



1 Code qualifying PETITIONER as a candidate, and (4) place PETITIONER’S name and ballot  
2 designation on the ballot, sample ballot, and voter pamphlet for candidate for Governor for the State of  
3 California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election.

4 **INTRODUCTION**

5  
6 Petitioner and Plaintiff RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE, in his capacity as an elector, taxpayer,  
7 and candidate for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary  
8 Election, declares and alleges as follows:

9 1. By this verified petition, PETITIONER RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE  
10 (“PETITIONER”) seeks a writ of mandate under California Elections Code Section 13314 to compel  
11 SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official capacity as, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR CALIFORNIA  
12 (“RESPONDENT”) to accept and file nomination documents submitted by PETITIONER and to  
13 qualify PETITIONER as a candidate for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026  
14 Gubernatorial Primary Election, and to take all necessary and appropriate steps to place  
15 PETITIONER’S name on the ballot materials for such election.  
16

17 2. This petition is brought on the grounds that RESPONDENT has wrongfully refused to  
18 accept and file the nomination documents and supporting materials submitted by PETITIONER and  
19 RESPONDENT wrongfully refused to qualify PETITIONER as a candidate on the grounds that  
20 PETITIONER submitted documents and records that allegedly included “deficiencies that must be  
21 corrected”.  
22

23 3. This action is brought in part under California Elections Code Section 13314, in that it  
24 seeks to prevent an error that is about to occur in placing the names of candidates for Governor for the  
25 State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election on a ballot, sample ballot, and  
26 voter pamphlet by RESPONDENT and that RESPONDENT has neglected its duty in that regard, in  
27  
28

1 that RESPONDENT has wrongfully refused to accept and file the nomination documents that  
2 PETITIONER properly submitted to qualify as a candidate.

3 **PARTIES**

4 4. Petitioner and Plaintiff RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE (“PETITIONER”) is, and at all  
5 relevant times hereto was, a resident voter, taxpayer, and candidate for Governor for the State of  
6 California. PETITIONER is currently registered to vote in the State of California. In this capacity,  
7 PETITIONER has standing to bring this action pursuant to California Elections Code Section 13314  
8 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 526a. PETITIONER seeks to be listed on the ballot the candidate  
9 for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election.  
10

11 5. Respondent and Defendant SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official capacity as,  
12 SECRETARY OF STATE FOR CALIFORNIA (“RESPONDENT”) is the Elections Official for the  
13 State of California and the Secretary of State for the State of California. As the Elections Official for  
14 the State of California, RESPONDENT has a ministerial non-discretionary duty not to violate the laws  
15 of the State of California.  
16

17 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 6. PETITIONER is a candidate for Governor for the State of California in the June 2,  
19 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election, and is therefore entitled under California Elections Code Section  
20 13314 to bring this action.  
21

22 7. Pursuant to California Elections Code Section 13314, this Court is the proper venue for  
23 this action because the acts complained of involve the actions of RESPONDENT as the Secretary of  
24 State of California and the relief sought is within the jurisdiction of this Court.  
25

26 8. This action is timely because the filing occurred immediately after the events  
27 complained of in relation to RESPONDENT’S actions, and in time to allow the Court to make a ruling  
28

1 without interfering, delaying, or impacting the process and procedures for the June 2, 2026  
2 Gubernatorial Primary Election.

3 9. Except immediate for relief from this Court, PETITIONER does not have an adequate  
4 remedy for RESPONDENT’S excluding PETITIONER from the ballot, sample ballot, and voter  
5 pamphlet because these documents will be sent to registered voters in the State of California in the  
6 upcoming days, thereby making this Petition for Writ of Mandate the only appropriate means of  
7 providing timely relief to PETITIONER.  
8

9 **PRIORITY MATTER**

10 10. Pursuant to California Elections Code Section 13314(a)(3), a writ of mandate in  
11 relation to an election matter shall have priority over all other civil matters.  
12

13 11. Pursuant to communications from the Secretary of State, the voting materials including  
14 sample ballot and voter pamphlet will be sent to the printers for publication and distribution on March  
15 27, 2026, so this matter must be decided by the Court no later than March 26, 2026.  
16

17 **TIMELY PETITION**

18 12. Petitioner did not learn that his name would not appear on the certified list of  
19 candidates until March 17, 2026. Petitioner promptly retained counsel and is filing this Writ within  
20 two days of being notified that there was no administrative remedy available to him other than filing  
21 this Writ.  
22

23 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

24 13. On June 2, 2026, the State of California will hold its Gubernatorial Primary Election in  
25 which registered voters will vote for their choice for the next Governor.

26 14. Under California Election Code Section 8902(a), the deadline for submitting  
27 nomination documents for this June 2, 2026 election was Thursday, March 6, 2026 at 5:00 pm.  
28

1           15.     On March 5, 2026, PETITIONER submitted the requisite forms and documents to  
2 RESPONDENT, in compliance with California Elections Code §§ 8902 and 8903.

3           16.     The forms submitted included redacted and unredacted copies of PETITIONER’S  
4 federal tax returns for the 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 tax years, as required under California Elections  
5 Code §§ 8902 and 8903.  
6

7           17.     For purposes of submitting the tax returns to RESPONDENT, the tax returns were  
8 collated and inspected for submission by David Rachford, CPA.

9           18.     On Saturday, March 7, 2026 at 3:07 pm, RESPONDENT contacted PETITIONER via  
10 email and claimed that RESPONDENT “identified deficiencies that must be corrected”, giving  
11 PETITIONER until March 16, 2026 at 5:00 pm to resubmit corrected hard copies to RESPONDENT’S  
12 Election Division. Such “deficiencies”, as alleged by RESPONDENT, for the 2021, 2022, 2023, and  
13 2024 tax returns included claims that the redacted and unredacted versions did not match, unredacted  
14 versions were not submitted, and the CPA’s name was inappropriately redacted.  
15

16           19.     On Tuesday, March 10, 2026 at 9:29 pm, Wesley from RESPONDENT’S office  
17 contacted PETITIONER via email, on its accord, and states that the March 7, 2026 feedback was  
18 corrected so that the only “deficiencies” were that unredacted versions of the 2022 and 2023 tax  
19 returns were not submitted.  
20

21           20.     This email communication caused confusion to PETITIONER as RESPONDENT had  
22 unilaterally, and prior to any response from PETITIONER, went from alleging deficiencies in tax  
23 records from four (4) years to now alleging deficiencies in tax records from two (2) years.  
24

25           21.     On Wednesday, March 11, 2026 at 10:36 pm, PETITIONER, after reviewing all of its  
26 submitted tax records and disclosures, contacted Wesley from RESPONDENT’S office via email and  
27  
28

1 asked to “confirm that the ONLY filed we need to resubmit to ensure qualification are the unredacted  
2 versions of tax years 2022 and 2023.”

3           22.     On Thursday, March 12, 2026 at 10:05 am, Wesley from RESPONDENT’S office  
4 responded to PETITIONER with the same longer list of “deficiencies” that RESPONDENT initially  
5 listed in its March 7, 2026 email, contradicting RESPONDENT’S March 10, 2026 email that only the  
6 unredacted versions of the 2022 and 2023 tax returns were not submitted.  
7

8           23.     This email communication from RESPONDENT reinforced PETITIONER’S belief that  
9 RESPONDENT was arbitrarily establishing thresholds for PETITIONER to meet and hurdles to jump  
10 through in an effort to disqualify PETITIONER.  
11

12           24.     On Thursday, March 12, 2026 at 10:10 am, PETITIONER, via email, sought  
13 clarification from Wesley from RESPONDENT’S office as to “what was not identical between the  
14 redacted and unredacted versions in ’21 and ’24 – so we can avoid any similar errors both for those  
15 years and when we submit for ’22 and ’23?”  
16

17           25.     On Friday, March 13, 2026 at 10:46 am, Wesley from RESPONDENT’S office, for the  
18 first time, identified with specificity what constituted the alleged “deficiencies” for the tax records of  
19 the four years of 2021 through 2024.

20           26.     On Friday, March 13, 2026 at 12:46 pm, PETITIONER’S campaign team provided  
21 RESPONDENT with the resubmitted financial and tax disclosures via FedEx Overnight delivery from  
22 PETITIONER’S office in Santa Barbara, California to RESPONDENT’S office in Sacramento,  
23 California.  
24

25           27.     Due to RESPONDENT being closed on weekends, RESPONDENT was unable to take  
26 delivery of the documents until Monday, March 16, 2026 at 9:17 am.  
27  
28

1           28.     On Monday, March 16, 2026 at 4:50 pm, Wesley from RESPONDENT’S office  
2 contacted PETITIONER via email and informed him that RESPONDENT “identified additional  
3 deficiencies that must be corrected” and PETITIONER is “required to resubmit corrected hard copies  
4 to the Election Division **no later than 5:00 p.m. on Monday, March 16.**”

5  
6           29.     This March 16, 2026 email at 4:50 pm, required that PETITIONER resubmit hard  
7 copies of the documents **in person** at the Election Division within **ten minutes** of when  
8 RESPONDENT sent the email.

9           30.     Due to PETITIONER’S employment as a university professor, PETITIONER did not  
10 see RESPONDENT’S 4:50 pm email until approximately 6:00 pm and responded the email at 6:04  
11 pm.

12  
13           31.     The impossible deadline from RESPONDENT substantiated PETITIONER’S  
14 reasonable belief that, even though he had in good faith and in good belief complied with the filing  
15 requirements, RESPONDENT never had the intention to accept PETITIONER’S nomination papers  
16 and supporting documents for PETITIONER’S eligibility for Governor for the State of California in  
17 the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election.

18  
19           32.     On Monday, March 16, 2026 at 8:14 pm, PETITIONER responded to Wesley’s email  
20 with great detail and specificity, along with images, explaining why the “additional deficiencies” were  
21 in fact not deficiencies and were instead a failure of RESPONDENT to correctly identify certain  
22 documents and values in those documents.

23  
24           33.     PETITIONER explained that it hired a Certified Public Account (“CPA”) who collated,  
25 organized, and double-checked the submissions to ensure they were in compliance with all of the  
26 information requests of RESPONDENT.

1           34.     On March 17, 2026 at 12:12 pm, RESPONDENT contacted PETITIONER via email,  
2 and insisting that the documents submitted were still deficient in that they were not “identical” and  
3 with certain numbers missing.

4           35.     For example, RESPONDENT claimed that the redacted and unredacted 2022 tax  
5 returns are not identical, stating that “Schedule C does not match in Box C.” However, this claim by  
6 RESPONDENT falls flat because PETITIONER provided photographic evidence showing that Box C  
7 in Schedule C for both redacted and unredacted versions of the 2022 tax returns **are identical**.

8           36.     Furthermore, RESPONDENT claimed that the IRS Form 8829 are not identical for  
9 2022 because the tax year is crossed out on the form. However, this is a result of RESPONDENT not  
10 understanding that the IRS Form 8829 for the 2022 was no longer available online, so the standard  
11 practice for a CPA or any tax preparer is to take the IRS Form 8829 for the 2023 and cross out 2023  
12 and write 2022 and initial the correction, which is what was done.

13           37.     RESPONDENT claimed that IRS Form 8829 for the 2023 has different numbers and  
14 values in it. However, this is because RESPONDENT did not acknowledge the aforementioned  
15 change of IRS Form 8829 from 2023 to 2022, and therefore considered both forms to be for the 2023  
16 tax year.

17           38.     RESPONDENT claimed that PETITIONER’S phone number was not redacted, as  
18 required in California Elections Code 8903(a)(1)(B). However, PETITIONER provided photographic  
19 evidence showing that its phone number **was in fact redacted**.

20           39.     On March 17, 2026 at approximately 11:15 am, PETITIONER spoke with Wesley from  
21 RESPONDENT’S office and explained that the alleged “deficiencies” were incorrectly interpreted and  
22 in fact did not exist. In response, Wesley told PETITIONER that there was no supervisor available for  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 further review, the decision was final and the only recourse was Court involvement with the filing of a  
2 Writ of Mandate.

3 40. On March 17, 2026 at 12:51 pm, PETITIONER emailed Wesley from  
4 RESPONDENT'S office and again explained that RESPONDENT was incorrect in its assessment that  
5 deficiencies existed.  
6

7 41. On March 17, 2026 at approximately 3:00 pm, a members of PETITIONER'S  
8 campaign staff delivered to RESPONDENT'S office, which RESPONDENT accepted, further  
9 documents in attempt to fulfill the ever-changing requirements of RESPONDENT.  
10

11 42. Following these multiples steps and responses between PETITIONER and  
12 RESPONDENT, there has yet to be any confirmation from RESPONDENT that it will accept and file  
13 nomination documents submitted by PETITIONER and qualify PETITIONER as a candidate for  
14 Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election.

15 43. This action is permitted under California Elections Code Section 13314 as  
16 PETITIONER has exhausted all other remedies required prior to filing this Petition.  
17

18 44. Given that there is an impending deadline for RESPONDENT to publish the names and  
19 ballot designation on the ballot, sample ballot, and voter pamphlet for candidates for Governor for the  
20 State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election, the absence of each qualified  
21 candidate will harm not only those candidates, but the general public.

22 45. Unless RESPONDENT is enjoined and restrained from allowing or cause these voting  
23 materials to be published without PETITIONER'S name, then all registered voters will be harmed by  
24 not having the full array of candidates to select from. This is something that will cause irreparable  
25 harm which cannot be measured by any financial compensation or damages.  
26  
27  
28

1 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Writ of Mandate – CCP § 1085 and 1021.5)**

3 46. PETITIONER hereby incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 45 as through fully set forth  
4 herein.

5 47. RESPONDENT has a ministerial non-discretionary duty not to violate the laws of the  
6 State of California.

7 48. California Elections Code Section 13314(a)(2) lays out that a writ of mandate shall be  
8 issued upon proof that the public official in charge of the election is committing an error, omission, or  
9 neglect and that the issuance of the writ will not substantially interfere with the conduct of the  
10 election.  
11

12 49. The Code of Civil Procedure Section 1085 authorizes issuance of a writ of mandate to  
13 compel the performance of a duty by a government official.  
14

15 50. Based on the facts as explained in this Petition, PETITIONER properly submitted the  
16 required tax returns, in the required format, to RESPONDENT.  
17

18 51. Therefore, RESPONDENT has a ministerial, non-discretionary duty to quality  
19 PETITIONER as a candidate and to include PETITIONER on the ballot for Governor for the State of  
20 California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election.

21 52. If RESPONDENT believes there were submission errors by PETITIONER, the proper  
22 remedy is to not preclude PETITIONER from eligibility, but rather to provide PETITIONER an  
23 opportunity to remedy such errors.  
24

25 53. In this instance, and despite PETITIONER remedying all alleged “deficiencies” and  
26 explaining with specificity each and every matter, RESPONDENT is insisting on precluding  
27 PETITIONER from being on the ballot, sample ballot, and voter pamphlet for candidate for Governor  
28

1 for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election, in violation of  
2 California law.

3 54. PETITIONER substantially complied with all disclosure requirements, provided all  
4 required tax records, provided explanations, and continuing answer all of RESPONDENT’S inquiries  
5 in good faith and with good belief that RESPONDENT was acting in accordance with the law.  
6

7 55. For these reasons, the action by RESPONDENT to not accept PETITIONER’S  
8 nomination papers and submission documents was wrongful and based on arbitrary standards from  
9 RESPONDENT’S office who did not perform the duty of their office.

10 56. Because of these wrongful acts by RESPONDENT, PETITIONER has been denied the  
11 right to candidacy for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary  
12 Election.  
13

14 57. The correct remedy is the issuance of the writ of mandate for RESPONDENT to  
15 perform its duty and file PETITIONER’S nomination documents and qualify PETITIONER as a  
16 candidate for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election.  
17

18 58. This action is timely and will not interfere with the printing of the ballot, sample ballot,  
19 and voter pamphlet for candidate for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026  
20 Gubernatorial Primary Election or with the election itself.

21 59. Other than this Petition for Writ of Mandate, PETITIONER has no other remedy to  
22 achieve or protect its right to for candidacy for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026  
23 Gubernatorial Primary Election  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**(Injunctive Relief – Elections Code Section 13314 and CCP Sections 526a and 1021.5)**

60. PETITIONER hereby incorporates Paragraphs 1 through 59 as through fully set forth herein.

61. PETITIONER provided RESPONDENT with all appropriate and necessary documents and disclosures well before the deadline proscribed by California Elections Code.

62. Despite numerous communications between PETITIONER and RESPONDENT, PETITIONER is still left scratching its head and chasing moving targets based on RESPONDENT’S arbitrary application of California Elections Code §§ 8902 and 8903.

63. PETITIONER fully complied with the statutory requirements, explained its compliance to RESPONDENT, and showed why RESPONDENT was incorrect in its assessments of PETITIONER’S tax records.

64. As such, PETITIONER seeks an injunction from this Court ordering that RESPONDENT include PETITIONER on the ballot, sample ballot, and voter pamphlet for candidate for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election pursuant to Elections Code Section 13314 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 526a.

//

//

//

1 **WHEREFORE, Petitioner and Plaintiff RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE respectfully prays that:**

2 1. That this Court issue a peremptory Writ of Mandate, without hearing or further notice,  
3 immediately and directly ordering RESPONDENT, and all persons under RESPONDENT’S authority,  
4 control and direction to:

5 a. File PETITIONER’S nomination documents, qualify PETITIONER as a  
6 candidate and place PETITIONER’S name and ballot designation on the ballot, sample ballot, and  
7 voter pamphlet for candidate for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial  
8 Primary Election; and  
9

10 b. Include PETITIONER’S Statement of Qualification in the voter pamphlet for  
11 the Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial Primary Election;  
12

13 2. The Court enter an Order awarding PETITIONER its reasonable attorneys’ fees and  
14 costs incurred in bringing this action, as permitted under California Code of Civil Procedure § 1021.5  
15 and any other relevant law, precedent, or statute.

16 3. The Court award all other such further relief it deems just and proper.  
17

18  
19 Dated: March 19, 2026

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Tawfiq J. Morrar  
Attorney for Petitioner and Plaintiff,  
RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE



1 Petitioners ability to timely file the necessary documents. Furthermore, as discussed below, the  
2 tax disclosure act is unconstitutional.

3 Respondent has not yet certified the list of candidates to be voted on throughout the state  
4 as this deadline is currently set for March 26, 2026.<sup>1</sup>

5 **C. The Disclosure Act is Unconstitutional.**

6 The California Constitution exclusively prescribes the qualifications for California  
7 Governor. Specifically, the California Constitution provides that “[t]he Governor shall be an  
8 elector who has been a citizen of the United States and a resident of this State for 5 years  
9 immediately preceding the Governor’s election. The Governor may not hold other public office.  
10 No Governor may serve more than 2 terms.” CA. Const., Art. V, § 2. Notably, the California  
11 Constitution does not include a requirement that a candidate for Governor file five years of tax  
12 returns. *Id.*

13 When the California Constitution exclusively prescribes the qualifications for an office, as  
14 it does for Governor, the State Legislature does not have authority to add additional qualification  
15 requirements. *See Wallace v. Superior Ct. In & For Placer Cnty.*, 141 Cal. App. 2d 771, 776  
16 (1956), *disapproved of by Knoll v. Davidson*, 12 Cal. 3d 335 (1974) (“With but one exception, the  
17 courts have recognized the general rule that when a state Constitution names the qualification for  
18 a constitutional office, the legislature has no authority to prescribe additional qualifications, or to  
19 remove any of the requirements provided for in the Constitution, unless that instrument, expressly  
20 or by implication, gives the legislature such power.”). *Compare Boyer v. Cnty. of Ventura*, 33 Cal.  
21 App. 5th 49, 55–56 (2019) (allowing the Legislature to impose qualifications when the California  
22 Constitution did not lay out the requirements for County Sheriff).

23 Even though tax returns could provide voters with important information, the California  
24 Supreme Court struck down the Disclosure Act as applied to Presidential candidates. *See Patterson*  
25 *v. Padilla*, 8 Cal.5<sup>th</sup> 220, 251 (2019). The Court determined that because “the relevant provisions  
26 of the Disclosure Act condition a presidential candidate’s placement on the primary ballot on

---

27 <sup>1</sup> California Secretary of State Key Dates and Deadlines, Primary Election – June 2, 2026. Last  
28 visited on March 19, 2026: [https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/upcoming-elections/primary-  
election-june-2-2026/key-dates-and-deadlines](https://www.sos.ca.gov/elections/upcoming-elections/primary-election-june-2-2026/key-dates-and-deadlines)

1 compliance with an additional requirement that is concededly not” in the California Constitution,  
2 the law was unconstitutional. *Id.* at 233. Since the California Supreme Court determined that the  
3 providing of tax returns was an additional qualification for United States Presidents under the  
4 California Constitution, this Court should likewise determine that the Disclosure Act is an  
5 unconstitutional additional qualification for a candidate running for California governor.

6 Because the California Constitution expressly provides the requirements for California  
7 Governor, the California Legislature was without authority to impose additional qualification  
8 requirements on candidates for governor. Thus, the Disclosure Act is unconstitutional. Rudolph  
9 “Butch” Ware complied with all qualifications for Governor provided by the California  
10 Constitution, and thus, the Court should order Respondent to place Rudolph “Butch” Ware name  
11 on the primary ballot.

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 For the reasons stated above, this Court should immediately enter an order requiring  
14 Respondent to list Rudolph “Butch” Ware on the Certified List of Candidates, together with such  
15 other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

16  
17  
18 Dated: March 19, 2026

19 By:   
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 Tawfiq J. Morrar  
22 Attorney for Petitioner and Plaintiff,  
23 RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



1 **Tawfiq J. Morrar (SBN 291072)**  
2 **The Morrar Law Office**  
3 **9381 East Stockton Blvd, Suite 118**  
4 **Elk Grove, CA 95624**  
5 **Telephone: (916) 968-7973**  
6 **Facsimile: (916) 647-0537**  
7 **Email: TJMorrar@MorrarLaw.com**

8 **Attorney for Petitioner and Plaintiff,**  
9 **RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE**

10 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
11 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

12 RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE,  
13  
14 Petitioner and Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official capacity  
17 as, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR  
18 CALIFORNIA;

19 Respondent and Defendant.

20 **) DECLARATION OF DAVID RACHFORD**  
21 **) IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY**  
22 **) VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF**  
23 **) MANDATE AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

24 I, DAVID RACHFORD, hereby declare as follows:

25 1. I am a Certified Public Accountant licensed in the State of California, with  
26 license number 156651.

27 2. I was retained by Petitioner and Plaintiff, RUDOLPH “BUTCH” WARE  
28 (“PETITIONER”) in relation to certain tax forms to be submitted to SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her  
official capacity as, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR CALIFORNIA (“RESPONDENT”) for

1 PETITIONER'S candidacy for Governor for the State of California in the June 2, 2026 Gubernatorial  
2 Primary Election.

3 3. These forms included redacted and unredacted copies of PETITIONER'S federal tax  
4 returns for the 2021, 2022, 2023, and 2024 tax years, as required under California Elections Code §§  
5 8902 and 8903.  
6

7 4. For purposes of complying with PETITIONER'S disclosure requirement for his  
8 candidacy, I collated and inspected the tax returns for submission to RESPONDENT.

9 5. I examined the tax returns prior to submission and ensured that they were in  
10 compliance with California Elections Code §§ 8902 and 8903 as required by RESPONDENT.  
11

12 6. Beginning on March 7, 2026, when RESPONDENT began alleging that "deficiencies"  
13 existed in the tax returns, I reviewed the comments by RESPONDENT and failed to see any  
14 substantial deficiencies based on my observation and understanding of the compliance standards for  
15 California Elections Code §§ 8902 and 8903.  
16

17  
18  
19 Dated: March 19, 2026

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
David Rachford



1 The Court, having received and reviewed Petitioner’s Verified Emergency Application for  
2 Writ of Mandate and good cause appearing therefore, IT IS ORDERED:

3  
4 \_\_\_\_ Order to Show cause why Petitioner’s Petition for Writ of Mandate, which  
5 ORDERS Respondent to place Rudolph “Butch” Ware onto the Certified List of Candidates for  
6 the 2026 California Gubernatorial primary election, should not be granted, issue the interim stay  
7 relief requested herein ORDERING Respondent to place Rudolph “Butch” Ware onto the  
8 Certified List of Candidates for the 2026 California Gubernatorial primary election;

9  
10 **OR**

11  
12 \_\_\_\_ Grant the Petitioner’s Petition for Peremptory Writ of Mandate without a hearing,  
13 ORDERING the Respondent to place Rudolph “Butch” Ware onto the Certified List of Candidates  
14 for the 2026 California Gubernatorial primary election.

15  
16 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

17  
18 Date: March \_\_\_\_, 2026

19 \_\_\_\_\_  
Superior Court Judge