

1 John A. Freedman
2 Jeremy Karpatkin
3 Erica McCabe
4 Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
5 601 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
6 Washington, D.C. 20001
7 (202) 942-5000

8 John.Freedman@arnoldporter.com
9 Jeremy.Karpatkin@arnoldporter.com
10 Erica.McCabe@arnoldporter.com

11 *Admitted pro hac vice

12 Steven L. Mayer
13 Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
14 Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor
15 San Francisco, CA 94111
16 (415) 471-3100

17 Steve.Mayer@arnoldporter.com

18 *Admitted pro hac vice

19 Leah R. Novak
20 Arnold & Porter Kay Scholer LLP
21 250 W. 55th Street
22 New York, NY 10019
23 (212) 836-8000

24 Leah.Novak@arnoldporter.com

25 *Admitted pro hac vice

26 Daniel J. Adelman (011368)
27 Arizona Center for Law
28 In the Public Interest
352 E. Camelback Rd., #200
Phoenix, AZ 85012
(602) 258-8850

danny@aclpi.org

Jon Sherman
Michelle Kanter Cohen
Beauregard Patterson
Fair Elections Center
1825 K St. NW, Ste. 701
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 331-0114

jsherman@fairelectionscenter.org

mkantercohen@fairelectionscenter.org

bpatterson@fairelectionscenter.org

*Admitted pro hac vice

*Counsel for Poder Latinx, Chicanos
Por La Causa, and Chicanos Por La
Causa Action Fund*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

MI FAMILIA VOTA, et al.
Plaintiffs,

v.

ADRIAN FONTES, in his official
capacity as Arizona Secretary of
State, et al.,

Defendants,
and

Case No. 22-00509-PHX-SRB
(Lead)

**PODER LATINX, CHICANOS POR LA
CAUSA, AND CHICANOS POR LA
CAUSA ACTION FUND'S COMBINED
CROSS-MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT ON COUNTS
TWO AND SIX OF THEIR SECOND
AMENDED COMPLAINT AND**

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

Speaker of the House Ben Toma and
Senate President Warren Petersen,
Intervenor-Defendants.

**RESPONSE TO ATTORNEY
GENERAL’S AND REPUBLICAN
NATIONAL COMMITTEE’S MOTIONS
FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

LIVING UNITED FOR CHANGE IN
ARIZONA, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
ADRIAN FONTES, in his official
capacity as Arizona Secretary of
State, et al.,
Defendant,
and
STATE OF ARIZONA, et al.,
Intervenor-Defendants,
and
Speaker of the House Ben Toma and
Senate President Warren Petersen,
Intervenor-Defendants.

Consolidated Cases
No. CV-22-00519-PHX-SRB
No. CV-22-01003-PHX-SRB
No. CV-22-01124-PHX-SRB
No. CV-22-01369-PHX-SRB
No. CV-22-01381-PHX-SRB
No. CV-22-01602-PHX-SRB
No. CV-22-01901-PHX-SRB

PODER LATINX, et al.
Plaintiff,
v.
ADRIAN FONTES, in his official
capacity as Arizona Secretary of
State, et al.,
Defendants,
and
Speaker of the House Ben Toma and
Senate President Warren Petersen,
Intervenor-Defendants.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff,
v.
STATE OF ARIZONA, et al.,
Defendants,
and

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

1 Speaker of the House Ben Toma and
2 Senate President Warren Petersen,
3 Intervenor-Defendants.

4 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL
5 COMMITTEE, et al.,
6 Plaintiffs,
7 v.
8 ADRIAN FONTES, in his official
9 capacity as Arizona Secretary of
10 State, et al.,
11 Defendants,
12 and
13 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL
14 COMMITTEE,
15 Intervenor-Defendant,
16 and
17 Speaker of the House Ben Toma and
18 Senate President Warren Petersen,
19 Intervenor-Defendants.

20 ARIZONA ASIAN AMERICAN NATIVE
21 HAWAIIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER
22 FOR EQUITY COALITION,
23 Plaintiff,
24 v.
25 ADRIAN FONTES, in his official
26 capacity as Arizona Secretary of
27 State, et al.,
28 Defendants,
and
Speaker of the House Ben Toma and
Senate President Warren Petersen,
Intervenor-Defendants.

PROMISE ARIZONA, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
ADRIAN FONTES, in his official
capacity as Arizona Secretary of
State, et al.,
Defendants,

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

and
Speaker of the House Ben Toma and
Senate President Warren Petersen,
Intervenor-Defendants.

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

- I. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) violates 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) as a matter of law because it requires county officials to subject voters to different standards, practices, and procedures. 1
- II. Poder Latinx and CPLC may enforce 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) via 42 U.S.C. § 1983 or directly under the Civil Rights Act. 5
- III. The Attorney General and State of Arizona’s Motion on NVRA Section 8(b) should be denied..... 8
 - A. NVRA Section 8(b) applies to all voter registration processes, including the challenged provisions, not only to voter removals. 9
 - B. The Challenged Provisions are neither uniform nor nondiscriminatory on their face..... 12

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

1

2

3

4 *Am. Tobacco Co. v. Patterson,*

5 456 U.S. 63 (1982) 9

6 *Arcia v. Fla. Sec’y of State,*

7 772 F.3d 1335 (11th Cir. 2014) 9

8 *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc. (ITCA),*

9 570 U.S. 1 (2013) 1

10 *Blessing v. Freestone,*

11 520 U.S. 329 (1997) 6, 7

12 *Cannon v. Univ. of Chi.,*

13 441 U.S. 677 (1979) 6

14 *Dunn v. Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n,*

15 519 U.S. 465 (1997) 13

16 *Esquivel-Quintana v. Sessions,*

17 581 U.S. 385 (2017) 8

18 *Frazier v. Callicutt,*

19 383 F. Supp. 15 (N.D. Miss. 1974) 3, 4

20 *Gade v. Nat’l Solid Wastes Mgmt. Ass’n,*

21 505 U.S. 88 (1992) 8

22 *Gonzaga Univ. v. Doe,*

23 536 U.S. 273 (2002) 6, 7, 8

24 *Gonzalez v. Ariz.,*

25 No. CV 06-1268-PHX-ROS, 2008 WL 11395499 (D. Ariz. Feb. 5, 2008) 4

26 *Greater Birmingham Ministries v. Merrill,*

27 No. 2:22CV205-MHT, 2022 WL 5027180 (M.D. Ala. Oct. 4, 2022) 10

28 *Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Union Planters Bank, N.A.,*

 530 U.S. 1 (2000) 9

Hearn v. W. Conf. of Teamsters Pension Tr. Fund,

 68 F.3d 301 (9th Cir. 1995) 14

1 *Johnson v. Hous. Auth. of Jefferson Parish,*
 2 442 F.3d 356 (5th Cir. 2006) 8

3 *Nat’l Council of La Raza v. Cegavske,*
 4 800 F.3d 1032 (9th Cir. 2015) 9

5 *Project Vote v. Blackwell,*
 6 455 F. Supp. 2d 694 (N.D. Ohio 2006) 10

7 *Project Vote/Voting for Am., Inc. v. Long,*
 8 682 F.3d 331 (4th Cir. 2012) 10, 11

9 *Project Vote/Voting for Am., Inc. v. Long,*
 10 752 F. Supp. 2d 697 (E.D. Va. 2010) 10, 11, 12

11 *Richards v. United States,*
 12 369 U.S. 1 (1962) 8

13 *Shivelhood v. Davis,*
 14 336 F. Supp. 1111 (D. Vt. 1971) 3, 4

15 *True the Vote v. Hosemann,*
 16 43 F. Supp. 3d 693 (S.D. Miss. 2014) 10

17 *United States v. Fla.,*
 18 870 F. Supp. 2d 1346 (N.D. Fla. 2012) 14

19 **Statutes**

20 A.R.S. § 16-165(I) *passim*

21 42 U.S.C. § 1983 5, 6, 7, 8

22 52 U.S.C. § 10101 *passim*

23 52 U.S.C. § 20501 12

24 52 U.S.C. § 20504 12

25 52 U.S.C. § 20505 1, 12

26 52 U.S.C. § 20506 12

27 52 U.S.C. § 20507 *passim*

28

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

Other Authorities

110 CONG. REC. H 1,695 (1964)..... 2
110 CONG. REC. S 5,004 (1964)..... 3
110 CONG. REC. S 6,734 (1964)..... 3
110 CONG. REC. S 6,740 (1964)..... 2
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d) 13
U.S. CONST. amend. XIV 5
U.S. CONST. amend. XV 5

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

1 Plaintiffs Poder Latinx, Chicanos Por La Causa, and Chicanos Por La Causa Action
2 Fund (“Poder Latinx and CPLC”) hereby move for entry of partial summary judgment on
3 their Civil Rights Act claim under 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) (Count II) and oppose the
4 Intervenor’s motion on the same count (ECF No. 367 at 15).

5 Additionally, Poder Latinx moves for partial summary judgment on Count Six,
6 which claims that HB 2492’s documentary proof of residence requirement cannot be
7 lawfully applied to the national mail voter registration form under Section 6 of the National
8 Voter Registration Act (“NVRA”), 52 U.S.C. § 20505, and *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council*
9 *of Arizona, Inc. (ITCA)*, 570 U.S. 1 (2013). Poder Latinx joins and incorporates by
10 reference Section I of the Tohono O’odham Plaintiffs’ brief.

11 **I. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) VIOLATES 52 U.S.C. § 10101(A)(2)(A) AS A MATTER OF**
12 **LAW BECAUSE IT REQUIRES COUNTY OFFICIALS TO SUBJECT**
13 **VOTERS TO DIFFERENT STANDARDS, PRACTICES, AND**
14 **PROCEDURES.**

15 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) prohibits election officials from subjecting voters to
16 different standards, practices, and procedures. It provides that:

17 No person acting under color of law shall--(A) in determining whether any
18 individual is qualified under State law or laws to vote in any election, apply
19 any standard, practice, or procedure different from the standards, practices,
20 or procedures applied under such law or laws to other individuals within the
21 same county, parish, or similar political subdivision who have been found by
22 State officials to be qualified to vote[.]

23 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A). As enacted by HB 2243, however, A.R.S. § 16-165(I) requires
24 Arizona county recorders to do what Section 10101(a)(2)(A) forbids. It directs county
25 recorders to subject registered voters whom a recorder has “reason to believe” are not
26 United States citizens—and only those voters—to an additional investigation using the
27 Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (“SAVE”) System and potential
28 cancellation.

Subsection 16-165(I) is the only provision in HB 2492 or HB 2243 that invokes this
inherently subjective and vague “reason to believe” standard. A.R.S. § 16-165(I)

1 commands the application of different “standard[s], practice[s], or procedure[s]” based on
2 nothing more than mere suspicion that a registered voter lacks U.S. citizenship.

3 The Secretary of State admits that A.R.S. § 16-165(I) “requires a different ‘standard,
4 practice, or procedure’ for determining a voter’s qualifications for voters who a county
5 recorder ‘has reason to believe are not United States citizens’ than for voters who a county
6 recorder does not have reason to believe are not United States citizens.” Non-U.S.
7 Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Statement of Material Facts (“CSOMF”) ECF No. 388 ¶ 44; ECF
8 No. 189 ¶ 102. The Secretary further admits that A.R.S. § 16-165(I) directs county
9 recorders to sort voters into two categories: those who will be subjected to the additional
10 SAVE System verification procedure and those who “are not suspected of lacking U.S.
11 citizenship [and] will not be subjected to the investigation and potential cancellations [*sic*]
12 provisions set forth in HB 2243.” CSOMF ¶ 45; ECF No. 189 ¶¶ 102–03. Crucially, this
13 sorting will be premised on any “reason to believe” a registered voter is not a U.S. citizen,
14 whether based on a private party’s accusation or someone’s biased perception of that
15 voter’s use of a language other than English, name, dress, or religion. Accordingly, on its
16 face, subsection 16-165(I) requires applying different standards, practices, and procedures
17 to eligible voters within the same county, because whenever recorder staff suspect a
18 registered voter is not a citizen, even without concrete or objective information, that voter
19 will be subject to a citizenship investigation and potential cancellation. This is what Section
20 10101(a)(2)(A) prohibits.

21 Congress enacted 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) to prevent election officials from
22 subjecting would-be voters to different registration practices like the unequally applied
23 investigations A.R.S. § 16-165(I) requires. Congress “directed [Section 1010(a)(2)(A)]
24 primarily at discriminatory practices applied in the process of registering voters. It requires
25 the application of uniform practices in determining whether an individual is qualified to
26 vote.” 110 CONG. REC. H 1,695 (Feb. 3, 1964). Congress explicitly sought to prohibit
27 “arbitrary exercises of discretion on the part of” registrars. 110 CONG. REC. S 6,740 (Apr.
28

1 1, 1964). Noting that by 1964 “many of the more blatant forms of discrimination” had been
2 made “subject to judicial review and invalidation,” supporters of Title I worried that
3 registrars might “rel[y] on [their] discretionary powers” to carry out discrimination. 110
4 CONG. REC. S 6,734 (Apr. 1, 1964). Accordingly, Congress prohibited the “unequal
5 application of [a] rule” or the “prejudiced application of a standard.” 110 CONG. REC. S
6 5,004 (Mar. 11, 1964). Section 10101(a)(2)(A) prevents voters from being subjected to
7 different or discriminatory procedures in the process of determining whether they meet
8 voter qualification and registration requirements. The statute is explicitly intended to
9 prevent election officials from acting on standardless suspicions or biases or unbridled
10 discretion when deciding which voters to subject to which registration processes. By
11 requiring Arizona county recorders to subject any voter to investigation and other
12 additional procedures based on an undefined, arbitrary “reason to believe” the voter is not
13 a citizen, A.R.S. § 16-165(I) requires Arizona county recorders to use the unrestrained
14 discretion Congress barred in the voter registration process.

15 In line with Congress’s intent, courts have applied Section 10101(a)(2)(A) to
16 prohibit registrars from requiring particular classes of registrants to provide more proof of
17 eligibility than other registrants. For example, in *Shivelhood v. Davis*, 336 F. Supp. 1111
18 (D. Vt. 1971), the court held that registrars could not require college students to provide
19 more proof of residence than non-students merely because they suspect college students
20 are not in fact residents of a town. *Id.* 1114–15. The court held that 52 U.S.C. §
21 10101(a)(2)(A) forbids registrars from forcing college students to fill out additional
22 residence questionnaires “unless all applicants are required to complete the same
23 questionnaire.” *Id.* at 1115.

24 Similarly, in *Frazier v. Callicutt*, 383 F. Supp. 15 (N.D. Miss. 1974), the plaintiffs
25 brought a Section 10101(a)(2)(A) claim against the county’s registrar and the board of
26 election commissioners, alleging “the registrar ha[d] applied one set of standards in
27 approving or disapproving applications for registration to applicants who are students at
28

1 Rust College or Mississippi Industrial College . . . and another set of standards” for “all
2 other applicants.” *Id.* at 17–18. The court found that the registrar had violated the Civil
3 Rights Act when he “summarily” rejected every college student’s voter registration
4 application and referred them to the board for further review but approved almost all non-
5 student registrants’ applications “on a subjective basis” without further investigation. *Id.*
6 at 18–20. The court found Section 10101(a)(2)(A) had been violated by the application of
7 “obviously different standard[s]” for students and non-students. *Id.* at 19.

8 As in *Frazier*, HB 2243 commands a wholly subjective evaluation of registered
9 voters’ eligibility. And, on its face, HB 2243 imposes differential standards, practices, and
10 procedures based on nothing more than the subjective impressions and guesses of county
11 recorders’ staff as to registered voters’ eligibility or ineligibility. A.R.S. § 16-165(I)’s
12 vague “reason to believe” language invites county recorders to make such guesses and
13 target voters for investigation based on race, ethnicity, dress, English proficiency,
14 languages spoken, or other characteristics. Singling out certain voters for additional voter
15 registration procedures based on nothing more than hunches and allegations, rather than
16 evidence, of ineligibility is prohibited by the Civil Rights Act. And Arizona’s practice of
17 requiring some voters but not others to undergo additional procedures based on an arbitrary
18 suspicion that they are not citizens is also forbidden by Section 10101(a)(2)(A).

19 It is also important to note that courts have long recognized that
20 Section 10101(a)(2)(A)’s protections extend beyond overt discrimination. *See Gonzalez v.*
21 *Ariz.*, No. CV 06-1268-PHX-ROS, 2008 WL 11395499, at *3–4 (D. Ariz. Feb. 5, 2008)
22 (considering plaintiffs’ claim of differential treatment of voters who moved within a county
23 and voters who moved between counties); *Shivelhood*, 336 F. Supp. at 1113–15; *Frazier*,
24 383 F. Supp. at 20. This is consistent with the provision’s text, which is not limited to
25 discrimination based on race or other characteristics. *Cf.* 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(1) (limited
26 to “race, color, or previous condition of servitude”).

27
28

1 A.R.S. § 16-165(I) directs Arizona county recorders to subject some—but
2 indisputably not *all*—registered voters to additional procedures based on a subjective
3 “reason to believe” those voters are not citizens. On its face then, purely as a matter of law,
4 *any* application of this statute will violate Section 10101(a)(2)(A). Unless county recorders
5 and their staff intend to subject *all* of Arizona’s millions of registered voters to a citizenship
6 investigation and additional procedures, then *any* use of this provision will cause the
7 application of different standards, practices, and procedures to determine the voting
8 qualifications of only certain voters suspected of lacking U.S. citizenship.

9 Poder Latinx and CPLC thus respectfully request that this court find that A.R.S. §
10 16-165(I) violates 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) and enter partial summary judgment on this
11 claim.¹ For both this claim (Count II) and Count VI, Poder Latinx and CPLC request entry
12 of a declaratory judgment but will not seek injunctive relief until the conclusion of this
13 case.

14 **II. PODER LATINX AND CPLC MAY ENFORCE 52 U.S.C. § 10101(A)(2)(A)**
15 **VIA 42 U.S.C. § 1983 OR DIRECTLY UNDER THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT.**

16 The RNC argues that there is no private right of action to enforce any claims brought
17 under 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2) of the Civil Rights Act, ECF No. 367 at 11–15, but this
18 argument fails as a matter of law. Poder Latinx and CPLC join and incorporate Section II
19 of the Mi Familia Vota Plaintiffs’ (“MFV’s”) brief in support of their motion for partial
20 summary judgment, which concerns the enforceability of 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(B) by
21 private litigants. Because the Standards, Practices, and Procedures Provision (§
22 10101(a)(2)(A)) and the Materiality Provision (§ 10101(a)(2)(B)) are part of the same
23 provision, almost all of the arguments in MFV’s brief—excluding only those specific to
24

25 ¹ If the Court finds a violation of 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) and enters summary
26 judgment, then under the doctrine of constitutional avoidance, there is no need to adjudicate
27 Poder Latinx and CPLC’s alternative claim alleging A.R.S. § 16-165(I) violates
28 prohibitions against racial and national origin discrimination under the Fourteenth and
Fifteenth Amendments (Count Three, *see* Second Am. Compl., ECF No. 169 ¶¶ 108–18).

1 the text in subsection 10101(a)(2)(B)—apply to § 10101(a)(2)(A) with equal force and
2 support a finding of private enforceability here as well. In addition to the points MFV
3 raises, Poder Latinx and CPLC note the following additional points.²

4 Poder Latinx and CPLC may enforce 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) through 42 U.S.C.
5 § 1983. Subsection 10101(a)(2)(A) of the Civil Rights Act “confers an individual right”
6 and is therefore “presumptively enforceable” by private plaintiffs under Section 1983.
7 *Gonzaga Univ. v. Doe*, 536 U.S. 273, 284 (2002). Plaintiffs only need to show that these
8 provisions create “specific, individually enforceable rights” that provide a “basis for
9 private enforcement.” *Id.* at 281. “Plaintiffs suing under § 1983 do not have the burden of
10 showing an intent to create a private remedy because § 1983 generally supplies a remedy
11 for the vindication of rights secured by federal statutes.” *Id.* at 284.

12 Under *Gonzaga*, a court must determine whether the federal statute contains
13 “explicit rights-creating” terms and “explicit ‘right- or duty-creating language.’” 536 U.S.
14 at 284 & n.3 (quoting *Cannon v. Univ. of Chi.*, 441 U.S. 677, 690 n.13 (1979)). Courts also
15 consider the three factors set forth in *Blessing v. Freestone*, 520 U.S. 329 (1997), which
16 were reaffirmed in *Gonzaga*, 536 U.S. at 282:

17 First, Congress must have intended that the provision in question benefit the
18 plaintiff. Second, the plaintiff must demonstrate that the right assertedly
19 protected by the statute is not so “vague and amorphous” that its enforcement
20 would strain judicial competence. Third, the statute must unambiguously
21 impose a binding obligation on the States. In other words, the provision
giving rise to the asserted right must be couched in mandatory, rather than
precatory, terms.

22 *Blessing*, 520 U.S. at 340–41 (citations and quotation marks omitted). Subsection
23 10101(a)(2)(A) shares the prototypical rights-creating language—“No person . . . shall”—
24 with the Materiality Provision. As explained in MFV’s brief, that prefatory phrase parallels
25 standard rights-creating language from other statutes, which courts have found confer an
26

27 ² The Court cannot avoid resolving the private right of action dispute as to 52 U.S.C.
28 § 10101(a)(2)(A), as only Poder Latinx and CPLC have asserted this particular claim.

1 enforceable private right via 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *Gonzaga*, 536 U.S. at 284. *Gonzaga* itself
2 contrasted the nondisclosure provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act
3 with “the individually focused terminology of Titles VI and IX (‘No person . . . shall . . .
4 be subjected to discrimination’).” 536 U.S. at 287.³

5 Like the Materiality Provision, subsection 10101(a)(2)(A) creates an individually
6 enforceable right, specifically an individual right against discrimination in voter
7 qualification standards, practices, and procedures. It provides:

8 No person acting under color of law shall--(A) in determining whether any
9 individual is qualified under State law or laws to vote in any election, apply
10 any standard, practice, or procedure different from the standards, practices,
11 or procedures applied under such law or laws to other individuals within the
same county, parish, or similar political subdivision who have been found by
State officials to be qualified to vote[.]

12 The text of Subsection 10101(a)(2)(A) is likewise “phrased in terms of the persons
13 benefited,” *Gonzaga*, 536 U.S. at 274, and satisfies each of the *Blessing* factors.

14 As to *Blessing* factor 1, Section 10101(a)(2)(A) is focused on individual voters
15 (“any individual”). It was intended to benefit individual voters, *Blessing*, 520 U.S. at 340,
16 and does not have “an ‘aggregate’ focus.” *Gonzaga*, 536 U.S. at 288 (quoting *Blessing*,
17 520 U.S. at 343–44). Section 10101(a)(2)(A) also meets *Blessing* factor 2. Section
18 10101(a)(2)(A)’s prohibition of discrimination in voter qualification procedures is an
19 objective and administrable standard, which is “not so vague and amorphous that its
20 enforcement would strain judicial competence.” *Blessing*, 520 U.S. at 340–41 (quotation
21 marks omitted). And Section 10101(a)(2)(A) satisfies *Blessing* factor 3, as it
22 “unambiguously impose[s] a binding obligation on” state and local election officials and
23 is “couched in mandatory, rather than precatory, terms.” 520 U.S. at 341. Section
24 10101(a)(2) uses the mandatory “shall.”

25 _____
26 ³ “No person acting under color of law shall” also echoes Section 1983 itself. *See* 42 U.S.C.
27 § 1983 (“Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or
28 usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be
subjected, any citizen of the United States . . .”).

1 It would be anomalous to single out subsection 10101(a)(2)(A) as only enforceable
2 by the federal government, given subsection 10101(a)(2), as a whole, gives individual
3 voters concrete rights against different types of discriminatory and arbitrary conduct. It is
4 well-established that “a section of a statute should not be read in isolation from the context
5 of the whole Act.” *Richards v. United States*, 369 U.S. 1, 11 (1962). Moreover, Intervenors
6 have not identified any basis for concluding that Congress intended to confer an
7 individually enforceable right for only some, but not all, subparts of subsection
8 10101(a)(2). *Gonzaga*, 536 U.S. at 281. The Supreme Court has frequently stated that the
9 “[s]urrounding provisions” in a statute “guide [its] interpretation.” *Esquivel-Quintana v.*
10 *Sessions*, 581 U.S. 385, 393 (2017); *see also Gade v. Nat’l Solid Wastes Mgmt. Ass’n*, 505
11 U.S. 88, 99 (1992). Divergent results for intertwined or closely linked statutory provisions
12 would be illogical. *Cf. Johnson v. Hous. Auth. of Jefferson Parish*, 442 F.3d 356, 362 (5th
13 Cir. 2006) (“Logic prevents the conclusion that Congress could have intended to create
14 enforceable rights for one group of Housing Act rental assistance recipients but not the
15 other.”).

16 Accordingly, as with the Materiality Provision in subsection 10101(a)(2)(B), this
17 Court should find that subsection 10101(a)(2)(A) is presumptively enforceable by private
18 plaintiffs via 42 U.S.C. § 1983. And for reasons explained in MFV’s brief, the Intervenors
19 have failed to rebut this presumption of private enforceability. Alternatively, Poder Latinx
20 and CPLC may enforce subsection 10101(a)(2)(A) directly under the Civil Rights Act, as
21 Congress intended to create a private remedy, as explained in MFV’s brief.

22 **III. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND STATE OF ARIZONA’S MOTION ON**
23 **NVRA SECTION 8(B) SHOULD BE DENIED.**

24 Poder Latinx and several Consolidated Plaintiffs argue that because HB 2492 and
25 HB 2243 result in disparate treatment as between naturalized citizens and U.S.-born
26 citizens, as well as within and between Arizona counties, the Challenged Provisions are
27 nonuniform and discriminatory in violation of Section 8(b) of the NVRA. The DNC
28

1 Plaintiffs argue HB 2492 violates Section 8(b) because it treats federal-only voters
2 differently than other Arizona voters. *See Democratic Nat’l Comm. v. Fontes*, Case No.
3 2:22-cv-01369-SRB, Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, ECF No. 1 ¶¶ 73–
4 78.

5 Defendants Attorney General Kristin Mayes and the State of Arizona (“the Moving
6 Defendants”) have moved for summary judgment making two arguments. ECF No. 364 at
7 5–8. First, they contend that Section 8(b) applies only to voter removals, an argument that
8 is contrary to the statutory text and explicit legislative intent. Second, the Moving
9 Defendants argue that the remaining provisions regarding post-registration cancellations
10 are uniform and nondiscriminatory “on the face” of the laws, ignoring the outstanding
11 factual issues and the discrimination that will result from the Challenged Provisions. Both
12 arguments fail.

13 **A. NVRA Section 8(b) applies to all voter registration processes,**
14 **including the challenged provisions, not only to voter removals.**

15 Section 8(b)’s uniform and nondiscriminatory requirement (the “Uniformity
16 Requirement”) applies to “any State program or activity to protect the integrity of the
17 electoral process by ensuring the maintenance of an accurate and current voter registration
18 roll for elections for Federal office.” 52 U.S.C. § 20507(b). Contrary to Defendants’
19 position, Section 8(b)’s requirements apply to all stages of the voter registration process,
20 as the statutory language does not limit Section 8(b)’s reach only to voter cancellations or
21 removals. The processing of voter registration applications—including their acceptance
22 and rejection—is certainly necessary to “the maintenance of an accurate and current voter
23 registration roll.” *Id.* The Moving Defendants provide no contrary plain text argument. The
24 NVRA’s plain language must be enforced according to the ordinary meaning of its terms.
25 *Nat’l Council of La Raza v. Cegavske*, 800 F.3d 1032, 1045 (9th Cir. 2015) (citing *Hartford*
26 *Underwriters Ins. Co. v. Union Planters Bank, N.A.*, 530 U.S. 1, 6 (2000); *Am. Tobacco*
27 *Co. v. Patterson*, 456 U.S. 63, 68 (1982)); *see also Arcia v. Fla. Sec’y of State*, 772 F.3d
28

1 1335, 1347 (11th Cir. 2014) (“Our job is to honor the broad statutory language in the
2 [NVRA] . . .”).

3 The Moving Defendants do not cite any case law that supports their position.
4 Notably, at least one court has applied Section 8(b) to voter registration activities that do
5 not concern voter removals. *Project Vote v. Blackwell*, 455 F. Supp. 2d 694, 703 (N.D.
6 Ohio 2006) (Ohio restrictions on voter registration drives violated Section 8(b) as “neither
7 uniform nor non-discriminatory” by creating barriers to voter registration “only for a
8 selected class of persons”). And courts have consistently held that similar language in
9 another subsection of Section 8, Section 8(i)—which concerns the “accuracy and currency”
10 of the voter list⁴—applies to the entire voter registration process. Analyzing that provision,
11 courts have noted that the process of reviewing voter registration applications is a
12 “program” and “activity” that promotes the accuracy and currency of voter lists. *See*
13 *Project Vote/Voting for Am., Inc. v. Long*, 682 F.3d 331, 335 (4th Cir. 2012); *see also*
14 *Greater Birmingham Ministries v. Merrill*, No. 2:22CV205-MHT, 2022 WL 5027180, at
15 *3 (M.D. Ala. Oct. 4, 2022) (rejecting argument that Section 8(i)(1) should be read to
16 pertain only to records relating to removal of voters); *True the Vote v. Hosemann*, 43 F.
17 Supp. 3d 693, 720 (S.D. Miss. 2014) (under Section 8(i)(1), “activities geared towards
18 ensuring that a State’s official list of voters is errorless and up-to-date . . . generally relate
19 to voter registration and removal, the processes by which a State updates its lists to ensure
20 they reflect all eligible voters”).

21 Courts have also noted that the statutory term “‘current’ refers to something that is
22 ‘occurring in or belonging to the present time’ or is ‘most recent,’ while the term ‘accurate’
23 refers to something ‘free from error . . . esp[ecially] as the result of care’ or ‘in exact
24 conformity to truth or to some standard.’” *See Project Vote/Voting for Am., Inc. v. Long*,

25
26
27
28 ⁴ Section 8(i)(1) requires public disclosure of “all records concerning the implementation
of programs and activities conducted for the purpose of ensuring the accuracy and currency
of official lists of eligible voters.” 52 U.S.C. § 20507(i)(1).

1 752 F. Supp. 2d 697, 706 (E.D. Va. 2010) (citing Webster’s *Third New International*
2 *Dictionary* 14, 557 (2002)); *see also Long*, 682 F.3d at 335. Maintaining a “current” voter
3 list or roll necessarily implicates review of registration applications. As the Fourth Circuit
4 reasoned, “[b]y registering eligible applicants and rejecting ineligible applicants, state
5 officials ‘ensure that the state is keeping a “most recent” and errorless account of which
6 persons are qualified or entitled to vote within the state.’” *Long*, 682 F.3d at 335 (citing
7 *Long*, 752 F. Supp. 2d at 706). Because evaluating voter registration applications is critical
8 for “ensuring the accuracy and currency of the official lists of eligible voters,” the process
9 of determining whether a voter registration applicant is added to the official voter list falls
10 within Section 8(b)’s plain language. *See Long*, 752 F. Supp. 2d at 705–06.

11 The statutory context further supports that Section 8(b) covers the entire application
12 process, not only removals. Section 8 itself is titled “Requirements with respect to
13 *administration of voter registration*,” 52 U.S.C. § 20507 (emphasis added), and its
14 requirements begin with the obligation to ensure that any applicant who timely submits a
15 valid registration form is registered to vote in an election. *Id.* § 20507(a)(1); *Long*, 752 F.
16 Supp. 2d at 708. Other Section 8 subsection headings and text expressly state that they
17 pertain only to “removal,” demonstrating that Congress was clear when it was referring
18 only to removals. *See* 52 U.S.C. § 20507(c)(2)(A) (subsection entitled “Voter removal
19 programs” specifically refers to programs designed to “systematically *remove* the names
20 of ineligible voters from the official lists of eligible voters”); *id.* § 20507(d) (“Removal of
21 names from voting rolls”). If Congress intended to limit Section 8(b) to “removals,” it
22 certainly could have referred to “removals” in Section 8(b)’s heading or text. *See also*
23 *Long*, 752 F. Supp. 2d at 708–09 (“[W]here Congress wanted to draw specific attention to
24 programs and activities designed to make lists of eligible voters accurate and current
25 through voter removal procedures, it specifically did so.”). This analysis further reflects
26 Section 8(b)’s application to the entire voter registration process.

1 Additionally, the purpose of most of the NVRA’s provisions is to expand
2 opportunities to register to vote. In the NVRA, Congress found that “discriminatory and
3 unfair registration laws can have a direct and damaging effect on voter participation in
4 elections for Federal office and disproportionately harm voter participation by various
5 groups, including racial minorities.” 52 U.S.C. § 20501(a)(3). Two of the NVRA’s
6 specifically enumerated purposes are to “increase the number of eligible citizens who
7 register to vote” and “to make it possible for Federal, State, and local governments to
8 implement this chapter in a manner that enhances the participation of eligible citizens as
9 voters in elections.” 52 U.S.C. § 20501(b)(1) & (2). Some of the key provisions of the
10 statute require states to offer registration opportunities at motor vehicle agencies, (52
11 U.S.C. § 20504), public assistance agencies, (52 U.S.C. § 20506), and accept and use a
12 federal voter registration form, (52 U.S.C. § 20505). *See also Long*, 752 F. Supp. 2d at
13 708–09 (“[E]ach of the substantive provisions in [the NVRA], including [Section 8],
14 discuss methods to promote increased voter registration, with some subsections providing
15 added emphasis on voter registration programs to be conducted by the state.”). This broader
16 context further supports the conclusion that Section 8(b)’s uniformity and
17 nondiscriminatory requirements apply to the entire voter registration process. *See id.*

18 The Court here should hold that Section 8(b) applies to the Challenged Provisions
19 in their entirety because Section 8(b) covers procedures to determine which new registrants
20 will be added to the official list of eligible voters.

21 **B. The Challenged Provisions are neither uniform nor nondiscriminatory**
22 **on their face.**

23 The Moving Defendants concede that Section 8(b) applies to post-registration
24 removal procedures and, therefore, to at least some of the Challenged Provisions. ECF No.
25 364 at 6. Their motion is also premature; as they recognize, “[b]ecause discovery is
26 ongoing, the State takes no position at this time on whether the registration cancellation
27 provisions in the Voting Laws, *as applied*, result in a non-uniform or discriminatory
28

1 program for maintaining accurate registration lists.” *Id.* at 6 n.12 (emphasis in original).
2 Under Rule 56(d), summary judgment on this claim would be improper until discovery is
3 completed. The Moving Defendants fail to explain why this Court should prejudge
4 Plaintiffs’ claims under Section 8(b) based solely on the face of the Challenged Provisions.
5 Because such a premature ruling would not narrow the issues or otherwise advance the
6 case, this Court should decline Defendants’ unusual invitation to do so.

7 Even if this Court were inclined to rule on Defendants’ assertions that the
8 Challenged Provisions are uniform and nondiscriminatory “[a]t least on the[ir] face,” ECF
9 No. 364 at 11—and it should not—Defendants’ arguments have no basis in the statutory
10 text or case law.

11 First, there is no textual basis to support Moving Defendants’ argument that the only
12 type of uniformity Section 8(b) requires is for a law to apply across a whole jurisdiction.
13 52 U.S.C. § 20507(b). “Uniform” means “consistent in conduct or opinion” or “having
14 always the same form, manner, or degree: not varying or variable.”⁵ Nor is there any textual
15 basis to support their argument that “nondiscriminatory”—the plain meaning of which is
16 simply “not discriminatory”—means solely that it does not violate the Voting Rights Act.
17 Defendants provide no basis for importing all of the requirements of the Voting Rights Act
18 into Section 8(b).⁶ Moreover, such a narrow definition would make the term
19 “nondiscriminatory” surplusage because the provision goes on to also specifically require
20 “compliance with the Voting Rights Act.” 52 U.S.C. § 20507(b); *see Dunn v. Commodity*
21 *Futures Trading Comm’n*, 519 U.S. 465, 472 (1997) (“[L]egislative enactments should not
22 be construed to render their provisions mere surplusage.”). And Section 8(b) applies to any
23

24 ⁵ *Merriam-Webster Dictionary*, Definition of Uniform, [https://www.merriam-](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/uniform)
25 [webster.com/dictionary/uniform](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/uniform) (last visited June 1, 2023).

26 ⁶ In any event, LUCHA Plaintiffs allege that these provisions violate the Voting Rights
27 Act. ECF No. 67 ¶¶ 363–71. Defendants have not moved for summary judgment on this
28 claim and, therefore, even under Defendants’ narrow construction of Section 8(b), this
claim is not ripe for summary judgment.

1 “program or activity,” not only to “laws.” Thus, Section 8(b) applies to any program or
2 activity, including implementation of the Challenged Provisions, that is inconsistent in
3 conduct or that is variable or discriminatory. The Challenged Provisions do not apply
4 uniformly across each jurisdiction and instead subject voters to differential and
5 discriminatory treatment even within counties. *See* Controverting Statement of Facts
6 (“CSOF”), ECF No. 389 at 13 ¶¶ 13–16.⁷

7 As Consolidated Plaintiffs allege, by their nature, the Challenged Provisions target
8 naturalized citizens because they require the investigation of registration applicants and
9 registered voters using databases that inevitably contain stale government data showing an
10 individual was not a U.S. citizen at some time in the past, while no database of any kind
11 would indicate a native-born voter previously lacked U.S. citizenship, resulting in
12 differential treatment of naturalized citizens. *See* Second Am. Compl., ECF No. 169 ¶¶ 91–
13 92; *see also id.* ¶¶ 89–94; Sec’y of State Ans. to Second Am. Compl., ECF No. 189 ¶¶ 5,
14 51; CSOF, ECF No. 389 at 13 ¶¶ 13–16; LUCHA Plaintiffs’ Am. Compl., Doc. 67 ¶¶ 100–
15 16, 361; *cf. United States v. Fla.*, 870 F. Supp. 2d 1346, 1350-51 (N.D. Fla. 2012) (state
16 purge program “probably ran afoul of [NVRA section 8(b)]” because its methodology
17 made it likely that newly naturalized citizens were the primary individuals who would have
18 to respond and provide documentation). Defendants do not address these factual allegations
19 about the nature of the databases at issue, and the Court cannot do so either at this stage.
20 Furthermore, the Challenged Provisions also fail to inform Arizona state and local officials
21 as to how they should review and evaluate outdated citizenship status information
22 contained in government databases. As a result, different county recorders and different
23

24 _____
25 ⁷ The Senate Report cited by the Moving Defendants (ECF No. 364 at 6), does not justify
26 their narrow reading of Section 8(b), since the report does not state that it describes the
27 provision’s sole or only impact or intent. In any event, even if the report does support their
28 reading, it cannot override the NVRA’s statutory language. *Hearn v. W. Conf. of Teamsters
Pension Tr. Fund*, 68 F.3d 301, 304 (9th Cir. 1995) (“[L]egislative history—no matter how
clear—can’t override statutory text.”).

1 staff members within a county recorder's office will inevitably apply varying rules,
2 standards, and procedures in comparing voter registration applicants and registered voters
3 to the enumerated databases. *See* Second Am. Compl., ECF No. 189 ¶¶ 91–92. As several
4 Plaintiffs argue, the Challenged Provisions further divide registered voters into two groups:
5 those who are suspected of lacking U.S. citizenship and those who are not. This openly
6 invites county recorders to treat registered voters in a nonuniform and/or discriminatory
7 manner based on their race, ethnicity, national origin, dress, English proficiency, and other
8 impermissible criteria, in violation of Section 8(b). *See id.* ¶ 94. In addition, the DNC
9 Plaintiffs argue that the Challenged Provisions are nonuniform in their treatment of federal-
10 only voters as compared with other Arizona voters by (1) excluding them from voting early
11 and in presidential elections and (2) singling them out for investigation and possible
12 prosecution. *See Democratic Nat'l Comm. v. Fontes*, Case No. 2:22-cv-01369-SRB,
13 Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, ECF No. 1 ¶¶ 73–78.

14 Finally, there are disputed issues of material fact as to whether the Challenged
15 Provisions will cause the nonuniform and discriminatory treatment of voter registration
16 applicants and registered voters and thereby violate Section 8(b). These questions cannot
17 be resolved while discovery is ongoing and depositions have not yet begun. Consistent
18 with this Court's order denying the Moving Defendants' motion to dismiss this necessarily
19 fact-intensive claim under the NVRA, ECF No. 304 at 30, Plaintiffs are entitled to complete
20 discovery and obtain evidence to prove their claims at trial. Plaintiffs are currently awaiting
21 outstanding document and other written discovery, including from state officials. *See, e.g.*,
22 Notices of Service of Discovery, ECF Nos. 366, 372 & 383. In addition, following
23 document discovery, Plaintiffs intend to depose state and county defendants to establish
24 that the Challenged Provisions will cause nonuniform and discriminatory treatment of voter
25 registration applicants and registered voters. Plaintiffs also intend to offer expert testimony
26 that will elucidate the nonuniform and discriminatory nature of the Challenged Provisions.

1 As a result, it would be inappropriate to grant summary judgment on Plaintiffs' Section
2 8(b) claims.

3 For the foregoing reasons, the Moving Defendants' motion for summary judgment
4 as to Section 8(b) of the NVRA must be denied.

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

1 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 5th day of June, 2023.

2
3 /s/ Jon Sherman

4 Jon Sherman
5 Michelle Kanter Cohen
6 Beauregard Patterson
7 Fair Elections Center
8 1825 K St. NW, Ste. 701
9 Washington, D.C. 20006
10 jsherman@fairelectionscenter.org
11 mkantercohen@fairelectionscenter.org
12 bpatterson@fairelectionscenter.org
13 (202) 331-0114

14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
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
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

Jeremy Karpatkin
John A. Freedman
Erica McCabe
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Jeremy.Karpatkin@arnoldporter.com
John.Freedman@arnoldporter.com
Erica.McCabe@arnoldporter.com
(202) 942-5000

Steven L. Mayer
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Steve.Mayer@arnoldporter.com
(415) 471-3100

Leah R. Novak
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
250 West 55th Street
New York, NY 10019
Leah.Novak@arnoldporter.com
(212) 836-8000

Daniel J. Adelman
Arizona Center for Law in the Public Interest
352 E. Camelback Rd., Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85012

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

danny@aclpi.org
(602) 258-8850

Counsel for Poder Latinx and CPLC

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM