

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

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Mi Familia Vota, et al.,  
  
Plaintiffs,  
  
v.  
  
Adrian Fontes, in his official capacity as  
Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

No. CV-22-00509-PHX-SRB  
  
**ORDER**

---

**AND CONSOLIDATED CASES**

On November 7, 2022, the Tohono O’odham Nation, Gila River Indian Community, and individuals Keanu Stevens, Alanna Siquieros, and LaDonna Jacket (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) filed a Complaint in this Court. (Doc. 1, 22-cv-1901, Compl.) Their Complaint attacked the legality of an Arizona law, H.B. 2492. (*See generally id.*) Prior to November 7, 2022, several nonprofit organizations and the United States also filed lawsuits challenging the legality of H.B. 2492 under the same legal theories advanced by Plaintiffs. (*See* Doc. 164, 11/10/2022 Order at 3–5; *see generally* Doc. 304, 02/16/2023 Order.) All these lawsuits were consolidated before this Court (“Consolidated Case”).<sup>1</sup> (*See* 11/10/2022 Order.) On September 16, 2022, Defendants State of Arizona and the Arizona Attorney General (collectively, “Defendants”) moved to dismiss the

---


<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs filed an Amended Complaint on December 9, 2022. (Doc. 21, 22-cv-1901, Amended Compl.) Plaintiffs’ lawsuit was consolidated into the Consolidated Case on December 23, 2022. (Doc. 29, 22-cv-1901, 12/23/2022 Order.)

1 Consolidated Case (“Consolidated Motion”). (Doc. 127, Consolidated Mot.) On February  
2 16, 2023, the Court declined to dismiss all but one of the claims made in the Consolidated  
3 Case. (See 02/16/2023 Order at 35.)

4 On December 27, 2022, Defendants moved to dismiss Plaintiffs’ Amended  
5 Complaint (“Tohono O’odham Motion”). (Doc. 197, Mot.) Plaintiffs filed their Response  
6 on February 9, 2023, to which Defendants replied on March 10, 2023. (Doc. 267, Resp.  
7 to Mot.; Doc. 314, Reply.) In Reply, Defendants conceded that “[b]ecause the [Tohono  
8 O’odham] Motion incorporates arguments from th[e] Consolidated Motion, the Court’s  
9 February 16, 2023 ruling effectively disposes of the [Tohono O’odham] Motion, as well.”  
10 (Reply at 2.) The Court agrees that the 02/16/2023 Order “effectively denies and  
11 otherwise undercuts the grounds for dismissal identified in” the Tohono O’odham  
12 Motion. (See *id.* at 3.)

13 **IT IS ORDERED** denying Defendants State of Arizona and the Arizona Attorney  
14 General’s Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 197).

15  
16 Dated this 15th day of March, 2023.

17  
18  
19  
20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 Susan R. Bolton  
23 United States District Judge  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28