

1 Daniel C. Barr (#010149)
Paul F. Eckstein (#001822)
2 Alexis E. Danneman (#030478)
Austin C. Yost (#034602)
3 Samantha J. Burke (#036064)
PERKINS COIE LLP
4 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788
5 Telephone: 602.351.8000
Facsimile: 602.648.7000
6 DBarr@perkinscoie.com
PEckstein@perkinscoie.com
7 ADanneman@perkinscoie.com
AYost@perkinscoie.com
8 SBurke@perkinscoie.com
DocketPHX@perkinscoie.com

9 *Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes*

10 ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT

11 MOHAVE COUNTY

12 TED BOYD, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs/Contestants,

14 v.

15 KRIS MAYES,

16 Defendant/Contestee,

17 and

18 KATIE HOBBS, et al.,

19 Defendants.
20

No. S8015CV202201468

**DEFENDANT KRIS MAYES' NOTICE
OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY**

(Assigned to the Hon. Lee F. Jantzen)

1 Defendant Kris Mayes submits this notice of supplemental authority in support of her
2 motion to dismiss and reply.

3 On December 16, after Ms. Mayes submitted her reply in support of her motion to dismiss,
4 Maricopa County Judge Melissa Julian issued a detailed ruling dismissing—in full and with
5 prejudice—an election contest brought by Mark Finchem, former nominee in the 2022 general
6 election for Arizona Secretary of State. [See Exhibit A, 12/16/2022 Under Advisement Ruling]
7 Judge Julian’s ruling bears directly on several issues in the present election contest—issues that
8 will be considered by this Court in deciding Mayes’ motion to dismiss.

9 **First**, in reaffirming and applying long-standing Arizona pleading standards, Judge Julian
10 properly found that a statement of election contest—like any other complaint—must rest on
11 allegations of *fact*, not “legal conclusions masquerading as alleged facts.” [Ex. A at 9] When
12 evaluating the sufficiency of an election contest complaint, “[t]he Court will not . . . speculate
13 about hypothetical facts that might entitle the plaintiff to relief.” [*Id.* at 4 (quoting *Cullen v. Auto-*
14 *Owners Ins. Co.*, 218 Ariz. 417, 420, ¶ 14 (2008))] “Nor will the Court ‘accept as true allegations
15 consisting of conclusions of law, inferences or deductions that are not necessarily implied by
16 well-pleaded facts, unreasonable inferences or unsupported conclusions from such facts, or legal
17 conclusions alleged as facts.’” [*Id.* (quoting *Jeter v. Mayo Clinic Ariz.*, 211 Ariz. 386, 389, ¶ 4
18 (App. 2005))] As set forth in detail in Mayes’ motion to dismiss and supporting reply, Plaintiffs’
19 complaint here is devoid of any facts necessary to survive beyond the pleading stages, resting
20 instead entirely on speculation, hypotheticals, and unsupported conclusions. The complaint
21 should be dismissed in full and with prejudice.

22 **Second**, again applying well-established Arizona law, the court held Mr. Finchem’s claim
23 that the voting machines used on election day were not properly certified was barred by the
24 doctrine of laches. [*Id.* at 4-6] The voting machine challenge, the court found, constituted a

1 “procedural challenge” because it involves “the manner in which an election is held.” [*Id.* at 5
2 (quoting *Sherman v. City of Tempe*, 202 Ariz. 339, 342, ¶ 10 (2002))] And a “procedural
3 challenge to an election filed *after* the election has taken place is particularly vulnerable” to
4 laches because of the heightened prejudice to voters and the public that a post-election challenge
5 poses. [*Id.* (emphasis added)] That prejudice, combined with the fact that Mr. Finchem could
6 have brought his certification challenge “anytime” over the last few years but waited to do so
7 until after he lost the election, warranted application of laches and dismissal of prejudice.

8 The same is true here for Plaintiffs’ procedural challenge to the method by which election
9 officials verify signatures on early ballots (Count V of Plaintiffs’ complaint). That method has
10 been part of the Elections Procedure Manual since 2019. Plaintiffs’ delay in waiting to challenge
11 it until after Mr. Hamadeh lost the election is unreasonable and would work an immeasurable
12 prejudice on the public and Ms. Mayes. The Court should reach the same result as Judge Julian
13 and hold Count V is barred by laches.

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM

1 Dated: December 18, 2022

PERKINS COIE LLP

2
3 By: *s/ Daniel C. Barr*

4 Daniel C. Barr
5 Paul F. Eckstein
6 Alexis E. Danneman
7 Austin C. Yost
8 Samantha J. Burke
9 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000
10 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788

Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes

11 Original efiled with the Mohave County Superior
12 Court and served on the following parties through
13 AZTurboCourt on this 18th day of December 2022:

14 David A. Warrington
15 Gary Lawkowski
16 DHILLON LAW GROUP, INC.
17 2121 E. Eisenhower Ave., Ste. 608
18 Alexandria, VA 22314
19 DWarrington@dhillonlaw.com
20 GLawkowski@dhillonlaw.com

21 Timothy A. La Sota
22 TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC
23 21 E. Camelback Rd., Ste. 305
24 Phoenix, AZ 85016
tim@timlasota.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants

D. Andrew Gaona
Coppersmith Brockelman PLC
2800 N. Central Ave., Ste. 1900
Phoenix, AZ, 85004
agaona@cblawyers.com

1 Sambo (Bo) Dul
2 State United Democracy Center
3 8205 S. Priest Dr., #10312
4 Tempe, AZ 95284
5 bo@stateuniteddemocracy.org

6 *Attorneys for Defendant Arizona Secretary*
7 *of State Katie Hobbs*

8 Thomas P. Liddy
9 Joseph La Rue
10 Joe Branco
11 Karen Hartman-Tellez
12 Jack L. O'Connor III
13 Sean M. Moore
14 Rosa Aguilar
15 Maricopa County Attorney's Office
16 225 West Madison St.
17 Phoenix, AZ 85003
18 liddyt@mcao.maricopa.gov
19 laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov
20 brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov
21 hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov
22 oconnorj@mcao.maricopa.gov
23 moores@mcao.maricopa.gov
24 raguilar@mcao.maricopa.gov
c-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov

Emily Craiger
THE BURGESS LAW GROUP
3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224
Phoenix, AZ 85016
emily@theburgesslawgroup.com

Attorneys for Maricopa County

Celeste Robertson
Joseph Young
Apache County Attorney's Office
245 West 1st South
St. Johns, AZ 85936
crobertson@apachelaw.net

1 jyoung@apachelaw.net

2 *Attorneys for Defendants Larry Noble, Apache*
3 *County Recorder, and Apache County Board of*
4 *Supervisors*

4 Christine J. Roberts
5 Paul Correa
6 Cochise County Attorney's Office
7 P.O. Drawer CA
8 Bisbee, AZ 85603
9 croberts@cochise.az.gov
10 pcorrea@cochise.az.gov

11 *Attorneys for Defendants David W. Stevens,*
12 *Cochise County Recorder, and Cochise County*
13 *Board of Supervisors*

14 Bill Ring
15 Coconino County Attorney's Office
16 110 East Cherry Avenue
17 Flagstaff, AZ 86001
18 wring@coconino.az.gov

19 *Attorney for Defendants Patty Hansen, Coconino*
20 *County Recorder, and Coconino County Board of*
21 *Supervisors*

22 Jeff Dalton
23 Gila County Attorney's Office
24 1400 East Ash Street
25 Globe, AZ 85501
26 jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov

27 *Attorney for Defendants Sadie Jo Bingham, Gila*
28 *County Recorder, and Gila County Board of*
29 *Supervisors*

30 Jean Roof
31 Graham County Attorney's Office
32 800 West Main Street
33 Safford, AZ 85546

1 jroof@graham.az.gov

2 *Attorneys for Defendants Wendy John, Graham*
3 *County Recorder, and Graham County Board of*
4 *Supervisors*

4 Rob Gilliland
5 Greenlee County Attorney's Office
6 P.O. Box 1717
7 Clifton, AZ 85533
8 rgilliland@greenlee.az.gov

7 *Attorney for Defendants Sharie Milheiro,*
8 *Greenlee County Recorder, and Greenlee County*
9 *Board of Supervisors*

9 Ryan N. Dooley
10 La Paz County Attorney's Office
11 1320 Kofa Avenue
12 Parker, AZ 85344
13 rdooley@lapazcountyaz.org

13 *Attorney for Defendants Richard Garcia, La Paz*
14 *County Recorder, and La Paz County Board of*
15 *Supervisors*

15 Ryan Esplin
16 Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division
17 P.O. Box 7000
18 Kingman, AZ 86402-7000
19 EspliR@mohave.gov

18 *Attorney for Defendants Kristi Blair, Mohave*
19 *County Recorder, and Mohave County Board of*
20 *Supervisors*

20 Jason Moore
21 Navajo County Attorney's Office
22 P.O. Box 668
23 Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668
24 jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov

1 *Attorney for Defendants Michael Sample, Navajo*
2 *County Recorder, and Navajo County Board of*
3 *Supervisors*

3 Daniel Jurkowitz
4 Ellen Brown
4 Javier Gherna
5 Pima County Attorney's Office
5 32 N. Stone #2100
6 Tucson, AZ 85701
6 Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov
7 Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov
7 Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov
8

9 *Attorney for Defendants Gabriella Cázares-*
10 *Kelley, Pima County Recorder, and Pima County*
11 *Board of Supervisors*

11 Craig Cameron
11 Scott Johnson
12 Allen Quist
12 Jim Mitchell
13 Pinal County Attorney's Office
13 30 North Florence Street
14 Florence, AZ 85132
14 craig.cameron@pinal.gov
15 scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov
15 allen.quist@pinal.gov
16 james.mitchell@pinal.gov
17

17 *Attorneys for Defendants Dana Lewis, Pinal*
18 *County Recorder, and Pinal County Board of*
19 *Supervisors*

19 Kimberly Hunley
20 Laura Roubicek
20 Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office
21 2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201
21 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090
22 khunley@santacruzcountyaz.gov
23 lroubicek@santacruzcountyaz.gov
24

1 *Attorneys for Defendants Suzanne Sainz, Santa*
2 *Cruz County Recorder, and Santa Cruz County*
3 *Board of Supervisors*

3 Colleen Connor
4 Thomas Stoxen
4 Yavapai County Attorney's Office
5 255 East Gurley Street, 3rd Floor
5 Prescott, AZ 86301
6 Colleen.Connor@yavapaiaz.gov
6 Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov

7 *Attorney for Defendants Michelle M. Burchill,*
8 *Yavapai County Recorder, and Yavapai County*
9 *Board of Supervisors*

10 Bill Kerekes
10 Yuma County Attorney's Office
11 198 South Main Street
11 Yuma, AZ 85364
12 bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov

13 *Attorney for Defendants Richard Colwell, Yuma*
14 *County Recorder, and Yuma County Board of*
15 *Supervisors*

16 *s/ Indy Fitzgerald*
17 _____
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM