

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT**

CRAIG BECKMAN, a qualified elector, )

Plaintiff/Appellant, )

v. )

HUGH LYTLE, No Labels  
Party/Arizona Independent Party  
candidate for Arizona Governor;  
ADRIAN FONTES, in his official  
capacity as Arizona Secretary of State;  
APACHE COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS; LARRY NOBLE, in  
his official capacity as Apache County  
Recorder; COCHISE COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; BILLY  
CLOUD, in his official capacity as  
Cochise County Recorder; COCONINO  
COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS; AUBREY  
SONDEREGGER, in her official  
capacity as Coconino County Recorder;  
GILA COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS; WENDY  
MANNIGEL-SMITH, in her official  
capacity as Gila County Recorder;  
GRAHAM COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS; POLLY MERRIMAN,  
in her official capacity as Graham  
County Recorder; GREENLEE  
COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS; ERIN MILLER, in  
her official capacity as Greenlee  
County Recorder; LA PAZ COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS;  
RICHARD GARCIA, in his official  
capacity as La Paz County Recorder;  
MARICOPA COUNTY BOARD OF  
SUPERVISORS; JUSTIN HEAP, in  
his official capacity as Maricopa  
County Recorder; MOHAVE, COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; LYDIA  
HENRY, in her official capacity as  
Mohave County Recorder; NAVAJO

No.

Maricopa County Superior Court  
Case No.: CV2026-014149



COUNTY BOARD OF )  
SUPERVISORS; TIMOTHY JORDAN, )  
in his official capacity as Navajo )  
County Recorder; PIMA COUNTY )  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; )  
GABRIELLA CÁZARES-KELLY, in )  
her official capacity as Pima County )  
Recorder; PINAL COUNTY BOARD )  
OF SUPERVISORS; DANA LEWIS, in )  
her official capacity as Pinal County )  
Recorder; SANTA CRUZ COUNTY )  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; ANITA )  
MORENO, in her official capacity as )  
Santa Cruz Recorder; YAVAPAI )  
COUNTY BOARD OF )  
SUPERVISORS; MICHELLE )  
BURCHILL, in her official capacity as )  
Yavapai County Recorder; YUMA )  
COUNTY BOARD OF )  
SUPERVISORS; and DAVID LARA, in )  
his official capacity as Yuma County )  
Recorder, )  
Defendants/Appellees. )

---

**APPELLANT’S ARCAP 10 STATEMENT IN  
EXPEDITED ELECTION MATTER**

---

Austin C. Yost (034602)

[ayost@cblawyers.com](mailto:ayost@cblawyers.com)

Sambo (Bo) Dul (030313)

[bdul@cblawyers.com](mailto:bdul@cblawyers.com)

Kelleen Mull (036517)

[kmull@cblawyers.com](mailto:kmull@cblawyers.com)

**COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**

2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

T: (602) 381-5485

*Attorneys for Plaintiff/Appellant Craig Beckman*

Under Arizona Rule of Civil Appellate Procedure 10, Plaintiff/Appellant Craig Beckman states as follows:

**I. Notice of Appeal**

A copy of the stamped notice of appeal filed on April 16, 2026 with the Maricopa County Superior Court is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

**II. Designation as Expedited Election Matter**

Plaintiff/Appellant Craig Beckman certifies that this case is an Expedited Election Matter under A.R.S. § 16-351(A). An appeal to the Arizona Supreme Court is required under A.R.S. § 16-351(A) and Arizona Rule of Civil Appellate Procedure 10(d)(1).

**III. Names and Contact Information of Counsel**

The names and contact information of counsel for each party are as follows:

**Attorneys for Defendant/Appellee Hugh Lytle**

James D. Smith  
Andrew G. Pappas  
Joshua Messer  
Stefan D. Oakley  
Daniel L. Rosen  
Osborn Maledon, P.A.  
2929 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
(602) 640-9000  
[jsmith@omlaw.com](mailto:jsmith@omlaw.com)

[apappas@omlaw.com](mailto:apappas@omlaw.com)  
[jmesser@omlaw.com](mailto:jmesser@omlaw.com)  
[soakley@omlaw.com](mailto:soakley@omlaw.com)  
[drosen@omlaw.com](mailto:drosen@omlaw.com)

**Attorneys for Ariona Secretary of State Adrian Fontes**

Karen J. Hartman-Tellez  
Joshua M. Whitaker  
Jaylia Yan  
Arizona Attorney General's Office  
2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
(602) 542-5025  
[Karen.Hartman@azag.gov](mailto:Karen.Hartman@azag.gov)  
[Joshua.Whitaker@azag.gov](mailto:Joshua.Whitaker@azag.gov)  
[Jaylia.Yan@azag.gov](mailto:Jaylia.Yan@azag.gov)

**Attorneys for Apache County Defendants**

Chris Resar  
[Cresar@apachecountyaz.gov](mailto:Cresar@apachecountyaz.gov)  
Celeste Robertson  
[crobertson@apachecountyaz.gov](mailto:crobertson@apachecountyaz.gov)  
Apache County Attorney's Office  
245 West 1st South  
St. Johns, Arizona 85936  
(928) 337-7560

**Attorneys for Cochise County Defendants**

Christine J. Roberts  
Dylan Hendel  
Cochise County Attorney's Office  
P.O. Drawer CA  
Bisbee, Arizona 85603  
(520) 432-8700  
[croberts@cochise.az.gov](mailto:croberts@cochise.az.gov)

[dhendel@cochise.az.gov](mailto:dhendel@cochise.az.gov)

### **Attorney for Coconino County Defendants**

Rose Winkeler  
Flagstaff Law Group  
720 North Beaver Street  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001  
(928) 233-6800  
[rose@flaglawgroup.com](mailto:rose@flaglawgroup.com)

### **Attorney for Gila County Defendants**

Jessica Scibelli  
Jeff Dalton  
Brad Beauchamp  
Joe Albo  
Gila County Attorney's Office  
1400 East Ash Street  
Globe, Arizona 85501  
(928) 402-8630  
[jscibelli@gilacountyaz.gov](mailto:jscibelli@gilacountyaz.gov)  
[jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov](mailto:jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov)  
[bbeauchamp@gilacountyaz.gov](mailto:bbeauchamp@gilacountyaz.gov)  
[jalbo@gilacountyaz.gov](mailto:jalbo@gilacountyaz.gov)

### **Attorneys for Graham County Defendants**

Michelle Beus  
John Griffith  
Scott Bennett  
Jean Roof  
Graham County Attorney's Office  
800 West Main Street  
Safford, Arizona 85546  
(928) 428-3620  
[mbeus@graham.az.gov](mailto:mbeus@graham.az.gov)  
[jgriffith@graham.az.gov](mailto:jgriffith@graham.az.gov)

[sbennett@graham.az.gov](mailto:sbennett@graham.az.gov)  
[jroof@graham.az.gov](mailto:jroof@graham.az.gov)

**Attorney for Greenlee County Defendants**

Gary Griffith  
Jeremy Ford  
Greenlee County Attorney's Office  
P.O. Box 1717  
Clifton, Arizona 85533  
(928) 865-4108  
[ggriffith@greenlee.az.gov](mailto:ggriffith@greenlee.az.gov)  
[jford@greenlee.az.gov](mailto:jford@greenlee.az.gov)

**Attorney for La Paz County Defendants**

Rachel Shackelford  
Cheralee Robbins  
La Paz County Attorney's Office  
1320 Kofa Avenue  
Parker, Arizona 85344  
(382) 669-6118  
[rshackelford@lapaz.gov](mailto:rshackelford@lapaz.gov)  
[crobbsins@lapaz.gov](mailto:crobbsins@lapaz.gov)

**Attorneys for Maricopa County Defendants**

Rosa Aguilar Dhakal  
Brett Gibson  
Maricopa County Attorney's Office  
Civil Services Division  
225 West Madison Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
(602) 506-3411  
[aguilarr@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:aguilarr@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
[Brett.Gibson@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:Brett.Gibson@mcao.maricopa.gov)

**Attorney for Mohave County Defendants**

Ryan Esplin  
Jason Mitchell  
Will Davis  
Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division  
P.O. Box 7000  
Kingman, Arizona 86402-7000  
(928) 753-0719  
[EspliR@mohave.gov](mailto:EspliR@mohave.gov)  
[mitchj@mohave.gov](mailto:mitchj@mohave.gov)  
[davisw@mohave.gov](mailto:davisw@mohave.gov)

**Attorney for Navajo County Defendants**

Jason Moore  
Navajo County Attorney's Office  
P.O. Box 668  
Holbrook, Arizona 86025-0668  
(928) 524-4026  
[jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov](mailto:jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov)

**Attorney for Pima County Defendants**

Daniel Jurkowitz  
Ellen Brown  
Javier Gherna  
Pima County Attorney's Office  
32 N. Stone #2100  
Tucson, Arizona 85701  
(520) 740-5600  
[Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov](mailto:Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov)  
[Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov](mailto:Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov)  
[Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov](mailto:Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov)

**Attorneys for Pinal County Defendant**

Craig Cameron  
Scott Johnson

Jim Mitchell  
Ian Daranyi  
Christine Roberts  
Danielle Parlich  
Pinal County Attorney's Office  
30 North Florence Street  
Florence, Arizona 85132  
(520) 866-6271  
[craig.cameron@pinal.gov](mailto:craig.cameron@pinal.gov)  
[scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov](mailto:scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov)  
[James.mitchell@pinal.gov](mailto:James.mitchell@pinal.gov)  
[Ian.daranyi@pinal.gov](mailto:Ian.daranyi@pinal.gov)  
[Christine.roberts@pinal.gov](mailto:Christine.roberts@pinal.gov)  
[Danielle.parlich@pinal.gov](mailto:Danielle.parlich@pinal.gov)

**Attorneys for Santa Cruz County Defendants**

William Moran  
Robert May  
Mathew Cannon  
George Silva  
Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office  
2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201  
Nogales, Arizona 85621-1090  
(520) 761-7800  
[wmoran@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:wmoran@santacruzcountyaz.gov)  
[rmay@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:rmay@santacruzcountyaz.gov)  
[mcannon@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:mcannon@santacruzcountyaz.gov)  
[gsilva@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:gsilva@santacruzcountyaz.gov)

**Attorney for Yavapai County Defendants**

Thomas Stoxen  
Michael Gordon  
Yavapai County Attorney's Office  
255 East Gurley Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Prescott, Arizona 86301  
(928) 771-3344

[Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov](mailto:Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov)  
[Michael.gordon@yavapaiaz.gov](mailto:Michael.gordon@yavapaiaz.gov)

**Attorney for Yuma County Defendants**

Bill Kerekes  
Kesia Morrison  
Yuma County Attorney's Office  
198 South Main Street  
Yuma, Arizona 85364  
(928) 817-4300  
[bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov](mailto:bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov)  
[Keisa.morrison@yumacountyaz.gov](mailto:Keisa.morrison@yumacountyaz.gov)

**IV. Maricopa County Superior Court Judgment**

The final judgment of the Maricopa County Superior Court from which this appeal is taken is attached as **Exhibit 2**.

**V. Designation of Transcript**

The transcript of the April 13, 2026 Election Challenge Evidentiary Hearing was filed in the Maricopa County Superior Court on April 16, 2026. That transcript is included in the record on appeal.

**VI. Request for Scheduling Conference**

Plaintiff/Appellant Craig Beckman requests that this Court set an initial telephonic status conference to determine the schedule for the expedited proceedings in this matter.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17th day of April, 2026.

**COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**

By: /s/ Austin C. Yost  
Austin C. Yost  
Sambo (Bo) Dul  
Kelleen Mull

*Attorneys for Plaintiff/Appellant  
Craig Beckman*

# **EXHIBIT 1**

1 Austin C. Yost (034602)  
2 Sambo (Bo) Dul (030313)  
3 Kelleen Mull (036517)  
4 **COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**  
5 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900  
6 Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
7 T: (602) 381-5485  
8 ayost@cblawyers.com  
9 bdul@cblawyers.com  
10 kmull@cblawyers.com

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*  
12 *Craig Beckman*

13 **ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT**

14 **MARICOPA COUNTY**

15 CRAIG BECKMAN, a qualified elector,  
16  
17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 HUGH LYTLE, No Labels Party/Arizona  
20 Independent Party candidate for Arizona  
21 Governor, et al.,

22 Defendants.

23 No. CV2026-014350  
24 CV2026-014149  
25 (Consolidated)

26 **NOTICE OF APPEAL**

27 (Assigned to the Hon. Michael Mandell)

28 TERI HOURIHAN, an individual and  
qualified elector,

Plaintiff,

v.

HUGH LYTLE, an individual and candidate  
for Governor, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Craig Beckman hereby submits a notice of appeal to the Arizona Supreme Court. *See* A.R.S. § 16-351(A) (“The [superior court’s] decision is appealable only to the supreme court[.]”). Plaintiff appeals this Court’s April 14, 2026 Under Advisement Ruling (filed April 15, 2026) entering a final judgment in this matter in favor of Defendant Hugh

1 Lytle and against Plaintiff and denying Plaintiff's request to enjoin placement of Mr.  
2 Lytle's name on the ballot for the office of Arizona Governor (attached as **Exhibit A**).

3 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 16th day of April, 2026.

4 **COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**

5  
6 By /s/ Austin C. Yost  
Austin C. Yost  
7 Sambo (Bo) Dul  
8 Kelleen Mull

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Craig Beckman*

10 ORIGINAL efiled and served via electronic  
means this 16th day of April, 2026, upon:

11 The Honorable Michael Mandell  
12 [andrea.boleyn@jbazmc.maricopa.gov](mailto:andrea.boleyn@jbazmc.maricopa.gov)  
[nickolas.martin@jbazmc.maricopa.gov](mailto:nickolas.martin@jbazmc.maricopa.gov)

13 James D. Smith  
[jsmith@omlaw.com](mailto:jsmith@omlaw.com)  
14 Andrew G. Pappas  
[apappas@omlaw.com](mailto:apappas@omlaw.com)  
15 Joshua Messer  
[jmesser@omlaw.com](mailto:jmesser@omlaw.com)  
16 Stefan D. Oakley  
[soakley@omlaw.com](mailto:soakley@omlaw.com)

17 Daniel L. Rosen  
[drosen@omlaw.com](mailto:drosen@omlaw.com)  
18 Osborn Maledon, P.A.  
2929 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000  
19 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
*Attorneys for Candidate/Defendant Hugh Lytle*

20 Karen J. Hartman-Tellez  
21 [Karen.Hartman@azag.gov](mailto:Karen.Hartman@azag.gov)  
Joshua M. Whitaker  
22 [Joshua.Whitaker@azag.gov](mailto:Joshua.Whitaker@azag.gov)  
Jaylia Yan  
23 [Jaylia.Yan@azag.gov](mailto:Jaylia.Yan@azag.gov)  
Arizona Attorney General's Office  
24 2005 North Central Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
25 *Attorneys for Ariona Secretary of State Adrian Fontes*

26 Chris Resar  
[Cresar@apachecountyaz.gov](mailto:Cresar@apachecountyaz.gov)  
27 Celeste Robertson  
[crobertson@apachecountyaz.gov](mailto:crobertson@apachecountyaz.gov)  
28

1 Apache County Attorney's Office  
245 West 1st South  
2 St. Johns, AZ 85936  
*Attorneys for Apache County Defendants*  
3 Dylan Hendel  
[dhendel@cochise.az.gov](mailto:dhendel@cochise.az.gov)  
4 Daniel Restrepo  
[CVAttymeo@cochise.az.gov](mailto:CVAttymeo@cochise.az.gov)  
5 Cochise County Attorney's Office  
P.O. Drawer CA  
6 Bisbee, AZ 85603  
*Attorneys for Cochise County Defendants*  
7  
8 Rose Winkeler  
[rose@flaglawgroup.com](mailto:rose@flaglawgroup.com)  
Flagstaff Law Group  
9 720 North Beaver Street  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001  
10 *Attorney for Coconino County Defendants*  
11 Joe Albo  
[jalbo@gilacountyaz.gov](mailto:jalbo@gilacountyaz.gov)  
12 Marcie Hamblen  
[mhamblen@gilacountyaz.gov](mailto:mhamblen@gilacountyaz.gov)  
13 Gila County Attorney's Office  
1400 East Ash Street  
14 Globe, Arizona 85501  
*Attorney for Gila County Defendants*  
15  
16 Michelle Beus  
[mbeus@graham.az.gov](mailto:mbeus@graham.az.gov)  
Scott Bennett  
17 [sbennett@graham.az.gov](mailto:sbennett@graham.az.gov)  
Graham County Attorney's Office  
18 800 West Main Street  
Safford, Arizona 85546  
19 *Attorneys for Graham County Defendants*  
20  
21 Gary Griffith  
[ggriffith@greenlee.az.gov](mailto:ggriffith@greenlee.az.gov)  
Greenlee County Attorney's Office  
P.O. Box 1717  
22 Clifton, Arizona 85533  
*Attorney for Greenlee County Defendants*  
23  
24 Rachel Shackelford  
[rshackelford@lapaz.gov](mailto:rshackelford@lapaz.gov)  
Cheralee Robbins  
25 [crobbins@lapaz.gov](mailto:crobbins@lapaz.gov)  
La Paz County Attorney's Office  
26 1320 Kofa Avenue  
Parker, Arizona 85344  
27 *Attorney for La Paz County Defendants*  
28

1 Rosa Aguilar Dhakal  
[aguilarr@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:aguilarr@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
2 Brett Gibson  
[Brett.Gibson@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:Brett.Gibson@mcao.maricopa.gov)  
3 Maricopa County Attorney's Office  
Civil Services Division  
4 225 West Madison Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
5 *Attorneys for Maricopa County Defendants*

6 Ryan Esplin  
[EspliR@mohave.gov](mailto:EspliR@mohave.gov)  
7 Jason Mitchell  
[mitchj@mohave.gov](mailto:mitchj@mohave.gov)  
8 Will Davis  
[davisw@mohave.gov](mailto:davisw@mohave.gov)  
9 Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division  
P.O. Box 7000  
10 Kingman, AZ 86402-7000  
*Attorney for Mohave County Defendants*

11 Jason Moore  
[jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov](mailto:jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov)  
12 Navajo County Attorney's Office  
13 P.O. Box 668  
Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668  
14 *Attorney for Navajo County Defendants*

15 Daniel Jurkowitz  
[Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov](mailto:Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov)  
16 Javier Gherna  
[Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov](mailto:Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov)  
17 Pima County Attorney's Office  
32 N. Stone #2100  
18 Tucson, AZ 85701  
*Attorney for Pima County Defendants*

19 Craig Cameron  
[craig.cameron@pinal.gov](mailto:craig.cameron@pinal.gov)  
20 Pinal County Attorney's Office  
21 30 North Florence Street  
Florence, AZ 85132  
22 *Attorneys for Pinal County Defendant*

23 William Moran  
[wmoran@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:wmoran@santacruzcountyaz.gov)  
24 Robert May  
[rmay@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:rmay@santacruzcountyaz.gov)  
25 Mathew Cannon  
[mcannon@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:mcannon@santacruzcountyaz.gov)  
26 George Silva  
[gsilva@santacruzcountyaz.gov](mailto:gsilva@santacruzcountyaz.gov)  
27 Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office  
2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201  
28

1 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090

2 *Attorneys for Santa Cruz County Defendants*

3 Thomas Stoxen  
4 Michael Gordon  
5 Yavapai County Attorney's Office  
6 255 East Gurley Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
7 Prescott, AZ 86301  
8 [Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov](mailto:Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov)  
9 [Michael.gordon@yavapaiaz.gov](mailto:Michael.gordon@yavapaiaz.gov)  
10 *Attorney for Yavapai County Defendants*

11 Bill Kerekes  
12 [bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov](mailto:bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov)  
13 Kesia Morrison  
14 [Keisa.morrison@yumacountyaz.gov](mailto:Keisa.morrison@yumacountyaz.gov)  
15 Yuma County Attorney's Office  
16 198 South Main Street  
17 Yuma, AZ 85364  
18 *Attorney for Yuma County Defendants*

19 /s/ Diana Hanson

---

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

# **EXHIBIT 2**

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2026-014149

04/14/2026

HONORABLE MICHAEL MANDELL

CLERK OF THE COURT

C. Curley

Deputy

TERI HOUIHAN

TERI HOUIHAN

6635 W HAPPY VALLEY RD

STE A1-4-621

GLENDAL AZ 85310

SAMBO DUL

AUSTIN C YOST

KELLEEN R MULL

v.

HUGH LYTLE, et al.

JAMES DEMOSTHENES SMITH

KESIA MORRISON

DANIEL JURKOWITZ

JOE A ALBO JR.

ROSA AGUILAR

ROSE WINKELER

GARY GRIFFITH

MICHAEL J GORDON

CHRIS RESARE

JASON MOORE

CRAIG C CAMERON

ROBERT F MAY

RACHEL SHACKELFORD

WILLIAM DAVIS

KAREN HARTMAN-TELLEZ

DYLAN HENDEL

ANDREW GEORGE PAPPAS

STEFAN D OAKLEY

JOSHUA J MESSER

DANIEL L ROSEN

D MICHELLE BEUS

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2026-014149

04/14/2026

WILLIAM J KEREKES  
BRETT A GIBSON  
THOMAS M STOXEN  
IAN M DARANYI  
DANIELLE PARLICH  
WILLIAM MORAN  
CHERALEE W ROBBINS  
JOSHUA MICHAEL WHITAKER  
JAYLIA YAN  
DANIEL SEBASTIAN RESTREPO  
DOCKET CV TX  
JUDGE MANDELL  
MACIE HAMBLIN  
GILA COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE  
1400 E ASH ST  
GLOBE AZ 85501

**UNDER ADVISEMENT RULING**

The Court has reviewed and considered Plaintiff Craig Beckman's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment, Defendant Hugh Lytle's Motion for Summary Judgment, the Joint Statement of Facts (all filed on April 13, 2026), together with the oral arguments presented by the parties, and the authorities cited in the filed papers. Having considered the record as a whole and the parties' stipulation for decision on summary judgment, the Court finds no genuine dispute of material fact and concludes that Defendant Hugh Lytle is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

The Court also wishes to thank you parties for the professionalism demonstrated both in the pleadings as well as the arguments presented as part of this consolidated matter (including CV2026-014350).

**STIPULATED FACTS**

The material facts are undisputed for purposes of the cross-motions. Hugh Lytle is a candidate for Governor of Arizona. His nomination paper and nomination petitions listed an address in Scottsdale, Arizona, with an 85250 zip code as his residential address. The parties stipulated that this address is a private mailbox in a UPS Store, that Mr. Lytle has received mail

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2026-014149

04/14/2026

there for approximately twelve years, and that his campaign website has listed that same address as the campaign's address since the inception of his gubernatorial campaign.

The parties also stipulated that Mr. Lytle resides at 20044 N 101st Way, Scottsdale, Arizona 85255. The two addresses are both located in Scottsdale, Arizona, and are approximately twelve miles apart. The UPS Store address is in Legislative District 4, while the residential address is in Legislative District 3. It is also undisputed that Mr. Lytle's address has never been protected under A.R.S. § 16-153, that he is the only person by that name registered to vote in Arizona during the campaign, and that he is a candidate for statewide office.

### LEGAL STANDARD

Summary judgment is appropriate only if no genuine issue of material fact exists and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *See* Rule 56(a), Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure; *Orme School v. Reeves*, 166 Ariz. 301, 305, 802 P.2d 1000, 1004 (1990); *Hourani v. Benson Hosp.*, 211 Ariz. 427, 432, 122 P.3d 6, 11 (App. 2005).

In election challenges to the form or content of nomination papers and petitions, Arizona courts “do not remove candidates from the ballot for mere technical departures’ from the statutorily required forms.” *Dedolph v. McDermott*, 230 Ariz. 130, 131, ¶ 3, 281 P.3d 484, 485 (2012) (*quoting Bee v. Day*, 218 Ariz. 505, 507, ¶¶ 9–10, 189 P.3d 1078, 1080 (2008)). Instead, courts “assess whether nominating papers substantially comply with the statutory requirements.” *Id.* (*citing Bee*) (reversing trial court’s order striking from the ballot a candidate who incorrectly identified her surname in her nomination paper as “Cheuront-McDermott” rather than “McDermott”). The substantial-compliance inquiry focuses on whether the omission or inaccuracy could confuse or mislead electors signing the petition, and the documents must be evaluated as a whole. *See Moreno v. Jones*, 213 Ariz. 94, 102, ¶ 42, 139 P.3d 612, 620 (2006) (citation omitted) (holding that petitions specifying the year, but not the specific date, of primary election were not confusing because “there was only one primary that year for” the relevant legislative office).

### ANALYSIS

#### I. Nomination Papers

Plaintiff correctly asserts that Mr. Lytle did not strictly comply with the literal requirements of A.R.S. § 16-311(A). The parties stipulated that Mr. Lytle has an actual residence address, that he did not reside at the UPS Store address listed on the nomination paper, and that his address was not protected under A.R.S. § 16-153. Under the statute’s text, the nomination paper should have stated his actual residence address.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2026-014149

04/14/2026

But strict compliance is not the operative test. Under controlling Arizona authority, the Court must determine whether the nomination paper substantially complied with the statute before denying ballot access. *See Lohr v. Bolick*, 249 Ariz. 428, 431, ¶¶ 7-10, 471 P.3d 639, 642 (2020) (Arizona courts consider “whether nomination documents substantially compl[y] with statutory requirements even if the statute at issue does not expressly state substantial compliance is sufficient.”); *Dedolph*, 230 Ariz. at 131, ¶ 3, 281 P.3d at 485. The relevant inquiry, as instructed by the Arizona Supreme Court, **is whether the address used on the paper could confuse or mislead electors concerning the candidate’s eligibility for the office sought.** *See Lohr*, 249 Ariz. at 432-33, ¶¶ 11-12, 471 P.3d at 642-43; *Moreno*, 213 Ariz. at 102, ¶ 42, 139 P.3d at 620.

On this record, the Court finds that the address used in the nomination papers would not confuse, nor mislead electors concerning Mr. Lytle’s eligibility to run for Governor. Mr. Lytle is running for statewide office, not district, precinct, or municipal office. Both the UPS Store address and his physical residence are in Scottsdale. There is no dispute that Mr. Lytle has been an Arizona resident for many years, that he resides in Maricopa County, and that he satisfies the constitutional and statutory residency requirements for Governor. The purpose identified in *Lohr* and other cases for the statutory address requirement—ensuring that the candidate resides in the jurisdiction he seeks to represent—is fulfilled here.

The Court is not persuaded that the different legislative districts or zip codes compel a different result. Those facts may have carried greater significance had Mr. Lytle sought a district-based office. But this case concerns a statewide race. For that reason, the differences between Legislative District 3 and Legislative District 4, and between zip codes 85255 and 85250, do not reasonably suggest that electors could have been misled about whether Mr. Lytle was eligible to run for Governor of Arizona.

The Court likewise does not find dispositive the absence of protected-address status under A.R.S. § 16-153. *Lohr* expressly recognized lack of strict compliance while still applying substantial-compliance principles to nomination papers and petitions. Although the Supreme Court cautioned that candidates should use their actual residence addresses and that intentional deviation “flirts with disqualification,” the holding remains that ballot access is not forfeited where the challenged address usage, under the facts presented, did not likely confuse or mislead electors. *Lohr*, 249 Ariz. at 434, ¶ 24, 471 P.3d at 645.

Nor does the record establish the type of voter confusion that would warrant invalidating the nomination paper. Mr. Lytle had used the private mailbox for approximately twelve years, displayed it on his campaign website, and there is no evidence in the summary-judgment record that any elector was actually misled about his identity, his candidacy, or his eligibility for

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2026-014149

04/14/2026

Governor. Viewing the nomination paper as a whole, the Court concludes that it substantially complied with A.R.S. § 16-311(A).

## **II. Nomination Petitions**

The same analysis governs the arguments concerning Mr. Lytle’s nomination petitions. Section 16-314(C) prescribes the form of nomination petitions and uses the phrase “who resides at” before the address line. The parties stipulate that the petitions used the UPS Store address rather than Mr. Lytle’s actual physical residence, and that the petitions included a one-digit error in the street number. Again, that is not strict compliance.

Nonetheless, as addressed previously, Arizona law holds that a candidate may substantially comply with A.R.S. § 16-314(C) even when the petition sheets list a private mailbox rather than the candidate’s physical residence, so long as the use of that address does not mislead or confuse voters regarding the candidate’s eligibility for the office sought. *See Lohr*, 249 Ariz. at 432-33, ¶¶ 14-19, 471 P.3d at 643-44. The substantial-compliance analysis likewise considers the petition as a whole. *See Bee*, 218 Ariz. at 508, ¶ 12, 189 P.3d at 1081

Here, the undisputed facts again establish substantial compliance. Mr. Lytle sought statewide office. The address appearing on the petitions was in Scottsdale, Arizona, where he in fact resided, albeit at a different Scottsdale address. He was the only registered voter in Arizona with that name throughout the campaign. No evidence in the record suggests that signers were confused about who was seeking nomination or about whether he met the residency requirements for Governor. The one-digit discrepancy in the street number does not materially alter the analysis; at most, it is an additional irregularity, and this record contains no basis to conclude that it affected the result or misled electors.

Considering the petitions as a whole and applying the substantial-compliance doctrine required by Arizona law, the Court concludes that the petitions substantially complied with A.R.S. § 16-314(C).

## **III. Plaintiff’s Cross-Motion**

Plaintiff’s cross-motion rests principally on the argument that the plain language of A.R.S. §§ 16-311(A) and 16-314(C) should be enforced without recourse to substantial-compliance principles because Mr. Lytle had an actual, unprotected residence address and knowingly used a different address. The Court does not minimize the seriousness of accurate candidate filings. But the Arizona Supreme Court requires this Court to apply the substantial-compliance framework to nomination-document challenges of this kind. Under that framework, and on the undisputed facts presented here, Plaintiff has not established a basis to remove Mr. Lytle from the ballot.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2026-014149

04/14/2026

Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** granting Defendant Hugh Lytle's Motion for Summary Judgment.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** denying Plaintiff Craig Beckman's Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** denying the request to enjoin placement of Defendant Hugh Lytle's name on the ballot for the office of Governor.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** dismissing the verified Complaint, filed on April 6, 2026, with prejudice.

The Court finds this ruling disposes of all outstanding claims and issues in this case. Because no further matters remain pending, the Court signs this minute entry as a final judgment entered pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 54(c).

The parties are notified that, under A.R.S. § 16-351(A), any notice of appeal must be filed within five calendar days after the Superior Court's decision in a challenge to the nomination of a candidate. *See Bohart v. Hanna*, 213 Ariz. 480, 143 P.3d 1021 (2006). An appeal that is belatedly prosecuted, such as one filed on the last day of the statutory deadline, may be dismissed on grounds of laches even if timely filed. *See McClung v. Bennett*, 225 Ariz. 154, 235 P.3d 1037 (2010). Special procedural rules govern expedited appeals in election cases. Ariz. R. Civ. App. P.10.

*/s/ MICHAEL S. MANDELL*

---

HONORABLE MICHAEL S. MANDELL  
JUDGE OF THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT