

## Georgia on Offense

### The Path Forward to Strengthen Our Elections

Georgia’s elections follow a rigorous system of checks and balances that ensures every election is free, fair, and secure. In recent years, however, we’ve seen bad actors exploit weaknesses in state law — fueling misinformation, legal battles, and spurious attempts to overturn the will of the voters.

This factsheet outlines three commonsense policy solutions that Georgia lawmakers and election administrators can consider to close those gaps — before and after Election Day. For a deeper dive into the national context and proven solutions, see our full report, “[States on Offense: The Path Forward to Strengthen Our Elections](#).” For more information, please [contact us](#).

*This resource is strictly nonpartisan and for educational use only. It is 501(c)(3) compliant and not intended for any partisan, political, or electioneering activities.*

### Georgia Elections By the Numbers

**Registered Voters:** 7,288,915<sup>1</sup>

**Voter Turnout (Registered Voters %):** 2022 [57 %] 2024 [74 %]<sup>2</sup>

**Voting Methods (Election Day/Early In-Person/Mail %):** 2022: 38%/58%/6%; 2024: 23%/71%/5%<sup>3</sup>

**Recent Attempts to Exploit Election Vulnerabilities:**

- [Judge Says Activist Group’s List of Challenged Voters “Lacks Reliability; Verges on Recklessness”](#)
- [Court Rebuffs State Board Attempts to Give Counties Certification Discretion](#)

<sup>1</sup> “Data Hub - Voter Registration”, Ga. Secy’ of State website (data reflects active registered voters as of Sept. 2, 2025). Accessed at <https://sos.ga.gov/election-data-hub> on Sept. 3, 2025.

<sup>2</sup> 2022 EAVS Report, p. 6, Appendix A: Descriptive Tables, Overview Table 1: 2022 EAVS at a Glance; 2024 EAVS Report, p. 6, Appendix A: Descriptive Tables, Executive Summary Table 1: 2024 EAVS at a Glance.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

## Three Fixes for Stronger Georgia Elections

<b>1</b>	<b>Limit frivolous and time-consuming pre-election mass challenges</b> by raising the standards for mass challenges.
<b>2</b>	<b>Protect the will of the voters</b> by requiring certification and faithful performance by presidential electors after canvassing.
<b>3</b>	<b>Reduce frivolous post-election challenges</b> by clarifying processes and deadlines for post-election challenges.

### Fix #1: Limit Frivolous Pre-Election Mass Challenges

***Lawmakers can raise standards for mass challenges so that election officials do not waste scarce time and resources on frivolous challenges.***

Georgia recently enacted legislation that allows self-appointed activists to challenge thousands of voter registrations at a time. Before the 2022 election, [six individuals challenged nearly 90,000 voter registrations](#). While election officials sustained fewer than 2,500 of these challenges, they nonetheless had to devote significant time and resources to investigate and resolve these largely frivolous challenges. Georgia's systematic voter list maintenance system already keeps the state's voter rolls accurate and up-to-date.

### Fix #2: Ensure Voters' Preferences Are Upheld

***Lawmakers can establish the board's non-discretionary duties to certify county elections and transmit final returns to the Secretary of State once canvassing is complete. They can also require the replacement of any faithless electors, ensuring that voters' choices are accurately reflected.***

County election boards and election superintendents are responsible for canvassing and certifying elections. While the exact composition and authority of county boards have been a subject of recent legislative and administrative controversy, they have always been bipartisan by design. County boards have some authority to investigate discrepancies in precinct returns, but are not allowed to engage in unfounded queries that may delay certification. Additionally, Georgia statutes currently lack protections against "faithless" presidential electors who ignore their oaths.

## **Fix #3: Limit Post-Election Challenges**

***Lawmakers can implement explicit procedures, minimum evidentiary standards, and clear deadlines for post-election challenges and resolution.***

While Georgia statutes clearly define the limited grounds for post-election judicial challenges, the process and deadlines for resolution are less clear. Challenges often proceed slowly through the state's trial and appellate courts, delaying certification, even though nearly all of them are ultimately dismissed. These delays could impede Georgia's ability to meet federal deadlines for naming its presidential electors or certify new officeholders in time to take their seats.

**Secure Democracy Foundation** is a nonpartisan, 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization building stronger elections, state by state. Our work is state-focused, informed by election policy insights from a national perspective, and realized by seizing common ground.