

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

In re: Nomination Petition of William :
Parker for the Democratic :
Nomination for Representative in :
Congress, 12th District : No. 127 M.D. 2026
: Heard: March 30, 2026
Objection of: Carmen Pace, Jack :
Alto, Sam Wasserman, Sylvia :
Wilson, Emily Wolfe, and Janice :
Wedell :

BEFORE: HONORABLE MICHAEL H. WOJCIK, Judge

OPINION NOT REPORTED

MEMORANDUM OPINION
BY JUDGE WOJCIK

FILED: April 1, 2026

Presently before the Court is the Petition to Set Aside the Nomination Petition of William Parker (Petition to Set Aside and Candidate, respectively) as a Democratic candidate for nomination to the office of Representative in the United States House of Representatives (House) for the 12th Congressional District in the General Primary Election (Primary Election) to be held on May 19, 2026. The counseled Petition to Set Aside was filed by Carmen Pace, Jack Alto, Sam Wasserman, Sylvia Wilson, Emily Wolfe, and Janice Wedell (Objectors).

Pursuant to Section 912.1(12) of the Pennsylvania Election Code (Election Code),¹ a candidate for the office of Representative in the House must

¹ Act of June 3, 1937, P.L. 1333, added by the Act of December 12, 1984, P.L. 968, *as amended*, 25 P.S. §2872.1(12). Section 912.1(12) of the Election Code states: “Candidates for nomination of offices as listed below shall present a nominating petition containing at least as many valid signatures of registered and enrolled members of the proper party as listed below: . . . Representative in Congress: One thousand.”

present at least 1000 valid signatures of registered and enrolled electors of the candidate's political party. On or before March 10, 2026, Candidate filed a Nomination Petition with the Secretary of the Commonwealth to appear on the Primary Election ballot for that office. On March 17, 2026, Objectors filed the instant Petition to Set Aside alleging that the Nomination Petition is invalid because Candidate failed to obtain a sufficient number of valid signatures.

On March 18, 2026, this Court entered a Scheduling and Case Management Order (CMO)² scheduling a hearing on the Petition to Set Aside for March 25, 2026, at 11:00 a.m.,³ and imposing certain duties and obligations upon Objectors and Candidate. Specifically, the CMO “directed Objector[s] to secure the services of a court stenographer for the hearing,” and that the “[f]ailure of Objector[s] to secure the services of a court stenographer may result in the dismissal of this matter.” CMO at 1.A.⁴ The CMO also directed Objectors to “secure, by

² As this Court has observed:

The purpose of scheduling and case management orders in election cases is to facilitate the proceedings in an expeditious and timely manner due to the extreme time limitations placed on election matters. That is why objectors are ordered to immediately arrange to meet with the candidate or his/her representative to reach a stipulation as to the number of signatures that are challenged and/or valid. In short, time is of the essence in election matters. As such, the Court expects compliance.

In re Nomination Petition of Ford, 994 A.2d 9, 12 n.3 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2010) *overruled in part on other grounds by In re Nomination Petition of Gales*, 54 A.3d 855, 860-61 (Pa. 2012).

³ By subsequent March 27, 2026 order, we continued the hearing on the Petition to Set Aside on March 30, 2026, at 9:30 a.m., to conclusion.

⁴ It is appropriate for this Court to take judicial notice of documents that are filed and entered in our docket and that of the Supreme Court. *See, e.g.*, Pa.R.E. 201(b)(2) (permitting courts **(Footnote continued on next page...)**)

request or subpoena, the presence of a Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors (SURE) system^[5] operator at the hearing.” *Id.* at 1.B. The CMO also directed the parties to “meet and review each and every challenged signature line.” *Id.* at 3.A.

On March 25, 2026, Candidate and counsel for Objectors (Counsel) appeared for a hearing on the line-by-line challenge to the signature lines.⁶ The parties stipulated that there were 622 signature lines that were signed by enrolled members of the Democratic Party at the listed address on the date of signing. As a result, an additional 378 signatures of enrolled members of the Democratic Party at the listed address at the time of signing needed to be found in the Nomination Petition during the course of the hearings in this matter.

We initially note that “in reviewing election issues, ‘we must consider the longstanding and overriding policy in our Commonwealth to protect the elective franchise,’ and that the Election Code must ‘be liberally construed to protect a candidate’s right to run for office and the voters’ right to elect the candidate of their choice.’” *In re Nomination Papers of James*, 944 A.2d 69, 72 (Pa. 2008) (citation

to take judicial notice of facts that may be “determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned”); *Moss v. Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole*, 194 A.3d 1130, 1137 n.11 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2018) (taking judicial notice of docket entries that were not part of the original record); *Miller v. Unemployment Compensation Board of Review*, 131 A.3d 110, 115 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2015) (taking judicial notice of the entries on a claimant’s criminal docket and the records contained therein); *Germantown Cab Co. v. Philadelphia Parking Authority*, 27 A.3d 280, 283 n.8 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2011) (taking judicial notice of the docket in a Supreme Court case involving a similar point of law).

⁵ As this Court has previously explained, “[t]he SURE system is the Statewide Uniform Registry of Electors, the statewide database of voter registration maintained by the Department of State and administered by each county.” *In re Nomination Petition of Morrison-Wesley*, 946 A.2d 789, 792-93 n.4 (Pa. Cmwlth.), *aff’d*, 944 A.2d 78 (Pa. 2008).

⁶ Candidate also stipulated to the invalidity of a number of signature lines collected by circulators who were not enrolled members of the Democratic Party at the time of the Nomination Petition’s circulation.

omitted). The purpose of the Election Code is to protect, not defeat, a citizen's vote. *Dayhoff v. Weaver*, 808 A.2d 1002, 1006 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2002).

However, “the policy of the liberal reading of the Election Code cannot be distorted to emasculate those requirements necessary to assure the probity of the process.” *In re Cianfrani*, 359 A.2d 383, 384 (Pa. 1976). The provisions of the Election Code relating to the form of nominating petitions and the accompanying affidavits are not mere technicalities but are necessary measures to prevent fraud and to preserve the integrity of the election process. *In re Nomination Petition of Farnese*, 17 A.3d 357, 372 (Pa. 2011). “It is not for us to legislate or by interpretation to add to legislation matters which the legislature saw fit not to include.” *Commonwealth ex rel. Fox v. Swing*, 186 A.2d 24, 27 (Pa. 1962).

Furthermore, “[a] party alleging defects in a nominating petition has the burden of proving such defects, as nomination petitions are presumed to be valid.” *In re Nomination Petition of Beyer*, 115 A.3d 835, 838 (Pa. 2015).⁷ This Court is “[e]ntrusted with the responsibility of protecting the Commonwealth’s compelling interest in preserving the integrity of the election process.” *In re Nomination Papers of Carlson*, 430 A.2d 1210, 1212 (Pa. Cmwlth.), *aff’d*, 430 A.2d 1155 (Pa. 1981). The Supreme Court may reverse our order concerning the validity of challenges to nomination petitions only if our findings of fact are not supported by substantial evidence, if we abused our discretion, or if we committed an error of law. *In re Nomination Petition of Beyer*, 115 A.3d at 838.

⁷ See also Section 977 of the Election Code, which states, in relevant part: “All nomination petitions . . . received and filed within the periods limited by this act shall be deemed to be valid, unless, within seven days after the last day for filing said nomination petition . . . , a petition is presented to the court specifically setting forth the objections thereto, and praying that the said petition . . . be set aside.” 25 P.S. §2937.

As a preliminary matter, we note that Objectors withdrew the objections to the following signature lines during the course of the hearings:

- Page 1, Line 6
- Page 2, Line 14
- Page 9, Line 3
- Page 10, Line 21
- Page 10, Line 29
- Page 12, Line 2
- Page 14, Line 6
- Page 14, Line 14
- Page 15, Line 4
- Page 15, Line 9
- Page 16, Line 14
- Page 22, Line 3
- Page 22, Line 18
- Page 22, Line 19
- Page 25, Line 1
- Page 26, Line 3
- Page 32, Line 2
- Page 37, Line 5
- Page 38, Line 21
- Page 38, Line 22
- Page 39, Line 1
- Page 47, Line 10
- Page 55, Line 7
- Page 63, Line 13
- Page 64, Line 7
- Page 70, Line 24
- Page 71, Line 9
- Page 71, Line 23
- Page 72, Line 11
- Page 75, Line 8
- Page 75, Line 15
- Page 76, Line 19
- Page 77, Line 18
- Page 78, Line 4
- Page 93, Line 21
- Page 137, Line 12
- Page 137, Line 13
- Page 139, Line 12

- Page 142, Line 11
- Page 143, Line 13
- Page 143, Line 20
- Page 143, Line 27
- Page 146, Line 8
- Page 146, Line 9
- Page 146, Line 20
- Page 147, Line 5

Adding the aforementioned 46 signature lines, Candidate's Nomination Petition contains a total number of 668 signatures that are valid.

Next, during the course of the hearings, it was discovered that Objectors had waived a number of signature line challenges because they were merely repeated objections to prior unrelated signature lines. As a result, the following objections were waived and the signature lines are valid:

- Page 154, Line 1
- Page 154, Line 2
- Page 154, Line 3
- Page 154, Line 4
- Page 154, Line 5
- Page 154, Line 6
- Page 154, Line 7
- Page 154, Line 8
- Page 154, Line 9
- Page 154, Line 10
- Page 154, Line 11
- Page 154, Line 12
- Page 154, Line 14
- Page 154, Line 16
- Page 154, Line 17
- Page 154, Line 18
- Page 154, Line 19
- Page 154, Line 20
- Page 154, Line 21
- Page 154, Line 22
- Page 154, Line 23
- Page 154, Line 24
- Page 154, Line 25
- Page 154, Line 27

- Page 154, Line 28
- Page 154, Line 29
- Page 154, Line 30
- Page 155, Line 2
- Page 155, Line 3
- Page 155, Line 4
- Page 155, Line 5
- Page 155, Line 6
- Page 155, Line 7
- Page 155, Line 8
- Page 155, Line 9
- Page 155, Line 10
- Page 155, Line 11
- Page 155, Line 12
- Page 155, Line 13
- Page 155, Line 14
- Page 155, Line 15
- Page 155, Line 16
- Page 155, Line 17
- Page 155, Line 18
- Page 155, Line 19
- Page 155, Line 20
- Page 155, Line 21
- Page 155, Line 22
- Page 155, Line 24
- Page 155, Line 25
- Page 155, Line 26
- Page 155, Line 27
- Page 155, Line 29
- Page 155, Line 30

Adding the aforementioned 54 signature lines, Candidate's Nomination Petition contains a total number of 722 valid signatures.

Finally, based on the credible evidence adduced at the hearings as to the challenged lines, and the presumption of validity as to the unchallenged lines, we found that the following electors' signature lines were matched by their signatures that are contained in the SURE system and are genuine, *i.e.*, these lines

were completed and signed by enrolled Democratic electors of the 12th Congressional District at the stated address:

- Page 1, Line 16
- Page 1, Line 26
- Page 2, Line 3
- Page 2, Line 22
- Page 2, Line 24
- Page 7, Line 3
- Page 7, Line 7
- Page 7, Line 10
- Page 8, Line 11
- Page 8, Line 13
- Page 9, Line 5
- Page 9, Line 11
- Page 9, Line 14
- Page 10, Line 1
- Page 10, Line 3
- Page 10, Line 8
- Page 10, Line 11
- Page 10, Line 20
- Page 12, Line 1
- Page 12, Line 7
- Page 12, Line 8
- Page 13, Line 4
- Page 13, Line 5
- Page 13, Line 6
- Page 14, Line 1
- Page 14, Line 10
- Page 14, Line 11
- Page 14, Line 12
- Page 15, Line 1
- Page 15, Line 2
- Page 15, Line 3
- Page 15, Line 12
- Page 16, Line 7
- Page 17, Line 1
- Page 18, Line 6
- Page 19, Line 10
- Page 19, Line 12
- Page 20, Line 2

- Page 22, Line 15
- Page 22, Line 17
- Page 22, Line 20
- Page 22, Line 23
- Page 22, Line 24
- Page 25, Line 5
- Page 25, Line 9
- Page 25, Line 11
- Page 25, Line 12
- Page 26, Line 1
- Page 26, Line 5
- Page 26, Line 6
- Page 26, Line 8
- Page 29, Line 4
- Page 29, Line 5
- Page 29, Line 12
- Page 29, Line 13
- Page 29, Line 14
- Page 30, Line 5
- Page 30, Line 6
- Page 30, Line 8
- Page 30, Line 14
- Page 31, Line 2
- Page 31, Line 8
- Page 31, Line 10
- Page 31, Line 11
- Page 31, Line 12
- Page 31, Line 14
- Page 32, Line 1
- Page 32, Line 5
- Page 32, Line 7
- Page 32, Line 8
- Page 32, Line 9
- Page 32, Line 10
- Page 33, Line 12
- Page 36, Line 1
- Page 38, Line 2
- Page 39, Line 6
- Page 39, Line 13
- Page 43, Line 4
- Page 43, Line 9
- Page 47, Line 6
- Page 47, Line 9

- Page 47, Line 12
- Page 47, Line 13
- Page 52, Line 4
- Page 52, Line 6
- Page 52, Line 10
- Page 52, Line 14
- Page 55, Line 8
- Page 55, Line 11
- Page 55, Line 12
- Page 57, Line 5
- Page 57, Line 6
- Page 57, Line 8
- Page 57, Line 11
- Page 57, Line 12
- Page 57, Line 14
- Page 58, Line 1
- Page 58, Line 5
- Page 58, Line 13
- Page 60, Line 8
- Page 60, Line 9
- Page 60, Line 11
- Page 60, Line 13
- Page 60, Line 14
- Page 66, Line 10
- Page 69, Line 25
- Page 70, Line 3
- Page 70, Line 7
- Page 80, Line 27
- Page 81, Line 25
- Page 82, Line 16
- Page 82, Line 19
- Page 84, Line 13
- Page 89, Line 4
- Page 89, Line 11
- Page 89, Line 19
- Page 93, Line 1
- Page 93, Line 2
- Page 93, Line 3
- Page 93, Line 8
- Page 93, Line 9
- Page 93, Line 10
- Page 93, Line 11
- Page 93, Line 12

- Page 93, Line 13
- Page 93, Line 15
- Page 93, Line 17
- Page 93, Line 18
- Page 93, Line 19
- Page 93, Line 20
- Page 93, Line 23
- Page 93, Line 25
- Page 93, Line 26
- Page 93, Line 27
- Page 93, Line 28
- Page 94, Line 5
- Page 94, Line 7
- Page 94, Line 8
- Page 94, Line 12
- Page 94, Line 14
- Page 94, Line 15
- Page 94, Line 16
- Page 94, Line 17
- Page 94, Line 18
- Page 94, Line 19
- Page 94, Line 20
- Page 94, Line 21
- Page 94, Line 22
- Page 94, Line 23
- Page 94, Line 24
- Page 94, Line 25
- Page 94, Line 26
- Page 94, Line 27
- Page 94, Line 28
- Page 94, Line 29
- Page 94, Line 30
- Page 98, Line 4
- Page 100, Line 22
- Page 101, Line 22
- Page 102, Line 10
- Page 103, Line 13
- Page 106, Line 24
- Page 112, Line 23
- Page 114, Line 1
- Page 114, Line 2
- Page 114, Line 3
- Page 114, Line 4

- Page 114, Line 5
- Page 114, Line 6
- Page 114, Line 7
- Page 114, Line 8
- Page 114, Line 9
- Page 114, Line 10
- Page 114, Line 11
- Page 114, Line 12
- Page 114, Line 13
- Page 114, Line 14
- Page 114, Line 15
- Page 114, Line 16
- Page 114, Line 17
- Page 114, Line 18
- Page 114, Line 19
- Page 114, Line 20
- Page 114, Line 21
- Page 114, Line 22
- Page 114, Line 23
- Page 114, Line 24
- Page 114, Line 25
- Page 114, Line 26
- Page 114, Line 27
- Page 115, Line 23
- Page 119, Line 15
- Page 121, Line 5
- Page 121, Line 6
- Page 121, Line 19
- Page 122, Line 11
- Page 123, Line 1
- Page 124, Line 15
- Page 124, Line 16
- Page 124, Line 17
- Page 126, Line 8
- Page 128, Line 21
- Page 128, Line 1
- Page 128, Line 4
- Page 128, Line 5
- Page 128, Line 6
- Page 128, Line 7
- Page 128, Line 8
- Page 128, Line 9
- Page 128, Line 10

- Page 128, Line 11
- Page 128, Line 12
- Page 128, Line 13
- Page 128, Line 14
- Page 128, Line 15
- Page 128, Line 18
- Page 128, Line 21
- Page 128, Line 22
- Page 128, Line 24
- Page 128, Line 25
- Page 128, Line 26
- Page 128, Line 27
- Page 128, Line 28
- Page 128, Line 29
- Page 129, Line 1
- Page 129, Line 2
- Page 129, Line 3
- Page 129, Line 10
- Page 129, Line 11
- Page 129, Line 12
- Page 129, Line 21
- Page 129, Line 22
- Page 129, Line 27
- Page 129, Line 28
- Page 129, Line 29
- Page 129, Line 30
- Page 130, Line 1
- Page 130, Line 2
- Page 130, Line 8
- Page 130, Line 9
- Page 130, Line 10
- Page 130, Line 11
- Page 130, Line 12
- Page 130, Line 13
- Page 130, Line 16
- Page 130, Line 17
- Page 130, Line 18
- Page 130, Line 19
- Page 130, Line 20
- Page 130, Line 21
- Page 130, Line 22
- Page 130, Line 25
- Page 130, Line 26

- Page 130, Line 27
- Page 130, Line 28
- Page 130, Line 29
- Page 130, Line 30
- Page 132, Line 1
- Page 132, Line 7
- Page 132, Line 17
- Page 133, Line 22
- Page 133, Line 28
- Page 134, Line 1
- Page 134, Line 4
- Page 134, Line 10
- Page 134, Line 11
- Page 135, Line 4
- Page 135, Line 7
- Page 136, Line 3
- Page 137, Line 6
- Page 137, Line 7
- Page 137, Line 9
- Page 137, Line 16
- Page 137, Line 19
- Page 137, Line 20
- Page 139, Line 7
- Page 140, Line 5
- Page 140, Line 8
- Page 142, Line 9
- Page 142, Line 10
- Page 142, Line 16
- Page 142, Line 17
- Page 142, Line 18
- Page 142, Line 19
- Page 142, Line 20
- Page 142, Line 21
- Page 142, Line 23
- Page 142, Line 24
- Page 142, Line 25
- Page 143, Line 8
- Page 143, Line 11
- Page 143, Line 12
- Page 143, Line 23
- Page 143, Line 24
- Page 143, Line 25
- Page 143, Line 26

- Page 143, Line 28
- Page 143, Line 30
- Page 144, Line 1
- Page 144, Line 2
- Page 144, Line 6
- Page 145, Line 5
- Page 145, Line 6
- Page 145, Line 7
- Page 145, Line 8
- Page 145, Line 9
- Page 146, Line 3
- Page 146, Line 5
- Page 146, Line 11
- Page 146, Line 13
- Page 146, Line 19
- Page 146, Line 21
- Page 146, Line 24
- Page 146, Line 30
- Page 149, Line 1
- Page 150, Line 12
- Page 150, Line 18
- Page 152, Line 2
- Page 153, Line 4
- Page 154, Line 6
- Page 156, Line 8
- Page 156, Line 11
- Page 156, Line 30
- Page 157, Line 28
- Page 158, Line 9

Adding the aforementioned 325 signature lines, Candidate’s Nomination Petition contains a total number of 1047 signatures that are valid, and the Nomination Petition will appear on the ballot in the upcoming Primary Election. Accordingly, we issue the following:

ORDER

AND NOW, this 1st day of April, 2026, it is **ORDERED**:

1. Based on the facts as outlined above, and the presumption of validity, the Nomination Petition of William Parker as a Democratic candidate for

nomination to the office of Representative in the United States House of Representatives for the 12th Congressional District in the General Primary Election to be held on May 19, 2026, contains 1000 valid signatures of qualified and enrolled electors as required by Section 912.1(12) of the Election Code, 25 P.S. §2872.1(12); and the Petition to Set Aside the Nomination Petition of William Parker is **DISMISSED**.

2. The Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is directed to **PLACE** the name of William Parker as a Democratic candidate for nomination to the office of Representative in the United States House of Representatives for the 12th Congressional District in the General Primary Election to be held on May 19, 2026.

3. Each party shall bear his, her, or their own costs.

4. The Prothonotary shall notify the parties hereto and their counsel of this order and shall also certify a copy hereof to the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania forthwith.

Michael H. Wojcik

MICHAEL H. WOJCIK, Judge