



LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SERVICES

Alaska State Legislature
Division of Legal and Research Services
State Capitol, Juneau, AK 99801

(907) 465-3991 phone
(907) 465-3908 fax
research@legis.state.ak.us

Memorandum

TO: Senator Joe Thomas
FROM: Susan Warner, Legislative Analyst
DATE: January 21, 2011
RE: Legal History of Counting Write-in Votes in Alaska
LRS Report 11.113

You asked about the history in Alaska of write-in vote counting. You were particularly interested in legal precedents, and you asked for copies of pertinent decisions.

Within certain parameters defined by the U.S. Constitution, states have the authority to make their own election laws, and most states allow voters to write in the name of a candidate who is not listed on the ballot. Legal challenges occur most often in close races; courts then attempt to balance the constitutional right of citizens to elect the person of their choice against state laws that are designed to ensure efficient and orderly elections, among other things. The Alaska Supreme Court has consistently held that the right of citizens to select their government representatives is a fundamental prerogative of citizenship and should not be impaired or destroyed by "strained" statutory constructions.¹ As such, the Court in the most recent case (*Miller v. Treadwell*, 2010) held as follows:

Voter intent is paramount, and any misspelling, abbreviation, or other minor variation in the form of the candidate's name on a write-in ballot does not invalidate a ballot so long as the intention of the voter can be ascertained.²

Alaska Voting Law

As you know, Alaska law does not allow write-in voting during primary elections, but provisions must be made for write-in voting on general election ballots. Alaska's rules for counting write-in ballots specify that a vote for a write-in candidate "shall be counted" if the oval is filled in and if the candidate's last name, or the candidate's name as it appears on the declaration of candidacy, is written in the space provided.³ The law further specifies that the rules on counting ballots are, without exception, mandatory.

Miller v. Treadwell

Voter intent prevailed in litigation over the counting of write-in ballots in Alaska's 2010 U.S. Senate race. Joe Miller, the Republican senate candidate on the general ballot, argued that write-in votes for his opponent should not have been counted unless the candidate's name was spelled flawlessly. The Alaska Supreme Court ruled against Mr. Miller in *Miller v. Treadwell*, and the Court opinion begins with powerful language in support of voter enfranchisement. The Court proclaims that a citizen's right to vote is *of profound importance; key to participatory democracy; and a polar, cardinal, and bedrock principle*. The Court also notes that such longstanding principles have been consistently applied to election issues in Alaska over the past 50 years.

¹ *Carr v. Thomas*, 586 P.2d 622, 627(1978). We provide this document as Attachment A.

² *Miller v. Treadwell*, Alaska Supreme Court No. S-14112, December 22, 2010. Please note the recitation of pertinent case history entitled "Longstanding Alaska Election Principles" on page 2 of that decision (Attachment B).

³ 15.15.360(a)(11).

Mr. Miller had argued that Alaska statutory language excludes any vote that is not spelled perfectly. The Superior Court held that if the legislature intended a candidate's name to be spelled perfectly, legislators would have used words like *exactly*, *precisely*, or *perfectly*.⁴ The Supreme Court agreed and held that Alaska's statutory language is meant to be *inclusive* rather than *exclusive*:

It is designed to ensure that ballots are counted, not excluded. And this inclusiveness is consistent with the overarching purpose of an election: to ascertain the public will. . . . Voter intent is paramount, and any misspelling, abbreviation, or other minor variation in the form of the candidate's name on a write-in ballot does not invalidate a ballot so long as the intention of the voter can be ascertained.

Additionally, the Court noted that Alaskan voters arrive at their polling places with a variety of backgrounds and capabilities, including some being raised without English as their first language, and such issues should not take away a person's right to decide which candidate to elect:

We must construe the statute's language in light of the purpose of preserving a voter's choice rather than ignoring it.

Legal Precedents

The decision reached in *Miller v. Treadwell* reflects the tendency for all U.S. courts to favor voter intent over ambiguous statutory language, but election scholar Richard Hasen asserts that the Alaska Supreme Court—even before *Miller*—appears to have gone the furthest in giving emphasis to voter intent.⁵ Alaska's 1978 precedent-setting case, *Carr v. Thomas*, involved the question of counting certain ballots, and Alaska's highest court declared that the state would need "clear and unmistakable" statutory language to take away a citizen's right to have his or her voted counted.

Alaska courts have consistently emphasized the importance of voter intent. The decisions for the following Alaska cases are attached to this document:

- *Willis v. Thomas*, 600 P.2d 1079 (1979). The Alaska Supreme Court depended on a determination of voter intent in ruling on the results of a recount of ballots in Senate District F (Attachment D).
- *Fischer v. Stout*, 741 P.2d 217 (1987). The Alaska Supreme Court ruled on whether certain votes or classes of votes were properly counted or rejected in the 1986 race for Senate District H. The Court held that ballots marked with a pen rather than punched still showed clear voter intent and should be counted (Attachment E).
- *Finkelstein v. Stout*, 774 P.2d 786 (1989). The Alaska Supreme Court ruled on a ballot recount for Seat A in House District 13. The Court considered voter intent with regard to questioned signatures on absentee ballots (Attachment F).
- *Edgmon v. Moses*, 152 P.3d 1154 (2007). The Alaska Supreme Court ruled on the results of a recount in the District 37 Democratic primary. Considering ballot markings, the Court found that marks clearly intended as votes should be counted (Attachment G).

⁴ *Joe Miller v. Lieutenant Governor Craig Campbell*, Case No. IJU-10-1007CI, Memorandum of Decision and Order on Motion for Summary Judgment and Cross Motions, December 10, 2010. We provide this document as Attachment C.

⁵ Richard L. Hasen, "The Democracy Canon," *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 62, 2009, p. 87.

Addressing Irregular Write-in Votes in Other States

Although Alaska statute does not address the inevitable misspellings and illegibility of written-in names, many states attempt to clarify how such votes will be counted, and these rules always give primacy to voter intent. There are variations among states, but this directive, by its very nature, is subjective and gives vote-counters the authority to determine who a voter intended to elect. Here are examples from four states:

- California accepts a “reasonable facsimile” of a write-in candidate’s name (Cal. Elec. Code § 15342).
- Nebraska will count a write-in vote without the first name of the candidate, and the write-in name must be “reasonably close to the proper spelling” (Neb. Rev. Stat. § 32-615).
- Delaware allows for a “misspelled or minor variation” of a write-in candidate (Del. Code Ann. Title 15, § 4972 (b)(8)).
- Washington election officials are required to “exercise all reasonable efforts to determine the voter’s intent (WAC 434-262-160).

Some states provide further guidance on counting irregular write-in votes. Washington State has an extensive, pictorial booklet on how election officials are expected to count nearly every deviation from what might be considered a standard marking, including samples of acceptable and unacceptable write-in votes. Attachment H is the portion of the booklet that deals with write-in votes, and the entire document can be viewed at http://www.sos.wa.gov/_assets/elections/2009StatewideStandardsonWhatisaVote.pdf.

We hope this is helpful. If you have questions or need additional information, please let us know.