CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Is there anybody whose's going to testify as to counts other than the two of you? Are you testifying or are you just...

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: What about people from the Division?

to get there in just a minute. But as far as you're concerned, the only two people that are going to testify as to what was attached to the first petition, the second petition is the two of you guys; correct? You don't have anybody else that you're -- providing the count and I don't either and you're going to say I counted and you're going to say you counted?

MR. T. COOK: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. So we'll get to that, all right. Now as to ask Commissioner Riordan's question, do we have -- are there individuals -- do you want is it ask that question or do you want me to ask that question?

commission member s. Riordan: Well, I think procedurally, we can do a couple of things, and I would suggest that we take a look at the second challenge and we decide whether as a commission we would count the Senator's first submission and the

Right.

And then

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Count it as one 3 submission? 4 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Yeah. 5 If we would -- if we would sandwich the two 6 7 together for purposes of the 500. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And that's -- that's 8 just the pure legal issue, I take it? 9 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Yeah. 10 that might get us down to... 11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Mr. McClamroch, do you 12 agree with that as well? 13 MR. T. McCLAMROCH: Yeah. 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Mr. Cook? 15 Uh-huh. MR. T. COOK: 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. With respect 17 to that, as I understand it, if we -- we lump that, 18 and if you would agree, if we lump those two 19 together, there are over 500 less the Tippecanoe 20 issue. 21 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Or -- or unless 22 there are over 500 but he still thinks that they 23 are not all valid. 2.4 That's what I mean, less CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 25

second submission because that seems like a

threshold issue.

1

the Tippecanoe issue. That's the first step.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Well, I don't want to limit it to Tippecanoe, but there are less than 500 ballots, let's just put it that way.

tried to pin him down on whether he had something other than two -- you know, maybe I missed that.

All right. Given that, I agree with Commissioner Riordan. The first issue is -- we're going to take the issues backwards because of -- as a purely legal issue, does the second CAN-7 filling, which how many signatures came with the second CAN-7 -- Mr. McClamroch?

MR. T. McCLAMROCH: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: How many came with the second CAN?

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Thirteen.

MR. T. McCLAMROCH: Thirteen.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Thirteen votes with the second CAN-7.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: In the 4th District?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: In the 4th District.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: And where were those from?

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Morgan County.

MR. T. McCLAMROCH: Morgan County.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. So the question -- the question -- the legal question which I now want to address the counsel is -- I'm sorry, I suppose there hasn't been a legal argument from the two of you. Mr. McClamroch, you have the opportunity address whether there should be...

MR. T. McCLAMROCH: Well, I did a few minutes ago. I mean I can't state it any differently.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. And then what I would ask the two Division counsel with respect to that, we have -- we clearly have two separate filings. There's no dispute that both filings were in the -- within the time period to make those filings; correct?

The challenge is, specifically, on the issue of whether the second filing can supplement the first filing or whether it has to redo the entire first filing again; is that correct? Is that your argument, Mr. Cook?

MR. T. COOK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'll start with Dale and then I'll flip over to Leslie.

MR. D. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Commission, this focuses on interpretation of

Indiana Code 3-8-3-2, and of course --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Give me -- which one, Dale?

MR. D. SIMMONS: And that's on Page 169. Of course, understanding that again, there's another section in that chapter that indicates when you -- when the filing deadline is and that they are timely.

The section reads, and I think the word that the commission might want to focus on, is accompanied by certain language. I suppose one -- I would imagine or argue -- I certainly see that there were accompanying -- and I think maybe it's whether you read it simultaneously or more broadly and simultaneously. When filed immediately, with the other argument, the other now, and they are accompanying the requests. It would depend on how you interpret that particular section.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What's the section that says the -- the deadline is the 22nd?

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: It's 4, Section 4.

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And 5 -- 4 and 5.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So as I understand it,
No. 5 says that a request or petition filed under

Commission, the law that governs both presidential

and primary petition candidates and candidates for governor or U.S. Senator by major parties is silent with regard to the method for delivery from the county voter registration office after certification.

Custom has certainly been that the candidate's committee collects them, prepares them for filing, and submits them, and that's done in the ordinary course of the Election Division's business. being said, we did receive a number of letters from individual county voter registration offices.

For example, there was one from Blackford County that contained a McCain petition that was submitted directly by the county voter registration office. So we do receive other submissions in a different way, but we have also received filings from the candidates directly.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Leslie.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. MS. L. BARNES: Ι would agree with Dale that the statute the commission's being asked to interpret is 3-8-3-2 and also with Mr. King, in that it has been the Division's custom to accept petitions that are sent directly from the county.

It seems that the question before the

23 2.4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Commission is whether -- whether or not they interpret the definition accompanied by to be simultaneously filed along with the request? Do the petitions have to be filed at the time the request is filed?

The -- there is no case law that interprets

3-8-2, although there is case law in Indiana that
does interpret the definition of accompanied by. I

don't know if the Commission wants us to go into

that. The -- I guess if we were to allow the

requests to be filed first and then petitions to

come in, a candidate would be able to file a

request for ballot placement without the necessary

number of signatures and then the signatures could

trickle in.

At what point then would the co-directors issue a confirmation of filing? State statute requires the co-directors to issue a CAN-5 or something similar to a CAN-5 for the presidential candidate, let the candidate know we have received your request and petition, and that the confirmation is in no way confirming that the candidate's valid or eligible to be placed on the ballot, but it is the Division's -- in complying with the statute, the General Assembly requires the

division to let a candidate know when we have received their either request for ballot placement or their declaration of candidacy.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Go ahead.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: My sense, there's no dispute that all of these signatures came in before the deadline which was due on February 22nd. I am inclined to accept all of the petitions that were submitted by that point, the 22nd of February at noon.

For purposes of resolving the other question of whether there are the requisite number of valid signatures in the 4th Congressional District which I understand to be the dispute so I --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Was that a motion?

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: If that makes sense? And then I was intending -- actually, I would say --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: -- that's my inclination, that's my thinking and so I would move that we essentially reject Mr. Cook's first argument, that the two filings by Senator McCain should be analyzed separately, and rather we

^ ^ ^

analyze them together as though they were made as one filing; for the purpose of resolving the remaining question, of whether there are 500 ballots in the 4th Congressional District?

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I agree with that.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The motion's been made and seconded, any further discussion on that?

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I have one question. You mentioned interpreting the words accompanied by, is that -- is the precedent that you're referring to in interpretation of statute under the Indiana Election Code?

MS. L. BARNES: No. No, it's not.

commission member D. dumezich: It is not,
okay. It's just a general...

MS. L. BARNES: Correct.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Okay. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And let me -- since I've been on this commission, we have made every effort, I think, to read -- read our statutes somewhat liberally, and frankly, I think the term that's been used by the commissioners before, to let the people decide.

To the extent we're going to err, we're going

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

to err -- at least personally -- to the extent I'm going to err, I'm going to err on the side of keeping somebody on the ballot. So I agree completely with Miss Riordan, and I agree with the motion to the extent it says basically we're going to interpret our statutes -- we're not going to adopt a hyper-technical reading of our statutes to keep somebody off the ballot. I would rather have the people of Indiana make those decisions rather than hyper-technical reading of what the statute requires speaking from our side.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The motion's already been made and seconded, but I appreciate your backup -- all right, the motion's made and seconded, any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Hearing none, all in favor of -- restate your motion, denying...

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: That we -- let me put it this way, --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Aggregate.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: -- I would move that the Commission aggregate all the signatures

And Tony,

filed on the 22nd of February -- filed on or before 1 the 22nd of February by the Senator for the purpose 2 of determining whether they are valid, 500 validly 3 certified signatures in the 4th Congressional 4 District. 5 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: That's what I interpreted 6 the motion. 7 That's a second? CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 8 Did I second it, yes. VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 9 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All in favor, signify by 10 saying aye? 11 THE COMMISSION: Aye. 12 Those opposed, same CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 13 sign? 14 (No response.) 15 That being said, we've CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 16 now limited the issue to looking at, as I 17 understand it, --18 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: The count. 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- the count. 20 would you characterize that as one of the issues? 21 I think the only issue is VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 22 determine there are 500 signatures in the 4th 23

signatures that are on file.

24

25

Congressional District that are validly certified

2.5

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: And to sort of further try to narrow down the issue. My understanding is, Mr. Cook, your argument is that 47 of those in Tippecanoe are not valid because they were not certified by all members of the bipartisan Board of Voter Registration?

MR. T. COOK: Not necessarily all of them because -- I don't think I would make the argument that all three of them have to, but my argument is that because they failed to proceed in the -- what I view as bipartisan spirit of the creation of that body, that they are invalid.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understood. So what you're saying is...

MR. T. COOK: Because there was not -- because they were both Republicans.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So you're saying legally, it's okay, you just don't like it?

MR. T. COOK: No. I'm saying the spirit of the -- the step -- the Supreme Court case that I referred to dealing with the election division makes clear that the legislative intent behind the creation of that body was to have it be a bipartisan entity.

And I believe that -- because the language

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 question: 8 9 MR. T. COOK: 10 11 12 members of the board? 13 14 members of the board? 15 MR. T. COOK: 16 17 18 19 20 did not sign them. 21 22 23 24

25

used in that is used in the creation of county boards of registration and in fact is used in the Tippecanoe County as far as splitting resources, evenly staffing, budgetary, etc., etc., that the intent behind the creation of that body was for it to be a bipartisan one.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask you this You don't dispute that there are two Republican signatures on those 47?

I do not.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And if they're both

And if they're both CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

That is true.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. It's just the Democrat didn't sign; correct?

MR. T. COOK: Was never made aware of these petitions, was never allowed to evaluate them, and

As I understand your CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: argument then, in counties where we have a multi-member board, three-member board, including like Tippecanoe, the minority member of the board

could freeze up the entire petition process by simply refusing to sign, is your argument; right?

MR. T. COOK: I -- I think that that could occur in any election board of one or more people. I think that...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: But that's the upside of your argument? Your argument is that they have -- even though they're a minority member, they disagree, they can freeze the petition process, and if it had been a Republican say in Lake County, he could have blocked say the Obama or Clinton...

MR. T. COOK: I think that effective that's been the case with...

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Mr. Chairman, in defense of Mr. Cook's position, --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Maybe I didn't understand.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: -- the clerk in any other county, one person can freeze up the whole system by refusing to certify it. So I mean that's not unique to a three-member county because one person in any county under that scenario -- in my county, we have a clerk, she certifies it, and she could say I'm not -- I don't like John McCain or whoever, I'm going to certify any of them.

MR. T. COOK: It's true. And the legislature made it clear that over a certain population threshold, they wanted -- they wanted multi-member bipartisan boards to deal with voter registration issues. They made that clear. And that's why some of the smaller counties, as you said, are allowed to have a one-person clerk certify this.

But at any level of any of these boards, sure, one person could -- whether it be the clerk, whether it be a two-person board in which one of the members refuses to, so certainly that possibility exists in any board of registration.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Of course, the -COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The difference would -- give me one second, the difference with the remedy for one clerk is that you have a (indiscernible) with the circuit court to force them to do their duty.

In this case, you would agree with me that the statute says that there's a -- there are three members, and that two of them went ahead and signed -- a majority of them went ahead and signed; is that correct?

MR. T. COOK: I would argue that two

Republican members signed it incorrectly. 1 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand. But you 2 3 would agree that the two... MR. T. COOK: Yes, this are two signatures. 4 5 Yes, it is the clerk, and yes, it is the Republican co-director. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. And if I can ask 7 one more question, and I want to -- I want to 8 address a cite that is not in our book, 1-1-4-1, 9 what does 1-1-4-1 provide? Have you ever looked... 10 MR. T. McCLAMROCH: I just -- I just cited it 11 a -- I just cited it a few minutes ago. 12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And it says as I -- and 13 I quote, words importing joint authority to three 14 (3) or more persons shall be construed as authority 15 to a majority of the persons. In that case, that 16 17 would be two of the three; correct? VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Where did you get that? 18 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I thought that's what 19 Toby read. 20 MR. T. McCLAMROCH: 1-1-4-1. 21 I was looking for it 22 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: but... 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Somebody just handed it 24 25 to me.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Yes. I've got copies.

commission member s. RIORDAN: I see a legal issue bubbling up that seems to be whether the commission would view this statute in a hyper-technical or very technical fashion, and that would be to require bipartisan certification in Tippecanoe County or not, so that's something that we have to think about.

And I agree with the chairman that we should err or on the side of access, and that's what I'm thinking about right now. But these petitions have ten signatures so if we're looking at 500 signatures, you know, we're looking at 50, 60 or 70 or maybe a hundred pieces of paper.

And I would say within the 4th Congressional District, in the first submission and the second submission, that's open them up.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Your suggestion is that they open, that the Commission open them up and count them?

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: The 4th, let's open them up.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And count which?

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: The 4th

Congressional District to see if there are 500 signatures.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The entire 4th Congressional District?

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Well, Mr.

Wheeler, and I know that my personal experience
isn't particularly germane, but I can say that I'm
very very familiar with this process and I know
that it doesn't take that along to do it. Not
because I've reviewed these, of course, but
because...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And your contention is that the Commission as a whole should do that?

commission member s. Riordan: Or you know, I would be happy to do it on behalf of my political party, with Dan -- we don't have to agree on anything, but I just -- I'd like to see them?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: There was an attempt at the Division to do that; correct?

MR. D. SIMMONS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What happened?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Last Friday, we attempted to meet at the, I believe the Chairman's request to see if staff could get together and agree, and in the sense that okay, how many do you see

here -- seven -- you see seven, okay, then we can put that in a pile and we can agree on how to count that.

And we were unable to agree to that process.

The Democratic members of the Election Division did

not -- for reasons I'm not fully and can explain,

I'm not fully understanding, would not do that.

MS. P. POTESTA: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, please, we'll address that.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We can get there in just a second.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Well...

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: You'll get a chance to say...

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: I think -- I think those are -- we've narrowed this down to a specific issue by the parties -- the parties agreeing to stipulation of certain facts -- I think we are past that point at this time, because the question --

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Actually, I disagree. I don't -- I don't think we've stipulated to what's in those boxes, and I won't, until I see what's there so...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Hold on a

were was we were down to the legal issue of whether the 47 votes in Tippecanoe County, if this goes up or down; correct -- correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Cook and Mr. McClamroch, this goes up or down on whether or not we count -- if we don't -- if we choose not to count those 47 votes, then the petition -- you would agree, Mr. McClamroch, that the petitions are -- are under -- you would agree; correct -- you don't want to agree?

MR. T. McCLAMROCH: I told you my count was 514 so I've already said 514.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 514 minus 47 brings you under.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: But I think that we should agree to tell rules by which were -- which were counted which is whether or not two Republican signatures would allow us to say that those are certified.

so I would -- before we go in through the exercise of counting it, I want to make sure that we have an agreement from the board, that in fact when we count these things, when we pull something up, both the petitions have two of our signatures on the back of it, that that is something that's

going to be counted or not, depending on how the 1 board votes. 2 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: 3 Yeah. I mean I 4 propose that as a legal issue that we have to 5 resolve but I don't why we have to resolve that before we can see what's inside those boxes. 6 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: 7 the --8 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask... 9 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: 10 11 suspense is just killing us. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask legal --12 legal counsel on both sides. 13 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Just a misunderstand. 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Oh, I'm sorry. 15 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: We owe our co-director 16 17 here. 18 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Oh, I'm sorry. 19 apologize. VICE CHAIR A. LONG: She asked to have the 20 floor a while ago. 21 I apologize. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 2.2 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I would ask the Chair to 23 2.4 recognize her to address the issues she chose to 25 address.

MS. P. POTESTA: Mr. Chairman, thank you

Mr. Long for bringing that up. Just for the

record, so there are no speculations anywhere, I

made the decision myself as co-director, Democratic

Co-Director of the Division not to count the

ballots on March 7th, as we were asked to do by the

Chairman, because we could not agree on a method on

which to count them or record them. So for that

reason, I decided we would not participate.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I thank you. In fairness to Pam, given the conversation the Commission has had up there, there is certainly some disagreement about that. Let me ask one question of Dale.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: One second.

And I firmly agree with the standard that you applied, hence the reason we should move this to a vote, for the very reason your co-director did not count them last Friday.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Well, I don't know that I necessarily said we need to count them. I want to see them.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Let me -let me stop and ask one additional question.

Mr. Simmons, did you go ahead and count in the

presence of a Democrat but not with any agreement 1 of a Democrat; correct? 2 MR. D. SIMMONS: Correct. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And your number was? 4 At the direction of Mr. King, MR. D. SIMMONS: 5 I went ahead and counted only the 4th Congressional 6 District in the presence of Michelle Brzycki. 7 subsequently cross-checked with the scan copies to 8 come up with the count of my own at Mr. King's 9 request. 10 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And that number was? 11 MR. D. SIMMONS: 514. 12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And that includes the 47 13 Tippecanoes? 14 Yes, it would include those. MR. D. SIMMONS: 15 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And then Miss Brzycki, 16 may I -- did you -- did you look at them? 17 I did count petitions, not MS. M. BRZYCKI: 18 I looked at both the photocopies the originals. 19 and I looked at the scans. 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And your number was? 21 I counted the photocopies MS. M. BRZYCKI: 22 twice, the scans twice, and if you aggregate it 2.3 with the 13 in the second submission, as you've 24 decided, 511 certified signatures submitted to us. 25

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Okay. Then that -- are 2 there issues -- so if we get this squarely from --3 MS. M. BRZYCKI: Yes. 4 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: -- everybody, beyond the 5 47? 6 The three in question that is MS. M. BRZYCKI: 7 a difference between my number and Dale's number 8 and I believe, even though we didn't work with 9 either party, their numbers, I can explain because 10 I -- those petitions very well by now. 11 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Copy of the 12 When you say 511 certified signatures -second. 13 MS. M. BRZYCKI: Submitted. 14 -- that were COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: 15 not submitted, you are not saying that you believe 16 that there are 511 validly certified signatures? 17 That's true, just submitted. MS. M. BRZYCKI: 18 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Okay. 19 never looked at the originals in those boxes? 20 No, I haven't. MS. M. BRZYCKI: 21 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: 22 Simmons, you have looked at the originals? 2.3 MR. D. SIMMONS: I have, yes. COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Are there any 25

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right.

1	photocopies in the originals?
2	MR. D. SIMMONS: Yes. I did find photocopies.
3	COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: In what in
4	what county's submission?
5	MR. D. SIMMONS: Morgan.
6	COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: In Morgan
7	counsel's submission?
8	MR. D. SIMMONS: Uh-huh.
9	COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: How many
10	photocopies did you find?
11	MR. D. SIMMONS: I found five separate
12	petitions that were photocopied
13	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Found the signatures.
14	MR. D. SIMMONS: and recorded the first
15	name of each petition.
16	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And how many names are on
17	the photocopy?
18	MR. D. SIMMONS: There were 30 signatures.
19	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Total?
20	MR. D. SIMMONS: Total.
21	COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: And were any of
22	those duplicates of each other?
23	MR. D. SIMMONS: I'm not sure what you mean,
24	Commissioner Riordan.
	GOWNTGGTON MEMBER S PIORDAN: Well, if if

you -- if you assuming you discover a photocopy in 1 that, is that another identical copy of it; in 2 3 other words, any names of petitions submitted for counting twice? 4 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I think she said a 5 duplicated petition? 6 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Yeah. 7 MR. D. SIMMONS: When I found a photocopy of 8 the original, I simply did not count again. 9 already counted. 1.0 And Michelle, did you do CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 11 the same thing? 12 What I did was I MS. M. BRZYCKI: Yes. 1.3 organized them by county and then alphabetized them 14 by the last name on the first line, whether or not 15 it was counted or not, and then if it was the exact 16 17 same, I pulled those aside and did not count them. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So your 511 --18 MS. M. BRZYCKI: 19 My 511. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 20 -- removes the Morgan County duplicate? 21 22 MS. M. BRZYCKI: Yes. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I think at least there's 23 some awareness that there were duplicates out of 24 25 Morgan County?

-	MS. M. BRZICKI: 165.
2	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You did you not count
3	those?
4	MS. M. BRZYCKI: I did not count them.
5	There's five pages all of originals that were
6	included in the submission, not five photocopies of
7	ones that were not
8	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And you did the same
9	thing, did you not count them?
10	MR. D. SIMMONS: Correct.
11	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Now
12	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: He's got five photocopied
13	pages that are for each individual; correct?
14	MR. D. SIMMONS: They're photocopies of
15	originals from the same county, Morgan County.
16	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Where are the originals?
17	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: They're the ones here.
18	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: So they're so they're
19	just duplicates?
20	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We've got duplicates.
21	VICE CHAIR A. LONG: All of the ones you count
22	in your 514 were original signatures?
23	MR. D. SIMMONS: Right.
24	COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: And so
25	you're you're counting

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Yes.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: And all -- all the ones you counted in your 511 were original signatures?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Yes.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Okay.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: So you -- when you say original signatures, do you mean signatures in ink with the -- with the ink signature of the certifying body on the ballot?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Certainly, the best I can determine it. I mean...

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Okay

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask, you were -- you were going to make a distinction. Were you just going to explain the difference between the 511 and 514, plus three?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Yes. I -- when you mean the certified copies, I mean the number that was on the back of the form, the numbers that the county certified, so the number certified in the 4th. I did not -- when you came -- when it came to an issue that was an obvious clerical error, such as they have reversed the columns or had done the entire sheet upside down, and each case was obviously what the intent of the person filled out.

MS. M. BRZYCKI: I saw numerous ones in the 511 that I had questions on and made no decisions on.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: When you say numerous, are you referring to Tippecanoe or just something separate?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Tippecanoe is one of my numerous concerns.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right.

MS. M. BRZYCKI: But it's not my place.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I'll make it your place. What are the numerous ones?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Well, Tippecanoe was one issue. Another issue is ones that are not signed at all. Another issue of whether a stamp constitutes a clerk's signature of receipt -- I'm not talking about -- I mean there is the issue of whether or not a stamp, an ink stamp that -- like a deputy would use or an employee would use and then an issue on top of that is whether a raised seal of a county counts as a clerk's signature.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. Do you know -- so that particular county, do you know if they did that with say the Obama petitions and the Clinton petitions as well, would that be something...

2.2

MS. M. BRZYCKI: I would -- I can -- I will check. They did one with the raised signature, they did not. The petitions that we checked for the other presidential candidates in our possession was the two Democrats signed. Also, Tippecanoe County was signed by a Democratic and a Republican for each one, so the Obama petitions and the Clinton petitions.

I did not go through all the other petitions to see if there's any that were just not signed. Another problem would be -- and this -- this suggest where the discrepancy of three counts between Dale and my number is in Monroe County there is three signatures on the front and on the back they do not certify anything for the 4th District.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So they missed three?

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: No.

MS. M. BRZYCKI: They didn't certify those three.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: They just didn't put any number in the blank.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Did you -- did you count it?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Monroe County -- I did not.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Yes, ma'am.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: But you don't dispute that there are 5 -- 540 -- 511 voters put their names on those petitions to support the presence of Senator McCain on the ballot in Indiana?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: I would say that that number would be even higher considering that a lot of people, but...

commission member s. Riordan: The signatures
may not look invalid for the reasons that they
weren't --

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Exactly.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: -- in that congressional district?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Also the three that were not certified on the back of the Monroe County petition could have been happen elsewhere and I wouldn't feel comfortable saying that 511 is the number or 514 is the number, but I can -- I am very comfortable in saying that 511 is the number certified by the county.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So ...

commission member s. Riordan: So 511 that were -- that were certified and our dispute is whether or not those certifications are valid?

MS. M. BRZYCKI: Exactly.

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: I think that all of this discussion and the points that have been made really points up -- the unfortunate reality that Indiana is a state that puts up some obstacles between the individual and the ballot, puts obstacles between, obviously, the candidate and the ballot, and in my view, the voter and the ballot with our voter ID and otherwise.

But we've talked before about how we favor the notion of access and I think that has to apply regardless of party, that that has to be our primary informing philosophy, and it is mine. I know that the details imposed by our statutes governing presidential ballot access are very very strict.

I know that because it was my job for my presidential candidate to actually gather over 500 signatures in the 4th Congressional District and I know that it is a very difficult thing to do.

And Mr. McClamroch made the point that Senator McCain should not be required to come back and verify every single one of those signatures, and I think that's right, but I also think that the law in Indiana requires you to do that and I had to do

it for my candidate, and I like I said, it's a lot of work.

But my view after hearing all of this and participating in this lengthy discussion, which I think is very important, I would be inclined to total all of those signatures, if there is a mark of some type from a certifying authority, whether it is a member of a board of voter registration, a raised seal or some other identifying marks, such as a signature stamp, certifying that that voter is registered in that district, that we should accept that.

And if there are 511, if there are 514, if there's 501, that's enough, and Senator McCain is his party's nominee -- he's not my party's nominee, but he's his party's nominee, and I don't think that these technical problems should keep him off the ballot in the State of Indiana because that's what matters to the people of the State of Indiana.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Was that a motion?

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Yes, it is.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The motion's been made and seconded, any further discussion? Let me add...

2.4

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Discussion, yeah,
that's -- go ahead.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I was going to add speaking as someone who has collected petitions and organizing them for a candidate that is no longer in the race, let me speak to the -- and I hope we're speaking to the legislature and for those of you from the -- from the media here, I hope you convey this to the legislature, I think -- and I was responsible for multiple states.

We have an arcane method of putting these individuals on the ballot. It is one that is as you can see from what we've done today is fraught with confusion, fraught with error, fraught with the opportunity for problems like we've dealt with today.

I agree with Commissioner Riordan that it is not the candidate's responsibility to go through and certify, it is the county clerk's certification, and if a county clerk improperly certifies, I don't know that it's fair to allow particularly a candidate of the opposite political party to be responsible for those improper certifications.

As a consequence, I agree and I would

certainly add or courage the legislature to do away with that particular ballot process, this petition process, at least by congressional district because I believe it's unwieldily, it's very difficult for the candidates, and it's fraught with precisely the problems we've seen here today.

want to go one step further and tell this young man here, Mr. Cook, what a classy job you did here today. I mean that was a real piece of work. They asked you if you were an attorney, you conducted -- we didn't know the answer, and that's -- for those of us that are lawyers, that was -- should be taken as a compliment. Maybe others won't think of it as a compliment.

MR. T. COOK: Thank you.

vice Chair A. Long: The fact is you've done a real service for the people of the State of Indiana because you've pointed out exactly how arcane our system is. And you know, the legislators need to address this -- I mean putting blocks between the people getting to the ballot are -- to either be on it or to voters. They're not serving our cause.

And you've done a nice job here and I'm very proud of you -- of the presentation that you've

made. We would have expected that out of Mr.

McClamroch, he's a seasoned veteran, and he,

obviously, did a good job. I hope the message here

goes out to the legislature. We need -- we need to

stop making it so difficult for people who run for

office.

McCain, Senator McCain is his party's nominee presumptively, and I agree he needs to be on the ballot. And I believe if we're going to error, it's going to be -- in my mind, unless the law is so abundantly clear that there's a violation, if it's ambiguous at all, that we error on the side of letting people run from any people before them.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: If you do decide to go to law school, I'll give you my card. Send me your resume.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Were that being said, would you like to restate your motion?

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: No.

MR. T. McCLAMROCH: But is that a motion? Is it a motion to deny the challenge?

COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: As I understood that, it

was a motion to deny the challenge based upon I 1 think the count from both --2 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Both counties; 3 right? 4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Both -- we already voted 5 on the first count and the second count -- now 6 we're determining the first counts, and we voted to 7 aggregate them. As we understand, the aggregated 8 numbers I heard from Michelle was 511, from Dale it 9 was 514, either way that's over 500, and I took 10 that as a basis of Commissioner Riordan's motion? 11 COMMISSION MEMBER S. RIORDAN: I'll second 12 that. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It's been made and 14 second, all in favor, signify by saying aye? 15 THE COMMISSION: Aye. 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same 17 sign? 18 (No response.) 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Thank you very much. 20 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Thank you. 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let's take a minute 22 recess, and then we have --2.3 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Michelle, thank you. 24 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- five minutes, then we

have Senator Waltz's residency challenge.

(A recess was taken.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: While -- Michelle, while you're handing that out, I am going to call the meet to go order, and I am going to ask Mr. King, do you have a statement?

MR. B. KING: Yes. Mr. King -- rather, sorry, Mr. Chairman and Commission Members, just for the sake of clarity, that the effect of the motion just adopted prior to recess was to deny the complaint in both Causes, 08-171 and 08-176?

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That is correct.

COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: Correct

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: And that Senator McCain will be on our ballot unless there's some other impediment to that.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Don't say that after

Mr. McClamroch left. All right. I'm going to call

cause No. 8-170. It's a challenge to the candidacy

of Brent Waltz, candidate for Indiana State Senate,

District 36. I see Senator Waltz is here. Senator

Waltz, I'm going to ask that -- well, actually, I

can ask Mr. King to administer the oath since you

were not present for the oath.

SENATOR B. WALTZ: Very good.

MR. B. KING: Please stand.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And if there is anyone else that is going to testify with respect to Mr. Waltz's that was not here earlier and did not take the oath, please stand as well?

(The participants complied.)

MR. B. KING: Please respond I do at the conclusion of the oath. I do solemnly swear that the testimony I will give the Commission in this cause today will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help me, God?

SENATOR B. WALTZ: I do.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Could you -- there are several people at the table. Could the counsel introduce themselves and whoever is sitting with you?

MR. B. SPEAR: Yes. Mr. Chairman, my name is Bob speaker. I'm counsel for Senator Waltz.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: I'm sorry, I didn't...

MR. B. SPEAR: Bob Spear, that's S-P-E-A-R.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. And Senator Waltz is with you. And then the Challenger?

MR. D. VIGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Dylan Vigh. I'm with the law offices of

Dylan a. Vigh.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: Could I get your name
again?

MR. D. VIGH: It's Dylan Vigh. V-I-G-H is the last name, and D-Y-L-A-N is the first one.

VICE CHAIR A. LONG: D-Y...

MR. D. VIGH: -- L-A-N. And I'm with the law offices of Dylan A. Vigh here in Indianapolis, and seated next to my right is the Challenger, Michael Beeles.

issue. I have appearances from both of you.

Mr. Vigh you had previously filed, in addition to your appearance, and I believe that's in the materials that has been handed to the commission members now, a request for an issuance after subpoena?

MR. D. VIGH: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And a variety of documents relate to go Mr. Waltz, Senator Waltz and his residence. The problem as I think we indicated in a conference call with you is that the issuance after subpoena would involve the full -- full commission to meet and actually issue an order, the issuance of such a subpoena.

I indicated to you that, as I understood it, neither the Division nor I as Chairman of the Commission had the ability to issue such a subpoena, and therefore, we were unable to act on it at that point in time.

With respect to your request for issuance of a subpoena, I guess that's -- that's still outstanding. How do you want to handle that given the fact that we're having a hearing right now?

MR. D. VIGH: Well, having researched the issue, Mr. Chairman, I guess I've come to the unfortunate conclusion that my -- my client doesn't have the ability, obviously, to issue the subpoena. As you indicated, the Commission has to do so.

So what we would request is that the committee go ahead and grant the request for the issuance of a subpoena, understanding that it's sort after moot consideration considering that we're here today to discuss the issue and we have until tomorrow in which to finalize it.

Some of the documents, obviously, are pertinent, and sort of as a preliminary statement, as a prelude to what we would present here today, it's an unfortunate circumstance when it turns into an adversarial process in order to procure this

information. And quite frankly, that's what it's been.

2.4

It's been very difficult, as the committee knows, and will know, my client actually has had a protective order against him for attempting to procure some if not all of this information by whatever means possible, and those means generally comport with his ability, his constitutional rights to redress grievances.

And I want to bring that before the committee and really delve into that somewhat, is that what my client did, what Mr. Beeles did is he took an opportunity, his constitutional right, pursuant to the 5th Amendment --

me back you up. I'm ready for opening statements in a minute. I'm good with that. Let me deal with the request for issuance of subpoena.

MR. D. VIGH: And we would ask for a special consideration, a special meeting. If those documents aren't produced by Senator Waltz today, we ask the committee hold off until tomorrow, convene a special meeting for us so that we have an opportunity for Senator Waltz to produce those documents.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand the request. Let me -- I think as I addressed it in our telephone conversation, as I understand it, due to the requirements of the Indiana's Public Meeting Statute, it would be impossible for the Commission to notice and have a meeting, a second meeting, nor can we, I believe, recess and have another meeting.

I believe it's an impractical impossibility.

I'll defer to either of any counsel or the

co-directors to issue that issue, but I don't

believe it's possible for us to, for example, hold

a portion of this hearing, recess it, having this

stuff done and then reconvene this hearing by

tomorrow. I believe that's impractical. That's a

legal impossibility, if I'm correct. Leslie or

Dale or...

MS. L. BARNES: I'm not aware of anything that would prevent you from recessing, and under the Open Door Law, the two days' notice that's required can be waived under certain circumstances. I'm not sure. Perhaps Mr. Simmons is more familiar with these rules.

MR. D. SIMMONS: Within the Open Door Law, it does allow a governing body to -- as long as they announce the date and the time and the subject

1.4

matter of the agenda doesn't change, they can recess and reconvene without the 48 hours.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Fair enough. All right. We'll take that under advisement, the request for the issuance of a subpoena. For example, as you indicated, he may have brought all that information anyway.

MR. D. VIGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And we'll be able to address that. At this point in time, I think that's the only preliminary issues with respect to this particular challenge, and is it Vigh?

MR. D. VIGH: It's Vigh.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Vigh. I apologize.

Mr. Vigh, you and your client have the burden of proof so you get to go first. I'd like brief opening statements, like ten minutes or so, and then I assume you have evidence to introduce as I assume Senator Waltz, and his attorney, Mr. Spear?

MR. B. SPEAR: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Give me -- spend about -- give me about ten minutes on a brief opening statement.

MR. D. VIGH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of my client, as I indicated earlier, what

1.6

we're here for is to redress a grievance.

Essentially, what my client's done is taken the opportunity pursuant to his constitutional right to redress the grievance and formally and unequivocably believes that Senator Waltz does not live or reside at the address indicated in his filings that have been tendered I believe to each committee member pursuant to notebooks that were prepared in advance.

That particular common address is located at 307 Elmead Court, #2010, and that's the actually unit itself. And just for brief description of -- the residence itself is a series of townhomes that are connected but in this particular townhome that Mr. Waltz resides in or has listed as his primary address, there's actually four units.

You enter in through the front door and to your immediate left or right are the bottom two units which are respectively 1009, 1010 -- 1010, and then there's two upper units, and Mr. Waltz resides at 2010.

My client filed his challenge to Mr. Waltz's residency, and for all intents and purposes, what I would like to do is turn the chair over to him so that he could for the sake of brevity briefly

explain the reasons why he decided to file that challenge, and then I'll go into after opening statements are concluded, a list of evidence that we have.

I just might note to the commission, to

Mr. Chairman, himself, that it has been difficult
to procure certain information. Of course, we're
not privy, nor do we have the subpoena power to
gather information pertinent to the challenge;
specifically, residential leases that Mr. Waltz
might have, since he is not the owner of the
condominium unit and utility bills.

What I've done is I've attached as an exhibit in the exhibit notebooks that I'll tender to each commission member, including the Chairman, our exhibits, but they are sparse, to say the least. They number a total of five exhibits. We were unable to procure any copy of Mr. Waltz's utility bills after this case hit the media, due to the fact of privacy concerns, and we fully appreciate that.

But this is not Mr. Beeles' challenge. This is really the public at large. When a challenge is made by any member, any constituent, any district, that the Senator should come forth, obviously, with

information pertaining to evidence showing that he does unequivocably live in the residence in which he delineates that he spends the night there.

The other fact I would take into consideration, the Commission is -- by my research and calculation, what we're dealing with, in defining residency, is the residence of a person since it is unequivocal that Mr. -- Senator Waltz is unmarried that Indiana Statute 3-5-5-15 defines the residence of a person who somebody unmarried and who does not have immediate family is where the person usually sleeps.

And that's an important consideration for the Commission to take into account -- what it's going to have to do is define that. Understanding, having researched this particular statute, that this statute in effect has been played several times before commissions both presently and in the past.

But because of Mr. Waltz's status as being an unmarried individual with no immediate family, his official residence is where he sleeps, and where he usually sleeps, I would argue to the Commission is probably more than 50 percent in a given year, and that would seem to me is usually where you sleep.

_

It could be more than that. The evidence that we hope to present to the commission will prove positive that in fact he does not sleep at that residence, that that residence is used solely for storage at this time.

At this time I'll just turn it over to Mr. Beeles as to why he went ahead and issued a challenge himself claiming it.

MR. M. BEELES: Thank you. Basically, the complaint, the challenge came from -- I guess up to now, if you talk to several people, this is something that actually started to develop back in '04, before the November election with the Democratic candidate.

So when I got involved, I went to several different people that I really trust, and I really have respect for in politics and -- which I was involved in dealing with local politics several years, they always mentioned, you know, thinking about running for state senator in District 36, and it always popped up.

Well, Brent Waltz doesn't live where he says he lives. Everybody that you talk to, he doesn't live there, you may want to look into it, so I looked into it, and started basically with the

voter registration and went over to different areas 1 of public information so this is where we're at 2 right now. 3 I believe we have a very valid issue or I 4 would not be here. I'm still giving you the 5 total -- total of evidence, I'll let him take back 6 over. 7 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me -- let me ask one 8 question. 9 MR. M. BEELES: Sure. 10 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Your counsel referred to 11 this as not your challenge, but the people's 12 challenge. With respect -- are you candidate? 13 I am now a candidate, yes. MR. M. BEELES: 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: For what? 15 MR. M. BEELES: State senate seat versus... 1.6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So you're a candidate 17 for his seat? 18 MR. M. BEELES: Yes. 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: On the Republican or 20 Democratic side? 21 Republican side. MR. M. BEELES: 22 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So if you knock him out 2.3 on this challenge, are there any other candidates? 24

MR. D. VIGH: No, there's not.

- 11	
1	MR. M. BEELES: Considered a Republican, no.
2	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. So if you
3	knock him out, you're the presumptive Republican
4	candidate; correct?
5	MR. M. BEELES: If that's the way it rules,
6	yes.
7	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So from a you have a
8	real personal interest in knocking him out, which
9	is if he's off the ballot, you're on the ballot;
10	right.
11	MR. M. BEELES: Right.
12	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. Anything else,
13	Mr. Vigh?
14	MR. D. VIGH: Nothing else, other than just
15	the opportunity to hand the notebooks out to the
16	committee members.
17	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We'll do that in just a
18	second.
19	MR. D. VIGH: Okay.
20	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me hear Mr.
21	Spear's
22	MR. D. VIGH: Thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: opening and then
24	we'll go into the evidence.
25	MR. B. SPEAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, my name is Bob Spear. I represent
Respondent, Senator Brent Waltz. The
qualifications for State Senator in Indiana are
found in Article 4, Section 7 of the Indiana
Constitution, which reads no person should be a
Senator representative at the time of his election
who is not a citizen of the United States nor
anyone who has not been for two years next
preceding his election an inhabitant of this state
and for one year next proceeding an election an
inhabitant of the district from which he may be
chosen. Senators shall be at least 25, and
representatives, at least 21 years of age.

This is refined but not changed by Indiana

Code 3-8-1-13 which says a candidate for the office

of senator in the general assembly must: 1) be a

United States citizen at the time of election; 2

have resided in the state for at least two (2)

years and in the senate district for at least one

year before the election; and 3) be at least

twenty-five (25) years old upon taking office as

provided in Article 4, Section 7 of the

Constitution of the State of Indiana.

The boundaries of Senate District 36 are found in Indiana Code 2-1-11-36 which includes Precinct 4

1 2

.

in Johnson County. Now Senator Brent Waltz lives, 1 resides at and is domiciled at 307 Elmead Court, 2 #2010, Greenwood, Indiana, 46142 since October 3 2003, which is Senate District 36, and meets the 4 standards set by the Indiana Supreme Court in the 5 State Election Board versus Bayh, at 521 N.E.2d 6 1313, Indiana Supreme Court 1988, and this 7 residency challenge is frivolous. Thank you. 8 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Mr. Vigh. 9 MR. D. VIGH: At this point I'd like to hand 10 these notebooks out to the committee members, 11 12 please. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And is this a 13 (indiscernible) copy of this complaint? 14 MR. D. VIGH: Yes. 15 MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, if I may just say, 16 Mr. Vigh's agreed also to provide a copy for the... 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: For the records of the 18 Division? 19 MR. B. KING: Yes. 20 I apologize for... MR. D. VIGH: 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So we -- that just 22 means -- that just means we can write on ours. 23 MR. D. VIGH: Thank you. And for the sake of 24

brevity, as I indicated in the opening statement,

we just have five exhibits, Exhibit A through E, and what I'll do is, again, for the sake of brevity, is just to summarize.

The first exhibit is an affidavit of Chad Woods. Chad Woods is a 21-year-old individual that lives in a tenement where Senator Brent Waltz resides. He lives and shares a common ceiling/floor with Senator Waltz. He is, in effect, in 10 -- 10307 Elmead Court. The affidavit speaks for itself.

But through my conversations that I had with Mr. Chad Woods, he had indicated that he had only known the Senator to be there, approximately, 12 times, and that he as in Paragraph 3, in his opinion, based on his personal knowledge and familiarity with the tenant located at 307 Elmead, that Senator Brent Waltz has not slept there within the past year.

Of course, that's important, because in order to qualify for the district seat, you have to have to resided at the address within the senate district for a period of at least one year. The sum and substance of this affidavit essentially say that is Senator Waltz does not sleep there. And of course, going back to what we would be Exhibit D

that we have which is the real standard in defining the residence of Senator Waltz, who is an unmarried with no immediate family, is the place where he usually sleeps.

2.2

Chad Woods who has not been convicted of a felony, but did not want to appear here today, and of course, I could not coerce him, (indiscernible) being in power to do so, but he was willing to execute and sign an affidavit. That's the sum and substance of Exhibit A.

Exhibit B that we have is just generally our request for the issuance of a subpoena. We requested specifically that Senator Waltz appear here today. He, obviously, has appeared of his own volition and accord, and we also requested a series of enumerated documents -- of importance would be his residential leases, and of importance, would be copies of utility bills.

We are at a loss and frustrated, of course, due to the fact that we don't have the ability or access or are privy to this information. However, that being said, I would draw the committee's attention to Exhibit C, which is in and of itself is an unusual exhibit, because that is an exparte order attached that Senator Waltz sought from the

Johnson County Court and received against my client, Mr. Beeles.

I enter it into evidence and ask the Commission just take apprisal of the issue dealing with the exhibits that were tendered ex parte to the Honorable Judge Handy. Those exhibits are comprised almost exclusively of newspaper paper articles.

So the reason in putting in these newspaper paper articles, quite frankly, was since it was good enough for an ex parte commission, with all due respect to an ex parte hearing, and then Johnson Superior Court, that I hope that at least the commission would give us due weight here on the articles that Senator Waltz delineated as exhibits.

And specifically, Exhibit A, on Page 2, Senator Waltz, through his own testimony and through newspaper articles, indicates that the Duke Energy utility records on average as place of residence over the last month for 2007 is approximately \$17 per month.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And you're reading from the last sentence of the exhibit?

MR. D. VIGH: I'm reading, yes, actually the last sentence on what would be Page 1 of Exhibit A

to our Exhibit C, and then the subsequent page where it says that somebody from Duke Energy indicated that \$17 a month utility bill is comparable to operating a refrigerator.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I take it the purpose of this is you couldn't get the utility bills because the subpoena wasn't out, but your contention is because Senator Waltz introduced this as part of the protective order, we ought to take some notice of the fact that the utility bills which you couldn't obtain say that he was basically using enough electricity to run a refrigerator?

MR. D. VIGH: That is correct. And since he specific -- excuse me, specifically, identified this newspaper article as an exhibit in the ex parte hearing, that the committee should give it at least some weight here with respect to the residency challenge.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And let me suggest

perhaps the best way to handle this, and I'm going

to refer to this as well for the other items in

your subpoena, Senator Waltz is here and available

to testify. He will be testifying under oath and I

think the appropriate method, rather than

introducing these newspaper exhibits, is he is

quoted in this article? 1 Yes, he is. 2 MR. D. VIGH: 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I think the appropriate 4 method to handle this from an evidentiary 5 standpoint is simply to ask him those questions, and -- and he's under oath, and either you know, he 6 says I made that statement, or with all due respect 7 to the members of our (indiscernible) state, maybe 8 they got it wrong, but we'll find out directly from 9 his mouth under -- under penalty of perjury. So 10 11 we'll find out one way or the other. And I would suggest that's the best way to introduce rather 12 13 than ask us to take notice of newspaper articles which... 14 MR. D. VIGH: And in that regard, then we 15 would ask ... 16 17 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: He can call him himself. 18 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: That's my 19 understanding. 20 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: (Indiscernible). I'll defer and let. 21 MR. D. VIGH: 22 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I mean we -- you know 23 we --24 MR. D. VIGH: I'll let -- I'll let Mr.

25

Spear...

Elmead Court in Greenwood, Indiana, 46142 is the 1 zip code. 2 And how long have you resided at that particular 3 address for? 4 Since October of 2003. 5 And do you rent that? 6 I do. 7 And would do you rent that from? 8 From Pamela Ingalls, I-N-G-A-L-L-S; first name 9 Pamela, PAMELA. 10 And do you have any personal relationship with 11 Ms. Inqalls? 12 13 Α No. And have you brought here today any copies of 14 leases that you have with Ms. Ingalls on that 15 particular residence? 16 Yes. 17 And have you brought any rent checks for that 18 particular residence here today? 19 A No. 20 And why have you not brought any rent checks or 21 cancelled rent checks? 22 I suspect that because there'll be adequate 23 evidence that we'll be provided that will

demonstrate conclusively that I live where I

24

- 1 | live.
- 2 | Q And do you pay rent at that particular address
- 3 there?
- 4 **A** I do.
- 5 ||Q| And what is the rent per month?
- 6 **A** \$525 a month.
- 7 ||Q| And how is that paid to Ms. Ingalls every month?
- 8 | A By personal check.
- 9 Q And when is that rent due?
- 10 A It's due the 1st of each month.
- 11 ||Q| And how actually tender payment?
- 12 A Via the mail.
- 13 Q Via the mail?
- 14 A U.S. Postal Service First Class.
- 15 Q And in that particular address at 307 Elmead,
- 16 Apartment 2010, in the last year, how many
- 17 | nights would you say you've slept there?
- 18 | A Well, I've never counted.
- 19 **Q** Approximately, how many nights? Would it be
- 20 more than six months out of a given year?
- 21 **A** I have never counted.
- 22 0 Would it be more than three months?
- 23 A I have never counted.
- 24 **Q** Let's say --
- 25 A But I do -- but for the record, I do sleep

- there, but I've never counted the exact precise numbers of nights I've spent there.
 - Q Let's take the last month, how many nights have you slept there in the last month?
 - A I've never counted.

4

5

8

9

10

- 6 Q You can't give an approximation? Is it more than seven?
 - A You're asking me to speculate.
 - Q I'm not asking you to speculate. I'm just asking you to give me an answer as to how many nights --
- 12 A Yes, it's been -- it's more than seven, and more than half.
- 14 **0** More than half?
- 15 **A** (The witness nodded.)
- 16 And when you say more than half, what are you referring to?
- 18 A I'm answering your question.
- 19 Q Half of what?
- 20 A You asked me -- if I understand you correctly,
 21 the question was: Have you spent more than half
 22 of the nights within the last month at my home?
 23 And the answer is yes.
- 24 O And what time do you usually arrive at home?
- 25 \mathbf{A} I keep very erratic hours; particularly, this

- time of year. Last night I arrived home about
 2 2:00 o'clock in the morning, but actually it was
 this morning that I arrived home.
 - Q And with respect to 307 Elmead, when was the last time you entertained or had guests over at that residence?
 - A Well, I had a friend of mine, Greg Hannon

 (Phonetic), who assisted me with some

 photographs that we will be presenting this
 afternoon.
- 11 Q Okay. And when was he over at your particular 12 residence?
- 13 **A** A few days ago.

5

6

7

8

9

10

18

19

- 14 ||Q| And do you receive mail at that address?
- 15 A I do not. I have a post office box in Greenwood

 16 that I've had since 19__, either late 1995 or

 17 early 1996.
 - Q And are you familiar with the article where it was quoted that you pay approximately \$17 a month in utility bills?
- I'm familiar with the article. I don't know if
 necessarily that was the quote. I haven't read
 that article in several weeks, but if memory
 serves correctly, it says, and I do remember
 saying this to the reporter, that I pay my bill,

whatever that is.

2.4

I can tell you that a few days after the story came out, that I did receive a utility bill, it was between 40 and \$50, which I then pay to Duke Energy.

- Q Okay. Did you bring that here with you today?
- 7 A I did not.
 - Q Okay. And why did you not bring that utility here today -- surely, you thought it must be an issue?
 - A I would not presume what you would determine to be an issue.
 - Well, regardless of that, it appeared from a previous article that there is an issue that indicated that you grant approximately \$17 a month in 2007 which was the equivalent of a refrigerator, so it being equivalent of running a refrigerator, I would presume that that means that you do not run any electricity, and you're indicating that your last utility was in the amount of \$40?
 - \mathbf{A} I said between 40 and \$50.
 - $oldsymbol{Q}$ And do you have actually a telephone, a land line hooked up to that residence?
 - A No. I use my cell phone for all my

1 communication.

- Q Okay. And how long have you not had a land line connected to that residence in that regard?
- A I've never had a land line connected to that residence.
- o You've never had a land line?
- A No. I've had my cell phone since late 1995, early 1996, and I use that for my primary communication.
- Q Do you have any reason to know why there was a sticker attached to your mailbox which indicated that your particular residency was vacant?
- A I think so. And this is a little speculative, but I believe it's the U.S. Postal Service, any time that there's a mailbox that is not in use, that they will annotate that.

It has nothing to do with the vacancy or lack thereof of a residence. It has, I believe, everything to do with the lack of use of a post office box or a mailbox or a mail slot, for that matter, and so that's what it refers to. And I believe it's the U.S. Postal Service that does that.

Q Okay. So you don't dispute that there was in effect a sticker or some sort of adhesive that

2.3

was attached to the top of your -- your mailing box that said 2010 was vacant; is that correct?

I don't dispute that there was a piece of tape that somebody, and again -- and the reason why I say this is because a television reporter was shooting some film and was interviewing me and said oh, we were taking some footage of your home and we notice that had there was a United States Postal worker that came in and was actually putting tape on that.

So that's why I'm presuming that that's the case. How that originally got there, I wouldn't speculate on, but that is what a newspaper, or a TV reporter told me.

- Q Okay. And are you familiar with the quotes that were put into the media regarding your failed attendance in that particular residence or unit; specifically, The Woods, Paige Woods and Chad Woods?
- A I don't remember any quote specifically from him. That doesn't mean that it doesn't exist.
- Q Have you had any interaction with any other -other residents in that unit?
- A Yes, I have.

 $m{Q}$ Okay. And would, specifically, have you had

interaction with?

- A Velma Wilmer (Phonetic), who is a 90-year-old lady, sometimes she'll leave the keys stuck in her door in the entryway, and when I'm -- if it's not too late, I'll knock on the door and remind her that she should probably take the keys out of that. That's happened a few times.
- Q Okay. Is that the Velma Wilmer that said that she didn't believe that you lived at that particular address and that that address was in fact vacant?
- 12 A I don't know if she said that or not.
- **Q** Okay.

- 14 A She's never said that to me.
- Well, according to the newspaper, she said and I
 quote there's no one living there, and she said
 she's lived in the building the last eight years
 and she believed that you store items in the
 condominium, but she did not recall seeing you
 in at least a year. Do you recall seeing Ms.

 Velma Wilmer within the last year?
 - A I don't remember the timing on that. I would also draw your attention that there are some other articles later on under the headline backtracking from your client that says that

Ms. Wilmer does not routinely look out the window and does not see people coming and going and would not be qualified to make that statement.

1.0

2.4

So apparently, she seems to have backtracked a little bit herself on it. Keep in mind, she's is 90 years of age. And when I arrive home, normally she -- it's probably past her bedtime most nights. So I don't know if necessarily out of respect for her if she might be the most qualified person to make that -- that assessment.

But I do interact with her -- I have over the years and am fairly fond of her. She's a very nice lady. She's always been very nice to me.

- Q Are you familiar with Paige Woods and Chad Woods that live below you?
- A I think I may have seen them a few -- on a few occasions but I don't believe that I've ever been introduced to them.
- Q Okay. Do you have any reason or have you formed any opinion as to why Chad Woods would by way of affidavit indicate that he does not believe you've slept there within the past year?
- A I have no opinion on that. I don't know him, and really have not discussed with him the

1 affidavit.

1.4

2.2

- Are you familiar with his wife's quotation in the newspaper that indicated she's never heard footsteps actually on the common wall ceiling that you two share and that she doesn't believe that you live there?
- A I do remember reading that article and I kind of was amused when I read that. I thought I'd turn up some Metallica at 2:00 o'clock in the morning just to let her know that I'm there next time. So I did read that article, yes.
- Q And it's your testimony that in the last month you've slept at that residence at least 15 days; is that correct?
 - Yes. And again, that's an approximation, but

 I've never kept track of the number of days or

 nights that I sleep there. My business takes me

 out of state on occasion, and certainty, this

 time of year is a -- a fairly busy time with the

 Indiana General Assembly.

Sometimes I'll stay the night at the Columbia Club. It's generally a little bit more -- a little more convenient for me, sometimes if there's a early morning meeting with that. So it is a busy time.

- 1 Q Okay. And I can appreciate and respect that, 2 Senator.
 - A Thank you.

8

9

22

23

24

- What utilities do you have at that particular residence? You've testified that you don't have a phone. I understand you have electricity.

 What other utilities do you incur there?
 - A I have water which is folded into the lease payment and also my utility bill.
- 10 Q Okay. Do you have a cable bill at all --
- 11 A No.
- 12 | Q -- or satellite?
- 13 **A** No.
- 14 || Q| You actually have a TV in the residence?
- 15 A No, I don't.
- 16 Q Okay. Any reason for that?
- I'm formally not there and my schedule is such
 that I don't watch a lot of TV. When I do, I'm
 normally at my office, which does have a
 television so -- I generally sleep when I'm
 there.
 - Q And I think you also indicated in the newspaper article that that residence on Elmead had all the creature comforts. What did you mean when you said that?

- A Well, I think the statement speaks for itself.

 I don't know what more I'd want to add or

 subtract from that.
 - Q Well, you, obviously, don't have a television so that would be one creature comfort that you don't have?
 - A I don't consider that a creature comfort. When you get home at 1:00 or 2:00 o'clock in the morning, there's generally not a lot of good programs on so...
 - Q Do you have internet hooked up there and/or a computer?
 - A No, I don't have a computer there. I have three other computers hooked up and I'll normally get my email and communication on line at an office which I have which is about 1.5 to 2 miles from my residence.
- 18 Q Do you ever spend the night at your parents'
 19 residence?
 - A I have on occasion, yes.

- 21 Q How many times in the last year would you say
 22 you've spent there, more than ten?
 - A I've never kept track. During January, they went on vacation to Florida for a good part of the month and they asked me to house sit there.

And I certainly oblige them to some extent. I don't know how many nights that was. I picked up the mail for them on a -- generally a daily basis but I've never kept track of how many nights I spent there.

- And after you're done doing your usual course of business say on a given day when the legislature is not in session, is the Elmead address where you usually spend and sleep at night?
- It will vary on a day by day or a week by week basis. I do some traveling, and when I'm out of state and out of town, I certainly don't stay there.

MR. D. VIGH: I have nothing further.

MR. B. SPEAR: If it please the Commission, I can probably do this on cross-examination or I can wait to call him myself, whichever...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I appreciate it, if it'll expedite the...

MR. B. SPEAR: Which I would hope so. He asked many of the questions I intended to ask.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

QUESTIONS BY MR. ROBERT SPEAR:

- Just to clarify a couple of things. You are currently serving as a Indiana State Senator; correct?
- 6 A Yes, sir.
- 7 Q And you were elected in 2004 from District 36?
- 8 A I was.

1

- 11 **A** That's my normal signature.
- 15 A My father goes by Darryl. I go by Brent, my middle name.
- 17 **Q** Right. And, in fact, your name appears on the ballot as Brent Waltz; is that correct?
- 19 **A** Yes.
- 20 Q Okay. Now what county is 307 Elwood (sic) Court #2010, Greenwood, Indiana, 46142 located in?
- 22 A Johnson County.
- 23 Q And do you know what precinct you live in?
- 24 A Pleasant 4.
- 25 ||Q| And you live in a condominium on the second

floor; is that correct? 1 I do. 2 A And you rent it? 3 I do. 4 When did you move to 307 Elwood Court? 5 It was in October 2003. 6 And do you consider the condominium to be your 7 primary residence? 8 I do. 9 A I'll show you what has been marked as Exhibit A 10 and ask you if you can identify it? 11 Judging by the bad picture, it looks --12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me interrupt for a 13 moment. Can you use 1? The Challenger has used A, 14 B, C so if you can... 15 MR. B. SPEAR: Oh, I'll be happy to. 16 With due respect, I just want to give counsel -- a 17 copy to counsel. 18 Bureau of Motor Vehicles, the lousy photograph 19 A seems to indicate that it's my driver's license 20 21 so... If you'd pass that around, MR. B. SPEAR: 22 Mr. Chairman. 23

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

copies or is that...

24

25

Do you have multiple

MR. D. VIGH: Right. 2 I'll move the admission of MR. B. SPEAR: 3 Exhibit 1. 4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Exhibit 1 is admitted. 5 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: (Indiscernible). 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We're pretty informal. 7 We do not... VICE CHAIR A. LONG: 8 Apparently... CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 9 Then I won't bother Okay. MR. B. SPEAR: 10 moving to admit them after this. 11 VICE CHAIR A. LONG: We'll wad them up and 12 throw them back at you. 13 MR. B. SPEAR: All right. 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You'll know if the Vice 15 Chair... 16 All right. MR. B. SPEAR: 17 I'll show you what's been marked as Exhibit 2 18 Q and ask you to identify that? 19 This is my rental lease agreement between 20 A Yes. myself and Pamela Ingalls. 21 Before you pass it over, I've got one question 22 to ask you about it? 23 \boldsymbol{A} Yes, sir. 24 If you look at the top left, it says one-year 25

correct?

rental lease agreement? 1 Uh-huh. 2 It's got two sets of initials there, is one of 3 those yours? 4 5 DBW, yes, sir. And then it says it's for 10-1-03 to 5-31-03, 6 which would be backwards, is that a 7 typographical error? 8 Yes, it is. 9 Should that be 5/31/04? 10 Yes, sir. 11 And the date of signature is 10/1/03? 12 Yes, it is. 13 Pass that up to the commission, please? 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Bob, let me -- if I 15 can -- I just want to ask a question. 16 MR. B. SPEAR: Sure. 17 I think it will be CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 18 expeditious if I (indiscernible) as your exhibits. 19 Senator Waltz, this is a copy of your driver's 20 license, and it shows as an address 307 Elmead --21 is it E-L-M-E-A-D or A-L-M-E-A-D? 22 SENATOR D. WALTZ: E-L-M-E-A-D. 23

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

the good commissioner from Northern Indiana

2.4

25

Thank you.

Apparently,

neglected to turn his cell phone off when I told 1 everybody. 2 COMMISSION MEMBER D. DUMEZICH: 3 correcting the deficiency as we speak. 4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I appreciate that. Your 5 prior -- this is an issue date of 9/6/06, prior 6 driver's license and address? 7 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Probably not. I would have 8 been 21, I believe, when my driver's license was 9 renewed -- I think that's right, and I would have 10 been a student at Wabash College, and my residence 11 would have been my mother and father's at the time. 12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you have more leases 13 coming? 14 MR. B. SPEAR: No, but I got a follow-up 15 16 question. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. 17 I take it that you and your landlord both signed 18 this lease? 19 Yes. 20 A And at the expiration of this lease, did you 21 continue on a month-to-month basis --22 We did. 23 A -- at this location? So you continuously lived 24 there since October 1st, 2003, or whenever in

October you moved in? 1 Yes, sir. 2 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me -- let me follow 4 up and just ask a quick -- a quick question just so 5 I'm clear. So in October of '03, is when you moved into this -- this address: correct? 6 7 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes. 8 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And your driver's 9 license was renewed in '06, so either -- I don't 10 know if it's six years or -- but your prior driver's license would have had to have been -- you 11 were still -- strike that. You're correct. 12 Never 13 mind. I had the dates wrong. I'm sorry. 14 MR. B. SPEAR: I think you got his age wrong but it's --15 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I was trying to figure out. 17 18 MR. B. SPEAR: His driver's license would have 19 been either five or six years earlier which would 20 have not had that address. 21 Right. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It would have 22 been prior to that address? 23 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes, sir. 24 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I wanted to make sure. 25 All right. I'll show you what has been marked

as Exhibit 3, and ask if you can identify that? 1 Yes, sir. 2 A What is it? 3 That is a voter registration card from Johnson 4 County. 5 Whose name's on it? 6 Q That would be my name, Darryl Brent Waltz, Jr. 7 A And what date was that signed? 8 That was signed on the 6th of October, 2003. 9 Would you pass that up to the Commission, 10 please? 11 (The witness complied.) 12 I'm unclear on a couple CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 13 of steps on it. I'm hitting them as the exhibits 14 are crossing me. 15 MR. B. SPEAR: Sure. 16 With respect to the CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 17 lease, and you may have asked this, and I was still 18 back on the driver's license, but with respect to 19 the lease, that has a hold-over or rollover 20 provision, and you're still operating under the 21 same lease? 22 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes. 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So I assume it's a year 24

to year kind of thing?

registration which was the one you've given us, the October 6th, 2003, and that's your current voter registration, the 124 North Smart Street listed as your prior address, what -- what address is that?

SENATOR D. WALTZ: That was my prior residence before that. It was my grandmother's residence, actually. She was suffering from Alzheimer's and I was leaving my mother and father's home around that time. And I was gone a great deal of the time, but I was there quite a bit, too, to help care for her and be with her so...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So that was at -- at your grandmother's address; correct?

SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I apologize,

Senator, but I'm doing this in kind of a delayed fashion.

SENATOR D. WALTZ: Well, I -- it's fine.

Well, I apologize, again, to the Commission for not having multiple copies.

- Senator, I'm going to show you what has been marked as Plaintiff's Exhibit 5 and ask if you can identify that?
- A Yes. This is my 2006 Indiana State tax return.

- And addressing your attention to -- now you've redacted this because you've taken out of the numbers out of it; correct?
 - A Yes, I have.

- In fact, I can't even tell from the first page
 whose return it is, but whose signature is on
 the second page?
- 8 A That would be mine.
 - Q And did you claim a renter's deduction?
- 10 **| A** I did, of \$2,500.
- 11 0 What location?
- 12 A 307 Elmead Court in Greenwood, Indiana, 46142

 13 with the name of the landlord being Pamela

 14 Ingalls.
- 15 ||Q| Pass that up to the Commission, please?
- 16 A (The witness complied.)
- MR. B. SPEAR: And I apologize to the

 Commission, but my photocopies of the 2005 were

 illegible, but I have 2004 here.
- 22 A This is my 2004 Indiana State tax return.
- 23 Q Does that have the same signature on it?
- 24 A Yes, sir.
- 25 Q Same renter's deduction?

A Yes, sir, and the same address as well.

2.4

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Senator Waltz, let me go back. Is the -- there's a phone number listed on here. I take it that's your cell phone number?

SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes, sir. If it's (317) 435-0195...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 0195?

SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes, sir.

- Q At this point, Senator, I'm going to ask you to briefly describe your condominium for the purposes of asking the commission?
- A Okay. Second floor, you go up the stairs, walk inside, there's a kitchen, which being a horrible cook, I never use. I'm generally on a good first name basis with most of the fast food restaurants in Greenwood, it seems.

But as you walk in, you're facing the kitchen. there's an entryway. You turn to the right, there's a living room, sofa, reclining chair, and you go -- I guess the direction would be in a southerly direction or left as you're facing that.

The bedroom is on the right. And then to the left, I have a number of different areas and things that I keep. And then bathroom is between the -- the other room and the living room.

- Okay. I'm going to mark (sic) you what has marked as Exhibit 7, which is multiple parts?
- **A** Okay.
- 4 Q If you start with the first picture, you tell us what that is?
- A Yes. This is a photograph taken actually in the entryway of my condominium facing the living room and a sofa and my reclining chair are visible.
- ||Q| Did you move those in when you moved in in 2003?
- **A** I did.
- ||Q| So you've got the same furniture?
- **A** Yes.

- Q Do you have a kitchen table?
- 15 A I don't.
- 16 Q You don't cook, do you?
- 17 A Not a cook.
- ||Q| Pass that up?
- **A** (The witness complied.)
 - CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Just for clarification purposes, these are the pictures you referred to previously as being taken within the last couple of...
- 24 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes. Yes. These are current photographs.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: As I understood your 1 testimony, this represents the way it's been over 2 time? 3 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Some furniture is moved 4 here and there, but for all intents and purposes, 5 all the items that were moved in are -- are there, 6 7 yes. What's the next picture? 8 The picture is a photograph taken in my bedroom, 9 my closet, and part of my bed and dresser are 10 visible. 11 Another view of your living room? 12 Yes. 13 What's that? 14 A view taken in the entryway. If you were to 15 back up about 5 feet, you'd be in my bathroom, 16 but you can also see part of the bed as well. 17 What is it, which room? 18 It's actually a hallway. 19 A And what does it -- does it show at the end of 20 that hallway? 21 At the end of the hallway is my bedroom. A 22 And the bedroom?

23

24

25

Q

Yes, sir.

Bob, hold on just one CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

second. 1 2 MR. B. SPEAR: Sure. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We're marking these as 3 4 Group Exhibit 7, --5 MR. B. SPEAR: Yes. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- is that what you're 6 7 doing, --MR. B. SPEAR: Yes. 8 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 9 -- rather than individual exhibits? 10 MR. B. SPEAR: Yes. 11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. So the 12 photographs will all be No. 7. 13 And finally? 14 Yes, same location showing part of my bedroom. 15 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Bob, just real quick. 16 The picture of the bedroom also includes -- I 17 assume that's intentionally to depict the 18 clothes --19 20 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- in there as well? 21 SENATOR D. WALTZ: Yes. 22 You will stipulate, however, that those clothes 23 Q weren't necessarily hanging there in 2003? 24 Some have been replaced in the last five years.

Some have not, by the way, which is a little scary in and of itself.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm not going to comment on the...

SENATOR D. WALTZ: No fashion.

- Q I'll show you Exhibit 8, and ask you if you can identify that --
- A Yes.

- **Q** -- briefly?
- This is an affidavit from my landlord Pamela

 Ingalls that swears under oath signed and

 notarized that her address, that she own as

 condominium located at 307 Elmead Court, #2010,

 and that she has continually leased the

 aforementioned condominium to me since October

 of 2003.
 - Q If you'd pass that up, please?
- **A** (The witness complied.)
- **Q** I show you what's been marked as Exhibit 9 and 20 ask if you can identify that?
- I can. It's an affidavit from Keith Thomas

 who -- who stipulates, notarized and under pain

 and penalty of perjury, that he is my cousin,

 that -- and I will read this, that I am -- I

 reside at 6980 South 125 West, Trafalgar,