

## News

NEWS

# Trump Lawyers Announce Next Steps Following Pennsylvania Lawsuit Dismissal

By [Jack Davis](#)

Published November 22, 2020 at 10:31am

Although a federal court ruling in Pennsylvania has blocked a hoped-for path to victory for the Trump campaign, it has opened up a path to the Supreme Court, according to the campaign's lawyers.

On Saturday, U.S. District Court Judge Matthew W. Brann threw out the Trump campaign's lawsuit that alleged there were widespread irregularities in Pennsylvania's voting.

The decision heaped scorn on the Trump campaign's effort to overturn results that showed that [presumptive](#) potential President-elect Joe Biden won the state in the Nov. 3 contest.

The Trump campaign alleges there has been [voter fraud](#) in states that include Arizona, Nevada, Georgia, Michigan and Wisconsin, as well as Pennsylvania. Despite multiple anecdotal claims of voting irregularities, proof has yet to surface that there was a widespread effort to distort the voting process in such a way that would have impacted the [final results](#) of the presidential election.

The Pennsylvania case argued that under guidance from Pennsylvania Secretary of State Kathy Boockvar, in Democratic counties, voters who cast ballots by mail were allowed to fix flaws that might have otherwise invalidated them, while Republican counties did not do so.

Despite the ruling, the campaign said it is not finished.

“Today’s decision turns out to help us in our strategy to get expeditiously to the U.S. Supreme Court. Although we fully disagree with this opinion, we’re thankful to the Obama-appointed judge for making this anticipated decision quickly, rather than simply trying to run out the clock,” Trump’s attorney, Rudy Giuliani, and Jenna Ellis, senior legal adviser to the campaign, said in a statement on the [campaign website](#).

“We will be seeking an expedited appeal to the Third Circuit. There is so much evidence that in Pennsylvania, Democrats eliminated our opportunity to present 50 witnesses and other evidence that election officials blatantly ignored Pennsylvania’s law denying independent review. This resulted in 682,777 ballots being cast illegally, wittingly or unwittingly. This is just an extension of the Big Tech, Big Media, Corrupt Democrat censorship of damning facts the American public needs to know,” the statement said.

“We are disappointed we did not at least get the opportunity to present our evidence at a hearing. Unfortunately the censorship continues. We hope that the Third Circuit will be as gracious as Judge Brann in deciding our appeal one way or the other as expeditiously as possible. This is another case that appears to be moving quickly to the United States Supreme Court,” the statement said.

Do you think this case will reach the Supreme Court?

Yes  No

Submit

Completing this poll entitles you to The Western Journal news updates free of charge. You may opt out at anytime. You also agree to our [Privacy Policy](#) and [Terms of Use](#).

In his ruling, Brann said the campaign asked him to “disenfranchise almost seven million voters. This Court has been unable to find any case in which a plaintiff has sought such a drastic remedy in the contest of an election, in terms of the sheer volume of votes asked to be invalidated,” according to the [document](#).

Brann indicated that the [campaign](#) has not substantiated its claims.

“One might expect that when seeking such a startling outcome, a plaintiff would

come formidably armed with compelling legal arguments and factual proof of rampant corruption, such that this Court would have no option but to regrettably grant the proposed injunctive relief despite the impact it would have on such a large group of citizens.,” he wrote.

“That has not happened. Instead, this Court has been presented with strained legal arguments without merit and speculative accusations, unpled in the operative complaint and unsupported by evidence.”

“In the United States of America, this cannot justify the disenfranchisement of a single voter, let alone all the voters of its sixth most populated state. Our people, laws, and institutions demand more. At bottom, Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden to state a claim upon which relief may be granted,” he wrote.

Brann said that the campaign’s claim of an equal protection violation “like Frankenstein’s Monster, has been haphazardly stitched together from two distinct theories in an attempt to avoid controlling precedent.”

Brann also wrote that the campaign lacked the legal standing to bring its claim before the court.

[Pennsylvania](#) is scheduled to certify its election results on Monday.

*We are committed to truth and accuracy in all of our journalism. Read our [editorial standards](#).*

### Submit a Correction



**Jack Davis**  
Contributor, News

- |         |           |              |         |
|---------|-----------|--------------|---------|
| Summary | More Info | Recent Posts | Contact |
|---------|-----------|--------------|---------|

Jack Davis is a freelance writer who joined The Western Journal in July 2015 and chronicled the campaign that saw President Donald Trump elected. Since then, he has written extensively for The Western Journal on the Trump administration as well as foreign policy and military issues.