

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SIXTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA**

JOHN WILLIAM LICCIONE,

Petitioner,

v.

Case No. 25-007207-CI

BRUCE H. BARTLETT, et al

Respondents.

_____ /

**PETITIONER’S MOTION TO COMPEL SUPPLEMENTATION OF PUBLIC
RECORDS PRODUCTION, FOR IN CAMERA REVIEW, AND FOR CONSIDERATION
OF NEWLY OBTAINED EVIDENCE**

Petitioner, John Liccione, pro se, moves this Court for an order compelling supplementation of Respondent’s public records production and, if necessary, in camera review, and states:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. This motion arises from a material discrepancy between a written March 4, 2025 communication describing a “database/software issue” in the processing of anomalous vote-by-mail (VBM) official election records, the 6th Circuit State Attorney’s Office (SAO6) Investigative Report’s characterization of the same matter as a “process issue” in which the system “works as designed,” and the failure to disclose and produce that written communication and its referenced vendor attachment, despite specific statutory pre-suit notice. Because the email and attachment were in Respondents’ custody on March 4, 2025, and because no exemption log or independent statutory determination has been provided, in camera review and supplemental production are necessary to resolve the completeness and lawfulness of the records production under Chapter 119.

II. CASE POSTURE

2. The Court's January 29, 2026 Alternative Writ found the Petition states a prima facie case for relief under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, and directed Respondents to respond and set a case management conference for potential evidentiary hearing(s).
3. Petitioner effected service of the Alternative Writ of Mandamus and Verified Petition on Respondent Bartlett on February 6, 2026, and on Respondent Macks on February 9, 2026, via certified mail, return receipt requested, as documented in the Notices of Service filed with the Court (DNs 17–23).
4. Because service was effected by certified mail, return receipt requested, Respondents are entitled to an additional 5 days under Florida Rule of Civil Procedure 1.090(e). Thus, service of the Alternative Writ triggers each Respondent's obligation to file an answer or other response within 25 days after service on that Respondent (20 days under Rules 1.140(a)(1) and 1.630(e), plus 5 days for mail service, computed pursuant to Rule 1.090(a) excluding weekends and legal holidays if the last day falls thereon). Accordingly, Respondent Bruce H. Bartlett's response is due on or before March 3, 2026, and Respondent Sara Macks' response is due on or before March 6, 2026.
5. As of the date of this Motion no response has been filed by either Respondent.

III. SUPPLEMENTAL FACTS REGARDING OMITTED RESPONSIVE RECORDS

6. On February 6, 2026, Petitioner submitted on behalf of his company, Ballotir, a Public Records Request to the Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections (“PCSOE”), which was assigned PRR2026-752 by the PCSOE. A true and correct copy of that request is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

7. In response to PRR2026-752, the PCSOE produced, among other responsive records not produced by Respondents, a March 4, 2025 email from Matt Smith, General Counsel for PCSOE on behalf of Julie Marcus, to SAO6 Investigator James Lenas. A true and correct copy of that produced email is attached hereto as **Exhibit B** (Pg 1 shown below).

Smith, Matt

From: Smith, Matt
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 4:59 PM
To: Lenas, Jim
Cc: Gillette, Marc
Subject: Liccione "sworn criminal complaint" / **Trade Secret pursuant to § 688.002/815.045/119.0715(3), F.S.**
Attachments: SKM_C450i25030415580.pdf

Good afternoon, Jim – per our conversation, I am forwarding a statement from VR Systems Inc., our election software vendor for processing vote-by-mail (VBM) requests and the VBM Report referenced in Mr. Liccione’s “sworn criminal complaint.” **Please note that the document attached is marked “Trade Secret” but is disclosed to you pursuant to § 119.0715(3), F.S.**

As you know, Mr. Liccione’s “sworn criminal complaint” essentially complains of two things: 1) a discrepancy between the date a VBM ballot was requested and the date which is reported on the VBM Report; and 2) the VBM seemingly indicating that social security numbers and/or driver licenses are not verified when a voter requests a VBM ballot.

Simply stated, per the attached vendor document, this is not the case but instead a database/software issue.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Please let us know if you have any further questions.

Thanks,

Matt Smith
General Counsel
Representing Julie Marcus, Supervisor of Elections
13001 Starkey Rd., Largo, FL 33773
(727) 464-5751
masmith@votepinellas.gov
Find us on [Facebook](#) ~ Follow us [@VotePinellas](#)

1

The 3/4/25 Matt Smith to James Lenas Redacted Email (Pg 1 of 2, See Exhibit B)

8. The March 4, 2025 Smith-to-Lenas email reflects transmission to Investigator Lenas in the course of official SAO6 business.
9. The email references and attaches a VR Systems vendor explanation PDF concerning a “software/database issue” addressed during the SAO6 investigation.
10. The PCSOE-produced copy of the email contains this unredacted sentence:

*“Simply stated, per the attached vendor document, this is not the case but instead **a database/software issue.**” (emphasis added)*
11. The next two paragraphs are completely redacted.
12. The email identifies an attachment (“SKM_C450i25030415580.pdf”), and that referenced vendor attachment was not included with the produced email by PCSOE.
13. In response to the SAO6 public records request that is the subject of this mandamus proceeding, SAO6 has neither identified the existence of, nor produced a copy of: (a) the March 4, 2025 email, nor the vendor explanation PDF file attached and referenced therein.
14. SAO6 has not identified the existence of this email or its attachment as withheld records.
15. SAO6 has not cited any statutory exemption for redaction or withholding.
16. SAO6 has not provided an exemption log.
17. The March 4, 2025 email demonstrates that the record was transmitted to SAO6 in the course of official duties and was within SAO6’s custody or control as of date of receipt.
18. Petitioner’s public records request to SAO6 expressly sought all communications and documents exchanged between SAO6 and PCSOE, VR Systems, or any third party concerning Petitioner’s criminal complaint and related investigative activity into his allegations pertaining to the VR Systems “No-No Ballot Bug” anomalies in Vote-by-Mail official election reports.

19. Under Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, an agency that withholds or redacts a public record must identify the specific statutory exemption relied upon and bears the burden of justifying the withholding.
20. When an agency asserts an exemption under Chapter 119, it bears the burden of establishing the applicability of that exemption and must state with specificity the statutory basis for withholding.
21. The agency's obligation to determine whether a statutory exemption applies is independent; a third party's designation of a document as confidential or proprietary does not, by itself, establish that the statutory requirements for exemption have been met.
22. Where the applicability of an asserted exemption cannot be determined from the face of the record, the Court may conduct an in camera review to determine whether the record qualifies for protection.

IV. ARGUMENT FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING AND SHOW CAUSE ORDER

23. The March 4, 2025 Smith-to-Lenas email (Exhibit B) and the SAO6 Investigative Report (DN 6, Bates no. D001-D010) are two sides of the same investigative conversation between Matt Smith and James Lenas, but they characterize the root cause of the VBM anomalies substantially differently.
24. The Smith-Lenas email explicitly states: "Simply stated, per the attached vendor document, this is not the case but instead a *database/software issue*." (emphasis added)
25. The Smith-to-Lenas email produced to Petitioner by PCSOE contains two fully redacted paragraphs immediately following the sentence stating that the matter is "...*not the case but instead a database/software issue*." The email further identifies a specific attachment by


filename (SKM_C450i25030415580.pdf) and expressly states that the attached vendor (i.e., VR Systems) document is marked “*Trade Secret*” but “*is disclosed to you pursuant to §119.0715(3), F.S.*” Although the email reflects that the attachment was transmitted to SAO6, neither the unredacted paragraphs nor the referenced attachment were produced by PCSOE in response to PRR 2026-752. No exemption log has been provided by either PCSOE or Respondents identifying any statutory basis for the redactions or the withholding of the attachment.

26. The redacted paragraphs and the referenced vendor attachment are directly relevant to reconciling the “database/software issue” characterization in the March 4 email with the Investigative Report’s statement that the system “works as designed” and that the matter was a “process issue.”
27. Because both documents arise from the same investigative exchange, the characterization of the anomaly as a “database/software issue” and the conclusion that the system “works as designed” and that the matter was a “process issue” present a material inconsistency unless clarified by the underlying vendor document and related communications.
28. Notably, the phrase “works as designed” appears in the SAO6 Investigative Report, not in the unredacted portion of the March 4, 2025 email. The email instead characterizes the matter as a “database/software issue.” A system may “work as designed” in the sense that it performs according to its design specification, while the underlying design specification itself contains a defect that produces inaccurate or misleading report outputs. Conversely, a design specification may be sound while an implementation error (coding bug) causes falsified outputs. These distinctions are materially different from a “process issue,” which ordinarily refers to user workflow or procedural handling external to the software system. The Court

cannot determine whether the Investigative Report's characterization accurately reflects the vendor's explanation without review of the redacted paragraphs and referenced attachment.

29. The temporal proximity between Petitioner's March 3, 2025 delivery of his criminal complaint and grand jury probe request to SAO6, the March 4, 2025 written acknowledgment of a "database/software issue" in the Smith-to-Lenas email, the March 11, 2025 documented modification to the relevant VR Systems Vote-By-Mail Request user interface as shown in *publicly accessible* Voter Focus Help Manual pages, and the March 13, 2025 admission communicated to Petitioner by Andrew Keefe, demonstrates that the withheld vendor explanation concerns an active and contemporaneously reviewed system issue during the SA25-147 investigation period. The Court need not determine causation at this stage. However, this sequence underscores the material relevance of the redacted paragraphs and referenced attachment and reinforces the necessity of in camera review and independent judicial evaluation of any claimed exemption.
30. Petitioner has further determined that, prior to and during the relevant investigation period, VR Systems maintained an online "Voter Focus" Help Manual accessible at the public URL root <https://content.vrsys.co/help>, containing detailed descriptions and screenshots of Vote-By-Mail request processing and batch import functionality, including the interface elements at issue. These materials were publicly accessible without authentication and were archived by third-party web repositories through at least December of 2025.

31. Subsequent to the filing of this mandamus proceeding, access to the Help site began returning a “403 ERROR – Request blocked” response generated by Amazon Web Services’ CloudFront content delivery network. A true and correct screenshot of that response is shown below.



VR Systems Help Manual Page 403 error response captured on 2/24/2026

32. The prior unrestricted public availability of these materials bears directly on whether the referenced vendor explanation PDF attachment and related descriptions of the “database/software issue” satisfy the statutory definition of a “trade secret,” which requires reasonable efforts to maintain secrecy under § 688.002(4), Florida Statutes. The change in accessibility further underscores the necessity of in camera review and independent judicial determination of any claimed exemption.

33. Because the redacted paragraphs and referenced vendor attachment were not produced or identified as withheld despite being within SAO6’s custody as of March 4, 2025, in camera

review is necessary to resolve the asserted withholding and to determine whether any statutory exemption properly applies.

34. The omission of the March 4, 2025 Smith-Lenas email from Respondents' production in response to PRR25-00371, despite its direct relevance and custody/control by SAO6 as of March 4, 2025, further supports Petitioner's claim that responsive records were not fully produced and that additional materials remain undisclosed within the investigative file.
35. Petitioner's December 1, 2025 §119.12(1)(b) pre-suit notice (DN 10, Exhibit H) specifically and surgically identified the omission of written communications between Investigator Lenas and PCSOE officials, stating:

“The production contains no substantive notes documenting the content of Lenas's March 4, 2025 communications with Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections General Counsel Matt Smith and Deputy Supervisor Marc Gillette, despite those communications being referenced in Lenas's narratives, and despite references to post phone call written 'information about the process' that Smith/Gillette had provided him.”
36. The March 4, 2025 Smith-Lenas email produced by PCSOE is *precisely* the written communication identified in that pre-suit notice. It was in SAO6 custody from the inception of investigation SA25-147, yet was not produced by Respondents in response to PRR25-00371 and was not produced following statutory pre-suit notice.
37. In light of the Court's prima facie findings in the Alternative Writ, these facts create disputed issues that cannot be resolved on the pleadings alone. An evidentiary hearing is necessary to determine the completeness and integrity of the investigative file, the basis for the redactions and omissions, whether all responsive communications were produced, and whether the Investigative Report accurately and fully reflects the technical information provided to SAO6. These determinations are necessary for the Court to assess the integrity of the investigative file and the lawfulness of the records production at issue in this proceeding.

38. The Court should issue an order to show cause or supplemental writ commanding the following individuals to appear at an evidentiary hearing and give sworn testimony concerning the matters identified herein: Matt Smith, Marc Gillette, Julie Marcus, Investigator James Lenas, Respondent Bruce H. Bartlett, Respondent Sara Macks, Chief Investigator David Wawrzynski, and Pinellas County Attorney Andrew Keefe. Each should be required to testify under oath regarding:

- a. The communications between Smith and Lenas during and after the SA25-147 investigation;
- b. Communications between VR Systems and the PCSOE and SAO6;
- c. The reasons for the omission of the March 4, 2025 email and the referenced VR Systems vendor explanation from the SAO6 Investigative Report and from Respondents' production in response to PRR25-00371;
- d. The basis for characterizing the matter as a "process issue" in the SA25-147 report, and that the system "works as designed," in light of the March 4, 2025 written communication describing a "database/software issue";
- e. Whether the narrative descriptions in the SAO6 Investigative Report fully and accurately reflect the technical explanation communicated by VR Systems to PCSOE and transmitted to SAO6;
- f. The overall handling of the investigation and records production amid the structural conflict of interest identified in the Petition;
- g. Relevant telephone communications between Petitioner and Andrew Keefe; and
- h. Any other matters relevant to the completeness, accuracy, and integrity of the SAO6 records production and Investigative Report.

39. Petitioner requests that the Court set an immediate date for the evidentiary hearing, consistent with the expedited nature of Chapter 119 enforcement actions under § 119.11, Florida Statutes, and with Petitioner's motion for expedited hearing (DN 12).

V. ARGUMENT AGAINST PASS-THROUGH OF THIRD-PARTY TRADE SECRET CLAIMS WITHOUT INDEPENDENT DETERMINATION

40. The March 4, 2025 Smith-to-Lenas email (Exhibit B) asserts a trade secret exemption for the attached VR Systems vendor explanation PDF (and the redacted paragraphs) under Florida Statutes §§ 688.002, 815.045, and 119.0715(3). However, Respondents cannot simply pass through a third party's trade secret designation without making an independent determination as to whether the information qualifies for exemption.

41. Under § 119.0715(3), Florida Statutes, an agency may withhold trade secret information disclosed to it, but the agency must independently evaluate whether the information meets the definition of a "trade secret" under § 688.002(4), Florida Statutes, which requires that the information derives independent economic value from not being generally known or readily ascertainable, and is the subject of reasonable efforts to maintain secrecy.

42. Similarly, § 815.045, Florida Statutes, protects cybersecurity-related information, but only if it relates to vulnerabilities or exploits that could compromise computer systems. A software defect or bug in a batch import or VBM report generation feature — such as the “database/software issue” referenced in the email — does not, on its face, constitute a cybersecurity exploit or necessarily derive independent economic value from secrecy. Accordingly, the applicability of §§688.002 or 815.045 cannot be presumed and requires independent agency evaluation.

43. Further, the March 4, 2025 Smith-to-Lenas email (Exhibit B) reflects that Matt Smith, as General Counsel for the PCSOE, relied upon VR Systems' designation of the attached vendor explanation PDF as "Trade Secret" and transmitted it to Investigator Lenas pursuant to §119.0715(3), F.S., without any indication of an independent determination as to whether the document met the statutory definition of a trade secret under §688.002(4), Florida Statutes. This reliance is compounded by Respondents SAO6 (Bruce H. Bartlett and Sara Macks), who accepted and perpetuated the third-party designation without independent verification, and who further omitted the email's existence — along with the VR Systems attachment — from production in response to PRR25-00371, despite its clear relevance and custody/control by SAO6 as of March 4, 2025.
44. This constitutes an improper delegation and concealment of the agencies' non-delegable duties under Chapter 119. An agency may not shift to a third party or requester the responsibility to determine exemption applicability, nor may it conceal records in its custody to avoid making that determination. The burden remains on the custodian to justify any withholding or redaction under a specific statutory exemption.
45. Florida courts have held that agencies cannot rely solely on a third party's assertion of confidentiality or trade secret status; the agency bears the burden of establishing the exemption's applicability. See *Tribune Co. v. Cannella*, 458 So. 2d 1075, 1077-78 (Fla. 1984) ("No provision is made for anyone other than the custodian of records to withhold a record, and the only justification for withholding a record or a portion thereof is the custodian's assertion of a statutory exemption."); see also *Sevro Corp. v. Florida Dep't of Env't Prot.*, 839 So. 2d 781 (Fla. 1st DCA 2003) (agency must independently verify trade secret claim).

46. By accepting VR Systems' trade secret designation without conducting an independent statutory analysis, and by omitting the email and attachment from production, Respondents failed to satisfy their duties under Chapter 119. This failure warrants compelled supplementation and, if necessary, in camera review to determine whether any claimed exemption properly applies.

VI. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests that the Court:

- A.** Order Respondents to immediately supplement their production to include the complete, unredacted March 4, 2025 Smith-to-Lenas email and the VR Systems vendor explanation PDF referenced therein (SKM_C450i25030415580.pdf), without reliance on third-party trade secret designations;
- B.** Alternatively, require Respondents to identify with specificity any statutory exemption claimed for redaction or withholding of the email or attachment and to produce a corresponding exemption log;
- C.** Conduct an in camera review of the unredacted email and attachment to determine whether any claimed exemption under §§ 119.0715(3), 688.002, or 815.045, Florida Statutes, applies, or whether the "database/software issue" description is non-proprietary information revealing a defect that must be disclosed;
- D.** Order an evidentiary hearing on the completeness, accuracy, and integrity of Respondents' public records production and the SAO6 Investigative Report in SA25-147, including the basis for the "process issue" and "works as designed" characterization in light of the March 4, 2025 written reference to a "database/software issue," and whether

the Investigative Report fully and accurately reflects the technical explanation communicated by VR Systems and transmitted to SAO6.;

- E.** Issue an order to show cause or additional writ commanding the following individuals to appear at the evidentiary hearing and give sworn testimony regarding the communications, omissions, redactions, investigative narrative, any misrepresentations, and the handling of records production amid the structural conflict of interest identified in the Petition:
- a. PCSOE General Counsel Matt Smith
 - b. PCSOE Chief Deputy Marc Gillette
 - c. PCSOE Julie Marcus
 - d. SAO6 Investigator James Lenas
 - e. Respondent Bruce H. Bartlett
 - f. Respondent Sara Macks
 - g. SAO6 Chief Investigator David Wawrzynski
 - h. Pinellas County Attorney Andrew Keefe
- F.** Set an immediate date for the evidentiary hearing, consistent with the expedited nature of Chapter 119 enforcement actions under § 119.11, Florida Statutes;

G. Award costs and such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper, including any sanctions authorized under Chapter 119 for non-compliance or improper withholding.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ John W. Liccione
John W. Liccione
Petitioner, Pro Se
1497 Main St. Ste 196
Dunedin, FL 34698
443-698-8156
jliccione@gmail.com

VERIFICATION

I, John W. Liccione, declare under penalty of perjury that I have read the foregoing Motion to Compel Supplementation of Public Records Production, for In Camera Review, and for Consideration of Newly Obtained Evidence, and that the factual statements and representations contained therein, including the exhibits and embedded screenshots, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Executed on this 24th day of February, 2026.

/s/ John W. Liccione

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this 24th day of February, 2026, a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served via email and e-service through the Florida Courts E-Filing Portal, to Respondent Bruce H. Bartlett (E-mail: brucebartlett@flsa6.gov) and Respondent Sara Macks (PublicRecordsRequests@flsa6.gov)

/s/ John W. Liccione

EXHIBIT A

John Liccione's Public Records Request to Pinellas County
Supervisor of Elections dated February 2, 2026

(PRR 2016-752)



February 6, 2026

John W. Liccione
Ballotir Founder and CEO
443-698-8156
John@ballotir.com

Public Records Request
Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections
13001 Starkey Rd.
Largo, FL 33773

PUBLIC RECORDS REQUEST

Chapter 119, Florida Statutes

To the Custodian of Public Records:

On behalf of Ballotir, LLC, I respectfully request access to and copies of public records pursuant to Chapter 119, Florida Statutes. This request is limited to records relating to the criminal complaint and grand jury probe demand submitted to the Office of the State Attorney for the Sixth Judicial Circuit of Florida by John Liccione, and the resulting investigation memorialized in the attached 10-page 6SAO Investigation Report, No. SA25-147. This request is confined to the subject matter reflected in that report and related records and communications.

This request seeks records in the possession, custody, or control of the Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections that reflect communications or exchanges of information within the PCSOE as well as with third parties in connection with SAO6 Investigation No. SA25-147.

Specifically, I request the following records for the period January 1, 2025 through the present:

1. All non-privileged communications (including emails, letters, memoranda, attachments, text messages, and message-app communications) between the Pinellas County Supervisor of Elections or its staff, it's attorneys and any third party concerning:
 - the criminal complaint submitted by John William Liccione,
 - the grand jury probe demand submitted by John William Liccione, or
 - SAO6 Investigation No. SA25-147, including matters described in the attached SA25-147 Report.
2. Without limiting the foregoing, responsive third-party communications include communications with:
 - the Office of the State Attorney for the Sixth Judicial Circuit (including Bruce Bartlett and investigative staff);
 - the Pinellas County Attorney's Office (including Andrew Keefe);
 - other Florida Supervisors of Elections or election officials;



- the Florida Department of State, including the Director of the Office of Election Crimes and Security, predecessor (Andrew Darlington) and successor (Jillian Pratt);
 - the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE);
 - any federal, state, or local law-enforcement, intelligence agency, DOD, or regulatory agency;
 - and VR Systems, Inc., including its officers, employees, contractors, or representatives.
3. All documents, data files, spreadsheets, exports, screenshots, reports, written summaries, or explanatory materials that were:
- provided to any of the third parties identified above, or
 - received from any such third party, in connection with SAO6 Investigation No. SA25-147 or the matters described in the attached SA25-147 Report.
4. Any records memorializing oral communications with any third party concerning SAO6 Investigation No. SA25-147, including notes, call logs, meeting notes, calendars, or internal summaries reflecting the substance of such communications.

If any portion of the requested records is claimed to be exempt or privileged, please provide:

- the non-exempt portions of the records,
- a written identification of each specific statutory exemption relied upon, and
- a brief description of the nature of the records withheld, as required by Chapter 119, Florida Statutes.

If no responsive records exist for any category above, please confirm that fact in writing.

I request that responsive records be provided electronically (PDF or native electronic format) where available, via the US mail on DVD, as well as via either email and/or download link. If there will be any charge associated with this request, please advise in advance of the estimated cost.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request. Please contact me if clarification is needed to facilitate a timely and efficient response.

Respectfully submitted,

EXHIBIT B

Matt Smith Email to James Lenas

Dated March 4, 2026

Smith, Matt

From: Smith, Matt
Sent: Tuesday, March 4, 2025 4:59 PM
To: Lenas, Jim
Cc: Gillette, Marc
Subject: Liccione "sworn criminal complaint" / ****Trade Secret pursuant to § 688.002/815.045/119.0715(3), F.S.****
Attachments: SKM_C450i25030415580.pdf

Good afternoon, Jim – per our conversation, I am forwarding a statement from VR Systems Inc., our election software vendor for processing vote-by-mail (VBM) requests and the VBM Report referenced in Mr. Liccione’s “sworn criminal complaint.” **Please note that the document attached is marked “Trade Secret” but is disclosed to you pursuant to § 119.0715(3), F.S.**

As you know, Mr. Liccione’s “sworn criminal complaint” essentially complains of two things: 1) a discrepancy between the date a VBM ballot was requested and the date which is reported on the VBM Report; and 2) the VBM seemingly indicating that social security numbers and/or driver licenses are not verified when a voter requests a VBM ballot.

Simply stated, per the attached vendor document, this is not the case but instead a database/software issue.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Please let us know if you have any further questions.

Thanks,

Matt Smith
General Counsel
Representing Julie Marcus, Supervisor of Elections
13001 Starkey Rd., Largo, FL 33773
(727) 464-5751
masmith@votepinellas.gov
Find us on [Facebook](#) ~ Follow us [@VotePinellas](#)

Under Florida law, email addresses are public records. If you do not want your email address released in response to a public-records request, do not send electronic mail to this entity. Instead, contact this office by phone or in writing. -- F.S. 668.6076

Conforme a la legislación de Florida, las direcciones de correo electrónico son registros públicos. Si no desea que su correo electrónico se divulgue como respuesta a una solicitud de registros públicos, no envíe un correo electrónico a esta entidad. En su lugar, póngase en contacto con esta oficina por teléfono o por escrito. -- F.S. 668.6076