

BALLOT ACCESS MUST BE GENUINELY OPEN TO ALL!!

[Lubin v. Panish](#), [415 U.S. 709, 719 \(1974\)](#) ([B]allot access must be genuinely open to all, subject to reasonable requirements.). See also [McCarthy v. Briscoe](#), 429 U.S. 1317 (1976); [Bullock v. Carter](#), [405 U.S. 134, 145 \(1972\)](#) (holding that in the absence of reasonable alternative means of ballot access, a state may not disqualify an indigent candidate unable to pay filing fees); [Moore v. Ogilvie](#), [394 U.S. 814, 818–19 \(1969\)](#) (overruling [MacDougall v. Green](#), [335 U.S. 281 \(1948\)](#) and holding that a requirement that independent candidates obtain 25,000 signatures, including 200 signatures from each of at least 50 of the state's 102 counties, violated the Equal Protection Clause); [Williams v. Rhodes](#), [393 U.S. 23, 24 \(1968\)](#) (invalidating a ballot access law that rendered it virtually impossible for new political party candidates or candidates from an old party, which has a very small number of members to appear on a ballot). [T]he totality of the Ohio restrictive laws taken as a whole imposes a burden on voting and associational rights which we hold is an invidious discrimination, in violation of the Equal Protection Clause. *Id.* at 34.