

YUMA 16 VOTER FRAUD CASES REVIEWED

June 26, 2023

Written By:

Matt Braynard, Executive Director

Ian Camacho, Research Director

The LAA Research Group



Origins of the Data

The 2022 documentary *2000 Mules* had no part whatsoever in these 16 cases as Dinesh D'Souza initially claimed.^{1 2} The Yuma Sheriff was not saying this to make D'Souza look bad, it just wasn't the case according to the emails obtained from the sheriff's office.^{3 4} In fact, one case (2022-22050) directly resulted from Look Ahead America's submission in November of 2021.⁵

RE: Non Commercial Records Request



From Alvarado, Adriana - Paralegal - Admin <Adriana.Alvarado@ycso.yumacountyaz.gov>

To 'ian.camacho@lookaheadamerica.org' <ian.camacho@lookaheadamerica.org>

Date 2023-06-08 18:12

 Summary  Headers  Plain text  Download all attachments

-  2022-22045_Redacted.pdf (~605 KB) 
-  2022-22046_Redacted.pdf (~497 KB) 
-  2022-22048_Redacted.pdf (~752 KB) 
-  2022-22050_Redacted.pdf (~511 KB) 
-  2022-22051_Redacted.pdf (~601 KB) 
-  2022-22053_Redacted.pdf (~473 KB) 
-  2022-22055_Redacted.pdf (~458 KB) 
-  2022-22056_Redacted.pdf (~435 KB) 
-  2022-22057_Redacted.pdf (~473 KB) 
-  2022-22058_Redacted.pdf (~466 KB) 
-  2022-27859_Redacted.pdf (~474 KB) 
-  2022-27860_Redacted.pdf (~490 KB) 
-  2022-27861_Redacted.pdf (~492 KB) 
-  2022-27862_Redacted.pdf (~470 KB) 
-  2022-27863_Redacted.pdf (~608 KB) 
-  2022-27864_Redacted.pdf (~679 KB) 

Good afternoon Mr. Camacho,

I have reviewed and redacted all reports and I am now able to confirm that none of these cases originated from True the Vote, Gregg Phillips, Catherine Engelbrecht, and/or Dinesh D. Souza.

Attached to this email please find a redacted copy of all 15 cases.

Thank you,



Adriana Alvarado

Paralegal – Administration

Yuma County Sheriff's Office

141 S. 3rd Avenue

Tel: (928) 783-6274 ext. 3019

Adriana.Alvarado@ycso.yumacountyaz.gov

Monday – Friday 07:00-15:00

¹ <https://twitter.com/DineshDSouza/status/1529533507617206272>

² <https://twitter.com/WhitlockJason/status/1526315725446688771>

³ <https://www.azmirror.com/2022/05/19/the-yuma-sheriff-isnt-investigating-election-fraud-because-of-2000-mules/>

⁴ <https://www.mediaite.com/news/sheriff-destroys-dinesh-dsouzas-claim-his-movie-sparked-election-fraud-investigation/>

⁵ <https://lookaheadamerica.org/azreport/>

Understanding Signature Analysis Numbering

The signature analysis numbers in the references and summaries which follow may not be apparent to the reader, and so the following summary provides an explanation.

In all cases, #1 indicates the known Arizona registration signature on file of the suspect used for comparison against the unknown and questioned item(s), which are always votes cast on ballots either in person, by mail-in ballots, or early/absentee ballots in Yuma County, Arizona.

In most cases, #2 indicates a questioned vote with the ballot cast in person in Yuma County. The lab checks against the signature(s) from the Yuma County e-poll pads or paper registrar records.

However, in one unique case with a #3, this was because the voter had died and obviously could not have cast it in person, and there were multiple suspects. #1 was the dead voter's known Arizona registration signature on file, #2 was the known Arizona registration signature on file of one suspect, and #3 was the known Arizona registration signature on file of another suspect.

In all cases where the vote was cast by mail-in ballot or by early/absentee vote in Yuma County, the questioned item begins with #A to indicate an absentee ballot.

In all cases with #A1, the number indicates the (first) questioned absentee ballot from Yuma County. Only one case involved two absentee ballots from Yuma, which was why it has an #A2.

In all cases with items that have dashes, such as #1-1, this indicates a known handwriting sample submitted by the suspect. The first number before the dash indicates that this is a known signature, known Arizona registration signature on file, but the second number distinguishes it from the Arizona registration record, such as a voluntarily submitted signature by the suspect for handwriting analysis in the investigation.

All of the items that were in question and sent to the lab for handwriting analysis came from Yuma County, whether in person ballots, mail-in ballots, or early/absentee ballots. This becomes apparent because every case required a warrant from the judge to obtain the ballots from the Yuma County elections records vault which stores the original copies to be used for analysis. Copies are not used because one cannot determine things that "wet signatures" reveal, such as pressure on paper, ball point pen characteristics, fine beginning and ending strokes that copiers may not pick up, and so on.

Case Summaries and References

(1) **2022-27864**:⁶ Washington registration occurred only a month before (09-04-2020) the vote cast there (10-23-2020), whereas the in-person ballot was cast first in Yuma (10-19-2020).

The investigator noted that the Washington seemed to match both the Arizona and Washington registration signatures, which also matched one another.

The signature analysis shows that it was likely the same voter who voted in Yuma, Arizona, but doesn't make a conclusion on the Washington signatures: "Questioned item #2 was compared to known item #1 resulting in the opinion that the questioned signature on item #2 was probably written by the writer of item #1."

Whether or not a voter fraud victim, Washington has jurisdiction as second ballot cast there.

Yuma DA says "insufficient evidence/no conviction likely."

Washington investigators there may need to check, and the statute of limitations has not expired at five years from the time of any offense (10-23-2025).

(2) **2022-27863**:⁷ One of two suspects deceased since the ballots were cast in the 2020 General Election, however, her alleged ballot signature does not appear to match the known records.

As for the living suspect, the first ballot was cast by mail in Washington (10-19-2020) and the second by mail in Arizona (10-20-2020). The suspect confirmed that he voted in Arizona for the federal contests, and in Washington for the local contests, but did not vote twice on the same contests. The notes comment that the suspect was "essentially admitting that he voted in both state but was unaware that it was illegal."

The investigator noted that the Washington ballots may not match both the Arizona and Washington registration signatures, which also matched one another.

The signature match for deceased suspect's signature was in question, but the signature match for the living suspect appeared to match the Arizona records.

No notes from the Yuma DA, but no known arrests either.

Washington investigators may need to check as the statute of limitations has not expired at five years from the time of any offense (10-19-2025), however, the jurisdiction on this one may fall under Arizona due to the second ballot being cast there.

⁶ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654722339/2022-27864>

⁷ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654722996/2022-27863>

(3) **2022-27862**:⁸ The first vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-19-2020) and the second vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Washington (10-28-2020).

The suspect confirms that he voted in Arizona, and that Washington mail forwards to his Arizona address. He possibly admitted to double voting: “advised him that it appeared that he had voted in Washington and in Yuma and he stated that he does not remember and it is possible that he could have. He added that he was sure that he voted in Yuma.”

The investigator noted that the ballots possibly match both the Arizona and Washington registration signatures, which also matched one another.

The signature match did not eliminate him as source of signatures: “Can neither be identified nor eliminated as the signer of item #A1. Both similarities and differences are noted between the questioned and known signatures.” They are waiting on him to come down and voluntarily submit a handwriting sample for them, which will likely never happen if he is guilty.

Yuma DA says “insufficient evidence/no conviction likely.”

Washington investigators may need to check this case information, and the statute of limitations has not expired at five years from the time of any offense (10-28-2025).

(4) **2022-27861**:⁹ The first vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Colorado (10-23-2020) and the second vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-26-2020).

It seems that the suspect may be the victim of voter fraud and possibly suffering from memory loss: “I explained to him that it appeared that he did vote in Colorado, in 2020, to which he agreed. I continued by saying that it appeared he voted in Yuma County as well. He stared off to his right for a few moments and rubbed his face. He then stated ‘well, yeah, now I’m thinking’ while continuing to rub his face. I asked if he lived alone or lived with anyone and he stated that he lived with his wife. He stated that she doesn’t do anything and it would have been him. He stated ‘the only thing, maybe I did vote here’.” Also noted: “he stated that he doesn’t remember things that well anymore.” The suspect confirmed the Arizona signatures as his.

The investigator noted that a copy of the Colorado ballot seemed different from the Arizona and Colorado registration signatures, which matched one another, however.

Report stated that the Colorado ones “are reproductions of the same signature and inconsistent with the other known signatures,” indicating that suspect was a victim of voter fraud.

Yuma DA declined prosecuting, stating “Insufficient evidence/no conviction likely.”

⁸ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654723567/2022-27862>

⁹ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654724663/2022-27861>

Colorado investigators may need to check this case information, but the statute of limitations has expired at 18 months from the time of any offense (04-26-2022) and appears that jurisdiction falls under Arizona anyway.

(5) **2022-27860**:¹⁰ The first vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Colorado (10-19-2020) and the second vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-28-2020).

Suspect claims not to remember voting, but said he only voted one time and seemed to indicate that if he voted it would have only been in Colorado. Also, he was not on the Arizona PEVL (Permanent Early Voter List), which meant that someone had to request his Arizona ballot. "I continued by saying that he was not on the permanent early voting list so someone would have had to request it be sent. He stated that it was weird."

The investigator noted that the ballots might match both the Arizona and Colorado registration signatures, which also matched one another.

A lab report showed it was not his signature: "Examination and comparison of questioned item #A1 with known item #1 resulted in the following opinion. There are indications that the questioned signature on item #A1 may NOT have been executed by the writer of item #1."

Yuma DA declined to prosecute, stating: "Insufficient evidence/no conviction likely".

Colorado investigators may need to check this case information, but the statute of limitations has expired at 18 months from the time of any offense (04-28-2022) and appears that jurisdiction falls under Arizona anyway.

(6) **2022-27859**:¹¹ The first vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-23-2020) and the second vote was completed and accepted on Election Day in Colorado (11-03-2020).

The investigator noted that the ballot seemed to match both the Arizona and Colorado registration signatures, which also matched one another.

Amazingly, the suspect admits to voting in both locations in the investigation: "I asked where he voted in the 2020 general election and if it was in Yuma or Colorado or both and he stated 'both'. I confirmed that he voted in both and he stated that this year he voted in Colorado and he stated he just sent it in. I told him I was talking about the November 3rd 2020 general election and he stated that they had been in Arizona at that time so he voted in Arizona. I asked if he went to a polling station or if he sent an early ballot and he stated that he sent an early ballot."

¹⁰ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654724941/2022-27860>

¹¹ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654725256/2022-27859>

The suspect even stated that nobody else has access to his mailbox, but later changes his story to state that he had issues with his neighbors “monkeying” with his mailbox.

The handwriting analysis with 5 handwriting samples confirms that the suspect is the one who voted in Yuma, which the suspect confirmed in the interview: “An examination and comparison of questioned item #A1 with known item #1 resulted in the following opinion: -The questioned signature on item #A1 was executed by the writer of #1.”

Nevertheless, the report concludes: “The Yuma County Attorney's Office declined to pursue charges in reference to this case.”

Colorado investigators may need to check this case information, but the statute of limitations has expired at 18 months from the time of any offense (05-03-2022).

(7) **2022-22058**:¹² One vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (11-03-2020) and the second vote was accepted on Election Day in Oregon (11-03-2020).

Suspect claimed that he hadn't lived in Oregon for five years, and only voted in Yuma. There's a female voice in the background that claims “whatever happened, happened in Oregon.”

The investigator noted that a copy of the ballot seemed very different from the Arizona and Oregon registration signatures, which matched one another, however.

The handwriting analysis confirmed that the suspect voted in Yuma: “The questioned signature on item #A1 was executed by the writer of item #1.”

The report concludes: “The Yuma County Attorney's Office declined to pursue charges in reference to this case.”

Oregon investigators may need to check this case information, although this is coming close to the statute of limitations at three years from the time of any offense (11-03-2023).

(8) **2022-22057**:¹³ One vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (11-03-2020) and the second vote was accepted on Election Day in Oregon (11-03-2020).

When interviewed, the suspect claimed he voted in Oregon and hadn't been to Arizona in 5-6 years, though his ex, whom he had run away from, may still be there and have access to his mail. The investigator noted that a copy of the ballot seemed very different from the Arizona and Oregon registration signatures, which matched one another, however.

¹² <https://www.scribd.com/document/654734599/2022-22058>

¹³ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654734886/2022-22057>

The handwriting analysis confirmed that the suspect did not fill out the Yuma ballot: “The questioned signature on item #A1 was probably not executed by the writer of item #1.” It thus seems he was the victim of voter fraud.

The report concludes: “The Yuma County Attorney's Office declined to pursue charges in reference to this case.”

Oregon investigators may need to check this case information, although this is coming close to the statute of limitations at three years from the time of any offense (11-03-2023).

(9) **2022-22056**:¹⁴ One vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-22-2020) after being requested, and the second vote was accepted on Election Day in Oregon (11-03-2020).

The investigator noted that a copy of the Oregon ballot seemed very different from the distinct Arizona and Oregon registration signatures, which matched one another, however. The suspect claimed that he only voted in Yuma, not in Oregon.

The handwriting analysis confirmed that the suspect did fill out the Yuma ballot: “The questioned signature on item #A1 was executed by the writer of item #1.”

The report concludes: “The Yuma County Attorney's Office declined to pursue charges in reference to this case.”

Oregon investigators may need to check this case information, although this is coming close to the statute of limitations at three years from the time of any offense (11-03-2023).

(10) **2022-22055**:¹⁵ One vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-22-2020) after being requested, and the second vote was accepted on Election Day in Oregon (11-03-2020).

The investigator noted that a rudimentary review suggests that both signatures on the ballot envelopes are the same as those on the Arizona and Oregon registration forms.

The suspect claimed that she only voted in Yuma, not Oregon, though she voted in the Oregon primary and goes back and forth on voting depending on elections. Suspect confirmed that her daughter and grandchildren live year-round at the Oregon address

The handwriting analysis confirmed that the suspect did fill out the Yuma ballot, “The questioned signature on item #A1 was probably executed by the writer of item #1.” They are waiting on her

¹⁴ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654735121/2022-22056>

¹⁵ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654735689/2022-22055>

to come down and voluntarily submit more handwriting samples for them, which will likely never happen if she is guilty, and even the investigator commented that this will not likely happen.

The report concludes: "The Yuma County Attorney's Office declined to pursue charges in reference to this case."

Oregon investigators may need to check this case information, although this is coming close to the statute of limitations at three years from the time of any offense (11-03-2023).

(11) **2022-22053**:¹⁶ One vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-28-2020) after being requested, and the second vote was accepted on Election Day in Oregon (11-03-2020).

The investigator noted that a rudimentary review suggests that a signature on the ballot envelope did not match those signatures on the Arizona and Oregon registration forms.

The suspect claimed that he did not vote at all, but was in Yuma during the time the ballots were cast. He also admitted that "she" learned to forge his signatures. Unlike the previous person in Oregon, the riots did not burn their mail but the suspect claimed that someone was going through their mailboxes across the street in Yuma. On a follow up, he stated "there was a female walking up and down the street during that time frame opening mail boxes and taking items indicating that it was possible she took the ballots and voted them."

The signature match report states that his signatures match the Yuma ballot, but the other samples had matching issues: "Examination and comparison of questioned item #A1 with known items #1-1, #1-6 and #2 resulted in the following opinions, 2. The [...] signatures on items #A1 and #1-1 were written by the same person. 3. Both similarities and differences are noted between the signatures on items #A1, #1-1 and the signatures on items #1-2, #1-6, #2."

The Yuma DA: "Declination received from the Yuma County Attorney's Office citing insufficient evidence, no conviction likely."

Oregon investigators may need to check this case information, although this is coming close to the statute of limitations at three years from the time of any offense (11-03-2023).

(12) **2022-22051**:¹⁷ One vote was cast by early ballot in Wisconsin (10-28-2020) after being requested, and the second vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-31-2020).

The investigator noted that a rudimentary review suggests that signatures on ballot envelopes matched the signatures on the Arizona and Wisconsin registration forms and each other.

¹⁶ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654736641/2022-22053>

¹⁷ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654737049/2022-22051>

The suspect gives evasive answers, stating he “tried to do it in Wisconsin but they would not let it and then he voted in Arizona or vice/versa.” Then he admitted to voting in person in Wisconsin, and threw out distractor questions and statements.

The signature match report confirmed the Yuma signature match: “There are indications that the questioned signature on item #A1 may have been executed by the writer of item #1.”

Wisconsin may need to check, and the statute of limitations has not expired at six years from the time of any offense (10-31-2026), but the jurisdiction seems to lie with Arizona as that was where the second ballot was cast.

(13) **2022-22050**:¹⁸ This case has been covered previously under <https://lookaheadamerica.org/Yuma>, however this document has data not previously known.

One vote was cast in person in Wisconsin (11-03-2020), and the second vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Arizona (11-03-2020).

The suspect essentially confessed to double voting, as she “advised the Yuma County Recorder’s Office that she had an Arizona absentee ballot sent to her new address in Wisconsin, but was able to vote in person in Wisconsin. She was told by someone at the Yuma County Recorder’s Office that her Arizona vote would be retracted. She advised that she had been contacted and told that she ‘double voted’.” The moment that the investigator asks if she voted in the 2020 General Election, the line disconnects. The suspect informs the investigator that she believed that they would “erase” her Arizona vote, which was why she voted in Wisconsin as she was concerned it wouldn’t be counted and couldn’t find records of it being received or counted online. At the end of the interview, the suspect asks for advice as to whether she should look into getting an attorney.

The signature match report stated: “The writer of #1 [...] can neither be identified, or eliminated, as the writer of the questioned signature on item #A1.”

The Yuma DA: “Case declined by Yuma County Attorney's Office.”

Wisconsin has been sent this information for review, and the statute of limitations has not expired at six years from the time of any offense (11-03-2026).

(14) **2022-22048**:¹⁹ One vote was cast by mail-in ballot in Rhode Island (10-23-2020), and the second vote was cast in person in Arizona (10-27-2020).

¹⁸ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654737198/2022-22050>

¹⁹ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654737451/2022-22048>

The investigator noted that a rudimentary review suggests that signatures on ballot envelopes matched the signatures on the Arizona and Rhode Island registration forms and each other.

The suspect confirmed what her mother stated, that she voted in Arizona in the 2020 General Election and in person. She stated that she did not vote in Rhode Island, but the address on file is an older one to which many people have access to the mail.

The signature match report stated: "The questioned signature on item #2 was probably executed by the writer of item #1."

The Yuma DA: "Case declined by Yuma County Attorney's Office."

Rhode Island may need to check, and the statute of limitations has not expired at ten years from the time of any offense (10-27-2030), but the jurisdiction seems to lie with Arizona as that was where the second ballot was cast.

(15) **2022-22046**:²⁰ Two ballots were sent in by mail-in ballot in Arizona (10-16-2020).

The investigator confirmed that the suspect voted twice in Arizona using early ballots. The suspect had received two, several weeks apart, and with variations in spelling on her name due to two active records in Yuma County, as well as different dates of birth are different due to registration using different identification documents (one uses MM/DD/YY, the other uses DD/MM/YY) thus creating confusion. Thus, the error came from the county clerk, and the suspect had sent in both thinking that the first was not counted or received due to a mistake. The investigator seemed to believe that this was not an indicator of criminal intent, and the records have since been corrected.

The signature match report confirmed the match: "The writing and signatures on items #A1 and #A2 appear to be the product of 1 writer."

The Yuma County DA's office noted: "On 12-16-2022 this case was declined by the Yuma County Attorney's Office."

Arizona may need to check, as the statute of limitations has not expired there at 5 years.

(16) **2022-22045**:²¹ A voter who had deceased in February 2019 had a ballot cast in his name (10-22-2020) as he was on the permanent early voter list and not removed for over a year.

²⁰ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654737638/2022-22046>

²¹ <https://www.scribd.com/document/654737861/2022-22045>

The detective spoke to the son of the deceased, who stated that he works as a trucker who lives in Mexico, and that the Arizona address is where his sister lives, and that his father had died in February of 2019. The son stated he, his (deceased) father, sisters and mother had access to the PO Box where the ballot had been sent. The son admitted that he had used his father's signature as "he knows his signature and that he has one that he uses for quick things and another for legal reasons" and was concerned about legal implications of doing so. Unsurprisingly, the son never returns the investigator's call and also does not submit handwriting samples for analysis.

The signature match report indicated that the wife of the deceased / mother of the son likely forged the signature of the dead voter: "There are indications that the signature on Item #A1 may have been executed by the writer of item #3 [wife of deceased/mother of son]. A1 is the ballot belonging to [her] and #3 are signatures belonging to [her]."

The Yuma DA declined to prosecute, stating: "Insufficient evidence/no conviction likely".

Arizona may need to check, as the statute of limitations has not expired there at 5 years.

Conclusions

While understandable that not all cases should be prosecuted by Yuma, especially as some were not in its jurisdiction in terms of the second ballot, some appeared to indicate voter fraud victims, and one was possibly an honest mistake brought on by the registrar's error, that none were prosecuted was surprising given that some of these voters essentially confessed and the signatures matched the handwriting analysis.

Look Ahead America will follow up with the states of Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and Wisconsin, as they have jurisdiction in some cases and in all of them the statutes of limitations have not yet expired.

How to Help

Volunteer with Look Ahead America at <https://LookAheadAmerica.org/volunteer>.

Support LAA by making a financial contribution at <https://LookAheadAmerica.org/donate>.

Join our Guilded community server at <https://guilded.gg/Look-Ahead-America> (learn how to use Guilded at <https://LookAheadAmerica.org/Guilded>).