

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

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Strong Communities Foundation of Arizona
Incorporated, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Stephen Richer, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV-24-02030-PHX-KML

ORDER

Plaintiffs Strong Communities Foundation of Arizona Inc. and Yvonne Cahill brought this suit in state court against each of Arizona’s counties and its recorder.¹ Maricopa County removed the case to federal court on August 12, 2024. As of that date, not all defendants had been served.

On August 16, 2024, two organizations—Voto Latino and One Arizona—moved to intervene as defendants. (Doc. 5.) Plaintiffs opposed that request. (Doc. 11.) On September 3, 2024, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and on September 15, 2024, plaintiffs lodged a proposed motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction. (Doc. 16.) Over the following two weeks, plaintiffs completed service of process on all defendants. On September 26, 2024, the Democratic National Committee filed a motion to intervene. (Doc. 46.) The next day, Maricopa County filed an opposition to plaintiffs’ request for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction although that oversized motion still needed a court order to be filed. (Doc. 48.) Pinal, Yavapai, and Navajo County joined

¹ The court will refer to the counties without also identifying the relevant defendant recorder.

1 Maricopa County's opposition. (Doc. 52, 53, 54.) On September 30, 2024, the court
2 allowed the filing of plaintiffs' motion and the case was transferred when Judge Brnovich
3 recused. (Doc. 56, 61.) Also on September 30, 2024, proposed intervenors Voto Latino and
4 One Arizona filed a separate opposition to the request for injunctive relief. (Doc. 62.)

5 At present, the following counties have been served but have not responded to
6 plaintiffs' motion for injunctive relief: Apache, Cochise, Coconino, Gila, Graham,
7 Greenlee, La Paz, Mojave, Pima, Santa Cruz, and Yuma. Those counties must file an
8 expedited response to plaintiffs' motion. Once all defendants have responded, plaintiffs
9 must file their reply.

10 Given the urgency of resolving the motion for injunctive relief and that the motions
11 to intervene are not fully briefed, the court will consider the arguments set forth by the
12 proposed intervenors but will not formally resolve the requests for intervention at this time.
13 In effect, the court will treat the proposed intervenors as amici for purposes of resolving
14 the request for injunctive relief. Plaintiffs' reply may therefore address any arguments
15 made by the proposed intervenors that are not addressed in Maricopa County's opposition.

16 Accordingly,

17 **IT IS ORDERED** no later than **October 3, 2024**, the following defendant counties
18 shall respond to the motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction:
19 Apache, Cochise, Coconino, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, La Paz, Mojave, Pima, Santa Cruz,
20 and Yuma. No later than **October 1, 2024**, Plaintiffs shall provide a copy of this order and
21 the motion for temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction (Doc. 57) to any
22 defendants who have not yet appeared.

23 /

24 /

25 /

26 /

27 /

28 /

