPLR § 408 provides that for Special proceedings, "leave of court shall be required for disclosure except for a notice under section 3123. A notice under section 3123 may be served at any time not later than three days before the petition is noticed to be heard and the statement denying or setting forth the reasons for failing to admit or deny shall be served not later than one day before the petition is noticed to be heard, unless the court orders otherwise on motion made without notice."

CPLR § 3101 provides that there shall be full disclosure of all matter material and necessary in the prosecution or defense of an action, regardless of the burden of proof.

Expedited Discovery can be ordered at the discretion of the Court.

The petitioner's application is **granted** with respect to the Electronic Systems & Software machine and denied with respect to the Dominion machine, it is hereby

ORDERED, that the petitioners are authorized to deliver to the Connecticut testing facility an Electronic Systems & Software voting machine for the requested testing. It is further

ORDERED, that to the extent that it has not already been provided, the respondents are directed to deliver to the petitioner an EMS for the machine simultaneously with the voting machine. It is further

ORDERED, that to the extent that it has not already been provided, the respondents shall provide as to the individually configured and installed software and firmware component including the voting terminal and the election management system the following:

- Function specification and requirements document (or equivalent);
- High level design specification (or equivalent)
- Detailed design specification (or equivalent)
- identification of all third-party software used in the system;
- Interface specifications (and application programming interfaces, or API) for any external software and hardware system;
- Installation, integration and configuration specification (or equivalent);
- Source code and system build specification;
- Maintenance and service manual (or equivalent)
- User-level documentation and manuals
- Other relevant information following completing the white box testing

In motion sequence number four, the State of New York (hereinafter referred to as "State") cross moves to stay this proceeding pending a determination in the federal action of United States of America v. New York state Board of Elections et al, CV 06-263 (N.D.N.Y) pursuant to CPLR §2201. The State argues that an action related to the within matter has been pending for four years in the Federal Court. According to the State the federal court has issued a number of remedial orders.

Nassau County opposes the State's application for a Stay indicating that the State is attempting to unnecessarily delay the proceedings to prevent Nassau from having the opportunity to expose the systems vulnerabilities.


The State's application for a Stay is **denied**. "It is appropriate to stay an action in deference to another only where the determination in the other will resolve all of the issues in the stayed action and the judgement on one trial will dispose of the controversy in both actions." *Somoza v. Pechnik* 3 A.D.3d 394 (2004). Contrary to the respondents' assertions, ordering this discovery is not in contravention with the previously issued Federal Court orders.

ORDERED, the parties are directed to appear before the undersigned on August 10, 2010 at 10:00 am before the undersigned for a status conference.

This constitutes the Decision and Order of the Court.

DATED: July 21, 2010
Mineola, N.Y. 11501

ENTER:



HON. MICHELE M. WOODARD
J.S.C.