

EXHIBIT 4

Declaration of [REDACTED]

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C Section 1746, I, [REDACTED], make the following declaration.

1. I am over the age of 21 years and am a resident of Monroe County, Florida.
2. I am under no legal disability that would prevent me from giving this declaration.
3. I hold a Bachelor of Science degree in Mathematics and a Master of Science degree in Statistics.
4. For thirty years, I have conducted statistical data analysis for companies in various industries, including aerospace, consumer packaged goods, disease detection and tracking, and fraud detection.
5. From November 13th, 2020 through November 28th, 2020, I conducted in-depth statistical analysis of publicly available data on the 2020 U.S. Presidential Election. This data included vote counts for each county in the United States, U.S. Census data, and type of voting machine data provided by the U.S. Election Assistance Committee.
6. The analysis yielded several “red flags” concerning the percentage of votes won by candidate Biden in counties using voting machines provided by Dominion Voting Systems. These red flags occurred in several States in the country, including possible red flag in Maricopa County, Arizona.
7. I began by using Chi-Squared Automatic Interaction Detection (CHAID), which treats the data in an agnostic way—that is, it imposes no parametric assumptions that could otherwise introduce

bias. Here, I posed the following question: “Do any voting machine types appear to have unusual results?” The answer provided by the statistical technique/algorithm was that machines from Dominion Voting Systems (Dominion) produced abnormal results.

8. Subsequent graphical and statistical analysis shows the unusual pattern involving machines from Dominion occurs in at least 100 counties and multiple States. Since machines from Dominion were used in Maricopa County, it is possible the unusual pattern continues there.
9. The results from most, if not all counties using the Dominion machines is three to five point six percentage points higher in favor of candidate Biden than the results should be. This pattern is seen easily in graphical form when the results from “Dominion” counties are overlaid against results from “non-Dominion” counties. The results from “Dominion” counties do not match the results from the rest of the counties in the United States. The results are certainly statistically significant, with a p-value of < 0.00004 . This translates into a statistical impossibility that something unusual involving Dominion machines is *not* occurring. This pattern appears in multiple States and the margin of votes implied by the unusual activity would easily sway the election results in those States. The margin of votes implied by the unusual pattern would certainly sway the election results in Arizona.
10. The following graph shows the pattern. The x-axis is our predicted percentage candidate Biden should win. The y-axis is the actual percentage Biden won. The green dots are counties in the

United States that use Dominion voting machines. Almost all of them are above an imaginary blue center prediction line, when in normal situations approximately half of them would be below the prediction line (as evidence by approximately half the counties in the U.S. (blue dots) that are below the blue centerline). More easily put, the green dots (counties with Dominion machines) are simply “too high”. The p-value of statistical analysis regarding the centerline for the green dots (Counties with Dominion machines) is 0.000000049, pointing to a statistical impossibility that this is a “random” statistical anomaly. Some external force caused this anomaly.



11. To confirm that Dominion machines were the source of the pattern/anomaly, I conducted further analysis using propensity scoring using U.S. census variables (Including ethnicities, income, professions, population density and other social/economic data) , which was used to place counties into paired groups. Such an analysis is important because one concern could be that counties with Dominion systems are systematically different from their counterparts, so abnormalities in the margin for Biden are driven by other characteristics unrelated to the election.
12. After matching counties using propensity score analysis, the only difference between the groups was the presence of Dominion machines. This approach again showed a highly statistically significant difference between the two groups, with candidate Biden again averaging three percentage points higher in Dominion counties than in the associated paired county. The associated p-value is < 0.00005 , against indicating a statistical impossibility that something unusual is not occurring involving Dominion machines.
13. The results of the analysis and the pattern seen in the included graph strongly suggest a systemic, system-wide algorithm was enacted by an outside agent. Our estimate of the possible impact in Maricopa County is 3 percentage points, causing the results of Arizona's vote tallies to be inflated accordingly.
14. This is based on the residual between Biden's actual vote percentage in Maricopa County and the predicted vote percentage,

which is obtained from a national model using county level data on demographic Census characteristics (e.g., percent white, black, asian, etc, percent self employed, and the industrial composition).

15. The best estimate of impact in Maricopa (only county with Dominion in AZ) is 3%. The national analysis yielded 5.6% as the estimate of impacted votes, which would imply a larger number of votes impacted in AZ. To be more conservative, I defer to 3%.
16. Statistical estimating yields that in Arizona, the best estimate of the number of impacted votes is 62,282. However, calculating a 95% confidence interval from national data yields that as many as 97,576 votes may have been impacted in Arizona.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the forgoing is true and correct.
Executed this November 28th, 2020.

,



11/28/20