



ALEX PADILLA | SECRETARY OF STATE | STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ELECTIONS DIVISION

1500 11th Street, 5TH Floor | Sacramento, CA 95814 | **Tel** 916.657.2166 | **Fax** 916.653.3214 | www.sos.ca.gov

November 17, 2020

County Clerk/Registrar of Voters (CC/ROV) Memorandum #20251

TO: All County Clerks/Registrars of Voters

FROM: /s/ Robbie Anderson
Elections Counsel

RE: Recall of Governor Gavin Newsom, Filed by Orrin E. Heatlie: Extension of
Time to Circulate Petitions and Revised Calendar of Events

On November 17, 2020, the Sacramento County Superior Court issued a final judgment in *Heatlie v. Padilla* (case number 34-2020-80003499) extending the time for the proponents of the current effort to recall Governor Gavin Newsom to circulate petitions from November 17, 2020, to and including March 17, 2021. The judgment is attached to this CCROV. The revised deadline may be subject to a future change, and any change will be communicated via CCROV.

Also attached is the revised calendar of events reflecting the extended date for the proponents to submit recall petitions to your offices, as well as future reporting dates. The next reporting date is Monday, December 14, 2020.

Please note that your offices are not required to verify any signatures until the Secretary of State certifies that 10 percent of the required signatures have been submitted. (Elec. Code § 11104(d).) This requirement was not altered by the judgment.


Finally, only the proponent or a person authorized by the proponent may submit signed recall petitions. (Elec. Code § 11103.) The lead proponent, Mr. Orrin Heatlie, will be submitting updated authorizations that extend the authority for persons authorized to submit petitions on his behalf through March 17, 2021.

Attachment

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

BENBROOK LAW GROUP, PC
BRADLEY A. BENBROOK (SBN 177786)
STEPHEN M. DUVERNAY (SBN 250957)
400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2530
Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 447-4900
Facsimile: (916) 447-4904

Attorneys for Petitioners
Orrin E. Heatlie and
California Patriot Coalition –
Recall Governor Gavin Newsom



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

ORRIN E. HEATLIE and CALIFORNIA
PATRIOT COALITION – RECALL
GOVERNOR GAVIN NEWSOM,

Petitioners,

v.

ALEX PADILLA, in his official capacity as
Secretary of State of the State of California,

Respondent.

Case No.: 34-2020-80003499

~~PROPOSED~~ JUDGMENT GRANTING
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

Code Civ. Proc. § 1085; Elections Code §
13314

STATEWIDE ELECTION MATTER
IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED

**ELECTION MATTER ENTITLED TO
CALENDAR PREFERENCE PURSUANT
TO ELECTIONS CODE § 13314(a)(3)**

Hearing Date: Nov. 6, 2020
Time: 11:00 a.m.
Department: 17

Petition Filed: October 2, 2020

ELECTION MATTER ENTITLED TO PRIORITY

1 In accordance with the Court's Final Ruling, which is attached to this Judgment as Exhibit
2 A, and incorporated herein by reference, IT IS HEREBY ADJUDGED AND DECREED that:

3 1. The Petition for Writ of Mandate is GRANTED.

4 2. Judgment is entered in favor of Petitioners Orrin E. Heatlie and California Patriot
5 Coalition – Recall Governor Gavin Newsom, and against Respondent Secretary of State Alex
6 Padilla, in his official capacity.

7 3. A writ of mandate shall issue extending the November 17, 2020 deadline for
8 Petitioners to submit recall petitions to elections officials, to and including March 17, 2021.

9 4. The Court's Final Ruling incorporated herein is not intended to preclude any party
10 from seeking additional relief should circumstances warrant such relief, and the Court hereby
11 retains jurisdiction for that purpose.

12 Dated: 16 Nov 2020



13 [Signature]
14 Hon. James R. Arguelles
15 Superior Court of California, County of
16 Sacramento

16 Approved as to Form:

17 [Signature]
18 Kevin Calia
19 Counsel for Respondent

EXHIBIT A

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

DATE / TIME	November 6, 2020 / 11:00 a.m.	DEPT. NO.	17
JUDGE	James P. Arguelles	CLERK	Slort
ORRIN E. HEATLIE and CALIFORNIA PATRIOT COALITION – RECALL GOVERNOR GAVIN NEWSOM, Petitioners, v. ALEX PADILLA, in his official capacity as Secretary of State of the State of California, Respondent.		Cases No.: 34-2020-80003499 <i>[Related Cases: 34-2020-80003404 and 34-2020-80003413]</i>	
Nature of Proceedings:		Petition for Writ of Mandate – Tentative Ruling	

The petition is GRANTED.

The parties' requests for judicial notice are GRANTED.

The court takes judicial notice of its files in the Related Cases captioned above.

Background

Petitioners have mounted an effort to remove Governor Newsom from office by recall election. (See Cal. Const., art. II, §§ 13-17; Elec. Code § 11000 *et seq.*)¹ To that end, they are in the process of circulating petitions for voters' signatures.² On June 10, 2020, Respondent approved Petitioners' petitions for circulation. (See § 11042.) Under article II, section 14 of the California Constitution, Petitioners have 160 days from that date to collect signatures numbering at least 12 percent of the votes cast in the last gubernatorial election. Twelve percent equals 1,495,709 signatures in this case. In addition, Petitioners must collect at least one percent of the last vote from five different counties. (Cal. Const., art. II, § 14(b).) The 160-day deadline facing Petitioners expires on November 17, 2020.

¹ Undesignated statutory references shall be to the Elections Code.

² California does not allow voters to sign petitions electronically. (See §§ 354.5, 11043.)

Petitioners commenced their recall effort in February 2020 – just before the Covid-19 pandemic swept the nation. Petitioners timed their initial activities with the hope of gathering signatures during the spring and summer months, when crowds typically gather at large events and outdoor venues. By June 10, 2020, however, Governor Newsom had issued executive orders directing Californians to remain at home and comply with social distancing, directing non-essential businesses to remain closed, and authorizing local jurisdictions gradually to re-open in compliance with standards published by the California Department of Public Health. Despite the initial plan to re-open gradually in four stages, many businesses and other institutions have been ordered closed, and the four-stage plan was replaced altogether with a four-tiered system focused on counties' weekly Covid-19 testing data.

Petitioners nonetheless undertook to collect signatures. They hired a political consulting firm in late June 2020, and the initial plan was to pay circulators to collect signatures. Given the difficulties in obtaining signatures during the pandemic, however, the per-signature cost rose dramatically, and Petitioners opted to proceed with a team of approximately 5,000 volunteer circulators instead. Petitioners' consultant estimates that efforts to collect signatures have yielded approximately 25 percent of the signatures that would be expected in a "normal" election cycle. This estimate is based on experience with initiatives and referenda as well as the effort to recall Governor Davis in 2003. (See Weber Decl., ¶¶ 4, 10.) Another consultant estimates that 25 percent of normal is "at best" the number of signatures garnered to date. (See Olson Decl., ¶ 11.) As of October 15, 2020, Petitioners had collected approximately 675,000 signatures. Between mid-September and mid-October 2020, Petitioners collected more than 50,000 signatures per week. (*Id.*, ¶ 18.)

Petitioners assert that they will not gather the requisite signatures unless the 160-day deadline is extended. In the Related Cases, Nos. 2020-80003404 (*Macarro v. Padilla*) and 2020-80003413 (*Sangiaco v. Padilla*), the court granted similar extensions to proponents of initiatives. Respondent stipulated to extensions in those cases. Petitioners argue that they should receive an extension like the ones the proponents in the Related Cases received. Respondent disagrees.

Petitioners ask for a writ suspending or extending the 160-day period on signature gathering:

- Petitioners pray ... [f]or a peremptory writ of mandate commanding Respondent Padilla to suspend the November 17, 2020 deadline to circulate and file petitions for the recall of Governor Gavin Newsom until all counties in the State have been authorized to reopen consistent with the State's guidelines for "minimal" risk levels or, alternatively, that the 160-day period to circulate and file recall petitions be extended for a period of not less than 90 days[.]

(Pet. at 18, ¶ 1.) Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, they also seek declaratory and injunctive relief as well as nominal damages.³ Respondent opposes the petition.

The court set a hearing on shortened time, and issued an expedited briefing schedule, in light of the November 17, 2020 deadline.

Legal Authority for Writ Relief

"Code of Civil Procedure section 1085 declares that a writ may be issued 'by any court ... to any inferior tribunal, corporation, board or person, to compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins, as a duty resulting from an office, trust, or station' The availability of writ relief to compel a public agency to perform an act prescribed by law has long been recognized. [Citation.]

"What is required to obtain writ relief is a showing by a petitioner of '(1) A clear, present and usually ministerial duty on the part of the respondent ... ; and (2) a clear, present and beneficial right in the petitioner to the performance of that duty' [Citation.] Mandamus is available to compel a public agency's performance or correct an agency's abuse of discretion whether the action being compelled or corrected can itself be characterized as 'ministerial' or 'legislative[.]'" [Citation.]

(*Mission Hosp. Reg'l Med. Ctr. v. Shewry* (2008) 168 Cal.App.4th 460, 478-479, underlining omitted.)

In addition, Section 13314(a) provides:

(1) An elector may seek a writ of mandate alleging that an error or omission has occurred, or is about to occur, in the placing of a name on, or in the printing of, a ballot, county voter information guide, state voter information guide, or other official matter, or that any neglect of duty has occurred, or is about to occur.

(2) A peremptory writ of mandate shall issue only upon proof of both of the following:

(A) That the error, omission, or neglect is in violation of this code or the Constitution.

(B) That issuance of the writ will not substantially interfere with the conduct of the election.

(3) The action or appeal shall have priority over all other civil matters.

³ "As a direct and proximate result of the actions of Respondent, Petitioners have suffered irreparable harm, including the loss of their [First Amendment] rights, entitling them to declaratory and injunctive relief, and nominal damages." (Pet., ¶ 59.)

(4) The Secretary of State shall be named as a respondent or a real party in interest in any proceeding under this section concerning a measure or a candidate described in Section 15375,⁴ except for a candidate for judge of the superior court.

Discussion

The parties agree that the circulation of recall petitions, like the circulation of initiative petitions, is core political activity protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution. Whether a state's ballot-access restrictions impermissibly infringe upon such activity turns on balancing of the state's legitimate regulatory interests against the affected First Amendment interests:

[The court] must first consider the character and magnitude of the asserted injury to the rights protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments that the plaintiff seeks to vindicate. It then must identify and evaluate the precise interests put forward by the State as justifications for the burden imposed by its rule. In passing judgment, the Court must not only determine the legitimacy and strength of each of those interests, it also must consider the extent to which those interests make it necessary to burden the plaintiff's rights. Only after weighing all these factors is the reviewing court in a position to decide whether the challenged provision is unconstitutional. [Citations.] The results of this evaluation will not be automatic; as we have recognized, there is "no substitute for the hard judgments that must be made."

(*Anderson v. Celebrezze* (1983) 460 U.S. 780, 789-790, 103 S. Ct. 1564, underlining omitted.) If the restrictions impose a severe burden, then they must be narrowly drawn and must advance a compelling state interest. (See *Burdick v. Takushi* (1992) 504 U.S. 428, 434, 112 S. Ct. 2059.) "Lesser burdens, however, trigger less exacting review, and a State's 'important regulatory interests' will usually be enough to justify 'reasonable, nondiscriminatory restrictions.'" (*Timmons v. Twin Cities Area New Party* (1997) 520 U.S. 351, 358-359, 117 S. Ct. 1364, additional quotation marks omitted.) "This is a sliding scale test, where the more severe the burden, the more compelling the state's interest must be, such that 'a state may justify election regulations imposing a lesser burden by demonstrating the state has important regulatory interests.'" (*Ariz. Green Party v. Reagan* (9th Cir. 2016) 838 F.3d 983, 988.)

In *Angle v. Miller* (9th Cir. 2012) 673 F.3d 1122, 1133, the Ninth Circuit predicated application of strict scrutiny upon the petitioner's reasonable diligence in gathering signatures. (See also *Fair Maps Nev. v. Cegavske* (D. Nev., May 29, 2020) 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 94696, *31 [applying *Angle*].) Respondent argues that Petitioners cannot demonstrate any severe burden warranting such scrutiny because they were not reasonably diligent. The court disagrees.

Petitioners' 160-day period began on June 10, 2020, and they presented 35,000 signatures to county election officials by July 3, 2020. (See Opp. at 11:18-19.) In addition, they hired a

⁴ Section 15375 describes holders of statewide office, such as the Governor.

consulting firm and switched from paid circulators to a team of 5,000 volunteers once the high cost of paid circulation became clear. According to Respondent's data, the 675,000 signatures that Petitioners have collected to date is more than double the number gathered during the last recall effort in 2019. (See Opp. at 5:9-13.) Petitioners have been reasonably diligent.

Respondent nonetheless argues that Petitioners cannot demonstrate reasonable diligence given their failure to submit signatures to county election officials since August 2020. Petitioners counter that county officials asked them not to submit signatures so that officials could focus on the November 2020 election. County officials' need to prioritize the upcoming election is evident: the Governor recently issued an executive order extending deadlines for local officials to process signatures on initiatives slated for the November 2020 ballot. (See Duvernay Decl., Exh. 10.) Further, Petitioners note that they are not legally required to submit signatures to county officials throughout the 160-day period.

Petitioners' arguments are persuasive. The fact that Petitioners stopped submitting signatures to county election officials in August 2020 does not negate a finding that they have proceeded with reasonable diligence.

Turning to the balancing of interests, Respondent identifies the following state interests in support of the 160-day deadline facing Petitioners: (1) the interest requiring a showing of popular support before the costs of a recall election are incurred, and (2) the interest in the integrity of the electoral process, by which the voters elected Governor Newsom for a full four-year term. These are weighty interests. The state's interests in managing the Covid-19 pandemic, and protecting public health through executive orders, are at least as significant. On the other side of the scale are Petitioners' interests in core political speech.

The *Angle* court wrote that ballot-access restrictions impose a severe burden on First Amendment rights where (1) the restrictions hamper one-on-one communication between petition circulators and voters or (2) where the restrictions "can make it less likely that proponents will be able to garner the signatures necessary to place an initiative on the ballot, 'thus limiting their ability to make the matter the focus of statewide discussion.'" (673 F.3d at 1132, quoting *Meyer v. Grant* (1988) 486 U.S. 414, 423, 108 S. Ct. 1886.) Since June 5, 2020, the state has identified signature gathering as an essential election-related activity in which residents may engage despite stay-at-home orders. (See Calia Decl., Exh. K, ¶ 9.) Because Petitioners' 160-day deadline did not commence until June 10, 2020, Respondent argues that the ballot-access restrictions in question have not hampered one-on-one communication with voters.

But under *Angle* strict scrutiny applies equally to restrictions that can reduce the probability sufficient signatures will be collected. Respondent argues that executive orders requiring residents to stay at home subject to exceptions, limiting large gatherings, and requiring certain businesses to remain closed or at limited capacity do not impact the likelihood Petitioners will meet their goals. This argument does not square with Respondent's position in the Related Cases, which both sides discuss in their legal briefs. In those cases, Respondent stipulated to

extend deadlines on signature gathering. Respondent emphasizes that the initiative proponents in the Related Cases began gathering signatures and sought writ relief in court before the Governor's stay-at-home order provided an exception for signature gathering. Hence, Respondent argues that its stipulations to extend the deadlines in the Related Cases are irrelevant to case at bench.

Respondent paints an incomplete picture. Respondent initially stipulated to extend the deadlines in the Related Cases on July 1, 2020, shortly after signature gathering was designated an essential activity exempt from the stay-at-home order. Most of the signatures the petitioners in the Related Cases had collected before then were collected while signature gathering was considered nonessential. Accordingly, Respondent argues that its initial stipulations were a response to the total ban on one-on-one contact with voters in effect when the Related Cases were filed.

When the court signed the initial stipulated extensions in the Related Cases, it retained jurisdiction so that additional expedited relief could be granted without the need to file a new action. In fact, the petitioners in one of the Related Cases, *Macarro v. Padilla*, sought a further extension of time to gather signatures. The *Macarro* petitioners sought the additional extension in September 2020. Between the time the *Macarro* petitioners obtained the initial extension and the time they sought the additional extension, signature gathering was an essential activity not subject to the Governor's stay-at-home order. Respondent nonetheless stipulated to the additional extension as follows:

1. On July 17, 2020, this Court entered judgment extending the deadline for proponents ... in light of significant restrictions on petitioners' First Amendment rights caused by the issuance of various COVID-19 stay-at-home orders. [...]

2. On July 1, 2020, because of continuing and increased community spread of COVID-19, the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) directed the suspension of indoor operations in various sectors including restaurants, entertainment venues and all bars for those counties on the County Monitoring List. There were 19 counties on the list on that date.

3. By July 13, 2020, the number of counties on the Monitoring List increased to 32 counties. As a result, on that date, CDPH expanded its July 1 directive to apply statewide and implemented additional restrictions for counties on the Monitoring List related to gyms, places of worship, personal care salons and malls. [...]

[¶]

5. On August 28, 2020, Governor Newsom announced a new four-tier "Blueprint for a Safer Economy" to replace the County Monitoring List At the time of his announcement, approximately 87% of the State's population was in "Tier 1," the tier

with the most widespread incidence of COVID-19 and the most restrictions on activities.

6. The restrictions described above have continued to make it extremely difficult for petitioners to engage in signature-gathering activities for their proposed initiative. Petitioners represent that the State-imposed restrictions since the date of the Court's previous order have continued to interfere with their ability to exercise their First Amendment rights in the same ways identified by the Court in its July 17, 2020 judgment and order.

7. Petitioners represent that they have made substantial efforts to increase their signature-gathering efforts, but they estimate that between June 18, 2020 ... and August 31, 2020, petitioners have only been able to increase the number of signatures from approximately 10% of the signatures they would normally be able to obtain (and were obtaining prior to the State's COVID-19 stay-at-home order in March, 2020) to approximately 16% of the signatures they would normally be able to obtain (and were obtaining prior to the State's COVID-19 stay-at-home order in March, 2020).

8. [...] Based on these circumstances and the Court's previous ruling, the parties agree that it would be appropriate for the Court to amend the July 17, 2020 judgment to extend the October 12, 2020 deadline for signatures therein by 62 days. This represents adding 84% to the 74 days between June 18, 2020 and August 31, 2020 during which petitioners were only able to obtain 16% of normal signatures. (Emphasis added.)

(See Register of Actions No. 30 in Case No. 34-2020-80003404.) In other words, even after signature gathering was designated an essential activity exempt from the stay-at-home order, Respondent represented to this court that the state's Covid-19 restrictions made it "extremely difficult" for the *Macarro* petitioners to collect enough signatures to place their initiative on the ballot. The same difficulties have been at work during the 160-day period facing Petitioners in the instant action.

Petitioners argue that representations Respondent made to the court in the *Macarro* stipulations judicially estop him to make contrary representations now. (See *The Swahn Group, Inc. v. Segal* (2010) 183 Cal.App.4th 831, 841 ["The doctrine of judicial estoppel precludes a party from taking inconsistent positions in separate judicial proceedings"].) Whether or not Respondent is estopped, his stipulations in *Macarro* gravely undermine his current position that state action has not significantly hampered Petitioners' efforts. As those stipulations indicate, even after signature gathering was deemed an essential activity, executive orders have kept swaths of businesses statewide closed or at partial capacity. Social distancing is still required, large gatherings are still barred, and travel outside the home is still restricted. The court finds that these ballot-access restrictions are themselves likely to prevent Petitioners from obtaining the requisite signatures. Coupled with the 160-day deadline, they are virtually guaranteed to do so.

Respondent asserts that factors other than Covid-19 restrictions have thwarted Petitioners' efforts to gather the needed signatures. He contends that the Governor's popularity and Petitioners' lack of funding are the true causes. The court is not convinced.

Respondent also argues that Covid-19 itself, rather than state restrictions responsive to it, is a reason Petitioners have not gathered more signatures. Indeed, voters might avoid circulators for fear that interacting with them will result in exposure to the virus. But it is impossible to separate with precision this impact on voter behavior from the impact of the ballot-access restrictions in place. Nor is such an allocation required. Enforcement of the 160-day deadline to present circumstances, including Covid-19, is itself state action. (See *Bond v. Dunlap* (D. Maine, July 24, 2020) 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 131389, *19, fn. 7 ["Although COVID-19 itself does not constitute state action, Maine's decision to enforce its ballot restrictions is state action, and the reasonableness of such restrictions must be considered against the altered landscape during the pandemic, which includes actions taken by the State in its response,] and collecting authorities. But see *Thompson v. Dewine* (6th Cir. 2020) 959 F.3d 804, 810 ["[W]e cannot hold private citizens' decisions to stay home for their own safety against the State".]) And as noted above, Respondent previously stipulated that ballot-access restrictions significantly burdened efforts to gather signatures.

Applying strict scrutiny, the court inquires whether the state's ballot-access restrictions are narrowly drawn to avoid unnecessary intrusion on First Amendment rights. (See *Planning & Conservation League, Inc. v. Lungren* (1995) 38 Cal.App.4th 497, 507.) As applied to present circumstances, the 160-day deadline is not narrowly drawn. Petitioners have only been able to obtain roughly 25 percent of the signatures that their diligent efforts would otherwise yield. It is virtually if not actually impossible for Petitioners to gather enough signatures under current conditions. An order providing Petitioners with a signature-gathering period in which their efforts will approximate unrestricted diligent efforts will preserve the state interests identified above: it will not be easier for Petitioners to recall the Governor than it would be under normal circumstances, nor will it sanction a recall election without a showing of the necessary popular support. Rather, the extended period for signature gathering will account for disabilities that ballot-access restrictions have yielded.⁵

The result would be the same even if the court were to apply something less than strict scrutiny. For ballot-access restrictions that are neither severe nor minimal, the burdens of the restrictions must be weighed against the state interests tendered as justifications, "taking into consideration the extent to which those interests make it necessary to burden the plaintiff's rights." (*SawariMedia LLC v. Whitmer* (E.D. Mich., June 11, 2020) 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 102237, *15-16, citations and additional quotation marks omitted.) As previously discussed, it is not

⁵ When Respondent stipulated to a second extension in *Macarro*, he stipulated to an extension equal to 84 percent of the signature-gathering period because the petitioners had only collected "16 percent of normal signatures." (See Register of Actions No. 30, ¶ 8, in Case No. 34-2020-80003404.) Respondent cannot credibly complain about a similarly calibrated offset in this case.

necessary under the circumstances to require Petitioners to gather almost 1.5 million signatures within 160 days. The state's considerable restrictions on gatherings, business activities and close interpersonal contacts have already burdened Petitioners' efforts. Strict adherence to the 160-day deadline would increase the burden beyond that necessary to uphold the integrity of the political process or assure that any recall election has sufficient popular support.

The court calibrates relief as it did in the Related Cases, i.e., by multiply the signature-gathering period (160 days) by the rate at which signature-gathering was diminished compared with normal circumstances (75%). Accordingly, the court will order a 120-day extension to March 17, 2021.

Disposition

The petition for writ of mandate is granted on the terms above. Respondent shall abide by the new deadline of March 17, 2021.

The court shall retain jurisdiction in this matter.

No other relief is granted.

Pursuant to CRC 3.1312, counsel for Petitioners shall lodge a proposed judgment to which this ruling is attached as an exhibit.

Consistent with Local Rule 1.06(B), parties requesting oral argument must call the court and opposing party, and email the court (Dept17@saccourt.ca.gov) and the opposing party(ies), by 4:00 p.m. on the court day before the hearing. If you do not call and email the court and the opposing party(ies) by 4:00 p.m. the court day before the hearing, no hearing will be held, and the tentative ruling shall become the final order of the court.

If a hearing is requested, it will be conducted remotely through the Zoom application and live-streamed on the court's YouTube page. The clerk will email the Zoom ID to counsel once a hearing is requested. The YouTube page is accessible from the Sacramento County Superior Court's public website.

Although any hearing will be live-streamed on the court's YouTube page, the broadcast will not be saved. Thus, if any party wishes to preserve the hearing for future use, a court reporter will be required. Any party desiring a court reporter shall so advise the Department 17 Clerk no later than 4:30 p.m. on the day before the hearing. The reporter's fee is \$30.00 for civil proceedings lasting under one hour, and \$239.00 per half day for proceedings lasting more than one hour. (Local Rule 1.12 and Government Code § 68086.)



ALEX PADILLA | SECRETARY OF STATE | STATE OF CALIFORNIA
ELECTIONS DIVISION

1500 11th Street, 5th Floor, Sacramento, CA 95814 | Tel 916.657.2166 | Fax 916.653.3214 | www.sos.ca.gov

November 17, 2020

TO: All County Clerks/Registrars of Voters

Honorable Gavin Newsom
Governor, State of California
State Capitol Building, 1st Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Mr. Orrin E. Heatlie
104 Oneill Court
Folsom, CA 95630

RE: Recall of Governor Gavin Newsom: REVISED Calendar of Events

On June 10, 2020, the Secretary of State's office approved petitions for circulation for the recall of Governor Gavin Newsom.

On November 17, 2020, the Sacramento County Superior Court issued a final judgment in *Heatlie v. Padilla* (case number 34-2020-80003499) extending the time for the proponents of the current effort to recall Governor Gavin Newsom to circulate petitions from November 17, 2020, to and including March 17, 2021.

The following are some key points with regard to the recall process:

1. The petitions must be submitted to the elections official in the county in which the petitions were circulated. They may be submitted on multiple occasions at any time during circulation period that ends Wednesday, March 17, 2021.
2. Elections Code section 11104¹ requires each county to report all of the following to the Secretary of State every 30 days: 1) the number of signatures submitted during that 30-day period ending five days previously, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; 2) the cumulative total of all signatures received since the initiation of the recall through the period ending five days previously, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; 3) the number of valid signatures, verified pursuant to Section 11104(b), submitted during the previous reporting period, and of valid signatures verified during the current reporting period; and 4) the cumulative total of all valid signatures that have been verified since the initiation of the recall and ending five days previously, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. These submissions should be directed to Jordan Kaku at petitions@sos.ca.gov.

¹ All section references are to the California Elections Code unless otherwise noted.

3. In accordance with section 11104(d), county elections officials are not required to verify any signatures until notified by the Secretary of State that the proponents have submitted at least 149,571 signatures, which is 10 percent of the total signatures required to qualify the recall for the ballot.
4. Section 11043 requires each signer to personally affix his or her signature, printed name, residence address (giving street and number, or if no street or number exists, adequate designation of residence so that the location may be readily ascertained), and the name of the incorporated city or unincorporated community in which the voter resides to the petition section in order for the signature to be valid.
5. Section 11102 requires each section of a recall petition to be filed with the elections official of the county in which it was circulated.
6. Section 11103 requires the proponents or a person authorized in writing by a proponent to file petition sections.
7. Initial signature withdrawal period: Sections 103 and 11303 permit any voter who signed the petition to remove their name by filing a written request that includes the voter's name, residence address, and signature with the county elections official prior to the filing of the petition section that contains the voter's name.
8. Supplemental signature withdrawal period: In addition, Section 11108(b) provides that any voter who has signed the petition and chooses to remove their name has 30 business days after the Secretary of State issues the notice to counties that a sufficient number of valid signatures has been collected to initiate a recall election to request this withdrawal in writing.
9. Sections of a recall petition are not public records, and as a result, only staff of the county elections official may have access to the petition sections. If the petition is found to be insufficient, the proponents listed on the notice of intention may examine the petition sections. (Gov. Code § 6253.5)
10. When a recall of the Governor is initiated, the recall duties of the Governor's office shall be performed by the Lieutenant Governor. (Cal. Const., art. II, § 17)

Dates and Deadlines

1. The minimum number of valid signatures required to qualify the recall is 1,495,709 (12% of the 12,464,235 votes cast in the last election for Governor). Valid signatures must be obtained from at least five counties and in each of those counties must equal at least 1% of the last vote for Governor. (Cal. Const., art. II, § 14(b))

2. Date proponent may begin circulating petitions.
 (§ 11042(d)).....Wednesday, June 10, 2020

3. Last date for proponent to circulate petition and file with county elections officials.
Wednesday, March 17, 2021

4. Each county elections official must report to the Secretary of State 30 days after a recall has been initiated (Wednesday, June 10, 2020) and every 30 days thereafter all of the following: 1) the number of signatures submitted during that 30-day period ending five days previously, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; 2) the cumulative total of all signatures received since the initiation of the recall through the period ending five days previously, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays; 3) the number of valid signatures, verified pursuant to Section 11104(b), submitted during the previous reporting period, and of valid signatures verified during the current reporting period; and 4) the cumulative total of all valid signatures that have been verified since the initiation of the recall and ending five days previously, excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. (§§ 11104, 11107)

The first reporting date is on Friday, July 10, 2020. The subsequent reporting dates are as follows:

Section 11104 Status Reports	
A1.	Friday, July 10, 2020
A2.	Monday, August 10, 2020 ²
A3.	Thursday, September 10, 2020 ²
A4.	Tuesday, October 13, 2020 ²
A5.	Thursday, November 12, 2020
A6.	Monday, December 14, 2020 ²
A7.	Wednesday, January 13, 2021
A8.	Tuesday, February 16, 2021 ²
A.9	Thursday, March 18, 2021 ²
A.10	Monday, April 19, 2021 ²

5. When the Secretary of State notifies county elections officials that more than 149,571 signatures have been filed pursuant to Section 11104(d), the county elections officials will have 30 business days to verify all signatures filed in their office as of that date. After each examination, the county elections official is required to certify the results and submit a blank copy of the petition to the Secretary of State. (§§ 9031(b), 11107)

The certification dates and sample forms will be provided to the county elections officials when the notice required by Section 11104(d) is issued.

² Date adjusted for official deadline which falls on a weekend or holiday. (Elections Code § 15)

6. The Secretary of State must maintain a continuous count of the signatures certified by county elections officials. (Cal. Const., art. II, § 14(c))

7. Last day county elections officials may certify the results of their verification of signatures to the Secretary of State. (§§ 9031(b), 11106, 11107).....Thursday, April 29, 2021

8. Within 10 days of receiving certifications from one or more county elections officials indicating that a sufficient number of registered voters signed the petition to initiate a recall election, the Secretary of State shall notify each county elections official. (§ 11108(a))

Note: With this notification to the county elections officials, the Secretary of State will provide a calendar setting forth the specific dates related to the following events detailed below.

9. Supplemental signature withdrawal period: Within 30 business days of the Secretary of State’s notice, as set forth in Item 8 above, any voter who has signed the petition may withdraw his or her name from the recall petition. (§ 11108(b))

10. No later than 10 business days after the supplemental signature withdrawal period, the county elections officials must report the total number of signatures withdrawn to the Secretary of State. (§ 11108(c))

11. Following receipt of the county elections officials’ reports of withdrawn signatures, the Secretary of State must determine if the petition has the requisite number of valid signatures to initiate a recall election and, if so, notify the Department of Finance of the results. If the petition does not have the requisite number of valid signature, the Secretary of State must notify the county elections officials that they must continue to verify signatures; however, this is dependent on a number of factual scenarios such as, if there are additional signatures to verify and whether the circulation period has ended. (§ 11108(c))

12. Upon notification by the Secretary of State that the petition has the requisite number of valid signatures to initiate a recall the Department of Finance shall, in consultation with the affected county elections officials and the Secretary of State, estimate the costs of the recall election and submit this estimate to the Chairperson of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and the Secretary of State. (§ 11108(d))

13. The Joint Legislative Budget Committee then has 30 days to review and comment on the estimate provided to them by the Department of Finance. (§ 11108(e))

14. Upon the expiration of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee’s 30-day review and comment period, the Secretary of State shall certify to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor that the proponents have submitted a sufficient number of valid signatures to qualify the recall for the ballot. (§§ 11108(e), 11109)
15. The Lieutenant Governor is required to call a recall election to be held not less than 60 days nor more than 80 days from the date of certification of sufficient signatures. A recall election may be conducted within 180 days from the date of certification of sufficient signatures in order that the election may be consolidated with the next regularly scheduled election occurring wholly or partially within the same jurisdiction in which the recall election is held, if the number of voters eligible to vote at that next regularly scheduled election equals at least 50 percent of all the voters eligible to vote at the recall election.
(Cal. Const., art. II § 15; § 11110)

Election

1. Top Funders Disclosure Requirement: Please see Elections Code sections 104, 107, and 18600 for Official Top Funders disclosure requirements effective January 1, 2020.
2. Last date candidate may file nomination papers with the county elections official. The Governor subject to the recall may not be a candidate.
(§ 11381(a), (c); Cal. Const., art. II, § 15(c)).....E-59
3. Last date for the Secretary of State to certify names of candidates to county elections officials. (§ 11381(a)).....E-55
4. If the majority vote on the question is to recall, the Governor is removed from office and the candidate who receives a plurality is the successor.
(Cal. Const., art. II, § 15(c))

Miscellaneous

1. California law prohibits the use of signatures, names, and addresses gathered on recall petitions to be used for any purpose other than to qualify the recall for the ballot. This means that the petitions cannot be used to create or add to mailing lists or similar lists for any purpose, including fund raising or requests for support. Any such misuse constitutes a crime under California law. (§ 18650; *Bilofsky v. Deukmejian* (1981) 124 Cal.App.3d 825; 63 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen. 37 (1980))
2. Any registered voter qualified to vote for the officer to be recalled may sign the recall petition. Any person who is 18 years of age or older may circulate the petition.
(§§ 102, 11045)

3. A registered voter at the time of signing a recall petition must personally affix his or her residence address and printed name along with his or her signature. If the voter is unable to personally affix his or residence address and printed name, the voter may request another person to print that information on the appropriate spaces on the recall petition. However, the voter shall personally affix his or her mark or signature on the appropriate space on the recall petition, which shall be witnessed by one person by subscribing his or her name thereon.
(§§ 100, 100.5, 11043)
4. Proponents of a recall, officers sought to be recalled, and candidates seeking to replace a recalled officer may have disclosure requirements under the Political Reform Act. (Government Code § 81000 et seq.) Questions should be directed to the Fair Political Practices Commission at the following address: 1102 Q Street, Suite 3000, Sacramento, California 95811, or by telephone at (866) 275-3772.
5. The Secretary of State shall publish the estimate submitted by the Department of Finance on the Secretary of State's public website no later than 21 business days after the Joint Legislative Budget Committee's 30-day period to review the estimate has expired.
(§ 11108(f))

If you have additional questions, please contact Robbie Anderson at (916) 657-2166 or at aanderso@sos.ca.gov.