



ATTORNEYS AT LAW
The Wilenichik & Bartness Building
2810 North Third Street Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Telephone: 602-606-2810 Facsimile: 602-606-2811

Dennis I. Wilenichik, #005350
Lee Miller, #012530
John "Jack" D. Wilenichik, #029353 (lead attorney)
jackw@wb-law.com
admin@wb-law.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

ARIZONA REPUBLICAN PARTY,

Plaintiff;

vs.

**MARICOPA COUNTY BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS, et al.**

Defendants.

Case No. CV2020-014553

**PLAINTIFF'S REPLY
RE: INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

(Oral Argument Requested)

**(Assigned to the Honorable
John R. Hannah, Jr.)**

Plaintiff Arizona Republican Party ("Plaintiff") hereby files this Reply in advance of the 3:15 hearing today.

Plaintiff just contacted the Defendants regarding their latest filing and the Declaration from Mr. Jarrett that was attached to it. Defendants admit that the Declaration contains a (material) error at paragraph 12, which is that the vote-tabulation machines *do* in fact read the precinct on each ballot, and they record that data (which Defendants have in their possession). Further, the County has an electronic "poll list" which is sortable by precinct, as mentioned in the Complaint.

To back up for a moment: what the statute at issue (16-602) contemplates is a comparison between "the number of votes cast as indicated on the machine or tabulator with the number of

1 votes cast as indicated on the poll list,” by precinct as opposed to polling place. The problem that
2 has been raised by the County is that doing a “hand” comparison of ballots to poll lists by precinct
3 cannot be done in fewer than fourteen days, which Mr. Jarrett’s Declaration was submitted to
4 support.

5 However, the “error” in Mr. Jarrett’s Declaration mentioned above means one very
6 important thing: that the County can do an *electronic* comparison, which Plaintiff believes is
7 *extremely easy to do*. It should be as easy as comparing two sets of data in an Excel spreadsheet:
8 (1) the number of votes reported by machines for each precinct (which Jarrett now admits *is* read
9 and recorded electronically), and (2) the number of votes recorded by the poll list for each precinct
10 (which is also electronic). This comparison would be an “electronic” (instead of hand-count)
11 comparison that otherwise satisfies the statute fully, i.e. a comparison of poll lists to tabulation
12 machines by precinct.

13 When, in a mandamus action, the government claims that relief is impossible to award, the
14 Court still retains an equitable discretion to create an equitable remedy. *Garcia v. City of S.*
15 *Tucson*, 135 Ariz. 604, 606, 663 P.2d 596, 598 (Ct. App. 1983). In the *Garcia* case, the plaintiff
16 sought mandamus to have the court order the City of South Tucson to pay on a large judgment
17 that the plaintiff held against it; and the City claimed that it simply did not have the money to pay.
18 So the Court balanced the equities and ordered that City follow a payment plan over a number of
19 months (and to levy taxes if necessary). The Court of Appeals upheld this decision, noting that
20 while “[i]mpossibility of performance is a recognized defense to mandamus,” courts “have
21 balanced the equities and exercised discretion as to the manner” of performance, and such
22 discretion “will be sustained on appeal absent a showing of an abuse of that discretion.” *Id.*, 135
23 Ariz. at 606, 663 P.2d at 598.

24 Here, at the minimum, Plaintiff asks the Court to order that the County quickly crunch the
25 numbers and provide the result before certifying the canvas (which by all accounts is not due until
26

1 next Monday). To put this request for relief in even more certain terms: Plaintiff asks the Court to
2 order that the County “compare the number of votes cast as indicated on the machine or tabulator
3 with the number of votes cast as indicated on the poll list,” by comparing the electronic poll list
4 to the machines’ electronic tabulation of votes. While Plaintiff expects that this can be done very,
5 very quickly -- Plaintiff also asks the Court to enjoin the canvass/certification at least until
6 Defendants can respond to the question of whether this can be done as easily as Plaintiff believes
7 (which Plaintiff’s counsel just called Defendants’ counsel to ask – apparently Mr. Jarrett is busy
8 right now and has not gotten back with an Answer). Assuming that the electronic comparison can
9 be done before Monday, then the Court can decide whether Plaintiff’s request to enjoin the
10 canvass beyond that date is moot.

11 Plaintiff will of course be available to discuss at the 3:15 hearing but wanted to submit this
12 brief in advance.

13 **RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED** on November 18, 2020.

14 **WILENCHIK & BARTNESS, P.C.**

15 */s/ John “Jack” D. Wilenichik*

16 Dennis I. Wilenichik, Esq.

17 Lee Miller, Esq.

18 John “Jack” D. Wilenichik, Esq.

19 The Wilenichik & Bartness Building

20 2810 North Third Street

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

jackw@wb-law.com

admin@wb-law.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

21 **ELECTRONICALLY** filed via
22 AZTurboCourt.com this 17th day
of November, 2020.

23 **ELECTRONICALLY** transmitted via
24 AZTurboCourt.com and emailed this 17th
25 day of November, 2020 to the Honorable
John R. Hannah, Jr.

1 **COPIES** electronically transmitted via
2 AZTurboCourt.com and emailed this 17th
3 day of November, 2020 upon:

4 Tom Liddy, liddyt@mcao.maricopa.gov
5 Emily Craiger, craigere@mcao.maricopa.gov
6 Joseph Vigil, vigilj@mcao.maricopa.gov
7 Joseph Branco, brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov
8 Joseph LaRue, laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov
9 *Attorneys for Defendants*

10 *Attorneys for Intervenors:*

11
12 Roopali H. Desai, Esq.
13 rdesai@cblawyers.com

14 Sarah R. Gonski, Esq.
15 SGonski@perkinscoie.com

16 Roy Herrera. Esq.
17 HerreraR@ballardspahr.com

18 Daniel A. Arellano, Esq.
19 ArellanoD@ballardspahr.com

20 By: /s/Christine M. Ferreira