

**GRIEVANCE, NOTICE OF FORESEEABLE
CONSTITUTIONAL HARM,
AND DEMAND FOR HEIGHTENED
SCRUTINY AND INVESTIGATION**

**Regarding Election Infrastructure Integrity,
Vendor Control, and Recount Thresholds**

From:

[Your Name]

Concerned Citizen

To:

**[State Secretary of State / Elections
Director]**

[State Attorney General]

**U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights
Division – Voting Section**

**U.S. Cybersecurity and Infrastructure
Security Agency (CISA)**

**U.S. Election Assistance Commission
(EAC)**

I. PURPOSE AND NOTICE

This correspondence constitutes a formal grievance, notice of foreseeable constitutional harm, and demand for heightened scrutiny regarding systemic risks to election integrity arising from changes in ownership, control, branding, or governance of election-technology vendors, combined with reduced thresholds for hand recounts in upcoming midterm elections.

This letter is written in anticipation of potential administrative, civil-rights, and constitutional litigation. It places all recipient agencies on notice that the risk profile surrounding election infrastructure has materially changed, and that continued reliance on lowered scrutiny standards may expose jurisdictions and federal actors to liability for deliberate indifference.

No allegation of specific wrongdoing is

asserted herein. The grievance asserts that known risk indicators now require a higher burden of verification, transparency, and independent review.

II. BACKGROUND AND SYSTEMIC RISK CONTEXT

Election systems are designated critical national infrastructure. Their integrity implicates fundamental constitutional rights, including the right to vote and the right to have that vote counted accurately and equally.

Recent developments—publicly reported and industry-documented—indicate: Changes or uncertainty regarding ownership, control, rebranding, or corporate governance of widely deployed voting-system vendors, including systems formerly marketed under the Dominion name and now operating under different corporate identities;

Increased consolidation and opacity within election-technology supply chains; and

Anticipated or enacted reductions in thresholds required to trigger hand recounts during midterm elections.

These developments, taken together, elevate the risk of undetected data disruption, whether malicious, negligent, or systemic, particularly where verification mechanisms are constrained by policy choice rather than technical necessity.

III. NATIONAL-LEVEL DATA INTEGRITY AND OVERSIGHT CONCERNS

Election-technology vendors operate across jurisdictions. Software updates, firmware, tabulation logic, reporting architecture, and vendor-managed systems are not confined to a single state.

Accordingly:

Risks to election data integrity are

inherently interstate and national in scope; Vendor-level compromise or malfunction may evade detection through localized audits; and

Fragmented oversight undermines both actual security and public confidence.

Where vendor ownership, control, or governance may reasonably be perceived as politically aligned, ideologically motivated, or regime-loyal—domestic or foreign—the obligation to impose independent, external scrutiny increases, not decreases.

IV. HEIGHTENED CONCERNS REGARDING LOWERED HAND-RECOUNT THRESHOLDS

Lowering thresholds for hand recounts during midterm elections raises substantial constitutional and administrative concerns.

Reduced recount access may:

Prevent detection of discrepancies where

electronic tabulation errors are small but systematic;

Shift the evidentiary burden onto voters or candidates who lack access to proprietary systems;

Create a structural presumption of accuracy unsupported by independent verification; and

Functionally insulate upstream vendor-level issues from meaningful review.

In an environment where election technology is increasingly complex, proprietary, and centralized, lower recount thresholds are inconsistent with due-process principles and best practices for democratic verification.

Where risk indicators increase, the burden of scrutiny must rise accordingly.

Maintaining or lowering recount thresholds under such conditions may constitute arbitrary administration of

elections and unequal treatment of voters.

V. LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY

Election administration must comply with constitutional requirements of fairness, transparency, and equal protection.

Relevant authority includes:

U.S. Const. amend. XIV (Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses);

U.S. Const. art. I, § 4 (Elections Clause);

Bush v. Gore, 531 U.S. 98 (2000) (equal protection applies to vote counting and recount standards);

Reynolds v. Sims, 377 U.S. 533 (1964) (vote dilution and equal weighting of votes);

52 U.S.C. § 10101 (Voting Rights Act protections);

Federal civil-rights enforcement authority and critical-infrastructure protection mandates.

Government actors may be held accountable where foreseeable risks are ignored and constitutional harms result.

VI. DEMANDS FOR ACTION

I formally demand the following:

Independent investigation and review of any ownership, control, rebranding, or governance changes affecting election-technology vendors used within this state or nationally, conducted by entities not reliant on prior certifications or vendor representations.

Public disclosure, to the maximum extent permitted by law, of vendor ownership structures, control interests, and results of cybersecurity and integrity audits.

Reevaluation and strengthening of hand-recount thresholds, with a presumption in favor of expanded access to recounts and audits where systemic risk indicators exist, rather than reduced verification

opportunities.

VII. PRESERVATION OF RECORD AND NOTICE

This grievance preserves the public record and documents foreseeability of election-integrity risks. Any failure to act, investigate, or reevaluate existing standards may be cited in future administrative proceedings, civil-rights actions, or constitutional litigation.

VIII. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Nothing in this correspondence waives any rights or remedies available under state or federal law. All rights are expressly reserved.

Respectfully,

[Your Name]

Concerned Citizen

