

In recent political debates and online discussions, a common claim has emerged: that former President Donald Trump lost all 60 of his court cases challenging the 2020 election results. This assertion is often used to discredit arguments questioning the election's integrity. However, a closer examination of the available data reveals that this claim is misleading and oversimplifies a complex legal landscape.

Let's break down the facts:

1. Total Number of Cases:

According to a comprehensive analysis by the [Brookings Institution](#), there were **194 court cases related to the 2020 election**, not 60 or 62 as often claimed.

2. Cases Dismissed for Lack of Evidence:

A [Reuters fact-check article](#) states that 50 cases were dismissed due to lack of evidence. **This number includes both state and federal cases**, not just federal cases as some commentators imply.

3. Other Dismissals:

Out of the 166 total dismissals reported by Reuters, **116 cases were dismissed for reasons other than lack of evidence**. These reasons primarily included lack of standing or mootness - procedural grounds rather than merit-based decisions.

4. Percentage Breakdown:

Approximately **70% of the dismissed cases (116 out of 166) were thrown out for procedural reasons**, not due to lack of evidence.

5. Trump's Victories:

Contrary to the claim that Trump lost all cases, the Brookings analysis indicates that **Trump's team won 28 out of the 194 cases**.

6. Federal vs. State Cases:

The often-cited "60 cases" figure likely conflates federal and state cases, leading to a misrepresentation of the actual legal outcomes.

This fact-check reveals several important points:

1. The claim of "60 lost cases" is numerically inaccurate and misleading.
2. A significant majority of case dismissals were due to procedural issues, not evidentiary failures.
3. Trump's legal team did achieve some victories, albeit in a minority of cases.
4. The legal challenges to the 2020 election were far more numerous and complex than often portrayed in popular discourse.
5. It's crucial to note that while this fact-check corrects misconceptions about the number and nature of the election-related lawsuits, it does not validate claims of widespread election fraud. The fact remains that no court found evidence of fraud on a scale that could have altered the election outcome.

**Mark Elias**, a prominent Democratic election lawyer, has been a controversial figure in the realm of election litigation. As the former general counsel for Hillary Clinton's 2016 campaign and a **key strategist for the Democratic National Committee**, Elias has been at the forefront of numerous legal battles surrounding elections. Elias has been instrumental in promoting a simplified narrative about Trump's legal challenges, often citing the "60 lost cases" claim that this fact-check has shown to be misleading. **Elias deliberately obfuscated the nuances of the legal proceedings to undermine Trump's election challenges** and to paint a more favorable picture of the Democratic party. Elias's firm, Perkins Coie, was also involved in funding the Steele dossier, which fueled unsubstantiated, malinformative claims about Trump's connections to Russia. While his supporters praise his legal acumen, detractors argue that his tactics often blur the line between "legal advocacy" and political propaganda, undermining public trust in the electoral process.

In conclusion, the oft-repeated claim that "Trump lost all 60 of his election cases" is a significant oversimplification that misrepresents the complex legal aftermath of the 2020 election. While Trump's legal efforts were largely unsuccessful in changing the election results, the reasons for these failures were varied and more nuanced than commonly portrayed.