

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA
HAMMOND DIVISION

CITY OF HAMMOND, et al.,)
)
 Plaintiffs,) CASE NO. 2:21-cv-00160-PPS-JEM
)
 vs.)
)
 LAKE COUNTY JUDICIAL)
 NOMINATING COMMISSION, et al.,)
)
 Defendants.)

PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO STATE DEFENDANTS' STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS

Plaintiffs, City of Hammond, Thomas McDermott, in his official and personal capacities, Eduardo Fontanez, and Lonnie Randolph, by counsel and pursuant to Local Rule 56-1(b)(2), respectfully file their Response to the Statement of Material Facts filed by the Defendants State of Indiana and the Indiana Secretary of State Diego Morales (collectively, the "State"):

1. Hammond is an Indiana municipality and governmental organization located in Lake County, Indiana. [ECF 58, ¶ 1].
 1. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.
 2. Thomas McDermott is the mayor of Hammond, Indiana and is an attorney that resides in Lake County, Indiana. [*Id.*, ¶ 5]. He is also a registered voter. [*Id.*].
 2. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.
 3. Lonnie Randolph is an Indiana State Senator from Lake County, an attorney, and a registered voter. [*Id.*, ¶ 6].
 3. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

4. Eduardo Fontanez is a registered voter and an attorney that resides in Lake County, Indiana. [*Id.*, ¶ 7-8].

4. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

5. For over a century, judges at all levels in Indiana were selected through partisan elections. [Exhibit 1 (“Bonnet Aff.”) at ¶ 4; *see also Spencer v. Knight*, 98 N.E. 342, 345 (Ind. 1912) (discussing that judicial elections be held at the time of general elections); *see also Beal v. Ray*, 17 Ind. 554 (Ind. 1861) (discussing the legality of a judicial election in 1861)].

5. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

6. This system led to criticism regarding impartiality, judicial independence, and the continued ability to select high quality trial judges. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 4.

6. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

7. Indiana has a compelling interest in protecting the public’s confidence in its representative government officials, including judges, and does not require the State to wait until actual instances of fraud, undue influence, bribery, malfeasance, or breach of public trust have occurred. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 5.

7. This is a legal conclusion, not a statement of material fact. Although there is a citation to evidence, namely the Bonnet Affidavit’s paragraph 5, that affidavit paragraph contains the same language as above and is also an impermissible legal conclusion. *See Paniaguas v. Aldon Companies, Inc.*, No. 2:04-CV-468-PRC, 2006 WL 2568210, *4-*5 (N.D. Ind. Sept. 5, 2006). “Compelling interest” is indisputably a legal term of art, and asserting that the government possesses a “compelling interest” is a legal conclusion to be drawn by a court—it is not an admissible statement of material fact that can support summary judgment. *See id.*; *cf. Nat’l Cap. Presbytery v. Mayorkas*,

567 F.Supp.3d 230, 240 (D.C. 2021) (explaining that a “compelling interest” inquiry is a “question[] of law”). Plaintiffs have fully responded to the State’s legal arguments within Plaintiffs’ response brief.

8. To address these concerns and further the state’s interest in protecting public confidence in government officials, Indiana’s 1965 General Assembly passed an act establishing the Judicial Study Commission (“the Commission”). Bonnet Aff. ¶ 6.

8. The Bonnet Affidavit states that Bonnet has worked for the Secretary of State since 2005. Public records subject to judicial notice reflect that he first became an attorney in 2007. <https://courtaapps.in.gov/rollofattorneys/attorney/e7659a99-14b7-e011-9d34-02215e942453?LastName=Bonnet&OrderBy=0&Page=1>. The Bonnet Affidavit does not aver that Bonnet was a member of the General Assembly in 1965. Even if he had been, he would lack personal knowledge of what motivated the entire body to act. Plaintiffs object to Paragraph 8 because Bonnet has not averred facts that would support that he has personal knowledge of the facts he avers to. Evid. R. 602.

9. The Commission was tasked with evaluating Indiana’s then judicial selection process through partisan political elections and to consider selection alternatives, as part of Indiana’s judicial reform movement. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 7 citing Edward W. Najam, Jr., *Merit Selection in Indiana: The Foundation for a Fair and Impartial Judiciary*, 46 IND. L. REV. 15 (2013); *see also* 1965 Ind. Acts 77; and *McCullough v. State*, 900 N.E.2d 745, 749 (Ind. 2009).

9. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

10. As part of the evaluation, the JNC sent questionnaires to Indiana attorneys and judges.

Bonnet Aff. ¶ 8 citing Najam at 19.

10. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

11. The results of the questionnaire survey showed that 79% of Indiana attorneys believed the partisan election system “could not continue to provide...highly qualified trial judges,” and 87% of Indiana attorneys believed politics influenced judicial selection to varying degrees. *Id.* at ¶ 9 citing Najam at 19.

11. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

12. The JNC study findings and recommendations ultimately led to the General Assembly’s initiation of the constitutional amendment process, which included revisions adopting merit selection for the Indiana Supreme Court judges and Indiana Court of Appeals judges under a revised Article 7 of the Indiana Constitution. *Id.* at ¶ 10, citing John G. Baker, *The History of the Indiana Trial Court System and Attempts at Renovation*, 30 IND. L. REV. 233, 258 (1997); *see also McCullough*, 900 N.E.2d at 749; *see also* Ind. Const. Art. 7 § 9.

12. The Bonnet Affidavit states that Bonnet has worked for the Secretary of State since 2005. Public records subject to judicial notice reflect that he first became an attorney in 2007. <https://courttapps.in.gov/rollofattorneys/attorney/c7659a99-14b7-e011-9d34-02215e942453?LastName=Bonnet&OrderBy=0&Page=1>. The Bonnet Affidavit does not aver that Bonnet was a member of the General Assembly at the time it initiated the constitutional amendment process. Even if he had been, he would lack personal knowledge of what motivated the entire body to act. Plaintiffs object to Paragraph 12 because Bonnet has not averred to facts that would support he has personal knowledge of the facts he avers to. Evid. R. 602..

13. Although merit selection was not adopted for Indiana trial court judges at that time, the General Assembly later adopted merit selection for counties in major Indiana metropolitan

areas with the second through fifth largest cities, being the counties of Lake, St. Joseph, Allen, and Vanderburgh. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 11.

13. Plaintiffs do not dispute that the General Assembly imposed a nomination-followed-by-retention-voting scheme on Lake, St. Joseph, Allen, and Vanderburgh counties during that time period; however, the Plaintiffs clarify that all circuit court judges, in every Indiana county, are elected. (*See* Dkt. 85 at 8-9 (explaining trial-court judge selection across Indiana)). Defendants' statement generally referring to "trial court judges" is confusing, as it does not recognize that in Lake, St. Joseph, Allen, and Vanderburgh counties, circuit court judges have always been elected.

14. Indiana now has a mixed system of merit selection and nonpartisan election to select trial court judges, and each county has its own statute governing its judicial selection process. [Ind. Code § 33-33, *et seq.*].

14. Plaintiffs dispute this. First, this is not a fact but is an interpretation of Indiana statutes. Second, counties do not have statutes governing judicial selection. Rather, the Indiana Legislature has generally used the boundaries of counties to define judicial circuits. Ind. Code Art. 33-33. The Legislature then established different voting procedures in different judicial circuits. *See id.* . Third, in Indiana, nearly all superior court judges are elected in **partisan** elections. *See* Ind. Code Art. 33-33; see also Indiana Judicial Branch, How Judges Are Selected in Indiana, found at <https://www.in.gov/courts/selection/>. The exceptions are the retention-vote counties (where voters get only a retention vote—Lake, Marion, and St. Joseph) and Allen County, which has nonpartisan elections for its superior court judges, Ind. Code § 33-

33-2-9. Thus, the Defendants incorrectly omit “partisan elections” from their Statement 14.

15. In 1972, Senate Enrolled Act 22 directed the JNC to conduct a study specific to Lake County’s court system and to report its findings during the 1973 legislative session. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 12 citing Institute for Court Management (“ICM”), *Report: A Program for the Improved Administration of Justice in Lake County* at 1 (1972); see also 1972 SEA 22.

15. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

16. The Commission contracted the Institute for Court Management (“ICM”) to perform the study. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 13. The majority of Lake County attorneys and judges ICM interviewed were dissatisfied with partisan election of judges in Lake County, which ICM found contributed to an attorney-managed administration of justice, unequal caseloads among Lake County judges, inconsistent application of Indiana’s trial rules, and an excessive number of cases being sent by Lake County judges to venues in outside counties. *Id.* at ¶ 14.

16. The Bonnet Affidavit states that Bonnet has worked for the Secretary of State since 2005. Public records subject to judicial notice reflect that he first became an attorney in 2007. <https://courtapps.in.gov/rollofattorneys/attorney/c7659a99-14b7-e011-9d34-02215e942453?LastName=Bonnet&OrderBy=0&Page=1>. The Bonnet Affidavit does not aver any basis for Bonnet to have personal knowledge of the facts averred to in Paragraph 16. Evid. R. 602

17. The 1973 Indiana General Assembly then adopted a hybrid appointment and retention merit system known as “The Missouri Plan”, for selecting Lake County superior court judges in the civil, criminal, and juvenile divisions. [*Bradley v. Work*, 154 F.3d 706 (7th Cir. 1998)].

17. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

18. A version of this hybrid system remains in effect today for Lake County superior court judges, where merit selection is used to appoint judges, with retention elections for incumbents. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 15; see also Ind. Code § 33-33, et seq. If a judge loses the retention election, the seat is vacant and a new judge is appointed through the merit selection process. *Id.*

18. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

19. Lake County's judicial selection laws provide for a hybrid system, where Lake County Judicial Nominating Commission ("LCJNC") submits 5 names/nominees to the Governor for each judicial vacancy, who then appoints a person from this list to fill the vacancy, based on qualifications of the nominees and without regard to political affiliation. Ind. Code § 33-33-45-38. Appointees then face retention elections about 2 years after their initial appointment, and then again every 6 years thereafter. *See* Ind. Code § 33-33-45-41.

19. Plaintiffs dispute that Lake County has judicial selection laws. The Legislature created a judicial circuit using Lake County's boundaries and implemented different voting procedures within that judicial circuit. Plaintiffs dispute that Paragraph 19 contains any facts, but rather summarizes Indiana statutes.

20. In 2008, the Judicial Conference of Indiana developed a Strategic Plan for the future of Indiana's judicial branch, steered by a Strategic Planning Committee organized by former Chief Justice Randall T. Shephard. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 16 citing *A Blueprint for Excellence and to Greater Accountability: Enhanced Access to Justice in Indiana's Judicial System*, INDIANA JUDICIAL BRANCH: STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE at 1, <https://www.in.gov/courts/iocs/files/strategic-white-paper.pdf>.

20. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

21. The plan describes a decades long reform measure to Indiana’s judicial branch, including moving towards a unified court system, state-centralized funding source, and push for merit selection of trial court judges, among other things. *Id.* ¶ 17.

21. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

22. A merit selection process is essential in a highly populated and highly diverse jurisdiction like Lake County to provide safeguards for limiting political influence in Lake County superior courts. *Id.* ¶ 18.

22. Plaintiffs do not dispute that the motivation behind the retention-only voting scheme being imposed in Lake County was race-based—that is, because Lake County is “highly diverse.”

23. Despite amendments from time-to-time to the nomination process and LCJNC’s structure, the appointment and retention process has remained largely unchanged for the majority of Lake County superior court divisions; except selection of the 4 county division judges did not change from elections to the hybrid process until Ind. Code § 33-33-45-25 was amended in 2011. *Id.* ¶ 19; *see also* P.L. 201-2011, § 61.

23. Plaintiffs dispute this. Plaintiffs dispute that Paragraph 23 contains facts; rather Paragraph 23 inaccurately summarizes decades of Indiana law. Additionally, Paragraph 23 does not accurately state the path to the current retention vote process in Lake County. In the early 1970’s, all Lake County superior court judges were subject to appointment followed by a retention vote. Then, in 1989, the Legislature provided that three Lake County superior court judges “comprise the county division,” Ind. Code § 33-5-29.5-42.5, and that those judges “shall be elected . . . by the electorate of Lake County,” Ind. Code § 33-5-29.5-42.5. Then, in 2011, the Legislature repealed

the provision of the election of the Lake County superior court judges that made up the county division, Ind. Code § 33-33-45-43; P.L. 201-2011, Sec. 114, leading to all Lake County superior court judges being subject to appointment followed by a retention vote.

24. As amended by HEA 1453, under the current version of Ind. Code § 33-33-45-28(a) – (b), LCJNC members consist of Governor appointees, Lake County board of commissioner appointees, and Indiana’s Chief Justice or their Justice designee. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 20.

24. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

25. The current appointment, selection, and retention process for Lake County superior court judges is a product of decades-old concerns and detailed study results to ensure fairness, integrity, impartial administration of justice, and judicial accountability. *Id.* ¶ 21 citing Frank Sullivan, Jr., “*What I’ve Learned About Judging*”, 48 VAL. U. L. REV. 195, 198 (2013).

25. Plaintiffs dispute this. This is a verbatim recitation of Mr. Bonnet’s Affidavit Statement 21, which misstates Justice Sullivan’s remarks. In Justice Sullivan’s speech, he spoke about the merit selection system for Indiana Supreme Court justices. There is simply no mention of “decades-old concerns” about Lake County superior court judges. (Dkt. 81-6 at 3.) In fact, in terms of Justice Sullivan’s discussion of judicial selection, Lake County is not mentioned a single time. In other words, Mr. Bonnet’s Affidavit Statement 21 lacks supporting evidence and must be stricken. *See Paniaguas*, 2006 WL 2568210, at *4 (listing categories of improper affidavit statements, including those lacking “supporting evidence”). Additionally, Mr. Bonnet’s Affidavit Statement 21 is an opinion not “grounded in observation or other first-hand experience,” *id.*, at *4, as there is no indication that Mr. Bonnet had

personal knowledge of “decades-old concerns” about Lake County superior court judges, especially considering that Mr. Bonnet did not hold his current position when the challenged statutory scheme was first put in place in 1973. *See* Ind. Code §§ 33-5-29.5-28, 39 (1974). Accordingly, there is a second reason why Affidavit Statement 21 must be stricken. *See Paniaguas*, 2006 WL 2568210, at *4.

26. The State has a compelling interest in judicial independence, impartiality, fairness, and judicial accountability that has long required some specialization in Indiana counties to ensure the judicial selection process reflects the diversity of the jurisdiction. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 22.

26. Plaintiffs dispute this. This is a verbatim recitation of Mr. Bonnet’s Affidavit Statement 22, which is a conclusion of law and is thus improper affidavit testimony. *Paniaguas*, 2006 WL 2568210, *5. “Compelling interest” is a legal term of art, and asserting that a governmental entity possesses a “compelling interest” is a legal conclusion to be drawn by a court—not an admissible fact that can support summary judgment. *See id*; *cf. Nat’l Cap. Presbytery*, 567 F.Supp.3d at 240. The Bonnet Affidavit also does not contain any supporting evidence that supports why certain counties allegedly require specialized voting procedures. *See Paniaguas*, 2006 WL 2568210, at *4 (listing categories of improper affidavit statements, including those lacking “supporting evidence”).

27. “Because the governor may appoint only from these approved finalists, merit selection constrains the ability of political officials to stack the courts with partisan judges.” *Id.* ¶ 23 citing Zachary Reger, *The Power of Attorneys: Addressing the Equal Protection Challenge to Merit-Based Judicial Selection*, 89 U. CHI. L. REV. 253 (2022).

27. Plaintiffs dispute this. While Defendants accurately quote a law review article, this statement must be stricken because it is not a recitation of fact, but rather legal argument and opinion. *See Paniaguas*, 2006 WL 2568210, at *4-*5 (explaining that legal arguments and legal opinions are inadmissible affidavit testimony that cannot support a summary judgment motion). In fact, the article itself speaks of merit selection as “an **ostensibly** nonpartisan process” and “**supposedly** nonpartisan,” undercutting any factual nature of Affidavit Statement 23. (Dkt. 81-7 at 3, 5 (emphases added)).

28. Further, HEA’s elimination of local attorney elections for a certain number of LCJNC members prevents actual or public perception of apparent bias of nominee selections influenced by the attorneys who may practice before them. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 24 citing Judicial Conference of Indiana – Strategic Planning Committee, *A New Way Forward*, at 22 (2008).

28. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

29. Statistics showing the annual total cases before Indiana trial courts were released by Indiana’s Judiciary for years 2020 and 2021, and include as follows:

County	2020	2021
All Counties	2,662,272	2,790,822
Marion County	480,580	516,776
Lake County	455,707	457,481
Allen	123,586	117,650
St. Joseph	91,913	99,775
Vanderburgh	84,214	89,877
Hamilton	50,188	50,716

Bonnet Aff. ¶ 25 citing Indiana Trial Court Statistics by County,

<https://publicaccess.courts.in.gov/ICOR> (last visited June 5, 2023).

29. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

30. Lake County's current hybrid system for selecting judicial officers involves various state and local officials through a process involving segregation of duties that vastly reduce the risks that any voter fraud could spill over into selection or retention of judges. Bonnet Aff. ¶ 26].

30. Plaintiffs dispute that Lake County itself has a system of selecting or electing judges.

The Legislature has imposed lesser voting rights in the judicial circuit that encompasses Lake County. This is a verbatim recitation of Mr. Bonnet's Affidavit Statement 26. Mr. Bonnet's Affidavit Statement 22 is a legal argument that is not grounded in factual support. *See Paniaguas*, 2006 WL 2568210, at *4-*5 (explaining that legal arguments and conclusions absent supporting evidence must be stricken). It accordingly must be stricken. *See id.* To state it another way, there is no admissible evidence that Lake County's challenged nominating scheme has prevented, in any way, voter fraud. Mr. Bonnet's legal argument as to the same is inadmissible and cannot support Defendants' motion for summary judgment. *See id.*

31. From 2007 – 2021, LCJNC consisted of 9 members: Indiana's chief justice or their appellate court designee as chairman; four attorney members elected by local attorneys; and four non-attorney local residents appointed by the Lake County board of commissioners (each of the three county commissioners appointed one person and the fourth was appointed by majority vote of the county board). Ind. Code § 33-33-45-28 (effective July 1, 2007 to April 28, 2021).

31. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

32. Both the elected attorney members and the appointed non-attorney members were required to consist of a minority, two women, and two men. [Ind. Code § 33-33-45-28(b) – (c) (2007)].

When a judicial vacancy occurred during this period, LCJNC had 60 days to certify three nominees to the Governor for appointment. Ind. Code § 33-33-45-34(a) (2004).

32. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

33. Qualified candidates were selected at a public meeting by a majority vote among at least five LCJNC members. [Ind. Code § 33-33-45-34(e) (2004)]. To qualify, LCJNC are required to evaluate candidates based on criteria under Ind. Code § 33-33-45-38; however, LCJNC may not consider political affiliation in evaluating candidates. Ind. Code § 33-33-45-38(4).

33. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

34. In 2021, Lake County judicial selection laws were amended by decreasing local control of LCJNC, increasing the number of certified nominees¹, adding gender and equity provisions to address recent criticism, and establishing a more unified and state-centralized nomination process. P.L. 204-2021, § 11.

34. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

35. LCJNC now consists of 7 members: Indiana's chief justice or their designee as chairman and ex officio voting member only in the event of tie; three governor appointees consisting of one attorney, one non-attorney who has never held a law license, and one woman; three Lake County board of commissioner appointees consisting of one attorney, a non-attorney never holding a law license, and a person of racial minority. Ind. Code § 33-33-45-28(a) – (b).

35. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

¹ See Ind. Code § 33-33-45-38(a) (increasing the number of certified nominees from 3 to 5).

36. By implication, nominees are now selected by a majority vote among at least 4 LCJNC members. Ind. Code § 33-33-45-34(e). The General Assembly also granted standing to the chief justice or their designee to dispute the validity of an appointed LCJNC member. Ind. Code § 33-33-45-28(b). Although the Lake County judicial selection laws were amended from time-to-time, substantive portions of the challenged hybrid process remain largely unchanged.

36. Plaintiffs do not dispute this.

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS

1. Thomas McDermott is a registered voter in Lake County. (Dkt. 84-2 at 1.)
2. Eduardo Fontanez is Hispanic, a member of a minority group. (Dkt. 84-3 at 1.)
3. Lonnie Randolph is black, a member of a minority group. (Dkt. 84-1 at 1.)
4. Fontanez, Randolph, and McDermott previously had the right to vote for Lake County Superior Court judges of the county division, and they voted in those elections. (Dkt. 84-2 at 1; Dkt. 84-2 at 1; Dkt. 84-1 at 1.)
5. Fontanez, Randolph, and McDermott now only enjoy the lesser voting right of voting whether to retain Superior Court judges appointed by the Governor. (Dkt. 84-2 at 1; Dkt. 84-3 at 1; Dkt. 84-1 at 1.)
6. To vote in a full and open election for Superior Court judges, Fontanez, Randolph, and McDermott would have to move to another county that enjoys full voting rights and register to vote. (Dkt. 84-2 at 1-2; Dkt. 84-3 at 1-2; Dkt. 84-1 at 2.)
7. Moving to another county would be an extreme burden and expense for Fontanez, Randolph, and McDermott. (Dkt. 84-2 at 2; Dkt. 84-3 at 2; Dkt. 84-1 at 2.)

8. According to 2020 Census data, 193,504 black residents eighteen years of age or older reside in Marion County, Indiana. 2020 Census Data, Race for the Population 18 Years and Over, available at [https://data.census.gov/table?g=0400000US18,18\\$0500000&y=2020&d=DEC+Redistricting+Data+\(PL+94-171\)&tid=DECENNIALPL2020.P3](https://data.census.gov/table?g=0400000US18,18$0500000&y=2020&d=DEC+Redistricting+Data+(PL+94-171)&tid=DECENNIALPL2020.P3).² (Dkt. 84-10 at 15.)

9. 89,806 black residents eighteen years of age or older reside in Lake County, Indiana. (*Id.* at 14.)

10. 25,176 black residents eighteen years of age or older reside in St. Joseph County, Indiana. (*Id.* at 20.)

11. The total number of black residents eighteen years of age or older that reside in Lake, Marion, and St. Joseph Counties is 308,486 (193,504 Marion County black residents eighteen years of age or older + 89,806 Lake County black residents eighteen years of age or older + 25,176 St. Joseph County black residents eighteen years of age or older = 308,486). (*Supra* ¶¶ 8-10.)

12. Indiana's total population of black residents eighteen years of age or older is 467,861. (Dkt. 84-10 at 3.)

13. 65.94% of Indiana's black residents eighteen years of age or older live in Lake, Marion, and St. Joseph Counties (308,486/467,861=65.94%). (*Supra* ¶¶ 11-12.)

14. Indiana's total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older is 4,137,310. (Dkt. 84-10 at 3.)

15. Indiana's total population of residents eighteen years of age or older is 5,192,579. (*Id.*)

² “[F]ederal courts frequently have judicially noticed federal census data.” *Skolnick v. Bd. of Comm'rs of Cook Cnty.*, 435 F.2d 361, 363 (7th Cir. 1970)

16. 80% of Indiana's residents eighteen years of age or older are white ($4,137,310/5,192,579=.79677$). (*Supra* ¶¶ 14-15.)

17. 20% of Indiana's residents are minorities. (*Supra* ¶ 16.)

18. Lake County has a total population of residents eighteen years of age or older of 380,651. (Dkt. 84-10 at 14.)

19. Lake County has a total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older of 222,325. (*Id.*)

20. Lake County has a total population of non-white residents eighteen years of age or older of 158,326 (380,651 total Lake County residents -222,325 white Lake County residents = 158,326 non-white Lake County residents). (*Supra* ¶¶ 18-19.)

21. 41.59% of Lake County residents over the age of eighteen are minorities (158,326 non-white Lake County population /380,651 total Lake County Population. (*Supra* ¶¶ 18, 20.)

22. Marion County has a total population of residents eighteen years of age or older of 742,442. (Dkt. 84-10 at 15.)

23. Marion County has a total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older of 423,140. (*Id.*)

24. Marion County has a total population of non-white residents eighteen years of age or older of 319,302 (742,442 total Marion County residents -423,140 white Marion County residents = 319,302 non-white Marion County residents). (*Supra* ¶¶ 22-23.)

25. 44% of Marion County residents over the age of eighteen are minorities (319,302 non-white Marion County population /724,441 total Marion County Population= .44). (*Supra* ¶¶ 22, 24.)

26. St. Joseph County has a total population of residents eighteen years of age or older of 210,201. (2020 Census Data, Race for the Population 18 Years and Over.)

27. St. Joseph County has a total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older of 157,821. (Dkt. 84-10 at 20.)

28. St. Joseph has a total population of non-white residents eighteen years of age or older of 52,380 (210,201 total St. Joseph County residents -157,821 white St. Joseph County residents = 52,380 non-white St. Joseph County residents). (*Supra* ¶¶ 26-27.)

29. 24.9% of St. Joseph County residents over the age of eighteen are minorities (52,380 non-white St. Joseph County population /210,201 total St. Joseph County Population=.249). (*Supra* ¶¶ 26, 28.)

30. Allen County has a total population of residents eighteen years of age or older of 287,203. (Dkt. 84-10 at 3.)

31. Allen County has a total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older of 216,585. (*Id.*)

32. Allen has a total population of non-white residents eighteen years of age or older of 70,618 (287,203 total Allen County residents -216,585 white Allen County residents = 70,618 non-white Allen County residents). (*Supra* ¶¶ 30-31.)

33. 24.58% of Allen County residents over the age of eighteen are minorities (70,618 non-white Allen County population /287,203 total Allen County Population= .2458). (*Supra* ¶¶ 30, 32.)

34. Indiana's total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older is 4,137,310 (*supra* ¶ 14); Lake County has a total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older of 222,325 (*supra* ¶ 14); Marion County has a total population of white residents

eighteen years of age or older of 423,140 (*supra* ¶ 23); St. Joseph County has a total population of white residents eighteen years of age or older of 157,821 (*supra* ¶ 27).

35. 803,286 white residents over 18 years of age live in Lake, Marion, and St. Joseph Counties (222,325 white residents 18 years of age or older in Lake County + 423,140 white residents 18 years of age or older in Marion County + 157,821 white residents 18 years of age or older in St. Joseph County = 803,286). (*Supra* ¶ 34.)

36. 3,334,024 of Indiana's white residents 18 years of age or older live in Counties other than Lake, Marion, St. Joseph Counties (4,137,310 white residents 18 years of age or older in Indiana – 803,286 white residents 18 years of age or older in Lake, Marion, and St. Joseph Counties= 3,334,024). (*Supra* ¶¶ 14, 34-35.)

37. 81% of Indiana's white residents reside in Counties other than Lake, Marion, and St. Joseph Counties (3,334,024 white residents in counties other than Lake, Marion, and St. Joseph Counties/ 4,137,310 Indiana's total population of white residents 18 years of age or older=.8058). (*Supra* ¶¶ 34, 36.)

38. Marion County has a voting age population of 742,442, Lake County has a voting age population of 380,651, Ailen County has a voting age population of 287,203, Hamilton County has a voting age population of 253,195, and St. Joseph County has a voting age population of 210,201. (Dkt. 84-10 at 3, 10, 14, 15.)

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Bryan H. Babb

Bryan H. Babb, Atty. No. 21535-49
Bradley M. Dick, Atty. No. 29647-49
Seema R. Shah, Atty No. 26583-49
BOSE McKINNEY & EVANS LLP
111 Monument Circle, Suite 2700
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 684-5000

(317) 684-5173 (Fax)
bbabb@boselaw.com
bdick@boselaw.com
sshah@boselaw.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on August 10, 2023, a copy of the foregoing document was filed electronically. Notice of this filing will be sent to the following parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. Parties may access this filing through the Court's system.

Jefferson S. Garn
Jefferson.Garn@atg.in.gov

Michael E. Tolbert
mtolbert@tolbertlegal.com

Candace C. Williams
cwilliams@tolbertlegal.com

Shelice R. Tolbert
stolbert@tolbertlegal.com

Rogelio Dominguez
roy@dominguezlawyer.com

Kari A. Morrigan
Kari.morrigan@atg.in.gov

Meredith B. McCutcheon
Meredith.mccutcheon@atg.in.gov

/s/ Bryan H. Babb

Bryan H. Babb

4605990_1