1	FLAGSTAFF LAW GROUP Rose Winkeler State Bar No. 025023 702 N. Beaver St. Flagstaff, Arizona 86001	
2		
3		
4	Telephone: (928) 233-6800 Email: rose@flaglawgroup.com Attorney for Defendant Coconino County	
5	Recorder Patty Hansen	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8		
9	Arizona Asian American Native Hawaiian And Pacific Islander for Equity	NO. CV-22-01381-PHX-SRB
10	Coalition;	
11	Plaintiff,	DEFENDANT COCONINO COUNTY
12	VS.	RECORDER'S ANSWER TO THE COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY
13	Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
14	Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,	
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	i difference de la constant de la co	
18	The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8 and 12 require that a Defendant Coconino	
19	County Recorder Patty Hansen timely serve a responsive pleading, and when the	
20	pleading is an Answer, to respond to allegations made. As set forth in their Answer	
21	below, Defendant Coconino County Recorder Patty Hansen (hereinafter "Defendant	
2223		
24	Hansen"), in her official capacity, affirmatively states that she is a nominal party to this	
25	litigation and her inclusion in this action is nominal only. Defendant Hansen takes no	
26	position with regard to the constitutionality of Senate Bill 2492 and Senate Bill 2243.	
27	Defendant Hansen will comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and orders of	
28	the Court entered relative to this case.	

Defendant Hansen, in her official capacity as the Coconino County Recorder, hereby answers Plaintiff's Complaint as follows:

INTRODUCTION

- To the extent that Defendant Hansen is knowledgeable of Proposition 200
 requiring voter identification and the legal decisions resolving challenges to the
 Proposition and the State of Arizona's implementation of a bifurcated voter
 registration system, she does not dispute the history as set forth in Paragraphs 1–4
 of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 2. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 5 and admits that the State of Arizona adopted House Bill 2492 during its most recent legislative session, but states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations in Paragraph 5.
- 3. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 6 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein or that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 4. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 7 and 8 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 5. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 9 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein or that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

- 6. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 10 and admits that the State of Arizona adopted House Bill 2492 during its most recent legislative session, and that Governor Ducey vetoed HB 2617, but states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations in Paragraph 10.
- 7. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 11 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein or that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 8. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 12 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits that HB 2243 requires a County Recorder to cancel a registration when they "confirm that a person registered is not a United States Citizen" within 35 days' notice and that the County Recorder must also notify the County Attorney and Attorney General for possible investigation if the person does not provide "satisfactory evidence of United States Citizenship," but states that the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 12 are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 9. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 13 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations contained therein are moot as the parties have stipulated to and this Court has issued an order prohibiting the Defendants from implementing these provisions of HB 2243 before January 1, 2023.
- 10. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 14 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits that
 HB 2243 requires a County Recorder to place a voter in inactive status if that
 person has been issued a driver license or the equivalent in another state and does

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

27

26

28

not return a form confirming that they are a resident of Arizona, but states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained therein.

- 11. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 15 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 12. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 16 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits that HB 2617 provided for a 90-day response time for voters appearing to not be Arizona residents and voters believed to not be U.S. Citizens, and that Governor Ducey vetoed HB 2617, but states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained therein.
- 13. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 17 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits that HB 2243 requires voters believed to not be US Citizens to show proof of citizenship, requires cancellation of their registration if they do not show such proof, and requires notification of the County Attorney and Attorney General for possible investigation, but states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of any remaining allegations contained therein.
- 14. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 18 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.

- 15. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 19–20 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations contained therein are moot as the parties have stipulated to and this Court has issued an order prohibiting the Defendants from implementing these provisions of HB 2243 before January 1, 2023.
- 16. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 21 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required. Nonetheless, she also states that she expressed concerns similar to those alleged by Plaintiff in a letter to Governor Ducey on March 24, 2022, asking that he veto HB 2492 and that she believed the mandates of the legislation placed her in the untenable position of violating the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 and *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona*, 570 U.S. 1 (2013).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

17. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 22–29 and admits that Plaintiffs have filed suit pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, but otherwise reiterates that she is a nominal party to the matter and is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to whether Plaintiffs are entitled to any relief under the statute.

PARTIES

- 18. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 30–33 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 19. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 34–36 and admits the allegations contained therein.

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26

27

28

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 20. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 37 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein and otherwise are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 21. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 38–39 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 22. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 40–47 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits the details of the history of Proposition 200 as described therein.
- 23. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 48–56 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein. Nonetheless, Defendant Hansen states that she objected to HB 2492 by letter to Governor Ducey on March 24, 2022, expressing her concern that the legislation conflicted with federal law and would create significant barriers for Arizonans trying to vote.
- 24. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 57 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 25. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 58 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits that Governor Ducey vetoed HB 2617, but further states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.

26	6. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 59 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that
	she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth
	of the allegations contained therein.

- 27. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 60 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits that the response periods provided in HB 2617 and HB 2243 differ as described therein, but further states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 28. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 61 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 29. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 62 of Plaintiff's Complaint and admits that Section 4 of HB 2492 amends A.R.S. § 16-121.01(A) as described therein.
- 30. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 63 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 31. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 64–71 and admits that Arizona law and HB 2492 include the language as described therein.
- 32. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 72 and admits the allegations contained therein.
- 33. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 73 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 34. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 74–76 and admits that Arizona law and HB 2492 include the language as described therein.

- 35. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 77–78 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 36. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 79 and admits that HB 2492 includes the language as described therein.
- 37. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 80 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.
- 38. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 81 and admits that HB 2492 adds A.R.S. 16-127 to State law which states that a registered voter who has not provided satisfactory evidence of citizenship is neither eligible to vote in presidential elections nor receive an early ballot. Defendant Hansen further admits that the provision does not include a requirement that the registered voter be notified of such ineligibility.
- 39. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 82 and admits that HB 2492 includes the language as described therein.
- 40. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 83 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 41. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 84–85 and admits that HB 2243 includes the language as described therein.
- 42. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 86 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that the allegations therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 43. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 87 and admits that HB 2492 requires

 Arizonans to provide their place of birth to complete their voter registration form,

but states that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations contained therein.

- 44. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 88–89 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein or that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 45. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 90–99 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein or that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.
- 46. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 100 and realleges and incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs of her Answer, as if fully set forth herein.
- 47. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 101-112 of Plaintiff's Complaint by stating that she is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations contained therein.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Undue Burden on the Right to Vote in Violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the U.S. Constitution)

48. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 113 and realleges and incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs of her Answer, as if fully set forth herein.

49. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 114–118 of Plaintiff's Complaint by that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- (Arbitrary and Disparate Treatment of Voter Registration Applicants Using the State Form in Violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.)
 - 50. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 119 and realleges and incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs of her Answer, as if fully set forth herein.
 - 51. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 120–124 of Plaintiff's Complaint by that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

- (National Origin Discrimination in Violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution)
 - 52. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 125 and realleges and incorporates by reference all prior paragraphs of her Answer, as if fully set forth herein.
 - 53. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 126–133 of Plaintiff's Complaint by that the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is required.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF 1 (Violation of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993) 2 60. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraph 156 and realleges and incorporates by 3 reference all prior paragraphs of her Answer, as if fully set forth herein. 4 61. Defendant Hansen Answers Paragraphs 157–174 of Plaintiff's Complaint by that 5 6 the allegations contained therein are legal conclusions to which no response is 7 required. 8 9 PRAYER FOR RELIEF 10 11 WHEREFORE, having fully responded to Plaintiff's Complaint, Defendant 12 Hansen respectfully requests: 13 1. That this Court designate Defendant Hansen as a nominal party and to deny 14 Plaintiff any award of costs or attorneys fees as against Defendant Hansen; 15 16 2. Defendant Hansen reiterates that she takes no position in regard to the merits 17 of the Complaint and will abide by whatever relief the Court may grant and 18 whatever order or judgment the Court may enter. 19 20 21 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 16th day of September, 2022. 22 23 FLAGSTAFF LAW GROUP 24 BY: /s/Rose M. Winkeler 25 ROSE M. WINKELER 26 Attorney for the Defendant Coconino County Recorder Patty Hansen 27 28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that on September 16, 2022, I electronically transmitted the foregoing document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF registrants on record. /s/Rose M. Winkeler RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACY DOCKET, COM