

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF HAWAI‘I

Bales v. Green

Bales v. Green · No. SCPW-25-0000384 · Decided December 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The Supreme Court of Hawai‘i denied without prejudice a petition for a writ of mandamus or extraordinary writ concerning appointments to the Board of Registration for the island of Hawai‘i. The court held that petitioners had not shown that qualified candidates were willing to serve, that the Governor knew of those candidates, or that the Governor unreasonably refused to appoint a qualified candidate.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Supreme Court of the State of Hawai‘i
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Sabrina S. McKenna, Acting Chief Justice; Todd W. Eddins, Justice; Lisa M. Ginoza, Justice; Vladimir P. Devens, Justice; Kirstin M. Hamman, Circuit Judge assigned by reason of vacancy
JURISDICTION	Supreme Court of the State of Hawai‘i
DECIDED	December 10, 2025
DOCKET	SCPW-25-0000384
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Original proceeding on a petition for writ of mandamus or extraordinary writ.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Extraordinary-writ relief requires a showing that qualified candidates are willing to serve, that the Governor is aware of those candidates, and that the Governor unreasonably refused to appoint a qualified candidate.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published order; precedential status identified as published.
PARTIES	Bridgit M.L. Bales, Maureen N. Rawlins, Eva E. Nani‘ole, Janice P.K. Kaho‘ohano‘hano, Caroline R.P. Montague-Mullins v. Josh Green, Governor of the State of Hawai‘i, Office of Elections, State of Hawai‘i, Board of Registration, Island of Hawai‘i, Susan L.K. Lee Loy, Jon Henricks, in official capacity as County Clerk, County of Hawai‘i

TOPICS

writ of certiorari

appellate procedure

election administration

election law

remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

election law

appellate procedure

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether petitioners established the prerequisites for a writ of mandamus or other extraordinary writ concerning appointments to the Board of Registration for the island of Hawai‘i.
2. Whether extraordinary writ relief was warranted on the record before the court.

HOLDINGS

1. Petitioners did not establish that qualified candidates were willing to serve, that the Governor was aware of those candidates, and that the Governor unreasonably refused to appoint a qualified candidate; therefore, extraordinary-writ relief was unwarranted at that time.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“An extraordinary writ is unwarranted at this time.” (at 2)

“It is ordered that the petition is denied without prejudice.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Petitioners sought extraordinary relief concerning appointments to the Board of Registration for the island of Hawai‘i. The court concluded that petitioners had not shown that qualified candidates were willing to serve, that the Governor knew of those candidates, or that the Governor had unreasonably refused to appoint a qualified candidate.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioners filed a petition for writ of mandamus or extraordinary writ on April 29, 2025, seeking relief concerning appointments to the Board of Registration for the island of Hawai‘i. The Supreme Court denied the petition without prejudice because petitioners had not shown the factual prerequisites for extraordinary relief.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- Hanabusa v. Lingle, 119 Hawai‘i 341, 350-52, 198 P.3d 604, 613-15 (2008)
- Womble Bond Dickinson (US) LLP v. Kim, 153 Hawai‘i 307, 319, 537 P.3d 1154, 1166 (2023)

