

“BIRTHE” CASES STRING CITE

I. Birther Cases with Decisions Recognizing that Obama is a ”Natural Born Citizen”	1
II. Birther Cases Rejected by Federal Courts	3
III. Birther Cases Rejected by State Courts & Administrative Agencies	7

I. Birther Cases with Decisions Recognizing that Obama is a “Natural Born Citizen”

Every court and administrative body to consider the issue has held that Obama is a Natural Born Citizen who is eligible to serve as President. *See, e.g., Allen v. Obama et al*, No. C20121317 (Ariz. Pima County Super. Ct. Mar. 7, 2012) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on the 2012 ballot; finding that Obama is a ”natural born citizen” under *Wong Kim Ark*; and expressly rejecting argument that *Minor v. Happersett* holds otherwise), *appeal filed* (Ariz. App. Ct. 2d Div. Mar. 8, 2012); *Ankeny v. Daniels*, 916 N.E.2d 678 (Ind. Ct. App. 2009) (“based upon the language of Article II, Section 1, Clause 4 and the guidance provided by *Wong Kim Ark*, we conclude that persons born within the borders of the United States are “natural born citizens” for Article II, Section 1 purposes, regardless of the citizenship of their parents”) *transfer denied* 929 N.E.2d 789 (Ind. 2010); *Fair v. Obama*, No. 06C12060692 (Md. Carroll Cty. Cir. Ct., Aug. 27, 2012 (relying on *Ankeny* and *Wong Kim Ark* to hold that Obama is a “natural born citizen” eligible to serve as President); *Farrar v. Obama*, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1215136-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen”), decision adopted by Ga. Sec’y of State (Feb. 7, 2012), *appeal dismissed, Farrar et al v. Obama et al.*, No. 2012CV211398 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *recons. denied* (Mar. 14, 2012), *appeal denied*, No. S12D1180 (Ga. Apr. 11, 2012); *Freeman v. Obama*, 12 SOEB GP 103 (Ill. Bd. of Elections Hearing Officer Recommendation Jan. 27, 2012) (overruling objection to Obama’s placement on 2012 primary ballot; finding that Obama’s long form birth certificate “clearly establishes” his eligibility for office as a “Natural Born Citizen”), *objection overruled* (Ill. Bd. of Elections, Feb. 3, 2012); *Freeman v. Obama*, No. 12 SOEB GE 112 (Ill. Bd. Elections, Sept. 17, 2012) (recommending rejection of objection filed seeking to keep Obama off general election ballot in 2012 on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”; relying on prior decision (12 SOEB GP 103) which held that Obama’s long form birth certificate sufficiently established birth in the United States); *Galasso v Obama*, No. STE 04588-12 (N.J. Adm. Apr. 10, 2012) (initial decision rejecting challenge to Obama's 2012 nominating position and finding that, assuming Obama was born in Hawaii, he is a "natural born citizen" eligible for the presidency per *Ankeny* and *Wong Kim Ark*), *decision adopted as final* (N.J. Sec’y of State Apr. 12, 2012); *Jackson v. Obama*, 12 SOEB GP 104 (Ill. Bd. of Elections Hearing Officer Recommendation Jan. 27, 2012) (recommending rejection of objection to Obama’s placement on 2012 primary ballot; finding that Obama’s long form birth certificate “clearly establishes” his eligibility for office as a “Natural Born Citizen”), *objection overruled* (Ill. Bd. of Elections, Feb. 3, 2012); *Jackson v. Obama*, No. 12 SOEB GE 113 (Ill. Bd. Elections, Sept. 17, 2012) (overruling objection filed seeking to keep Obama off general election ballot in 2012 on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”; relying on prior decision (12 SOEB GP 104) which held that Obama’s long form birth certificate sufficiently established birth in the United States); *Kesler v. Obama*, No. 2012-162 (Ind. Election Comm’n Feb. 24, 2012) (denying objection seeking to keep Obama off 2012 ballot on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”); *Jordan v. Secretary of State Sam Reed*, No. 12-2-01763-5, 2012 WL 4739216 (Wash. Super. Ct. Aug. 27, 2012) (dismissing as frivolous plaintiff’s complaint seeking to prevent state from including Obama on 2012 ballot, noting that many similar birther claims had been filed and, in some cases, such as *Ankeny v. Governor of State of Indiana*, 916 N.E.2d 678 (2009), courts addressed the merits of the birther claims; concluding: “just as all the so-called evidence offered by plaintiff has been in the blogosphere for years, in one form or another, so too has all the law rejecting plaintiff’s allegations. I can conceive of no reason why this lawsuit was

“BIRTHER” CASES STRING CITE

brought, except to join the chorus of noise in that blogosphere. The case is dismissed.”); **Judd et al v. Obama et al**, No. 8:12-cv-01507-DOC-AN (C.D. Cal. Oct. 17, 2012) (dismissing lawsuit purportedly removed by plaintiffs from state court case to federal court); **Judd et al v. Obama et al**, No. 8:12-cv-01888-DOC-AN (C.D. Cal. Nov. 7, 2012) (dismissing lawsuit stating election fraud, RICO, and various other claims seeking to prevent Obama from being on 2012 general election ballot (among other things); **Martin v. Obama**, No. 12 SOEB GE 111 (Ill. Bd. Elections, Sept. 17, 2012) (overruling objection filed seeking to keep Obama off general election ballot in 2012 on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”; relying on prior decision in *Freeman* and *Jackson* primary challenges (12 SOEB GP 103 and 12 SOEB GP 104), which held that Obama’s long form birth certificate sufficiently established birth in the United States); **Paige v. Obama**, No. 611-8-12 WNCV (Vt. Superior Ct., Sept. 21, 2012) (denying motion for temporary restraining order to prevent placement of Obama on the 2012 general election ballot and holding that “[t]he common law of England, the American colonies, and later the United States, all support one interpretation only: ‘that persons born within the borders of the United States are ‘natural born Citizens’ for Article II, Section 1 purposes, regardless of the citizenship of their parents’”), citing *Ankeny v. Governor of Indiana*, 916 N.E.2d 678, 688 (Ind. Ct. App. 2010); **Powell v. Obama**, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1216823-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen), *decision adopted by Ga. Sec’y of State* (Feb. 7, 2012), *appeal dismissed*, No. 2012CV211528 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *motion for injunction denied*, No. S12D1077 (Ga. Mar. 13, 2012), *appeal denied* (Ga. Apr. 4, 2012); **Purpura v Obama**, No. STE 04588-12, 2012 WL 1369003 (N.J. Adm. Apr. 10, 2012) (initial decision rejecting challenge to Obama's 2012 nominating position and finding that, assuming Obama was born in Hawaii, he is a "natural born citizen" eligible for the presidency per *Ankeny* and *Wong Kim Ark*), *decision adopted as final* (N.J. Sec’y of State Apr. 12, 2012) *aff’d*, No. A-004478-11-T03, 2012 WL 1949041 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. May 31, 2012) (per curiam), *cert. denied*, No. 071052 (N.J. Sept. 7, 2012); **Strunk v. N.Y. Bd. of Elections et al**, 35 Misc. 3d 1208(A), 2012 WL 1205117, 2012 N.Y. Slip Op. 50614 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Apr. 11, 2012) (N.Y. King County Supr. Ct. Apr. 11, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging, among other things, President Obama’s eligibility to his office; expressly rejecting the birther claim that Obama is ineligible on the basis of his father’s citizenship as frivolous, and issuing a show cause order as to why sanctions should not be imposed upon plaintiff); **Swensson v. Obama**, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1216218-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen”), *decision adopted by Ga. Sec’y of State* (Feb. 7, 2012), *appeal dismissed*, No. 2012CV211527 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *motion for injunction denied*, No. S12D1076 (Ga. Mar. 13, 2012), *appeal denied* (Ga. Apr. 4, 2012); **Tisdale v. Obama**, No. 3: 12-cv-00036 (E.D. Va. Jan. 23, 2012) (order dismissing complaint) (dismissing in *forma pauperis* complaint pursuant to 28 USC 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) and holding that “[i]t is well settled that those born in the United States are considered natural born citizens” and that plaintiff’s contentions otherwise are “without merit”), *aff’d*, No. 12-1124 (4th Cir. Jun 5, 2012) (per curiam); **Voeltz v. Obama**, No. 37 2012 CA 000467, 2012 WL 2524874 (Fla. 2nd Cir., Jun. 29, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot; finding that persons born in US are NBCs per *Wong Kim Ark* and *Ankeny*, regardless of parentage and rejecting birther argument to the contrary); **Voeltz v. Obama**, No. 37 2012 CA 002063 (Fla. 2nd Cir. Sept. 6, 2012) (dismissing complaint seeking declaration that Obama is not eligible for presidency because he was not born in US and was not born to two US citizen parents; finding that persons born in US are “natural born citizens” per *Wong Kim Ark* and *Ankeny*, regardless of parentage and rejecting birther argument to the contrary; reserving for later ruling motion for sanctions); **Welden v. Obama**, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1215137-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen), *decision adopted by Ga. Sec’y of State* (Feb. 7, 2012), *appeal dismissed*, No. 2012CV211527 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *motion for injunction denied*, No. S12D1059 (Ga. Mar. 13, 2012), *appeal denied* (Ga. Apr. 4, 2012).

II. Birther Cases Rejected by Federal Courts

Every federal court to rule on a birther case has rejected it. *See, e.g., Allen v. Soetoro*, 4:09-cv-00373 (D. Ariz. Jan. 29, 2010) (dismissing FOIA action seeking documents related to Obama’s eligibility), *aff’d* No. 11-15094 (9th Cir. Jul. 23, 2012); *Am. Grand Jury*, No Number Assigned (W.D.N.Y. Sept. 29, 2009) (letter from court staff attorney explaining that court could not accept “presentment” prepared by public, seeking to indict Obama for ineligibility to hold office and related matters); *In re Am. Grand Jury*, No. 3:09-mc-00215 (M.D. Tenn. Nov. 6, 2009) (summarily rejecting grand jury “presentment” challenging President Obama’s eligibility to serve as President as having no force under U.S. Constitution or law); *Anderson v. Obama*, No. 10-612, 2012 WL 1969419 (U.S. Jun. 4, 2012) (denying motion for leave to file petition for rehearing in case challenging the Patient Protection and Affordable Health Care Act, where petition sought an order compelling (a) the U.S. Marshalls to travel to Hawaii; (b) the Hawaii Department of Health to release the “original” birth certificate of Obama to the U.S. Marshalls; (c) the U.S. Marshalls to bring the certificate to the Supreme Court; and (d) the U.S. Secret Service to examine and verify whether the document is a forgery); *Barnett v. Obama*, 8:09-cv-00082, 2009 WL 3861788 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility; criticizing conduct of plaintiff’s counsel in case filed on behalf of active and former military personnel, state representatives, taxpayers, relatives, and political candidates), *order clarified*, 2009 WL 8557250 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 16, 2009), *aff’d sub nom. Drake v. Obama*, 664 F.3d 774 (9th Cir. 2011), *reh’g and reh’g en banc denied*, Nos. 09-56827, 10-55084 (Feb. 2, 2012), *cert denied*, No. 11-1225 (U.S. Jun. 7, 2012); *Berg v. Obama*, 574 F. Supp. 2d 509 (E.D. Pa. 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility; characterizing various plaintiff’s claims as frivolous), *aff’d*, 586 F.3d 234 (3d Cir. 2009), *cert. denied*, 555 U.S. 1126 (2009); *Berg v. Obama*, No. 1:08-cv-01933 (D.D.C. June 9, 2009) (dismissing *qui tam* case claiming Obama is not a U.S. citizen), *recons. denied*, 656 F. Supp. 2d 107 (D.D.C. 2009), *aff’d*, 383 F. App’x 7 (D.C. Cir. 2010); *Beverly v. Fed. Election Comm’n*, 1:08-cv-01538-AWI-GSA, 2009 WL 196361 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2009) (dismissing case that included claims regarding Obama’s eligibility), *aff’d*, No. 09-15562 (9th Cir. July 1, 2009), *cert. denied*, 130 S. Ct. 1732 (2010); *Bowhall v. Obama*, No. 2:10-cv-0609, 2010 WL 4932747, (M.D. Ala. Nov. 30, 2010) (dismissing complaint alleging, among other things, that Obama is not a “natural born citizen,” as frivolous), *aff’d*, No. 10-15938-C (11th Cir. Apr. 4, 2011) (affirming order that complaint was frivolous); *Church of Jesus Christ Christian/Aryan Nations of Missouri et al v. Obama*, No. 6:08cv03405, 2011 WL 4916569 (W.D. Mo. Oct. 17, 2011) (dismissing case brought on, among other bases, that, as non-white, Obama is not eligible to hold office), *aff’d*, No. 09-5012 (8th Cir. Jan. 31, 2012); *Cohen v. Obama*, No. 1:08-cv-02150, 2008 WL 5191864 (D.D.C. Dec. 11, 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility), *aff’d*, 332 F. App’x 640 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (per curiam), *reh’g and reh’g en banc denied*, No. 09-5012 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 25, 2009); *Connerat v. Obama*, No. 8:11-cv-01359-SDM-TGW (M.D. Fla. Dec. 21, 2011) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); *Cook v. Good*, No. 4:09-cv-00082, 2009 WL 2163535 (M.D. Ga. July 16, 2009) (denying TRO seeking stay of military orders pending confirmation of Obama’s eligibility; dismissing case), *appeal dismissed*, No. 09-14698-CC (11th Cir. Nov. 24, 2009); *Cook v. Simtech*, No. 8:2009cv01382 (M.D. Fla. July 27, 2009), *recons. denied*, (Aug. 6, 2009) (finding motion to reconsider “frivolous and wholly without merit); *Craig v. United States*, No. 5:09-cv-00343-F (W.D. Okla. Apr. 3, 2009) (dismissing case seeking declaration regarding definition of natural born citizen as “incomprehensible and frivolous”), *aff’d*, No. 09-6082, 340 F. App’x 471 (10th Cir. 2009), *cert. denied*, 130 S. Ct. 141 (2009); *Craig v. U.S. Dept. of Homeland Sec. et al*, No. 5:10-cv-00659-C (W.D. Okla. July 3, 2010) (dismissing case challenging various government publications defining term “natural born citizen” as unconstitutional); *Craig v. Holder*, No. 11-9501 (10th Cir. Mar. 17, 2011) (affirming Board of Immigration denial of request to certify that Craig is “natural born citizen” eligible for presidency), *reh’g denied* (Apr. 29, 2011); *Craig v. United States*, No. 5:10-cv-01345-C (W.D. Okla. Jan. 4, 2011) (Dismissing VOIA action brought to obtain documents related to federal definition of “natural born citizen”), *appeal voluntarily dismissed*, No. 11-6017 (10th Cir. Feb. 10, 2011); *Dawson v. Obama*, No. 2:08cv02754, 2009 WL 532617 (E.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); *Epperly v. Obama et al*, No. 1:12-cv-00011-TMB (D. Alaska, Aug. 24,

“BIRTHER” CASES STRING CITE

2012) (dismissing complaint seeking, among other things, declaration that Obama is not eligible to serve as President); *Essek v. Obama*, 08-379-GFVT (E.D. Ky. Jan. 15, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); *Florida et al. v. U.S. Dep. of Health & Human Svs.* No. 3:10-cv-91-RV/EMT (N.D. Fla. Apr. 8, 2010) (denying motion to intervene based on interest in pressing charge that President Obama is not a natural born citizen in lawsuit challenging the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act), *recons. denied* (Apr. 23, 2010); *Hamblin v. Obama*, 2:09cv00410, 2009 WL 2513986 (D. Ariz. Aug. 14, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s and McCain’s eligibility), *appeal dismissed*, 09-17014 (9th Cir. Nov. 6, 2009); *Hamrick v. Fukino*, No. 1:08-cv-00544 ACK-KSC, 2009 WL 1404535 (D. Haw. May 20, 2009) (dismissing case seeking copy of Obama’s certified birth certificate to determine whether he is natural born citizen); *Herbert v. US*, No. 3:08-cv-00634-TJC-MCR (M.D. Fla. July 1, 2008) (dismissing case alleging, among other things, that U.S. Supreme Court Chief Justice John Roberts violated the Constitution in refusing to accept plaintiff’s case); *Herbert v. Obama, et al*, No. 3:08-cv-01164 (M.D. Fla. Dec. 30, 2008) (dismissing complaint alleging, among other things, that Obama is not natural born citizen); *Herbert v. United States, et al*, No. 3:08cv01201 (M.D. Fla. Jan. 20, 2009) (dismissing complaint alleging, among other things, that Obama is not natural born citizen), *appeal dismissed*, No. 09-10661 (11th Cir. Aug. 3, 2009) (dismissing appeal as frivolous and wholly without merit), *cert. denied*, 130 S. Ct. 562 (2009), *reh’g denied*, 130 S.Ct. 1169 (2010); *Hollander v. McCain*, 566 F. Supp. 2d 63 (D.N.H. 2008) (dismissing case challenging McCain’s eligibility); *Hollister v. Soetoro*, 601 F. Supp. 2d 179 (D.D.C. 2009) (dismissing interpleader case challenging Obama’s eligibility), *subsequent order*, 258 F.R.D. 1 (Mar. 27, 2009) (imposing sanctions for filing claim that was not “warranted by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law or for establishing new law,” under Rule 11), *aff’d*, Nos. 09-5080 & 09-5161, 368 F. App’x 154 (D.C. Cir. 2010), *cert. denied*, 131 S. Ct. 1017 (2011), *reh’g denied* 131 S. Ct. 1627 (2011); *Hornbeck Offshore Services, L.L.C. v. Salazar et al*, No. 2:10-cv-01663-MLCF-JCW (E.D. La. Mar. 5, 2011) (denying motion to intervene based on interest in pressing charge that President Obama is not a natural born citizen in lawsuit challenging Obama Administration’s Moratorium on deepwater drilling in Gulf of Mexico); *Hunter v. U.S. Supreme Court*, No. 2:08cv00232, 2009 WL 111683 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 16, 2009), (dismissing case alleging, among other things, that Obama is not eligible), *appeal dismissed*, No. 09-10246 (5th Cir. July 23, 2009), No. 10-10009 (Feb. 4, 2010), No. 10-100064 (Apr. 9, 2010); *In Re Paul Andrew Mitchell*, 304 F. App’x 113 (3rd Cir. Dec. 22, 2008) (denying petition for writ of mandamus regarding challenge to Obama’s eligibility); *Jones v. Obama*, No. 2:10-cv-01075 (C.D. Cal. July 20, 2010) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); *Judd v. Sec’y of State of Kentucky*, No. 3:11-cv-00027-DCR (E.D. Ky. Aug. 3, 2012 order) (same; stating that “[a] cursory review of this document indicates that it is yet another frivolous filing from the plaintiff); *Judd v. State Board of Elections of Virginia et al*, No. 1:11-cv-00618 (E.D. Va. 2011 Aug. 8, 2012 order) (same; finding that “Plaintiff’s Motion to remove President Barack Obama from the 2012 ballot and to award all delegates to plaintiff, which is predicted on allegations that Obama was not born in the United States and is not a United States citizen, will be denied as frivolous”); *Judd v. Cal. Secy of State et al*, No. 2:2011-cv-05440 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 25, 2012 order) (denying motion for relief from judgment seeking, among other things, removal of Obama from 2012 general election ballot on “natural born citizen” grounds; referring to arguments as “insubstantial or frivolous”); *Judd et al v. Obama et al*, No. 8:12-cv-01507-DOC-AN (C.D. Cal. Oct 17 2012) (dismissing birther lawsuit purportedly removed by plaintiffs from state court to federal court); *Judd et al v. Obama et al*, No. 8:12-cv-01888-DOC-AN (C.D. Cal. Docketed Oct. 30, 2012) (dismissing birther lawsuit stating election fraud, RICO, and various other claims seeking to prevent Obama from being on 2012 general election ballot (among other things)); *Judy v. McCain*, No. 2:08cv01162 (D. Nev. Sept. 8, 2008) (dismissing case challenging McCain’s eligibility); *Kerchner v. Obama*, 669 F. Supp. 2d 477 (D.N.J. 2009) *aff’d*, 612 F.3d 204 (3d Cir. 2010), *cert. denied*, 131 S. Ct. 663 (2010); *Liberty Legal Found., v. Nat’l Democratic Party of the USA, et al*, No. 2:12-cv-2143, 2012 WL 2368448 (W.D. Tenn. Jun. 21, 2012) (dismissing complaint seeking to prevent Obama from being on 2012 ballot); *see also* --- F. Supp. 2d ---, 2012 WL 1252484 (W.D. Tenn. Apr. 13, 2012) (denying motion to remand because issue of “natural born citizen” interpretation is a federal issue); 2012 WL

“BIRTHE” CASES STRING CITE

3683492 (Aug. 24, 2012) (granting sanctions pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1927: finding that “[C]ounsel for Plaintiff reasonably should have known that all Plaintiffs lacked standing to bring this suit, the Court holds that Plaintiffs' claims were frivolous and without any arguable basis in law. As such, counsel for Plaintiff has multiplied the proceedings in this case unreasonably and vexatiously and should therefore be required to satisfy personally the attorneys' fees reasonably incurred by Defendants because of such conduct.”), 2012 WL 6026856 (Dec. 4, 2012) (granting in part petition for attorneys fees); 2012 WL 6026496 (Dec. 4, 2012) (denying motion to reconsider order granting §1927 sanctions); **Liberty Legal Found. v. Nat’l Democratic Party of the USA, et al**, No. 2:11-cv-2089 (D Ariz. Jul. 11, 2011) (dismissing complaint seeking to prevent Obama from being on 2012 ballot; warning plaintiff’s attorney that knowingly continuing to bring claims that have previously been dismissed may warrant sanctions in the future”); **Maathai v. Obama**, No. 3:12-cv-00910 (M.D. Tenn., Sept. 4, 2012) (dismissing purported whistleblower case seeking ouster of President Obama on grounds that he does not qualify as “natural born citizen” due to alleged Kenyan birth and fact that he did not have two US citizen parents at birth); **Mackay v. Obama**, No. 2:11-CV-05458-JP (E.D. Pa. Oct. 6, 2011) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility), *appeal voluntarily dismissed*, No. 11- 3862 (3rd Cir. Nov. 2, 2011), *appeal dismissed*, No 11-3967 (Dec. 8, 2011); **McLanahan v. Obama**, No. 2:11-CV-00374-EFS (E.D. Wash. Oct. 13, 2011) (dismissing complaint challenging, among other things, Obama’s eligibility); **Morrow v. Obama**, No. 1:08-cv-22345 (S.D. Fla. Mar. 9, 2009) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility); **Neely v. Obama**, 2:08-cv-15243 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 4, 2009) (dismissing case challenging, among other things, Obama’s eligibility); **Patriot’s Heart Media Network, Inc. v. Soetoro**, No. 1:09-mc-00442-RCL (D.D.C. Sept. 10, 2009) (rejecting request to convene grand jury to investigate Obama’s eligibility; dismissing petition for lack of jurisdiction); **Purpura v. Sebelius**, No. 3:10-CV-04814, 2011 WL 1547768, (D.N.J. Apr. 21, 2011) (dismissing case challenging Patient Protection and Affordable Care on various grounds, including that was not signed into law by a person eligible to be President of the United States), *aff’d*, 446 F. App’x 496 (3d Cir. 2011) *cert. denied*, 132 S. Ct. 1037 (U.S. 2012) *reh’g denied*, 132 S.Ct. 1631 (U.S. 2012); **Reade v. Galvin**, No. 1:12-cv-11492, 2012 WL 5385683 (D. Mass. Oct. 30, 2012) (dismissing complaint filed against Massachusetts Secretary of State for allegedly refusing to consider plaintiff’s challenge to Obama’s eligibility to be included on 2012 primary ballot; finding that Reade does not have standing to challenge eligibility in court); **Rhodes v. Gates**, 5:09-cv-00703-XR (W.D. Tex. Aug. 28, 2009) (denying TRO seeking to stay military orders due to challenge to Obama’s eligibility); **Rhodes v. MacDonald**, No. 4:09-cv-106, 2009 WL 2997605 (M.D. Ga. Sept. 16, 2009) (denying TRO seeking to stay military orders due to challenge to Obama’s eligibility; criticizing complaint as frivolous), *recons. denied*, 2009 WL 3111834 (Sept. 18, 2009), *subsequent order*, 670 F. Supp. 2d 1363 (M.D. Ga. 2009) (imposing \$20,000 sanction for violating Rule 11), *aff’d*, 368 F. App’x 949, (11th Cir. 2010), *reh’g denied*, No. 09-15418-BB (11th Cir. May 14, 2010), *app. for stay denied*, 131 S.Ct. 44 (2010), *cert. denied*, 131 S. Ct. 918 (2011); **Riethmiller v. Electors for State of Alabama**, No. 2:12-cv-823, 2012 WL 5042026 (M.D. Ala. Oct. 2, 2012) *report and recommendation adopted*, 2012 WL 5045219 (M.D. Ala. Oct. 18, 2012) (dismissing complaint seeking, among other things, injunction preventing defendants from placing candidate Obama on the ballot for the November 2012 election and declaration that Obama is ineligible to hold office of President as he is not a “natural born” citizen); **Riethmiller v. Electors for State of Arizona**, No. 2:12-cv-2034 (D. Ariz., Sept. 29, 2012) (same); **[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain v.. Electors for the State of Delaware**, No. 1:12cv1197-UNA (D. Del., Oct. 9, 2012) (same); **[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain (Reithmiller) v. Electors for State of Illinois**, No. 1:12-cv-01373 (C.D. Ill. Oct. 1, 2012) (same; finding that birther-related complaint “is frivolous, fails to state a legal claim over which this Court would have proper jurisdiction, and fails to even minimally comply with [FRCP 8]”); **Riethmiller v. Electors for State of Indiana**, No.1:12-cv-335 (N.D. Ind. Sept. 24, 2012) (same; finding complaint to be frivolous; imposing filing restrictions on plaintiff for filing frivolous actions); **[Reithmiller] Annamarie ? Last Name Uncertain v. Electors for Kentucky**, No. 3:12-cv-602, 2012 WL 5398565 (W.D. La. Nov. 5, 2012) (same; relying on *Berg v. Obama*, 586 F.3d 234, 239 (3d Cir. 2009).to dismiss similar birther complaint); **[Reithmiller] Annamarie v. Electors ex rel. Louisiana**, No. 1:12-cv-601, 2012 WL 5878153 (M.D. La.

“BIRTHE” CASES STRING CITE

Oct. 15, 2012) (recommending dismissal of complaint which included birther claims, as “both fanciful and delusional,” which “fail as a matter of law”) Order Adopting Recommendations and Dismissing Case (Nov. 21, 2012); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain v Electors for the State of Maine*, No. 1:12-cv-293 (D. Me. Sep 27, 2012) (magistrate recommendation to dismiss case *sua sponte* as frivolous) Sept. 27, 2012 (order adopting recommendation and dismissing case with prejudice); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie LNU v. Electors for State of Mississippi*, No. 3:12-cv-671 (S.D. Miss. Oct. 10, 2012) (same), Order (Oct. 30, 2012) adopting recommendation and dismissing case as frivolous); *Riethmiller v. Electors for State of Missouri*, No. 4:12-cv-1739 (E.D. Mo. Sept. 27, 2012) (same); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain v. Electors ex rel. Montana*, No. 9:12-cv-164, 2012 WL 5879607 (D. Mont. Oct. 17, 2012) (same); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain. Electors for the State of Nebraska*, No. 8:12-cv-348, 2012 WL 5874371 (D. Neb., docketed Sept. 27, 2012) (dismissing complaint: “The 52-page Complaint submitted by Plaintiff consists of, at best, nonsensical and rambling statements regarding President Barack Obama’s citizenship and his eligibility to be President of the United States on grounds he is not a “natural born citizen”); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain) v. Electors for the State of New York*, No. 1:12-cv-906 (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 3, 2012) (order *sua sponte* and summarily dismissing, as frivolous, complaint alleging, among other things, that Obama is ineligible for presidency on grounds he is not a “natural born citizen”; finding that appeal cannot be taken in good faith) ; *[Reithmiller] Last Name Uncertain v. Electors for Ohio*, No. 5:12-mc-122, 2012 WL 5304734 (N.D. Ohio Oct. 25, 2012) (same); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain v. Electors for the State of Pennsylvania*, No. 2:12-cv-05767 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 17, 2012) (“The complaint, which asserts that President Obama is not a suitable presidential candidate and seeks his removal from the ballot in the 2012 presidential election, is dismissed as frivolous.”); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie Last Name Uncertain v. Electors for the State of Virginia*, No. 1:12-cv-58 2012 WL 4742363 (W.D. Va. Oct 4, 2012) (*sua sponte* order dismissing birther complaint as frivolous); *Riethmiller v Electors for the State of Washington*, No. 2:12-cv-548 (E.D. Wash. Sept. 26, 2012) (same); *[Reithmiller] Annamarie LNU v. Electors for the State of Wisconsin*, No. 1:12-cv-977 (E.D. Wis. Sept. 27, 2012) (same); *Robinson v. Bowen*, 567 F. Supp. 2d 1144 (N.D. Cal. 2008) (dismissing case challenging McCain’s eligibility); *Roy v. Fed. Election Comm’n*, 2:08cv01519, 2008 WL 4921263 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 14, 2008) (dismissing case challenging eligibility of Obama and McCain); *Sibley v. Obama*, 866 F.Supp.2d 17 (D.D.C. Jun. 6, 2012) (dismissing complaint containing, among other things, a “petition for writs “quo warranto” to remove President Obama from his current office and, also or alternatively, to bar him from running for the office of president again in the upcoming November election”), *affirmed per curiam* No. 12-5198 (D.C. Cir. Dec. 6, 2012) (granting summary affirmance and stating that Sibley’s claims are without merit); *Sibley v. Obama*, No. 1:12-cv-01832 (D.D.C. Dec. 19, 2012) (dismissing purported *quo warranto* suit asking court to compel Obama to demonstrate that he is a “natural born citizen”); *Stamper v. United States*, No. 1:08-cv-2593, 2008 WL 4838073 (N.D. Ohio Nov. 4, 2008) (dismissing case challenging McCain’s and Obama’s eligibility, finding that appeal could not be taken in good faith); *Strunk v. N.Y. Bd. of Elections*, No. 1:08-cv-4289 (E.D.N.Y. Oct. 30, 2008) (dismissing case challenging, among other things, Obama’s eligibility), *appeal dismissed*, No. 08-5422 (2d Cir. Nov. 14, 2008); *Strunk v. U.S. Dept. of State*, 693 F. Supp. 2d 112 (D.D.C. Cir. 2010) (FOIA case seeking records from various agencies relating to Obama and his mother) (granting motion to dismiss to extent Strunk sought information relating to Obama; denying Strunk’s request for mandamus relief and for quo warranto action; granting stay of discovery) *mandamus denied*, No. 08-5503 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 8, 2009), *mandamus denied*, No. 09-5322 (D.C. Cir. Nov. 25, 2009), *appeal dismissed*, No. 10-5092, (D.C. Cir. Aug. 26, 2010); *see also Strunk v. U.S. Dept. of State*, 770 F.Supp.2d 10 (D.D.C. 2011) (granting summary judgment as to Department of State; finding that agency had “demonstrated full compliance with the FOIA”; determining that CBP had not yet demonstrated that its search for responsive records was adequate); 845 F. Supp. 2d 38, 47 (D.D.C. 2012) (finding that CBP demonstrated its search for responsive records was adequate and reasonable and that it properly withheld information under FOIA Exemption 6; however, CBP had not demonstrated that it properly withheld information under Exemption 7(E)); 2012 WL 577763 (D.D.C. Feb. 15, 2012) (ordering CPB to file renewed motion for summary judgment with respect to the information withheld

under Exemption 7(E)); --- F. Supp. ----, 2012 WL 5875653 (D.D.C. Nov. 21, 2012) (finding that CBP properly has withheld information from the one-page document containing travel information about Stanley Ann Dunham and granting summary judgment on that issue; further finding that since all agencies had demonstrated compliance with the FOIA and entitlement to judgment as a matter of law, final judgment in favor of defendants was proper); *Strunk v. Obama*, No. 1:10-cv-00486-RCL (Jan. 1, 2011) (dismissing case alleging Obama not eligible to be President), 2012 WL 3113947 (D.D.C. Aug. 1, 2012) (denying as frivolous motion for leave to amend to reassert claims and supplement claims); *In re Super Am. Grand Jury*, No. 1:09-mc-00346-RCL (D.D.C. July 2, 2009) (denying leave to file grand jury presentment challenging Obama’s eligibility); *Taitz v. Obama*, 707 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2010) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility), *recons. denied*, No. 1:10-cv-00151 (D.D.C. June 18, 2010), *2d mot. for recons. denied*, 754 F.Supp.2d 57 (D.D.C. 2010); *Taitz v. Astrue*, 806 F. Supp. 2d 214 (D.D.C. 2011) (dismissing FOIA complaint seeking documents allegedly related to Obama’s eligibility), *recons. denied* (Oct. 17, 2011), *aff’d* No. 11- 5304, 2012 WL 1930959 (D.C. Cir. May 25, 2012); *Taitz v. Ruemmler*, No. 1:11-cv-01421, 2011 WL 4916936 (D.D.C. Oct. 17, 2011) (dismissing FOIA complaint seeking documents allegedly related to Obama’s eligibility), *mandamus dismissed*, No. 11-5329 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 23, 2012), *aff’d*, No. 11-5306, 2012 WL 1922284 (D.C. Cir. May 25, 2012); *Taitz v. Astrue*, No. 1:11-cv-00519-SOM -RLP (D. Haw. Oct. 26, 2011) (rejecting *ex parte* application to compel discovery regarding Obama’s eligibility in related case pending in the District of Columbia); *Taitz v. Sebelius*, No. 12-cv-01092-DMG-JC (C.D. Cal. Aug. 16, 2012) (dismissing, on lack of venue grounds, complaint stating RICO claims and seeking, among other things, to invalidate the Affordable Health Care Act’s validity, on grounds that Obama was not eligible to serve as President when he signed it); *Taitz v. Sebelius*, No. 3:12-cv-03251-P (N.D. Tex. Nov. 20, 2012) (dismissing complaint stating RICO claims and seeking, among other things, to invalidate the Affordable Health Care Act’s validity, on grounds that Obama was not eligible to serve as President when he signed it), Judgment (Nov. 26, 2012) (dismissing case with prejudice and assessing costs against Plaintiff); *Thomas v. Hosemann*, No. 2:08-cv-00241-KS-MTP (S.D. Miss. Dec. 18, 2008) (voluntarily dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility; case dismissed with prejudice); *Thomas v. Hosemann*, No. 1:08-mc-00280 (D. Haw. Dec. 18, 2008) (dismissing action seeking to compel Hawaii Dept. of Health to provide access to documents allegedly related to Obama’s eligibility); *Tisdale v. Obama*, No. 3:12-cv-00036-JAG (E.D. Va. Jan. 23, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility; finding that Obama is “natural born citizen” because he was born in Hawaii), *aff’d*, No. 12-1124 (4th Cir. Jun 5, 2012) (per curiam). *See also Lakin Article 138 Complaint*, No Number Assigned (US Army Admin. Law Div. Dec 11, 2009) (rejecting Article 138 Complaint as deficient); *Lakin Court Martial - United States v. Lakin*, No. 20100995 (Mil. Dist. of Wash. DC Dec. 16, 2010) (court martial finding Lakin guilty of, among other things, failure to report to deploy; rejecting claim that his failure was based on legitimate questions as to Obama’s eligibility), *appeal withdrawn*, (A. Ct. Crim. App. July 28, 2011); *Lakin v. Lind*, No. ARMY MISC 20100778 (A. Ct. Crim. App. Oct. 12, 2010) (order) (denying petition for writ of mandamus to compel discovery factual matters allegedly relating to Obama’s eligibility in court martial proceedings).

III. Birther Cases Rejected by State Courts & Administrative Agencies

Every state court and administrative agency to rule on a birther complaint has rejected it. *See, e.g., Allen v. Obama et al*, No. C20121046 (Ariz. Pima County Super. Ct. Feb. 24, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot); *Allen v. Obama et al*, No. C20121317 (Ariz. Pima County Super. Ct. Mar. 7, 2012) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on the 2012 ballot; finding that Obama is a “natural born citizen” under *Wong Kim Ark*; and expressly rejecting argument that *Minor v. Happersett* holds otherwise), *appeal filed* (Ariz. App. Ct. 2d Div. Mar. 8, 2012); *Ankeny v. Governor of the State of Indiana*, No. 49D10-0812-PL-055511, 2009 WL 1632611 (Ind. Marion County Super. Ct. Mar. 16, 2009) (dismissing challenge to McCain’s and Obama’s eligibility), *aff’d*, 916 N.E. 2d 678 (Ind. Ct. App. 2009) (holding that Obama, who was born in Hawaii, is a “natural born citizen” eligible to be president), *transfer denied*, 929 N.E. 2d 789 (Ind. 2010); *Berg v. Obama*, No.

“BIRTHE” CASES STRING CITE

186 MD 2012 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Mar. 16, 2012) (dismissing complaint filed to challenge Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot); **Brockhausen v. Andrade**, No. 08-1001-C368 (Tex. Williamson County Dist. Ct. (368th) Jan. 22, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); **Broe v. Reed**, No. 82473-8 (Wash. Jan. 8, 2009) (dismissing writ of mandamus challenging Obama’s eligibility); **Collette v Obama et al**, No. 512012CA2041WS (Fla. 6th Cir. Ct., Sept. 9, 2012 (dismissing complaint seeking to prevent Obama from appearing on 2012 ballot); **Connerat v. Browning**, 999 So. 2d 644 (Table) 2008 WL 5378138 (Fla. 2008) (dismissing petition for extraordinary emergency writ of mandamus challenging Obama’s eligibility); **Connerat v. Obama**, No. 09003103SC (Fla. Pinellas County Small Claims Ct. May 5, 2009) (dismissing claim brought against Obama on grounds that he is not “natural born citizen”); **Connerat v. Obama**, No. 09005522SC (Fla. Pinellas County Small Claims Ct. Jul 28, 2009) (dismissing claim brought against Obama on grounds that he is not “natural born citizen); **Constitution Party v. Lingle**, No. 29473, 2008 WL 5125984 (Haw. Dec. 5, 2008) (dismissing complaint contesting 2008 Presidential election results and rejecting contention that defendant improperly failed to require proof that candidate Barack Obama was qualified to be a candidate for President of the United States), *recons. denied* (Dec. 12, 2008); **Corbett v. Bowen**, No. 30-2008-00114112-CU-FR- CJC, (Cal. Orange County Super. Ct. June 8, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); **Craig v. Oklahoma**, No. MA-109808 (Okla. Oct. 17, 2011) (dismissing application seeking determination of definition of “natural born citizen” for purposes of presidential eligibility); **Daniels v. Husted**, No. 12M000653 (Oh. Commn Pleas Ct, Sept. 7, 2012) (dismissing complaint filed seeking to prevent Obama from being on ballot in Ohio 2012 general election); **Dean v Obama** (*In re Objection of Thomas Dean*), No Number Assigned, (N.Y Bd. of Elections Determination Feb. 28, 2011) (rejecting petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot and finding that petition designating Obama as candidate is valid); **Donofrio v. Wells**, No. AM-0153-08T2 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. Oct. 30, 2008) (denying application for emergent relief challenging eligibility of McCain and Obama), *aff’d*, No Number Assigned (N.J. Oct. 31, 2008), *application for stay denied*, 129 S. Ct. 752 (2008); **Dummett at al v. Bowen**, No. 34-2012-80001091(Cal. Sacramento Cty. Sup. Ct., Oct. 26, 2012) (dismissing birther case seeking to prevent placement of Obama on 2012 general election ballot); **Epperly v. Obama** (Alaska Div. of Elections (Director Gail Fenumiai Feb. 28, 2012) (rejecting petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on the 2012 ballot); **Fair v. Obama**, No. 06C12060692 (Md. Carroll Cty. Cir. Ct., Aug. 27, 2012 (relying on *Ankeny* and *Wong Kim Ark* to hold that Obama is a “natural born citizen” eligible to serve as President); **Farrar v. Obama**, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1215136-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen”), *decision adopted as final* (Ga. Sec’y of State Feb. 7, 2012); *appeal dismissed*, **Farrar et al v. Obama et al**, No. 2012CV211398 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *recons. denied* (Mar. 14, 2012), *appeal denied*, No. S12D1180 (Ga. Apr. 11, 2012); **Fitzpatrick v. Obama**, No. 09R81 (N.C. Catawba Cty Super. Ct. May 2009) (rejecting purported “indictment” issued against Obama on grounds that he was not a natural born citizen eligible to serve as President); **Freeman v. Obama**, 12 SOEB GP 103 (Ill. Bd. of Elections Hearing Officer Recommendation Jan. 27, 2012) (overruling objection to Obama’s placement on 2012 primary ballot; finding that Obama’s long form birth certificate “clearly establishes” his eligibility for office as a “Natural Born Citizen”), *objection overruled* (Ill. Bd. of Elections, Feb. 3, 2012); **Freeman v. Obama**, No. 12 SOEB GE 112 (Ill. Bd. Elections, Sept. 17, 2012) (recommending rejection of objection filed seeking to keep Obama off general election ballot in 2012 on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”; relying on prior decision (12 SOEB GP 103) which held that Obama’s long form birth certificate sufficiently established birth in the United States); **Galasso v. Obama**, No. STE 04534-12 (N.J. Adm. Apr 10, 2012) (initial decision rejecting challenge to Obama's 2012 nominating position and finding that, assuming Obama was born in Hawaii, he is a "natural born citizen" eligible for the presidency per *Ankeny* and *Wong Kim Ark*), *decision adopted as final* (N.J. Sec’y of State Apr. 12, 2012); **Garvey v. Obama** (*In re Objection of Christopher Garvey*), No Number Assigned, (N.Y Bd. of Elections, Feb. 28, 2011) (rejecting petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot and finding that petition designating Obama as candidate is valid); **Garvey v. N.Y. Bd. of Elections**, No. 12-002764 (N.Y. Supreme Ct. Nassau County Mar. 6, 2012) (rejecting petition for writ of

“BIRTHER” CASES STRING CITE

mandamus and seeking show cause order, challenging New York Bd. of Elections rejection of plaintiff's ballot challenge); **Greenberg v. Brunner**, No. 2008CV1024 (Ohio Wood County Ct. Com. Pl. Jan. 14, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama's eligibility; assessing costs against plaintiff); **Hackney v. Obama**, No Number Assigned (Alaska Div. of Elections (Gail Fenumiai, Director) May 29, 2012) (dismissing petition challenging Obama's eligibility to be on the 2012 ballot); **Hendershot v. Kennedy**, No. 01-CV-2011-002321.00 (Al. Jefferson County-Birmingham Cir. Ct. Jan. 9, 2012) (dismissing case challenging Obama's eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot); **House v. Obama**, et al, No. 12-CI-01048 (Ky. Commonw. Ct., Oct. __, 2012) (dismissing case seeking to prevent Obama from placement on 2012 general election ballot); **In re John McCain's Ineligibility to Be on Presidential Primary Ballot in Pa.** No. 184 MD 2008 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Mar. 13, 2008) (dismissing case challenging McCain's eligibility), *aff'd*, 944 A.2d 75 (Pa. 2008); **Jackson v. Obama**, 12 SOEB GP 104 (Ill. Bd. of Elections Hearing Officer Recommendation Jan. 27, 2012) (recommending rejection of objection to Obama's placement on 2012 primary ballot; finding that Obama's long form birth certificate "clearly establishes" his eligibility for office as a "Natural Born Citizen"), *objection overruled* (Ill. Bd. of Elections, Feb. 3, 2012); **Jackson v. Obama**, No. 12 SOEB GE 113 (Ill. Bd. Elections, Sept. 17, 2012) (overruling objection filed seeking to keep Obama off general election ballot in 2012 on grounds that he is not a "natural born citizen"; relying on prior decision (12 SOEB GP 104) which held that Obama's long form birth certificate sufficiently established birth in the United States); **Jordan v. Secretary of State Sam Reed**, No. 12-2-01763-5, 2012 WL 4739216 (Wash. Super. Ct. Aug. 27, 2012) (dismissing as frivolous plaintiff's complaint seeking to prevent state from including Obama on 2012 ballot, noting that many similar birther claims had been filed and, in some cases, such as *Ankeny v. Governor of State of Indiana*, 916 N.E.2d 678 (2009), courts addressed the merits of the birther claims; concluding: "just as all the so-called evidence offered by plaintiff has been in the blogosphere for years, in one form or another, so too has all the law rejecting plaintiff's allegations. I can conceive of no reason why this lawsuit was brought, except to join the chorus of noise in that blogosphere. The case is dismissed."); **Justice v. Fuddy**, No. 1CC09-1-000783 (Haw. Cir. Ct. Oct. 9, 2009) (dismissing case seeking access to records allegedly relevant to Obama's eligibility), *aff'd* 253 P.3d 665 (Haw. Ct. App. 2011), as corrected (Apr. 26, 2011); **Kerchner v. Obama**, No. 85 MD 2012 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Mar. 1, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama's eligibility to be on 2012 ballot); **Kesler v. Obama**, No. 2012-162 (Ind. Election Comm'n Feb. 24, 2012) (denying objection seeking to keep Obama off 2012 ballot on grounds that he is not a "natural born citizen") (written decision unavailable but video of hearing is available at www.in.gov/sos/022412_Video_3.html (last visited April 11, 2012)); **Keyes v. Bowen**, No. 34-2008-80000096-CUWMGDS (Ca. Sacramento Cty Super. Ct. Mar. 13, 2009) (dismissing petition for writ of mandate in case challenging, among other things, Obama's eligibility to be on the California ballot; assessing costs against plaintiff), *aff'd*, 189 Cal. App. 4th 647, 117 Cal.Rptr.3d 207 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010) (affirming dismissal), *pet. for rev. denied*, No. S188724 (Cal. Feb. 2, 2011), *cert denied*, 132 S. Ct. 99 (2011); **Laity v. State of New York**, No. 2012-039-319, Claim No. 120982-81370 (N.Y. Ct. of Claims July 12, 2012) (dismissing claim brought against Board of Elections for rejecting plaintiff's objections to placement of Obama on 2012 ballot); **Lightfoot et al v. Bowen et al**, No. S168690 (Cal. Dec. 5, 2008) (denying petition for writ of mandate and stay), *app. for stay denied*, 129 S. Ct. 1053 (Jan. 26, 2009); **Marquis v. Reed**, No. 08-2-34955-1 SEA (Wash. King County Super. Ct. Oct. 27, 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama's eligibility); **Martin v. Lingle**, No. 29414, 2008 WL 4684786 (Haw. Oct. 22, 2008) (rejecting petition seeking disclosure of Obama's birth records allegedly related to his eligibility); **Martin v. Lingle**, No. 1CC08-1-002147 (Haw. Cir. Ct. 1st Cir. Jan. 12, 2009) (dismissing case seeking to compel disclosure of Obama's birth records based on challenge to his eligibility), *recons. denied*, (Jan. 27, 2009), *appeal dismissed*, No. 29643, 2009 WL 1669050 (Haw. Ct. App. June 9, 2009), *cert. denied*, No. 29643, 2009 WL 2372096 (Haw. Aug. 3, 2009); **Martin v. Bennett**, No. 1CC10-1-000969 (Haw. Cir. Ct. Sept. 7, 2010) (dismissing case seeking to compel disclosure of Obama's birth records based on challenge to his eligibility); **Martin v. Obama**, No. 12 SOEB GE 111 (Ill. Bd. Elections, Sept. 17, 2012) (overruling objection filed seeking to keep Obama off general election ballot in 2012 on grounds that he is not a "natural born citizen"; relying on prior decision in *Freeman* and *Jackson* primary challenges (12 SOEB GP 103 and 12 SOEB GP 104), which

“BIRTHER” CASES STRING CITE

held that Obama’s long form birth certificate sufficiently established birth in the United States); **Mcinnish v. Chapman**, No. 1110665 (Al. Sup. Ct. Mar. 27, 2012) (denying petition for writ of mandamus to require secretary of state to order Obama to produce original birth certificate); **Mcinnish v. Chapman**, No. 03-CV-2012-001053 (Al. Cir. Ct. Dec. 7, 2012) (granting motion to dismiss complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on the ballot); **Meroni v. McHenry County Grand Jury Foreman**, No. 09mr339 (Ill. Cir. Ct. Jan. 20, 2010) (dismissing case seeking to compel grand jury investigation into Obama’s eligibility); **Meroni et al v. Obama**, 12 SOEB GP 104 (Ill. Bd. of Elections Hearing Officer Recommendation Jan. 27, 2012) (Obama’s birth certificate “clearly establishes” his eligibility for office as a “Natural Born Citizen”), *objection overruled* (Ill. State Bd. of Elections, Feb. 3, 2012); **Neal v. Brunner**, No. 2008CV72726 (Ohio Ct. Com. Pl. Wood County Nov. 17, 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility) (as reported by Ohio Secretary of State); **Noonan v. Bowen et al**, No. 2012-80001048 (Cal. Sacramento Cty. Super. Ct., July 5, 2012) (dismissing petition for writ of mandate, seeking to challenge Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot); **Noonan et al v. Bowen**, No. S207078 (Cal. Dec. 6, 2012) (denying petition for writ of mandate/prohibition challenging 2012 election of Obama as President); **Patriot’s Heart Media Network v. Ill. Bd. of Elections**, No. 10CH000605 (Ill. McHenry County Chancery. Ct. Mar. 8, 2010) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on ballot); **Powell v. Obama**, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1216823-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen”), *decision adopted as final* (Ga. Sec’y of State Feb. 7, 2012), *appeal dismissed*, No. 2012CV211528 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *motion for injunction denied*, No. S12D1077 (Ga. Mar. 13, 2012), *appeal denied* (Ga. Apr. 4, 2012); **Purpura v Obama**, No. STE 04588-12, 2012 WL 1369003 (N.J. Adm. Apr. 10, 2012) (initial decision rejecting challenge to Obama’s 2012 nominating position and finding that, assuming Obama was born in Hawaii, he is a “natural born citizen” eligible for the presidency per *Ankeny* and *Wong Kim Ark*), *decision adopted as final* (N.J. Sec’y of State Apr. 12, 2012) *aff’d*, No. A-004478-11-T03, 2012 WL 1949041 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. May 31, 2012) (per curiam), *cert. denied*, No. 071052 (N.J. Sept. 7, 2012); **Ripley v. Obama**, No. 2012-163 (Ind. Election Comm’n Feb. 24, 2012) (denying objection seeking to keep Obama off 2012 ballot on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”) (written decision unavailable but video of hearing is available at www.in.gov/sos/022412_Video_3.html (last visited April 11, 2012)); **Scheveck v. Obama**, No Number Assigned (S.D. Bd. of Elections May 11, 2011) (dismissing HAVA complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to appear on ballot); **Schneller v. Cortes**, No. 199 MM 2008 (Pa. Jan. 8, 2009) (denying emergency application challenging Obama’s eligibility), *pet. for cert. dismissed*, 129 S. Ct. 2830 (2009); **Schneller v. Obama**, No. 75 MD 2012 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot), *appeal dismissed*, No. 24 MAP 2012 (Pa. Mar. 23, 2012), *recons. denied* (Pa. Apr. 26, 2012); **Schneller v. Corbett et al**, No. 212 MD 201 (Pa. Commw. Ct., May 25, 2012) (dismissing multiple claims relating to “natural born citizen” issue, including purported “quo warranto” action on grounds that Obama is ineligible to be President and action to compel state election board to hold hearing on Obama’s eligibility); **Sibley v. D.C. Board of Elections and Ethics**, No. 2012 CA 004892 B (D.C. Super. Ct., Sept. 7, 2012) (dismissing complaint seeking to prevent Obama from appearing on 2012 ballot); **Sibley v. D.C. Board of Elections & Ethics**, No. 12 AA 1498 (D.C. Ct. App., Sept. 18, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 general election ballot); *reh’g denied* (Oct. 2, 2012).. **Sorenson v. Riley**, No. CV-2008-001906.00 (Ala. Montgomery County Cir. Ct. Jan. 1, 2009) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s and McCain’s eligibility); **Sorenson v. Kennedy**, No. 01-CV-2011-0023.00 (Ala. Montgomery County Cir. Ct. Jan. 19, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot); **Spuck v. Secretary of State**, No. 2008CV1116 (Ohio Erie County Ct. Com. Pl. Dec 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility) (as reported by Ohio Secretary of State); **Strunk v. Patterson**, No. 029641/2008 (N.Y. King County Supr. Ct. Nov. 3, 2008) (dismissing case seeking to stay 2008 election on various grounds); **Strunk v. Patterson**, No. 029642/2008 (N.Y. King County Supr. Ct. Nov. 24, 2009) (denying motion for subpoenas to multiple government agencies for documents allegedly relating to Obama’s eligibility and denying motion for protective order); **Strunk v. N.Y. Bd. of Elections et al**, 35 Misc. 3d

“BIRTHER” CASES STRING CITE

1208(A), 2012 WL 1205117, 2012 N.Y. Slip Op. 50614 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Apr. 11, 2012) (N.Y. King County Supr. Ct. Apr. 11, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging, among other things, President Obama’s eligibility to his office; expressly rejecting the birther claim that Obama is ineligible on the basis of his father’s citizenship as frivolous, and issuing a show cause order as to why sanctions should not be imposed upon plaintiff); **Strunk v. Obama** (*In re Objection of Christopher-Earl: Strunk*), No Number Assigned, (N.Y. Bd. of Elections Feb. 28, 2012) (rejecting petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot and finding that petition designating Obama as candidate is valid); **Stumpo v. Gov. of Michigan**, No. 08-140-MM (Mich. Dist. Ct. (30th Mar. 31, 2009) (granting summary disposition in case filed challenging Obama’s eligibility), *appeal dismissed*, No. 291681 (Mich. Ct. App. June 3, 2009), *recons. denied* (Oct. 1, 2009); **Sullivan v. Marshall**, No. 08-cvs-021393 (N.C. Super. Ct. Mar. 16, 2009) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); **Sullivan v. N.C. Sec’y of State**, No. 08-cv-1076 (N.C. Super. Ct. Oct. 29, 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility); **Sunahara v. Haw. Dept. of Health**, No. 1cc12-1-000006 (Haw. 1st Dist. Ct. Mar. 8, 2012) (complaint seeking access to birth/death records of Sunahara based on alleged connection to Obama’s eligibility); **Swensson v. Obama**, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1216218-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen”), *decision adopted as final* (Ga. Sec’y of State Feb. 7, 2012), No. 2012CV211527 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *motion for injunction denied*, No. S12D1076 (Ga. Mar. 13, 2012), *appeal denied* (Ga. Apr. 4, 2012); **Swihart v. Obama**, No. 2012-176 (Ind. Election Comm’n Feb. 24, 2012) (denying objection seeking to keep Obama off 2012 ballot on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”) (written decision unavailable but video of hearing is available at www.in.gov/sos/022412_Video_3.html (last visited April 11, 2012)); **Taitz v. Fuddy**, No. 1CC11-1-001731 (Haw. 1st Cir. Ct. Nov. 10, 2011) (dismissing appeal of agency refusal to grant access to documents allegedly related to Obama’s eligibility), *recons. denied* (Jan. 6, 2012), *recons. denied* (Feb. 7, 2012); **Taitz v. Obama**, No. BLC 2011-4 (N.H. Ballot Law Comm’n Nov. 18, 2011) (dismissing petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot), *recons. denied* (Nov. 28, 2011); **Taitz v. Obama**, No Number Assigned (Haw. Office of Elections Dec. 2, 2011) (rejecting petition seeking to challenge Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot and demand for emergency hearing re: same); **Taitz v. Gardner**, No. 2011-0880 (N.H. Dec. 27, 2011) (denying petition for original jurisdiction and/or appeal challenging order entered by N.H. Ballot Law Comm’n in *Taitz v. Obama*, No. BLC 2011-4 (N.H. Ballot Law Comm’n Nov. 18, 2011)); **Taitz v. Nishimura**, No. SPCW-12-000014, 2012 WL 120367 (Haw. Jan. 12, 2012) (denying petition for writ of mandamus to force circuit court judge to issue order forcing Dept. of Health to grant access to documents allegedly related to Obama’s eligibility); **Taitz v. Obama**, No Number Assigned (Ind. Election Div. Feb. 16, 2012) (notice to Taitz that her election challenge could not be accepted due to failure to follow appropriate procedures); **Taitz et al v. Ind. Elec. Commn. et al**, No. 49D0103MI012046 (Ind. Marion County Super. Ct. June 12, 2012) (dismissing election contest brought by multiple plaintiffs challenging election board’s rejection of challenges seeking to exclude Obama from 2012 ballot and seeking to prohibit Indiana Secretary of State from including Obama on ballot; permitting Taitz to amend complaint to allege other causes of action); Order dismissing amended complaint in its entirety (Nov. 5, 2012) (dismissing amended complaint stating claims for declaratory and injunctive relief regarding Obama’s eligibility to be on the ballot); **Taitz v. Obama**, No. 30-2012 00582135 (Cal. Super. Ct. July 13, 2012) (denying “emergency” motion to stay certification of primary election results on grounds that Obama not eligible to serve as President (among others)); Order (Nov. 7, 2012) (dismissing case with prejudice); **Terry v. Handel**, No. 2008cv158774 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Oct. 24, 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility), *appeal dismissed*, No. S09D0284 (Ga. Dec. 3, 2008), *recons. denied*, (Ga. Jan. 12, 2009), *appeal dismissed*, No. S09A1373 (Ga. May 18, 2009); **Thompson v. Kennedy**, No. 75-CV-2012-000003.00 (Ala. St. Clair-Pell County Cir. Ct. Jan. 13, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot); **Thompson v. Obama** (*In re Objection of Julianne Thompson*), No Number Assigned, (N.Y. Bd. of Elections Determination Feb. 28, 2011) (rejecting petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot and finding that petition designating Obama as candidate is valid); **Van Allen v. Obama** (*In re Objection of H. William Van Allen*),

“BIRTHER” CASES STRING CITE

No Number Assigned, (N.Y. Bd. of Elections Determination Feb. 28, 2011) (rejecting petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot and finding that petition designating Obama as candidate is valid); *Van Allen v. N.Y. State Bd. of Elections*, 36 Misc. 3d 1212(A) (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Jul. 9, 2012) (dismissing petition for writ of mandamus, emergency injunctive relief and declaratory relief regarding definition of “natural born citizen”); *Vestal v. Obama*, No Number Assigned (N.C. Bd. of Elections Dec. 13, 2011) (rejecting purported “Complaint Under §19-3 Elections Fraud; Emergency Hearing Requested” filed in apparent attempt to challenge Obama’s eligibility to remain on the ballot); *Voeltz v. Obama*, No. 37 2012 CA 000467, 2012 WL 2524874 (Fla. Cir. Ct. June 29, 2012) (dismissing complaint challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot; finding that persons born in US are NBCs per *Wong Kim Ark* and *Ankeny*, regardless of parentage and rejecting birther argument to the contrary); *Voeltz v. Obama*, No. 37 2012 CA 002063, 2012 WL 4117478 (Fla. Cir. Ct. Sept. 6, 2012) (dismissing complaint seeking declaration that Obama is not eligible for presidency because he was not born in US and was not born to two US citizen parents; finding that persons born in US are “natural born citizens” per *Wong Kim Ark* and *Ankeny*, regardless of parentage and rejecting birther argument to the contrary; reserving for later ruling motion for sanctions); *Volodarsky v Obama (In re Objection of Leonard Volodarsky)*, No Number Assigned, (N.Y. Bd. of Elections Feb. 28, 2011) (rejecting petition challenging Obama’s eligibility to be on 2012 ballot and finding that petition designating Obama as candidate is valid); *Welden v. Obama*, No. OSAH-SECSTATE-CE-1215137-60-MALIHI (Ga. Office of St. Admin. Hrg. Feb. 3, 2012) (rejecting challenge to Obama’s eligibility to appear on 2012 ballot; finding that Obama was born in U.S. and is a “natural born citizen”), *decision adopted as final* (Ga. Sec’y of State Feb. 7, 2012), *appeal dismissed*, No. 2012CV211527 (Ga. Fulton County Super. Ct. Mar. 2, 2012), *motion for injunction denied*, No. S12D1059 (Ga. Mar. 13, 2012), *appeal denied* (Ga. Apr. 4, 2012); *Weyl v. Obama*, No. 2012-161 (Ind. Election Comm’n Feb. 24, 2012) (denying objection seeking to keep Obama off 2012 ballot on grounds that he is not a “natural born citizen”) (written decision unavailable but video of hearing is available at www.in.gov/sos/022412_Video_3.html (last visited April 11, 2012)); *Wolf v. Fuddy*, No. 1CC11-1-002276 (Haw. 1st Cir. Ct. Sept. 30, 2011) (dismissing case seeking to compel disclosure of documents allegedly related to Obama’s eligibility); *Wrotnowski v. Bysiewicz*, 958 A. 2d 709 (Conn. 2008) (dismissing case challenging Obama’s eligibility), *app. for stay denied*, 129 S. Ct. 775 (2008).