

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE STATE OF OREGON  
FOR THE COUNTY OF MARION

BEVERLY CLARNO, GARY WILHELMS,  
JAMES L. WILCOX, and LARRY  
CAMPBELL,

Petitioners,

v.

SHEMIA FAGAN, in her official capacity as  
Secretary of State of Oregon,

Respondent.

Case No. 21CV40180

**Senior Judge Mary M. James, Presiding Judge  
of Special Judicial Panel  
Senior Judge Henry C. Breithaupt, Special  
Master to Special Judicial Panel**

MOTION TO MAKE MORE DEFINITE AND  
CERTAIN (ORCP 21D)

**ORS 20.140 - State fees deferred at filing**

**UTCR CONFERRAL INFORMATION**

Pursuant to UTCR 5.010, counsel for Respondent certifies that before filing this motion, Respondent’s counsel conferred in good faith with Petitioners’ counsel about the issues raised in this motion. The parties could not resolve the issues raised in this motion without the assistance of the Court.

**MOTION**

Pursuant to ORCP 21 D, Respondent respectfully moves this Court for an Order to require Petitioners to make more definite and certain the following allegations in the Petition by Thursday, October 21, by specifying any congressional district plan they will urge the Court to adopt:

“104. It is practicable to draw an alternative redistricting map that complies with ORS § 188.010(1) in which congressional districts are contiguous and of equal population, are apportioned to utilize existing geographic or political boundaries, do not divide communities of common interest, and are connected by transportation links.

1 105. Wherefore, Petitioners pray that the Court award them the following relief: ... c. Adopt  
2 a congressional district plan that complies with the Oregon Constitution and Statutes. SB  
259-B § 1(8)(a)....”

### 3 LEGAL STANDARD

4 When a petition’s allegations are unclear, the proper procedure is to move for an order  
5 requiring the petition to be more definite and certain. *See Bahr v. Marion Cty.*, 38 Or App 597,  
6 602, 590 P2d 1240 (1979), *appeal after remand* 47 Or App 627, 614 P2d 1224 (1980). “Any  
7 vagueness, uncertainty or ambiguity in the allegations of a complaint should be attacked by a  
8 pretrial motion to make more definite and certain . . . .” *Galego v. Knudsen*, 282 Or 155, 159  
9 (1978). ORCP 21 D provides that “the court may require the pleading to be made definite and  
10 certain by amendment when the allegations of a pleading are so indefinite or uncertain that the  
11 precise nature of the charge, defense, or reply is not apparent.”

### 12 ARGUMENT

13 The Court should require Petitioners to identify the alternative “congressional district  
14 plan” that they ask the Court to order. *See* Petition ¶ 105(c). Without knowing what map  
15 Petitioners have in mind, Respondent cannot present evidence to respond to the relief that  
16 Petitioners seek.

17 Petitioners allege that the redistricting plan enacted by the Oregon Legislative Assembly  
18 violates ORS 188.010(1) because the plan “needlessly splits counties, needlessly splits  
19 communities of interest; needlessly ignores other political and geographic boundaries; and  
20 needlessly draws districts not connected by transportation links.” Petition ¶ 98. Petitioners also  
21 allege “[i]t is practicable to draw an alternative redistricting map that complies with ORS  
22 § 188.010(1) in which congressional districts are contiguous and of equal population, are  
23 apportioned to utilize existing geographic or political boundaries, do not divide communities of  
24 common interest, and are connected by transportation links.” Petition ¶ 104.

25 But Petitioners do not allege how the Legislative Assembly could have drafted a plan  
26 that more “nearly” complies with the criteria enumerated in ORS 188.010(1). Petition ¶ 104.

1 Nor do they provide any details about the redistricting plan Petitioners will urge the Court to  
2 adopt. Petition ¶ 105(c).

3 The handful of details Petitioners allege only illustrate the vagueness of their Petition.  
4 For example, Petitioners allege it is unlawful for District 5 to include any portion of Deschutes  
5 County or Multnomah County. Petition ¶¶ 50, 65, 67–68. Redrawing the map to those  
6 specifications would leave District 5 with hundreds of thousands fewer people than needed to  
7 meet the federal constitutional requirement for districts of equal population. *See Karcher v.*  
8 *Daggett*, 462 U.S. 725, 730–31 (1983) (requiring congressional districts to be “as  
9 nearly as practicable” to equally populous).

10 The Petition is silent about how the Court should expand District 5 to meet the equal  
11 population requirement. Given Petitioners’ claim that the northern border of District 5 is too far  
12 north and the eastern border is too far east, presumably they seek to expand District 5 south into  
13 District 4, westward into District 6, or both. But doing so would in turn require expanding  
14 Districts 4 and 6 elsewhere to keep all six districts with equal population.

15 To allow both sides to prepare to present evidence, the rules provide that a petition must  
16 contain “[a] plain and concise statement of the ultimate facts constituting a claim for relief” and  
17 “[a] demand of the relief which the party claims[.]” ORCP 18. By failing to state facts showing  
18 that the Legislative Assembly could have drafted a plan that more “nearly” complies with the  
19 criteria enumerated in ORS 188.010(1), the Petition fails to make a “statement of the ultimate  
20 facts constituting a claim for relief.” *See* ORCP 18 A. By failing to state how the Court should  
21 draft a plan, the Petition fails to specify the “demand of the relief which the party claims.” *See*  
22 ORCP 18 B.

23 This fundamental tenant of Petitioners’ case must be disclosed in enough time for  
24 Respondent to submit evidence objection to Petitioners’ proposed remedy. Under the Court’s  
25 scheduling order, all parties submit their evidence by Monday, October 25. Last week,  
26 Petitioners themselves proposed the deadline of Thursday, October 21, to disclose the map they

1 urge the Court to adopt. *See* Declaration of Brian Simmonds Marshall (Oct. 17, 2021) ¶ 2 &  
2 Attachs. B at 18–19 (filed with Response to Motion to Amend Scheduling Order). The Court  
3 should require Petitioners to do so by that deadline.

4 Whether through amending the scheduling order or by granting this motion, the Court  
5 should require Petitioners to give Respondent fair notice of the remedy they seek.

### 6 CONCLUSION

7 For these reasons, Respondent requests that the motion be granted and Petitioners be  
8 required to make their Petition more definite and certain by October 21 by specifying any  
9 “congressional district plan” they ask the Court to order. The plan should be disclosed in the  
10 same standard electronic formats the Legislative Assembly has provided for the enacted  
11 redistricting plan, SB 881, through its redistricting website,  
12 <https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/redistricting/>.

13  
14 DATED October 18, 2021.

15 Respectfully submitted,

16 ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM  
17 Attorney General

18  
19 *s/ Brian Simmonds Marshall*

20 BRIAN SIMMONDS MARSHALL #196129  
21 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
22 SADIE FORZLEY #151025  
23 ALEXANDER C. JONES #213898  
24 Assistant Attorneys General  
25 Trial Attorneys  
26 Tel (971) 673-1880  
Fax (971) 673-5000  
Brian.S.Marshall@doj.state.or.us  
Sadie.Forzley@doj.state.or.us  
Alex.Jones@doj.state.or.us  
Of Attorneys for Respondent

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I certify that on October 18, 2021, I served the foregoing MOTION TO MAKE  
3 MORE DEFINITE AND CERTAIN (ORCP 21D) upon the parties hereto by the method  
4 indicated below, and addressed to the following:

5 Shawn M. Lindsay  
6 Harris Berne Christensen LLP  
7 15350 SW Sequoia Parkway, Suite 250  
8 Portland, OR 97224  
*Of Attorneys for Petitioners*

    HAND DELIVERY  
  X   MAIL DELIVERY  
    OVERNIGHT MAIL  
  X   E-MAIL  
  X   SERVED BY E-FILING

9 Misha Tseytlin  
10 Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP  
11 227 W. Monroe Street, Ste. 3900  
12 Chicago, IL 60606  
*Of Attorneys for Petitioners*

    HAND DELIVERY  
  X   MAIL DELIVERY  
    OVERNIGHT MAIL  
  X   E-MAIL  
  X   SERVED BY E-FILING

13  
14 s/ Brian Simmonds Marshall  
15 BRIAN SIMMONDS MARSHALL #196129  
16 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
17 SADIE FORZLEY #151025  
18 ALEXANDER C. JONES #213898  
19 Assistant Attorneys General  
20 Trial Attorneys  
21 Tel (971) 673-1880  
22 Fax (971) 673-5000  
23 Brian.S.Marshall@doj.state.or.us  
24 Sadie.Forzley@doj.state.or.us  
25 Alex.Jones@doj.state.or.us  
26 Of Attorneys for Respondent

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCS.COM