

CHERYL L. JOHNSON  
CLERK

H-154 THE CAPITOL

GLORIA J. LETT  
DEPUTY CLERK

ROBERT F. REEVES  
DEPUTY CLERK

Office of the Clerk  
U.S. House of Representatives  
Washington, DC 20515-6601

HOUSE MAIL ROOM  
FEB 10 21 AM 11:05

February 10, 2021


The Honorable Zoe Lofgren  
The Honorable Rodney Davis  
Committee on House Administration  
1309 Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairperson Lofgren and Ranking Member Davis:

I transmit herewith correspondence captioned "Reply to Resistance to Motion to Dismiss Notice of Contest Regarding the Election for Representative in the 117<sup>th</sup> Congress from the Second Congressional District of Iowa". The enclosed correspondence was received in the Office of the Clerk by hand delivery on February 9, 2021.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,



Gloria L. Lett  
Deputy Clerk

Enclosures

IN THE  
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

---

RITA HART,  
Contestant,

v.

MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS,  
Contestee,

---


REPLY TO RESISTANCE TO MOTION TO DISMISS NOTICE OF CONTEST  
REGARDING THE ELECTION FOR REPRESENTATIVE  
IN THE 117th CONGRESS FROM THE  
SECOND CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF IOWA

---

**Alan R. Ostergren**  
Alan R. Ostergren, P.C.  
500 Locust Street, Suite 199  
Des Moines, IA 50309

**Ryan G. Koopmans**  
Belin McCormick  
666 Walnut Street, Suite 2000  
Des Moines, IA 50309

**Mark A. Schultheis**  
Nyemaster Goode  
700 Walnut Street, Suite 1600  
Des Moines, IA 50309



Contestant Rita Hart does not attempt to justify her failure to first raise her claims before a neutral panel of Iowa judges before filing her contest with the House of Representatives. She claims that she doesn't have to but fails to meaningfully distinguish the numerous precedents where the House has dismissed contests for a failure to exhaust state-law remedies. And her notice of contest does not allege fraud, misconduct, or irregularities. In essence, she says that her disagreement with routine election administration decisions that disfavored her is enough to sustain a contest.

In a way there is a kind of perverse consistency in Hart's position. She wants to ignore Iowa law on contesting an election just like she wants to ignore Iowa law on how ballots are properly counted or rejected by election officials. In fact, she says the quiet part out loud when she cites *McCloskey v. McIntyre*, H.R. Rep. 99-58—the infamous “Bloody Eighth” election contest—for the proposition that the House can discard state law as it sees fit.<sup>1</sup>

Hart's resistance does not devote a single word to explain why she did not raise her claims before a neutral panel of Iowa judges as was her right under Iowa law. *See*, Iowa Code § 60.1. Of course, a trial in an Iowa contest court would have presented risks to Hart's position. She would have had to have actual live witnesses (instead of just affidavits drafted by lawyers). Her claims could have been tested by cross-

---

<sup>1</sup> Hart quotes thi: “[T]he Committee on House Administration has noted that ‘in addition to the fact that the House is not legally bound to follow state law . . . .’”

examination. Proof could have been introduced in opposition to her claims. Logical and factual inconsistencies in her case would have been visible to all.

Hart doesn't have to worry about any of those things right now. She can present wild allegations about ballots in her favor and simply assume that Iowa election law is no obstacle to her victory. She can huff and puff in her filings without the fear that neutral judges will not agree with her. She can posture publicly without being confronted about facts that are inconvenient to her position. She can even make the absurd argument that raising procedural default in a motion to dismiss somehow concedes the fact allegations of Hart's contest.<sup>2</sup>

Hart argues that House precedent doesn't mean what it says. She denies the import of the House's decision in case after case to refuse to entertain a contest where the contestant has not first done everything possible under state law. And then she drops the real argument: the House can do what it wants under majority rules. The word "precedent" means little or nothing, in her view, to a Member.

Hart's argument is essentially about power, not law. In the end, this House *can* do many things by the brute force of a majority vote. But this does not mean it *should* do those things. If ratified by the House, Hart's decision to not first contest the election under Iowa law will mark a troubling departure from precedent and will

---

<sup>2</sup> News flash to Hart's attorney: that's not how this works—not any of it.

encourage even greater departures from norms in judging election contests. This House should not indulge Hart's request to demolish precedent simply because she cannot accept that she lost a close race.

This House stands at a precipice. It seems that a long-standing norm crumbles each day in our civil society. At some point someone has to ask the question: How do we come back from this? Can the House endure the might-makes-right display of majority power as Hart asks for? What is the next escalation?

This House should dismiss Hart's notice of contest.

**Mariannette Miller-Meeks**  
Member of Congress  
Second Congressional District of Iowa

By:



---

**Alan R. Ostergren**  
Alan R. Ostergren, P.C.  
500 Locust Street, Suite 199  
Des Moines, IA 50309

**Ryan G. Koopmans**  
Belin McCormick  
666 Walnut Street, Suite 2000  
Des Moines, IA 50309

**Mark A. Schultheis**  
Nyemaster Goode  
700 Walnut Street, Suite 1600  
Des Moines, IA 50309