1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	D. Andrew Gaona (028414) Austin C. Yost (034602) COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 T: (602) 381-5486 agaona@cblawyers.com ayost@cblawyers.com Abha Khanna* Makeba Rutahindurwa* ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP 1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100 Seattle, Washington 98101 T: (206) 656-0177 akhanna@elias.law mrutahindurwa@elias.law Marilyn Gabriela Robb*	BOCKET COM
12	Elena A. Rodriguez Armenta* ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP 250 Massachusetts Ave NW, Suite 400	OC/K
13		
14	Washington, D.C. 20001 T: (202) 968-4330	
15	mrobb@elias.law erodriguezarmenta@elias.law	
16 17	Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants Arizona Alliance for Retired Americans and Voto Latino	
18	*Pro Hac Vice Application Forthcoming	
19	ARIZONA SUPER	RIOR COURT
20	YAVAPAI COUNTY	
21	ARIZONA FREE ENTERPRISE CLUB, an) No. S1300CV202300872
22	Arizona nonprofit corporation, and MARY KAY RUWETTE, individually, ANSWER IN INTERVENTION TO VERIFIED SPECIAL AC	ANSWER IN INTERVENTION
23) TO VERIFIED SPECIAL ACTION COMPLAINT
24	V.) (Assigned to the Hon. John Napper)
25		
26	ADRIAN FONTES, in his official capacity as the Secretary of State of Arizona,)
27	Defendant.	
28		

ARIZONA ALLIANCE OF RETIRED AMERICANS; and MI FAMILIA VOTA,

Intervenors-Defendants.

Intervenor-Defendants the Arizona Alliance for Retired Americans and Voto Latino (collectively, "Intervenors") answer Plaintiffs' Verified Special Action Complaint ("Verified Complaint") as follows:

- 1. Paragraph 1 contains a legal contention to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 2. Paragraph 2 contains a legal contention to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that Arizona requires early voting options in every election and that election officials must mail a ballot to every voter on an active early voting list, but otherwise deny the aliegations in Paragraph 2 of the Verified Complaint.
- 3. Paragraph 3 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 4. Paragraph 4 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 5. Paragraph 5 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the cited statutory provision states that completed early ballots shall be "delivered or mailed to the county recorder or other officer in charge of elections of the political subdivision in which the elector is registered or deposited by the voter or the voter's agent at any polling place in the county." Intervenors also admit that printed instructions to early voters are to include the following statement: "In order to be valid and counted, the ballot and affidavit must be delivered to the office of the county recorder or other officer in charge of elections or may be deposited at any polling place in the county no later than 7:00 p.m. on election day." Intervenors deny that Arizona law allows for drop boxes only at polling places.

1 6. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the 2 truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Verified Complaint and therefore 3 deny them. 4 7. Intervenors admit that the Secretary of State has not repudiated the 2019 5 Elections Procedures Manual's ("EPM") drop box policies. Paragraph 7 of the Verified 6 Complaint otherwise states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the 7 extent a response is required, the allegations are denied. 8 8. Admitted. 9 9. Paragraph 9 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no 10 response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied. 11 10. Denied. 12 11. Denied. Denied. 13 12. **JURISDICTION** 14 15 13. Intervenors admit that the Court has jurisdiction under Article 6, § 14 of the 16 Arizona Constitution, but denies that jurisdiction is conferred by A.R.S. § 12-1831 or -2021, 17 or Rule 4 of the Arizona Rules of Procedure for Special Actions. 18 14. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the 19 truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 14 of the Verified Complaint and therefore 20 deny them. 21 **PARTIES** 22 15. Intervenors admit that Plaintiff Arizona Free Enterprise Club is an Arizona 23 nonprofit corporation organized and operated pursuant to section 501(c)(4) of the Internal 24 Revenue Code. Intervenors otherwise lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a 25 belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 15 of the Verified Complaint 26 and therefore deny them. 27

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

16. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 16 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.

17. Admitted.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- 18. Intervenors admit that the majority of qualified electors who participate in Arizona elections vote via the State's early voting system. The remainder of Paragraph 13 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited case but otherwise deny the allegations.
- 19. Paragraph 19 contains a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited case but otherwise deny the allegations.
- 20. Paragraph 20 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are admitted.
- 21. Paragraph 21 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 22. Paragraph 22 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 23. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 23 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 24. Intervenors admit that the Commission on Federal Election Reform, led by President Jimmy Carter and former Secretary of State James Baker, was formed in 2004 and issued a report in 2005 titled "Building Confidence in U.S. Elections." Intervenors otherwise lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 24 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.

- 25. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 25 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 26. Intervenors admit that A.R.S. § 16-548(A) authorizes "the voter or the voter's agent" to deposit a ballot at a polling place. Paragraph 26 of the Verified Complaint otherwise states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 27. Paragraph 27 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 28. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief about the Legislature's reasons for enacting A.R.S. § 16-547(A). Paragraph 28 of the Verified Complaint otherwise states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 29. Paragraph 29 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears without emphasis in the cited statutes but otherwise deny the allegations..
- 30. Intervenors admit that the Secretary has issued rules for drop boxes through the EPM, and that the EPM instructs County Recorders or other elections officers to "develop and implement secure ballot retrieval and chain of custody procedures." Intervenors deny the remaining allegations.
- 31. Paragraph 31 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the EPM has the force of law and is punishable as a class two misdemeanor but deny the remaining allegations.
- 32. Paragraph 32 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited cases.

-5-

33. Intervenors admit that the most recent EPM approved by the Secretary of State, the Governor, and the Attorney General was published in December 2019 and remains in effect, that the 2021 EPM did not take effect, and that the Governor and Attorney General have not yet approved the 2023 EPM. Intervenors further admit that the 2023 and 2019 EPMs contain substantially similar drop box provisions but deny the characterization that changes to the 2019 EPM's provisions are "few," "minor," or "largely cosmetic." Paragraph 33 of the Verified Complaint otherwise states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegation is denied.

- 34. Denied
- 35. Denied.
- 36. Intervenors admit that the EPM regulates unstaffed drop boxes and allows them to be placed outdoors. Intervenors deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 36.
- 37. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 37 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 38. Paragraph 38 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 39. Paragraph 39 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 40. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegation in Paragraph 40 of the Verified Complaint about USPS mail collection boxes and therefore deny it. Intervenors admit that the EPM requires all drop boxes to be "secured by a lock and/or sealable with a tamper-evident seal."
- 41. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 41 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 42. Paragraph 42 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

- 43. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 43 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 44. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 44 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 45. Intervenors admit that during the 2022 election, an Arizona court entered a restraining order against armed observers who intimidated Arizonans seeking to vote via drop box. Intervenors deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 45.
- 46. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 46 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 47. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 47 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 48. Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 48 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 49. Intervenors deny that the EPM suggests that election officials install drop boxes in the vicinity of a government building. Rather, the EPM requires that drop boxes are "located in a secure location, such as inside or in front of a federal, state, local, or tribal government building." Intervenors otherwise lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 49 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 50. Paragraph 50 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 51. Intervenors admit that the EPM does not dictate the numbers or geographic distribution of unstaffed drop-boxes that a county may or must provide, and that counties

13

14 15

17 18

19

20

16

21 22

23

25

26

24

27 28

and municipalities may decide how many drop boxes to establish, if any. To the extent Paragraph 51 alleges that the EPM lacks the authority to regulate drop boxes, that allegation is denied. Intervenors otherwise lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 51 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.

- 52. Intervenors admit that the EPM does not regulate the apportionment of drop boxes based on county population or geography. Intervenors otherwise lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 51 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them. -SRACTDOCKET, COM
 - 53. Denied.
 - 54. Denied.
 - 55. Admitted.
 - 56. Denied.
 - 57. Denied.
- Intervenors lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the 58. truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 58 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- Intervenors deny that Arizona's unstaffed drop boxes lack a statutory basis. 59. Intervenors otherwise lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 59 of the Verified Complaint and therefore deny them.
- 60. Paragraph 60 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the Wisconsin Supreme Court held that Wisconsin drop boxes were illegal under Wisconsin state law.
- 61. Paragraph 61 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited case but deny that the cited statute remains law in Wisconsin,

as a Wisconsin court has held that the statutory provision quoted in Paragraph 61 of the Verified Complaint is preempted by the Voting Rights Act. *Carey v. Wisconsin Elections Comm'n*, 624 F. Supp. 3d 1020, 1032 (W.D. Wis. 2022).

- 62. Paragraph 62 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.
- 63. Paragraph 63 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited case, though with different punctuation and capitalization.
- 64. Paragraph 64 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited case, but at ¶ 61 of the opinion. To the extent Paragraph 64 alleges that the cited statute remains law in Wisconsin, that allegation is denied.
- 65. Paragraph 65 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited case but deny that details of Arizona's drop box scheme are in memos prepared by WEC [Wisconsin Elections Commission] staff, or that Arizona's use of drop boxes lack statutory support.
- 66. Paragraph 66 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited case.
 - 67. Denied.

COUNT I

- 68. Intervenors incorporate by reference each of their preceding admissions, denials, and statements as if fully set forth in this paragraph.
- 69. Paragraph 69 of the Verified Complaint states a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Intervenors admit that the quoted language appears in the cited statute.

1	GENERAL DENIAL	
2	85. Intervenors deny every allegation in the Verified Complaint that is no	
3	expressly admitted herein.	
4		
5	86. Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part for failure to state a claim	
6		
7	upon which relief can be granted. 87 Plaintiffe' claims are berred because Plaintiffe look standing	
,	87. Plaintiffs' claims are barred because Plaintiffs lack standing.	
8	88. Plaintiffs' claims are barred by laches.	
9	89. Intervenors reserve the right to assert additional affirmative defense	
10	including, but not limited to, those set forth in Rule 8(d) of the Arizona Rules of Civil	
11	Procedure, as additional facts are discovered.	
12	OC/L	
13	WHEREFORE, having fully answered Plaintiffs' Verified Complaint, Intervenors	
14	pray for judgment as follows:	
15	A. That the Court dismiss Plaintiffs' Verified Complaint;	
16	B. That judgment be entered in favor of Intervenors and against Plaintiffs of	
17	Plaintiffs' Verified Complaint and that Plaintiffs take nothing thereby;	
18	C. That Intervenors be awarded reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and	
19	D. For such other and further relief as the Court, in its inherent discretion, deem	
20	appropriate.	
21	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17th day of November, 2023.	
22	COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC	
23	By: <u>/s/ D. Andrew Gaona</u>	
24	D. Andrew Gaona Austin C. Yost	
25		
26	ELIAS LAW GROUP, LLP	
27	Abha Khanna* Makeba Rutahindurwa*	
28	Marilyn Gabriela Robb* Elena A. Rodriguez Armenta*	
l	Erena in regargas i maena	

1	
2	Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants Arizona Alliance for Retired Americans and Voto Latino
3	* Application Pro Hac Vice Forthcoming
4	ORIGINAL e-filed and served via electronic
5	means this 17th day of November, 2023, upon:
6	Honorable John D. Napper Yavapai County Superior Court c/o Felicia L. Slaton
7	c/o Felicia L. Slaton Div2@courts.az.gov
8	
9	Timothy A. La Sota tim@timlasota.com
10	Timothy A. La Sota, PLC 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Thomas G. Olp tolp@thomasmoresociety.org Thoms More Society 309 West Washington Street, Suite 1250 Chicago, Illinois 60606 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Kara Karlson Kara.Karlson@azag.gov
11	Phoenix, Arizona 85016
12	Thomas G. Olp tolp@thomasmoresociety.org
13	Thoms More Society 309 West Washington Street, Suite 1250
14	Chicago, Illinois 60606
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Very Verlager
16	Kara Karlson <u>Kara.Karlson@azag.gov</u>
17	Karen J. Hartman-Tellez Karen.Hartman@azag,gov
18	Kyle Cummings
19	Kyle.Cummings@azag.gov Arizona Attorney General
20	2005 North Central Avenue
21	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1592 Attorneys for Defendant Arizona Secretary
22	of State Adrian Fontes
23	/s/ Diana J. Hanson
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	