OHIO VOTERS WHO MOVED TO GEORGIA AND SUBSEQUENTLY VOTED THERE

September 25, 2026 Butler County Challenge of Right to Vote Hearing Review

Inconsistent Board Votes

- **105 of 108 challenges were denied**. The Board did not state a reason for the denials at the hearing or in subsequent emails or public-record responses.
- This followed the Board **granting 104 of 119 similar North Carolina challenges** during the preceding 30 days, raising concerns about the uniform application of the law and evidentiary standards.
- The Board preprinted hearing documents cited that it could not determine voting history without personal identifying information to "definitively confirm" the Ohio and Georgia voters are the same. This differed from the statements used when granting the 104 North Carolina challenges, saying (1) first and last date voted, or (2) "without personal identifying information to confirm the record, it appears the most recent voting history is in NC" and ." **What specific evidentiary distinction justified the different treatment?**
- Similar 2024 North Carolina challenges were **denied** under NVRA provisions, **despite Ohio law in which a person who moves to another state and votes there has lost Ohio residence.** This reflects yet another differing standard applied to out-of-state voting challenges.
- Other Ohio counties reached different outcomes on materially similar out-of-state voting challenges, raising concerns about uniform application of the law statewide.

Personal Identifying Information (PII): **The Board now contends that PII is necessary to "definitively confirm" Ohio and Georgia voters are the same**, despite granting 104 similar challenges involving Ohio and North Carolina voters based on the following independent, documented chain:

- Ohio and Georgia names and date of birth match on Ohio and Georgia official voter registration records.
- USPS National Change of Address (NCOA) records link the Ohio and Georgia addresses.
- The Ohio "moved from" address matches the Ohio voter registration address, and the Georgia "moved to" address matches the Georgia voter registration address – or a subsequent move within Georgia.
- Georgia registration records show voting history.

- **SSN4 is an imperfect means of identity verification:**
  - **652** Butler voters have no/nonmatching SSN4 to SSA records;
  - **74,435** OH voter registrations did not match SSA records in 2026 alone.
    https://www.ssa.gov/data/HAVV.html
- **SSN4 is not available to private citizens:** Requiring citizens to provide it to establish identity undermines the voter's statutory right to challenge.
- **Board has investigated SSN4:** The Board investigated interstate identity through government sources using SSN4 verification for a North Carolina challenge, but did not conduct similar verification for the Georgia challenges.

Limited Investigation

Ohio law requires Boards to **"investigate and determine the residence qualifications of electors"** and Secretary LaRose encouraged Boards to "further investigate challenged electors;" however, the Board appears to generally limit its investigation to its own records rather than using available governmental verification to resolve challenge issues. For example, the Board:

- **May not contact the SOS for relevant information:** The Board stated that JACOB WESLEY FLANNERY did not appear on a Board NCOA list, even though challenger's NCOA evidence - using the same source as ERIC – showed he moved 11/1/2025. The SOS conducted a March 2026 statewide NCOA review. When asked whether the Board contacted the SOS to determine whether he appeared on the SOS NCOA list, the Board confirmed that it had not.
- **May not utilize all available communication methods:** The Board mails notices to challenged voters, but doesn't appear to attempt to contact voters by phone or email, if available, to confirm residency.
- **May not contact election officials in the other state:** The Board confirmed that a prior challenged voter **WAS NOT** registered in another state by checking identifying information with the other state, but did not appear to have used the same interstate verification process to confirm that a challenged Ohio voter **IS** the same person registered and voting in the other state.

Residence IS NOT Independently Determined:

- **Boards must determine the voter's actual residence:** When the Board's records do not establish a challenged voter's residence, the absence of contrary information should not substitute for a determination of residence.
- **Ohio law requires the Board to investigate and determine residence qualifications -** not simply treat the voter as an "Ohio resident" because its records do not resolve the identity or residence question.
- **The duty is to investigate until the elector's residence qualification is determined** – not merely to attempt to determine it.

Challenges and Cancellation Safeguards

- Challenges allow citizens to present evidence of potential voter ineligibility for Board investigation and residence determination, with **safeguards** against erroneous cancellation, including provisional voting & reinstatement.
- **Similar safeguards DO NOT EXIST to protect ELIGIBLE votes from being diluted by INELIGIBLE votes when Ohio voters establish residency and vote in another state.**
- The SOS currently has interstate data-sharing agreements with **only 10** other states. Citizens are attempting to help fill the gap for states not covered by those agreements by identifying potentially ineligible registrations through Form 257 Challenges of Right to Vote.