

July 30th, 2026

Bureau of Elections
Richard H. Austin
430 W. Allegan St, 1st floor
Lansing, MI 48933

Dear Bureau of Elections Board of Canvassers,

The following is my response to Mark Brewer, attorney for Bobby Antilla (herein referred to as “Challenger”) of my qualifying petitions for Michigan Senate District 38:

I maintain that the petition signature requirements provided in the Michigan Board of Canvassers Petition Manual Without Party Affiliation Manual (herein referred to as the “Manual”) dated February 26th have been met and therefore my candidacy for the November 3rd, 2026, election as an Independent for the Michigan Senate District 38 should be granted. After meeting these requirements, not granting me ballot access would be a blatant disregard of the will and voices of the people. Further supporting evidence and dispute of the Challenger’s accusations are as follows:

Challenge Submittal and Request for Additional Time

The Challenger submitted their request to the Board of Canvassers at 3:56 pm on Thursday, July 23rd. The Challenger then requests that they be given more time to comb through signatures to find additional discrepancies in which they want to try and drive my petition signature numbers below the 1,500 required minimum. Having 849 signatures over the required minimum, there is no way that granting the Challenger additional days to review my signatures will drive my qualifying number below that minimum amount. Furthermore, I submitted my signatures to the Bureau of Elections on time and in accordance with the Manual.

Signature Submission and Invalid Signatures

My campaign counted 2,349 signatures, exceeding the 1,500 minimum by 848, and submitted those on time to the Board of Canvassers in Lansing at 9:30 am on July 16, 2026. The challenger claims that they found 268 invalid signatures. However, we counted and found the total number of invalid signatures the challenger reported to add up to 264- not 268. After reviewing each of those signature challenges, we maintain that 83 of those invalid signature claims should be considered valid. Please see the attached document for more detailed notes on how we arrived at our numbers.

Challenge of 3 Signatures Through Affidavits

My campaign refutes two (2) of the three (3) signed affidavits the challenger presented on July 23rd, 2026. Both Robert Buchkoe and John Braamse were in my presence when signing my petition while I was meeting a friend at the Third Base Bar. After I obtained a signature from another person and was finishing up a conversation with them, my friend asked if they would be interested in signing. I estimate my distance from them to be about 12 feet away. I could see both Mr. Buchkoe and Mr. Braamse signing my petition from where I was standing. When I finished my conversation with the previous signer, I went over to thank Mr. Buchkoe and Mr. Braamse for signing it. We believe that this is a desperate and pitiful attempt of the Challenger to try and validate their claim that the rest of my 837 signatures I collected should be thrown out.

Request to Invalidate Cambensy Signed Petitions

On page 9 of the Manual, under Challenge Procedure, it states in part that the challenge must specify each signature in question and why it is being challenged. It further specifies that the signature page number of the sheet, and line number, and reason be stated. By extrapolating that the three (3) signatures with affidavits, two (2) of which we refute, makes the 837 signatures null and void that I collected violates the Manual challenge process.

Forged Signature Accusation

Please see the attached affidavit from Jason Chapman attesting that his signatures are not forged. It should be noted that Jason Chapman supplied 19 pages of signatures, signing his name 19 times in the petition circulator block. The Challenger states that 15 petition pages have invalid signature blocks from Jason Chapman. However, in the supplied material from the Challenger, only 15 signature blocks appear. Given the late submittal time, we are unsure if this is yet another error on the Challengers' part to accurately include the number they are disputing, or, if they are only disputing 15 of the 19 pages.

Further, on page 16 of the Manual under Acceptable Sheet Variations: The circulator's signature is illegible, the Board of Canvassers recognizes that signatures from voters and circulators will have some variance. The request by the Challenger is in direct conflict with the Manual under this section.

Party Affiliation

The Challenger is stating that because of Chapman's connection to the Democratic Party that he is disqualified from circulating petitions for a non-partisan candidate. The Challenger does not provide any evidence from the Manual to support this claim that members of a political party may not circulate petitions. The signatures were turned in by myself, the candidate- not Mr. Chapman, as stated on my affidavit with the Board of Canvassers on July 16th as the person submitting signatures for ballot access.

Denial of FOIA Request for Other Challenges

With 8 other Independent candidates in Michigan requesting ballot access, a FOIA request was made by Jason Chapman to determine if other candidates without party affiliation were receiving challenges, especially from Mr. Brewer who is the attorney on retainer for the Michigan Democratic Party. The FOIA request came back as a denial, which we believe means there are no other challenges received. Thus, given the far-reaching allegations in the Challengers submittal against me, we believe their reason for submittal is a very targeted and personal case by a few individuals within the Marquette County Democratic Party. Though not relevant to the Manual for meeting petition signature thresholds, we look forward to presenting the history with these individuals leading up to the challenge in which we feel gives a much better picture of what is going on here should we be presented the opportunity.

Challenge as a Whole in Summary

My petitions meet the standard of requirement under Michigan election law and were accepted as such within the defined time requirement, and in number. Accordingly, granting the Challenger request to invalidate my signatures will:

1. Lend validity to the unfair petition signature requirement that candidates without party affiliation face in Michigan vs. partisan candidates who can obtain ballot access by paying a \$100 fee.
2. Disparage my name and candidacy. The Challenger seeks, even with a lost challenge, to cast dispersions on the legitimacy of my campaign.
3. Have the lines of election integrity redrawn to favor the two-party system without regard to the Bureau of Elections Manual and standards.
4. Disenfranchise 2,349 petition signers.
5. Adversely affect my ability to campaign at a crucial juncture in the campaign cycle while other candidates, bearing no burden to qualify beyond party affiliation and a \$100 fee, are aggressively advertising, campaigning and coalescing support.
6. Subvert and influence the people of Michigan's ability to seek public office independent of party affiliation.

I ask, in fairness and good order, that this challenge be immediately dismissed so that I may pursue my candidacy as an Independent who has clearly met the affirmation standard to appear on the general election ballot at your next Board of Canvassers meeting in August.

Thank you for your time and all you do in your official roll for the state of Michigan.

With deep and abiding respect,



Sara Cambensy
Prospective Candidate, Michigan 38th District Senate