1	Tyler Green*		
2	Cameron T. Norris* Daniel Shapiro*		
3	CONSOVOY McCarthy PLLC		
4	1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700		
	Arlington, VA 22209 (703) 243-9423		
5	tyler@consovoymccarthy.com		
6	cam@consovoymccarthy.com		
7	daniel@consovoymccarthy.com *pro hac vice		
8	Vary Langhafan Ariz Dan Na 024722		
9	Kory Langhofer, Ariz. Bar No. 024722 Thomas Basile, Ariz. Bar. No. 031150		
10	STATECRAFT PLLC		
11	649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85003	. Com	
	(602) 382-4078		
12	kory@statecraftlaw.com	10°C	
13	tom@statecraftlaw.com	22°	
14	Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants	,	
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
16	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
17	INCE III VALLER CONTROL	1	
18	Mi Familia Vota, et al., Plaintiffs,	Case No: 2:21-cv-1423-DWL	
19	Traintins,	Case 110. 2.21-61-1425-D WE	
20	v.	INTERVENOR-DEFENDANTS'	
21	Katie Hobbs, et al.,	JOINDER OF ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONSOLIDATED	
22	Defendants.	MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS'	
		AND INTERVENOR-PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINTS UNDER RULES 12(B)(1	
23		AND 12(B)(6)	
24			
25			
26			
27			

28

Case 2:21-cv-01423-DWL Document 73 Filed 11/18/21 Page 2 of 3

Per this Court's order (Doc. 53), the Republican National Committee and National Republican Senatorial Committee will not file separate motions to dismiss; they instead join parts I.B, III, and IV of the State's motion (Doc. 72). Intervenor-Defendants join the State's motion in lieu of filing an answer to Intervenor-Plaintiffs' complaint. And though Intervenor-Defendants have already answered Plaintiffs' complaint, they should be allowed to join the State's motion to dismiss. *See* 5C Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. §1361 & n.7 (3d ed.) (collecting cases where "federal courts have allowed" post-answer motions to dismiss). Plaintiffs could not be prejudiced because they must respond to the State's motion to dismiss anyway, Intervenor-Defendants raised these same defenses in their answer, and the Rules allow the Court to simply treat Intervenor-Defendants as having raised these defenses under Rules 12(c), 12(i), or 56, rather than Rule 12(b). *See Resol. Tr. Corp. v. Holland & Knight*, 832 F. Supp. 1528, 1529 n.2 (S.D. Fla. 1993); *Doty v. United States*, 2016 WL 3398579, at *2 (D.N.J. June 15); *Green v. Henry Cty. Comm'n*, 2020 WL 974388, at *3 & n.4 (M.D. Ala. Feb. 28).

Case 2:21-cv-01423-DWL Document 73 Filed 11/18/21 Page 3 of 3

1	Respectfully submitted this 18th day of November, 2021.	
2		
3	<u>By: /s/ Tyler Green</u>	
4	Tyler Green*	
5	Cameron T. Norris*	
	Daniel Shapiro* CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC	
6	1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700	
7	Arlington, VA 22209	
8	(703) 243-9423	
9	tyler@consovoymccarthy.com cam@consovoymccarthy.com	
	daniel@consovoymccarthy.com	
10	*pro hac vice	
11	Kory Langhofer, Ariz. Bar No. 024722	
12	Thomas Basile, Ariz. Bar. No. 031150	
13	STATECRAFT PLLC	
	649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor	
14	Phoenix, Arizona 85003 (602) 382-4078	
15	kory@statecraftlaw.com	
16	tom@statecraftlaw.com	
17	Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants	
	Phoenix, Arizona 85003 (602) 382-4078 kory@statecraftlaw.com tom@statecraftlaw.com Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants	
18		
19		
20	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
21	I e-filed this document on November 18, 2021, which emailed everyone requiring	
22	notice.	
23		
24	<u>/s/ Tyler Green</u> Attorney for Intervenor-Defendants	
	Attorney for intervenor-berendants	
25		
26		
27		
28		