

On August 30, 2022, County Defendants Wise, Scarpello, and Tatum moved pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) for reconsideration and/or clarification of this Court’s Order and Judgment, specifically this Court’s determination that the standard for municipal liability—set out in *Monell v. New York City Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978)—applies to this case. See ECF No. 184 (“Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification”). Plaintiffs timely filed a Response, in which they agreed “that *Ex parte Young*, [209 U.S. 123, 160 (1908),] rather than *Monell*, provides the proper framework for determining whether equitable relief is available from the County Defendants, and that County Defendants may be properly enjoined pursuant to *Ex parte Young*.” See ECF No. 191 (“Response”) at 2 (citation omitted). Intervenor-Defendants Paxton, Pendley, and Torres filed no Response.

After County Defendants filed their Motion for Reconsideration, the Fifth Circuit *sua sponte* ordered an expedited appeal. See *LULAC v. Paxton*, No. 22-50690, Order of Sept. 7, 2022. After County Defendants contacted the Fifth Circuit’s Clerk’s Office to notify them of the pending Rule 59(e) motion below, the Fifth Circuit issued a Directive to the parties to the appeal asking that they file letter briefs of no more than two pages addressing its appellate jurisdiction. See *LULAC v. Paxton*, No. 22-50690, Directive of Sept. 15, 2022. County Defendants Wise and Tatum filed a Motion for Leave to File Letter Brief and a Letter Brief, contending that as a result of the pending Rule 59(e) motion below, the Fifth Circuit presently lacks jurisdiction pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(4)(A)(iv) and 4(a)(4)(B)(i). See *LULAC v. Paxton*, No. 22-50690, Motion to File Letter Brief (Sept. 19, 2022) (*see* Exh. 1).

Earlier today, the Fifth Circuit granted Movants’ Motion to File Letter Brief and ordered that “the appeal is abated and the briefing schedule is suspended” pending this court’s disposition

of County Defendants' Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification. *See LULAC v. Paxton*, No. 22-50690, Order of Sept. 20, 2022 (*see* Exh. 2).

Accordingly, County Defendants are aware of no known procedural or jurisdictional barriers to this Court's resolution of their Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification.

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

Dated: September 20, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Orion Armon

Orion Armon (CO SBN 34923)

COOLEY LLP

Orion Armon (CO SBN 34923)

oarmon@cooley.com

1144 15th Street, Suite 2300

Denver, CO 80202-2686

Telephone: +1 720 566-4000

Facsimile: +1 720 566-4099

COOLEY LLP

Kathleen Hartnett* (CA SBN 314267)

khartnett@cooley.com

Beatriz Mejia* (CA SBN 190948)

bmejia@cooley.com

Sharon Song* (CA SBN 313535)

ssong@cooley.com

David S. Louk* (CA SBN 304654)

dlouk@cooley.com

Kelsey Spector* (CA SBN 321488)

kspector@cooley.com

Germaine Habell* (CA SBN 333090)

ghabell@cooley.com

Caroline A. Lebel* (CA SBN 340067)

clebel@cooley.com

3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111-4004

Telephone: +1 415 693-2000

Facsimile: +1 415 693-2222

STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY
CENTER

Christine P. Sun* (CA SBN 218701)

3749 Buchanan St., No. 475165

San Francisco, CA 94147-3103

Telephone: +1 615 574-9108

christine@statesuniteddemocracy.org

STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY
CENTER

Ranjana Natarajan (TX SBN 24071013)

1801 E 51st St., Suite 365, No. 334
Austin, TX 78723
Telephone: +1 323 422-8578
ranjana@statesuniteddemocracy.org

STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER
Robert Cotter* (IL SBN 6334375)
7510 N. Greenview Ave., Apt. #3
Chicago, IL 60626
Telephone: (224) 235-2606
robert@statesuniteddemocracy.org

STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER
Marina Eisner* (DC SBN 1005593)
1101 17 Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
Telephone: (240) 600-1316
marina@statesuniteddemocracy.org

SUSMAN GODFREY
Neal S. Manne State Bar No. 12937980
Robert Rivera, Jr. State Bar No. 16958030
1000 Louisiana, Suite 5100
Houston, TX 77002-5096
Telephone: (713) 651-9366
Facsimile: (713) 654-6666
nmanne@susmangodfrey.com
rrivera@susmangodfrey.com

EL PASO COUNTY ATTORNEYS
Jo Anne Bernal (TX SBN 02208720)
El Paso County Attorney
Joanne.Bernal@epcounty.com
John E. Untereker (TX SBN 24080627)
Assistant County Attorney
juntereker@epcounty.com
500 East San Antonio, Room 503
El Paso, Texas 79901
Telephone: +1 915 546-2050
Facsimile: +1 915 546-2133

**Admitted pro hac vice*

*Attorneys for Lisa Wise, in her official
capacity as the El Paso County Elections
Administrator*

and

JOHN CREUZOT
CRIMINAL DISTRICT ATTORNEY
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

/s/ Barbara S. Nicholas

Barbara S. Nicholas
Assistant District Attorney
Texas Bar No. 24032785
barbara.nicholas@dallascounty.org

Ben Stool
Assistant District Attorney
Texas Bar No. 19312500
ben.stool@dallascounty.org
500 Elm Street, Suite 6300
Dallas, Texas 75202
Phone: (214) 653-7358
Fax: (214) 653-6134

*Attorneys for Michael Scarpello, in his
official capacity as the Dallas County
Elections Administrator*

and

CHRISTIAN D. MENEFEE
HARRIS COUNTY ATTORNEY

/s/ Tiffany S. Bingham

JONATHAN G.C. FOMBONNE
First Assistant Harris County Attorney
State Bar No. 24102702
Jonathan.Fombonne@harriscountytexas.gov

TIFFANY S. BINGHAM
Managing Counsel
State Bar No. 24012287
Tiffany.Bingham@harriscountytexas.gov

SAMEER S. BIRRING
Assistant County Attorney
State Bar No. 24087169
Sameer.Birring@harriscountytexas.gov

*Attorneys for Clifford Tatum, in his official
capacity as the Harris County Elections
Administrator*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 20, 2022, **Defendants Lisa Wise, Michael Scarpello, and Clifford Tatum's Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification** was served through the Court's CM/ECF Document Filing System upon each attorney of record.

/s/ Orion Armon

Orion Armon (CO SBN 34923)

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

EXHIBIT 1

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

No. 22-50690

**IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT**

TEXAS STATE LULAC; VOTO LATINO,

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

v.

BRUCE ELFANT; ET AL.,

Defendants,

LUPE C. TORRES, IN HER OFFICIAL COMPACITY AS THE MEDINA COUNTY ELECTIONS ADMINISTRATOR; TERRIE PENDLEY, IN HER OFFICIAL COMPACITY AS THE REAL COUNTY TAX ASSESSOR-COLLECTOR; KEN PAXTON, TEXAS ATTORNEY GENERAL,

*Intervenor Defendants -
Appellants.*

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas,
Austin Division, No. 1:21-cv-00546-LY
The Honorable Lee Yeakel, U.S. District Judge

**COUNTY DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE LETTER
BRIEF REGARDING THE FIFTH CIRCUIT'S APPELLATE
JURISDICTION**

COOLEY LLP
Kathleen R. Hartnett
khartnett@cooley.com
3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
+1 415 693 2000 (telephone)
+1 415 693 2222 (facsimile)

*Attorneys for El Paso County Elections
Administrator Lisa Wise*

STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY
CENTER
Ranjana Natarajan
ranjana@statesuniteddemocracy.org
1801 E 51st St., Suite 365, No. 334
Austin, TX 78723
+1 323 422 8578 (telephone)

Jonathan Fombonne
First Assistant County Attorney
HARRIS COUNTY
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
jonathan.fombonne@harriscountytexas.gov
1019 Congress St.
Houston, TX 77002
Telephone: +1 713 274-5102

*Attorney for Harris County Elections
Administrator Clifford Tatum*

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE LETTER BRIEF

Movants El Paso County Elections Administrator Lisa Wise and Harris County Elections Administrator Clifford Tatum respectfully request leave to file the attached letter brief in response to this Court's September 15, 2022, Directive to file letter briefs of no more than two pages addressing this Court's appellate jurisdiction. That Directive followed Movants' and County Defendant Scarpello's timely filed Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification of the Court's August 2, 2022 Order and Judgment in the district court. *See* Case No. 1:21-cv-000546-LY, ECF No. 184 ("Motion for Reconsideration").

In its August 2 Order on Cross-Motions for Summary Judgment, the district court concluded that Movants and other County Defendants may be enjoined under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 because they have a "policy or custom" related to enforcement of SB 1111 that was the "moving force" behind Plaintiffs' injuries. *See* ECF No. 171 ("Order") at 15 (quoting *Monell v. New York City Dep't of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S.

658, 694 (1978)). Plaintiffs, however, neither pleaded nor moved to enjoin County Defendants under a *Monell* theory of liability. Indeed, Plaintiffs brought only a facial challenge to the contested provisions of SB 1111, and *neither* the Plaintiffs *nor* the State Defendants raised the *Monell* issue. Rather, in response to Plaintiffs’ motion, Defendant Yvonne Ramon—citing *Monell* and *Los Angeles County v. Humphries*, 562 U.S. 29, 36–37 (2010)—contended that “in order to establish their entitlement to [injunctive] relief [against Ramon], Plaintiffs must provide evidence of an official policy promulgated by Defendant Ramon.” ECF No. 151 at 1.

Neither of the moving parties responded to Defendant Ramon’s contention that *Monell* applied. *See* ECF Nos. 154–1, 156, 165. But after the district court adopted Defendant Ramon’s position on *Monell*, and in an effort to have the district court correct that error without the need for this Court’s intervention, Movants and other County Defendants timely filed their Motion for Reconsideration, contending that the district court erred in holding County Defendants liable pursuant to *Monell*. *See* Motion for Reconsideration at 6–11. Where—as here—a suit for injunctive relief is brought against a county official who is merely enforcing state law, any injunction against them should issue pursuant to *Ex parte Young*, 209 U.S. 123, 160 (1908). *See Daves v. Dallas Cnty., Tex.*, 22 F.4th 522, 532–33 (5th Cir. 2022) (recognizing whether local officials are acting “for a local governmental unit or the

state” determines whether the standard Section 1983 inquiry or the heightened *Monell* municipal liability inquiry applies).

For the reasons explained in the proposed Letter Brief, Movants respectfully contend that their and County Defendant Scarpello’s Motion for Reconsideration holds in abeyance Intervenor-Defendants’ notice of appeal, which cannot become effective until the District Court rules on their motion.

As Movants have an interest in seeing that their Motion for Reconsideration is resolved in the district court before any appeal of the Order at issue commences, Movants respectfully request that they be permitted to file the attached letter brief in response to the Court’s inquiry about its jurisdiction over the appeal.¹

¹ If the Court does not decide the jurisdictional issue by Thursday, September 22, or if the Court concludes it retains jurisdiction over the appeal, Movants plan to timely file a motion for leave to file an *amicus curiae* brief addressing the *Monell* issue pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(6).

Dated: September 19, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

By: */s/ Kathleen Hartnett*

Kathleen R. Hartnett
COOLEY LLP
khartnett@cooley.com
3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: +1 415 693-2000
Facsimile: +1 415 693-2222

Ranjana Natarajan
STATES UNITED
DEMOCRACY CENTER
ranjana@statesuniteddemocracy.org
1801 E 51st St., Suite 365, No. 334
Austin, TX 78723
Telephone: +1 323 422-8578

*Attorneys for Lisa Wise, in her official
capacity as El Paso County Elections
Administrator*

Jonathan Fombonne
First Assistant County Attorney
HARRIS COUNTY
ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
jonathan.fombonne@harriscountytexas.gov
1019 Congress St.
Houston, TX 77002
Telephone: +1 713 274-5102

*Attorney for Clifford Tatum, in his official
capacity as Harris County Elections
Administrator*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system. I further certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

/s/ Kathleen Hartnett

Kathleen R. Hartnett

Attorney for Movants

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCS.COM



Kathleen R. Hartnett
T: +1 415 693 2071
khartnett@cooley.com

Via ECF

September 19, 2022

Honorable Lyle W. Cayce
Clerk of Court
United States Court of Appeal for the Fifth Circuit
600 S. Maestri Place, Suite 115
New Orleans, LA 70130

**Re: Texas State *LULAC v. Paxton*, No. 22-50690
USDC No. 1:21-CV-546**

Dear Mr. Cayce,

County Defendants El Paso County Elections Administrator Lisa Wise and Harris County Elections Administrator Clifford Tatum respectfully submit this letter in response to the Court's September 15, 2022 Directive to file letter briefs of no more than two pages addressing this Court's appellate jurisdiction. County Defendants are not presently parties to this appeal, but they are interested parties as to the question of this Court's jurisdiction over the appeal while their Motion for Reconsideration and/or Clarification of the Court's August 2, 2022 Order and Judgment is considered in the district court. *See* Case No. 1:21-cv-000546-LY, ECF No. 184 ("Motion for Reconsideration"). The El Paso, Harris, and Dallas County Defendants timely filed their Motion for Reconsideration within 28 days of the district court's August 2, 2022, Order and Judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) (or in the alternative under Rule 60(b)).

This Circuit treats a timely filed motion for reconsideration "as a Rule 59(e) motion that suspends the time for filing a notice of appeal." *Bass v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.*, 211 F.3d 959, 962 (5th Cir. 2000) (citing *Hamilton Plaintiffs v. Williams Plaintiffs*, 147 F.3d 367, 371 n.10 (5th Cir. 1998)). A timely filed Rule 59(e) motion is among those motions specified under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a)(4)(A) that "suspends or renders dormant a notice of appeal until all such motions are disposed of by the trial court[,] . . . regardless of whether the motion was filed before or after the notice of appeal." *Ross v. Marshall*, 426 F.3d 745, 751–52 (5th Cir. 2005); *see also Tripati v. Henman*, 845 F.2d 205, 206 (9th Cir. 1988) ("Because the purpose of Rule 4(a)(4) is to prevent duplication of effort by the courts, appellate review of the underlying merits of [appellant's] summary judgment appeal would be premature prior to the district court's consideration of the motion to alter or amend the judgment."); Fed. R. App. P. 4 Advisory Committee Note to Paragraph (a)(4) (1993) ("A notice filed before the filing of one of the specified motions or after the filing of a motion but before disposition of the motion is, in effect, suspended until the motion is disposed of, whereupon, the previously filed notice effectively places jurisdiction in the court of appeals.").



In their Opening Brief, the Intervenor Defendants-Appellants contend that this Court retains jurisdiction over the appeal because County Defendants’ Motion for Reconsideration was “not a proper Rule 59 motion,” suggesting that it seeks only “a change to the district court’s order . . . *not* its final judgment.” Brief for Intervenor Defendants-Appellants (“Br.”) at 4. This contention is wrong, for several reasons.

First, County Defendants’ Motion sought reconsideration of both the district court’s “Order *and* Judgment.” See Motion for Reconsideration at 1 (emphasis added). The Motion asked the district court to reconsider the basis for liability underpinning its order and judgment, and since the legal reasoning challenged by the County Defendants underpinned the district court’s judgment, the motion certainly relates to the merits. See *Osterneck v. Ernst & Whinney*, 489 U.S. 169, 174 (1989) (“[A] postjudgment motion will be considered a Rule 59(e) motion where it involves reconsideration of matters properly encompassed in a decision on the merits.” (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)).

Second, even if County Defendants’ Motion only sought a change to the Order, not the Judgment, such a distinction is without a difference. This Court and district courts throughout this Circuit regularly treat a Motion for Reconsideration of a court’s *order* as a properly filed Rule 59(e) motion. See *Charles L.M. v. Ne. Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 884 F.2d 869, 869 (5th Cir. 1989) (recognizing that “motion for reconsideration of the *order* granting the motion to dismiss” is “treat[ed] as a Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion that tolls the running of the thirty-day period for filing notice of appeal” and that “[o]nce the rule 59(e) motion was ruled upon, the thirty-day period for appeal began running anew” (emphasis added)); see also *Flynn v. Terrebonne Par. Sch. Bd.*, 348 F. Supp. 2d 769, 771 (E.D. La. 2004) (reviewing motion for reconsideration “under Rule 59(e)” that seeks “reconsideration of a prior *order*” (emphasis added)); *Fields v. Pool Offshore, Inc.*, No. CIV. A. 97-3170, 1998 WL 43217, at *2 (E.D. La. Feb. 3, 1998) (same).

Third, even assuming that the County Defendants’ Motion was “not a proper Rule 59 motion,” Br. at 4, County Defendants moved in the alternative under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b), which provides relief from a judgment, order, or proceeding. See Motion for Reconsideration at 2 n.2. A timely Rule 60(b) motion also “suspends or renders dormant a notice of appeal until all such motions are disposed of by the trial court[,] . . . regardless of whether the motion was filed before or after the notice of appeal.” *Ross*, 426 F.3d at 751–52; see Fed. R. App. P. 4(a)(4)(A)(vi).

Accordingly, this Court presently lacks appellate jurisdiction over the instant case.



Sincerely,

/s/ Kathleen Hartnett

Kathleen R. Hartnett
COOLEY LLP
khartnett@cooley.com
3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: +1 415 693-2000
Facsimile: +1 415 693-2222

Jonathan Fombonne
First Assistant County Attorney
HARRIS COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE
jonathan.fombonne@harriscountytexas.gov
1019 Congress St.
Houston, TX 77002
Telephone: +1 713 274-5102

Ranjana Natarajan
STATES UNITED
DEMOCRACY CENTER
ranjana@statesuniteddemocracy.org
1801 E 51st St., Suite 365, No. 334
Austin, TX 78723
Telephone: +1 323 422-8578

*Attorney for Clifford Tatum, in his official
capacity as Harris County Elections
Administrator*

*Attorneys for El Paso County Elections
Administrator Lisa Wise*

CC:

Mr. Christopher D. Dodge
Elias Law Group, L.L.P.
10 G Street, N.E.
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002

Mr. John Russell Hardin
Perkins Coie, L.L.P.
500 N. Akard Street
Suite 3300
Dallas, TX 75201

Mr. Robert E. Henneke
Texas Public Policy Foundation
901 Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701

Ms. Kathleen Theresa Hunker
Office of the Attorney General of Texas
Special Litigation Unit
P.O. Box 12548 (MC 009)
Austin, TX 78711-2548



Ms. Melinda K Johnson
Elias Law Group, L.L.P.
10 G Street, N.E.
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002

Mr. Michael Brandon Jones
Elias Law Group, L.L.P.
10 G Street, N.E.
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002

Ms. Beth Ellen Klusmann
Office of the Texas Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548 (MC-059)
Austin, TX 78711-2548

Mr. Uzoma Nkem Nkwonta
Elias Law Group, L.L.P.
10 G Street, N.E.
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002

Ms. Autumn Hamit Patterson
Texas Public Policy Foundation
901 Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701

Ms. Lanora Christine Pettit
Office of the Attorney General of Texas
Office of the Solicitor General
P.O. Box 12548 (MC-059)
Austin, TX 78711-2548

Mr. Luis Roberto Vera Jr.
Law Offices of Luis Roberto Vera, Jr. & Associates
111 Soledad Street
Suite 1325
San Antonio, TX 78205-0000

Mr. Chance Weldon
901 Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701

Mr. Graham White
Elias Law Group, L.L.P.
10 G Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20002

Mr. Benjamin D. Wilson
Office of the Attorney General of Texas
Office of the Solicitor General
P.O. Box 12548 (MC-059)
Austin, TX 78711-2548

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

EXHIBIT 2

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

No. 22-50690

TEXAS STATE LULAC; VOTO LATINO,

Plaintiffs—Appellees,

versus

BRUCE ELFANT; ET AL.,

Defendants,

versus

LUPE C. TORRES, *in her Official Capacity as the Medina County Elections Administrator*; TERRIE PENDLEY, *in her Official Capacity as the Real County Tax Assessor-Collector*; KEN PAXTON, *Texas Attorney General,*

Intervenor Defendants—Appellants.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Texas
USDC No. 1:21-CV-546

ORDER:

IT IS ORDERED that the motion of Lisa Wise and Clifford Tatum for leave to file letter brief is GRANTED.

No. 22-50690

In light of the motion for reconsideration and/or clarification timely filed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), which remains pending in the district court, the appeal is abated and the briefing schedule is suspended. The parties are directed to jointly notify the clerk's office of our Court when the district court disposes of the Rule 59(e) motion. At that point, the Court will set a new schedule to complete briefing. The previously entered administrative stay remains in place.

LYLE W. CAYCE, CLERK
United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit
/s/ Lyle W. Cayce

ENTERED AT THE DIRECTION OF THE COURT

United States Court of Appeals

FIFTH CIRCUIT
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

LYLE W. CAYCE
CLERK

TEL. 504-310-7700
600 S. MAESTRI PLACE,
Suite 115
NEW ORLEANS, LA 70130

September 20, 2022

MEMORANDUM TO COUNSEL OR PARTIES LISTED BELOW:

No. 22-50690 Texas State LULAC v. Paxton
USDC No. 1:21-CV-546

Enclosed is an order entered in this case.

Sincerely,

LYLE W. CAYCE, Clerk

Lisa E. Ferrara

By: _____
Lisa E. Ferrara, Deputy Clerk
504-310-7675

Mr. Philip Devlin
Mr. Christopher D. Dodge
Mr. John Russell Hardin
Mr. Robert E. Henneke
Ms. Kathleen Theresa Hunker
Ms. Melinda K Johnson
Mr. Michael Brandon Jones
Ms. Beth Ellen Klusmann
Mr. Uzoma Nkem Nkwonta
Ms. Autumn Hamit Patterson
Ms. Lanora Christine Pettit
Mr. Luis Roberto Vera Jr.
Mr. Chance Weldon
Mr. Graham White
Mr. Benjamin D. Wilson