

1 Sarah R. Gonski (Bar No. 032567)  
2 **PERKINS COIE LLP**  
3 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000  
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788  
5 Telephone: 602.351.8000  
6 Facsimile: 602.648.7000  
7 SGonski@perkinscoie.com

8 Roy Herrera (Bar No. 032901)  
9 Daniel A. Arellano (Bar No. 032304)  
10 **BALLARD SPAHR LLP**  
11 1 East Washington Street, Suite 2300  
12 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2555  
13 Telephone: 602.798.5400  
14 Facsimile: 602.798.5595  
15 HerreraR@ballardspahr.com  
16 ArellanoD@ballardspahr.com

17 *Attorneys for the Arizona Democratic Party*  
18 [additional counsel listed on signature page]

19 **ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT**  
20 **COUNTY OF MARICOPA**

21 ARIZONA REPUBLICAN PARTY,  
22  
23 Plaintiff,  
24  
25 vs.  
26  
27 ADRIAN FONTES, et al..  
28  
29 Defendants.

Case No. CV2020-014553

**ARIZONA DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S  
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

Expedited Election Matter

Hon. \_\_\_\_\_

Two days after Maricopa County (the “County”) completed its hand audit recount for the 2020 general election—finding *zero* discrepancies in the machine tabulated count—Plaintiff the Arizona Republican Party now wants the County to start the process over, this time auditing even more ballots. Their theory is that the Arizona Secretary of State, Attorney General, and Governor collectively misread Arizona election law when they promulgated the 2019 Election Procedures Manual, and confused the terms “precincts” and “polling places” when determining how many ballots are subject to a hand count audit.

1 Plaintiff's claims have no merit. And their requested remedy, if granted, would  
2 significantly and unnecessarily delay the processing of ballots well past the eleventh hour,  
3 when nearly all the ballots have been processed and counted. The Arizona Democratic  
4 Party ("ADP") seeks to intervene as a defendant in this matter so that it may prevent this  
5 intrusion on the vote tabulation process and protect the rights of its members and affiliated  
6 candidates in Maricopa County. Two judges from this Court granted ADP's request for  
7 intervention in Republican-sponsored lawsuits within the last week alone. The Honorable  
8 Margaret Mahoney granted the ADP's request for intervention in *Aguilera v. Fontes*, No.  
9 CV2020-014083 (Maricopa Cty. Super. Ct. Nov. 5, 2020), as did the Honorable Daniel  
10 Kiley in *Donald J. Trump for President, Inc. v. Hobbs*, No. CV2020-014248 (Maricopa  
11 Cty. Ct. Nov. 9, 2020). The same result should follow here.

12 ADP meets the applicable requirements for intervention under Rule 24 of the  
13 Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure. ADP is dedicated to supporting the election of  
14 Democratic candidates across Arizona and has a keen interest in the outcome of this  
15 litigation. Any delay in the processing and tabulation of ballots in the state's most  
16 populous county could result in missed deadlines that would impact races in which  
17 Democratic candidates have competed. Further, the current Defendants do not adequately  
18 represent ADP's interests in this litigation; ADP's interests may diverge from the interests  
19 of the government defendants who are representatives of the Counties' interests in election  
20 administration rather than active participants in the election contests on the ballot. ADP  
21 should be permitted to intervene as of right, or, in the alternative should be granted  
22 permissive intervention. As required by Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 24(c), this  
23 Motion is accompanied by a Proposed Answer, which is attached hereto as Exhibit 1, and a  
24 proposed form of order, filed concurrently with this motion.

25 Counsel for ADP contacted counsel regarding this motion and was advised that the  
26 Plaintiff does not object to ADP's intervention. Counsel for the County Defendants had not  
27 yet responded to ADP's messages by the time of filing.

28

## ARGUMENT

1 Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 24 allows for both intervention as of right and  
2 permissive intervention, and is a “remedial” rule that should be “liberally construed with  
3 the view of assisting parties in obtaining justice and protecting their rights.” *Bechtel v.*  
4 *Rose In & For Maricopa Cty.*, 722 P.2d 236, 240 (Ariz. 1986) (citation omitted).

5 **A. ADP is entitled to intervene as of right under Rule 24(a).**

6 ADP is entitled to intervene as of right in this case. The Court must allow  
7 intervention in any case where a party “claims an interest relating to the subject of the  
8 action” and “disposing of the action in the person’s absence may as a practical matter  
9 impair or impede the person’s ability to protect that interest, unless existing parties  
10 adequately represent that interest.” Ariz. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2). Rule 24 is a remedial rule  
11 that “should be construed liberally in order to assist parties seeking to obtain justice in  
12 protecting their rights.” *Dowling v. Stapley*, 221 Ariz. 251, 270 ¶58 (App. 2009). Four  
13 elements are necessary for a successful motion to intervene under Rule 24(a): “(1) the  
14 motion must be timely; (2) the applicant must assert an interest relating to the property or  
15 transaction which is the subject of the action; (3) the applicant must show that disposition  
16 of the action may impair or impede its ability to protect its interest; and (4) the applicant  
17 must show that the other parties would not adequately represent its interests.” *Woodbridge*  
18 *Structured Funding, LLC v. Ariz. Lottery*, 235 Ariz. 25, 28 ¶13 (App. 2014).

19 Here, all four requirements demonstrate the need for intervention. *First*, the motion  
20 is timely. Plaintiff filed their Complaint just yesterday, and ADP files this motion before  
21 the Court has heard argument or made any substantive rulings. Timeliness under Rule 24 is  
22 “flexible” and the most important consideration “is whether the delay in moving for  
23 intervention will prejudice the existing parties to the case.” *Weaver v. Synthes, Ltd.*  
24 *(U.S.A.)*, 162 Ariz. 442, 446 (App. 1989). Given that all issues remain live before the  
25 Court, no party will be prejudiced by ADP’s intervention, and the Court should therefore  
26 consider the motion timely.

27 *Second* and *third*, ADP clearly has important rights at stake that would be impaired  
28 if the Court were to grant Plaintiff’s requested relief. Given that this matter could

1 potentially impact whether the County will be able to canvass its results on time, it plainly  
2 affects the proper counting of votes of ADP’s members and constituents. *See State v. Key*,  
3 128 Ariz. 419, 421 (App. 1981) (noting the right to have one’s vote counted as  
4 “fundamental”). Additionally, ADP is a critical participant in the electoral process and has  
5 a statutory right and responsibility to send observers to the hand count audit. A.R.S. § 16-  
6 602(B)(7). To ensure a predictable, fair and equitable electoral environment, ADP will  
7 have to divert scarce resources and allocate unexpected volunteer hours to observe any  
8 additional hand count audit that would be ordered. These interests are readily sufficient to  
9 merit intervention.

10 *Fourth*, ADP’s interests would not be adequately represented by the Defendants  
11 named in this lawsuit. ADP’s particular interest in this case is not shared by the County  
12 Defendants, whose stake in this lawsuit is defined solely by their statutory duties to  
13 conduct elections. ADP’s interest is in ensuring that their affiliated voters have their votes  
14 counted in a timely, orderly manner in accordance with state and federal law, and that it  
15 does not have to disrupt organizational plans to accommodate unexpected and extra-  
16 statutory counting procedures. Because these interests are meaningfully different than  
17 those of election administrators, political actors are routinely granted intervention in  
18 actions where election officials are named as defendants. *See, e.g., Donald J. Trump for*  
19 *President, Inc. v. Hobbs*, No. CV2020-014248 (Maricopa Cty. Ct. Nov. 9, 2020) (ADP  
20 granted intervention in election dispute); *Aguilera v. Fontes*, No. CV2020-014083  
21 (Maricopa Cty. Super. Ct. Nov. 5, 2020) (same); *Maricopa County Republican Party et al.*  
22 *v. Reagan et al.*, No. CV2018-013963 (Maricopa Cty. Super. Ct. Nov. 9, 2018) (granting  
23 intervention to political parties and other interested political actors in election dispute); *Mi*  
24 *Familia Vota v. Hobbs*, No. 20-cv-01093 (D. Ariz. Oct. 2, 2020) (granting intervention to  
25 political party in election dispute); *see also Issa v. Newsom*, No. 2:20-cv-01044-MCE-  
26 CKD, 2020 WL 3074351, at \*4 (E.D. Cal. June 10, 2020) (“While [government]  
27 Defendants’ arguments turn on their inherent authority as state executives and their  
28 responsibility to properly administer election laws, Proposed [political party] Intervenors

1 are concerned with ensuring their party members and the voters they represent have the  
2 opportunity to vote in the upcoming federal election, advancing their overall electoral  
3 prospects, and allocating their limited resources to inform voters about the election  
4 procedures.”).

5 **B. In the alternative, ADP should be granted permissive intervention.**

6 In the alternative, ADP should be permitted to intervene as a party who “has a claim  
7 or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law and fact.” Ariz. R.  
8 Civ. P. 24(b)(1). When this standard is met, Arizona courts may consider other factors to  
9 guide its decision as to whether to grant permissive intervention, including: (1) “the nature  
10 and extent of the intervenors’ interest,” (2) “their standing to raise relevant legal issues,”  
11 (3) “the legal position they seek to advance, and its probable relation to the merits of the  
12 case,” (4) “whether the intervenors’ interests are adequately represented by other parties,”  
13 (5) “whether intervention will prolong or unduly delay the litigation,” and (6) “whether  
14 parties seeking intervention will significantly contribute to full development of the  
15 underlying factual issues in the suit and to the just and equitable adjudication of the legal  
16 questions presented.” *Bechtel*, 722 P.2d at 240. As with Rule 24(a), Rule 24(b) should  
17 similarly be liberally construed. *Dowling*, 221 Ariz. at 272 ¶ 67 (citing *Bechtel v. Rose*,  
18 150 Ariz. 68, 72 (1986)). Ultimately, whether a party may intervene under Rule 24(b) is  
19 left to the adjudicating court’s decision. *See id.* at ¶ 16 (concluding trial court did not abuse  
20 its discretion in performing Rule 24(b) analysis).

21 Here, each factor weighs in favor of permitting ADP’s permissive intervention. *Cf.*  
22 *Ariz. Democratic Party v. Hobbs*, No. 2:20-cv-01143-DLR, ECF No. 60 (D. Ariz. June 26,  
23 2020) (granting permissive intervention to political party entities). First, ADP has a distinct  
24 interest in the lawful administration of this election without interference from Plaintiff  
25 during the processing of ballots. Second, as a participant in the hand count audit process  
26 itself, ADP opposes any eleventh-hour expansion of that process, particularly where the  
27 sought expansion is not contemplated by state law and will have no bearing on the ultimate  
28 results of this election. Third, ADP’s interest is distinct from other parties, as only ADP

1 can represent both its organizational interests and the interests of individual voters—  
2 including ADP’s affiliated candidates, members, and constituents—who have an interest in  
3 the orderly administration of the tabulation process and in the finality of election results.  
4 Fourth, ADP seeks intervention promptly, on the day after the Complaint was filed, and  
5 thus its intervention will not delay the proceedings. Lastly, ADP will contribute to full  
6 factual development of this case, because it can present evidence regarding the impact of  
7 delaying the counting of ballots after the County complied with the letter of the  
8 law. Because Rule 24 should be “liberally construed” to protect the rights of all parties,  
9 *Dowling*, 221 Ariz. at 272 ¶ 67, the Court should permit intervention in this case.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 For these reasons, ADP requests that the Court grant its Motion to Intervene.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

1 DATED: November 13, 2020

2

3

4

By: */s Sarah R. Gonski*

Sarah R. Gonski (Bar No. 032567)

**PERKINS COIE LLP**

2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000

Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788

Telephone: 602.351.8000

Facsimile: 602.648.7000

SGonski@perkinscoie.com

8

9

Marc E. Elias\*

**PERKINS COIE LLP**

700 Thirteenth Street NW, Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20005-3960

Telephone: (202) 654-6200

Facsimile: (202) 654-6211

MElias@perkinscoie.com

10

11

12

13

14

Roy Herrera (Bar No. 032901)

Daniel A. Arellano (Bar No. 032304)

**BALLARD SPAHR LLP**

1 East Washington Street, Suite 2300

Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2555

Telephone: 602.798.5400

Facsimile: 602.798.5595

HerreraR@ballardspahr.com

ArellanoD@ballardspahr.com

15

16

17

18

19

*\*Pro hac vice application to be filed*

20

*Attorneys for the Arizona Democratic Party*

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28