

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA  
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF  
FLORIDA, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LAUREL M. LEE, in her official  
capacity as Florida Secretary of State,  
et al.,

Defendants,

and

REPUBLICAN NATIONAL  
COMMITTEE, and NATIONAL  
REPUBLICAN SENATORIAL  
COMMITTEE,

Intervenor-  
Defendants.

Cases Consolidated for Trial:

Nos.: 4:21-cv-186-MW/MAF  
4:21-cv-187-MW/MAF  
4:21-cv-201-MW/MAF  
4:21-cv-242-MW/MAF

**PLAINTIFFS' JOINT BRIEF IN RESPONSE TO COURT'S**  
**ORDER REQUESTING BRIEFING ON SPECIFIC**  
**QUESTIONS RELATED TO STANDING**

Pursuant to the Court’s Order for Briefing on Standing (ECF No. 543), Plaintiffs in the above-captioned consolidated cases respond to the Court’s specific questions as follows<sup>1</sup>:

**FIRST QUESTION (ECF No. 543 at 1-2): What is the best controlling authority from the U.S. Supreme Court or the Eleventh Circuit addressing whether this Court’s analysis of associational standing differs, if at all, when an organization has only “constituents” rather than traditional, individual members?**

Organizations without formal “members” may have associational standing on behalf of their constituents if their constituents possess relevant indicia of membership in the organization. The analysis is the same, regardless of the terminology used.

- ***Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advertising Commission*, 432 U.S. 333 (1977):** An organization need not have individual “members” for associational standing if it represents a constituency and provides means by which constituents express “their collective views and protect their collective interests.” *Id.* at 345.
- ***Doe v. Stincer*, 175 F.3d 879 (11th Cir. 1999):** A “protection and advocacy” organization authorized by Congress to serve as a representative body for individuals with mental illness had standing to sue on behalf of its constituents. The Eleventh Circuit concluded that the composition of the organization’s Board and Advisory Council meant that constituents of the organization “possess the means to influence the priorities and activities” of the organization, and that the organization could therefore sue on its constituents’ behalf. *Id.* at 886

In addition, an organization whose members are themselves organizations has standing to sue on behalf of its member organizations’ members:

- ***New York State Club Association, Inc. v. City of New York*, 487 U.S. 1 (1988):** A consortium organization made up of member organizations has

---

<sup>1</sup> In this joint filing, Plaintiffs address only the specific questions asked by the Court, with the brevity requested by the Court. Plaintiffs do not address other authority for standing (including, e.g., direct organizational standing, injury to an organization’s First Amendment speech rights, or reputational harm).

standing to sue on behalf of its member organizations' members, as long as those member organizations would have standing to bring the same challenge. *Id.* at 9-10.

**What are the best non-controlling persuasive cases on the same question?**

- ***America Unites for Kids v. Rousseau*, 985 F.3d 1075 (9th Cir. 2021):** Organization without members that advocated on behalf of public employees concerned about exposure to environmental risk had standing to sue on behalf of a “supporter,” because organization served a “specialized segment” of the community that was the “primary beneficiary” of its activities, even in the absence of direct evidence that the organization was subject to the influence of its constituents. *Id.* at 1096-97.
- ***Flyers Rights Education Fund, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Transportation*, 957 F.3d 1359 (D.C. Cir. 2020):** Organization without formal members that advocated for airline passengers could sue on behalf of those who signed up to receive information from it, where the organization operated a hotline for such individuals, frequently polled them to determine what issues to pursue on their behalf, and considered their views in decision-making, because that member input guided the organization’s activities. *Id.* at 1361-62.
- ***Oregon Advocacy Center v. Mink*, 322 F.3d 1101 (9th Cir. 2003):** Rejected an “overly formalistic” argument to conclude that organization representing persons with mental illness could sue on that constituency’s behalf, even though they were not its members and could not actually control organization’s finances and activities: its constituents were functionally equivalent to members for standing purposes, because they were a “specialized segment of Oregon’s community” and the primary beneficiary of the organization’s activities. *Id.* at 1110-11.

**Other Persuasive Authority [applicable to Plaintiff Disability Rights Florida]:**

- **42 U.S.C. § 15043(a)(2)(A)(i):** Each state’s Protection and Advocacy system “shall have the authority to pursue legal, administrative, and other appropriate remedies or approaches to ensure the protection of, and advocacy for, the rights of” disabled individuals, “with particular attention to members of ethnic and racial minority groups.”

**SECOND QUESTION (ECF No. 543 at 2): What is the best controlling authority from either the U.S. Supreme Court or the Eleventh Circuit addressing what an organization must demonstrate for associational standing if the organization does not have individual members and/or constituents testify about any injury to those individual members and/or constituents?**

There is no requirement that an organization must have individual members or constituents testify about injury to them, so long as the organization offers evidence that one or more of its members or constituents has been or will be injured.

- ***Hunt v. Washington State Apple Advertising Commission*, 432 U.S. 333 (1977):** The Court emphasized that “neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires the participation of individual members in the lawsuit.” *Id.* The association’s claims did not “require[] individualized proof” from specific members. *Id.* at 344. Indeed, the fact that proof from individual members was unnecessary is why the claims were “properly resolved in a group context.” *Id.*
- ***Florida State Conference of NAACP v. Browning*, 522 F.3d 1153 (11th Cir. 2008):** Organizations representing interests of racial and ethnic minority communities had standing to challenge voter registration statute even though it was impossible to know in advance which members would be left off the rolls, and no individual members testified to their injuries (which had not yet happened). *Id.* at 1160. “When the alleged harm is prospective, [the Eleventh Circuit has] not required that the organizational plaintiffs *name names* because *every member* faces a *probability* of harm in the near and definite future.” *Id.* (emphases added). All that an organization must demonstrate is “when and in what manner the alleged [members’] injuries are likely to occur.” *Id.* at 1161.
- ***Doe v. Stincer*, 175 F.3d 879 (11th Cir. 1999):** A “protection and advocacy” organization authorized by Congress to serve as a representative body for individuals with mental illness had standing to sue on behalf of that constituency, even though no constituents testified at trial. *Id.* at 882. To establish associational standing under *Hunt*, “an association may bring suit on behalf of its members or constituents despite the fact that individual members have not actually brought suit themselves. Nor must the association name the

members on whose behalf suit is brought.” *Id.*

Decisions rejecting “probabilistic standing” are not to the contrary, but merely require concrete evidence that particular members face injury, rather than just statistical probabilities:

- ***Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488 (2009)**: While the Court rejected organizational standing based on “a statistical probability that some . . . members are threatened with concrete injury” and required “specific allegations establishing that at least one identified member had suffered or would suffer harm,” it never required such evidence via the affected member’s own testimony, and it clarified that the organization need not name a specific member “where all the members of the organization are affected by the challenged activity.” *Id.* at 497-99.
- ***Georgia Republican Party v. Securities and Exchange Commission*, 888 F.3d 1198 (11th Cir. 2018)**. To establish associational standing, an organization must make specific allegations that at least one identified member has, or will, suffer harm, but the court did not require that the member’s own testimony be used to show such harm. Rather, the plaintiff had offered no evidence *of any kind* that “at least one of [its] members is certain to be injured” by the challenged conduct. *Id.* at 1203-04.

**What are the best non-controlling persuasive cases on the same question?**

- ***Sandusky County Democratic Party v. Blackwell*, 387 F.3d 565 (6th Cir. 2004)**: Political parties and labor unions had standing to challenge voting procedures involving provisional ballots, even though they “ha[d] not identified specific voters” who were members and would be allegedly injured by the challenged law. *Id.* at 574. The Sixth Circuit explained that “this is understandable” because “a voter cannot know in advance that his or her name will be dropped from the rolls, or listed in an incorrect precinct, or listed correctly but subject to a human error by an election worker who mistakenly believes the voter is at the wrong polling place.” *Id.*
- ***Hotel & Restaurant Employees Union, Local 25 v. Smith*, 846 F.2d 1499 (D.C. Cir. 1988)**: Union had standing to challenge immigration regulations on behalf of anonymous members, because union had shown that the injured members existed, and the identity of the members “adds no essential

information bearing on the injury component of standing.” *Id.* at 1506.

- ***Gwinnett County NAACP v. Gwinnett County Board of Registration & Elections*, 446 F. Supp. 3d 1111 (N.D. Ga. 2020):** Organization had associational standing based on testimony from its Executive Director that its 5,000 members included unnamed “registered Gwinnett County voters who intended to vote at one of the seven satellite locations” that would have fewer days of early voting under the challenged law. *Id.* at 1120. “While [the executive director] did not read off a list of names, she specifically articulated that some Gwinnett County voters, who are represented by GCPA, will be harmed by Defendants’ decision. This would be sufficient to allow the individual voters to sue in their own right. Accordingly, GCPA has associational standing.” *Id.*
- ***Fla. Democratic Party v. Scott*, 215 F. Supp. 3d 1250 (N.D. Fla. 2016):** “[P]olitical parties have standing to assert, at least, the rights of [their] members who will vote in an upcoming election.” *Id.* at 1254. “That was so even though the political party could not identify specific voters that would be affected; it is sufficient that some inevitably would.” *Id.*
- ***Fla. Democratic Party v. Hood*, 342 F. Supp. 2d 1073 (N.D. Fla. 2004):** A political party had “standing to assert, at least, the rights of its members who will vote in the November 2004 election,” even though it had not “identified specific voters who will seek to vote at a polling place that will be deemed wrong by election workers,” as “by their nature, mistakes cannot be specifically identified in advance.” *Id.* at 1078.

**THIRD QUESTION (ECF No. 543 at 2): What is the best controlling authority from either the U.S. Supreme Court or the Eleventh Circuit addressing whether a diversion-of-resources injury exists when the diversion involves an organization’s time, separate and apart from the organization’s funds?**

Organizations can establish standing based on diversion of any type of resources; it need not involve and is not limited to diversion of funds.

- ***Fort Lauderdale Food Not Bombs v. City of Fort Lauderdale*, 11 F.4th 1266 (11th Cir. 2021):** Plaintiff organization had standing based on diversion of resources where challenged ordinance caused the organization “to expend resources in the form of volunteer time, including efforts to collect bail money and organize legal representation for its members who were arrested under the Ordinance,” and where “volunteers who would have normally worked on

preparing for food-sharing demonstrations had to divert their energies to advocacy activities such as attending City meetings and organizing protests against the Ordinance.” *Id.* at 1287.

- ***Arcia v. Florida Secretary of State*, 772 F.3d 1335 (11th Cir. 2014):** “[O]ur precedent provides that organizations can establish standing to challenge election laws by showing that they will have to divert personnel and time to educating potential voters on compliance with the laws and assisting voters who might be left off the registration rolls on Election Day.” *Id.* at 1341.
- ***Fla. State Conference of NAACP v. Browning*, 522 F.3d 1153 (11th Cir. 2008):** Organizations have diversion-of-resources standing where they “reasonably anticipate that they will have to divert personnel and time to educating volunteers and voters on compliance with Subsection 6 and to resolving the problem of voters left off the registration rolls on election day. *Id.* at 1158, 1165-66. These resources would otherwise be spent on registration drives and election-day education and monitoring.” *Id.* This was so “[e]ven though the injuries are anticipated rather than completed events.” *Id.*

#### What are the best non-controlling persuasive cases on the same question?

- ***Common Cause Indiana v. Lawson*, 937 F.3d 944 (7th Cir. 2019):** Affirmed standing on a diversion-of-resources theory where plaintiff organizations would “be required to increase the time or funds (or both) spent on certain activities to alleviate potentially harmful effects of” challenged law. *Id.* at 952.
- ***OCA-Greater Houston v. Texas*, 867 F.3d 604 (5th Cir. 2017):** Found diversion-of-resources standing based on organizational plaintiff’s “additional time and effort spent explaining the Texas provisions at issue to limited English proficient voters,” which meant that “OCA must spend more time on each call (and reach fewer people in the same amount of time) because of” the challenged law. *Id.* at 610.
- ***National Council of La Raza v. Cegavske*, 800 F.3d 1032 (9th Cir. 2015):** Plaintiff organization alleged it had “expended additional resources, including staff and volunteer time, on efforts to assist individuals with voter registration” as a result of the challenged law. *Id.* at 1039-40. The court held that “injuries of the sort that Plaintiffs allege are concrete and particular for purposes of Article III” and found standing based on diversion of resources. *Id.*

- ***Scott v. Schedler*, 771 F.3d 831 (5th Cir. 2014)**: NAACP had standing to sue because its head of voter registration spent additional time on voter registration drives as a result of the challenged action: “Even if Taylor had spent none of the NAACP’s money, the NAACP would have still devoted resources to counteract Schedler’s allegedly unlawful practices because Taylor devoted his time to the drives.” *Id.* at 837.
- ***Georgia State Conf. of NAACP v. Kemp*, 841 F. Supp. 2d 1320 (N.D. Ga. 2012)**: Allegations that plaintiff organization had “expended additional resources—such as staff and volunteer time—on efforts to assist individuals with voter registration” as a result of the challenged conduct “plainly satisfy the injury prong of the Article III test for standing.” *Id.* at 1336.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of February, 2022.

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth

Frederick S. Wermuth  
Florida Bar No. 0184111  
Thomas A. Zehnder  
Florida Bar No. 0063274  
King, Blackwell, Zehnder  
& Wermuth, P.A.  
P.O. Box 1631  
Orlando, FL 32802-1631  
Telephone: (407) 422-2472  
Facsimile: (407) 648-0161  
fwerthemuth@kbzwlaw.com  
tzehnder@kbzwlaw.com

Marc E. Elias  
Elisabeth Frost  
David R. Fox\*  
Lalitha D. Madduri\*  
Christina A. Ford  
Francesca Gibson\*  
Elias Law Group LLP  
10 G St. NE, Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20002  
Telephone: (202) 968-4490  
melias@elias.law

/s/ P. Benjamin Duke

P. Benjamin Duke\*  
Shira M. Poliak\*  
Covington & Burling LLP  
620 Eighth Avenue  
New York, NY 10018  
Telephone: 212-841-1270  
pbduke@cov.com  
spoliak@cov.com

Benjamin L. Cavataro  
Florida Bar No. 113534  
Morgan E. Saunders\*  
Michael A. Fletcher II\*  
Elizabeth T. Fouhey\*  
Cyrus Nasserri\*  
Covington & Burling LLP  
850 Tenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: 202-662-5693  
bcavataro@cov.com  
msaunders@cov.com  
mfletcher@cov.com  
efouhey@cov.com  
cnasserri@cov.com



efrost@elias.law  
dfox@elias.law  
lmadduri@elias.law  
cford@elias.law  
fgibson@elias.law

*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Robert D. Fram\*  
Ellen Y. Choi\*  
Nia Joyner\*\*  
Covington & Burling LLP  
415 Mission Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: 415-591-7025  
rfram@cov.com  
echoi@cov.com  
njoyner@cov.com

Michael Pernick\*  
Morenike Fajana\*  
Romane Paul\*  
NAACP Legal Defense & Educational  
Fund, Inc.  
40 Rector Street, 5th Floor  
New York, NY 10006  
Telephone: 212-965-2200  
mfajana@naacpldf.org

Amia Trigg\*  
Mahogane D. Reed\*  
NAACP Legal Defense & Educational  
Fund, Inc.  
700 14th Street NW, Ste. 600,  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: 202-682-1300  
atrigg@naacpldf.org

Nellie L. King  
Fla. Bar No. 0099562  
The Law Offices of Nellie L. King, P.A.  
319 Clematis Street, Suite 107  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Telephone: 561-833-1084  
Nellie@CriminalDefenseFla.com

*\*Admitted pro hac vice*

*Counsel for NAACP Plaintiffs*

/s/ John A. Freedman

Kira Romero-Craft  
Florida Bar No. 49927  
Miranda Galindo \*  
LatinoJustice, PRLDEF  
523 W Colonial Dr.  
Orlando, FL 32804  
Telephone: 321-418-6354  
Kromero@latinojustice.org  
Mgalindo@latinojustice.org

Brenda Wright \*  
DEMOS  
80 Broad St, 4th Flr  
New York, NY 10004  
Telephone: 212-633-1405  
bwright@demos.org

Judith B. Dianis \*  
Gilda R. Daniels  
Jorge Vasquez \*  
Sabrina Khan \*  
Esperanza Segarra  
Florida Bar No. 527211  
Sharion Scott \*  
ADVANCEMENT PROJECT  
1220 L Street, N.W., Suite 850  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone: 202-728-9557  
Jbrowne@advancementproject.org  
Gdaniels@advancementproject.org  
Jvasquez@advancementproject.org  
Skhan@advancementproject.org  
Esegarra@advancementproject.org  
Sscott@advancementproject.org

/s/ Michelle Kanter Cohen

Nancy G. Abudu  
Florida Bar No. 111881  
Caren Short\*  
Jack Genberg\*  
Southern Poverty Law Center  
P.O. Box 1287  
Decatur, Ga 30031-1287  
Telephone: 404-521-6700  
Fax: 404-221-5857  
nancy.abudu@splcenter.org  
caren.short@splcenter.org  
jack.genberg@splcenter.org

Michelle Kanter Cohen\*  
Jon Sherman\*  
Cecilia Aguilera\*  
Fair Elections Center  
1825 K Street NW, Suite 450  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: 202-331-0114  
mkantercohen@fairelectionscenter.org  
jsherman@fairelectionscenter.org  
caguilera@fairelectionscenter.org

Debra A. Dandeneau  
Florida Bar No. 0978360  
William H. Devaney\*  
Baker McKenzie LLP  
452 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10018  
Telephone: (212) 626-4100  
debra.dandeneau@bakermckenzie.com  
william.devaney@bakermckenzie.com

*\*Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

John A. Freedman\*  
Jeremy C. Karpatkin  
Elisabeth S. Theodore\*  
Janine M. Lopez\*  
Leslie C. Bailey\*  
Sam I. Ferenc\*  
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
601 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001-3743  
Telephone: 202-942-5000  
John.Freedman@arnoldporter.com  
Jeremy.Karpatkin@arnoldporter.com  
Elisabeth.Theodore@arnoldporter.com  
Janine.Lopez@arnoldporter.com  
Leslie.Bailey@arnoldporter.com  
Sam.Ferenc@arnoldporter.com

*Counsel for HTFF Plaintiff*

Jeffrey A. Miller \*  
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
3000 El Camino Road  
Five Palo Alto Square, Suite 500  
Palo Alto, CA 94306-3807  
Telephone: 650-319-4500  
Jeffrey.Miller@arnoldporter.com

Aaron Stiefel\*  
Daniel R. Bernstein\*  
Ryan D. Buhdu\*  
Andrew R. Hirschel\*  
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, NY 10019-9710  
Telephone: 212-836-8000  
Aaron.Stiefel@arnoldporter.com  
Daniel.Bernstein@arnoldporter.com  
Ryan.Budhu@arnoldporter.com  
Andrew.Hirshel@arnoldporter.com

*\*Admitted pro hac vice*

*Counsel for Florida Rising Plaintiffs*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on February 7, 2022 I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system, which will send a notice of electronic filing to all counsel in the Service List below.

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth

Frederick S. Wermuth

Florida Bar No. 0184111

*Counsel for League Plaintiffs*

**SERVICE LIST**

Bradley R. McVay  
Ashley E. Davis  
Colleen E. O'Brien  
William D. Chappell  
Florida Department of State  
RA Gray Building  
500 South Bronough Street, Ste. 100  
Tallahassee, FL 32399  
Telephone: 850-245-6531  
brad.mcvay@dos.myflorida.com  
ashley.davis@dos.myflorida.com  
colleen.obrien@dos.myflorida.com  
david.chappell@dos.myflorida.com

Mohammad O. Jazil  
Gary V. Perko  
Holzman Vogel Baran Torchinsky &  
Josefiak PLLC

William H. Stafford, III  
Bilal A. Faruqui  
Karen A. Brodeen  
Rachel R. Siegel  
William Chorba  
Office of the Attorney General  
PL-01 The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Telephone: 850-414-3785  
william.stafford@myfloridalegal.com  
bilal.faruqui@myfloridalegal.com  
karen.brodeen@myfloridalegal.com  
rachel.siegel@myfloridalegal.com  
william.chorba@myfloridalegal.com

*Counsel for Defendant Ashley Moody*

119 S. Monroe Street, Suite 500  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Telephone: 850-567-5762  
mJazil@holtzmanvogel.com  
gperko@holtzmanvogel.com

Phillip M. Gordon  
Kenneth C. Daines  
Holzman Vogel Baran Torchinsky &  
Josefiak PLLC  
15405 John Marshall Hwy.  
Haymarket, VA 20169  
Telephone: 540-341-8808  
pgordon@holtzmanvogel.com  
kdaines@holtzmanvogel.com

*Counsel for Defendant Laurel M. Lee*

Robert C. Swain  
Diana M. Johnson  
Alachua County Attorney's Office  
12 SE First St.  
Gainesville, FL 32602  
Telephone: 352-374-5218  
bswain@alachuacounty.us  
dmjohnson@alachuacounty.us

Edward P. Cuffe  
Susan Erdelyi  
Marks Gray, P.A.  
1200 Riverplace Blvd, Ste. 800  
Jacksonville, FL 32207  
Telephone: 904-807-2110  
sse@marksgray.com  
pcuffe@marksgray.com

*Counsel for Defendant Kim A. Barton*

*Counsel for Defendants Christopher Milton, Mark Anderson, Amanda Seyfang, Sharon Chason, Tomi S. Brown, Starlet Cannon, Heather Riley, Shirley Knight, Laura Hutto, Carol Dunaway, Travis Hart, Grant Conyers, Janet Adkins, Charles Overturf, Tappie Villane, Vicky Oakes, William Keen, Jennifer Musgrove, Dana Southerland, Deborah Osborne, Joseph Morgan, Bobby Beasley and Carol Rudd*

Frank M. Mari  
John M. Janousek  
Roper, P.A.  
2707 E. Jefferson St.  
Orlando, FL 32803  
Telephone: 407-897-5150  
fmari@roperpa.com  
jjanousek@roperpa.com

*Counsel for Defendants Mark Negley,  
Connie Sanchez, John Hanlon, Marty  
Bishop, Heath Driggers, Lori Scott,  
Kaiti Lenhart, and Penny Ogg*

Andy V. Bardos  
James T. Moore, Jr.  
GrayRobinson PA  
301 S. Bronough St, Ste. 600  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Telephone: 850-577-9090  
andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com  
tim.moore@gray-robinson.com

*Counsel for Defendant Jennifer J.  
Edwards, Leslie Swan, Alan Hays,  
Tommy Doyle, Michael Bennett,  
Wesley Wilcox, Joyce Griffin, Brian  
Corley, Christopher Anderson and  
Paul Stamoulis*

Jon A. Jouben  
Kyle J. Benda  
Hernando County  
20 N. Main Street, Ste. 462

Ronald A. Labasky  
Brewton Plante PA  
215 S. Monroe Street, Ste. 825  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Telephone: 850-222-7718  
rlabasky@bplawfirm.net

John T. LaVia  
Gardner, Bist, Bowden, Bush, Dee,  
Lavia & Wright, P.A.  
1300 Thomaswood Drive  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Telephone: 850-385-0070  
jlavia@gbwlegal.com

*Counsel for Defendants Chris H.  
Chambless, Vicki Davis, Mary Jane  
Arrington, Gertrude Walker and Lori  
Edwards*

Stephen M. Todd  
Office of The County Attorney  
601 E. Kennedy Blvd., 27<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Tampa, FL 33602  
Telephone: 813-272-5670  
todds@hillsboroughcounty.org

*Counsel for Defendant Craig Latimer*

Kelly L. Vicari  
Jared D. Kahn  
Pinellas County Attorney's Office  
315 Court Street, 6th Floor

Brookesville, FL 34601-2850  
Telephone: 351-754-4122  
jjouben@co.hernando.fl.us  
kbenda@co.hernando.fl.us

*Counsel for Defendant Shirley  
Anderson*

Matthew R. Shaud  
Escambia County Attorneys Office  
221 Palafox Place, Ste. 430  
Pensacola, FL 32502  
Telephone: 850-595-4970  
mrshaud@myescambia.com

*Counsel for Defendant David H.  
Stafford*

Dale Scott  
Bell & Roper, P.A.  
2707 E. Jefferson St.  
Orlando, Florida 32803  
Telephone: 407-897-5150  
dscott@bellroperlaw.com

*Counsel for Defendant Maureen Baird*

Robert Shearman  
Geraldo F. Olivo  
Henderson, Franklin, Starnes  
& Holt, P.A.  
1715 Monroe Street  
Ft. Myers, Florida 33901  
Telephone: 239-334-1346

Clearwater, FL 33756  
Telephone: 727-464-3354  
kvicari@pinellascounty.org  
jkahn@pinellascounty.org

*Counsel for Defendant Julie Marcus*

Benjamin Salzillo  
Nathaniel A. Klitsberg  
Joseph K. Jarone  
Brendalyn V.A. Edwards  
115 South Andrews Ave., Ste. 423  
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301  
Telephone: 954-357-7600  
bsalizzo@broward.org  
nklitsberg@broward.org  
jkjarone@broward.org  
breedwards@broward.org

*Counsel for Defendant Joe Scott*

Craig D. Feiser  
Jason Teal  
Mary Margaret Giannini  
117 W. Duval Street, Suite 480  
Jacksonville, Florida 32202  
Telephone: 904-255-5052  
cfeiser@coj.net  
mgiannini@coj.net

*Counsel for Defendant Mike Hogan*

Mark Herron  
S. Denay Brown  
Patrick O'Bryant  
Messer Caparello & Self, P.A.  
2618 Centennial Place  
Tallahassee, Florida 32308  
Telephone: 850-222-0720

robert.shearman@henlaw.com  
jerry.olivo@henlaw.com

*Counsel for Defendants Aletris  
Farnam, Diane Smith, Brenda Hoots,  
Therisa Meadows, Tammy Jones and  
Melissa Arnold*

Gregory T. Stewart  
Elizabeth D. Ellis  
Kirsten H. Mood  
Nabors, Giblin & Nickerson, P.A.  
1500 Mahan Drive, Suite 200  
Tallahassee, FL 32308  
Telephone: 850-224-4070  
gstewart@ngnlaw.com  
eellis@ngnlaw.com  
kmood@ngnlaw.com

*Counsel for Defendant Paul Lux*

W. Kevin Bledsoe  
London L. Ott  
123 W. Indiana Avenue, Room 301  
Deland, Florida 32720  
Telephone: 386-736-5950  
kbledsoe@volusia.org  
lott@volusia.org

*Counsel for Defendant Lisa Lewis*

Michael B. Valdes  
Oren Rosenthal  
Miami-Dade Attorney's Office  
Stephen P. Clark Center  
111 N.W. 1st Street, Suite 2810  
Miami, Florida 33128  
Telephone: 305-375-5620  
michael.valdes@miamidade.gov  
oren.rosenthal@miamidade.gov

mherron@lawfla.com  
dbrown@lawfla.com  
pobryant@lawfla.com

*Counsel for Defendant Mark Earley*

Nicholas Shannin  
Shannin Law Firm  
214 S. Lucerne Circle East  
Orlando, Florida 32801  
Telephone: 407-985-2222  
nshannin@shanninlaw.com

*Counsel for Defendant Bill Cowles*

Morgan Bentley  
Bentley Law Firm, P.A.  
783 South Orange Ave., Third Floor  
Sarasota, Florida 34236  
Telephone: 941-556-9030  
mbentley@thebentleylawfirm.com

*Counsel for Defendant Ron Turner*

Ashley D. Houlihan  
Palm Beach County Supervisor of  
Elections  
240 S Military Trail  
West Palm Beach, FL 33416  
Telephone: 561-656-6200  
ashleyhoulihan@votepalmbeach.gov



*Counsel for Defendant Christine White*

Ronald A. Labasky  
Brewton Plante PA  
215 S. Monroe Street, Ste. 825  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Telephone: 850-222-7718  
rlabasky@bplawfirm.net

*Counsel for Defendant Wendy Link*

Benjamin J. Gibson  
Daniel E. Nordby  
George N. Meros, Jr.  
Amber S. Nunnally  
Frank A. Zacherl  
Tara R. Price  
Shutts & Bowen LLP  
215 S. Monroe St., Ste. 804  
Tallahassee, FL 32301  
Telephone: 850-241-1720  
bgibson@shutts.com  
dnordby@shutts.com  
gmeros@shutts.com  
anunnally@shutts.com  
fzacherl@shutts.com  
tprice@shutts.com

Daniel J. Shapiro  
Cameron T. Norris  
Tyler R. Green  
Steven C. Begakis  
Consovoy McCarthy, PLLC  
1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700  
Arlington, VA 22209  
Telephone: 703-243-9423  
daniel@consovoymccarthy.com  
cam@consovoymccarthy.com  
tyler@consovoymccarthy.com  
steven@consovoymccarthy.com

*Counsel for Intervenor Defendants  
Republican National Committee and*

*National Republican Senatorial  
Committee*

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM