

STATE OF CONNECTICUT
STATE ELECTIONS ENFORCEMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of a Referral by Suffield Registrars of Voters
Darlene F. Burrell and Lynn F. Joyal, West Suffield

File No. 2021-052

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Suffield Registrars of Voters made this referral alleging that Alexis A. Greenway (hereinafter "Respondent") voted twice at the November 3, 2020 election. Specifically, they alleged that Respondent voted in person in Suffield, Connecticut, and by the early voting process in Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona. After investigation of this matter, the Commission makes the following findings and conclusions:

1. The Suffield Registrars of Voters referred this matter as elections officials pursuant to their authority in General Statutes § 9-7b (a) (2). This referral was triggered by "hits" generated by an ERIC¹ system canvas report.

2. The Greenwich Registrars of Voters, by referral, indicated that:

Two ballots cast in the name of Alexis Ann Greenway, DOB: 1/19/1998 in the November 3, 2020 Presidential Election. One ballot cast in Suffield, CT and the other cast in Phoenix, AZ.

Chief Deputy Recorder of the Maricopa County Recorder's Office in Arizona, Tanya Wheeless, stated in an email, "We can confirm that Ms. Greenway, same DOB, appears to have voted in our 2020 general election through our early voting process. Her signature was verified as accurate."

The possible fraud was discovered from information provided on the 2021 ERIC Cross State report sent to us by the CT SOTS.

Attached is a copy of the email from Arizona along with a copy of the absentee ballot application Suffield, CT received and the ballot affidavit Phoenix, AZ received from Ms. Greenway.

¹ The ERIC System is a database of individual registration and voting records by jurisdiction for elections shared by states participating in the program. "Hits" are information from election officials that an individual voted in more than one jurisdiction at the same election. Connecticut and Arizona are participating states.

Applicable Law

3. General Statutes § 9-360, provides:

Any person not legally qualified who fraudulently votes in any town meeting, primary, election or referendum in which the person is not qualified to vote, and any legally qualified person who, at such meeting, primary, election or referendum, fraudulently votes more than once at the same meeting, primary, election or referendum, shall be fined not less than three hundred dollars or more than five hundred dollars and shall be imprisoned not less than one year or more than two years and shall be disfranchised. Any person who votes or attempts to vote at any election, primary, referendum or town meeting by assuming the name of another legally qualified person shall be guilty of a class D felony and shall be disfranchised.

State and County Records

4. Connecticut: Records indicate that Respondent was registered to vote as of September 21, 2017. Respondent signed an absentee ballot application on September 22, 2020. At the time of this referral, her voter history indicated that she last voted by absentee ballot at the November 3, 2020 election in Suffield. Respondent was made inactive on March 16, 2021 as she failed to respond to the Registrars of Voters annual canvass of electors.
5. Arizona: Records indicate that Respondent registered in February 27, 2016 in Maricopa County, identifying herself as a “student.” Records indicate that she was issued an absentee for the November 3, 2020 election in Maricopa County on September 2, 2020. Records indicate that she appeared to have made a Maricopa County Ballot Affidavit on October 26, 2022. The Maricopa County Recorder’s Office confirmed with Referring Officials on March 16, 2021, that Respondent appeared to have voted in Arizona at the November 3, 2020 general election.

Facts After Investigation

6. By way of background, the investigation determined that Respondent was registered in Connecticut at her parents address in Suffield. Further, it was determined that Respondent no longer lives in Connecticut and now resides in Scottsdale, Arizona. The Commission investigator assigned to this matter consulted with an Arizona Attorney General Investigator (“AAGI”) from the State of Arizona Office of the Attorney General Special Investigations Section (“SIS”).
7. In the course of this investigation the AAGI confirmed that the SIS was also investigating whether Respondent voted both in Arizona and Connecticut at the November 3, 2020

election. Further, the AAGI confirmed that in an interview with Respondent she “adamantly denied” double voting and determined that she currently resides with her parents in Scottsdale.

8. The AAGI advised the Commission investigator that the evidentiary documents from Arizona, and obtained by the SIS containing sample signatures of Respondent, “did not appear to be consistent with signed voter documents from CT.”
9. After investigation, a comparison of the signatures in the name of Respondent obtained from both Connecticut and Arizona appear to be markedly different between samples from the respective jurisdictions.
10. The AAGI provided to the Commission investigator a November 30, 2022 report of an interview of Respondent, it indicates:
At this point in time, it does not appear that Alexis Greenway requested an absentee ballot from Connecticut and voted there. I shared my findings with [an] Attorney General Prosecutor ... and it was determined that we would close our case and potentially send the findings of our investigation to [the Commission investigator] to assist in his investigation.
11. To date, no formal findings from the SIS have been received by the Commission.

Analysis and Conclusion

12. The facts from investigations in both Connecticut and Arizona indicate that there is conflicting evidence regarding whether Respondent violated General Statutes § 9-360 by voting twice at the November 3, 2020 election in those jurisdictions. Though, taken as a whole, the facts show that it is more likely than not, that she did not vote twice.
13. Specifically, while state and county voting records indicate that an individual voted in both jurisdictions in Respondent’s name, documents shared by SIS and its AAGI contain signatures on the respective documents from Connecticut and Arizona in the name of Respondent which are not similar. Therefore, the Commission determines there is insufficient evidence to conclusively show that Respondent voted twice at the November 3, 2020 election in violation of General Statutes § 9-360.
14. Furthermore, the Commission notes that the Arizona Attorney General Prosecutor recommended that the case in that state be closed after investigation.

15. The Commission, for the reasons detailed herein, will dismiss this matter with no further action and without prejudice.
16. The Commission reserves the right to reopen this matter should information become available pertaining the underlying facts of this investigation that tend to establish fraudulent voting occurred at the November 3, 2020 election.

ORDER

The following Order is issued on the basis of the aforementioned findings:

This matter is dismissed with no further action and without prejudice. The Commission reserves the right to reopen the matter should information become available pertaining to the underlying facts of this investigation that tend to establish that fraudulent voting occurred at the November 3, 2020 election.

Adopted this 5th day of April, 2023 at Hartford, Connecticut.



Stephen T. Penny, Chairman
By Order of the Commission