

**MARK BRNOVICH
ATTORNEY GENERAL**

Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 15838)
Chief Deputy & Chief of Staff
Brunn (“Beau”) W. Roysden III (No. 28698)
Division Chief
Drew C. Ensign (No. 25463)
Deputy Solicitor General
Robert J. Makar (No. 33579)
Assistant Attorney General
2005 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
Telephone: (602) 542-5200
Drew.Ensign@azag.gov

Attorneys for Defendant
Mark Brnovich, Arizona Attorney General

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Arizona Asian American Native
Hawaiian And Pacific Islander For
Equity Coalition,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as
Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No: 2:22-cv-01381-SRB

**STATE’S REPLY SUPPORTING
CONSOLIDATION**

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
27
28

REPLY

1
2 Amongst the six Plaintiffs of the consolidated suit and this one, Arizona Asian
3 American Native Hawaiian And Pacific Islander For Equity Coalition (“AAANHPI”) is a
4 uniquely unreasonable, high-maintenance litigant—making consolidation particularly
5 appropriate to prevent its distinctly burdensome approach from causing needless waste of
6 this Court and Defendants’ resources.

7 A quick comparison to AAANHPI’s fellow co-Plaintiff readily confirms the distinct
8 unreasonability of its litigation strategy here:

- 9
- 10 • All other Plaintiffs—including the United States, which as a sovereign government
11 has unique interests apart from private plaintiffs—either moved for consolidation
12 themselves or consented to it. Alone amongst Plaintiffs, AAANHPI has not only
13 opposed consolidation, but instead filed a lengthy brief in opposition that exceeds
14 the length of all other previous consolidation-related filings in this case *combined*.
 - 15 • All other Plaintiffs were satisfied with the Attorney General’s level of detail
16 provided by email in connection with Local Rule 12.1 and not a single one had any
17 issue with it. Alone amongst Plaintiffs, AAANHPI objected and required a lengthy
18 email exchange that was ultimately pointless since—as was obvious from the
19 beginning—AAANHPI had no intention of amending its complaint. AAANHPI
20 insisted upon a resource-draining exchange that was quixotic since—as all other
21 Plaintiffs recognized—there was no meaningful chance that the parties would
22 resolve their disputes by amendment. *See Ex. A.*
 - 23 • Not one of the other Plaintiffs has attempted to compel conducting a Rule 26(f)
24 conference without knowing whether the cases will be consolidated. That approach
25 is plainly wasteful, since any deadlines agreed to would need to be reset post-
26 consolidation. But even though *both* the Attorney General and the Secretary of State
27 objected to this wasteful approach, AAANHPI has insisted upon conducting such
28 conferences today and tomorrow (October 3 and 4). *See Ex. B.*¹

29 It is against that backdrop of unreasonable litigation conduct that AAANHPI’s
30 unreasonable opposition to consolidation arises. AAANHPI faults the State for the brevity
31 of its motion. But given the glaringly obvious appropriateness of consolidation, the State’s

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100

¹ In the first of its two Rule 26(f) conferences, AAANHPI expressed its desire to eliminate this Court’s presumptive limit on document requests to 25 RFPs and instead permit unlimited RFPs—again underscoring the hyper-aggressive and unreasonable approach that AAANHPI is continuing to take. That in turn underscores the desirability of consolidation for resolving contested discovery matters, rather than having them addressed piecemeal.

1 brief was appropriately brief. Indeed, when the United States, Poder Latinx, and DNC
2 moved for consolidation, their motions were quite understandably short as well. *See Docs.*
3 68 (1¼ pages), 78 (1 page), 90 (1¼ pages). But once again, AAANHPI rejects the more-
4 reasonable approach of its co-Plaintiffs and instead embarks upon a more resource-
5 intensive one of its own.

6 The problem here is not the shortness of the Attorney General’s motion, but rather
7 then length of AAANHPI’s opposition—which is just yet another manifestation of its
8 consistently burdensome approach to this suit.

9 Ultimately, Plaintiffs’ five fellow co-Plaintiffs provide a useful yardstick defining
10 the limits of reasonable litigation conduct in this suit. AAANHPI is consistently well
11 beyond the bound of it. Its opposition to consolidation is yet another example of it, which
12 this Court should reject and instead grant the State’s motion to consolidate.

13 Consolidation is appropriate when “actions before the court involve a common
14 question of law or fact.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). Five challenges to the precise enactments at
15 issue in the instant case have already been consolidated in 2:22-cv-00509. These challenges
16 are effectively coterminous, challenging HB 2492 under a range of legal theories, with
17 several also challenging HB 2243 (collectively, the “Acts”). Indeed, AAANHPI strains in
18 Response to identify *any* substantive differences between the instant claims and the
19 consolidated claims. AAANHPI instead relies upon differences in *timing* at which such
20 equivalent claims were added to various consolidated matters (at 7), but provides no detail
21 whatsoever to *any* differences in the “legal challenges” made against the Acts between the
22 instant case and the consolidated cases. *See also* Op. at 2 (conclusory assertion that “the
23 claims are different”). That does not suffice, and the manifest overlap between
24 AAANHPI’s suit and the five prior ones amply warrants consolidation.

25 AAANHPI itself recognized the obvious commonality and judicial economy here
26 by moving to transfer this case itself. Those same considerations warrant consolidation
27 here too. Indeed, the most AAANHPI will say on that front is its underwhelming contention
28 that the same overlap that warranted transfer “*does not compel* consolidation.” Opp. at 8

1 (emphasis added). True, but those same factors that AAANHPI itself recognized strongly
2 militate in favor of consolidation here.

3 Strangely, AAANHPI asserts (at 8) “entirely uniform resolutions across all cases is
4 not a pre-ordained result” as a reason weighing *against* consolidation. These are equivalent
5 constitutional and federal statutory challenges to the same State statutes before the same
6 Court: there *should* be a uniform resolution. It would be bizarre, for example, if AAANHPI
7 were to prevail on its NVRA challenge to HB 2492 and the United States failed on its
8 substantively identical challenge to it. It further is inequitable to permit all Plaintiffs
9 collectively multiple bites at the apple, and to expose the State to duplicative proceedings
10 and the risk of inconsistent judgments.

11 AAANHPI (at 7) touts this Court’s order resolving its motion for a preliminary
12 injunction. But this Court’s September 8 order resolving AAANHPI’s motion for a
13 preliminary injunction provides no basis to deny consolidation. *See* Doc. 54. As an initial
14 matter, it is fully resolved so any relevance that ever attached to it is now moot.

15 But it was hardly relevant to consolidation even when pending. That motion was
16 resolved because the Attorney General, Secretary of State, all county recorders and
17 AAANHPI ultimately agreed that the laws at issue, by their enacted terms, were not
18 intended to be effective/operative before the November 2022 election. There was thus no
19 need for any injunction since there was no law actually then in-force to enjoin. That order—
20 not actually styled an injunction, *see* Doc. 54—in fact enjoins nothing because the parties
21 agreed there is no legal operation of HB 2243 to enjoin.

22 AAANHPI, however, was unwilling to accept any memorialization of that
23 agreement except by court order, to which Defendants reluctantly agreed to avoid
24 needlessly imposing a fire drill upon this Court when the parties were in fact in agreement
25 about the core issues. But AAANHPI now seeks to weaponize that agreement (at 7) to
26 oppose consolidation. It provides no basis for doing so. It is a mere codification of all
27 respective parties’ agreement that the law is not intended to be in effect at the relevant
28 times, and hence will not. And AAANHPI’s attempted exploitation of *agreement* between

1 the parties—twisting a reasonable *agreement* into an unreasonable basis to oppose
2 consolidation—further underscores the imprudence and onerousness of AAANHPI’s
3 approach to litigation here.

4 * * *

5 There is a reason that *all* other Plaintiffs have either sought consolidation here or
6 consented to it. Consolidation is eminently appropriate and entirely reasonable. It
7 eliminates the risk of inconsistent judgments and substantially reduces the burdens upon
8 the parties and this Court.

9 AAANHPI presumably opposes consolidation precisely because it intends to
10 continue to litigate this case unreasonably—as the contrast between its actions and those
11 of its five co-Plaintiff groups consistently demonstrates. Consolidation would necessarily
12 frustrate that desire. But that is a feature of consolidation and not a bug, and makes
13 consolidation all the more warranted here.

14 **CONCLUSION**

15 The State’s motion to consolidate this action should be granted.

16
17 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 3rd day of October, 2022.

18 **MARK BRNOVICH**
19 **ATTORNEY GENERAL**

20 By: s/ Drew C. Ensign

21 Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 15838)

22 *Chief Deputy & Chief of Staff*

23 Brunn (“Beau”) W. Roysden III (No. 28698)

24 *Solicitor General*

25 Drew C. Ensign (No. 25463)

26 *Deputy Solicitor General*

27 Robert J. Makar (No. 33579)

28 *Assistant Attorney General*

2005 N. Central Avenue

Phoenix, Arizona 85004

Telephone: (602) 542-5200

Drew.Ensign@azag.gov

Attorneys for Defendant Mark Brnovich,

Arizona Attorney General

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
27
28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 3rd day of October, 2022, I caused the foregoing document to be electronically transmitted to the Clerk’s Office using the CM/ECF System for Filing, which will send notice of such filing to all registered CM/ECF users.

s/ Drew C. Ensign
Attorneys for Defendant Mark Brnovich,
Arizona Attorney General

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM