



Hillary's Body Count Rises: Lead Attorney Investigating Her FOUND DEAD

It just goes to show that this woman will do whatever it takes to become president of the United States, to include killing anyone who gets in her way!

By **Prissy Holly** August 5, 2016



It's becoming increasingly apparent that the last thing you want to do is cross the Clintons. Over the past several decades, many people who have gotten too close to unearthing Bill and Hillary's scandals have wound up dead under mysterious circumstances.



[Ricardo L. Villalba. \(Jul. 01, 2016\).](#) "YOU GOT SERVED!" DNC and Debbie Wasserman Schultz get served in Wilding class action [*Wilding et al. v. DNC Services Corp. et al*, Case No. 16-cv-61511-Judge-William-J-Zloch, filed Jun. 28, 2016 (S.D. FL)]. Jam PAC. <https://youtu.be/D3FMqZruOXE>

On Tuesday morning, it was just revealed that Shawn Lucas, the lead attorney who was working to expose the Democratic National Committee fraud case in Florida was unexpectedly found dead in his home.



Shawn Lucas, attorney, serving process in *Wilding et al. v. DNC Services Corp. et al.*, Case No. 16-cv-61511-WJZ, filed Jun. 28, 2016, died mysteriously on Aug. 2, 2016. He had delivered the Wilding [Class Action by Bernie Sanders supporters and delegates] COMPLAINT to the DNC headquarters on Jul. 3, 2016

According to [one report](#), the young man was found lying on the bathroom floor by his girlfriend after she returned home for the evening. Paramedics responded to the residence, but they found no signs of life after attempting to revive him.

Following the lawyer's unexpected passing, a social media frenzy has ensued, with many immediately crying foul over the lawyer's sudden and unexpected passing.

"Another death possibly related to election fraud and the DNC," [one headline read](#). "The body count is rising. Shaun Lucas found dead," [another site wrote](#).

#

Reproduced for educational purposes only.

Attachments:

1. COMPLAINT, Doc. No. 1, filed Jun. 28, 2016, *Wilding et al. v. DNC Services Corp. et al.*, Case No. 16-cv-61511-WJZ, filed Jun. 28, 2016
2. SHAWN LUCAS DEATH REPORT, Doc. No. 24-1, filed Aug. 05, 2016, *Wilding et al. v. DNC Services Corp. et al.*, Case No. 16-cv-61511-WJZ, filed Aug. 05, 2016.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

FORT LAUDERDALE DIVISION

CASE NO.

CAROL WILDING; STANLEY RIFKEN;
SHARON CRAWFORD; WILLIAM SCOTT
FRANZ; DAVID PULASKI; MARY
JASMINE WELCH; JOSE ALBERTO
GONZALEZ; JANE ELLEN PLATTNER;
KIM MARIE HOULE; TIMOTHY BINGEN;
SUSAN REED; ANGELA MONSON; AIMEE
R. COLEMAN; ELESNA SNYDER;
MATTHEW SHAW; ZACHARY JAMES
HANEY; ESTRELLA GONZALEZ;
CATHERINE G. CYKO; LAURA GENNA;
MARIANNE BLAIR; TAMARA L.
JOHNSTON; VALERIE ELYSE RESCH;
BRETT TEEGARDIN; DANIEL O'MEARA;
PEGGY LEW; DANIEL J. REYNOLDS;
BRENDA LEE SMITH; MARLOWE ST.
CLOUD PRIMACK; PATRICIA D.
CASSIDY; BRITTANY R. MUSICK;
HARRIS BIERHOFF; FELICIA MICHELLE
TAYLOR; SUSAN L. SINGER; KYLE G.
BRAUND; LAUREN HALE; WILLIAM
CRANDALL; KIRSTEN HURST; DUFFY
ROBERT WEISS; CONNIE ANDERSON;
GREGORY WITKOWSKI; ELIZABETH
FIGUEROA; BRANDY KINCAID;
KIMBERLY ALBERTS; RACHEL
RODERICK; LAURA MICHELLE
VAUGHN; TWANA SPARKS; LISA GALE;
TAMMY DEITCH-COULTER; KAYITE
ASHCRAFT; ALECIA R. DAVIS; DOMINIC
RONZANI; LUKE GRIM; ROSALIE
CONSIGLIO; EDWIN LUGO; HEATHER
DADE; MICHAEL S. REED; RHIANNON
CRANDALL; KATHRYN BAILEY; RYAN
GHAN; LISA SETTLE; YALONDA DYE
COOPER; DANIEL S. COOPER; MATTHEW
JOSEPH BRADY; ANDREW ROUSSEAU;

COMPLAINT- CLASS ACTION

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

SUSAN CATTERALL; JULIE HAMPTON;
CHRIS BUBB; ERIK FURREBOE; ZEKE
SHAW; BENJAMIN ILARRAZA; LUCILLE
GROOMS; CHRISTINE MAIURANO;
LEWIS L. HUMISTON, IV; JOHN LYNCH;
JAMES SIMON; LESTER JOHN BATES, III;
JEFFREY GOLDBERG; RICK WASHIK;
RICHARD BOOKER; KARLIE COLE;
ERICH SPARKS; PRABU
GOPALAKRISHNAN; CARLOS
VILLAMAR; CAROLYN JACOBSON; DAN
ELLIS DUDLEY; LISA ANNE MENEELY;
D.J. BUSCHINI; RAYMOND D.
MAXWELL; DAVID L. MEULI; KENNETH
E. PUCKETT; DAVID N. PYLES; CYNTHIA
T. CHAN; STEFANIE BIRDSONG; AMBER
RAE KNOWLTON; TIMO A. JOHANN;
JEFF ROGERS; HEATHER JORDAN; RANA
KANGAS-KENT; SUSAN FRISBIE; BAKH
INAMOV; THEDA LARSON-WRIGHT;
KIRSTEN HOFFMAN; ANTHONY
GRUDIN; BRUCE BUSTO; SUZANNE M.
CORK; EMMA L. YOUNG; SEAN LYNCH;
SHERRY DAVIS; NANCY BERNERS-LEE;
PHYLLIS CRIDDLE; AUSTIN DREIS-
ORNELAS; MELISSA LIANG; JOSEPH
GLEASON; GRETA MICKEY; DIANE
EMILY DREYFUS; KATHLEEN L. DODGE;
CATHERINE WILLOTT; TRISTAN
BURGENER; SHARON JANIS; and ERIK
MICHAEL FERRAGUT, individually, and on
behalf of all those similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORPORATION, d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE;
and DEBORAH "DEBBIE" WASSERMAN
SCHULTZ,

Defendants.

PLAINTIFFS CAROL WILDING; STANLEY RIFKEN; SHARON CRAWFORD;
WILLIAM SCOTT FRANZ; DAVID PULASKI; MARY JASMINE WELCH; JOSE
ALBERTO GONZALEZ; JANE ELLEN PLATTNER; KIM MARIE HOULE; TIMOTHY
BINGEN; SUSAN REED; ANGELA MONSON; AIMEE R. COLEMAN; ELESHA SNYDER;
MATTHEW SHAW; ZACHARY JAMES HANEY; ESTRELLA GONZALEZ; CATHERINE
G. CYKO; LAURA GENNA; MARIANNE BLAIR; TAMARA L. JOHNSTON; VALERIE
ELYSE RESCH; BRETT TEEGARDIN; DANIEL O'MEARA; PEGGY LEW; DANIEL J.
REYNOLDS; BRENDA LEE SMITH; MARLOWE ST. CLOUD PRIMACK; PATRICIA D.
CASSIDY; BRITTANY R. MUSICK; HARRIS BIERHOFF; FELICIA MICHELLE TAYLOR;
SUSAN L. SINGER; KYLE G. BRAUND; LAUREN HALE; WILLIAM CRANDALL;
KIRSTEN HURST; DUFFY ROBERT WEISS; CONNIE ANDERSON; GREGORY
WITKOWSKI; ELIZABETH FIGUEROA; BRANDY KINCAID; KIMBERLY ALBERTS;
RACHEL RODERICK; LAURA MICHELLE VAUGHN; TWANA SPARKS; LISA GALE;
TAMMY DEITCH-COULTER; KAYITE ASHCRAFT; ALECIA R. DAVIS; DOMINIC
RONZANI; LUKE GRIM; ROSALIE CONSIGLIO; EDWIN LUGO; HEATHER DADE;
MICHAEL S. REED; RHIANNON CRANDALL; KATHRYN BAILEY; RYAN GHAN; LISA
SETTLE; YALONDA DYE COOPER; DANIEL S. COOPER; MATTHEW JOSEPH BRADY;
ANDREW ROUSSEAU; SUSAN CATTERALL; JULIE HAMPTON; CHRIS BUBB; ERIK
FURREBOE; ZEKE SHAW; BENJAMIN ILARRAZA; LUCILLE GROOMS; CHRISTINE
MAIURANO; LEWIS L. HUMISTON, IV; JOHN LYNCH; JAMES SIMON; LESTER JOHN
BATES, III; JEFFREY GOLDBERG; RICK WASHIK; RICHARD BOOKER; KARLIE COLE;
ERICH SPARKS; PRABU GOPALAKRISHNAN; CARLOS VILLAMAR; CAROLYN
JACOBSON; DAN ELLIS DUDLEY; LISA ANNE MENEELY; D.J. BUSCHINI; RAYMOND

D. MAXWELL; DAVID L. MEULI; KENNETH E. PUCKETT; DAVID N. PYLES; CYNTHIA T. CHAN; STEFANIE BIRDSONG; AMBER RAE KNOWLTON; TIMO A. JOHANN; JEFF ROGERS; HEATHER JORDAN; RANA KANGAS-KENT; SUSAN FRISBIE; BAKH INAMOV; THEDA LARSON-WRIGHT; KIRSTEN HOFFMAN; ANTHONY GRUDIN; BRUCE BUSTO; SUZANNE M. CORK; EMMA L. YOUNG; SEAN LYNCH; SHERRY DAVIS; NANCY BERNERS-LEE; PHYLLIS CRIDDLE; AUSTIN DREIS-ORNELAS; MELISSA LIANG; JOSEPH GLEASON; GRETA MICKEY; DIANE EMILY DREYFUS; KATHLEEN L. DODGE; CATHERINE WILLOTT; TRISTAN BURGNER; SHARON JANIS; and ERIK MICHAEL FERRAGUT (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), individually and on behalf of all those similarly situated, by and through undersigned counsel, hereby sue Defendants, DNC SERVICES CORPORATION d/b/a DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE and DEBORAH “DEBBIE” WASSERMAN SCHULTZ (collectively, “Defendants”), and allege the following:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the claims asserted herein individually and on behalf of the class pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332(d), as amended in February 2005 by the Class Action Fairness Act. Alternatively, this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §1332(a). Subject matter jurisdiction is proper because: (1) the amount in controversy in this class action exceeds five million dollars, exclusive of interest and costs; and (2) a substantial number of the members of the proposed classes are citizens of a state different from that of Defendants. Personal jurisdiction is proper as both Defendants have purposefully availed themselves of the privilege of conducting business activities within this District, and Defendant, Deborah “Debbie” Wasserman Schultz resides in and is a Congresswoman representing portions

of this District. Venue is proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(1) because both Defendants are deemed to reside in this District and under 28 U.S.C. §1391(b)(2) because both Defendants conduct business in this District and a substantial part of the acts or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this District.

THE PARTIES AND CERTAIN RELEVANT NON-PARTIES

Plaintiffs

2. Plaintiff Carol Wilding (“Wilding”) is a resident of Pompano Beach, Florida. She contributed a total of \$445.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

3. Plaintiff Stanley Rifken (“Rifken”) is a resident of New York, New York. He contributed a total of \$552.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

4. Plaintiff Sharon Crawford (“Crawford”) is a resident of Ashville, North Carolina. She contributed a total of \$600.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

5. Plaintiff William Scott Franz (“Franz”) is a resident of Costa Mesa, California. He contributed a total of \$2,447.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

6. Plaintiff David Pulaski (“Pulaski”) is a resident of Houston, Texas. He contributed a total of \$254.10 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

7. Plaintiff Mary Jasmine Welch (“Welch”) is a resident of Portland, Oregon. She contributed a total of \$2,447.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

8. Plaintiff Jose Alberto Gonzalez (“J. Gonzalez”) is a resident of Pharr, Texas. He contributed a total of \$25.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

9. Plaintiff Jane Ellen Plattner (“Plattner”) is a resident of Golden, Colorado. She contributed a total of \$1,700.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

10. Plaintiff Kim Marie Houle (“Houle”) is a resident of Brooklyn, Connecticut. She contributed a total of \$445.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

11. Plaintiff Timothy Bingen (“Bingen”) is a resident of Minot, North Dakota. He contributed a total of \$379.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

12. Plaintiff Susan Reed (“S. Reed”) is a resident of Rockville, Maryland. She contributed a total of \$1,289.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

13. Plaintiff Angela Monson (“Monson”) is a resident of Dassel, Minnesota. She contributed a total of \$350.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

14. Plaintiff Aimee R. Coleman (“Coleman”) is a resident of Chattanooga, Tennessee. She contributed a total of \$2,544.13 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

15. Plaintiff Elesha Snyder (“Snyder”) is a resident of Dayton, Ohio. She contributed a total of \$365.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

16. Plaintiff Matthew Shaw (“M. Shaw”) is a resident of Leawood, Kansas. He contributed a total of \$222.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

17. Plaintiff Zachary James Haney (“Haney”) is a resident of Roxbury, Massachusetts. He contributed a total of \$91.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

18. Plaintiff Estrella Gonzalez (“E. Gonzalez”) is a resident of Fostoria, Ohio. She contributed a total of \$5.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

19. Plaintiff Catherine G. Cyko (“Cyko”) is a resident of Aurora, Illinois. She contributed a total of \$1,156.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

20. Plaintiff Laura Genna (“Genna”) is a resident of Bloomfield, New Jersey. She contributed a total of \$87.80 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

21. Plaintiff Marianne Blair (“Blair”) is a resident of Chicago, Illinois. She contributed a total of \$2,669.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

22. Plaintiff Tamara L. Johnston (“Johnston”) is a resident of Ozark, Missouri. She contributed a total of \$87.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

23. Plaintiff Valerie Elyse Resch (“Resch”) is a resident of Genoa City, Wisconsin. She contributed a total of \$47.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

24. Plaintiff Brett Teegardin (“Teegardin”) is a resident of Woodinville, Washington. He contributed a total of \$192.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

25. Plaintiff Daniel O’Meara (“O’Meara”) is a resident of Laconia, New Hampshire. He contributed a total of \$153.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

26. Plaintiff Peggy Lew (“Lew”) is a resident of Renton, Washington. She contributed a total of \$480.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

27. Plaintiff Daniel J. Reynolds (“Reynolds”) is a resident of Fort Smith, Arkansas. He contributed a total of \$182.81 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

28. Plaintiff Brenda Lee Smith (“Smith”) is a resident of Tallahassee, Florida. She contributed a total of \$4.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

29. Plaintiff Marlowe St. Cloud Primack (“Primack”) is a resident of Mountain View, California. She contributed a total of \$1,082.58 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

30. Plaintiff Patricia D. Cassidy (“Cassidy”) is a resident of Blandon, Pennsylvania. She contributed a total of \$1,036.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

31. Plaintiff Brittany R. Musick (“Musick”) is a resident of Bremen, Georgia. She contributed a total of \$19.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

32. Plaintiff Harris Bierhoff (“Bierhoff”) is a resident of Brentwood, California. He contributed a total of \$115.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

33. Plaintiff Felicia Michelle Taylor (“Taylor”) is a resident of West Valley City, Utah. She contributed a total of \$82.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

34. Plaintiff Susan L. Singer (“Singer”) is a resident of Niles, Illinois. She contributed a total of \$223.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

35. Plaintiff Kyle G. Braund (“Braund”) is a resident of Dadeville, Alabama. He contributed a total of \$54.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

36. Plaintiff Lauren Hale (“Hale”) is a resident of Portland, Maine. She contributed a total of \$35.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

37. Plaintiff William Crandall (“W. Crandall”) is a resident of Redwood City, California. He contributed a total of \$21,705.34 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

38. Plaintiff Kirsten Hurst (“Hurst”) is a resident of Nampa, Idaho. She contributed a total of \$2,447.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

39. Plaintiff Duffy Robert Weiss (“Weiss”) is a resident of Fargo, North Dakota. He contributed a total of \$121.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

40. Plaintiff Connie Anderson (“Anderson”) is a resident of Houston, Texas. She contributed a total of approximately \$900.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

41. Plaintiff Gregory Witkowski (“Witkowski”) is a resident of Highland, New York. He contributed a total of \$445.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

42. Plaintiff Elizabeth Figueroa (“Figueroa”) is a resident of Los Gatos, California. She contributed a total of \$246.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

43. Plaintiff Brandy Kincaid (“Kincaid”) is a resident of Clarksville, Tennessee. She contributed a total of \$314.24 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

44. Plaintiff Kimberly Alberts (“Alberts”) is a resident of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. She contributed a total of \$24.48 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

45. Plaintiff Rachel Roderick (“Roderick”) is a resident of Warwick, Rhode Island. She contributed a total of \$599.15 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

46. Plaintiff Laura Michelle Vaughn (“Vaughn”) is a resident of Juneau, Alaska. She contributed a total of \$238.80 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

47. Plaintiff Twana Sparks (“T. Sparks”) is a resident of Silver City, New Mexico. She contributed a total of \$2,700.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via both ActBlue and personal checks.

48. Plaintiff Lisa Gale (“Gale”) is a resident of Hendersonville, North Carolina. She contributed a total of \$730.37 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

49. Plaintiff Tammy Deitch-Coulter (“Deitch-Coulter”) is a resident of Lapeer, Michigan. She contributed a total of \$228.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

50. Plaintiff Kayite Ashcraft (“Ashcraft”) is a resident of Charlottesville, Virginia. He contributed a total of \$2,447.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

51. Plaintiff Alecia R. Davis (“A. Davis”) is a resident of Eureka, Montana. She contributed a total of \$531.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

52. Plaintiff Dominic Ronzani (“Ronzani”) is a resident of Deerfield Beach, Florida. He contributed a total of \$38.54 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

53. Plaintiff Luke Grim (“Grim”) is a resident of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. He contributed a total of \$30.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

54. Plaintiff Rosalie Consiglio (“Consiglio”) is a resident of Columbia, Maryland. She contributed a total of \$260.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

55. Plaintiff Edwin Lugo (“Lugo”) is a resident of New York City, New York. He contributed a total of \$53.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

56. Plaintiff Heather Dade (“Dade”) is a resident of Washington, DC. She contributed a total of \$110.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

57. Plaintiff Michael S. Reed (“M. Reed”) is a resident of Cheyenne, Wyoming. He contributed a total of \$75.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

58. Plaintiff Rhiannon Crandall (“R. Crandall”) is a resident of El Paso, Texas. She contributed a total of approximately \$1.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

59. Plaintiff Kathryn Bailey Conant (“Conant”) is a resident of Harpers Ferry, West Virginia. She contributed a total of \$301.70 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

60. Plaintiff Ryan Ghan (“Ghan”) is a resident of Reno, Nevada. He contributed a total of \$431.25 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

61. Plaintiff Lisa Settle (“Settle”) is a resident of Newport Beach, California. She contributed a total of \$1,255.40 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

62. Plaintiff Yalonda Dye Cooper (“Y. Cooper”) is a resident of Flint, Michigan. She contributed a total of 139.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

63. Plaintiff Daniel S. Cooper (“D. Cooper”) is a resident of Flint, Michigan. He contributed a total of \$110.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

64. Plaintiff Matthew Joseph Brady (“Brady”) is a resident of Wilmington, Delaware. He contributed a total of \$1,220.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

65. Plaintiff Andrew Rousseau (“Rousseau”) is a resident of North Hero, Vermont. He contributed a total of \$290.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

66. Plaintiff Susan Catterall (“Catterall”) is a resident of Hamilton, Indiana. She contributed a total of \$127.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

67. Plaintiff Julie Hampton (“Hampton”) is a resident of Fairfield, Iowa. She contributed a total of \$277.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

68. Plaintiff Chris Bubb (“Bubb”) is a resident of Denton, North Carolina. He contributed a total of \$92.39 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

69. Plaintiff Erik Furreboe (“Furreboe”) is a resident of Mesa, Arizona. He contributed a total of \$13.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

70. Plaintiff Zeke Shaw (“Z. Shaw”) is a resident of Acworth, Georgia. He contributed a total of \$3.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

71. Plaintiff Benjamin Ilarraza (“Ilarraza”) is a resident of Fort Worth, Texas. He contributed a total of \$225.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

72. Plaintiff Lucille Grooms (“Grooms”) is a resident of Boise, Idaho. She contributed a total of \$284.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

73. Plaintiff Christine Maiurano (“Maiurano”) is a resident of Gilbertsville, New York. She contributed a total of \$530.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

74. Plaintiff Lewis L. Humiston, IV (“Humiston”) is a resident of Auburn, Washington. He contributed a total of \$108.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

75. Plaintiff John Lynch (“J. Lynch”) is a resident of Stuart, Florida. He contributed a total of \$1,349.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

76. Plaintiff James Simon (“Simon”) is a resident of New York, New York. He contributed a total of \$2,700.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

77. Plaintiff Lester John Bates, III (“Bates”) is a resident of Kurtistown, Hawaii. He contributed a total of approximately \$390.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

78. Plaintiff Jeffrey Goldberg (“Goldberg”) is a resident of Cascade, Colorado. He contributed a total of \$82.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

79. Plaintiff Rick Washik (“Washik”) is a resident of Potsdam, New York. He contributed a total of \$304.20 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

80. Plaintiff Richard Booker (“Booker”) is a resident of Hampton, Virginia. He contributed a total of \$228.37 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

81. Plaintiff Karlie Cole (“Cole”) is a resident of Minneapolis, Minnesota. She contributed a total of \$226.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

82. Plaintiff Erich Sparks (“E. Sparks”) is a resident of Cazenovia, New York. He contributed a total of \$382.80 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

83. Plaintiff Prabu Gopalakrishnan (“Gopalakrishnan”) is a resident of Chicago, Illinois. He contributed a total of \$191.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

84. Plaintiff Carlos Villamar (“Villamar”) is a resident of Falls Church, Virginia. He contributed a total of \$195.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

85. Plaintiff Carolyn Jacobson (“Jacobson”) is a resident of Pasadena, California. She contributed a total of \$300.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

86. Plaintiff Dan Ellis Dudley (“Dudley”) is a resident of Douglas, Massachusetts. He contributed a total of \$773.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

87. Plaintiff Lisa Anne Meneely (“Meneely”) is a resident of Napa, California. She contributed a total of \$105.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

88. Plaintiff D.J. Buschini (“Buschini”) is a resident of Somerville, Massachusetts. He contributed a total of \$13.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

89. Plaintiff Raymond D. Maxwell (“Maxwell”) is a resident of Washington, District of Columbia. He contributed a total of \$114.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

90. Plaintiff David L. Meuli (“Meuli”) is a resident of Fairbanks, Alaska. He contributed a total of \$423.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

91. Plaintiff Kenneth E. Puckett (“Puckett”) is a resident of Portland, Oregon. He contributed a total of \$1,972.26 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

92. Plaintiff David N. Pyles (“Pyles”) is a resident of Nelson, New Hampshire. He contributed a total of \$1,005.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

93. Plaintiff Cynthia T. Chan (“Chan”) is a resident of Athens, Georgia. She contributed a total of \$111.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

94. Plaintiff Stefanie Birdsong (“Birdsong”) is a resident of Denver, Colorado. She contributed a total of \$159.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

95. Plaintiff Amber Rae Knowlton (“Knowlton”) is a resident of Lancaster, Massachusetts. She contributed a total of \$277.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

96. Plaintiff Timo A. Johann (“Johann”) is a resident of Mebane, North Carolina. He contributed a total of \$35.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

97. Plaintiff Jeff Rogers (“Rogers”) is a resident of Seattle, Washington. He contributed a total of \$160.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

98. Plaintiff Heather Jordan (“Jordan”) is a resident of Rogers, Arkansas. She contributed a total of \$26.50 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

99. Plaintiff Rana Kangas-Kent (“Kangas-Kent”) is a resident of Greenbrae, California. She contributed a total of \$156.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

100. Plaintiff Susan Frisbie (“Frisbie”) is a resident of Grass Valley, California. She contributed a total of \$1,456.80 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

101. Plaintiff Bakh Inamov (“Inamov”) is a resident of Greenbrae, California. He contributed a total of \$187.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

102. Plaintiff Theda Larson-Wright (“Larson-Wright”) is a resident of Arenas Valley, New Mexico. She contributed a total of \$1,012.65 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

103. Plaintiff Kirsten Hoffman (“Hoffman”) is a resident of Boston, Massachusetts. She contributed a total of \$2,700.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

104. Plaintiff Anthony Grudin (“Grudin”) is a resident of Burlington, Vermont. He contributed a total of \$64.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

105. Plaintiff Bruce Busto (“Busto”) is a resident of Ormond Beach, Florida. He contributed a total of \$375.00 to Bernie Sanders’ presidential campaign via ActBlue.

106. Plaintiff Suzanne M. Cork (“Cork”) is a resident of Battle Mountain, Nevada. She contributed a total of \$10 to the Defendant, DNC Services Corporation D/B/A Democratic National Committee (the “DNC”) in 2016.

107. Plaintiff Emma L. Young (“Young”) is a resident of Chicago, Illinois. She contributed a total of \$15 to the DNC between December 2015 and January 2016. She contributed online.

108. Plaintiff Sean Lynch (“S. Lynch”) is a resident of Wichester, Virginia. He contributed a total of \$3 to the DNC in 2016. He contributed online.

109. Plaintiff Sherry Davis (“S. Davis”) is a resident of Longview, Washington. She contributed a total of \$173 to the DNC in 2015-2016. She contributed in various ways, including online at www.democrats.org.

110. Plaintiff Nancy Berners-Lee (“Berners-Lee”) is a resident of Lexington, Massachusetts. She contributed a total of \$100 to the DNC on or about July 20, 2015. She contributed by check.

111. Plaintiff Phyllis Criddle (“Criddle”) is a resident of North Adams, Massachusetts. She contributed a total of \$18 to the DNC on or about May 16, 2016. She contributed by check.

112. Plaintiff Austin Dreis-Ornelas (“Dreis-Ornelas”) is a resident of Plano, Texas. He contributed a total of \$30.00 to the DNC from August 2015 through January 2016. He contributed via ActBlue.

113. Plaintiff Melissa Liang (“Liang”) is a resident of Royal Oak, Michigan. She is a registered Democrat, and has been for the past 16 years.

114. Plaintiff Joseph Gleason (“Gleason”) is a resident of Seattle, Washington. He is a registered Democrat, and has been for the past eight years.

115. Plaintiff Greta Mickey (“Mickey”) is a resident of Kingston, New York. She is a registered Democrat, and has been for over 10 years.

116. Plaintiff Diane Emily Dreyfus (“Dreyfus”) is a resident of Baltimore, Maryland. She is a registered Democrat, and has been for over 40 years.

117. Plaintiff Kathleen L. Dodge (“Dodge”) is a resident of Turner Falls, Massachusetts. She is a registered Democrat, and has been for over 40 years.

118. Plaintiff Catherine Willott (“Willott”) is a resident of Thousand Oaks, California. She is a registered Democrat, and has been for 32 years.

119. Plaintiff Tristan Burgener (“Burgener”) is a resident of Meza, Arizona. He is a registered Democrat, and has been for three years.

120. Plaintiff Sharon Janis (“Janis”) is a resident of St. Petersburg, Florida. She is a registered Democrat, and has been for eight years.

121. Plaintiff Erik Michael Ferragut (“Ferragut”) is a resident of Oak Ridge, Tennessee. He is a registered Democrat, and has been for 20 years.

Defendants

122. Defendant, DNC Services Corporation, d/b/a Democratic National Committee (the “DNC”), at all times relevant hereto, was and is a not-for-profit corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia and is the operating body of the United States Democratic Party. The DNC maintains its principal place of business at 430 South Capitol Street Southeast in Washington, District of Columbia.

123. Defendant, Deborah “Debbie” Wasserman Schultz (“Wasserman Schultz”) has been the Chairperson of the DNC since 2011. Wasserman Schultz maintains offices in Pembroke Pines, Florida, and Aventura, Florida, in addition to offices in Washington, D.C.

Non-Party

124. Non-party ActBlue is a United States political action committee established in June 2004 that enables online fundraising for Democratic Party campaigns. ActBlue charges a 3.95% “processing” fee for each contribution. Some Plaintiffs utilized ActBlue’s online services to make the contributions referred to herein.

GENERAL FACTS

125. The DNC is the formal governing body for the United States Democratic Party. The DNC is responsible for coordinating strategy in support of Democratic Party candidates for local, state, and national office.

126. As part of its duties, the DNC organizes the Democratic National Convention every four years to nominate and confirm a candidate for President, and establishes rules for the state caucuses and primaries that choose delegates to the convention.

127. Since 2011, Wasserman Schultz has been Chairperson of the DNC. Wasserman Schultz has also served as the U.S. Representative for Florida’s 23rd congressional district since 2013; before then, she represented Florida’s 20th district in the U.S. House of Representatives starting in 2005.

128. The DNC is governed by the Charter and Bylaws of the Democratic Party. These governing documents expressly obligate the DNC to maintain a neutral posture with respect to candidates seeking the party’s nomination for President during the nominating process. Article 5, Section 4 of the Charter states:

The National Chairperson shall serve full time and shall receive such compensation as may be determined by agreement between the Chairperson and the Democratic National Committee. In the conduct and management of the affairs and procedures of the Democratic National Committee, particularly as they apply to the preparation and conduct of the Presidential nominating process, the Chairperson *shall exercise impartiality and evenhandedness* as between the Presidential candidates and campaigns. The Chairperson shall be responsible for ensuring that the national officers and staff of the Democratic National Committee *maintain impartiality and evenhandedness* during the Democratic Party Presidential nominating process.

(emphasis added).

129. Consistent with what the Charter requires, the DNC, through Wasserman Schultz and other employees, and from the very beginning of the presidential race, has consistently and publicly affirmed its impartiality and evenhandedness with respect to the nominating process for the Democratic nominee for President in 2016. For example:

a) A September 3, 2015 article in *Politico* reporting on Wasserman Schultz's relationships with Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden quoted Wasserman Schultz as saying, "I count both Secretary Clinton and Vice President Biden as dear friends, but no matter who comprises our field of candidates it's my job to run a neutral primary process and that's what I am committed to doing[.]"¹

¹ See Edward-Isaac Dove & Marc Caputo, "Wasserman Schultz's divided loyalties," *Politico*, available at <http://www.politico.com/story/2015/09/debbie-wasserman-schultz-joe-biden-hillary-clinton-2016-loyalty-213294> (last visited June 20, 2016).

b) A September 16, 2015 article in *The Daily Beast* on the Democratic candidate debate schedule quoted DNC spokesperson Holly Shulman (“Shuman”) as stating, “[t]he DNC runs an impartial primary process.”²

c) Shulman was also quoted in an article appearing in the Daily Mail Online (UK) on October 16, 2015, as stating, “[t]he DNC runs an impartial primary process, period.”³

d) In a CNN appearance on May 17, 2016, where she discussed alleged “violence” by supporters of Bernie Sanders at the Nevada State Democratic Convention, Wasserman Schultz stated that, “[t]he Democratic National Committee remains neutral in this primary, based on our rules.”⁴

e) In a statement quoted by the Associated Press on May 21, 2016, while discussing Sanders’ endorsement of her primary opponent for Congress, Wasserman Schultz stated, “[e]ven though Senator Sanders has endorsed my

² See Olivia Nuzzi, “Is the Democratic National Committee in the Tank for Hillary?,” **The Daily Beast**, available at <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2015/09/16/is-the-democratic-national-committee-in-the-tank-for-hillary.html> (last visited June 20, 2016).

³ See David Martosko, “Democratic National Committeewoman says her party is ‘clearing a path’ for Hillary because ‘the women in charge’ want it that way,” available at <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3273404/Democratic-National-Committeewoman-says-party-clearing-path-Hillary-women-charge-want-way.html> (last visited June 20, 2016).

⁴ The video may be viewed on the internet at http://www.realclearpolitics.com/video/2016/05/17/debbie_wasserman_schultz_what_happened_at_nevada_convention_was_unacceptable_sanders_added_fuel_to_the_fire.html (last visited June 20, 2016).

opponent, I remain, as I have been from the beginning, neutral in the presidential Democratic primary.”⁵

130. Despite the requirements in the Charter, and in spite of the multiple public declarations of neutrality and impartiality with respect to the Democratic primary process, the DNC was not neutral. To the contrary, the DNC was biased in favor of one candidate – Hillary Clinton (“Clinton”) – from the beginning and throughout the process. The DNC devoted its considerable resources to supporting Clinton above any of the other Democratic candidates. Through its public claims to being neutral and impartial, the DNC actively concealed its bias from its own donors as well as donors to the campaigns of Clinton’s rivals, including Bernie Sanders (“Sanders”).

131. The truth of the DNC’s deception started to come to public light in June 2016.

132. On June 14, 2016, officials of the DNC announced that Russian government hackers had penetrated its computer network. The hackers had access to the network for approximately one year. According to the Washington Post, “[t]he intruders so thoroughly compromised the DNC’s system that they also were able to read all email and chat traffic” – but in the same article, “[t]he DNC said that no financial, donor or personal information appears to have been accessed or taken[.]”⁶

⁵ See Tribune news services, “Sanders says he is backing opponent of DNC chair Wasserman Schultz,” **Chicago Tribune** (May 21, 2016), *available at* <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/politics/ct-sanders-dnc-chair-20160521-story.html> (last visited June 20, 2016).

⁶ See Ellen Nakashima, “Russian government hackers penetrated DNC, stole opposition research on Trump,” **The Washington Post** (June 14, 2016), *available at*

[...continued]

133. The same day, CrowdStrike – a network security consulting firm retained by the DNC to investigate and respond to the breach – publicly released more details. According to CrowdStrike, two separate hacker groups affiliated with the Russian government, codenamed “Cozy Bear” and “Fancy Bear,” were detected as having infiltrated the DNC network. Both groups have a long history of successfully targeting sensitive government and industry computer networks in both the United States and other countries, often using “sophisticated phishing attacks.” CrowdStrike concluded that Cozy Bear’s intrusion of the DNC network began in summer of 2015, while Fancy Bear separately breached it in April 2016.⁷

134. On June 15, 2016, an individual using the name “Guccifer 2.0” established a publicly accessible website (<https://guccifer2.wordpress.com>) and posted a statement taking credit for the DNC server hack.⁸ Below the statement, Guccifer 2.0 posted a series of documents purportedly taken from the DNC’s servers including: (a) a 281-page confidential “Donald Trump Report” purportedly submitted to the DNC on 12/19/15 and containing extensive research on the presumptive Republican presidential nominee; (b) Excel spreadsheets containing the names and personal information of donors to the Democratic Party and Hillary Clinton’s campaign; and (c)

https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/russian-government-hackers-penetrated-dnc-stole-opposition-research-on-trump/2016/06/14/cf006cb4-316e-11e6-8ff7-7b6c1998b7a0_story.html (last visited June 23, 2016).

⁷ See Dmitri Alperovitch, “Bears in the Midst: Intrusion into the Democratic National Committee,” **CrowdStrike Blog** (June 14, 2016, updated June 15, 2016), *available at* <https://www.crowdstrike.com/blog/bears-midst-intrusion-democratic-national-committee/> (last visited June 23, 2016); Michael Kan, “Russian hackers breach DNC computers, steal data on Donald Trump,” **PCWorld** (June 14, 2016), *available at* <http://www.pcworld.com/article/3083440/security/russian-hackers-breach-dnc-computers-steal-data-on-trump.html> (last visited June 23, 2016).

⁸ See Ellen Nakashima, “‘Guccifer 2.0’ claims credit for DNC hack,” **The Washington Post** (June 15, 2016), *available at* https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/guccifer-20-claims-credit-for-dnc-hack/2016/06/15/abdcdf48-3366-11e6-8ff7-7b6c1998b7a0_story.html (last visited June 23, 2016).

a 59-page memorandum marked “Secret” setting forth national security and foreign policy “promises and proposals” and purportedly obtained from Clinton’s personal computer.⁹

135. Among the documents released by Guccifer 2.0 on June 15th is a two-page Microsoft Word file with a “Confidential” watermark that appears to be a memorandum written to the Democratic National Committee regarding “2016 GOP presidential candidates” and dated May 26, 2015. A true and correct copy of this document (hereinafter, “DNC Memo”) is attached as **Exhibit 1**.¹⁰

136. The DNC Memo presents, “a suggested strategy for positioning and public messaging around the 2016 Republican presidential field.” It states that, “Our goals in the coming months will be to frame the Republican field and the eventual nominee early and to **provide a contrast between the GOP field and HRC.**¹¹” (emphasis added). The DNC Memo also advises that the DNC, “[u]se specific hits to muddy the waters around ethics, transparency and campaign finance attacks on HRC.” In order to “muddy the waters” around Clinton’s perceived vulnerabilities, the DNC Memo suggests “several different methods” of attack including: (a) “[w]orking through the DNC” to “utilize reporters” and create stories in the media “with no fingerprints”; (b) “prep[ping]” reporters for interviews with GOP candidates and having

⁹ Guccifer 2.0, “DNC’s Servers Hacked By A Lone Hacker,” *available at* <https://guccifer2.wordpress.com/2016/06/15/dnc/> (last visited June 23, 2016).

¹⁰ Despite being asked the question repeatedly, the DNC has never confirmed or denied the authenticity of any of the documents released by Guccifer 2.0. *See* Reno Berkeley, “DNC Tight-Lipped About Authenticity Of Documents From Guccifer 2.0 Hack,” **Inquisitr** (June 17, 2016), *available at* <http://www.inquisitr.com/3212344/dnc-tight-lipped-about-authenticity-of-documents-from-guccifer-2-0-hack/> (last visited June 24, 2016).

¹¹ “HRC” is short for Hillary Rodham Clinton.

off-the-record conversations with them; (c) making use of social media attacks; and (d) using the DNC to “insert our messaging” into Republican-favorable press.

137. By the date of the DNC Memo, the Democratic presidential nomination field already included, in addition to Clinton, Bernie Sanders, who announced his candidacy on April 30, 2015.¹² And at the time, there was also widespread speculation that others would soon enter the primary race including Joe Biden, Lincoln Chafee, Martin O’Malley, Elizabeth Warren, and Jim Webb.¹³

138. Despite there being every indication that the 2016 Democratic primary would be contested by multiple candidates, including Sanders, the DNC Memo makes no mention of any Democratic candidate except Clinton, and builds the DNC’s election strategy on the assumption that Clinton will be the nominee, with no doubts attached. Rather than reflecting an “impartial” or “evenhanded” approach to the nominating process, as required by the Charter, the DNC Memo strongly indicates that the DNC’s entire approach to the process was guided by the singular goal of elevating Clinton to the general election contest.

139. On June 18 and 21, 2016, Guccifer 2.0 released additional files purportedly taken from the DNC’s servers. Among these documents are even more items that appear to be of a highly sensitive nature including: (a) multiple spreadsheets of donors to the DNC and other organizations, including the Clinton Foundation, containing personal information such as names, email addresses, and phone numbers; (b) a “private and confidential” memorandum to Secretary

¹² See Dan Merica, “Bernie Sanders is running for president,” **CNN Politics** (Apr. 30, 2015), available at <http://www.cnn.com/2015/04/29/politics/bernie-sanders-announces-presidential-run/> (last visited June 23, 2016).

¹³ See Newsday.com with the Associated Press, “2016 presidential race: Possible Democratic candidates,” **Newsday** (Apr. 29, 2015), available at <http://www.newsday.com/news/nation/democrats-who-may-run-for-president-in-2016-from-clinton-to-biden-1.9988978> (last visited June 23, 2016). Of these, only Joe Biden and Elizabeth Warren ultimately decided not to run.

of Defense Ashton Carter from a senior advisor regarding appointments to the Joint Chiefs of Staff; (c) fee, travel, and lodging requirements for Clinton's paid speeches; (d) Clinton's tax returns; and (e) thousands of pages of research, apparently prepared by DNC staff as well as Clinton's campaign staff, relating to Clinton's candidacy including her "vulnerabilities," potential attacks, rebuttals, policy positions, and opposition research on the other Democratic candidates.¹⁴

140. These additional files entail further, substantial evidence that the DNC was anything but "impartial," "evenhanded," or "neutral" with respect to the Democratic nominating process. To the contrary, and in spite of the governing Charter and its multiple public statements, the DNC devoted its resources to propelling Clinton's candidacy ahead of all of her rivals, even if this meant working directly against the interests of Democratic Party members, including Bernie Sanders' supporters.

141. All conditions precedent to the commencement and prosecution to final judgment of this civil action have taken place, have been performed, or have been waived or excused by Defendants.

142. Plaintiffs have been compelled to engage the services of the undersigned attorneys and to pay them a reasonable fee.

¹⁴ See "DNC Researched Clinton Speeches, Travel Records," **The Smoking Gun** (June 21, 2016), available at <http://www.thesmokinggun.com/documents/crime/dnc-researched-clinton-speeches-travel-records-621985> (last visited June 24, 2016); Salam Marcos, "Guccifer 2.0: 'Neutral' DNC Staff Conducted Research for Clinton," **Progressive Army**, (June 21, 2016) available at <http://progressivearmy.com/2016/06/21/guccifer-2-0-dnc-conducted-research-clinton/> (last visited June 24, 2016); Stephen K. Bannon & Alexander Marlow, "Secret Memo: 42-Page Leaked DNC Document Reveals Clinton Foundation Scandal 'Vulnerabilities' For Hillary Clinton," **Breitbart** (June 21, 2016), available at <http://www.breitbart.com/2016-presidential-race/2016/06/21/secret-memo-42-page-leaked-dnc-document-reveals-clinton-foundation-scandal-vulnerabilities-hillary-clinton/> (June 24, 2016).

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATION

143. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit on behalf of themselves and the proposed class members under Rules 23(b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, as noted below.

144. There are three proposed classes (hereinafter collectively referred to as the “Classes”):

- a) All people or entities who have contributed to the DNC from January 1, 2015 through the date of this action (“DNC Donor Class”);
- b) All people or entities who have contributed to the Bernie Sanders campaign from January 1, 2015 through the date of this action (“Sanders Donor Class”); and
- c) All registered members of the Democratic Party (“Democratic Party Class”).¹⁵

145. Plaintiffs, Cork, Young, S. Lynch, S. Davis, Berners-Lee, Criddle, and Dreis-Ornelas bring this action on behalf of themselves and the DNC Donor Class. Hereinafter, they will be referred to collectively as the “DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs.”

146. Plaintiffs, Wilding, Rifken, Crawford, Franz, Pulaski, Welch, J. Gonzalez, Plattner, Houle, Bingen, S. Reed, Monson, Coleman, Snyder, M. Shaw, Haney, E. Gonzalez, Cyko, Genna, Blair, Johnston, Resch, Teegardin, O’Meara, Lew, Reynolds, Smith, Primack, Cassidy, Musick, Bierhoff, Taylor, Singer, Braund, Hale, W. Crandall, Hurst, Weiss, Anderson,

¹⁵ Specifically excluded from the class definitions are Defendants; the officers, directors, or employees of Defendants; any entity in which Defendants have a controlling interest; and any affiliate, legal representative, heir, or assign of Defendants. Also excluded are any federal, state, or local governmental entities, any judicial officer presiding over this action and the members of his/her immediate family and judicial staff, and any juror assigned to this action.

Witkowski, Figueroa, Kincaid, Alberts, Roderick, Vaughn, T. Sparks, Gale, Deitch-Coulter, Ashcraft, A. Davis, Ronzani, Grim, Consiglio, Lugo, Dade, M. Reed, R. Crandall, Conant, Ghan, Settle, Y. Cooper, D. Cooper, Brady, Rousseau, Catterall, Hampton, Bubb, Furreboe, Z. Shaw, Ilarraza, Grooms, Maiurano, Humiston, J. Lynch, Simon, Bates, Goldberg, Washik, Booker, Cole, E. Sparks, Gopalakrishnan, Villamar, Jacobson, Dudley, Meneely, Buschini, Maxwell, Meuli, Puckett, Pyles, Chan, Birdsong, Knowlton, Johann, Rogers, Jordan, Kangas-Kent, Frisbie, Inamov, Larson-Wright, Hoffman, Grudin, and Busto bring this action on behalf of themselves and the Sanders Donor Class. Hereinafter, they will be referred to collectively as the “Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs.”

147. Plaintiffs, Liang, Gleason, Mickey, Dreyfus, Dodge, Willott, Burgener, Janis, and Ferragut bring this action on behalf of themselves and the Democratic Party Class. Hereinafter, they will be referred to collectively as the “Democratic Party Class Plaintiffs.”

148. ***Numerosity.*** The members of each of the Classes are so numerous that their individual joinder is impracticable.

149. ***Existence and Predominance of Common Questions of Law and Fact.*** Common questions of law and fact exist as to all members of the Classes and predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Classes.

150. ***Typicality.*** Plaintiffs’ claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Classes they seek to represent, and Plaintiffs have the same claims as those of the other class members they seek to represent.

151. ***Adequacy of Representation.*** Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of their respective Classes. Plaintiffs have retained counsel highly

experienced in class action litigation, and Plaintiffs intend to prosecute this action vigorously.

Plaintiffs have no adverse or antagonistic interests to those of the Classes.

152. The prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the Classes would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to individual members of the Classes which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the parties opposing the Classes.

153. Defendants acted on grounds generally applicable to the Classes with respect to the matters complained of herein, thereby making appropriate the relief sought herein with respect to each of the Classes as a whole.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

(Fraud)

(DNC Donor Class & Sanders Donor Class)

154. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1 through 153 above as if fully set forth herein.

155. Defendants knowingly made false statements and omissions concerning material facts.

156. Defendants intended that the false statements and omissions would induce the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class, to rely on them.

157. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class, relied on Defendants' false statements and omissions to their injury.

158. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and malicious. Defendants had actual knowledge of the wrongfulness of the conduct and the high probability that injury to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class would result and, despite that knowledge, intentionally pursued that course of conduct, resulting in injury.

159. Defendants' conduct was so reckless or wanting in care that it constituted a conscious disregard or indifference to the rights of the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class.

COUNT II

(Negligent Misrepresentation) (DNC Donor Class & Sanders Donor Class)

160. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1 through 153 above as if fully set forth herein.

161. Defendants made misrepresentations and omissions concerning material facts.

162. At the time of the misrepresentations and omissions, Defendants either knew them to be false, made them without knowledge of the truth or falsity, or should have known them to be false.

163. Defendants intended that the misrepresentations and omissions would induce the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class, to rely on them.

164. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class, justifiably relied on Defendants' misrepresentations and omissions to their injury.

165. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and malicious. Defendants had actual knowledge of the wrongfulness of the conduct and the high probability that injury to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class would result and, despite that knowledge, intentionally pursued that course of conduct, resulting in injury.

166. Defendants' conduct was so reckless or wanting in care that it constituted a conscious disregard or indifference to the rights of The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class and members of the DNC Donor Class and Sanders Donor Class.

COUNT III

(Violation of § 28-3904 of the D.C. Code) (DNC Donor Class & Sanders Donor Class)

167. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class re-allege paragraphs 1 through 153 above as if fully set forth herein.

168. For purposes of the allegations in this complaint, the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class, are "consumers" pursuant to subsection 28-3901(a)(2) of the District of Columbia Code.

169. For purposes of the allegations in this complaint, Defendants are "persons" pursuant to subsection 28-3901(a)(1) of the District of Columbia Code.

170. Defendants misrepresented as to material facts that had a tendency to mislead the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class.

171. Defendants failed to state material facts, and such failure tended to mislead the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class.

172. As such, Defendants violated subsections 28-3904(e) and 28-3904(f) of the District of Columbia Code.

173. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and malicious. Defendants had actual knowledge of the wrongfulness of the conduct and the high probability that injury to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class would result and, despite that knowledge, intentionally pursued that course of conduct, resulting in injury.

174. Defendants' conduct was so reckless or wanting in care that it constituted a conscious disregard or indifference to the rights of The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs, the Sanders Donor Class Plaintiffs, and members of the DNC Donor Class and the Sanders Donor Class.

COUNT IV

(Unjust Enrichment) (DNC Donor Class)

175. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1 through 153 above as if fully set forth herein.

176. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class conferred benefits on the Defendants, who had knowledge thereof.

177. Defendants voluntarily accepted and retained the benefits conferred.

178. The circumstances are such that it would be inequitable for the Defendants to retain the benefits without paying the value thereof to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class.

179. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and malicious. Defendants had actual knowledge of the wrongfulness of the conduct and the high probability that injury to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class would result and, despite that knowledge, intentionally pursued that course of conduct, resulting in injury.

180. Defendants' conduct was so reckless or wanting in care that it constituted a conscious disregard or indifference to the rights of the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class.

COUNT V

(Breach of Fiduciary Duty) (Democratic Party Class)

181. The Democratic Party Class Plaintiffs re-allege paragraphs 1 through 153 above as if fully set forth herein.

182. Defendants had a fiduciary duty to the Democratic Party Class Plaintiffs and members of the Democratic Party Class.

183. Defendants breached their fiduciary duty to the Democratic Party Class Plaintiffs and members of the Democratic Party Class.

184. The Democratic Party Class Plaintiffs and members of the Democratic Party Class have been proximately damaged by Defendants' breach.

185. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and malicious. Defendants had actual knowledge of the wrongfulness of the conduct and the high probability that injury to the Democratic Party Class Plaintiffs and members of the Democratic Party Class would result and, despite that knowledge, intentionally pursued that course of conduct, resulting in injury.

186. Defendants' conduct was so reckless or wanting in care that it constituted a conscious disregard or indifference to the rights of the Democratic Party Class Plaintiffs and members of the Democratic Party Class.

COUNT VI

**(Negligence)
(DNC Donor Class)**

187. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs as re-allege paragraphs 1 through 153 above as if fully set forth herein.

188. Defendants owed a duty to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class to use and exercise reasonable and due care in obtaining, retaining, and securing the personal and financial information provided to them in connection with their contributions to the DNC.

189. Defendants owed a duty to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class to provide security, consistent with industry standards and requirements, to ensure that the DNC's computer systems and networks, and the personnel responsible for them, adequately protected the personal and financial information of the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class.

190. Defendants owed a duty of care to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class because they were a foreseeable and probable victim of any inadequate data security practices. Defendants solicited, gathered, and stored the sensitive financial and personal data provided by the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class to facilitate their contributions. Defendants knew they inadequately safeguarded this information on the DNC computer systems and that sophisticated hackers routinely attempted to access this valuable data without authorization. Defendants knew that a breach of the system

would inflict considerable damages upon the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class, and Defendants were therefore charged with a duty to adequately protect this critically sensitive information.

191. Defendants maintained a special relationship with the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class. The DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class entrusted Defendants with their personal and financial information on the assumption that Defendants would safeguard this information, and Defendants were in a position to protect against the harm suffered by the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class as a result of the network breaches.

192. In light of their special relationship with the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class, Defendants knew, or should have known, of the risks inherent in collecting and storing the personal and financial information of the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class, and the importance of providing adequate security of that information.

193. Defendants breached the duties they owed to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class by failing to exercise reasonable care and implement adequate security protocols – including protocols consistent with industry standards – sufficient to protect the personal and financial information of the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class.

194. Defendants breached the duties they owed to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class by failing to properly implement technical systems or security practices that could have prevented the theft of the information at issue.

195. Defendants breached the duties they owed to the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class by failing to properly maintain the sensitive personal and financial information of the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class. Given the risk involved and the amount of data at issue, Defendants breach of their duties was entirely unreasonable.

196. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent conduct, the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class have suffered injury and are entitled to damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

197. Defendants' conduct was so reckless or wanting in care that it constituted a conscious disregard or indifference to the safety and rights of the DNC Donor Class Plaintiffs and members of the DNC Donor Class.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for a judgment:

198. For declaratory and injunctive relief declaring illegal and enjoining, preliminarily and permanently, Defendants' violation of and failure to follow the Charter and Bylaws of the Democratic Party;

199. Certification of this action as a class action, designation of Plaintiffs as class representatives and undersigned counsel as class counsel;

200. For compensatory, general, restitutionary, restorative, statutory, treble, and special damages for Plaintiffs against Defendants;

201. Exemplary/punitive damages as against Defendants in an amount sufficient to deter and to make an example of Defendants;

202. Attorneys' fees and costs;

- 203. Prejudgment and post-judgment interest; and
- 204. The cost of this suit and such other relief as the court finds just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

- 205. Plaintiffs demand a jury trial on all issues so triable.

DATED: June 28, 2016

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

/s/ Jared H. Beck

By: Jared H. Beck

BECK & LEE TRIAL LAWYERS
JARED H. BECK
ELIZABETH LEE BECK
Corporate Park at Kendall
12485 SW 137th Ave., Suite 205
Miami, Florida 33186
Telephone: (305) 234-2060
Facsimile: (786) 664-3334
jared@beckandlee.com
elizabeth@beckandlee.com

CULLIN O'BRIEN LAW, P.A.
CULLIN O'BRIEN
6541 NE 21st Way
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33108
Telephone: (561) 676-6370
Facsimile: (561) 320-0285
cullin@cullinobrienlaw.com

ANTONINO G. HERNANDEZ P.A.
ANTONINO G. HERNANDEZ
4 SE 1st Street, 2nd Floor
Miami, Florida 33131
Telephone: (305) 282 3698
Facsimile: (786) 513 7748
Hern8491@bellsouth.net

Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Classes

Exhibit 1

To: The Democratic National Committee
Re: 2016 GOP presidential candidates
Date: May 26, 2015

Below, please find a suggested strategy for positioning and public messaging around the 2016 Republican presidential field. Ultimately, we need to

Our Goals& Strategy

Our goals in the coming months will be to frame the Republican field and the eventual nominee early and to provide a contrast between the GOP field and HRC. Over the long-term, these efforts will be aimed at getting us the best match-up in the general election, and weakening the eventual nominee through the course of the primary. We have outlined three strategies to obtain our goal:

- 1) Highlight when GOP candidates are outside of the mainstream on key issues, ideally driving the rest of the field to follow with positions that will hurt them in a general election;
- 2) Damage Republican presidential candidates' credibility with voters by looking for targeted opportunities to undermine their specific messaging;
- 3) Use specific hits to muddy the waters around ethics, transparency and campaign finance attacks on HRC

Operationalizing the Strategy

Highlighting Extreme or Unpopular Positions

There are two ways to approach the strategies mentioned above. The first is to use the field as a whole to inflict damage on itself similar to what happened to Mitt Romney in 2012. The variety and volume of candidates is a positive here, and many of the lesser known can serve as a cudgel to move the more established candidates further to the right. In this scenario, we don't want to marginalize the more extreme candidates, but make them more "Pied Piper" candidates who actually represent the mainstream of the Republican Party. In these issues, we would elevate statements and policies from any candidate—including second and third-tier candidates—on issues that will make them seem too far to the right on social issues and too far from the priorities of everyday Americans on economic issues.

Undermining Their Message& Credibility, Based on our General Election Priorities

In addition to pinning down the field on key issues, we will work to undermine the Republican candidate's specific messaging, while keeping in mind which candidates and which messages we believe are most powerful. These messages and the responses to them will change given new campaign positioning and new learnings from polling and research, but on these issues, we will keep the focus on the most likely candidates to allow some possibility for growth with the weaker candidates.

- Jeb Bush
 - What to undermine: the notion he is a "moderate" or concerned about regular Americans; perceived inroads with the Latino population.
- Marco Rubio

- What to undermine: the idea he has “fresh” ideas; his perceived appeal to Latinos and younger voters
- Scott Walker
 - What to undermine: his Wisconsin record, particularly on jobs; the idea he can rally working- and middle class Americans.
- Rand Paul
 - What to undermine: the idea he is a “different” kind of Republican; his stance on the military and his appeal to millennials and communities of color.
- Chris Christie
 - What to undermine: his success as governor, his hypocrisy in telling it like it is vs. his ethical issues and acts of a typical politician.

Muddying the Waters

As we all know, the right wing attack machine has been building its opposition research on Hillary Clinton for decades. HRC's critics have been telegraphing they are ready to attack and do so with reckless abandon. While reporters have much less of an appetite for ethics stories about GOP candidates, we will utilize the research to place highly targeted hits—for example, GOP candidates taking positions supported by their major super PAC donors.

Tactics

Working with the DNC and allied groups, we will use several different methods to land these attacks, including:

- **Reporter Outreach:** Working through the DNC and others, we should use background briefings, prep with reporters for interviews with GOP candidates, off-the-record conversations and oppo pitches to help pitch stories with no fingerprints and utilize reporters to drive a message.
- **Releases and Social Media:** Where appropriate these attacks can be leveraged for more public release, particularly the attacks around specific issues where a public release can point out that Republicans are outside of the mainstream.
- **Bracketing Events:** Both the DNC and outside groups are looking to do events and press surrounding Republican events to insert our messaging into their press and to force them to answer questions around key issues.

We look forward to discussing this strategy further. Our goal is to use this conversation to answer the questions who do we want to run against and how best to leverage other candidates to maneuver them into the right place.

Exhibit 1

Elizabeth Lee Beck

From: Press, MPD (MPD) [mpd.press@dc.gov]
Sent: Thursday, August 04, 2016 5:36 PM
To: elizabeth@beckandlee.com
Subject: Shawn Lucas Death Report
Attachments: Event___16128814_Public_Incident_Packet.pdf

Hi Elizabeth,

Please find the attached police report, per your request.

Thanks,

Rachel

CCN #16128814 - PUBLIC INCIDENT REPORT				
REPORT DATE / TIME Aug 02, 2016 21:58	DISTRICT / PSA Second District / 208	EVENT START DATE / TIME - EVENT END DATE / TIME Aug 02, 2016 19:13 - Aug 02, 2016 19:30	INCIDENT STATISTICS	
RESPONDING OFFICER Kathryn Fitzgerald (#7673) - MPD		WEATHER Clear		
ASSISTING OFFICER (ASSIST TYPE) Adam Sotelo (Body Worn Camera)				
TELETYPE DATE / TIME	TELETYPE #	WHO NOTIFIED TELETYPE	SHOTS FIRED <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	SHOTS EFFECT <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO

REPORTING PERSON

NAME R-1 SAVANNAH KING
HOME ADDRESS [REDACTED] STREET NW, WASHINGTON, DC 20009, UNITED STATES

PROPERTY & ITEMS

CCN #16128814 - PUBLIC NARRATIVE

R-1 reports she arrived home at 1913 hours and located her boyfriend Subject-1 laying unconscious on the bathroom floor. R-1 immediately called 911. DCFD Engine 9 responded and found no signs consistent with life. Subject-1 remained on scene.

On Scene- Detective Greene #D2-1515, Mobile Crime DFS 20, DC Medical Examiner Investigator Diaz. Cruiser 228 notified.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

**MOTION TO APPEAR *PRO HAC VICE*,
CONSENT TO DESIGNATION, AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

In accordance with Local Rules 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, the undersigned respectfully moves for the admission *pro hac vice* of Graham Wilson of the law firm of Perkins Coie LLP, 700 13th Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005, Telephone: (202) 628-6600, for purposes of appearance as co-counsel on behalf of Defendants DNC Services Corp. d/b/a the Democratic National Committee (“DNC”) and Deborah Wasserman Schultz (together, “Defendants”) in the above-styled case only, and pursuant to Rule 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, to permit Graham Wilson to receive electronic filings in this case, and in support thereof states as follows:

1. Graham Wilson is not admitted to practice in the Southern District of Florida and is a member in good standing of the District of Columbia Bar.

2. Movant, Gregg D. Thomas, Esquire, of the law firm of Thomas & LoCicero, 601 South Boulevard, P.O. Box 2602 (33601), Tampa, FL 33606, (813) 984-3060, is a member in good standing of the Florida Bar and the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and is authorized to file through the Court's electronic filing system. Movant consents to be designated as a member of the Bar of this Court with whom the Court and opposing counsel may readily communicate regarding the conduct of the case, upon whom filings shall be served, who shall be required to electronically file all documents and things that may be filed electronically, and who shall be responsible for filing documents in compliance with the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. *See* Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures.

3. In accordance with the local rules of this Court, Graham Wilson has made payment of this Court's \$75 admission fee. A certification in accordance with Rule 4(b) is attached hereto.

4. Graham Wilson, by and through designated counsel and pursuant to Section 2B CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, hereby requests the Court to provide Notice of Electronic Filings to Graham Wilson at email address: gwilson@perkinscoie.com.

WHEREFORE, Gregg D. Thomas, moves this Court to enter an Order granting Graham Wilson permission to appear before this Court on behalf of Defendants for all purposes relating to the proceedings in the above-styled matter and directing the Clerk to provide notice of electronic filings to Graham Wilson.

Date: August 2, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gregg D. Thomas

Gregg D. Thomas

Florida Bar No.: 223913

601 South Boulevard P.O. Box 2602 (33601)

Tampa, FL 33606

Telephone: (813) 984-3060

Facsimile: (813) 984-3070

gthomas@tlolawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendants

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.


Defendants.

_____ /

CERTIFICATION OF GRAHAM WILSON

Graham Wilson, Esquire, pursuant to Rule 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys, hereby certifies that (1) I have studied the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida; and (2) I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the District of Columbia and the following federal courts:

Jurisdiction	Date Admitted	Attorney Registration No.
District of Columbia	12/19/83	442077
U.S. Supreme Court	2/23/09	N/A
U.S. Court of Appeals - D.C. Circuit	1/4/95	N/A
U.S. Court of Appeals - 4th Circuit	8/19/14	N/A
U.S. Court of Appeals - 5th Circuit	8/26/11	N/A
U.S. Court of Appeals - 10th Circuit	6/17/99	N/A
U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia	1/9/95	N/A
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan	6/2/95	N/A
U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin	5/10/15	N/A



Graham Wilson

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice was served by CM/ECF on August 2, 2016 on all counsel or parties of record on the service list.

/s/ Gregg D. Thomas
Gregg D. Thomas

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
et al.,

Defendants.

SERVICE LIST

Jared H. Beck
Elizabeth Lee Beck
Email: jared@beckandlee.com
Email: elizabeth@beckandlee.com
BECK & LEE TRIAL LAWYERS
12485 SW 137th Ave., Suite 205
Miami, FL 33186
Tel: 305-234-2060
Fax: 786-664-3334

Antonio Gabriel Hernandez
Email: herna8491@bellsouth.net
ANTONIO G. HERNANDEZ P.A.
4 SouthEast 1st Street, 2nd Floor
Miami, FL 33131
Tel: 305-282-3698
Fax: 786-513-7748

Cullin Avram O'Brien
Email: cullin@cullinobrienlaw.com
CULLIN O'BRIEN LAW, P.A.
6541 NE 21st Way
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
Tel: 561-676-6370
Fax: 561-320-0285

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO APPEAR
PRO HAC VICE, CONSENT TO DESIGNATION AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

THIS CAUSE having come before the Court on the Motion to Appear *Pro Hac Vice* for Graham Wilson, Consent to Designation, and Request to Electronically Receive Notices of Electronic Filing (the “Motion”), pursuant to the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. This Court having considered the motion and all other relevant factors, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that:

The Motion is GRANTED. Graham Wilson may appear and participate in this action on behalf of Defendants the DNC and Deborah Wasserman Schultz. The Clerk shall provide electronic notification of all electronic filings to Graham Wilson, at gwilson@perkinscoie.com.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at _____, Florida, this
____ day of _____.

United States District Judge

Copies furnished to: All Counsel of Record

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

**MOTION TO APPEAR *PRO HAC VICE*,
CONSENT TO DESIGNATION, AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

In accordance with Local Rules 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, the undersigned respectfully moves for the admission *pro hac vice* of Elisabeth C. Frost of the law firm of Perkins Coie LLP, 700 13th Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005, Telephone: (202) 654-6256, for purposes of appearance as co-counsel on behalf of Defendants DNC Services Corp. d/b/a the Democratic National Committee (“DNC”) and Deborah Wasserman Schultz (together, “Defendants”) in the above-styled case only, and pursuant to Rule 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, to permit Elisabeth C. Frost to receive electronic filings in this case, and in support thereof states as follows:

1. Elisabeth C. Frost is not admitted to practice in the Southern District of Florida and is a member in good standing of the District of Columbia and New York State Bars.

2. Movant, Gregg D. Thomas, Esquire, of the law firm of Thomas & LoCicero, 601 South Boulevard, P.O. Box 2602 (33601), Tampa, FL 33606, (813) 984-3060, is a member in good standing of the The Florida Bar and the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and is authorized to file through the Court's electronic filing system. Movant consents to be designated as a member of the Bar of this Court with whom the Court and opposing counsel may readily communicate regarding the conduct of the case, upon whom filings shall be served, who shall be required to electronically file all documents and things that may be filed electronically, and who shall be responsible for filing documents in compliance with the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. *See* Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures.

3. In accordance with the local rules of this Court, Elisabeth C. Frost has made payment of this Court's \$75 admission fee. A certification in accordance with Rule 4(b) is attached hereto.

4. Elisabeth C. Frost, by and through designated counsel and pursuant to Section 2B CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, hereby requests the Court to provide Notice of Electronic Filings to Elisabeth C. Frost at email address: efrost@perkinscoie.com.

WHEREFORE, Gregg D. Thomas, moves this Court to enter an Order granting Elisabeth C. Frost permission to appear before this Court on behalf of Defendants for all purposes relating to the proceedings in the above-styled matter and directing the Clerk to provide notice of electronic filings to Elisabeth C. Frost.

Date: August 2, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gregg D. Thomas

Gregg D. Thomas

Florida Bar No.: 223913

601 South Boulevard P.O. Box 2602 (33601)

Tampa, FL 33606

Telephone: (813) 984-3060

Facsimile: (813) 984-3070

gthomas@tlolawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

_____ /

CERTIFICATION OF ELISABETH C. FROST

Elisabeth C. Frost, Esquire, pursuant to Rule 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys, hereby certifies that (1) I have studied the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida; and (2) I am a member in good standing of the Bars of the District of Columbia and New York, as well as the following federal courts: the United States Supreme Court; the U.S. Courts of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, the Fourth Circuit, and the D.C. Circuit; the U.S. District Courts for the District of Columbia, the Eastern District of New York, the Southern District of New York, the Northern District of New York, and the Western District of Wisconsin.



Elisabeth C. Frost

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice was served by CM/ECF on August 2, 2016 on all counsel or parties of record on the service list.

/s/ Gregg D. Thomas
Gregg D. Thomas

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
et al.,

Defendants.

SERVICE LIST

Jared H. Beck
Elizabeth Lee Beck
Email: jared@beckandlee.com
Email: elizabeth@beckandlee.com
BECK & LEE TRIAL LAWYERS
12485 SW 137th Ave., Suite 205
Miami, FL 33186
Tel: 305-234-2060
Fax: 786-664-3334

Antonio Gabriel Hernandez
Email: herna8491@bellsouth.net
ANTONIO G. HERNANDEZ P.A.
4 SouthEast 1st Street, 2nd Floor
Miami, FL 33131
Tel: 305-282-3698
Fax: 786-513-7748

Cullin Avram O'Brien
Email: cullin@cullinobrienlaw.com
CULLIN O'BRIEN LAW, P.A.
6541 NE 21st Way
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
Tel: 561-676-6370
Fax: 561-320-0285

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

_____ /

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO APPEAR
PRO HAC VICE, CONSENT TO DESIGNATION AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

THIS CAUSE having come before the Court on the Motion to Appear *Pro Hac Vice* for Elisabeth C. Frost, Consent to Designation, and Request to Electronically Receive Notices of Electronic Filing (the “Motion”), pursuant to the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. This Court having considered the motion and all other relevant factors, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that:

The Motion is GRANTED. Elisabeth C. Frost may appear and participate in this action on behalf of Defendants the DNC and Deborah Wasserman Schultz. The Clerk shall provide electronic notification of all electronic filings to Elisabeth C. Frost, at efrost@perkinscoie.com.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at _____, Florida, this
____ day of _____.

United States District Judge

Copies furnished to: All Counsel of Record

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

**MOTION TO APPEAR *PRO HAC VICE*,
CONSENT TO DESIGNATION, AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

In accordance with Local Rules 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, the undersigned respectfully moves for the admission *pro hac vice* of Marc E. Elias of the law firm of Perkins Coie LLP, 700 13th Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005, Telephone: (202) 434-1609, for purposes of appearance as co-counsel on behalf of Defendants DNC Services Corp. d/b/a the Democratic National Committee (“DNC”) and Deborah Wasserman Schultz (together, “Defendants”) in the above-styled case only, and pursuant to Rule 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, to permit Marc E. Elias to receive electronic filings in this case, and in support thereof states as follows:

1. Marc E. Elias is not admitted to practice in the Southern District of Florida and is a member in good standing of the District of Columbia Bar.

2. Movant, Gregg D. Thomas, Esquire, of the law firm of Thomas & LoCicero, 601 South Boulevard, P.O. Box 2602 (33601), Tampa, FL 33606, (813) 984-3060, is a member in good standing of the The Florida Bar and the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and is authorized to file through the Court's electronic filing system. Movant consents to be designated as a member of the Bar of this Court with whom the Court and opposing counsel may readily communicate regarding the conduct of the case, upon whom filings shall be served, who shall be required to electronically file all documents and things that may be filed electronically, and who shall be responsible for filing documents in compliance with the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. *See* Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures.

3. In accordance with the local rules of this Court, Marc E. Elias has made payment of this Court's \$75 admission fee. A certification in accordance with Rule 4(b) is attached hereto.

4. Marc E. Elias, by and through designated counsel and pursuant to Section 2B CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, hereby requests the Court to provide Notice of Electronic Filings to Marc E. Elias at email address: melias@perkinscoie.com.

WHEREFORE, Gregg D. Thomas, moves this Court to enter an Order granting Marc E. Elias permission to appear before this Court on behalf of Defendants for all purposes relating to the proceedings in the above-styled matter and directing the Clerk to provide notice of electronic filings to Marc E. Elias.

Date: August 2, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Gregg D. Thomas

Gregg D. Thomas

Florida Bar No.: 223913

601 South Boulevard P.O. Box 2602 (33601)

Tampa, FL 33606

Telephone: (813) 984-3060

Facsimile: (813) 984-3070

gthomas@tlolawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

_____ /

CERTIFICATION OF MARC E. ELIAS

Marc E. Elias, Esquire, pursuant to Rule 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys, hereby certifies that (1) I have studied the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida; and (2) I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the District of Columbia and the following federal courts: U.S. Supreme Court; U.S. Courts of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit, the Fourth Circuit, the Fifth Circuit and the Tenth Circuit; U.S. District Courts for the District of Columbia, the Eastern District of Michigan, and the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Wisconsin.



Marc E. Elias

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice was served by CM/ECF on August 2, 2016 on all counsel or parties of record on the service list.

/s/ Gregg D. Thomas
Gregg D. Thomas

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
et al.,

Defendants.

SERVICE LIST

Jared H. Beck
Elizabeth Lee Beck
Email: jared@beckandlee.com
Email: elizabeth@beckandlee.com
BECK & LEE TRIAL LAWYERS
12485 SW 137th Ave., Suite 205
Miami, FL 33186
Tel: 305-234-2060
Fax: 786-664-3334

Antonio Gabriel Hernandez
Email: hern8491@bellsouth.net
ANTONIO G. HERNANDEZ P.A.
4 SouthEast 1st Street, 2nd Floor
Miami, FL 33131
Tel: 305-282-3698
Fax: 786-513-7748

Cullin Avram O'Brien
Email: cullin@cullinobrienlaw.com
CULLIN O'BRIEN LAW, P.A.
6541 NE 21st Way
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
Tel: 561-676-6370
Fax: 561-320-0285

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO APPEAR
PRO HAC VICE, CONSENT TO DESIGNATION AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

THIS CAUSE having come before the Court on the Motion to Appear *Pro Hac Vice* for Marc E. Elias, Consent to Designation, and Request to Electronically Receive Notices of Electronic Filing (the "Motion"), pursuant to the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. This Court having considered the motion and all other relevant factors, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that:

The Motion is GRANTED. Marc E. Elias may appear and participate in this action on behalf of Defendants the DNC and Deborah Wasserman Schultz. The Clerk shall provide electronic notification of all electronic filings to Marc E. Elias, at melias@perkinscoie.com.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at _____, Florida, this
____ day of _____.

United States District Judge

Copies furnished to: All Counsel of Record

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

**MOTION TO APPEAR *PRO HAC VICE*,
CONSENT TO DESIGNATION, AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

In accordance with Local Rules 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida, the undersigned respectfully moves for the admission *pro hac vice* of Ruthzee Louijeune of the law firm of Perkins Coie LLP, 700 13th Street, N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C. 20005, Telephone: (202) 628-6600, for purposes of appearance as co-counsel on behalf of Defendants DNC Services Corp. d/b/a the Democratic National Committee (“DNC”) and Deborah Wasserman Schultz (together, “Defendants”) in the above-styled case only, and pursuant to Rule 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, to permit Ruthzee Louijeune to receive electronic filings in this case, and in support thereof states as follows:

1. Ruthzee Louijeune is not admitted to practice in the Southern District of Florida and is a member in good standing of the District of Columbia Bar.

2. Movant, Gregg D. Thomas, Esquire, of the law firm of Thomas & LoCicero, 601 South Boulevard, P.O. Box 2602 (33601), Tampa, FL 33606, (813) 984-3060, is a member in good standing of the The Florida Bar and the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and is authorized to file through the Court's electronic filing system. Movant consents to be designated as a member of the Bar of this Court with whom the Court and opposing counsel may readily communicate regarding the conduct of the case, upon whom filings shall be served, who shall be required to electronically file all documents and things that may be filed electronically, and who shall be responsible for filing documents in compliance with the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. *See* Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures.

3. In accordance with the local rules of this Court, Ruthzee Louijeune has made payment of this Court's \$75 admission fee. A certification in accordance with Rule 4(b) is attached hereto.

4. Ruthzee Louijeune, by and through designated counsel and pursuant to Section 2B CM/ECF Administrative Procedures, hereby requests the Court to provide Notice of Electronic Filings to Ruthzee Louijeune at email address: rlouijeune@perkinscoie.com.

WHEREFORE, Gregg D. Thomas, moves this Court to enter an Order granting Ruthzee Louijeune permission to appear before this Court on behalf of Defendants for all purposes relating to the proceedings in the above-styled matter and directing the Clerk to provide notice of electronic filings to Ruthzee Louijeune.

Date: August 2, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Gregg D. Thomas_____

Gregg D. Thomas

Florida Bar No.: 223913

601 South Boulevard P.O. Box 2602 (33601)

Tampa, FL 33606

Telephone: (813) 984-3060

Facsimile: (813) 984-3070

gthomas@tlolawfirm.com

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.


DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

_____ /

CERTIFICATION OF RUTHZEE LOUIJEUNE

Ruthzee Louijeune, Esquire, pursuant to Rule 4(b) of the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys, hereby certifies that (1) I have studied the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida; and (2) I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the District of Columbia.



Ruthzee Louijeune

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Motion to Appear Pro Hac Vice was served by CM/ECF on August 2, 2016 on all counsel or parties of record on the service list.

/s/Gregg D. Thomas

-

Gregg D. Thomas

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No. 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
et al.,

Defendants.

SERVICE LIST

Jared H. Beck
Elizabeth Lee Beck
Email: jared@beckandlee.com
Email: elizabeth@beckandlee.com
BECK & LEE TRIAL LAWYERS
12485 SW 137th Ave., Suite 205
Miami, FL 33186
Tel: 305-234-2060
Fax: 786-664-3334

Antonio Gabriel Hernandez
Email: herna8491@bellsouth.net
ANTONIO G. HERNANDEZ P.A.
4 SouthEast 1st Street, 2nd Floor
Miami, FL 33131
Tel: 305-282-3698
Fax: 786-513-7748

Cullin Avram O'Brien
Email: cullin@cullinobrienlaw.com
CULLIN O'BRIEN LAW, P.A.
6541 NE 21st Way
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33308
Tel: 561-676-6370
Fax: 561-320-0285

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

Case No.: 0:16-CV-61511-WJZ

CAROL WILDING, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

DNC SERVICES CORP., d/b/a
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, et al.

Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO APPEAR
PRO HAC VICE, CONSENT TO DESIGNATION AND REQUEST TO
ELECTRONICALLY RECEIVE NOTICES OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

THIS CAUSE having come before the Court on the Motion to Appear *Pro Hac Vice* for Ruthzee Louijeune, Consent to Designation, and Request to Electronically Receive Notices of Electronic Filing (the “Motion”), pursuant to the Special Rules Governing the Admission and Practice of Attorneys in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida and Section 2B of the CM/ECF Administrative Procedures. This Court having considered the motion and all other relevant factors, it is hereby

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that:

The Motion is GRANTED. Ruthzee Louijeune may appear and participate in this action on behalf of Defendants the DNC and Deborah Wasserman Schultz. The Clerk shall provide electronic notification of all electronic filings to Ruthzee Louijeune, at rlouijeune@perkinscoie.com.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers at _____, Florida, this
____ day of _____.

United States District Judge

Copies furnished to: All Counsel of Record