

**Janet D. Farrar**  
4886 St Hwy A  
Gordonville Missouri 63701  
(573) 979-0067  
janfarrar@reagan.com

August 8, 2016

Sent via Email and  
Regular Mail on  
August 8, 2016

Jason Kander  
Missouri Secretary of State  
Attn: Election Division, Elections Integrity  
600 W. Main Street  
Jefferson City, MO 65101  
(573) 751-2301 Phone, Election Integrity  
(573) 751-4936 Phone, Main Office  
[elections@sos.mo.gov](mailto:elections@sos.mo.gov) Email


Dear Secretary Kander / Elections Integrity:

Please find attached a completed Elections Complaint Form  
that I obtained from your website at [http://s1.sos.mo.gov/  
CMSImages/ElectionIntegrity/ElectionsComplaintForm.pdf](http://s1.sos.mo.gov/CMSImages/ElectionIntegrity/ElectionsComplaintForm.pdf)

Kindly put all verification board members in each county on  
notice that this Complaint has been filed.

Thank you for investigating this matter of utmost  
importance.

Sincerely,

  
Jan Farrar

Enclosure: Janet D. Farrar, Election Complaint Form, Missouri  
Secretary of State's Office, including supporting documentation  
and additional facts, August 8, 2016.

**Elections Complaint Form**  
**Missouri Secretary of State's Office**

*Note: if you believe you have witnessed a violation of Title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 for federal elections, please fill out a Title III of HAVA Elections Complaint Form.*

Name Janet D. Farrar  
Address 4886 St Hwy A, Gordonville MO 63701  
County Cape Girardeau  
Phone (573) 979-0067  
Email janfarrar@reagan.com

My complaint pertains to the Election held on August 2, 2016 . . . and all previous elections since the introduction of electronic voting machines

**I have or will file a complaint with (check all that apply):**

- |                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Missouri Attorney General's Office | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Missouri Ethics Commission         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Local Election Authority           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Local Law Enforcement              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

My complaint is regarding (check one):

- Absentee voting
- Candidate Qualifications
- Voting
- Election Judge Misconduct
- Improper Voter Registration
- Other Election law violation inability of election authorities to certify and verify elections

**State the facts of the alleged violation including:**

- **The name and mailing address of the person or persons alleged to have committed the violation; and**
- **A description of the act or acts you believe to be a violation.**

---

---

---

---

**See attached supporting documentation and additional facts**

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

(facts cont'd)

See attached supporting documentation and additional facts

By my signature I swear or affirm that, to the best of my knowledge, the information provided on this form is true.



Signature of person filing complaint

August 8, 2016

Date

*Please be as thorough as possible and attach supporting documentation or additional facts, if any.*

*Return this form to:  
Missouri Secretary of State's Office  
Attn: Elections Division  
600 W Main St.  
Jefferson City, MO 65101*

**JANET D. FARRAR, ELECTION COMPLAINT,**  
supporting documentation and additional facts, August 8, 2016

---

**Elections Complaint of Janet D. Farrar** supporting documentation  
and additional facts, Aug. 8, 2016

---

Missouri's elections, including the August 2, 2016 election, have been un-certifiable and un-verifiable since the introduction of electronic voting machines.

**SUMMARY OF COMPLAINT:**

I am just a simple grandmother who cares deeply about whether or not our Missouri elections are free and fair. If they are not, then I will not have left a sound Republic to my grandbabies. No citizen who loves God, her family, friends, neighbors and America can tolerate that.

Verification boards across the state are set to meet "not later than the second Tuesday after the election" regarding the August 2, 2016 primary election. Missouri Election Statute, [Section 115.507.1](#)

The August 2, 2016 elections *cannot* be certified or verified due to certain fundamental flaws in the statute and resulting flawed, un-Constitutional election practices about which I have just been informed.

Any election authority that certifies or verifies Missouri's election will be committing a fraud, unwittingly or knowingly, makes no matter. Election authorities cannot certify that the votes selected by a voter using an electronic voting machine were accurately displayed in the tallies reported by the machine.

Since the veracity of all electronic vote tallies cannot be certified, the August 2, 2016 election must be invalidated. Further, the results of past elections that used electronic voting machines must be invalidated, and steps must be taken forthwith to insure that the upcoming November 2016 election uses all paper ballots and manual, certifiable and verifiable processes.

**JANET D. FARRAR, ELECTION COMPLAINT,**

supporting documentation and additional facts, August 8, 2016

After reviewing the Missouri Statute Chapter 115, Election Authorities and Conduct of Elections, it appears that no election authority can or should certify and verify the vote count where electronic voting machines were or are being used.

The process for certifying and verifying paper ballots and write-ins is not being applied consistently and with equal reliability, impartiality and verifiability to electronic voting.

**ELECTRONIC VOTING MACHINE UN-CERTIFIABILITY**

[Section 115.249.1](#) "Standards required of voting machines" states in pertinent part:

"(6) Correctly registers or records and accurately counts all votes cast for each candidate and for and against each question;

(7) Is provided with a lock or locks which prevent any movement of the voting or registering mechanism and any tampering with the mechanism;"

[Section 115.257.1](#) "Electronic voting machines to be put in order, procedure to be followed" states in pertinent part:

The preparation shall be watched by two observers designated by the election authority, one from each major political party, and shall be open to representatives of the political parties, candidates, the news media and the public.

Nowhere in the statute is an election authority permitted to unlock and program the voting machines, as required by at least Section 115.456.1.

However, [Section 115.456.1](#) "Responsibilities of election authority--counting optical scan ballots--counting paper ballots--marks indicating political party preference, how construed," states in pertinent part:

"Prior to tabulating ballots, all machines shall be programmed to reject blank ballots where no votes are recorded or where an overvote is registered in any race."

**JANET D. FARRAR, ELECTION COMPLAINT,**

supporting documentation and additional facts, August 8, 2016

Since the election authority must certify and verify an accurate vote, the statute requires the election authority managing precinct voting to certify that each machine has been programmed to reject blank ballots.

However, the statute *nowhere* permits the election authority to have done such programming, much less certify and verify it. This Section 115.456.1 alone invalidates on its face all certifications and verifications of Missouri election results since the first use of electronic voting machines.

**VERIFICATION BOARDS UN-CERTIFIABILITY**

In like manner, it is and has been impossible for the Verification Boards to certify elections in Missouri since the advent of electronic voting machines, including the August 2, 2016 election.

[Section 115.503.1](#) "Verification board to inspect or cause inspection of secured electronic voting machines" and

[Section 115.507.1](#) "Announcement of results by verification board, contents, when due--abstract of votes to be official returns" state in pertinent part:

"15.507. 1. Not later than the second Tuesday after the election, the verification board shall issue a statement announcing the results of each election held within its jurisdiction and shall certify the returns to each political subdivision and special district submitting a candidate or question at the election."

Since the statute itself prevents the ability of the election authorities to certify the accuracy of the printouts from all electronic voting machines, past verification boards have certified past elections fraudulently -- at least since the advent of electronic voting machines that are the subject of this complaint. Programming experts tell me that "random sampling" audits are easy to fool or manipulate if one has *inside* knowledge of the systems and procedures.

The meetings of the verification boards to be held following the August 2, 2016 will be equally fraudulent if they certify and verify the election results without first determining if the certifications by the election judges of the outputs of

**JANET D. FARRAR, ELECTION COMPLAINT,**

supporting documentation and additional facts, August 8, 2016

electronic voting machines are anything other than blind faith that the software running those machines did not alter the tallies reported.

You will surely agree that blind faith is not a reliable certification standard.

My county clerk told me just today regarding election judges "we give them a lot of information and sometimes it is overwhelming to them." Any reasonable person knows that overwhelmed laypeople *cannot and will not be able to* detect voting machine fraud and election rigging by technically sophisticated insiders.

In addition, a former congressional candidate in our district told me on Sunday that he commented to the person scanning his ballot on August 2, 2016 that the scanner she was using to scan his ballot was rigged. He said the person replied, "I know."

**THE SOLEMN OATH OF AN ELECTION AUTHORITY**

[Section 115.091.1](#) "Oath of election judge." Requires an election judge to make an oath in pertinent part:

"I solemnly swear that I will impartially discharge the duties of judge according to law . . ." (emphasis added)

The law requires certifications of electronic voting about matters like (a) the accuracy of the vote and (b) programming to prevent the counting of blank ballots. Such certifications are *technical impossibilities for election authorities*. Therefore, every election authority's certification has been and is fraudulent.

In short, certification of the printout of electronic voting machines is not equivalent to the bi-partisan and double-checked physical counting of votes from printed ballots. Also, the allegedly random sampling at best only proves that the machines selected were OK, perhaps. But, what about the chain of custody on the paper ballots used for the allegedly random choices. Was it comprised of bi-partisan observers throughout? Could boxes of ballots be switched out in storage? Were they the actual ballots, or were they specially switched out for the allegedly "random" tests?

**JANET D. FARRAR, ELECTION COMPLAINT,**

supporting documentation and additional facts, August 8, 2016

**MAN IN THE MIDDLE VOTE "SHIFTING"**

As the vote totals are reported to the Secretary of State, can you say with 100% certainty that no "Man in the Middle" information technology services, people, vendors, subcontractors or other third parties did not alter or shift vote totals before they arrived at the Secretary of State's voting tabulator.

As you no doubt know, this very thing happened in Ohio in 2004 via a Tennessee vendor named SmartTech that was caught altering votes for the Republican George W. Bush running against Democrat John Kerry. The technical expert who disclosed this fraud, Michael Connell, died in a mysterious small plane crash six weeks after his deposition.

Questions are being raised about a somewhat concealed Missouri vendor relationship with Nippon (Japan) Telephone & Telegraph, NTT DATA INC, and its Silicon Valley affiliate NTT Innovation Institute, Inc. with close ties to Barack Obama, Hillary Clinton, The Clinton Foundation and The IBM Eclipse Foundation. These companies promote "open" and "unshackled" data. How does one "unshackle" Missouri's data without stealing it? How much of Missouri's data are they handling? Why is NTT DATA INC listed as "NIT DATA INC" in the Missouri state purchasing website? How are Missouri interests served by allowing our data to be handled by an offshore state telephone company?

Who are the information technology vendors (including any and all embedded subcontractor relationships) that have any part large or small in Missouri's elections? How are they vetted?

Kindly provide for public review the security logs showing the flow of election data in and out of Missouri's central vote tabulator(s) on election night. Security experts tell me that this will show the "DNS" numbers (addresses) of the servers sending and receiving data from the main Secretary of State computers.

The unequal treatment of the vote (between paper ballots and electronic voting) is unconstitutional and offends the very soul of our American Republic: "one person, one vote."



**JANET D. FARRAR, ELECTION COMPLAINT,**  
supporting documentation and additional facts, August 8, 2016

**MISSOURI'S ELECTIONS ARE UNVERIFIABLE**

In summary, Missouri's elections, since the advent of electronic voting, have been unverifiable, and therefore fraudulent. The opportunity for mischief abounds and unscrupulous actors have surely rushed in to fill the void. Such has been the nature of corrupt public figures and their co-conspirators since time immemorial. It appears that old-school ballot stuffing has given way to "vote shifting."

If one doubts, see the HBO documentary *Hacking Democracy* (2006) ("America, the world's greatest democracy, and at its heart, the VOTE") for proof of election rigging using electronic voting machines. [Full Length](#)<sup>1</sup> | [7-min. Clip](#).<sup>2</sup>

In full disclosure, I am distributing this complaint widely to voters in my 8th District and to other Districts and their candidates who ran for office on August 2, 2016 across the state.

**Footnote:** The Missouri statutes cited above are illustrative and not exhaustive on each subject presented. I reserve the right to supplement this complaint as needed.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://youtu.be/rVTXbARGXso>

<sup>2</sup> <https://youtu.be/t75xvZ3osFg>