

1 Eric P. Early, State Bar Number 166275  
eearly@earlysullivan.com  
2 Jeremy J. F. Gray, State Bar Number 150075  
jgray@earlysullivan.com  
3 Ryan M. Hemar, State Bar Number 305335  
rhemar@earlysullivan.com  
4 EARLY SULLIVAN WRIGHT  
GIZER & McRAE LLP  
5 6420 Wilshire Boulevard, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90048  
6 Telephone: (323) 301-4660  
Facsimile: (323) 301-4676  
7

8 Attorneys for Petitioners  
ORRIN E. HEATLIE, MIKE NETTER, and THE  
CALIFORNIA PATRIOT COALITION –  
9 RECALL GOVERNOR GAVIN NEWSOM

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**  
12

13 ORRIN E. HEATLIE, MIKE NETTER, and  
14 THE CALIFORNIA PATRIOT  
COALITION – RECALL GOVERNOR  
15 GAVIN NEWSOM (FPPC ID No.  
1424018),  
16

17 Petitioners,

18 vs.

19 DR. SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of State of the State of  
California,  
20

21 Respondent,

22 BRIAN JAMISON, in his official capacity  
as Acting State Printer of the State of  
California; GAVIN NEWSOM, in his  
23 official capacity as Governor of the State of  
California,  
24

25 Real Parties in Interest.  
26  
27

Case No.:

Action filed:

**VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE**

**ELECTION MATTER – IMMEDIATE  
ACTION REQUESTED**  
[Cal. Elec. Code § 13314]

**[Petitioners' Request for Judicial Notice  
Filed and Served Concurrently Herewith]**

**CRITICAL DATE: August 6, 2021**

Date: TBD

Time: TBD

Dept: TBD

1 Petitioners Orrin E. Heatlie, Mike Netter, and “The California Patriot Coalition – Recall  
2 Governor Gavin Newsom” (“Petitioners”) petition this Court pursuant to Elections Code sections  
3 9092, 11327, 13307 and 13314, and Government Code section 88006 for a writ of mandate  
4 commanding Respondent Dr. Shirley N. Weber, Secretary of State of California, to delete several  
5 false and misleading statements from the “Recall Argument” proposed by real party in interest  
6 Governor Gavin Newsom for submission in the voter information guide to be used for the  
7 September 14, 2021 California gubernatorial recall election.

8 By this verified petition, Petitioners allege:

9 I.

10 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

11 1. The California Secretary of State’s Office is overseeing the content and publication  
12 of the Voter Information Guide that will be sent to California voters in advance of the September  
13 14, 2021 special recall election (the “Guide”).

14 2. The content of the statements to be included in the Guide by the person who is the  
15 subject of the recall election (Governor Gavin Newsom) and the Lead Proponent of the recall  
16 (Petitioner Orrin E. Heatlie), are controlled by California law, which expressly prevent including  
17 in the Guide the false and misleading statements that Newsom proposes to include in the Guide  
18 (“Newsom’s Recall Argument”), which largely mirror his and his supporters’ paid  
19 advertisements. The Guide is not a paid advertisement.

20 “The argument shall not contain any demonstrably false, slanderous,  
21 or libelous statements nor any obscene or profane language,  
statements, or insinuations.”<sup>1</sup>

22 “The contents of the California Voter Information Guide, including  
23 the recall arguments, shall be subject to public inspection and  
24 challenge pursuant to Elections Code section 9092 and Government  
Code 88006 from July 17, 2021, to August 6, 2021.”<sup>2</sup>

25 Elections Code section 9092 provides in pertinent part: “Not less  
26 than 20 days before he or she submits the copy for the state voter  
information guide to the State Printer, the Secretary of State shall

27 <sup>1</sup> See the Secretary of State’s July 8, 2021 letter to Petitioner Heatlie, attached as Exhibit 1  
to Petitioners’ Request for Judicial Notice.

28 <sup>2</sup> *Id.*



1 make the copy available for public examination. Any elector may  
2 seek a writ of mandate requiring a copy to be amended or deleted  
3 from the state voter information guide. A peremptory writ of  
4 mandate shall issue only upon clear and convincing proof that the  
5 copy in question **is false, misleading**, or inconsistent with the  
6 requirements of this code or Chapter 8 (commencing with Section  
7 88000) of Title 9 of the Government Code, and that issuance of the  
8 writ will not substantially interfere with the printing and distribution  
9 of the state voter information guide as required by law.” (Emphasis  
10 added.)

11 3. As the evidence submitted herewith makes very clear, the recall is not – as  
12 Newsom repeatedly falsely states in the Newsom Recall Argument – a “Republican recall” or “an  
13 attempt by National Republicans and Trump supporters” to “grab power” from Newsom. The  
14 Constitutional recall has instead been supported by Californians of all political persuasions.  
15 Moreover, nearly half of the gubernatorial candidates certified by the Secretary of State to run  
16 against Newsom ***are not even Republicans.***<sup>3</sup>

17 4. This Petition respectfully requests a Court Order – by no later than the August 6,  
18 2021 deadline imposed by the California Secretary of State – striking portions of Newsom’s  
19 Recall Argument.

## 20 II.

### 21 PARTIES

22 5. Petitioner Orrin E. Heatlie is a resident of the County of Sacramento, California,  
23 and is now and has been at all relevant times, a registered voter of the State of California.  
24 Petitioner Heatlie is the Lead Proponent of the effort to recall Governor Gavin Newsom and a  
25 Board Member of Petitioner the California Patriot Coalition – Recall Governor Gavin Newsom.

26 6. Petitioner Mike Netter is a resident of the County of Los Angeles, California, and  
27 is now and has been at all relevant times, a registered voter of the State of California. Petitioner  
28 Netter is one of the Main Proponents of the effort to recall Governor Gavin Newsom, and a Board  
29 Member of Petitioner the California Patriot Coalition – Recall Governor Gavin Newsom.

---

30 <sup>3</sup> See the Secretary of State’s July 21, 2021 Certified list of Gubernatorial Candidates  
31 attached as Exhibit 2 to Petitioners’ Request for Judicial Notice.





1 Elections Code section 9092 and Government Code section 88006.

2 13. The Petitioners have standing to bring this Writ under Elections Code section  
3 321(a). Election Code Section 9092 provides that “elector[s]” have standing to challenge  
4 candidate statements to be included in voter information guides. Section 321(a) defines an  
5 “elector” as “a person who is a United States citizen 18 years of age or older and . . . is a resident  
6 of an election precinct in this state on or before the day of an election.” Petitioners Heatlie and  
7 Netter are both United States citizens over the age of 18 who are, and at all relevant times will  
8 remain, residents of the state of California. Thus, Petitioners have standing to pursue this petition  
9 for writ of mandate.

10 IV.

11 **THE LAWS AT ISSUE**

12 **A. Petitioners and the Approximately 2 Million Californians of All Political**  
13 **Persuasions Who Signed Recall Petitions Are Following the California**  
14 **Constitution, and Not Engaged In Any Sort of Nefarious “Power Grab”**

15 14. Newsom falsely and misleadingly refers to the millions of Californians asserting  
16 their Constitutional Rights as all being Republican Trump supporters impliedly acting  
17 subversively to grab power. Not so. Those supporting the recall are following their  
18 Constitutional rights as expressly provided for in California’s Constitution which Newsom swore  
19 to uphold, protect and defend:

20 “All political power is inherent in the people. Government is  
21 instituted for their protection, security, and benefit, and they have  
22 the right to alter or reform it when the public good may require.”

23 (Cal. Const., Art. II, § 1.)

24 “Recall is the power of the electors to remove an elective officer.”

25 (Cal. Const., Art. II, § 13; see also Cal. Const., Art. II, §§ 14-18

26 (describing the procedures for recalling a state officer)).<sup>4</sup>

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
4 See, e.g., Cal. Const., Art. II, § 14(a) (“Recall of a state officer is initiated by delivering to the Secretary of State a petition alleging reason for recall. Sufficiency of reason is not



1           **B. Procedural and Legal Standards At Issue Here**

2           15.     California Elections Code section 11327 provides: “An officer whose recall is  
3 being sought may file a statement with the elections official in accordance with Section 13307, to  
4 be sent to each voter, together with the voter information guide.”

5           16.     Prior to submitting the Guide to the State Printer for the printing and eventual  
6 distribution to the electorate, California law provides for a public display period of 20 days.  
7 During that 20-day period, any elector (citizen) may seek a writ of mandate objecting to the  
8 content of the written statement. Cal. Elec. Code § 9092; Gov. Code § 8806.

9           17.     California Election law provides that a citizen may challenge a candidate’s  
10 statement and a writ of mandate may be issued upon a showing of “clear and convincing proof  
11 that the copy in question is *false, misleading, or inconsistent with the requirements of this code*  
12 or Chapter 8 (commencing with Section 88000) of Title 9 of the Government Code, and that  
13 issuance of the writ will not substantially interfere with the printing and distribution of the state  
14 voter information guide as required by law.” (Cal. Elec. Code § 9092 (emphasis added.)) This  
15 language is mirrored in Government Code section 88006, with regard to ballot pamphlets.

16           18.     On July 17, 2021, Respondent Weber, acting pursuant to Elections Code section  
17 9092, made available for public inspection the final proposed copy for the Guide to be used for  
18 the September 14, 2021 gubernatorial recall election. The 20-day period specified by Elections  
19 Code section 9092 for public examination of and challenges to the proposed voter information  
20 guide will expire on August 6, 2021.

21           19.     The Guide released by Respondent Weber included a Recall Argument submitted  
22 on behalf of Real Party in Interest Newsom.<sup>5</sup>

23           20.     Pursuant to Elections Code section 9092 and Government Code section 88006,  
24

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 reviewable”); § 15(c) (“If the majority vote on the question is to recall, the officer is removed  
27 and, if there is a candidate, the candidate who receives a plurality is the successor”); § 16 (“The  
Legislature shall provide for circulation, filing, and certification of petitions, nomination of  
candidates, and the recall election”).

<sup>5</sup> A true and correct copy of Newsom’s (proposed) Recall Argument is attached as Exhibit  
3 to Petitioners’ Request for Judicial Notice.



1 Petitioners bring this petition for writ of mandate to require the deletion and/or amendment of  
2 portions of Newsom’s Recall Argument on the grounds that they are false, misleading, and/or  
3 inconsistent with the relevant provisions of the Elections Code and Government Code, including  
4 without limitation Elections Code section 13307(a)(1).

5 21. Application of Section 9092, Section 13307(a)(1) and the decision in *Huntington*  
6 *Beach City Council v. Superior Ct.*, 94 Cal.App.4th 1417 (2002) to Newsom’s Recall Argument  
7 (*Huntington Beach* is described below), require that several statements be stricken and/or  
8 modified because they are inconsistent with the Election Code and/or are false and misleading.

9 V.

10 **NEWSOM’S VIOLATION OF THE LAWS AT ISSUE**

11 Petitioners include a chart starting at paragraph 30 hereinbelow which lists every  
12 statement in the Newsom Recall Argument and explains how and why several of the statements  
13 must be deleted or changed to comply with the law.

14 **A. Newsom’s Recall Argument Violates California Elections Code**

15 **Section 13307(a)(1).**

16 22. The recall is governed in part by California Elections Code section 13307(a)(1)  
17 which expressly governs “nonpartisan” elections. In conformity with the nonpartisan nature of  
18 the recall, Section 13307(a)(1) specifically prohibits any reference to the candidate’s “party  
19 affiliation” in Newsom’s Recall Argument: “[t]he [Recall Argument] **shall not** include the **party**  
20 **affiliation** of the candidate.” (Cal. Elect. Code § 13307(a)(1) (emphasis added.)) Newsom’s  
21 Recall Argument violates Section 13307(a)(1) for several separate and independent reasons:

- 22
- 23 a. Newsom’s Recall Argument states that he is the “Democratic” Governor of  
24 California. Pursuant to 13307(a)(1), his party affiliation – the word  
25 “Democratic” – must be removed.<sup>6</sup>  
26

27

---

<sup>6</sup> Newsom’s inclusion of his Party Affiliation in the Recall Argument also arguably skirts  
Judge James P. Arguelles’s July 12, 2021 Order preventing Newsom from including his Party  
Affiliation in the recall election ballots. See July 12, 2021 Order in *Newsom v. Weber*; Case no.



1           b. Also, Newsom repeatedly refers to his perceived opponents as being  
2           “Republican(s).” The obvious intent and effect of these statements is to call  
3           attention to Newsom’s political affiliation by negative implication, which,  
4           under California law is a statutory violation. *See Spicer v. City of Camarillo*,  
5           195 Cal.App.4th 1423, 1427 (2011) (a statute may express the law by  
6           “negative implication,” which is the unstated but implicitly evident expression  
7           of the statute).

8 Thus, each use of the word “Republican” or “Trump” should be stricken from Newsom’s Recall  
9 Argument for these reasons, and others which are explained below.

10                   **B. Newsom’s Recall Argument violates California Elections Code**  
11                   **Section 9092.**

12           23. Elections Code Section 9092 provides that this Court may, upon a Writ of  
13 Mandate, strike from the Recall Argument any statements which are “false, misleading, or  
14 inconsistent with the requirements of this code.”

15           24. Newsom’s sweeping statements about the purported “Republican” nature of the  
16 recall are precisely the type of unqualified arguments which should be stricken. Under California  
17 law, candidate arguments which make unequivocal and sweeping statements about the existence  
18 of a set of facts, *without acknowledging objectively observable exceptions*, should be stricken as  
19 misleading. *See Huntington Beach City Council v. Superior Ct.*, 94 Cal.App.4th 1417, 1423-24 &  
20 1435-36 (2002).

21           25. *Huntington Beach* concerned a local ballot initiative to impose a sales tax on the  
22 natural gas purchased by the only electricity generating plant in the city of Huntington Beach (the  
23 “City”). The City’s voter guide statement included two largely blanket statements which claimed  
24 that the plant’s electricity would be used out-of-state and that the new tax burden (passed on via  
25 higher electricity prices) would fall on non-Californians. The Court ordered these two statements  
26

---

27  
34-2021-80003666-CU-MW-GDS, attached as Exhibit 4 to Petitioner’s accompanying Request  
for Judicial Notice.



1 stricken because they did not accommodate exceptions. The City’s statement claimed that the  
2 plant owner “refused to sign a contract for use of electricity solely in California.” The court ruled  
3 this statement misleading because the refusal only applied to two of the plant’s five units and that  
4 three of the plants actually could generate electricity for use in California. The City also claimed  
5 that “*any* cost to [the plant’s owner] will be passed on primarily to people outside of Huntington  
6 Beach and California” (emphasis added). The court concluded that because electricity from the  
7 plant could end up being used in California, this definitive statement (even though qualified by  
8 the word “primarily”) was misleading. The same analysis which animated the decision in  
9 *Huntington Beach* requires the conclusion that Newsom’s blanket statements that the recall is a  
10 “Republican” endeavor are profoundly misleading because they completely ignore the political  
11 diversity of the recall’s petitioners and supporters and even the Certified list of gubernatorial  
12 candidates themselves.

13 26. The unequivocal characterization of the recall being “Republican” is false and  
14 misleading for several other reasons as well:

15 a. As a matter of law, the express language of Section 13307(a)(1) provides that  
16 the Recall is a “nonpartisan” election. Newsom’s false and misleading  
17 description of the election as a “Republican” endeavor is plainly inconsistent  
18 with Section 13307(a)(1). It would be wholly inappropriate for the State to  
19 sanction such a misleading mischaracterization in its official voter guide, by  
20 sanctioning Newsom’s attempt to include an obvious and highly partisan  
21 statement in the Guide. The characterization of the recall as a Republican  
22 endeavor in Newsom’s Recall Argument must be stricken and/or revised each  
23 time it appears.

24 a. As well, the term “Republican” is false and misleading and must be stricken  
25 because nearly one-half of the candidates running against Newsom *are not*  
26 *Republicans*. In fact, only 24 of the 46 candidates are Republicans. 22 of the  
27 candidates *are not* Republicans. Nonetheless, Newsom falsely and  
misleadingly claims that the recall is an attempt by “Republicans” to “force an



election” and “takeover our state.”<sup>7</sup>

Party Affiliation	Number of Candidates
No Party Preference	10
Democratic	9
Republican	24
Libertarian	1
Green	2

b. By way of further example, Newsom’s false, misleading and outrageous statement that the recall’s “leading supporters are the same Republicans who fought to overturn the presidential election and launched efforts to undermine the right to vote across this country” is at best misleading, at worst flat-out false, and in all events a hyperbolic outrage. In addition to the fact that nearly 50% of those running against Newsom are not Republicans, **evidence submitted herewith as Exhibits A through F proves that lifelong Democrats and members of other parties are passionately involved in seeing that Newsom is recalled.**<sup>8</sup>

VI.

**SUMMARY OF THE PETITIONERS’ ACCOMPANYING EVIDENCE**

27. Accompanying this Petition are five sworn declarations from leading supporters of recall; none of whom are Republicans and several of whom voted for Newsom:

a. Andrea Hedstrom is a Democrat who worked as a lead volunteer on the recall. She gathered signatures and conducted several media interviews in support of

<sup>7</sup> See the Secretary of State’s Official Certified List of Candidates, which is attached as **Exhibit 2** to Petitioners’ accompanying Request for Judicial Notice.

<sup>8</sup> Newsom’s outrageous and intensely partisan statement referenced above in ¶ 26.b. is also barred as explained hereinabove by section 11307(a)(1)’s provision that the recall election is “non-partisan”.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

the recall. Ms. Hedstrom previously supported Democrats and supported and voted for Newsom (even naming her son Gavin after him). She is not a Republican. **Exhibit A.**

b. Craig Gordon spent \$25,000 of his own money on billboards supporting the recall along Highway 99 and Interstate 5. He also volunteered to collect numerous signatures for the recall. Mr. Gordon has never voted for a Republican in his life. **Exhibit B.**

c. Honor “Mimi” Robson is the Chair of the Libertarian Party of California. Ms. Robson describes in her Declaration the significant efforts by the Libertarian Party to recall Newsom. She declares that she is “offended” by Newsom’s characterization of the recall as an effort “by Republicans and Trump supporters” as she is neither. **Exhibit C.**

d. Bianca Von Krieg, openly transgender, and Daniel MacKinnon, also are California citizens who enthusiastically support the recall and gathered signatures. Neither are Republicans. **Exhibits D and E.**

28. Several of the declarants point out that in obtaining petition signatures, and in their daily life, they encountered many non-Republicans that supported the recall.

29. Also accompanying this Petition is the sworn declaration of Paul Olson, who verified the signatures on the recall petition. In the course of verifying the signatures, Olson observed that a significant percentage of the signatories were non-Republicans. **Exhibit F.**

**VII.**

**CHART OF STATEMENTS TO BE STRICKEN AND/OR REVISED**

30. The following statements in Newsom’s Recall Argument are false, misleading, and/or inconsistent with the relevant provisions of the Elections Code and Government Code and are therefore unlawful and should be stricken and/or revised.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Attached hereto as **Exhibit G** is a copy of Newsom’s Recall Argument with proposed segments stricken and/or revised as per the requests in the below chart.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

<b>Newsom's Recall Argument</b>	<b>Petitioner's Response</b>
<p>"The recall is an attempt by national Republicans and Trump supporters to force an election and grab power in California."</p> <p><b>This statement should be deleted in its entirety.</b></p>	<p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of terms "national Republicans" and "Trump supporters" is false and misleading.</u></b> See the Sworn Declarations attached hereto as Exhibits A through F. Also, see <b>Exhibit 2 to Petitioner's Request for Judicial Notice which evidences that</b> of the 46 candidates running to replace Newsom, only 24 are Republicans.</p> <p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of the terms "national Republicans" and "Trump Supporters," as well as the phrase "force and election and grab power," is false and misleading for other reasons as well.</u></b> Newsom's description of his political opponents as "Republicans" and "Trump supporters" is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the <i>Huntington Beach</i> court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall is a Republican endeavor, much less an effort sought by supporters of former President Trump. Moreover, as a matter of California law, this recall is "nonpartisan" which requires this language to be stricken as well. Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).</p> <p>Additionally, the term "force an election and grab power" is a wholly misleading. Newsom's statement falsely implies that there is something improper and wrong about the recall election when in fact, the recall of Newsom is expressly allowed by the California Constitution. (Cal. Const. Art. II, §§ 1, 13-18.)</p> <p><b><u>This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the terms "national Republicans" and "Trump Supporters."</u></b> By contending that this recall is being sought by "national Republicans" and "Trump supporters," Newsom impermissibly describes his political affiliation as a Democrat by negative implication. Section</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

	<p>13307(a)(1) clearly intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes the election as “nonpartisan.” See <i>Spicer</i>, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427.</p>
<p>“VOTE NO on the recall of Democratic Governor Gavin Newsom to stop the Republican takeover of our state.”</p> <p><b>This statement should be amended to read: “VOTE NO on the recall of Governor Gavin Newsom.”<sup>10</sup></b></p>	<p><b><u>This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the word “Democratic”.</u></b> This statement’s description of Newsom as the “Democratic” Governor violates the plain language Elections Code section 13307(a)(1), which provides: “The statement shall not include the party affiliation of the candidate.” The mention of Newsom’s Party Affiliation also arguably skirts the recent Order by Judge Arguelles, which prevents Newsom from placing his Party Affiliation on the recall ballots. See <i>Newsom v. Weber</i>; Case no. 34-2021-80003666-CU-MW-GDS.</p> <p><b><u>This statement also violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the words “Republican Takeover.”</u></b> By referring to the recall election as a “Republican takeover,” Newsom impermissibly describes his political affiliation as a democrat by negative implication. Section 13307(a)(1) intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes the election as “nonpartisan.” See <i>Spicer</i>, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427.</p> <p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of the phrase “Republican takeover” is false and misleading.</u></b> Newsom’s description of the recall as a “Republican takeover” is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the <i>Huntington Beach</i> court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall</p>

<sup>10</sup> Note that while Petitioners acknowledge that the proposed amended statements (and those for which amendment or removal are not sought) will, if approved by the Court, comply with California law, the Petitioners do not admit, imply or agree with, the truth or accuracy of any such statements, nor support them.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

is a Republican endeavor. As a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).

Moreover, the term “**takeover**” is a wholly misleading description of the valid recall process that California law provides for. Instead, the people of California are acting upon their express Constitutional rights to recall a sitting governor. (Cal. Const. Art. II, §§ 1, 13-18.) The word “takeover” is misleading in that it connotes some illegal act akin to an insurrection, to remove Newsom from office.

“The recall’s leading supporters are the same national Republicans who fought to overturn the presidential election and launched efforts to undermine the right to vote across the country.”

**This statement should be amended to read: “The recall’s supporters include national Republicans.”**

**This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the terms “national Republicans.”** By contending that the leading supporters of the recall are “national Republicans,” Newsom impermissibly describes his political affiliation as a democrat by negative implication. Section 13307(a)(1) intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes the election as “nonpartisan.” See *Spicer*, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427. The use of the term “national Republicans” in this statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) and should be stricken.

**This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of phrase “national Republicans” is false and misleading.** See the Sworn Declarations attached hereto as Exhibits A – F. Also, of the 46 candidates running to replace Newsom, only 24 are Republicans.

**This statement also violates Section 9092 because the term “national Republicans” is false and misleading for other reasons as well.** The term used herein is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the *Huntington Beach* court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall is a Republican endeavor, much less an effort sought by supporters of former

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

	<p>President Trump. As a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).</p> <p>Moreover, the phrase “<b><u>national Republicans who fought to overturn the presidential election and launched efforts to undermine the right to vote</u></b>” is a wholly misleading description of the valid recall process that California law provides for. Newsom’s statement falsely implies that there is something improper and wrong about the recall election and those supporting it when in fact, the recall of Newsom is expressly allowed by the California Constitution. (Cal. Const. Art. II, §§ 1, 13-18.)</p>
<p>“Here in California, they are abusing our recall laws in order to gain power and advance their partisan agenda.”</p> <p><b>This statement should be deleted in its entirety.</b></p>	<p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of phrase “abusing our recall laws in order to gain power and advance their partisan agenda” is false and misleading.</u></b> This is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the <i>Huntington Beach</i> court ordered stricken as misleading. As a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).</p> <p>Moreover, the millions of recall supporters are not “<b><u>abusing</u></b>” California’s recall laws. Rather, they are complying with the enumerated political process that California affords its citizens. The recall has followed the letter of the law as expressed in California’s Constitution. (Cal. Const. Art. II, §§ 1, 13-18.)</p> <p>Further, the statement “<b><u>advance their partisan agenda</u></b>” is false and misleading, given that the supporters of the recall (and indeed many of the candidates for office) are in-fact “nonpartisan” and come from various political persuasions.</p>
<p>“The leaders of the Republican recall seek to repeal California’s clean air protections, roll back gun safety laws and take away health care access for those who need it.”</p>	<p><b><u>This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the word “Republican.”</u></b> By using the phrase “Republican recall,” Newsom impermissibly describes his political</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**This statement should be amended to read:  
“The election seeks to recall Gavin Newsom from office. Newsom supports California’s clean air protections, gun safety laws and health care access for those who need it.”**

affiliation as a democrat by negative implication. Section 13307(a)(1) clearly intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes the election as “nonpartisan.” See *Spicer*, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427.

**This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of phrase “Republican recall” is false and misleading.** See the Sworn Declarations attached hereto as Exhibits A through F. Also, of the 46 candidates running to replace Newsom, only 24 are Republicans.

**This statement also violates Section 9092 because the term “Republican recall” is false and misleading for other reasons as well.** Newsom’s description of this election as a “Republican recall” is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the *Huntington Beach* court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall is a Republican endeavor. Also as a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).

“And as California makes important progress against COVID-19, handing power to Republicans and supporters of President Trump could set our state back in our fight against the pandemic.”

**This statement should be amended to read:  
“And as California makes important progress against COVID-19, recalling Governor Newsom could set our state back in our fight against the pandemic.”**

**This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the terms “Republicans” and “supporters of President Trump.”** By suggesting that his political opponents are “Republicans” and “supporters of President Trump,” Newsom impermissibly describes his political affiliation as a democrat by negative implication. Section 13307(a)(1) clearly intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes the election as “nonpartisan.” See *Spicer*, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427.

**This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of terms “national Republicans” and “Trump supporters” is false and misleading.** See the Sworn Declarations attached hereto as Exhibits A



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

	<p>through F. Also, of the 46 candidates running to replace Newsom, only 24 are Republicans.</p> <p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of the terms “Republicans” and “supporters of President Trump” is false and misleading for other reasons as well.</u></b> Newsom’s description of his political opponents as “Republicans” and “supporters of President Trump” is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the <i>Huntington Beach</i> court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall is a Republican endeavor, much less an effort sought by supporters of former President Trump. As a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).</p>
<p>“The past year and a half has challenged us all. Facing an unprecedented global crisis, Governor Newsom followed science and moved aggressively to save lives and help those hardest hit.”</p>	
<p>“Under Governor Newsom’s leadership, our state is beating the pandemic. Californians have some of the highest vaccination levels in the country – leaving us better protected against variants than most other states.”</p>	
<p>“Now, Governor Newsom is focused on our state’s economic and job recovery.”</p>	
<p>“He believes we must use this once in a lifetime moment to come together and ensure every resident – regardless of their race or zip code – can live a better life.”</p>	
<p>“That’s why he passed his \$100 billion California Comeback Plan – the largest economic recovery package in state history. Under the plan, two in three Californian families are receiving at least \$600 in direct relief, and 200,000 small businesses will benefit from our relief programs.”</p>	
<p>“Governor Newsom is pursuing major new solutions for our most pressing challenges – homelessness, education, infrastructure and wildfires.”</p>	

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

<p>“But all of our residents’ sacrifice and our state’s progress could be put at risk if this partisan, Republican recall succeeds.”</p> <p><b>This statement should be amended to read: “But all of our residents’ sacrifice and our state’s progress could be put at risk if this recall succeeds.”</b></p>	<p><b><u>This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the word “Republican.”</u></b> By using the phrase “Republican recall,” Newsom impermissibly describes his political affiliation as a democrat by negative implication. Section 13307(a)(1) clearly intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes the election as “nonpartisan.” See <i>Spicer</i>, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427.</p> <p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of term “Republican recall” is false and misleading.</u></b> See the Sworn Declarations attached hereto as Exhibits A through F. Also, of the 46 candidates running to replace Newsom, only 24 are Republicans.</p> <p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of the phrase “Republican recall” is false and misleading for other reasons as well.</u></b> Newsom’s description of this election as a “Republican recall” is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the <i>Huntington Beach</i> court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall is a Republican endeavor. Also as a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).</p>
<p>“That’s why Democrats and independents across the state and nation – including Joe Biden and Kamala Harris – oppose the recall. They believe Governor Newsom should be allowed to finish the job.”</p>	
<p>“VOTE NO on the recall to stop this Republican power grab.”</p> <p><b>This statement should be amended to read: “VOTE NO on the recall.”</b></p>	<p><b><u>This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the word “Republican.”</u></b> By referring to the recall election as a “Republican takeover,” Newsom impermissibly describes his political affiliation as a democrat by negative implication. Section 13307(a)(1) clearly intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes</p>

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

the election as “nonpartisan.” See *Spicer*, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427.

**This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of term “Republican” is false and misleading.** See the Sworn Declarations attached hereto as Exhibits A through F. Also, of the 46 candidates running to replace Newsom, only 24 are Republicans.

**This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of the phrase “Republican power grab” is false and misleading for other reasons as well.** Newsom’s description of the recall as a “Republican power grab” is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the *Huntington Beach* court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall is a Republican endeavor. Also as a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).

Moreover, the term “**power grab**” is a wholly misleading description of the valid recall process for which California law provides. (Cal. Const. Art. II, §§ 1, 13-18.)

“Stop the Republican Recall of Governor Newsom”

**This statement should be amended to read: “Stop the Recall of Governor Newsom.”**

**This statement violates Section 13307(a)(1) by the use of the word “Republican.”** By using the phrase “Republican recall,” Newsom impermissibly describes his political affiliation as a democrat by negative implication. Section 13307(a)(1) clearly intends to prohibit a party from implying his political affiliation by describing the affiliation of his opponents when it describes the election as “nonpartisan.” See *Spicer*, 195 Cal.App.4th at 1427.

**This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of the term “Republican Recall” is false and misleading.** See the Sworn Declarations attached hereto as Exhibits A through F. Also, of the 46 candidates running to replace Newsom, only 24 are Republicans.

	<p><b><u>This statement violates Section 9092 because its use of the phrase “Republican Recall” is false and misleading for other reasons as well.</u></b> Newsom’s description of this election as a “Republican Recall” is precisely the type of unqualified, categorical assertion which the <i>Huntington Beach</i> court ordered stricken as misleading. It is simply untrue that the recall is a Republican endeavor. Also, as a matter of California law, this recall is “nonpartisan.” Cal. Elec. Code § 13307(a)(1).</p>
<p>Stoptherepublicanrecall.com</p> <p><b>This statement should be deleted in its entirety.</b></p>	<p><b><u>See all of the reasons/positions set forth above.</u></b></p>

**CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Writ of Mandate)**

31. Petitioners incorporate each and every allegation contained in paragraphs 1 through 30, as though fully set forth herein.

32. Accordingly, Petitioners are entitled to a writ of mandate amending and deleting the statements in Newsom’s Recall Argument that are false, misleading, and inconsistent with the relevant provisions of the Elections Code.

Wherefore, Petitioners pray for judgment as follows:

1. That this Court issue a writ of mandate compelling Weber, her officers, agents and all other persons acting on her behalf and through her orders, to amend and delete the above-described statements according to proof and as set forth herein;

2. For costs of suit herein;

///

///

///

///

///

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

- 3. For reasonable attorney's fees as provided by law; and
- 4. For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 29, 2021

EARLY SULLIVAN WRIGHT  
GIZER & McRAE LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_


Eric P. Early  
Jeremy J. F. Gray  
Ryan M. Hemar  
Attorneys for Petitioners  
ORRIN E. HEATLIE, MIKE NETTER, and THE  
CALIFORNIA PATRIOT COALITION –  
RECALL GOVERNOR GAVIN NEWSOM

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

**VERIFICATION**

I, Orrin E. Heatlie, am the authorized representative of Petitioner the California Patriot Coalition – Recall Governor Gavin Newsom, in the above captioned action. I have read the foregoing Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate in this action and am familiar with its contents. The factual allegations (as distinguished from legal arguments) contained therein are true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on the 29th of July, 2021, at Sacramento County, California.

DocuSigned by:  
  
A3915A9EACC3480...

Orrin E. Heatlie



# EXHIBIT A

Declaration of Andrea Hedstrom

I, Andrea Hedstrom, declare as follows:

1. My name is Andrea Hedstrom. I am a California resident registered to vote in California, and over the age of 21. I have personal knowledge of the information herein and if called upon to testify, could and would competently testify thereto.
2. I am a married mother of four who has lived in California for ten years, during which time I have voted Democrat for many political races.
3. I myself voted for Gavin Newsom in the 2018 gubernatorial election. Additionally, I voted for Hillary Clinton in the 2016 presidential election, as well as voted for Bernie Sanders in the 2016 presidential primary.
4. My husband and many friends who consider themselves Democrats also voted for Gavin Newsom in the gubernatorial election.
5. I was previously a big supporter of Gavin Newsom and have closely followed him for nearly his entire political career. I respected his policies when he was on the Board of Supervisors in San Francisco, the Mayor of San Francisco, and the Lieutenant Governor of California. I enthusiastically voted for him when he ran for Governor of California in 2018. **I admired him so much that I even named my son Gavin.**
6. I have since become completely dissatisfied and fed up with Governor Newsom's failed leadership in California. The executive overreach he has wielded is truly astonishing. It is clear that he is not looking out for the best interests of the people of California.
7. **I support the effort to recall Governor Gavin Newsom.** In addition to long ago signing a recall petition, I have served as a lead volunteer for the recall campaign. Beginning in June 2020, I have successfully collected many signatures for the recall effort and have conducted several media interviews discussing my role in the effort to recall Governor Newsom.
8. While volunteering for the recall campaign, I have met many other disillusioned Californians who feel the same way as me. **Numerous people that signed the recall petition told me they were not Republicans, nor did they vote for President Trump.**


AHH



9. It is clear to me that this recall effort is not a partisan political issue. Rather, Californians from all diverse and varied backgrounds have had enough of Governor Newsom's reign and fully support the effort to recall him.

10. I am **not** a Republican, and I am offended by Governor Newsom's language saying this recall effort is a Republican takeover and his misleading statement implying it is only being brought by Trump supporters. This recall effort is a product of people's efforts of all political affiliations and viewpoints who want to see Newsom removed and replaced from office due to his abuses of power during his time as governor. Thank you very much.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. This declaration was executed in Citrus, California on July 26, 2021. Heights

  
Andrea Hedstrom

# EXHIBIT B

## Declaration of Craig Gordon

I, Craig Gordon, declare as follows:

1. I am a lifelong democrat, a California resident registered to vote in California, and over the age of 21. I have personal knowledge of the information herein and if called upon to testify, could and would competently testify thereto.
2. I voted for Bernie Sanders in the 2016 and 2020 presidential primaries, and I voted for Gavin Newsom when he ran for Governor of California.
- 3. To the best of my recollection I have never voted for a single Republican politician.**
4. I am a dairy farmer in San Bernardino County, California. Governor Newsom's lockdown orders, particularly his decision to shut down all the schools, have devastated the dairy industry.
- 5. I fully support the effort to recall Governor Gavin Newsom, and long ago signed a recall Newsom petition.**
6. I spent \$25,000 of my own money to install billboards along Highway 99 and made bumper stickers supporting the recall effort.
7. I also volunteered my time to collect signatures on the recall petition, and I printed bumper stickers and made banners advertising the recall election. I know for a fact, that a number of signatures that I obtained were also from people who are not Republicans.
8. Many of my colleagues in the agriculture business, of all political leanings, also support the recall, as well as my democratic barber Kevin, my work out partners Tim and Ken from Ontario who are Democrats, Chris Sarvis my democratic cousin from Orange County and Angie Ray my democratic Niece from San Diego, all support the Recall.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. This declaration was executed in San Bernardino County, California on July 26, 2021.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Craig Gordon

# EXHIBIT C

## Declaration of Honor "Mimi" Robson

I, Honor "Mimi" Robson, declare as follows:

1. I am the Chairperson of the Libertarian Party of California.
2. I am a California resident registered to vote in California and over the age of 21. I have personal knowledge of the information herein and, if called upon to testify, could and would competently testify thereto.
3. The Libertarian Party is the 3<sup>rd</sup> largest political party in the United States and achieved permanent ballot status in California in 1978. The Libertarian Party is one of only three political parties in the country to have our presidential candidate on every ballot in the country in the past two presidential elections.
4. The Libertarian Party of California (LPCA) is an affiliate of the National Libertarian Party and is NOT a part of, nor influenced by, any other political party. The LPCA is NOT affiliated with either the Republican or Democratic Parties.
5. The LPCA has been a proponent of recalling Governor Gavin Newsom starting with the non-partisan recall effort of Erin Cruz. On October 15, 2019 the LPCA Executive Committee (EC) passed a resolution supporting that recall effort. The LPCA EC once again passed a motion on September 12, 2020 supporting the non-partisan recall effort of Orrin Heatlie. The LPCA, along with many of our county affiliates throughout the state, circulated the recall petitions for both efforts.
6. Since March of 2020 California residents and businesses have fled the state due to the restrictive environment caused by Governor Newsom's executive orders regarding the pandemic, coupled with the highest tax rates in the country. Countless businesses have had to close their doors forever due to the California Government and, in particular, Governor Newsom deeming them to be "non-essential."
7. Although the LPCA doesn't agree with all of the reasons that Republicans and other parties support the recall effort, we supported it based on our party's platform and beliefs. Governor Newsom has used overreaching executive powers throughout his administration not only to impose devastating lock-downs throughout the state during the past 15 months, which has devastated lives and businesses in California, but also to divert funds from road repair and other projects for his own pet projects. He has continued his assault on the Second

Amendment and the natural rights of the individual to defend themselves, and has signed bills that would limit the liability of PG&E for wildfire damage caused by them at the expense of the consumers and taxpayers.

8. Governor Newsom championed and signed into law bills that have had devastating repercussions on independent contractors and the gig economy. AB-5 was so overwhelmingly unpopular with Californians that Proposition 22 was passed with almost 59% of the vote, but that only helped workers in certain industries, while others still struggle with not being able to work in California because of this legislation.
  
9. **I personally find it offensive that the Governor has written an argument that will be included in the voter information guide that states the recall effort is “an attempt by the national Republicans and Trump supporters to force an election and grab power in California.” I am neither a Republican nor a Trump supporter, and I support the recall for the above reasons, however I don’t support any type of “Republican takeover of our state.”** I believe the truth is that the Governor, and the super-majority of Democrats in Sacramento, are the ones that have been continuing a power grab against all Californians. I live in Los Angeles County, and it’s been reported that a larger percentage of Democrats in the county signed the recall petition than Republicans, which further stresses the fact that the Governor’s language in the recall argument is disingenuous at best and a flat out falsehood at worst.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

This declaration was executed in Los Angeles County, California on July 26, 2021.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mimi Robson", written over a horizontal line.

Honor "Mimi" Robson

# EXHIBIT D

Declaration of Bianca Von Krieg

I, Bianca Von Krieg, declare as follows:

1. I am a television and film actress, Democrat, Bernie Sanders supporter, Stanford graduate, transwoman, LGBT + community activist, and Democratic candidate for the United States House of Representatives in California's 12th Congressional District. [www. BiancaForSanFrancisco.org](http://www.BiancaForSanFrancisco.org).
2. I am a California resident registered to vote in California, and over the age of 21. I have personal knowledge of the information herein and if called upon to testify, could and would competently testify thereto.
3. I am descended from the original pioneers of California known as The 49ers and a "Daughter of Trinity."
4. This recall is certainly not a "Republican recall", much less a recall of exclusively "Trump supporters". I am not a Republican [REDACTED] Long ago I signed a recall Petition. As a volunteer, I also obtained the signatures of many other California registered voters on the recall Petition – many of whom were [REDACTED] neither "Republican" nor "Trump supporters".

*BVK* 5. I *DO NOT SUPPORT* [REDACTED] Governor Gavin Newsom for many reasons including for example, that:

- It has been estimated that over 30 billion dollars was lost to fraud and overall incompetence of the EDD on Newsom's watch;
- While California is home to approximately 156 billionaires, it also has a homeless population of approximately 157,000 people – the highest of any other state in the union. I have not seen Gavin Newsom do anything that has actually helped remedy this terrible homelessness problem.
- California's court system has caused at least approximately 1,300 defendants to wait behind bars for more than three years despite not being convicted or sentenced for a crime. <https://calmatters.org/justice/2021/03/waiting-for-justice/>
- California's billionaires have added approximately \$1.3 trillion to their net worth during the pandemic – a 44% increase from March 2020 to Feb 2021. <https://www.businessinsider.com/billionaires-added-13-trillion-net-worths-during-pandemic-wealth-inequality-2021-2>

*(12)*




6. **"Democrats" like Newsom have failed the Leftist agenda that I support.** So incensed was I by Newsom's failures, that I directed my office to focus their efforts on informing the California and national media regarding the devastating incompetence of Newsom's jock-crazy! A few days later, we succeeded:

"San Jose Mercury News to Gov. Gavin Newsom: "Newsom should stop trying to play Californians for fools".

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/04/20/editorial-newsom-should-stop-trying-to-play-californians-for-fools/>

7. It appears the Editorial Board of the San Jose Mercury News agreed with our assessment of Newsom's response, which was essentially that of 13 year old boy stamping his feet on the ground.
8. **As a Democratic Socialist it was my pleasure to politically ally with the leadership of Newsom Recall group in late 2020.**

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. This declaration was executed in San Francisco, California on July 26, 2021.



Bianca Von Krieg

CANDIDATE, US HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
CALIFORNIA'S 12<sup>TH</sup> DISTRICT

# EXHIBIT E

Declaration of Daniel MacKinnon

I, Daniel MacKinnon, declare as follows:

1. I am a California resident registered to vote in California, and over the age of 21. I have personal knowledge of the information herein and if called upon to testify, could and would competently testify thereto.
2. I am a husband, father of four, and public school teacher of 13 years who voted for Gavin Newsom for Governor.
3. I proudly signed the recall petition because Governor Newsom has failed to protect my parental rights regarding education and medical choices.
4. It is simply false when Newsom calls it a "Republican Recall." I am not a Republican, and I want a new Governor!

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

This declaration was executed in California California on July 26, 2021.



Daniel MacKinnon

# EXHIBIT F

## Declaration of Paul Olson

I, Paul Olson, declare as follows:

1. I am a California resident registered to vote in California, and over the age of 21. I have personal knowledge of the information herein and if called upon to testify, could and would competently testify thereto.
2. I am a principal of GOCO Consulting.
3. GOCO Consulting was responsible for verifying information and signatures collected on the petitions to recall Gavin Newsom, to make sure the signed petitions would pass muster with the California Secretary of State's petition verification process.
4. In the course of verifying information, we would compare the information provided by signers to voter registration records, which records also include party registration.
5. We observed that while a considerable number of Republicans did sign the petitions, **a significant percentage of the signatures collected were from non-Republican voters, including many Democrats.**
6. In fact, in certain areas of California, we found that the percentage of signatures on petitions obtained from people registered as Democrats exceeded 20%.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of California that the foregoing is true and correct. This declaration was executed in Tulare County, California, on July 29, 2021.

DocuSigned by:

*Paul Olson*

7/29/2021

EB6A5BDF2A0247A...

Paul Olson

# EXHIBIT G

SEPTEMBER 14, 2021  
CALIFORNIA GUBERNATORIAL RECALL ELECTION  
RECALL ARGUMENT FORM



Name: Gavin Newsom

Recall Argument (500-word limit):

~~The recall is an attempt by national Republicans and Trump supporters to force an election and grab power in California.~~

VOTE NO on the recall of ~~Democratic~~ Governor Gavin Newsom ~~to stop the Republican takeover of our state.~~

~~The recall's leading supporters are the same national Republicans who fought to overturn the presidential election and launched efforts to undermine the right to vote across the country.~~

~~Here in California, they are abusing our recall laws in order to gain power and advance their partisan agenda.~~

~~The election seeks to recall Gavin Newsom from office. Newsom supports the leaders of the Republican recall seek to repeal California's clean air protections, roll back gun safety laws and take away health care access for those who need it.~~

~~And as California makes important progress against COVID-19, handing power to Republicans and supporters of President Trump could set our state back in our fight against the pandemic.~~

The past year and a half has challenged us all. Facing an unprecedented global crisis, Governor Newsom followed science and moved aggressively to save lives and help those hardest hit.

(continued on next page)

The undersigned author of the above argument hereby declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that it is true and correct.

Signature

July 15, 2021  
Date

SEPTEMBER 14, 2021  
CALIFORNIA GUBERNATORIAL RECALL ELECTION  
RECALL ARGUMENT FORM



Name: Gavin Newsom

Under Governor Newsom's leadership, our state is beating the pandemic. Californians have some of the highest vaccination levels in the country – leaving us better protected against variants than most other states.

Now, Governor Newsom is focused on our state's economic and job recovery.

He believes we must use this once in a lifetime moment to come together and ensure every resident – regardless of their race or zip code – can live a better life.

That's why he passed his \$100 billion California Comeback Plan – the largest economic recovery package in state history. Under the plan, two in three Californian families are receiving at least \$600 in direct relief, and 200,000 small businesses will benefit from our relief programs.

Governor Newsom is pursuing major new solutions for our most pressing challenges – homelessness, education, infrastructure and wildfires.

But all of our residents' sacrifice and our state's progress could be put at risk if this ~~partisan, Republican~~ recall succeeds.

That's why Democrats and independents across the state and nation – including Joe Biden and Kamala Harris –

(continued on next page)

The undersigned author of the above argument hereby declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that it is true and correct.

  
Signature

July 15, 2021  
Date



SEPTEMBER 14, 2021  
CALIFORNIA GUBERNATORIAL RECALL ELECTION  
RECALL ARGUMENT FORM



Name: Gavin Newsom


oppose the recall. They believe Governor Newsom should be allowed to finish the job.

VOTE NO on the recall ~~to stop this Republican power grab.~~

Stop the ~~Republican~~ Recall of Governor Newsom

~~stoptherepublicanrecall.com~~

The undersigned author of the above argument hereby declares under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that it is true and correct.

  
Signature

July 15, 2021  
Date