IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DSCC, et al., *Plaintiffs*, v. DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as President of the United States, *et al.*, *Defendants*.	Case No. 1:26-CV-3674

FEDERAL DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' INTERROGATORY No. 1

On October 29, 2026, the Court ordered that the government respond to Interrogatory No. 1 of Plaintiffs' requests for expedited discovery. *See* Minute Order (Oct. 29, 2026). Plaintiffs' Interrogatory No. 1 seeks the following:

> Identify all States where Defendants have sent state or local election officials communications demanding or requesting that they (i) remove specific registered voters from their statewide voter registration lists; (ii) refuse to issue ballots to specific registered voters; or (iii) segregate, or otherwise not count and tabulate, any ballots returned by specific registered voters for the upcoming November 3, 2026 General Election.

As the Court ordered, the relevant time period for this request is from July 1, 2026 through the date of the government's response. Consistent with this Court's and Plaintiffs' counsel's statements at the hearing, Defendants understand their response at this time to be limited to "formal communications." *See* Transcript of Oct. 29, 2026 Hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Expedited Discovery and Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Hr'g Tr.)

at 40:4-15; *see also id.* at 39:13-18 (Pls' Counsel: "Your Honor, if I may, I think what we're trying to get is just a very basic question here. And it's, you know, which jurisdictions and where has DOJ and DHS sent these demands or made similar demands about segregating ballots, removing voters, and not issuing ballots to certain voters?").

Defendants respond to Plaintiffs' Interrogatory as follows:

OBJECTIONS TO DEFINITIONS

1. Defendants object to Definition No. 1 on the ground that it is overbroad to the extent that it purports to include entire federal agencies, multiple agency components, every United States Attorney's Office, and all officers, employees, and agents, and to the extent it purports to include DHS and DOJ components not named in this lawsuit. Defendant DHS is responding on behalf of named Defendant DHS. Defendants further object to Definition No. 1 on the ground that it is overbroad and not proportional to the needs of the case because it includes, among other individuals, all of Defendants' thousands of current and former employees regardless of their position and regardless of their involvement in the events giving rise to the claims or defenses in this case. Defendants will construe this definition, and the requests generally, to be limited to seek information from persons who are reasonably likely to have information relevant to the claims or defenses in these cases and responsive to Plaintiffs' interrogatory.

2. Defendants object to Definition No. 2 on the ground that it is overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and vague, because it encompasses every conceivable transmission of information. Defendants further object to Definition No. 2 because the phrase "and other electronically stored data" is vague. Defendants further object to Definition No. 2 to the extent it requires inquiry into informal oral communications, conversations, or meetings not memorialized in any record. Defendants will construe this definition, consistent with the colloquies at the October 29, 2026 hearing, to refer to formal, written communications, consistent with the types of letters sent by the Department of Justice on Oct. 13, 2026 and attached to Plaintiffs' motion, ECF No. 19-2, at Exhibit Z.

3. Defendants object to Definition No. 3 on the ground that it is overly broad, vague, and does not reflect any plain language reading of the words "demanding" or "requesting." The terms "directing," "urging," "instructing," and "asking" are subjective and may encompass the government's advocacy, routine communications, or informational exchanges. The phrase "any specific action" is vague and overly broad. The phrase "warning of civil, criminal, or other associated penalty if the official does not do so" is overly broad. Defendants further object to Definition No. 3 on the ground that it is argumentative because the definition characterizes communications in a manner favorable to Plaintiffs' case theory. Defendants will construe this definition, consistent with the colloquies at the October 29, 2026 hearing, to refer to formal, written communications, consistent with the types of letters sent by the Department of Justice on Oct. 13, 2026 and attached to Plaintiffs' motion, ECF No. 19-2, at Exhibit Z.

4. Defendants object to Definition No. 4 on the ground that it is overbroad and not proportional to the needs of the case to the extent that it includes counsel and other employees with responsibilities not related to Plaintiffs' allegations.

5. Defendants object to Definition No. 5 on the ground that it is overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and vague. Defendants object on the ground that the phrase "inclusion on any list, spreadsheet, file, or electronic device" is overbroad and ambiguous.

6. Defendants object to Definition No. 6 on the ground that it is overbroad and not proportional to the needs of the case because it includes actions that merely "distinguish in any way." Defendants further object on the ground that it is vague in terms of what qualifies under the definition. Defendants further object to the extent that the definition encompasses ordinary election administration procedures not intended to be encompassed by the interrogatories.

7. Defendants object to Definition No. 7 on the ground that it is overbroad, not proportional to the needs of the case, and burdensome because it requires detailed information regarding communications, including titles, dates, creators, recipients, and Bates numbers. Defendants object to the extent it attempts to impose supplementation requirements beyond those required by the Federal Rules or Court order.

8. Defendants object to Definition No. 8 on the ground that it is vague and ambiguous because it includes "any plan, decision, or proposal" and matters merely "under consideration." Defendants further object to the extent that it seeks information regarding tentative deliberations rather than finalized decisions. Defendants further object to the extent that it seeks privileged communications.

OBJECTIONS TO INSTRUCTIONS

9. Defendants object to all Plaintiffs' instructions, and Instruction Nos. 2 and 3 in particular, to the extent they purport to impose obligations beyond those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendants object to Instruction No. 2 to the extent that it is inconsistent with Rule 26(e) because it attempts to impose supplementation requirements beyond those required by the Federal Rules or Court order. Defendants further object on the ground that Instruction No. 2 is unduly burdensome in that it requires supplementation within 24 hours.

10. Defendants object to Instruction No. 2 to the extent that it is inconsistent with Instruction No. 1, vague, and overly burdensome on the government.

Interrogatory No. 1

INTERROGATORY NO. 1

Identify all States where Defendants have sent state or local election officials communications demanding or requesting that they (i) remove specific registered voters from their statewide voter registration lists; (ii) refuse to issue ballots to specific registered voters; or (iii) segregate, or otherwise not count and tabulate, any ballots returned by specific registered voters for the upcoming November 3, 2026 General Election.

Defendants' Objections: Defendants object to this interrogatory because the letters issued by DHS are not responsive and are not within the scope of this interrogatory. Plaintiffs attached the

following letters from DHS as exhibits to the Declaration of Uzoma Nkwonta (ECF No. 19-2) in Support of Plaintiffs' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order:

- Exhibit K: A July 16, 2026 Letter from DHS to the California Secretary of State
- Exhibit L: A July 16, 2026 Letter from DHS to the Nevada Secretary of State
- Exhibit M: A July 16, 2026 Letter from DHS to the Pennsylvania Secretary of State

These letters do not request to remove voters, to not issue certain ballots, or to segregate certain ballots. Rather, these letters ask state election officials to work with DHS to verify whether individuals identified in a preliminary analysis are non-citizens who are registered to vote. The letters further state that DHS's review found potential matches suggesting a certain number of registered voters may be non-citizens and offers to provide immigration records and assistance so the state can determine eligibility and take any appropriate actions before upcoming federal elections. Therefore, DHS's letters are unresponsive to Interrogatory No. 1. Nevertheless, and without conceding that these letters fall within the scope of Interrogatory 1, DHS has provided a list of states in the below response where DHS sent state or local election officials letters similar to those sent to California, Nevada, and Pennsylvania, and attached as Exhibits K-M to Plaintiffs' Declaration.

Response: Subject to the foregoing objections and based on Defendants' reasonable inquiry as of October 30, 2026, the following are the States identified under Defendants' construction of Interrogatory No. 1:

DOJ[1]

[1] On October 29, 2026, the Office of the Deputy Attorney General sent letters to all states reminding them of their obligation under 52 U.S.C. § 20701 to ensure preservation "for a period of twenty-two months from the date of any .

The State of California

The State of Washington

DHS

The State of California

The State of Nevada

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

The State of New Jersey

Dated: October 30, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

JOSEPH E. BORSON
Assistant Branch Director

/s/ Kathryn Barragan
Kathryn Barragan (DC Bar No. 90026294)
Trial Attorney
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 598-7696
Email: Kathryn.e.barragan@usdoj.gov

Abigail Nusbaum (FL Bar No. 1059558)
Trial Attorney
U.S. Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
Tel: (202) 451-7304
Email: Abigail.S.Nusbaum@usdoj.gov

. . [federal] election" of all records requisite to voting. Defendants maintain that these letters are not responsive to Interrogatory No. 1.

Counsel for Defendants

DHS Verification

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing interrogatory response of the United States Department of Homeland Security, as to Plaintiffs' First Interrogatory dated October 23, 2026, is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge based on information personally known to me and information that was made known to me in the course of my official duties.

Dated: October 30, 2026

JULIANA J BLACKWELL

Digitally signed by JULIANA J BLACKWELL
Date: 2026.10.30 11:47:13 -04'00'

Juliana Blackwell
Deputy Executive Secretary
Office of the Executive Secretary
U.S. Department of Homeland Security

DHS Verification

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing interrogatory response of the United States Department of Homeland Security,as to Plaintiffs' First Interrogatory dated October 23, 2026, is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge based on information personally known to me and information that was made known to me in the course of my official duties.

Dated: October 30, 2026

_____

DOJ Verification

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing interrogatory response of the United States Department of Justice, as to Plaintiffs' First Interrogatory dated October 23, 2026, is true and correct, to the best of my knowledge based on information personally known to me and information that was made known to me in the course of my official duties.

Dated: October 30, 2026

Brian Hawkins
Intergovernmental Liaison
Office of Legislative Affairs
Department of Justice