

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

NEW GEORGIA PROJECT, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER, in his  
official capacity as Georgia Secretary of  
State, *et al.*,

CIVIL ACTION NO.:  
1:24-cv-03412-SDG

---

**DOUGHERTY COUNTY DEFENDANTS’  
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION TO  
DISMISS PLAINTIFFS’ AMENDED COMPLAINT AS TO THEM**

COME NOW Dougherty County Board of Elections and Frederick Williams, Benny Hand, Annabelle Stubbs, Price Corr, and Jacob Clawson, in their official capacities as members of the Dougherty County Board of Elections (hereinafter “Dougherty County Defendants”), and hereby file this Reply in Support of their Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint as to the Dougherty County Defendants, respectfully showing the Court the following:

The Dougherty County Defendants adopt the briefing of their fellow “Seventeen County Board Member Defendants” to the extent any address the issues addressed in the arguments made by the other Seventeen County Board Member Defendants previously adopted and incorporated in the Dougherty County Defendants’ initial Motion and Brief (Doc. 254, pp. 4-5). The instant Reply will

focus on Plaintiffs’ lack of standing as well as their related and continuing failure to state a claim against the Dougherty County Defendants upon which relief can be granted.

Plaintiffs’ persistent failure to adequately state a claim against the Dougherty County Defendants upon which relief can be granted goes hand-in-hand with the fact that Plaintiffs cannot show any injury-in-fact whatsoever that is fairly (or at all) traceable to the challenged conduct of the Dougherty County Defendants. Despite their Response, Plaintiffs still fail to demonstrate a claim *specific to the Dougherty County Defendants* upon which relief can be granted. That failure—which pretermits preliminary matters like whether the NVRA even authorizes private rights of action, which the Dougherty County Defendants contend does not—is not ameliorated by Plaintiffs’ incorporation of the arguments set forth in the Consolidated Opposition as to whether Plaintiffs adequately state a claim *against the Dougherty County Defendants* upon which relief can be granted. Vague characterizations of “*several* County Defendants and members of the defendant class of county election boards” (Doc. 228 at 44), “*several* Georgia counties” (Doc. 228 at 47), and “disjointed approaches *various* counties are taking” (Doc. 228 at 101) are not sufficient to establish standing against the Dougherty County Defendants or to sufficiently state a claim against the Dougherty County Defendants. The fact that Plaintiffs arguably allege claims against other specific defendants but not the Dougherty County

Defendants underscores Plaintiffs' failure to state a claim and related failure to show standing as to these Defendants.

As pointed out by the Lowndes County Defendants, the Supreme Court has ruled defendants may not be treated as "a monolith." *Murthy v. Missouri*, 603 U.S. 43, 69 (2024). Standing is not "dispensed in gross." 603 U.S. at 61. Instead, a plaintiff must demonstrate standing for each claim "against each defendant." *Id.* This requires a showing that "a particular defendant" engaged in challenged action. *Id.*

It follows then that, without any claim sufficiently stated against the Dougherty County Defendants, Plaintiffs cannot show standing because they cannot show an injury-in-fact (either actual or imminent), traceability of the same to the Dougherty County Defendants, or redressability of the same. "The party invoking federal jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing these elements." *Lujan v. Defs. Of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 561 (1992). Plaintiffs have failed to meet their burden as to the Dougherty County Defendants.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons set forth above, in their initial Brief, and in the arguments made by the other members of the Seventeen County Board Member Defendants as well as those set forth in Sections I, II(A),(B), and IV(A),(B),(C) of the State Defendants' Brief in Support of Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 168-1) which were previously adopted and incorporated as if fully set forth therein, the Dougherty

County Defendants respectfully move this Court to dismiss the claims against them pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1) and (6).

WHEREFORE, the Dougherty County Defendants respectfully request their Motion be GRANTED.

Respectfully submitted this 21<sup>st</sup> day of April, 2025.

/s/ **Frances L. Clay**

Frances L. Clay  
Georgia Bar No. 129613

/s/ **Denzel L. Batore**

Denzel L. Batore  
Georgia Bar No. 511142

***Attorneys for Dougherty County  
Defendants***

Chambless, Higdon, Richardson,  
Katz & Griggs, LLP  
P.O. Box 6378  
Macon, GA 31208-6378  
Phone: 478-745-1181  
Fax: 478-746-9479  
E-mail: [fclay@chrkglaw.com](mailto:fclay@chrkglaw.com)  
E-mail: [dbatore@chrkglaw.com](mailto:dbatore@chrkglaw.com)

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 5.1 AND  
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing document has been prepared in accordance with the font type and margin requirements of Local Rule 5.1 of the Northern District of Georgia, using a font type of Times New Roman and a point size of 14.

This 21<sup>st</sup> day of April, 2025.

/s/ Denzel L. Batore

Denzel L. Batore

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on April 21<sup>st</sup>, 2025, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using CM/ECF system, which will automatically notify all counsel of record.

This 21<sup>st</sup> day of April, 2025.

/s/ Denzel L. Batore

Denzel L. Batore