

---

---

**PETITION NO. 351**

---

In The Court of Appeals of Maryland

---

LINDA SCHADE, ANDREW HARRIS, JUDITH BURNS, MARK ELRICH, KWAME  
ABAYOMI, TERRENCE FITZGERALD, SHARON BEARD, and PAUL SUH,

*Petitioners,*

v.

MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS, LINDA H. LAMONE (as Administrator of  
Maryland's State Board of Elections),

*Respondents.*

---

**PETITIONERS' BRIEF**

John B. Isbister  
Daniel S. Katz  
Richard D. Rosenthal  
TYDINGS & ROSENBERG LLP  
100 East Pratt Street, 26th Floor  
Baltimore, Maryland 21202

*Counsel for Petitioners*

Ryan P. Phair  
Laura A. Thoms  
Kathryn R. DeBord  
John P. Gonsoulin  
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
655 Fifteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

September 10, 2004

---

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
STATEMENT OF THE CASE .....	1
STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS PRESENTED .....	2
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	2
PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	13
ARGUMENT .....	17
I. THE CIRCUIT COURT APPLIED AN INCORRECT STANDARD IN ASSESSING THE SECURITY AND ACCURACY OF MARYLAND’S ELECTRONIC VOTING SYSTEM.....	18
A. The Circuit Court’s Determination That Dr. Shamos’s “Reasonableness” Standard of Security and Accuracy Is Sufficient To Protect The Integrity Of The Voting System Is Not Supported By Maryland Election Law.....	20
B. The Circuit Court’s “Good Enough” Approach To Election Security Is Inadequate In Light Of The National Importance of Counting And Recording All Votes Accurately In The Upcoming Presidential Election. ....	21
C. The Circuit Court’s “Reasonableness” Standard Allows for the Possibility of Significant Security Breaches and Fails to Properly Appreciate the Magnitude of the Resulting Harm. ....	23
D. The Maryland Legislature Indicated That The “Military” Standard Applied By Dr. Wertheimer Is The Correct Measure Of The Election Systems’ Security Under § 9-103. ....	25
II. EVEN IF § 9-102 AND § 9-103 IMPLICITLY INCORPORATES DR. SHAMOS’S “REASONABLENESS” STANDARD, THE RECORD AS A WHOLE DOES NOT SUPPORT THE CIRCUIT COURT’S FINDINGS. ....	26
A. The Circuit Court Abused Its Discretion by Refusing to Consider the Record as a Whole and Allowing Respondents to Develop a One-Sided and Untested Partial Record.....	27

**TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)**

	Page
1. The Circuit Court Erred By Excluding Testimony And Evidence Relating To California’s Investigation And Decertification Of the Diebold DRE Voting System.....	27
2. The Circuit Court Further Erred in Allowing Respondents to Introduce Evidence at Trial That Had Been Requested But Not Produced in Discovery.....	31
B. The Circuit Court’s Findings Even on the Partial Record Were Clearly Erroneous. ....	35
1. The Circuit Court’s Determination of Petitioners’ Likelihood of Success on the Merits Was Erroneous.....	35
2. The Circuit Court’s Assessment of Petitioners’ Requests for Partial Relief Was Erroneous.....	39
CONCLUSION .....	48
STATEMENT OF TYPE FONT AND TYPE SIZE .....	49

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	Page(s)
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>American Ass'n of People with Disabilities v. Shelley</i> , 324 F. Supp. 2d 1120 (C.D. Cal. 2004) .....	22
<i>Barnes v. Lednum</i> , 197 Md. 398, 79 A.2d 520 (1951).....	34
<i>Blackwelder Furniture Co. of Statesville, Inc. v. Seilig Mfg. Co.</i> , 550 F.2d 189 (4th Cir. 1977).....	18, 35
<i>Burroughs v. United States</i> , 290 U.S. 534 (1934) .....	22
<i>Bush v. Gore</i> , 531 U.S. 98 (2000) .....	2, 22, 46
<i>Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of the Lehigh Valley v. Grol</i> , No. 92-7061, 1995 WL 421900 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 8, 1993).....	34
<i>Common Cause v. Jones</i> , 213 F. Supp. 2d 1110 (C.D. Cal. 2002) .....	47
<i>Crane v. Dunn</i> , No. 109, 2004 WL 1646479 (Md. Ct. App. July 26, 2004).....	30
<i>Dutton v. Tawes</i> , 225 Md. 484, 171 A.2d 688 (1961).....	18
<i>Faya v. Almaraz</i> , 329 Md. 435, 620 A.2d 327 (1993).....	27
<i>Feldman v. Flood</i> , 176 F.R.D. 651 (M.D. Fla. 1997).....	34
<i>First Nat'l Bank of Boston v. Bellotti</i> , 435 U.S. 765 (1978) .....	22
<i>Helinski v. Harford Mem'l Hosp., Inc.</i> , 376 Md. 606, 831 A.2d 40 (2003).....	20
<i>In re Chase Manhattan Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 90 Civ. 6092, 1991 WL 79432 (S.D.N.Y. May 7, 1991).....	33, 34

