Brad Lee Barnhill
8104 Defiance Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
Phone: 702.613.2576
Brad@ElectBarnhill.net
Plaintiff, *in Propria Persona, sui juris*

FILED
ENTERED
RECEIVED
SERVED ON
COUNSEL/PARTIES OF RECORD
SEP - 4 2026
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA
BY: DEPUTY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Brad Lee Barnhill, Plaintiff, v. FRANCISCO V. AGUILAR, in his official capacity as Secretary of State of Nevada, Defendant.	Case No. _____ **COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF** *(National Voter Registration Act, 52 U.S.C. § 20501 et seq.)*

Brad Lee Barnhill ("Plaintiff"), appearing *in Propria Persona*, *sui juris*, alleges as follows against Defendant Francisco V. Aguilar, in his official capacity as Secretary of State of Nevada ("Defendant" or "Secretary"):

I. NATURE OF THE ACTION

1. This is a civil action for declaratory and injunctive relief under Section 11 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 ("NVRA"), 52 U.S.C. § 20510, to remedy Defendant's ongoing failure to comply with Section 8 of the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20507, which requires each State to "conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to remove the names of ineligible voters" from the official list of eligible voters and to maintain that list in an accurate and current condition.

2. Using voter registration data obtained directly from the Nevada Secretary of State's own public data-download portal, Plaintiff identified approximately 12,465 entries in Clark County reflecting apparent

duplicate voter registrations — that is, the same individual (matched on first name, last name, and birth year) associated with two or more distinct voter registration numbers and two or more distinct residential addresses, all showing recorded participation under each registration number in the 2024 General Election ("24G").

3. Plaintiff brought these findings to Defendant's attention in Defendant's official capacity as Nevada's Chief Election Officer, first by letter dated May 20, 2026, and then by formal written pre-suit notice and demand dated June 3, 2026, expressly invoking the NVRA and demanding corrective action within fourteen (14) calendar days.

4. On June 4, 2026, Defendant's office responded in writing (File No. C26-69 SOS), declining to take any action. Defendant's office reasoned that Plaintiff's submission amounted to a data-driven, "third-party" complaint rather than an individualized, personal-knowledge challenge filed with a county clerk under NRS 293.535 or NRS 293.547, and that it could not verify the submission met the NVRA's uniformity and nondiscrimination requirements for list-maintenance challenges. Defendant's office stated it "will not be taking action" on the complaint and closed the file.

5. Defendant's response does not dispute the existence or accuracy of the underlying data anomalies Plaintiff identified. Defendant's office declined to investigate, audit, or reconcile the flagged entries at any level — state or county — and instead directed Plaintiff to an individualized challenge process not designed for, and unsuited to, a systemic, data-driven finding of this scale.

6. Plaintiff provided Defendant with written notice of the violation alleged herein, as required by 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(1), by letter dated June 3, 2026, supplemented by an addendum dated June 4, 2026. Defendant has not corrected the violation within the ninety (90) days following receipt of that notice, as required by 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(2). Plaintiff accordingly brings this action.

///

///

7. Plaintiff brings this action in his individual capacity as an aggrieved Nevada elector. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek certification of a class pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) should discovery indicate that class treatment would materially aid enforcement of the relief sought herein.

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

8. This Court has federal-question subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this action arises under the laws of the United States, specifically the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20501 et seq.

9. This Court has authority to grant declaratory relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201–2202 and injunctive relief under 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(2).

10. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because Defendant performs official duties within this District, a substantial part of the events giving rise to this action occurred within this District (Clark County, Nevada), and Defendant's Las Vegas office received and acted upon the complaint at issue.

III. PARTIES

11. Plaintiff Brad Lee Barnhill is a citizen of Nevada, residing in Clark County, and a registered, eligible elector of the State of Nevada. Plaintiff is also the Independent American Party candidate for Nevada Secretary of State in the 2026 general election. Plaintiff is a "person who is aggrieved by a violation" of the NVRA within the meaning of 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b), both as a registered Nevada voter with a direct interest in the accuracy of the rolls on which his own vote is cast and counted, and as a candidate for the very office responsible for administering those rolls.

12. Defendant Francisco V. Aguilar is the Secretary of State of Nevada and is sued in his official capacity only. Under NRS 293.124, the Secretary of State is Nevada's Chief Election Officer, and under 52 U.S.C. § 20509, is the state official responsible for coordination of Nevada's responsibilities under the NVRA.

///

IV. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

13. Congress enacted the NVRA "to establish procedures that will increase the number of eligible citizens who register to vote," "to protect the integrity of the electoral process," and "to ensure that accurate and current voter registration rolls are maintained." 52 U.S.C. § 20501(b).

14. Section 8(a)(4) of the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4), requires that each State "conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to remove the names of ineligible voters from the official lists of eligible voters" by reason of the death of the registrant or a change in the residence of the registrant, in accordance with the removal procedures set out in the Act.

15. Section 8(i) of the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20507(i), requires that each State "maintain for at least 2 years and shall make available for public inspection... all records concerning the implementation of programs and activities conducted for the purpose of ensuring the accuracy and currency of official lists of eligible voters."

16. Section 9 of the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20508, requires the chief State election official to coordinate the State's responsibilities under the Act.

17. Section 11(b) of the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b), creates a private right of action for "a person who is aggrieved by a violation of this Act." Before commencing suit, such a person must first "provide written notice of the violation to the chief election official of the State involved." If the violation is not corrected within ninety (90) days after receipt of that notice, the aggrieved person may bring a civil action in an appropriate United States district court for declaratory or injunctive relief.

V. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

18. Plaintiff holds a Bachelor of Science degree in Computer Science from the University of Virginia (1981) and has more than twenty (20) years of professional experience in database analysis, data integrity review, and structured data systems.

19. On or about January 26, 2026, Plaintiff downloaded Nevada voter registration data directly from the Nevada Secretary of State's public data-download portal at https://www.nvsos.gov/SoSServices/DataDownload/ReportPreview.aspx.

20. Plaintiff conducted a systematic analysis of the Clark County voter registration dataset, including the fields for first name, last name, birth year, residential address, registration number, and recorded participation in the 2024 General Election.

21. That analysis identified 9,607 distinct individuals — matched on first name, last name, and birth year — each associated with more than one active voter registration number, comprising 12,465 total matched registration pairs. Of these individuals, 8,614 held two registration numbers, 795 held three, 153 held four, 33 held five, 8 held six, 2 held seven, and 2 held eight. Every one of the 12,465 matched pairs reflects: (a) two distinct voter registration numbers associated with the same identity fields; (b) two distinct residential addresses associated with those registration numbers; and (c) recorded participation in the 2024 General Election under both registration numbers in the pair.

22. After additional filtering and manual review, Plaintiff confirmed that this pattern was not the product of coincidental duplication in the underlying dataset: for each of the 9,607 identified individuals, the number of matched pairs associated with that individual corresponds precisely to the number of unique two-registration combinations arising from that individual's total distinct registration numbers. This confirms that the dataset reflects 9,607 individuals holding multiple simultaneous active registrations — including two individuals each holding eight distinct active registrations — rather than 12,465 independently occurring anomalies.

23. Plaintiff makes no allegation of criminal intent or individual wrongdoing by any voter. Plaintiff's findings concern apparent systemic anomalies in Nevada's voter registration data that, in Plaintiff's professional opinion, warrant official investigation, audit, and reconciliation.

24. On May 20, 2026, Plaintiff submitted a sworn Affidavit of Complaint documenting these findings to the Clark County District Attorney and, separately, to Defendant's Elections Division, requesting review, audit, and reconciliation of the affected entries.

25. On or about May 20, 2026, Defendant's office confirmed that Plaintiff's complaint had been assigned File No. C26-69 SOS and assigned to Compliance/Audit Investigator Darrell Harris.

26. More than fourteen (14) days passed with no further communication, no request for additional information, no interim findings, and no visible action from Defendant's office.

27. On June 3, 2026, Plaintiff sent Defendant a formal written demand and pre-suit notice, expressly invoking the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20501 et seq., and demanding that Defendant's office take specified corrective action within fourteen (14) calendar days to avoid federal litigation.

28. On June 4, 2026, Defendant's office issued a written closure letter stating that the SOS "will not be taking action on EIVRs that indicate, based on third-party data and not personal knowledge, regarding the existence of a duplicate voter registration," and directing Plaintiff instead to the individualized written-challenge procedures in NRS 293.535 and NRS 293.547, which require a challenge based on the challenger's personal knowledge and filed with the county clerk.

29. Defendant's June 4, 2026 letter did not dispute the accuracy of Plaintiff's underlying data analysis. It did not identify any audit, reconciliation, or independent verification performed by Defendant's office with respect to the approximately 12,465 flagged entries. It did not identify any coordination with the Clark County Clerk regarding those entries.

30. On June 4, 2026, Plaintiff sent Defendant a further written addendum explaining why the SOS's closure response failed to satisfy Defendant's obligations under 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4), including that: (a) Plaintiff's submission was a systematic database-integrity review, not an individualized voter challenge; (b) the Secretary of State, as Nevada's Chief Election Officer under NRS 293.124, bears overarching responsibility for the statewide voter registration list, a responsibility not discharged by redirecting a

statewide, data-driven complaint to county-level personal-knowledge challenge procedures; and (c) Defendant's own office possesses the technical capacity to perform the same duplicate-matching analysis Plaintiff performed, using the SOS's own published data, but has not done so.

31. As of the filing of this Complaint, Defendant has taken no independent action to investigate, audit, or reconcile the approximately 12,466 entries Plaintiff identified, and has not corrected the violation of 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4) alleged herein.

VI. SATISFACTION OF THE NVRA'S PRE-SUIT NOTICE REQUIREMENT

32. Plaintiff provided Defendant, the chief election official of the State of Nevada, with written notice of the violation alleged in this Complaint by letter dated June 3, 2026, sent via certified mail and electronic mail, and supplemented by written addendum dated June 4, 2026. 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(1).

33. More than ninety (90) days elapsed between Defendant's receipt of that notice and the filing of this Complaint, and Defendant did not correct the violation during that period. 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b)(2).

34. This action is timely brought following expiration of the statutory cure period.

VII. CLAIM FOR RELIEF

COUNT I — Violation of Section 8(a)(4) of the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4)

35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations set forth above as though fully set forth herein.

36. Section 8(a)(4) of the NVRA obligates Defendant, as Nevada's Chief Election Officer, to conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to remove ineligible voters from Nevada's official voter registration lists and to keep those lists accurate and current.

37. Plaintiff's analysis, performed using Defendant's own published voter registration data, identified 9,607 individuals in Clark County alone associated with more than one simultaneously active voter registration, reflected in 12,465 matched registration pairs, including two individuals each holding eight

distinct active registrations. Every one of these 12,465 pairs reflects dual participation in the 2024 General Election under separate registration numbers.

38. Defendant was placed on actual written notice of these findings no later than May 20, 2026, and again by formal NVRA demand on June 3, 2026, and has taken no independent investigative, auditing, or reconciliation action in response.

39. Defendant's stated position — that data-driven, systemic findings of this kind fall outside the scope of Defendant's list-maintenance obligations and may only be addressed through individualized, personal-knowledge challenges filed by name with a county clerk — is inconsistent with Defendant's statutory duty under 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4) to conduct a general program of reasonable list maintenance, a duty that exists independently of, and in addition to, the individualized challenge mechanisms found in NRS 293.535 and 293.547.

40. Defendant's failure to conduct any reasonable investigation, audit, or reconciliation of the flagged entries constitutes an ongoing violation of 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4).

41. Plaintiff has been and continues to be aggrieved by this violation, which undermines the accuracy of the voter registration list against which Plaintiff's own vote, and the votes of all lawful Nevada electors, are cast and counted, and which Plaintiff, as a candidate for the office responsible for administering Nevada's elections, has a direct professional and civic interest in remedying.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court:

A. Declare that Defendant has violated, and continues to violate, Section 8(a)(4) of the NVRA, 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4), by failing to conduct a general program that makes a reasonable effort to investigate, audit, and reconcile the approximately 12,466 apparent duplicate voter registration entries identified by Plaintiff in Clark County;

B. Enter an injunction requiring Defendant to (i) conduct or direct a good-faith audit and reconciliation of the flagged entries, in coordination with the Clark County Clerk as necessary; (ii) report the results of that audit, and any corrective action taken, to the Court and to Plaintiff within a time period set by the Court; and (iii) implement a documented, reasonable general program for identifying and resolving apparent duplicate registrations statewide going forward, consistent with 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4) and (i);

C. Award Plaintiff his costs of suit and, to the extent Plaintiff is represented by counsel, reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 52 U.S.C. § 20510(c)(2); and

D. Grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff seeks only declaratory and injunctive relief under 52 U.S.C. § 20510(b) and does not demand a trial by jury.

Dated this 3rd day of September, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brad Lee Barnhill

Brad Lee Barnhill
8104 Defiance Avenue
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129
Phone: 702.613.2576
Brad@ElectBarnhill.net
Plaintiff, *in Propria Persona, sui juris*

(verification follows on next page)

VERIFICATION

I, Brad Lee Barnhill, hereby declare that the factual allegations set forth in the foregoing Complaint concerning my own analysis, submissions, and correspondence are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief. I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost. (Romans 9:1) [1]

Executed on this 3rd day of September, 2026.

Brad Lee Barnhill

[1] In accord with ***Gordon v. State of Idaho***, 778 F.2d 1397, 1402–03 (9th Cir. 1985), the Court must employ the least restrictive means of assuring truthful testimony when a sincerely held religious belief conflicts with a prescribed oath or affirmation; this statement satisfies that objective without requiring me to use language that violates my religious convictions.