

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
ORLANDO DIVISION**

FLORIDA RISING TOGETHER, INC.
and FLORIDA RISING, INC.

Plaintiffs,

v.

CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as
Secretary of State for the State of Florida, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CIVIL CASE NO. 6:24-cv-01682

CHALLENGE TO THE
CONSTITUTIONALITY OF
FLORIDA STATUTE 97.053(6)

DECLARATORY RELIEF
REQUESTED

PERMANENT INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF REQUESTED

FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs Florida Rising Together, Inc. (“Florida Rising Together”), as an organization, and Florida Rising, Inc. (“Florida Rising”), on behalf of its members, by and through their undersigned attorneys, as and for their First Amended Complaint against Defendants, allege as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. This action seeks declaratory and injunctive relief to stop the Florida Secretary of State and 13 Supervisors of Elections from using the Exact Match Protocol to verify voter-registration applications that is preventing nearly 80,000 otherwise eligible Florida voter registration applicants from registering to vote, including thousands of

applicants who were registered to vote by Florida Rising Together, and including applicants who are members of Florida Rising. If the Exact Match Protocol is not enjoined, it will continue to unlawfully disenfranchise eligible applicants registered by Florida Rising Together, members of Florida Rising, and tens of thousands of other eligible Florida voters, the vast majority of whom are people of color.¹

2. Under Florida law, before adding an otherwise eligible voter to the rolls, election officials must verify the authenticity or nonexistence of the applicant's driver license number or the last four digits of their social security number, as applicable (collectively, Personal Identification Number, or "PIN"). Fla. Stat. §§ 97.053(2), (6).

3. Defendants, their predecessors, and other Florida election officials have developed and rely on an Exact Match Protocol to verify applicants' PINs. Under the Exact Match Protocol, information is deemed verified only when, across multiple databases maintained by local, state, and federal agencies, there is an exact, character-by-character

¹ This Complaint challenges the Florida Exact Match Protocol as applied by the Secretary of State and County Supervisors of Elections named as Defendants. In its order dismissing the Original Complaint, the Court stated that "Florida Rising offers no distinction for initiating the instant action against" fewer than all 67 County Election Supervisors when seeking statewide relief. Dkt. No.102, at 6-7. Having carefully reviewed the Court's order, controlling jurisprudence regarding standing, and the as applied nature of the claims in this litigation, Plaintiffs have named as Defendants all Supervisors of Elections in counties where Florida Rising Together has registered a substantial number of applicants who have been placed in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol and where Florida Rising has a large number of members, including members in "unverified" status. Plaintiffs limit the scope of the relief sought to those same counties. Defendants named are the only parties necessary to provide complete relief on all the claims asserted here. The inclusion of County Supervisors where Florida Rising Together does not register voters or where Florida Rising does not have members would be inconsistent with the nature of this action and unnecessarily waste judicial resources and time for the Court and all parties.

match of the applicant's identifying information. Specifically, if an applicant's first name, last name, residential address, date of birth, and PIN in the Florida Voter Registration System ("FVRS")—as input by the Supervisor of Elections—do not exactly match a record maintained by the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles ("DHSMV") or the federal Social Security Administration ("SSA"), the application is considered "unverified".

4. Eligible applicants can get caught up in the Exact Match Protocol for a variety of benign reasons, including but not limited to data entry errors, typos, and computer glitches; middle, compound, or hyphenated names in one record but not another; misreading handwriting or transposing a single letter or number when inputting an applicant's information; omitting or adding a hyphen, accent mark, initial, or tilde in an applicant's name; or entering an extra character or space. Any one of these can cause an applicant's PIN to be "unmatched"—and considered by the state as unverified—through no fault of the applicant.

5. Even though none of these common errors relate to a voter's eligibility to vote, a failure to match is often the only thing keeping otherwise eligible voters' applications from being considered verified, leaving them *presumptively ineligible* and denying them the right to vote.

6. A determination that a voter registration application is incomplete or "unverified" due to the Exact Match Protocol can have severe consequences, shifting the burden to the applicant to take onerous steps to provide documentation. If the applicant cannot provide this information before the election, the applicant risks not being able to vote at all or being relegated to casting a provisional ballot, which will not be counted

unless the applicant “cures” the issue by providing the requested information to election officials no later than 5 p.m. on the second day following the election. In practice, a substantial number of provisional ballots cast by these otherwise eligible voters are not counted.²

7. Suzan Hammack Bach, a Duval County resident over 65 and living outside the United States, is an example of how a voter can become ensnared by the Exact Match Protocol. Ms. Bach faced repeated denials of her voter registration applications due to Florida’s Exact Match Protocol and Duval County’s adherence to it. After multiple voter registration applications, the Division of Elections repeatedly marked her status as unverified, even after she provided several forms of identification. Indeed, each new submission triggered yet another round of verification demands. On Election Day 2024, a ballot was finally emailed to her, yet technical problems prevented her from accessing it, forcing her to rely on filling out a blank Federal Write-in Absentee Ballot instead, which resulted in her not voting in Florida statewide initiative elections that were important to her. Ms. Bach’s experience underscores significant challenges in the voter registration and verification process under Florida’s Exact Match Protocol.

8. Florida deploys the Exact Match Protocol with regularity on those who apply to register to vote with paper forms, while individuals who register online or at a motor vehicle office are almost entirely immune from being flagged as “unverified.” Third-party voter registration organizations like Florida Rising Together assist applicants with

² This disparity is due in part to the costs attendant to “curing” a provisional ballot, which in Florida requires making a special trip to the local election supervisor’s office after the election is over and after unofficial results are known—but only within a compressed two-day time frame (by 5:00 p.m. on the first Thursday after the election).

completing and submitting such paper forms through voter- registration drives. Black and other voters of color rely on paper forms and third-party voter registration drives at higher rates than do white voters. Given the high rates of false non-matches and low rates of curing, the Exact Match Protocol disproportionately disenfranchises people of color.

9. Florida's Exact Match Protocol is compounded by a legacy of historic and deliberate disenfranchisement and interacts with the effects of racial and economic discrimination to restrict access to the franchise. The Protocol raises additional barriers to register to vote, primarily for Black and other voters of color, denying them an equal opportunity to participate in Florida's political process. Since 2018, the Exact Match Protocol has prevented tens of thousands of otherwise-eligible applicants with "unverified" identifying information from being registered to vote. Indeed, nearly 80,000 Florida voter registrants are currently ineligible to vote solely due to the Exact Match Protocol. More than 5,800 applicants who were registered by Florida Rising Together, the vast majority of whom are persons of color, are currently in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Moreover, nearly 150 members of Florida Rising are currently in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

10. Not all Floridians bear this risk of disenfranchisement equally: Black and other applicants of color are much more likely to be rejected as "unverified" than white voters. Of the 79,447 applicants whose registrations have been held up due to the Exact Match Protocol, only 9% identify as white. By comparison, more than 55% of Florida's registered voters identify as white. Meanwhile, Black and Latino registrants are disproportionately being kept off the rolls due to the Exact Match Protocol. More than 57% of the registrants on the Exact Match "unverified" list identify as Black or Latino, which is

a much higher percentage than their share of the Florida registered voter pool (approximately 33%). Black voter registration applicants are put in “unverified” status at a rate (approximately 32%) nearly three times their share of the registrant pool (approximately 12%).

11. The Exact Match Protocol also has disparate geographical effects. Registrants from diverse, relatively urban Miami-Dade, Broward, Duval, and Orange Counties collectively account for over 60% of applicants who have not made it onto the rolls due to the Exact Match Protocol, even though those four counties account for approximately one-fourth of Florida’s registered voters.

12. Florida’s use of an Exact Match Protocol to verify applicants’ information, and its consequent disenfranchisement of voters, particularly Floridians of color, violates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (“NVRA”), and the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. These constitutional and statutory violations deprive tens of thousands of voters of the fundamental right to vote and require imposing appropriate declaratory and injunctive relief.

13. Unless the Court grants the relief requested herein by Plaintiffs, Florida’s Exact Match Protocol will continue to have a discriminatory impact on Florida Rising Together, Florida Rising, and Black citizens and other citizens of color across Florida. The Protocol will continue to impose severe burdens on Floridians’ fundamental right to vote.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

14. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, as a case arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States; under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, as a case seeking to enforce rights and privileges secured by

the Constitution and laws of the United States; and under 52 U.S.C. § 20510, which provides for jurisdiction of actions brought under the NVRA.

15. This Court has jurisdiction to grant declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202.

16. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because they do business in, and are elected or appointed officers of, the State of Florida and counties within the State of Florida.

17. Venue is proper in this district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) and 52 U.S.C. § 20510 because a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district and/or the violations took place in this district.

PARTIES

18. Plaintiff Florida Rising Together is a nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing economic and racial justice across Florida by building power in historically marginalized communities. Florida Rising Together is a 501(c)(3) nonpartisan, grassroots organization with a mission to increase the political power of marginalized people and excluded constituencies.

19. To that end, Florida Rising Together conducts massive voter registration, voter education, voter engagement, and election protection programs in numerous counties across Florida. Florida Rising Together registers, educates, and empowers Floridians to organize in their own communities to advance equity and fairness across the state. With thousands of members across Florida, Florida Rising Together is a leading voice for racial justice and expanding democracy in the state.

20. Florida's Exact Match Protocol is forcing Florida Rising Together to divert its limited resources to resolve voter- registration problems for Floridians they assist with

registering to vote. This frustrates a core component of Florida Rising Together's mission by interfering with its ability to register Floridians to vote. Some of the individuals who have had their voter registration applications delayed or denied due to the Exact Match Protocol were registered by Florida Rising Together or had been contacted by Florida Rising Together as part of their voter registration and get-out-the-vote work.

21. For many years, Florida Rising Together has assisted voters who are confused about their voter registration status and adversely impacted by the Exact Match Protocol. In light of the magnitude of the Exact Match Protocol's harm, Florida Rising Together has been forced to launch an outreach program designed specifically to contact individuals whose facially valid, timely voter registration applications have been denied or placed in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Florida Rising Together staff, in connection with their program, help impacted applicants navigate the barriers to registration erected by the Exact Match Protocol, so that they can vote. This outreach includes calling applicants in Broward, Duval, Gadsen, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties who have been placed in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Undertaking the program and responding to public confusion about registration status stemming from the Exact Match Protocol has required Florida Rising Together to deploy staff and other resources that would otherwise be devoted to the organization's core voter registration, voter education, and get-out-the-vote work. Because Florida Rising Together has diverted its resources to assist those denied or delayed access to the voter rolls because of the Exact Match Protocol, it is unable to reach as many other potential registrants as it would otherwise be capable of reaching.

22. While Florida Rising Together does not operate in all 67 Florida counties, Florida Rising Together has worked in Broward, Duval, Gadsen, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties to, among other things, register voters, educate voters about their voting rights, and assist voters whom they have previously registered to navigate and counteract the harms of the Exact Match Protocol.

23. The Exact Match Protocol has had a particularly harmful effect on the ongoing voter registration efforts of Florida Rising Together. While Florida Rising Together's investigation remains ongoing, so far, the organization has determined that more than 5,800 otherwise eligible applicants who Florida Rising Together attempted to register to vote are in "unverified" status—and not on Florida's voter rolls—solely due to the Exact Match Protocol. Those applicants, who predominantly identify as Black or non-white, live in the counties where Florida Rising Together has a significant presence and has worked to register voters, educate voters about their voting rights, and assist voters whom they have previously registered to navigate and counteract the harms of the Exact Match Protocol.

24. So far—its investigation is ongoing—Florida Rising Together has determined that the following numbers of applicants who were registered by Florida Rising Together are in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol: more than 1,300 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Miami-Dade County, nearly 800 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Broward County, more than 850 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Orange County, more than 1,000 unverified applicants Florida Rising

Together attempted to register in Duval County, more than 450 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Leon County, more than 350 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Hillsborough County, more than 150 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Polk County, more than 150 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Seminole County, approximately 100 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Gadsden County, approximately 100 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Pinellas County, nearly 50 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Volusia County, approximately 25 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Osceola County, and more than 20 unverified applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in Palm Beach County. All of these applicants' registration statuses were determined to be unverified as of August 2025 because of the Exact Match Protocol despite Defendant Supervisors having deemed them otherwise eligible to vote.

25. Plaintiff Florida Rising, Inc., is a 501(c)(4) grassroots, nonprofit, organization. Its mission is to build independent political power that centers historically marginalized communities and everyday Floridians. Florida Rising organizes multi-racial movements, supports legislative and policy changes, and works to foster state and local policies that allow Floridians to be safe, happy, healthy, and whole.

26. Florida Rising is a people-powered organization made up of members advancing economic and racial justice across Florida. Florida Rising and its members educate, register, and mobilize voters as one key way of holding politicians accountable and making their voices heard. Florida Rising has more than 100,000 members. Many of

those members live in Broward, Duval, Gadsen, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties.

27. Florida Rising's members include individuals who have been impacted or are at risk of being impacted by the Exact Match Protocol. These people are *eligible* voter registration applicants who, because of the Exact Match Protocol, have had or will in the future have their facially complete voter registration forms deemed "unverified" and who, as a direct result of the Exact Match Protocol, will not be registered to vote. So far—its investigation is ongoing— Florida Rising has identified nearly 150 members of the organization who are currently in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol. They include more than 40 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Miami-Dade County, more than 30 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Broward County, more than 30 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Orange County, approximately 15 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Duval County, 5 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Osceola County, 3 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Pinellas County, 2 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Polk County, 2 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Leon County, 2 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Hillsborough County, 2 currently unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Palm Beach County, and 1 currently unverified applicant who is a Florida Rising member in Volusia County.

28. As part of its ongoing investigation, Florida Rising has identified 289 members of the organization who were previously in "unverified" status due to the Exact

Match Protocol and subsequently made it onto the voter rolls. They include nearly 90 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Miami-Dade County, nearly 50 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Broward County, approximately 40 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Orange County, nearly 20 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Duval County, more than 10 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Osceola County, 7 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Pinellas County, more than 10 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Polk County, 7 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Leon County, nearly 20 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Hillsborough County, nearly 20 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Palm Beach County, 2 previously unverified applicants who are Florida Rising members in Volusia County, and 1 previously unverified applicant who is a Florida Rising member in Gadsden County.

29. Defendant Cord Byrd is sued in his official capacity as the Honorable Secretary of State for the State of Florida. Defendant Byrd serves as Florida's Chief Election Officer. Defendant Byrd is responsible for obtaining and maintaining uniformity in the interpretation and implementation of the election laws, including the Florida statute challenged herein. Defendant Byrd is responsible for maintaining and administering the official, centralized, statewide FVRS system and is charged with ensuring the accuracy of FVRS. Defendant Byrd's responsibilities include the Exact Match Protocol's matching and county notification processes conducted through the FVRS system. Defendant Byrd's office has signed memoranda of understanding with state and federal agencies to

facilitate the sharing of information contained in the statewide voter registration database, as well as the driver license information and social security information necessary to conduct the Exact Match Protocol.

30. Defendant Byrd's office bears responsibility, at least in part, for verifying the authenticity or nonexistence of the driver license number, the Florida identification card number, or the last four digits of the social security number provided by voter registration applicants in Florida.

31. Defendant Joe Scott is sued in his official capacity as the Broward County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Scott enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Scott's office has placed nearly 800 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and more than 30 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

32. Defendant Jerry Holland is sued in his official capacity as the Duval County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Holland enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other

processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Holland's office has placed more than 1,000 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and approximately 15 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

33. Defendant Craig Latimer is sued in his official capacity as the Hillsborough County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Latimer enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Latimer's office has placed more than 350 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and 2 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

34. Defendant Kenya Ponder Williams is sued in her official capacity as the Gadsden County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Williams enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Ponder Williams' office has placed approximately 100 eligible

applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

35. Defendant Mark Earley is sued in his official capacity as the Leon County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Earley enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants’ registration applications, determining applicants’ eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Earley’s office has placed more than 450 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and 2 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

36. Defendant Alina Garcia is sued in her official capacity as the Miami-Dade County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Garcia enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants’ registration applications, determining applicants’ eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Garcia’s office has placed more than 1,300 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and more than 40 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

37. Defendant Karen Castor Dentel is sued in her official capacity as the Orange County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Castor Dentel enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Castor Dentel's office has placed more than 850 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and more than 30 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

38. Defendant Mary Jane Arrington is sued in her official capacity as the Osceola County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Arrington enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Arrington's office has placed approximately 25 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and 5 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

39. Defendant Wendy Sartory Link is sued in her official capacity as the Palm Beach County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Link enforces the Exact Match Protocol

by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Link's office has placed more than 20 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and 2 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

40. Defendant Julie Marcus is sued in her official capacity as the Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Marcus enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Marcus' office has placed approximately 100 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and 3 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

41. Defendant Melony Bell is sued in her official capacity as the Polk County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Bell enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants,

administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Bell's office has placed more than 150 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register and 2 eligible applicants who are Florida Rising members in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

42. Defendant Amy Pennock is sued in her official capacity as the Seminole County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Pennock enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Pennock's office has placed more than 150 eligible applicants Florida Rising Together attempted to register in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

43. Defendant Lisa Lewis is sued in her official capacity as the Volusia County Supervisor of Elections. Defendant Lewis enforces the Exact Match Protocol by, among other things, processing impacted applicants' registration applications, determining applicants' eligibility, notifying impacted applicants when they are placed in unverified status due to the Exact Match Protocol, communicating with those applicants, administering the curing process, and overseeing the provisional ballot process and other processes impacting voters placed in unverified or rejected status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Defendant Lewis' office has placed nearly 50 eligible applicants Florida Rising

Together attempted to register and 1 eligible applicant who is a Florida Rising member in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

44. Copies of the notice letters advising Defendants of the NVRA violations described herein are attached as **Exhibit 1** and **Exhibit 2**.

FACTS AND BACKGROUND

A. The Help America Vote Act Does Not Require Using An Exact Match Protocol

45. The Help America Vote Act (“HAVA”) requires the State of Florida to maintain a centralized, computerized, statewide voter registration database as the single system for storing and managing Florida’s official list of registered voters. 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(1)(A).

46. All voter registration information obtained by Florida Supervisors of Elections must be electronically entered into the database on an expedited basis at the time the information is provided to them. The registration database must be coordinated with other agency databases within the state.

47. Voter registration applicants who have been issued a current and valid driver license must provide their driver license or state identification number (collectively, “DLN”) on the application. 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(5)(A). Applicants who lack a current DLN must provide the last four digits of their Social Security Number (“SSN4”). *Id.* If an applicant has not been issued either a driver license or SSN, Florida must still process the application and “assign the applicant a number which will serve to identify the applicant for voter registration purposes.” *Id.* Under HAVA, each legally registered voter in the state must be assigned a “unique identifier.” 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(1)(A).

48. HAVA requires that Defendant Byrd—Florida’s Chief Election Official—enter into an agreement with the head of Florida’s Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles (DHSMV) “to match information” in their respective databases “to the extent required to enable each such official to verify the accuracy of the information provided on applications for voter registration.” 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(5)(B). Further, DHSMV must enter into an agreement with the Commissioner of the Social Security Administration (SSA) for the same purpose. *Id.*

49. HAVA does not require that anything be done with the output of the matching of voter registration applicants’ information with data maintained by state motor vehicle agencies or the federal Social Security Administration.

50. HAVA does not mandate that voter registration applications be declined if the applicant’s voter registration record fails to match records in the DHSMV or SSA databases. See 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(5)(B).

51. The vast majority of states do not reject voter registration applications if the applicant’s voter registration record fails to match fields in the DHSMV or SSA databases.

52. In Pennsylvania, for example, if the “information cannot be verified,” the statewide voter registration database prompts the county voter registration commission to review the application for typographical errors and/or contact the voter to clarify and fix the discrepancy, but the county ultimately would approve the voter registration application provided that there are no independent grounds for rejecting the application. See Letter to Maureen Riordan, July 23, 2025, **Exhibit 3** at 9.

53. Similarly, in Ohio, voters are not removed from the voter rolls “solely because information in the voter registration system doesn’t match ID information from

the [Bureau of Motor Vehicles] or SSA.” Ohio Secretary of State, Ohio Election Official Manual Directive 2025-36 at 34 (2025), <https://www.ohiosos.gov/globalassets/elections/directives/2025/eom/dir2025-36-ch04.pdf>.

54. Georgia law provides that, in the event of a non-match of the applicant’s name, driver’s license number, social security number, or date of birth with information contained in the state driver’s license database or the federal SSA database, the applicant shall nevertheless be registered to vote. See O.C.G.A. 21-2-220.1(b).

55. Courts have routinely recognized that HAVA does not mandate that voter registration applications be declined if the applicant’s voter registration record fails to match fields in the DHSMV or SSA databases. *Fla. State Conf. of the NAACP v. Browning*, 522 F.3d 1153, 1169 n.16, 1171–72 (11th Cir. 2008); *Washington Ass’n of Churches v. Reed*, 492 F. Supp. 2d 1264, 1268–69 (W.D. Wash. 2006); *Morales v. Handel*, No. 1:08-CV-3172, 2008 WL 9401054, at *7–8 (N.D. Ga. Oct. 27, 2008).

B. The Requirements For Voter Registration Set Forth By Florida Law

56. Article VI, Section 2 of the Florida Constitution imposes three requirements on Floridians who seek to exercise their right to vote. An individual is eligible to vote if he or she is registered and: (1) a citizen of the United States; (2) at least 18 years old; and (3) a Florida permanent resident.

57. Article VI, Section 4 of the Florida Constitution provides two narrow circumstances under which otherwise eligible persons may be disqualified from voting: (1) the person is convicted of a felony and has not completed of all terms of their sentence, including parole or probation; or (2) the person is adjudicated to be mentally incompetent.

58. Under Florida law, Floridians otherwise eligible to vote must register to vote—i.e. submit voter registration applications—at least 29 days before a scheduled election to be eligible to vote in that election. Fla. Stat. §§ 97.053(3)–(4), 97.055(1)(a).

59. Floridians may submit voter-registration applications through multiple methods. Fla. Stat. § 97.053(1). Paper applications can be hand delivered by the applicant or a third party or mailed to a variety of offices, including any Supervisor of Elections, the Department of State’s Division of Elections, or DHSMV, among others. Fla. Stat. § 97.053(1). Additionally, applicants may submit applications online. Fla. Stat. § 97.0525. Further, applicants may submit electronic applications through DHSMV. See Fla. Admin. Code (“FAC”) § 1S-2.039(5) (“FVRS Voter Registration Procedures”).

60. According to Florida law, a voter registration application is complete when a voter registration official receives all information necessary to establish the applicant’s eligibility and that information is “verified pursuant to subsection (6).” Fla. Stat. § 97.053(2). “[S]ubsection (6)” provides that an application “may be accepted as valid only after the department has verified the authenticity or nonexistence of the [PIN] provided by the applicant.” Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6); *accord.* FAC § 1S-2.039(5).³

³ If an applicant indicates that they do not have a PIN, the application is complete once voter registration officials verify the nonexistence of a PIN. If officials determine a PIN exists, the applicant is required to resolve the matter. If the applicant does not provide a PIN, or provides an incomplete PIN, but does not indicate that they do not have a PIN, the application is deemed incomplete. FAC 1S-2.039(5)(b)–(c). The applicant can resolve the issue by providing a copy of their driver license, state identification card, or social security card.

61. Florida law does not specify the mechanism or the means by which that verification must occur, let alone require that an applicant's database records match character-for-character before they can be added to the rolls.

C. Florida Officials Verify Applicants' Information Via an Exact Match Protocol

62. Defendants rely on an Exact Match Protocol to verify applicants' information.. The Exact Match Protocol matches applicants' PIN number, first name, last name, address, and date of birth.

63. Under the Protocol, Supervisors of Elections in Broward, Duval, Gadsen, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties create digital FVRS records for new applicants, route them to the relevant agency, and keep otherwise-eligible applicants the Department deems "unverified" off the voter rolls.

64. Within 13 days of receiving a voter-registration application, Supervisors of Elections must enter an applicant's information from their application into FVRS. Fla. Stat. § 97.053(7). Supervisors must enter information "as it appears," though if a registration official "in unable to discern the correct or intended spelling of the name," they must enter the applicant's name "to the extent possible." FAC § 1S-2039(4)(c).

65. After the Supervisor "first determines that the applicant is otherwise eligible to vote," the Supervisor routes the applicant's FVRS record to the relevant agency, either DHSMV or SSA, to verify the first name, last name, date of birth, residential address, and PIN provided by the applicant and input by the Supervisor. FAC § 1S-2.039(5).

66. For applicants who provide a driver license or identification card number, Supervisors transmit the applicant's FVRS record to DHSMV, which attempts to match

the FVRS record to records contained in its Driver and Vehicle Information Database (“DAVID”). *Id.* For applicants who provide their SSN4, Supervisors transmit the applicant’s FVRS record to SSA, which attempts to match the FVRS record to records contained in its Help America Vote Verification database (“HAVV”). *Id.*

67. The Department of State, under the direction of Secretary Byrd, governs DHSMV’s and SSA’s matching protocols via data-sharing memoranda of understanding (“MOUs”) with each agency.

68. DHSMV and SSA classify FVRS records as “Matched,” “Possibly Matched,” or “Unmatched” and transmit them to either the Supervisors of Elections, or to the Department of State, depending on the matched status.

69. On information and belief, DHSMV and SSA classify FVRS records as “Matched” only if the agencies find an exact, character-by-character match between the applicant’s FVRS record and an agency record across all data fields (first name, last name, date of birth, residential address, and PIN number).

70. This Exact Match Protocol is not codified in or required by any federal or Florida statute or regulation.

71. “Matched” FVRS records are routed back to the Supervisors, who then flag the applicants’ PIN as “Verified” and add them to the rolls as active voters. FAC §§ 1S-2.039(5)(a)(1).

72. “Possibly Matched” and “Unmatched” FVRS records are routed to the Department of State’s Bureau of Voter Registration Services (“BVRs”) for further review. FAC §§ 1S-2.039(5)(a)(2).

73. If BVRS determines that a data entry error occurred, BVRS corrects the FVRS record and re-submits the record to the DHSMV or SSA for matching. BVRS staff use DHSMV's DAVID and a scanned image of the original voter registration application to attempt to resolve the failure to match. *Id.*

74. If BVRS determines that no data entry error occurred, but is able to confirm that the PIN belongs to the applicant, BVRS completes the registration process for that applicant. *Id.*

75. If BVRS is unable to resolve the failure to match, BVRS flags the applicant's FVRS record as "unverified" and sends it to the Supervisor of the applicant's home county for further action. FAC § 1S-2.039(5)(a)(3).

76. SSA's HAVV database, for instance, is widely known to routinely produce inconsistent results and high rates of false negatives i.e. finding "no match" between records belonging to the same person. The SSA's Inspector General evaluated HAVV and found it error-prone, noting among other things that HAVV's no-match response rate was 31 percent and that the HAVV program may indicate a no-match when a match does in fact exist in SSA records due to the limitations of the matching criteria: specifically, HAVV's inability to compensate for typographical errors, other common database errors, and mistakes.

77. The Inspector General's report concluded that the high no-match response rate could hinder the States' ability to determine whether applicants should be allowed to vote, and that the HAVV program provided the States with responses that may have prevented eligible individuals from registering to vote and allowed ineligible individuals to vote.

78. Insistence on character-by-character exactitude when comparing information from one database record with information in a record from a different database is a notoriously unreliable method of verification in the elections context. The process is invariably plagued with errors, especially when the match criteria demand an exact match across numerous data fields. Mismatches between databases can result from innocuous mistakes such as omitting a hyphen or initial, frequently through no fault of the applicant whatsoever. Examples include data entry errors, typos, misreading of imperfect handwriting by elections officials and computer glitches within the State's registration system. None of these common errors relate to a voter's eligibility to vote, yet routinely result in disenfranchisement under the Exact Match Protocol.

79. There are also many other ways in which the records of eligible voters who submit truthful and accurate registration applications may fail to "match." For example, voters who register in their married names may not match if their driver's license or Social Security records are in their maiden names. Voters with compound last names may not match if one database assigns part of the last name to the middle name position, but the other does not. Voters with symbols in their name, such as accent marks, may not match if one database recognizes those symbols and another does not. Finally, the voter's records may not match if the official doing the data entry omits or transposes any digits or characters when entering information from a voter registration application into FVRS, the Florida DHSMV's databases, or the Social Security Administration's records.

80. Eligible voters may also fail to match if there are small discrepancies between their registration applications and DHSMV or SSA records on file. If applicants

unwittingly reverse two digits in their driver's license number or omit a hyphen when filling out their name, their records may not match.

D. Eligible Voters Deemed “Unverified” By Florida’s Exact Match Protocol Face Additional Burdens to Avoid Disenfranchisement

81. In Miami-Dade County alone, since 2018, over 41,000 applications were set aside as “unverified”, with the applicants being sent letters by Supervisors of Elections. According to Supervisors’ own records—not to mention Florida regulations—these “unverified” applications are otherwise valid. Only the Exact Match Protocol prevents them from registering as active voters. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 4** is the letter template used by Miami-Dade County to inform applicants that their information could not be verified.

82. Once an applicant is notified that their application is “unverified,” the burden shifts to them to provide evidence to the Supervisor sufficient to verify their PIN. Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6).

83. State regulations require that Supervisors notify applicants whose records are classified as “unverified.” The notice must be “in, or substantially in, the form provided” by the Secretary of State. FAC § 1S-2.039(5)(a)(3). That notice informs the applicant that “as required by Florida law, the State has attempted but could not verify the . . . Florida driver’s license/Florida identification card or last four digits of the social security number . . . that you provided on your voter registration application.” DS-DE #122 (eff. 01/2012). The notice instructs the applicant to “mail, fax, or e-mail a copy” of the relevant ID card, or bring a copy in person to the county election office. *Id.*

84. If the applicant does not provide the required documents before presenting himself or herself to vote, the applicant is permitted to vote only via provisional ballot. Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6).

85. Provisional ballots are counted only if the applicant provides the required documents to the Supervisor by 5:00 p.m. on the second day following the election. *Id.* In practice, as indicated in **Exhibit 5**, some voters, including voters in Miami-Dade County, are informed that their provisional ballots have not been counted.

86. Some voters never learn that their provisional ballots have been rejected. Broward County, for example, as a matter of policy, does not provide notice to a voter whose provisional ballot is rejected due to the Exact Match Protocol.

87. Several voters in Broward, Duval, Miami-Dade, and Orange Counties, for example, had their provisional ballots rejected in recent elections, including the 2024 general election, due to the Exact Match Protocol.

88. The Exact Match Protocol takes time to execute from beginning to end. Floridians often receive notices in the time leading up to, on, and even after Election Day. The time lag, at a minimum, can sow confusion and leave Floridians uncertain about their eligibility to vote and may prevent voters from presenting identification or preserving their right to vote by casting a provisional ballot

89. The Exact Match Protocol disenfranchises eligible Florida citizens who would otherwise be able to vote without restriction pursuant to state law and would have been able to cast regular ballots that would have been counted.

E. Examples of How Defendants Play an Active Role in this Process

90. Each of the Defendants is directly involved with developing and administering the Exact Match Protocol; each Defendant's actions result in the disenfranchisement of voters resulting from the Exact Match Protocol.

91. On information and belief, the Florida Department of State, BVRS, and the DHSMV have executed approximately four MOUs since October 2012. Pursuant to the MOUs, the DHSMV supplies driver license and identification data to the State for voter registration purposes, including the Exact Match comparison of demographics in DHSMV files to voter-registration applications.

92. The MOUs grant the Secretary of State access to DHSMV's database, commonly referred to as "DAVID." According to an MOU, "[d]ata will be used to provide additional support in the voter registration process, . . . provide[] Deceased records and Change State of Record for verification of Driver license and SSN to implement the Help America Vote Act of 2002[.]"

93. The Secretary of State and the DHSMV have repeatedly amended, extended, and executed new versions of the MOUs. For instance, on August 24, 2020, an amendment was made to specify that "one of the purposes of the existing MOU is to provide driver license and identification card information to [the Secretary of State] so that it may share and exchange voter registration information with ERIC [Electronic Registration Information Center], a nongovernmental entity." And each year, the Secretary of State certifies that it has adequate controls in place to protect personal data from unauthorized access pursuant to the MOU.

94. The Secretary of State is aware that the Exact Match Protocol generates false negatives due to data entry errors, among other reasons. In an internal email justifying the Secretary of State's need for access to DAVID document images, Chief Toshia Brown wrote:

We need access to name, DOB, address array, photo array, signature array, DL, SSN and documents contained in DAVID to properly be able to verify demographic data as it pertains to voter registration and eligibility In the past we have had matches that the ssn, driver's license or name may not match exactly. If we have document images to verify against we can determine if there is a data entry error on the voter registration, felony information or in DAVID We have found some occasions where the DAVID summary screen was incorrect, but there was a document, such as social security card that showed the correct ssn.

95. Supervisors of Elections have a variety of responsibilities under the Exact Match Protocol, including moving applicants from "unverified" status to "active" status if they provide sufficient evidence to verify their identity. See Dkt. No. 70, 11.

96. In Duval County, according to its 2024 Voter Registration Procedures Manual, among the "primary duties" of the Supervisor of Elections is to "[m]aintain accurate voter registration rolls by removing voters . . . no longer eligible to vote in Florida[.]"

97. Duval County's 2024 Voter Registration Procedures Manual details the specific procedures for processing voter registration applications, including how to process a record where the Florida Department of State or BVRS "was not able to verify a match among the voter's name, date of birth and provided identifiers." The manual instructs the election worker to initiate the Exact Match Protocol's notice process.

98. Significantly, in its 2024 Voter Registration Procedures Manual, Duval County strongly urges its workers to carefully check their work and acknowledges that their data entry errors cause voters to be placed in “unverified” status:

Correct data entry is crucial. **Always double-check your work, but especially when entering name, date of birth, Florida Driver License number, Florida Identification Card number, and Social Security number.** Many voters who go into the UNVERIFIED status (and then must provide copies of identity documents) are due to our data entry errors.

99. Duval County training materials provide procedures expressly relating to processing and dealing with applicants who are placed in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol, namely the determination of eligibility through the EViD system, the county’s electronic pollbook system, and when to issue a provisional ballot in the case of ineligibility.

100. Orange County also issues notice letters to applicants determined to be ineligible under Exact Match. Orange County verifies the eligibility of potential voters, provides training procedures relating to eligibility, and issues provisional ballots for voters whose eligibility cannot be determined.

101. In Broward County, according to the County’s Pollworker Training & Procedures Manual, the Supervisor of Elections is the

[C]hief election officer in the county who is legally responsible for the administration and operation of an election and compliance of all federal, state, and local election laws, procedures and policies. The Supervisor has the final authority on issues of election administration, procedures, and questions of voter eligibility.

102. Broward County Supervisor of Elections Office specifically verifies voter eligibility and provides training on eligibility requirements and provisional ballot procedures when eligibility cannot be confirmed.

103. Broward County issues notice letters to applicants placed in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

F. The Exact Match Protocol Resulted in Repeated Denials of a Duval County Voter’s Right to Vote

104. Suzan Hammack Bach is a resident of Duval County who is over 65 and living outside the United States. Ms. Bach faced repeated denials of her right to vote due to Florida’s Exact Match Protocol and the Secretary and Duval County’s adherence to it.

105. Ms. Bach’s initial voter registration application was processed by the Duval County, Supervisor of Elections on July 25, 2024. On July 26, 2024, the Department of State changed Ms. Bach’s status to unverified. That same day, Ms. Bach’s voter registration application, which was a completed Federal Post Card Application (“FPCA”) form, was processed by Duval County. The Department again provided an unverified status on July 30, 2024.

106. On September 3, 2024, Ms. Bach spoke with Maggie Johnson, the Assistant Elections Officer for Duval County, who provided instructions for completing an additional voter registration form. Ms. Bach submitted an additional FCPA, which was processed by Duval County on September 6, 2024. On September 9, 2024, the Department once again marked her status as “unverified.”

107. On September 13, 2024, Ms. Bach provided Ms. Johnson with three forms of identification: her passport, a letter from SSA, and a bank account letter. Despite this, on September 18, 2024, Ms. Johnson responded to Ms. Bach stating that an image of Ms. Bach’s Social Security card was still required to resolve her “unverified” status.

108. On October 13, 2024, Ms. Bach submitted another FPCA form to Ms. Johnson via email. Ms. Johnson responded the same day, stating that because the

Department could not verify her information, Ms. Bach must provide a copy of her Social Security card, a Florida driver license, or a Florida identification card to be moved from “unverified” to “active” status. Ms. Johnson also stated that if Ms. Bach provides an FPCA form by mail to Duval County, then when Duval County resubmits the application to the Department, it is possible that the Department will verify her information.

109. On October 27, 2024, Jonathan Kooker, an attorney representing Ms. Bach, emailed Ms. Johnson stating that it was improper of Ms. Johnson to request from Ms. Bach a Social Security card because Ms. Bach is exempt from documentation requirements due to her age and overseas voter status and that Florida law does not require her to provide a social security card. Mr. Kooker requested that Duval County issue Ms. Bach an absentee ballot electronically.

110. On October 29, 2024, Ms. Johnson responded to Mr. Kooker, forwarding him correspondence from the City of Jacksonville’s General Counsel, Sonya Harrel, and Division of Elections Director, Maria Matthews, stating that Ms. Bach must still provide necessary information before she is able to vote. On October 30, 2024, Mr. Kooker responded to Ms. Johnson stating that Ms. Bach is willing to submit a copy of her passport in order to obtain a ballot.

111. On or before November 2, 2024, Mr. Kooker provided Ms. Johnson with Ms. Bach’s tax return displaying her social security number. That same day, Ms. Johnson responded, stating that she is hopeful that the tax return will be sufficient for the verification process.

112. At 2:14 p.m. on Election Day (November 5, 2024), Maya Buchanan, the Voter Protection Director at VoteFromAbroad.org, emailed Ms. Johnson asking for an

update on the status of Ms. Bach's case, which initiated a flurry of emails that afternoon and evening. Ms. Buchanan also stated that Ms. Bach had previously submitted a Federal Write-in Ballot. That same day, Ms. Johnson emailed Ms. Bach a General Election ballot and stated that she had been made an eligible voter in Duval County. At 7:38 p.m., Ms. Bach responded by stating that she was unable to open the email ballot. At 7:49 p.m., Ms. Johnson informed Ms. Bach that her write-in ballot would be canvassed and there was no need to return the official email ballot.

113. Ms. Bach did not vote in all of the elections for which she was eligible in her Federal Write-in Ballot, including the Florida statewide initiative measures, which were personally important to Ms. Bach. Ms. Bach was, and remains, upset about the fact that she did not vote on those initiative measures. Ms. Bach considers herself to have been partially disenfranchised in the November 2024 election.

G. Florida's Exact Match Protocol Disproportionately Impacts Black Applicants and Other Floridians of Color

114. The magnitude of the detrimental impact of Florida's Exact Match Protocol is immense.

115. Approximately 188,000 otherwise eligible individuals who completed voter registration applications in Florida beginning in 2018 have been placed in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

116. Approximately 108,000 of those registrants verified their identity and eventually made it onto Florida's voter rolls.

117. Nearly 80,000 individuals who submitted otherwise valid voter registration applications to Florida election officials are in “unverified” status and have not been able to register to vote solely due to the Exact Match Protocol.⁴

118. Tens of thousands of the aforementioned nearly 80,000 unsuccessful registrants (due to the Exact Match Protocol) submitted their applications after January 1, 2022.

119. The Exact Match Protocol is the leading reason why voter registration applicants do not successfully make it onto Florida voter rolls.

120. Black applicants and other Floridians of color face a significantly higher risk of having their voter registration applications placed in “unverified” status under the Exact Match Protocol compared to their white counterparts.

121. Black citizens account for approximately 12% of Florida’s registered voters, according to a current version of the statewide registered voter file. More than 600,000 registered voters in Florida identify as Black. By contrast, 25,091 (31.6%) of the applicants currently in “unverified” status identify as Black.

122. White citizens account for approximately 55% of Florida’s registered voters, according to a current version of the statewide registered voter file. Nearly 3 million registered voters in Florida identify as white. By contrast, only 7,176 (9.0%) of the applicants currently in “unverified” status identify as white.

⁴ These nearly 80,000 applications were rejected solely due to one of two reason codes: 611 (driver license mismatch) or 612 (SSN4 mismatch). That number does not include a batch of additional applications that were rejected for reason codes 611 or 612 and a combination of one or more other reasons.

123. Table 1 reflects the stark racial disparity of the Exact Match Protocol’s impact:

TABLE 1

Percentage of Applications in “Unverified” Status for Incorrect Driver License Number and SSN⁵		
Race	Percentage of Registered Voters	Percentage of ‘Unverified’ Due to Exact Match Protocol
Black	11.8%	31.6%
White	55.2%	9.0%

124. Florida’s Exact Match Protocol adversely impacts large numbers of otherwise eligible voters statewide, with a disparate and discriminatory impact on Black citizens and other citizens of color.

125. This enormous disparate racial impact against Black voters is consistent across individual counties and persists when looking specifically at the 13 counties—Broward, Duval, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia—where Florida Rising Together has registered a substantial number of voters who are currently in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol, and where Florida Rising has a significant number of members.

126. According to a recent version of Florida’s statewide voter file, those 13 counties have a total of nearly 3 million registered voters, of whom 1.25 million (42.0%) identify as white and more than 450,000 (15.2%) identify as Black. By contrast, those 13 counties have a total of 70,142 applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match

⁵ The percentages stated in Table 1 are subject to changes in the number of registered voters at any given time.

Protocol, of whom only 4,913 (7.0%) identify as white and 22,784 (32.5%) identify as Black.

127. The 70,142 applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol in the 13 counties at issue account for 88.3% of the statewide total of 79,447 Florida applicants who are currently in “unverified” status.

128. A closer look at data from those 13 counties demonstrate the scope, breadth, and depth of the impact wrought by the Exact Match Protocol.

TABLE 2: County-By-County Demographic Breakdown of Unverified Applicants

County	Race	% Registered Voters	% Unverified
Broward County <i>12,933 Unverified</i>	Black	23.5%	41.5%
	White	31.6%	9.7%
Duval County <i>7,262 Unverified</i>	Black	25.9%	41.9%
	White	48.7%	9.0%
Gadsden County <i>453 Unverified</i>	Black	52.2%	70.2%
	White	30.8%	3.3%
Hillsborough County <i>4,829 Unverified</i>	Black	15.2%	34.2%
	White	46.9%	9.2%
Leon County <i>2,052 Unverified</i>	Black	28.3%	52.7%
	White	48.6%	7.3%
Miami-Dade County <i>16,795 Unverified</i>	Black	11.0%	36.2%
	White	15.6%	3.6%
Orange County <i>11,471 Unverified</i>	Black	16.7%	22.5%
	White	37.5%	4.3%
	Hispanic	29.5%	42.5%
Osceola County <i>4,307 Unverified</i>	Black	9.7%	4.5%
	White	28.5%	3.2%
	Hispanic	50.6%	83.6%
Palm Beach County <i>3,618 Unverified</i>	Black	13.3%	35.0%
	White	56.7%	9.7%
Pinellas County <i>1,795 Unverified</i>	Black	7.7%	25.5%
	White	72.2%	20.2%
Polk County <i>2,217 Unverified</i>	Black	12.4%	10.2%
	White	49.8%	6.8%
	Hispanic	28.3%	62.5%

Seminole County <i>885 Unverified</i>	Black	11.3%	20.6%
	White	49.7%	8.4%
Volusia County <i>1,525 Unverified</i>	Black	9.0%	21.6%
	White	67.9%	18.2%

129. In Broward County, approximately 23.5% of the county’s approximately 400,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 31.6% identify as white. There are currently 12,933 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 5,369 (41.5%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while only 1,254 (9.7%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

130. In Duval County, approximately 25.9% of the county’s more than 200,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 48.7% identify as white. There are currently 7,262 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 3,044 (41.9%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while only 653 (9.0%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

131. In Gadsden County, approximately 52.2% of the county’s more than 6,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 30.8% identify as white. There are currently 453 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 318 (70.2%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while only 15 (3.3%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

132. In Hillsborough County, approximately 15.2% of the county’s more than 300,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 46.9% identify as White. There are currently 4,829 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 1,652 (34.2%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to

the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while only 397 (8.2%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

133. In Leon County, approximately 28.3% of the county’s approximately 70,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 48.6% identify as white. There are currently 2,052 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 1,081 (52.7%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while only 149 (7.3%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

134. In Orange County, approximately 16.7% of the county’s more than 300,000 registered voters identify as Black and 29.5% identify as Hispanic, while 37.5% identify as white. There are currently 11,471 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 2,578 (22.5%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black and 4,879 (42.5%) identify as Hispanic, while only 493 (4.3%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

135. In Osceola County, approximately 9.7% of the county’s more than 100,000 registered voters identify as Black and 50.6% identify as Hispanic, while 28.5% identify as white. There are currently 4,307 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 195 (5.5%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black and 3,602 (83.6%) identify as Hispanic, while only 137 (3.2%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

136. In Palm Beach County, approximately 13.3% of the county’s more than 300,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 56.7% identify as white. There are currently 3,618 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact

Match Protocol. Currently, 1,266 (35.0%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while only 351 (9.7%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

137. In Pinellas County, approximately 7.7% of the county’s more than 200,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 72.2% identify as white. There are currently 1,795 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 457 (25.5%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while 363 (20.2%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

138. In Polk County, approximately 12.4% of the county’s approximately 200,000 registered voters identify as Black and 28.3% identify as Hispanic, while 49.8% identify as white. There are currently 2,217 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 226 (10.2%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black and 1,386 (62.5%) identify as Hispanic, while only 151 (6.8%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

139. In Seminole County, approximately 11.3% of the county’s more than 100,000 registered voters identify as Black, while 49.7% identify as white. There are currently 885 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 182 (20.6%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black, while 74 (8.4%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

140. In Volusia County, approximately 9.0% of the county’s approximately 150,000 registered voters identify as Black and 14.0% identify as Hispanic, while 67.9%

identify as white. There are currently 1,525 voter registration applicants who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Currently, 330 (21.6%) of the applicants in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol identify as Black and 411 (27.0%) identify as Hispanic, while only 277 (18.2%) of “unverified” applicants identify as white.

H. Applicants’ Method of Registration Determines Whether They Are At Risk Of Being Harmed By The Exact Match Protocol

141. The Exact Match Protocol impacts applicants attempting to register to vote by filling out a paper voter registration application.

142. The Exact Match Protocol does not affect applicants attempting to register through the Florida Online Voter Registration System, available at <https://registertovoteflorida.gov/home>. This is because to access the system, Florida online voter registration applicants must provide their Florida driver license or Florida ID card number, the date of issuance, and their SSN. If the information provided by the applicant does not match, the applicant will not be able to complete the online transaction.

143. The Exact Match Protocol generally does not affect applicants attempting to register to vote at a motor vehicle office. This is because a voter registration application completed in person at a motor vehicle office is synced up with the information contained in Florida’s driver license database, thereby ensuring that the relevant data matches.

144. For example, according to information provided by Broward County, approximately 99.6% of applicants in the county placed in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol completed a paper voter registration application.

145. Further, according to information provided by Duval County, approximately 76.4% of applicants in the county who are in “unverified” status due to the Exact Match

Protocol registered through a third party voter registration organization (“3VPRO”). By contrast, less than 1% registered to vote at a driver license office, and zero percent registered to vote online. The remainder generally registered to vote by means that required completing a paper voter registration application, as reflected in the table below.

TABLE 3: Duval County Unverified Applicants’ Method of Registration

Method of Registration	%
Driver License Office	0.4%
Mail	4.0%
Public Assistance Office	0.2%
Statewide Move in from EVID	1.0%
Libraries	0.2%
Federal Post Card Application	0.2%
Office/Other	15.6%
3rd Party	76.4%
Unknown	2.0%

146. Applicants who register to vote through a 3VPRO in Duval County—and everywhere else in Florida—must complete a paper application.

147. A major driver of the large racial disparities is the fact that 3VPROs like Florida Rising Together are registering large numbers of Black and other non-white applicants in Broward, Duval, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia.

I. The Exact Match Protocol Works in Concert with Florida’s Legacy of Racial Discrimination to Harm Black and Other Non-White Voter Applicants

148. Florida’s Exact Match Protocol works in concert with Florida’s history of racial discrimination, particularly its official voting-related discrimination, the legacy and

effects of which continue to impact the opportunity for Black citizens and other citizens of color to register to vote and to participate in the political process.

149. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights highlighted the disproportionate disenfranchisement of Black voters in Florida in the 2000 presidential election. In addition, in the 2012 and 2016 presidential elections, data show that Black voters were at least twice as likely than white voters to have their ballot rejected or deemed “unverified.” Further, data from 2020 shows that Black voters disproportionately had their mail ballots rejected or deemed “unverified” due to missing or mismatched signatures. As recently as 2022, polling-place closures in predominantly Black neighborhoods burdened Black voters, restricting their voting options. And despite a successful ballot initiative in 2018 to re-enfranchise most Floridians with felony convictions, nearly a million people—predominantly Black—remain barred from the rolls for inability to pay legal fees. In addition, data show that for all voting-eligible adults in the 2022 elections in Florida, Black adults were disenfranchised at a rate nearly *double* that of all Florida adults.

150. Historical conditions and effects of racial discrimination in Florida make it more difficult for Black and other citizens of color to navigate the requirements and bureaucratic hurdles associated with Florida’s Exact Match Protocol.

151. The disparities outlined here reflect racial disparities beyond voting—disparities perpetuated by the inability of eligible Black voters and other eligible voters of color to participate at the polls at the same rate as others. With respect to household incomes, the 2022 American Community Survey (“ACS Survey”) indicated that Black households in Florida earn a median income of approximately \$50,000 as compared to approximately \$74,000 for white households in Florida. The ACS Survey also indicated

that Black residents in Florida live in poverty at a rate more than double that of white residents. Black residents in Florida were also nearly twice as likely as white residents to lack a high school diploma.

J. Florida's Exact Match Protocol Is Not Narrowly Drawn to Advance a Sufficiently Compelling State Interest and Is Unduly Burdensome

152. Florida's Exact Match Protocol, in practice, imposes a severe and unequal burden on Floridians' fundamental right to vote. The discriminatory and disproportionate effects of the Exact Match Protocol demonstrate it is not narrowly drawn to advance a sufficiently compelling state interest. Rather, the burdens the Protocol places on Florida citizens undermine any interest Plaintiffs may allege. Given the known pitfalls of the Exact Match Protocol, an unmatched FVRS record, for example, does not reliably indicate that the applicant is not who they say they are, nor does it justify Defendants shifting the burden to the applicant to provide additional proof of their identity.

153. Indeed, the Secretary already has other tools that perform the verification and anti-fraud functions poorly served by the Exact Match Protocol. These include data-matching protocols that account for common Exact Match errors like missing symbols or compound names, MOUs with other agencies in Florida and in other states, and enforcement of Florida's numerous criminal statutes prohibiting illegal registration and voting. For example, under Florida law, a false affirmation on a voter registration application subjects an applicant to fines of up to \$5,000 and incarceration of up to five years.

154. Due to its inherent inaccuracy, the Exact Match Protocol disrupts the orderly administration of and accurate record-keeping in Florida elections. The Exact Match Protocol bars otherwise-eligible voters from exercising their right to vote. The disparate

impact of Florida's registration requirements complicates orderly administration of elections.

155. These complications and inaccuracies undermine election integrity, thereby frustrating a legitimate state interest. Considered in conjunction with the burdens that the Protocol imposes on voting, the Exact Match Protocol's practical effect is to subvert public confidence in the integrity of elections.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

Count I

Violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution:

Undue Burden on the Right to Vote

42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Alleged by All Plaintiffs as to All Defendants)

156. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 150 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

157. The First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution protect the right to vote as a fundamental right. The First Amendment's guarantees of the freedoms of speech and association protect the right to vote and to participate in the political process. The right to vote is a fundamental constitutional right also protected by both the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

158. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides a cause of action, including for declaratory or injunctive relief, against

[e]very person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage ... subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws

159. By conflating a failure to match under the Exact Match Protocol with an inability to verify an applicant's first name, last name, date of birth, address, or PIN under

Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6), thereby preventing applicants from registering to vote, Defendants Secretary and Supervisors impose severe burdens on Floridians' fundamental right to vote.

160. Because of the issues arising out of the Exact Match Protocol, tens of thousands of otherwise valid voter- registration applications have been denied, leaving many Floridians in an "unverified" status and unable to cast regular ballots. In addition, to the extent these applicants cast provisional ballots, a significant number of voters are unable to cure their provisional ballots in time, further disenfranchising eligible voters and undermining the electoral process.

161. The Exact Match Protocol directly injures Plaintiffs Florida Rising Together and Florida Rising. More than 5,800 applicants who were registered by Florida Rising Together, the vast majority of whom are persons of color, are currently in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol. Moreover, nearly 150 members of Florida Rising are currently in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol.

162. The Exact Match Protocol's undeniably severe burdens cannot be justified regardless of the level of scrutiny applied.

163. There is no indication that the Exact Match Protocol has ever identified a single applicant who is actually ineligible to vote in Florida elections or that the Exact Match Protocol increases voters' confidence in the integrity of Florida elections.

164. None of the Exact Match Protocol's onerous burdens are necessary to achieve, or are reasonably related to, any sufficiently weighty state interest. There is no constitutionally adequate justification for Defendants, acting under color of state law, to deprive Black voters and other voters of color of the rights, privileges, and immunities

secured to them by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and protected under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

165. Therefore, all Defendants in this action have violated, and continue to violate, the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution.

166. While Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6) neither requires nor provides for the Exact Match Protocol, this claim constitutes an as-applied challenge to § 97.053(6) insofar as Defendants rely on it as the Protocol's statutory source.

167. Plaintiff Florida Rising Together asserts this claim against all State and all County Defendants in this lawsuit and requests enjoining implementation of the State and County Defendants' Exact Match Protocol as to Plaintiff Florida Rising Together, its registration activities, and eligible voters it registers, assists in registering, or otherwise interacts with.

168. Plaintiff Florida Rising asserts this claim against all State and all County Defendants in this lawsuit and requests enjoining implementation of the State and County Defendants' Exact Match Protocol as to Plaintiff Florida Rising and its members.

Count II

Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act

52 U.S.C. § 20507(b)(1) (Alleged by All Plaintiffs as to Defendants Secretary of State Byrd and Supervisors Scott, Holland, Castor Dentel, and Garcia)

169. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 155 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

170. With respect to “[c]onfirmation of voter registration,” Section 8 provides that [a]ny State program or activity to protect the integrity of the electoral process by ensuring the maintenance of an accurate and current voter registration roll for elections for Federal office . . . shall be uniform, nondiscriminatory, and in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

52 U.S.C. § 20507(b)(1).

171. Florida's Exact Match Protocol fails to ensure the maintenance of an accurate and current voter registration roll and is neither uniform nor non-discriminatory, nor does it comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

172. Of the 79,447 applicants whose registrations are currently in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol, only 9% identify as white. By comparison, more than 55% of Florida's registered voters identify as white. Meanwhile, Black and Latino registrants are disproportionately being kept off the rolls due to the Exact Match Protocol. More than 57% of applicants currently in "unverified" status identify as Black or Latino, which is a much higher percentage than their share of the Florida registered voter pool (approximately 33%). Black voter registration applicants are put in "unverified" status at a rate (approximately 32%) nearly three times their share of the registrant pool (approximately 12%).

173. The Exact Match Protocol also has disparate and arbitrary geographical effects. Applicants from Miami-Dade, Broward, Duval, and Orange Counties collectively account for over 60% of applicants who have not made it onto the rolls due to the Exact Match Protocol, even though those four counties account for approximately a quarter of Florida's eligible registered voters. Registrants from Broward, Duval, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties account for 70,142, or approximately 88.3%, of the applicants who are in "unverified" status due to the Exact Match Protocol, even though those 13 counties account for approximately 56.7% of Florida's eligible registered voters.

174. These statistics demonstrate that Defendants do not implement the Exact Match Protocol in a manner that is “uniform” or “nondiscriminatory,” and as such, do not “ensur[e] the maintenance of an accurate and current voter registration roll for elections for Federal office[.]” 52 U.S.C. § 20507(b).

175. Plaintiffs have a private right of action under the NVRA. Plaintiffs must “provide written notice of . . . violation[s] to the chief election official of the State involved.” 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(1). Defendant Byrd and Defendant Supervisors of Elections of Miami-Dade, Broward, Duval, and Orange Counties received notice of these violations on July 23, 2024, and failed to correct them within 90 days of receiving that notice. See Ex. 1; 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(2).

176. Plaintiffs assert this claim against Defendant Secretary Byrd and Defendant Supervisors of Elections of Miami-Dade, Broward, Duval, and Orange Counties.⁶

177. Plaintiff Florida Rising Together requests enjoining implementation of these State and County Defendants’ Exact Match Protocol as to Plaintiff Florida Rising Together, its registration activities, and eligible voters it registers, assists in registering, or otherwise interacts with.

178. Plaintiff Florida Rising requests enjoining implementation of these State and County Defendants’ Exact Match Protocol as to Plaintiff Florida Rising and its members.

⁶ Plaintiff will seek to amend the complaint to add the Defendant Supervisor of Elections for Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties once the 90-day notice period required by the NVRA has elapsed. See 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(2).

179. While Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6) neither requires nor provides for the Exact Match Protocol, this claim constitutes an as-applied challenge to § 97.053(6) insofar as Defendants rely on it as the Protocol's statutory source.

Count III

Violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

52 U.S.C. §§ 10301 et seq.; 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (Alleged by All Plaintiffs as to All Defendants)

180. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 155 of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein.

181. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 52 U.S.C. § 10301 provides in relevant part that:

(a) No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, or [membership in a language minority group].

(b) A violation of subsection (a) of this section is established if, based on the totality of circumstances, it is shown that the political processes leading to a nomination or election in the State or political subdivision are not equally open to participation by members of a class of citizens protected by subsection (a) of this section in that its members have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.

52 U.S.C. § 10301(a)-(b).

182. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides a cause of action, including for declaratory or injunctive relief, against

[e]very person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage . . . subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person

within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws

183. Relying on the Exact Match Protocol to verify applicants' information under Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6) constitutes a qualification or prerequisite to voting within the meaning of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, resulting in the denial or abridgement of Floridians' right to vote on account of their race or color in violation of Section 2.

184. The Exact Match Protocol imposes a substantial, unwarranted, and disparate burden on Black and other voter- registration applicants of color and Florida Rising's members and denies them an equal opportunity to register and to vote in Florida elections. That disparate burden is evident at the statewide level and also when looking individually or collectively at the impact in Broward, Duval, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties.

185. The Exact Match Protocol interacts with historical, socioeconomic, and other electoral conditions in Florida to prevent Black applicants and other voter- registration applicants of color from having an equal opportunity to register and vote. See *Thornburg v. Gingles*, 478 U.S. 30, 47 (1986).

186. Under the totality of circumstances, as a result of the Secretary's reliance on the Exact Match Protocol to deem applicants "unverified" and the Supervisors' refusal to add these otherwise eligible applicants to the rolls, the political process in Florida is not equally open to participation by Black and other voter registration applicants of color, insofar as they have less opportunity than other members of the Florida electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice.

187. Therefore, Defendants use of the Exact Match Protocol violates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

188. While Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6) neither requires nor provides for the Exact Match Protocol, this claim constitutes an as-applied challenge to § 97.053(6) insofar as Defendants rely on it as the Protocol's statutory source.

189. Plaintiff Florida Rising Together asserts this claim against all State and all County Defendants in this lawsuit and requests enjoining implementation of the State and County Defendants' Exact Match Protocol as to Plaintiff Florida Rising Together, its registration activities, and eligible voters it registers, assists in registering, or otherwise interacts with.

190. Plaintiff Florida Rising asserts this claim against all State and all County Defendants in this lawsuit and requests enjoining implementation of the State and County Defendants' Exact Match Protocol as to Plaintiff Florida Rising and its members.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court:

191. Enter judgment in favor of Plaintiffs and against Defendants on the claims for relief as alleged in this Complaint;

192. Enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 declaring that the Defendants' use of an Exact Match Protocol to delay or reject voter-registration applications from otherwise-eligible Floridians under Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6) violates (a) the fundamental right to vote under the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and (b) Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 52 U.S.C. § 10301;

193. Enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202 declaring that the Defendant Secretary and Defendants Supervisors of Elections of Miami-Dade, Broward, Duval, and Orange Counties use of an Exact Match Protocol to delay or reject voter- registration applications from otherwise-eligible Floridians under Fla. Stat. § 97.053(6) violates Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, 52 U.S.C. § 20507;

194. Grant Plaintiff permanent injunctive relief by ordering that:

(a) Defendant Secretary Byrd discontinue the Exact Match Protocol at least insofar as it results in Florida Rising members and voter applicants registered by Florida Rising Together being placed in “unverified” status due to a failure to match the applicant’s identifying information as it appears in their FVRS record with a corresponding SSA or DHSMV record, in Broward, Duval, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties;

(b) Defendants Supervisors of Elections permit, in Broward, Duval, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties, Florida Rising members and Floridians who Florida Rising Together assisted in registering and were moved to “unverified” status due to the Exact Match Protocol, to vote and have their ballots counted unless Defendants have or obtain other, independent evidence that casts doubt on the voter’s identity or eligibility to vote;

(c) Defendants Supervisors of Elections of Broward, Duval, Gadsden, Hillsborough, Leon, Miami-Dade, Orange, Osceola, Palm Beach, Pinellas, Polk, Seminole, and Volusia Counties place otherwise eligible applicants who are Florida Rising

members or who have been registered by Florida Rising Together on the voter rolls in active status even if their voter registration application is flagged by the Exact Match Protocol, absent some other, independent evidence that casts doubt on the applicant's identity or eligibility to vote;

(d) All Defendants provide notice to voters, including on their websites, of the relief ordered by the Court; and

(e) All Defendants maintain, preserve, and not destroy until after December 31, 2026, any and all records relating to Florida's voter-registration verification program under §97.053(6);

195. Retain jurisdiction over Defendants for such period of time as may be appropriate to ensure Defendants' compliance with relief ordered by this Court;

196. Award Plaintiffs their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to statute; and

197. Grant Plaintiffs such other and further relief as may be just and equitable.

Respectfully submitted this 16th day of October, 2024,

/s/ Angela M. Liu

Angela M. Liu*
Neil A. Steiner*
Dechert LLP
Three Bryant Park
1095 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-6797
(212) 698-3500
Neil.Steiner@dechert.com
Angela.Liu@dechert.com

Zane Martin*
Dechert LLP
45 Fremont
Street
26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 262-4563
Zane.Martin@dechert.com

* Admitted *pro hac vice*

Miriam Fahsi Haskell
FL Bar No. 69033
Community Justice Project, Inc.
3000 Biscayne Blvd #106
Miami, FL 33137
(305) 907-7697
miriam@communityjusticeproject.com

John Powers*
Hani Mirza**
Marian K. Schneider**
Advancement Project
1220 L Street NW, Suite 850
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 728-9557
JPowers@advancementproject.org

Mark Dorosin
FL Bar No. 1041169
201 FAMU Law Lane
Orlando, FL 32801
(407) 254-4043
markdorosin@gmail.com