

State of Illinois)
County of Cook) SS

BEFORE THE DULY CONSTITUTED MUNICIPAL OFFICERS ELECTORAL BOARD FOR THE VILLAGE OF NORRIDGE (“ELECTORAL BOARD”) FOR THE HEARING AND PASSING UPON OF OBJECTIONS TO THE NOMINATION PAPERS OF CANDIDATES FOR MUNICIPAL OFFICES IN THE VILLAGE OF NORRIDGE

Michael Straughn)
Petitioner-Objector)
v.) **No. 2020-NMOEB-VT-002**
Andrew Charles Kopinski)
Respondent-Candidate)

FINDINGS, DECISIONS AND ORDER

This cause coming on to be heard on January 5, 2021 by the Municipal Officers Electoral Board of the Village of Norridge (“Board”), was duly constituted, convened and consisting of the following: Hon Daniel **Tannhauser**, Chair, Hon. Ursula A. **Kucharski**, Senior Norridge Village Trustee in years of service, and Hon. Jacqueline P. **Gregorio**, Second Senior Village Trustee in years of Service. The Village Clerk, Hon. Debra J. **Budnik**, was statutorily disqualified, because she is seeking election on April 6, 2021 for the office of Village Trustee which is for same the same election and same office involving the trustee candidates whose nomination papers are being challenged in these proceedings.

Trustees **Kucharski** and **Gregorio** are both retiring from public service at the end of their current terms and are not on the April 6, 2021 ballot and therefore were not disqualified from serving on this Board. Consequently, this Board, was constituted pursuant to Section 10-9 of the Election Code (10 ILCS 5/10-9) (“Code”) for passing upon the objections of **Michael Straughn** (“**Objector**”) to the nomination papers of **ANDREW CHARLES KOPINSKI** (“**Candidate**”) for election to the office of **Village Trustee of the Village of Norridge** to be voted for at the **Consolidated Election to be held on the 6th day of April, 2021**, the Objector having appeared through and being represented by Attorney Scott D. Erdman, the Candidate having appeared through and being represented Attorney Frank Avila, the Board having reviewed the objections, heard and considered the testimony, reviewed the exhibits and the Zoom video recording, and the relevant statutory and case law entered into the record and being fully advised;

THE BOARD HEREBY MAKES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

1. The Candidate timely filed nomination papers for election to the office of Village Trustee of the Village of Norridge to be voted for at the Consolidated Election to be held on the 6th day of April, 2021.
2. The Objector timely and duly filed his objections to the Candidate's nomination papers.
3. The Board was legally constituted according to the laws of the State of Illinois.
4. A Call to the hearing on said objections was duly issued and was caused to be properly served on the members of the Board, the Objector, the Candidate, the attorney for the Objector, and the attorney for the Candidate (if known) in accordance with the Code.
5. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and ongoing restrictions as set forth by Governor J.B. Pritzker's Executive Orders, and due to the Village of Norridge's Declaration of Emergency, and pursuant to the amended rules of the Illinois Open Meetings Act (5 ILCS 120/1 et seq), the Electoral Board found it necessary to conduct this, and all subsequent meetings and hearings both in person and virtually using the Zoom platform and adopted a Motion to conduct this meeting and subsequent meetings and hearings of the Electoral Board in person and using the Zoom platform.

During all of the proceedings, the Board Chair participated from his office in the Norridge Village Hall through the Zoom platform as did Member Kucharski from her office in the Norridge Village Hall. During all of the proceedings Member Gregorio participated remotely through the Zoom platform as did the attorneys for both the Candidate and the Objector and members of the Public during two Public Comment periods. During all of the proceedings Electoral Board counsel were personally present in the Village Hall Board Room. Witnesses called by the parties participated in person or through the Zoom platform as indicated below.

The hearings conducted on January 5, January 12, January 15, and January 21, 2021 were recorded on the Zoom platform and have all been posted in their entirety on the official Village of Norridge website under the "Government/Agendas and Minutes/Zoom Electoral Board Hearings" tab.

6. The Board was first convened on Tuesday, January 5, 2021. Neither party objected to the composition of the Board. Neither party offered any comments regarding the proposed rules. The Board adopted the Rules of Procedure for the Municipal Officers Electoral Board for the Village of Norridge for the Hearing and Passing upon Objections to Nomination Papers of Candidates for Municipal Officers in the Village of Norridge which Rule 16 also appointed Joan S. Cherry and Thomas A. Jaconetty as the Board's attorneys.
7. The following persons, among others, were present at the hearings regarding the objections to the nomination papers of the Candidate which were conducted on January 5, January 12,

January 15, and January 21, 2021:

- a. Honorable Daniel Tannhauser, Chair;
- b. Honorable Ursula Kucharski, Member;
- c. Honorable Jacqueline Gregorio, Member;
- d. The Objector through his attorney, Scott D. Erdman;
- e. The Candidate through his Attorney Frank Avila;
- f. Various witnesses in person or through Zoom as described below; and
- f. Various other members of the public participating through the Zoom platform.

8. The Board's Attorneys offered into evidence the following documents on January 5:

- Board Exhibit A: Transmittal from Village Clerk to Electoral Board Chairman;
Board Exhibit B: The Call Service List and the Call;
Board Exhibit C: The Appearance of the Objector's attorney;
Board Exhibit D: The Appearance of the Candidate's attorney;
Board Exhibit E: The Electoral Board Rules, as adopted;
Board Exhibit F: The Candidate's nomination papers;
Board Exhibit G: The Objector's Petition;
Board Exhibit H: The Agenda for the Meeting;
Board Exhibit I: The Public Notice of the Meeting;
Board Exhibit J: Receipt of Call and Other Electoral Board Documents and Waiver of Statutory Service and Notice of Parties (group);
Board Exhibit K: Return of Package Drop-Offs (group);
Board Exhibit L: Photographs of Nomination Papers from the Office of Village Clerk.

The Exhibits were admitted into the record by the Board, upon motion, which was duly seconded, and passed by unanimous roll call vote of the Board.

9. At the January 5 hearing, *inter alia*, counsel for the parties
- a. acknowledged receipt of the Call, Service and Electoral Board documents;
 - b. entered, and agreed to exchange, their appearances;
 - c. agreed to waiver of statutory service and notice;
 - d. agreed that that the operative language of the statute at issue concerning the petition fastening and binding requirement was contained in 10 ILCS 5/10-4 (after the nature of the objections were outlined by Board counsel and Objector's counsel);
 - e. neither party intended to file any preliminary motions in the nature of a Motion to Strike and Dismiss, or otherwise, pursuant to Electoral Board Rule Board Rule 5; and
 - f. the Objector would be requesting subpoenas to issue for certain witnesses but that the Candidate would not be requesting any subpoenas since any intended witnesses were in the control of the Candidate and would be produced voluntarily.

The Board then adopted a Motion which was duly seconded, and passed by unanimous roll call vote of the Board to recess the hearing to January 12, 2021, at 3:30 PM.

10. Prior to the January 12 hearing Counsel for the Objector timely filed a request that personal appearance subpoenas to **Katherine Gaseor** and **Debra J. Budnik** in order to obtain their testimony. No objection was made by Counsel for the Candidate to the issuance of subpoenas. Electoral Board counsel conferred with, and polled, the Board members individually, and after determining that all three members had approved the subpoenas, it so authorized the Chair to issue them and inform counsel.
11. On January 12, the hearing continued. This case along with two other Village Trustee cases on the docket commenced at 3:45 PM and concluded at 12:22 AM on January 13, 2021, after approximately 8 hours and 23 minutes (See the two-part video on the Village of Norridge website). 2020-NMOEB-002 (Zoom video, 1/12/21 (I), 3:54:28-5:25:11).
12. **Testimony of Joanna Skupien:** Ms. Skupien was sworn and testified in the Village Hall From the conference room through the Zoom platform. She has been employed by the Village for 22 years and has accepted nominating petitions in the past. She accepted Candidate Kopinski's nominating petitions, which were filed by Adam Chudzik, on December 19, 2020. When she arrived at the front counter the petitions were already out of the manila envelope partially through the glass opening and laying on top of the envelope. The witness was then shown the two-page Exhibit L.

[Board counsel Jaconetty interjected that the first page shows the loose petition sheets on top of the manila envelope, as does the second page, which also establishes that Clerk Budnik had taken the photograph and emailed it to herself.]

She remembered that she had requested permission from Chudzik to remove the staple from the two-page document determined to be the statement of economic interests. She testified that she completed the petition checklist form which was signed by Chudzik and herself and advised that the D-5 notice would be sent to the Candidate. With the exception of the staple removed from the statement of economic interests there was no binding of the nomination papers: no clips, no holes, no shoelaces, no paper clip on the documents. She stated that Chudzik was facing his phone at the paperwork and then turned to face the wall clock and made verbal statements as to the date and time. Skupien also testified that Chudzik verified the date and time of filing as it appeared on the checklist. Chudzik was alone and the lobby was empty as she proceeded to date stamp the first and last signature sheet and various other pages in the nominating petitions.

Under cross-examination she acknowledged she supports the Norridge Improvement Party and the entire Village Board. Being one of three persons authorized to accept any petitions, she was summoned by staff, and after a very short time, arrived to see that the petitions were already out of the envelope and on the counter.

Finally, Skupien went back the Clerk's office and by then Budnik had arrived, and she turned over the documents to her, with a reminder to send the D-5 notice to the Candidate.

13. The **Chair Tannhauser** inspected the actual nomination papers (Electoral Board Exhibit F) made the following observations on the record:

“I checked for holes. There were no holes that I could see or staples. The clasp on the envelope just like in the picture were collapsed . . . The economic interest had staple holes and the clasp on the envelope does not look like it had been closed” (Zoom video (I), 1/12/21, 4:32:45-4:33:10; 4:35:36-4:35:55)

14. Electoral Board Counsel **Jaconetty** was requested to describe the physical state of the nomination papers:

“The first pages of the nomination papers are the statement of candidacy, there are no staple marks, hole punches, particular indentations, scratches or whatever in the paper that might be made by serrated paper clip or anything of that nature on the very first page. And, as you go through the documents, for example, at the pages 9 through 23 that I just looked at now, nothing indicates any type of connection of these papers together.”

“There are no holes, staple marks, indentations, striations created by a paper clip or anything of that of that nature. The only thing I see on these sheets is the normal, you know, slight wear and tear of bending and being handled by various people in the petition process. There is nothing on the back that would indicate that they had been connected together in any way.” (Zoom video, 1/12/21 (I), 4:35:50-4:37:41).

15. **Testimony of Adam Chudzik:** Mr. Chudzik was sworn and testified over the Zoom Platform that he is a Norridge resident and is familiar with Mr. Kopinski. He assisted him in organizing and preparing his trustee petitions. He put the sheets together and numbered them sequentially, put a clip on the petitions and put them in a manila envelope secured with a clasp. A paper clip was over all of the sheets together. He filed them at the Village at the 10 o'clock hour on December 19. He delivered them to the front desk and did not know who the person was at the front desk. It was not Kathy. A person took the sheets out of the envelope and went to get Joanna Skupien who about 2 -3 minutes to get there. The statement of economic interests had been stapled together by the Cook County Clerk. Joanna was handed the petitions by the other lady. He requested a copy of the petitions. Joanna asked if she could take the clip off.

Under cross-examination Mr. Chudzik testified that it was an older lady with brown hair that took the petitions at first with the paper clip was attached. He browsed and texted and does not recall going over to the clock. He did not feel it was necessary to take photographs of this filing and did not do so. He filed for Mr. Kopinski who is an acquaintance of his as a favor. On redirect examination he testified that he filed the petitions on a Saturday and filed his own petitions on Friday. He accepted the receipt for Mr. Kopinski's petitions.

16. **Debra J. Budnik** was unable to appear due to a medical emergency which caused her hospitalization on the morning of January 12. Objecter's counsel reserved the right to call her when available.

17. Counsel for the parties proceeded to make closing argument. They were advised that the Board would further enter a Case Management Order, dated January 12, requiring that the deadline for the parties to simultaneously provide a Memorandum/Brief applying relevant facts elicited by testimony to the applicable case law was Thursday, January 14, 2021, at 9:00 PM, and that the case was set for continuing electoral board hearings on Friday, January 15, 2021, at 6:00 PM. Pursuant to that Order, the Objector filed his “Objector’s Memorandum in Support of His Objections” on January 14 at 5:02 PM. The Candidate, due to a medical emergency concerning his daughter, sought and received leave to file his “Memorandum of Law” late, received at 10:07 PM.
18. The Board finds that the testimony and demeanor of Ms. Skupien was clear, unemotional, and consistent; without hesitation or animosity, or bias; and that she was a very credible witness, especially when she directly contradicted Mr. Chudzik’s testimony. The Board finds that Mr. Chudzik’s testimony was evasive and inattentive to, and distracted from, the filing process; his denial of not video-taping the process was not credible; that his failure to take any photograph of this particular petition-filing was inexplicable. Most importantly, the paper clip allegedly holding the petitions together was never found.
19. The Board finds that 10 ILCS 5/10-4 of the Election Code governs Independent Candidacies and that, with regard to nomination papers, it provides, *inter alia*, that:

“Such sheets, before being presented to the electoral board or filed with the proper office of the electoral district or division of the state or municipality, as the case may be, shall be **neatly fastened together in book form, by placing the sheets in a pile and fastening them together at one edge in a secure and suitable manner**, and the sheets shall then be numbered consecutively. (Emphasis supplied).”
20. The Board finds with regard to the phrase “in book form” that “it is universally known that a book is a collection of sheets fastened together along with one edge and usually trimmed at the other edges to form a single series of uniform leaves”. Bendell v. Educational Officers Electoral Board for School District 148, 338 Ill.App.3d, 458, 463, 788 N.E.2d 173 (1st Dist. 2003).
21. The Board finds that the word “secure” may be commonly understood as meaning attached, connected, or conjoined; that the word “suitable” may be commonly understood as meaning appropriate, apt, fitting, or proper; and that the words “fasten”, “fastened” and “fastening” may be commonly understood as meaning attached, attached firmly or securely in place, bound, clasped, connected together, fixed firmly, fixed together, or secured.
22. The Board finds that nominating papers which are disconnected and not attached together, but merely enclosed inside (or inserted into) an envelope, otherwise not connected together separately therein, are not properly “fastened in a secure and suitable manner”; and that such nomination papers are susceptible to falling, pulling or breaking apart, or otherwise lying loose and unattached, during the normal process of bending, handling, moving,

stamping or storing by the staff of the receiving authority; and that as such they are not “fastened together in book form . . . in a secure and suitable manner”.

23. The Board finds that various decisions have held that the absolute failure to bind and fasten nomination papers together has been ruled a fatal defect. Davis v. Young, 2020-COEL-000027 (Cook County Circuit Court 2021); Jefferson v. Mendoza, 2020-COEL-000028 (Cook County Circuit Court 2021); Valentin v. Esparza, No. 15-EB-ALD-004 (Chicago Electoral Board 2015); Milissis v. Wisniewski, No. 09-COEB-PD-12 (Cook County Electoral Board 2009). Williams v. Clark, No. 07-EB-ALD-025 (Chicago Electoral Board 2007); Brummit v. Brewer, No. 07-EB-ALD-062 (Chicago Electoral Board 2007); Thompson v. Hamilton, No. 03-EB-ALD-161 (Chicago Electoral Board 2003); Wilson v. Rowans, No. 03-EB-ALD-122 (Chicago Electoral Board 2003); Jones v. Castillo, No. 07-EB-ALD-144 (Chicago Electoral Board 2007); Rivers v. Calumet School District #155 Educational Officers Electoral Board, No. 01 CE 16 (Cook County Circuit Court 2001); Anderson v. Municipal Officers Electoral Board of Prospect Heights, No. 99 Co. 53 (Cook County Circuit Court 1999).
24. The Board finds that three court decisions have specifically criticized the use of paper clips as an inappropriate method of binding: Jones v. Dodendorf, 190 Ill.App.3d 557, 546 N.E.2d 92, 94 – 95 (2d Dist. 1989); Stanbuck v. Kusper, No. 71 C 217 (N.D. Ill. 1971) (unpublished); Girov v. Keith, 341 Ill.App.3d 902, 793 N.E.2d 935, 938 (3d Dist. 2003), rev'd. on other grounds, 212 Ill.2d 372 (2004) (relying on Jones: “[b]y its very nature, a paper clip allows the papers it ‘fastens’ to be pulled apart and rearranged at will, showing no sign of tampering and doing little to assure the continued integrity of the petition package submitted to the electoral official.”) The Board further finds that if a paper clip allegedly “fastening” nomination papers when submitted slipped off and could later not be found that circumstance *ipso facto* would be indicia that the petition had not been not “fastened. . . in a secure and suitable manner”. See also, Nocita v. Airdo, No. 15-MOEB-ALD-01 (Melrose Park Electoral Board), aff'd, No. 2015 COEL 00021 (Cook County Circuit Court. 2015) (voiding candidacy; demonstrative exhibit established that sheets could be removed without disturbing binder clip).
25. The Board finds that in Bendell v. Educational Officers Electoral Board for School District 148, 338 Ill.App.3d, 458, 464, 788 N.E.2d 173 (1st Dist. 2003), the Court permitted the use of a paper clip binding only because the physical condition of the filing was such that a six to eight-page petition, fastened with a serrated paper clip, could not be pulled apart when tested by a member of the electoral board: “The uncontroverted evidence is that they were securely fastened because a member of the Board was unable to pull them apart without removing the paper clip. This is a fact-specific case.” Further, the Bendell court also held: “Inasmuch as section 10-4 is mandatory, compliance with its provisions must be strict rather than substantial”, Id., 338 Ill. App. at 463.

The Board further finds that the various Chicago electoral board cases cited by the Candidate finding paper clip fastening to be acceptable were fact-intensive cases. In each case the specifically described clips or bindings were in existence, did in fact securely hold together the nominating papers, and their presence and use was verified by testimony of

- the receiving authority and/or additional witnesses and corroborating photographic evidence.
26. The Board finds that nominating papers disconnected and not attached together, and merely enclosed inside, or inserted into, a manila envelope—but otherwise not connected together separately therein—are not “fastened in a secure and suitable manner”. Davis v. Young, 2020-COEL-000027 (Circuit Court of Cook County 2021); Jefferson v. Mendoza, 2020-COEL-000028 (Circuit Court of Cook County 2021); and that being “enclosed” or “included within” such a 9 x 13-inch envelope, whether the outside clasp is engaged or not, are not fastened or bound as required by 10 ILCS 5/10-4. An envelope is neither a binding nor a fastening.
 27. The Board finds that in this case the uncontroverted actual physical condition of these nominating papers fails to disclose holes or hole punches, metal clasp fasteners, binding ties or staples indicating such methods of fastening. Nor do these nomination papers bear the tell-tale signs of any depressions, impressions, or indentations; creasing, crumpling or markings; striations, grooves or scratches; or cuts and tears into the papers which one would expect to be left after the use of a paper clip (serrated or otherwise) allegedly “securely and suitably fastening” together a 34-page document. Examination by Board members and photographic evidence corroborate these facts.
 28. At the January 12, 2021 hearing, late in the evening after the case of Straughn v. Mitera, 2020-NMOEB-VT-003 had been called (Zoom video (II), 6:25:19), Candidate’s counsel requested that the Chair of the Board and Member Gregorio recuse themselves and that a new Public Member Board be empaneled. The grounds alleged were that: (a) the Chair of this Board was also the Chair of the Norridge Improvement Party (NIP) which paid legal fees to the attorney for the Objector; (b) the members of this Board are also members of the NIP; and (c) Member Gregorio (who is participating remotely from Florida) was overheard engaged in conversation during a recess—not with other Board members—but with another unknown male (perhaps her husband) during which that third party (who is not a Board member) offers an opinion on the credibility of a witness. Candidate’s counsel alleged further participation would be “unethical”, “disturbing”, “a conflict of interest”, “inappropriate” and demonstrates a “lack of impartiality”, and “bias”. Nevertheless, Counsel indicated that he would proceed with the hearing and take up any matters regarding the composition of the Board in the Circuit Court (Zoom video (II), 1/12/21, 5:39-39:42, 1:08:15-1:08:35). The recusal issue raised pertains to all three cases: VT-001, VT-002, and VT-003.
 29. The Board finds that the law does not permit a claim of substitution of members “whenever objector feels a conflict is present.” Further, there is “no authority which requires an electoral board member to be disqualified from hearing a dispute because of past legal or political activity or conflicts.” In re Objection of Cook to Referendum Petition of Pierce, 122 Ill. App. 3d 1068, 1072 (5th Dist. 1984). In addition, Ryan v. Landek, 159 Ill. App. 3d. 10, 13 (1st Dist. 1987) (where two members of the Electoral Board were party members who had also circulated petitions), held that:

“the Election Code does not provide for substitution when an objector alleges political bias. The legislature has set up a stable mechanism for addressing pre-election grievances. The statutory provisions allowing substitution under particular circumstances and judicial review [10 ILCS 5/10-10.1] adequately insure an objector a fair hearing.”

Also, Ayers v. Martin, 233 Ill. App. 3d 397, 399-400 (4th Dist. 1991), similarly rejected claims of bias. The Court reasoned:

“In the instant case, plaintiff notes that two of the electoral board members had voted as members of the School Board to authorize the preparation of the objections to his petitions that they, as members of the electoral board, would review. He also claims the School Board has a pecuniary interest in the outcome, which was not present in Cook and Ryan. However, this argument is without merit.”

Further, Sjordal v. Municipal Officers Electoral Board of the City of Naperville, 2013 IL App (2d) 130189-U, involving a referendum petition, is illustrative. Sjordal alleged that the Electoral Board Chair (Mayor) was a petition signer; that the Proponent was co-chair of and a financial contributor to the Mayor’s campaign; that the councilman Electoral Board member had publicly opposed a related 2010 referendum; and that the city attorney had forwarded a memo addressing how to reverse the 2010 referendum to the Proponent’s firm. Id., ¶¶ 11. The Court affirmed the Electoral Board finding that the allegation of bias was “wholly unpersuasive”. Id., ¶14. The Court concluded that:

“The members of an administrative board “are presumed to have made their decisions in a fair and objective manner.” Fox Moraine, LLC v. United City of Yorkville, 2011 IL App (2d) 100017, ¶ 60. This presumption is not overcome merely because a decision-maker has previously taken a public position or expressed strong views on the issue. Concerned Adjoining Owners v. Pollution Control Board, 288 Ill. App. 3d 565, 573 (1997). To show bias or prejudice in an administrative proceeding, the petitioner must show that a disinterested observer might conclude that the administrative board, or its members, had prejudged the facts or law of the case. Id. We reject Sjordal’s argument that he was deprived of a fair hearing before an unbiased Board.” Id., ¶¶ 41-42.

Finally, in this case, none of the Board members here have “a direct, personal substantial pecuniary interest”. See Tumey v. Ohio, 273 U.S. 510, 523, 532 (1927), and Ward v. Village of Monroeville, 409 U.S. 57, 61-62 (1972). None would be called as a witness or to pass judgment on his or her own personal credibility. See Girot v. Keith, 212 Ill. 2d 372, 376, 379-381 (2004). None has a personal and pecuniary interest in the fate of a referendum petition affecting him or her. See Zurek v. Franklin Park Officers Electoral Board, 2014 IL App (1st) 142618 and Anderson v. McHenry Township, 289 Ill. App. 3d 830, 833-34 (1997). There is no blood relationship between any board member and a party. See Mank v. Board of Fire and Police Commissioners, 7 Ill. App. 3d 478, 484 (1972). The

officials on the Norridge Electoral Board have no personal financial stake in the outcome, are not passing upon their own credibility, and are not deciding issues impacting their own legal rights, terms of office or compensation. Nor are these local public official members “candidates for the office with relation to which the objector’s petition is filed”. 10 ILCS 5/10-9.

The Board members individually declined to recuse themselves (Zoom video, 1/15/21, 12:45-16:44), and under the law acted properly when making their individual decisions.

30. For the reasons stated above, the Board finds that the failure of the Candidate to strictly comply with the mandatory provisions of 10 ILCS 5/10-4 of the Election that he “fasten” his nomination papers “in a secure and suitable manner” and instead filed his nomination papers in an unbound, unconnected, unfastened, and loose manner invalidating those petitions as being not in compliance with the Election Code.
31. There being no further allegations remaining against the Candidate, upon motion made on January 15, 2021, which was duly seconded, by unanimous roll call vote, the Board ruled that the Objections were sustained and that the Candidate’s name **NOT** be printed on the April 6, 2021 Consolidated Election ballot.
32. All evidence or exhibits tendered by those appearing at the hearing, if any, was heard and considered by the Board. All arguments that were made at the hearing, if any, were heard and considered by the Board. All oral arguments, testimony, physical evidence, and the Zoom video recordings were considered by the Board.

BASED UPON THE BOARD’S FINDINGS AND DECISIONS, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that the **Objector’s Petition is Sustained** that the **objections** to the nomination papers of the Candidate, **ANDREW CHARLES KOPINSKI**, candidate for the office of **Village Trustee** of the Village of Norridge, located in the County of Cook, State of Illinois, **are hereby NOT** in conformity with the findings contained herein. The name of **ANDREW CHARLES KOPINSKI**, as candidate for the office of **Village Trustee of the Village of Norridge**, located in the County of Cook, State of Illinois, **NOT be printed** on the ballot for the Consolidated Election to be held on Tuesday, the 6h day of April, 2021.

Dated at Norridge in Cook County, Illinois this on 21st day of January, 2021.

EITHER PARTY MAY SEEK OR SECURE JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS DECISION BY FILING A PETITION IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY WITHIN FIVE (5) DAYS AFTER THE DECISION OF THE ELECTORAL BOARD, AS PROVIDED IN 10 ILCS 5/10-10.1 OF THE ELECTION CODE.


Daniel Tannhauser, Chair

Ursula A. Kucharski

Ursula A. Kucharski, Senior Village Trustee

Jacqueline P. Gregorio
Jacqueline P. Gregorio, Second Senior Village Trustee