

An anonymous election integrity non-profit recently commissioned respected Lansing, Michigan Forensic Analysis firm, Spekin Forensics, LLC to “examine and recount the ballots, envelopes, totals tapes, record books and other documents” from the 2020 election in Detroit. This included all 134 Absent Voter Counting Boards (AVCB’s) and all 503 precincts. The firm’s team spent a month from April 17th to May 17th at the Detroit Department of Elections, where they were permitted to view, but not touch the ballots. The DOE staff handled all ballots and assisted in the counting process.

Key findings of the report, released on July 26th include:

- In two of the 134 counting boards, AVCB’s #79 and #122, the analysts paired up each ballot envelope with its corresponding ballot application. This was a long and painstaking process, according to the team leader, Erich Spekin.

Spekin and his team discovered that a significant percentage of the ballot applications turned up *missing*.

Note: that under Michigan Election Law, a signed absent voter ballot application is an eligibility requirement for absentee voting. MCL 168.759 states clearly:

Subject to section 761(2), a clerk or assistant clerk shall not deliver an absent voter ballot to an applicant who does not sign the application.

Thus, a signed *application* is needed to obtain an absent voter ballot. Yet, in 20% of cases in one Detroit absent voter counting board and 12% in another, *this eligibility requirement was not met*. These ballots were therefore illegitimate and in a non-corrupted election system would have been rejected.

- Spekin extrapolated the 20 and 12 percent numbers and stated:

It would follow that if all the boards were compared in this manner, with approximately 170,000 AV ballots, the range at 8%-20% would be 13,600 to 34,000 ballots with no application requesting the ballot.

Of course, unless and until the rest of the AVCB’s are evaluated, we won’t know if the numbers are higher or lower. However, what we do know is that barring some “miraculous” discovery of the missing ballot applications (which would be highly suspicious after two and half years), we now have documented, *forensic* evidence supportive of election fraud in Detroit. Indeed this evidence can now be combined with the eyewitness evidence of the numerous challengers’ affidavits as documented in the author’s and MC4EI’s *TCF Timeline: the 2020 Election in Detroit*. * That report found that the central marker for fraud was the fact that so many challengers reported seeing ballots not found in the poll books, meaning they were not listed in the precinct-specific download of that section of the state voter roll. In Michigan it’s known as the Qualified Voter File or QVF.

Normally, voted ballots in Michigan are “received into the QVF” at the clerk’s office after the voter first requests and later submits a signed absentee ballot application. In 2020, that was the law (it has since been changed by Democrats seemingly bent on removing any and all safeguards against fraud). This ballot analysis raises a serious question: how did these ballots apparently circumvent the normal process, become mixed in with, and presumably get counted along with, legitimate ballots, despite their not being sent out pursuant to a signed ballot application?

When this author led a team of challengers at the same TCF Center (re-named Huntington Place) on November 8th, 2022, the identical scenario unfolded, starting at approximately 4:30 pm, when GOP and non-partisan challengers from across the counting board began reporting multiple ballots that were not showing up in the electronic poll book. Soon, the majority of ballots were not listed and they continued to appear well into the early morning hours of November 9th, by which time thousands of these unlisted ballots had been counted.

From the outset, GOP and non-partisan challengers attempted to challenge the ballots, but the election inspectors were told to truncate the process after merely logging the challenge. They purposely left out the most important step in the challenge procedure – writing the ballot number on the body of the ballot after its stub was removed (the number is then covered with a colored tape for privacy).

This is the proper procedure prescribed by Michigan Election Law and allows the ballot to be retrieved later by canvassers, or through a court order. If found to be ineligible, such a ballot and all its votes can be “backed out” of the final results. By omitting the ballot-numbering step in the procedure, they effectively anonymize the challenged ballot so that it can never be retrieved, thereby rendering the “challenge” effectively meaningless.

However, when our challenger leadership team confronted the Detroit Clerk’s Senior Advisor, Chris Thomas, in the center of the room, insisting that these ballots be challenged in the proper way, he flatly refused, saying “there’s no way we’re going to put that ballot number on there and that tape over it. Not happening.” He said this despite having sent an email to the challenger credentialing bodies only three days earlier outlining the proper procedure.

- The report flushes out the atrocious 70% of imbalanced counting boards, (where the number of ballots counted by the tabulator doesn’t match the number of physical ballots in the ballot box). This was originally reported by the Wayne Board of Canvassers back in November, 2020, but this report gives an idea of the magnitude of the discrepancies. For example:

In AV 49 the total we counted within the ballots present in the presidential race for Biden is 902, however, the total reported as votes cast and counted for AV board is 965 for Biden. It is unclear where these additional 63 votes would have come from as they are not present in the ballots presented. Duplicate scanning and counting of ballots is possible and could account for this discrepancy but the computer and system data including the scans of the ballots from the tabulators would need to be examined to confirm or deny this possibility.

The report gives many examples of large discrepancies (ie 20-60 ballots) in the 134 counting boards and described “dozens” more. When there is a higher ballot count on the tabulator than actual physical ballots, it raises the possibility that individual ballots were run through the tabulator multiple times. This supports what we challengers saw on the ground those two days in 2020 and undercuts so-called expert pronouncements on the topic.

- The forensics team noted that a sub-group of the ballots inspected looked different from the majority of ballots. The workers at the Department of elections commented that that ballots in one group felt thinner and lighter than the other. Although not permitted to examine the ballots themselves, they took photographs, which showed that the print on one group of ballots was clearly lighter than the other. Per the report:

At the same time when this printing anomaly was noted, many of the City of Detroit staff commented to each member of my team that the ballot paper felt different on some of the ballots. We were unable to touch the paper or examine completely to determine this. It occurred while the representative was flipping the ballots, some were sticking to one another, and they made comments that some ballots felt thicker than others. In my opinion, further examination should occur on these ballots and AV boards to confirm these differences, the number of instances where this may have occurred, patterns that may exist on voting on the different paper stock, and any further determinations that can be made from either paper that exists. This can be crucial evidence in light of the possibility of additional ballots being introduced as discussed in affidavits and evidenced by videos.

Could “additional ballots being introduced” be ballots not lawfully requested through a registered voter’s signed ballot application? We now have forensic evidence from a team of trained crime scene investigators that shows that in the two counting boards where they matched ballot envelopes with their corresponding ballot applications, a significant percentage of the applications were missing, which strongly suggests that those ballots were not eligible and, in an uncorrupted election system, would have been rejected. At a time when many ardent, election integrity champions have reluctantly moved on from the 2020 Election, perhaps, in Michigan at least, it is time to dig even deeper.

* GOP/non-partisan challengers attesting in sworn statements to each seeing these unlisted ballots in the *thousands* were Matt Seely, Bob Cushman, Jason Humes, John McGrath, and Chris Schornak. The latter alone estimated “at least 8 thousand ballots that could not be verified.” Keep in mind; these challengers operated at different locations throughout a massive Central Counting Board with 134 individual counting boards scattered throughout TCF Center.

