

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF JACKSON COUNTY, MISSOURI
AT KANSAS CITY**

ELIZABETH HEALEY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF MISSOURI, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2516-CV31273

Division: 8

**KCEB DEFENDANT’S ANSWER TO PETITION FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATIVE RELIEF**

Defendants, Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners; Sarah (Sally) Miller, Sharon Turner Buie, and Ralph F. Munyan II, in their official capacities as Commissioners of the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners; and Shawn Kieffer and Lauri Ealom, in their official capacities as directors of the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners, (jointly, the “KCEB Defendants”), state the following for their answer to Plaintiffs’ Petition for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief.

The KCEB Defendants take no position on whether HB 1 violates the prohibition on mid-decade congressional redistricting and the compactness requirements of Article III, § 45 of the Missouri Constitution as asserted by Plaintiffs. The KCEB Defendants further state that they have not been requested by the State of Missouri to establish precinct boundaries to implement HB 1.

INTRODUCTION

1. The Missouri Constitution’s limitation on the General Assembly’s authority to draw congressional districts is clear: That power is triggered *only* “[w]hen the number of

representatives to which the state is entitled in the House of the Congress of the United States under the census . . . is certified to the governor.” Mo. Const. art. III, § 45.

ANSWER: Paragraph 1 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 1 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

2. The Missouri Supreme Court has long understood that congressional maps drawn by the General Assembly after census results are certified will “remain in place for the next decade or until a Census shows that the districts should change.” *Pearson v. Koster*, 359 S.W.3d 35, 37-38 (Mo. banc 2012) (“*Pearson I*”). Missouri lawmakers have similarly understood that congressional maps are drawn upon the release of census data once per decade, *not* at the whim of politicians every so often. As the recent Speaker of the House stated, to voluntarily engage in congressional redistricting again after having done so in 2022 “would be out of character with the way Missouri operates.”

ANSWER: Paragraph 2 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 2 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

3. Indeed. And yet when President Trump directed Missouri lawmakers to redraw congressional districts to satisfy his political aims, Missouri’s leaders bucked their constitutional duty. After a rushed special legislative session with limited opportunities for debate, the General Assembly enacted a new congressional map designed to deliver President Trump the political advantage he demanded.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri General Assembly enacted a congressional redistricting map in 2025 and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 3 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

4. In so doing, the General Assembly resurrected a district configuration that had been overwhelmingly rejected in 2022—one that divides up Kansas City, the urban core of

Congressional District (“CD”) 5, into three separate portions, each combined in a different district with rural counties hundreds of miles away. When the vast majority of lawmakers voted that map down in 2022, then-Governor Mike Parson celebrated the General Assembly’s decision to choose instead a map that “meets our constitutional requirements” and “is fair to the people of Missouri,” noting “that’s the way democracy works.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri General Assembly enacted a congressional redistricting map in 2025 and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 4 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

5. In stark contrast, the General Assembly’s decision in 2025 to ignore constitutional constraints by picking up the pen to redraw congressional districts—carving up historical communities and slicing across political boundaries in the process—is decidedly *not* how democracy works.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri General Assembly enacted a congressional redistricting map in 2025 and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 5 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

6. The Missouri Constitution flatly prohibits the unprecedented, ungrounded, and undemocratic mid-cycle redistricting that resulted in HB 1. This Court must declare HB 1 unconstitutional and enjoin its use in Missouri’s congressional elections.

ANSWER: Paragraph 6 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 6 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. This Court maintains original subject-matter jurisdiction over this action under §§ 478.220, 526.030, and 527.010 of the Missouri Revised Statutes and Missouri Supreme Court Rules 87.01 and 92.01.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that this Court has subject-matter jurisdiction.

8. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants, including the individual Defendants, who are sued in their official capacities.

ANSWER: Paragraph 8 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

9. Venue is proper in this Court because Defendants Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners, Sarah Miller, Sharon Turner Buie, Ralph F. Munyan II, Shawn Kieffer, and Lauri Ealom maintain their principal offices in Kansas City, Missouri, *see* RSMo. § 508.010(2)(2); because Defendants Jackson County Board of Election Commissioners, Tammy Brown, Sara Zorich, Michael K. Whitehead, Henry R. Carner, Colleen M. Scott, and Lyle K. Query maintain their principal offices in Jackson County, Missouri, *see id.*; and because Plaintiffs Giselle Anatol, Marques Bussey, and Mary Sapp reside in Jackson County, Missouri, *see id.* § 508.010(2)(1).

ANSWER: Paragraph 9 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 9 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

PARTIES

10. Plaintiffs are citizens of the United States and registered voters in Missouri.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 10 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

11. Plaintiff Elizabeth Healey is a registered voter in Kansas City, Missouri. She was in CD 5 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 6 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 11 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

12. Plaintiff Giselle Anatol is a registered voter in Kansas City, Missouri. She was in CD 5 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 4 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 12 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

13. Plaintiff Marques Bussey is a registered voter in Kansas City, Missouri. He was in CD 5 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 5 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 13 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

14. Plaintiff Mary Sapp is a registered voter in Kansas City, Missouri. She was in CD 5 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 4 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 14 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

15. Plaintiff Louie Wright is a registered voter in Kansas City, Missouri. He was in CD 5 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 6 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 15 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

16. Plaintiff Sarah Beagle is a registered voter in St. Louis, Missouri. She was in CD 1 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 1 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 16 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

17. Plaintiff Kyle Heard is a registered voter in St. Louis, Missouri. He was in CD 1 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 1 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 17 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

18. Plaintiff Tom Self is a registered voter in Richmond Heights, Missouri. He was in CD 2 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 1 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 18 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

19. Plaintiff Janet Sorrells is a registered voter in Maplewood, Missouri. She was in CD 2 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 1 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 19 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

20. Plaintiff Margaret Wolf Freivogel is a registered voter in Kirkwood, Missouri. She was in CD 2 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 2 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 20 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

21. Plaintiff Sorin Nastasia is a registered voter in St. Louis, Missouri. He was in CD 2 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 2 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 21 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

22. Plaintiff Morton Todd is a registered voter in St. Charles, Missouri. He was in CD 3 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 3 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 22 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

23. Plaintiff Colleen Coble is a registered voter in Columbia, Missouri. She was in CD 4 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 3 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 23 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

24. Plaintiff Beverly Rollings is a registered voter in Sedalia, Missouri. She was in CD 4 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 5 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 24 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

25. Plaintiff Lane Nichols-Elliott is a registered voter in Springfield, Missouri. She was in CD 7 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 7 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 25 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

26. Plaintiff Randal McCallian is a registered voter in Newburg, Missouri. She was in CD 8 under the 2022 Map and will be in CD 8 under the map enacted by HB 1.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 26 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

27. Defendant State of Missouri enforces the State's congressional district boundaries.

ANSWER: Paragraph 27 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 27 of Plaintiff's Petition.

28. Defendant Denny Hoskins is the Secretary of State of Missouri. He is sued in his official capacity. Defendant Hoskins is Missouri's chief election officer. He is charged with administering and overseeing laws related to elections across the state, including implementing the state's congressional districts and candidate filings for the next election. *See* Mo. Const. art. IV, § 14; RSMo. §§ 115.136(1), 115.353.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Denny Hoskins is the Missouri Secretary of State and state that the Missouri Secretary of State's duties are set forth in Missouri Constitution and statutes, which speak for themselves, and deny any allegations of Paragraph 28 that are inconsistent with the Constitution and such statutes.

29. Defendant Jackson County Board of Election Commissioners—along with its directors and commissioners, who are sued in their official capacity—is charged with “conduct[ing] all public elections” within Jackson County and with “establish[ing]” “precinct boundaries” in Jackson County. RSMo. §§ 115.023, 115.113; *see also id.* §§ 115.115, 115.079, 115.099, 115.127, 115.163, 115.247, 115.389, 115.393, 115.499. The Jackson County Board of Election Commissioners' principal office is in Independence, Missouri, in Jackson County.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the JCEB is the board of election commissioners serving as the election authority for that portion of Jackson County, Missouri not

within the city limits of the City of Kansas City, Missouri, and further states that the responsibilities of the JCEB are established by Missouri statutes, which speak for themselves.

30. Defendant Michael K. Whitehead, Henry R. Carner, Colleen M. Scott, and Lyle K. Query are sued in their official capacities as commissioners of the Jackson County Board of Election Commissioners. They are proper defendants for their role in discharging the powers and duties of the Board. *Id.* § 115.027.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Michael K. Whitehead, Henry R. Carner, Colleen M. Scott, and Lyle K. Query are commissioners of the JCEB and are sued in their official capacity, but deny that they are proper defendants.

31. Defendants Tammy Brown and Sarah Zorich are sued in their official capacities as directors of the Jackson County Board of Election Commissioners. They are proper defendants for their role in discharging the powers and duties of the Board. *Id.* § 115.045.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Tammy Brown and Sarah Zorich are directors of the JCEB and are sued in their official capacity, but deny that they are proper defendants.

32. Defendant Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners—along with its directors and commissioners, who are sued in their official capacity—is charged with “conduct[ing] all public elections” within Kansas City and with “establish[ing]” “precinct boundaries” in Kansas City. *Id.* §§ 115.023, 115.113; *see also id.* §§ 115.115, 115.079, 115.099, 115.127, 115.163, 115.247, 115.389, 115.393, 115.499. The Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners’ principal office is in Kansas City, Missouri.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the KCEB is the board of election commissioners serving as the election authority for that portion of Jackson County, Missouri within the city limits of the City of Kansas City, Missouri, and further state that the responsibilities of the KCEB are established by Missouri statutes, which speak for themselves.

33. Defendants Sarah Miller, Sharon Turner Buie, and Ralph F. Munyan II are sued in their official capacities as commissioners of the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners.

They are the proper defendants for their role in discharging the powers and duties of the Board. *Id.* § 115.027.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Sarah Miller, Sharon Turner Buie, and Ralph F. Munyan II are commissioners of the KCEB and are sued in their official capacity, but deny that they are proper defendants.

34. Defendants Shawn Kieffer and Lauri Ealom are sued in their official capacities as directors of the Kansas City Board of Election Commissioners. They are the proper defendants for their role in discharging the powers and duties of the Board. *Id.* § 115.045.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Shawn Kieffer and Lauri Ealom are directors of the KCEB and are sued in their official capacity, but deny that they are proper defendants.

BACKGROUND

I. Missouri's Legislature adopted a congressional map following the 2020 census, as required by the Missouri Constitution.

35. Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution governs the redistricting process for Missouri's congressional seats. It states:

When the number of representatives to which the state is entitled in the House of the Congress of the United States under the census of 1950 and each census thereafter is certified to the governor, the general assembly shall by law divide the state into districts corresponding with the number of representatives to which it is entitled, which districts shall be composed of contiguous territory as compact and as nearly equal in population as may be.

ANSWER: Paragraph 35 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. The KCEB Defendants further state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 35 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

36. On April 26, 2021, the U.S. Census Bureau released and certified the 2020 Census results to states, including Missouri, for use in their decennial redistricting efforts.

ANSWER: Admitted.

37. Pursuant to Article III, Section 45, the Missouri General Assembly then began developing a new congressional map.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri General Assembly developed new congressional maps after the 2020 Census results were released and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 37 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

38. In December 2021, a week before the General Assembly was set to begin its 2022 legislative session, the House and Senate Redistricting Committees revealed a joint proposed congressional map that retained the existing 6-2 Republican-controlled Missouri delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri General Assembly enacted new congressional maps in 2022, following the 2020 Census, and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 38 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

39. Upon the plan's reveal, Senator Mike Bernskoetter, Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Redistricting, advocated for the plan's passage by describing it as "a fair and constitutional map with common-sense boundaries that everyday Missourians can recognize."

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 39 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

40. Similarly, Representative Dan Shaul, Chairman of the House Select Committee on Redistricting, commented that the joint proposed map was created by "balancing the legislative process while maintaining compactness, contiguity, equal population, and preserving the existing districts' core identities." Rep. Shaul further defended the 6-2 map as the "right thing to do" because the map "accurately reflects the state of Missouri and the districts." Especially where "there's no fixing this bill for 10 years," Rep. Shaul noted that he and the committee believed this map would achieve the goal of "giving continuity and consistency to the state of Missouri" and helping the prior districts "maintain[] their identity."

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 40 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

41. Representative Ron Hicks introduced in the House a different proposed map that would have yielded a 7-1 Republican-led delegation. That proposed map would have divided Kansas City—the diverse, urban core of CD 5—into three portions. It would have combined parts of Kansas City with counties in the far eastern, southern, and northern reaches of Missouri—all of which are more rural and less diverse than the Kansas City metropolitan area. The House rejected that map by a margin of 120 to 23, and instead passed a slightly amended version of the joint proposed map advocated by the redistricting committee chairs.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 41 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

42. Rep. Shaul commented publicly after the vote that: “We took the data from the Census and the input of Missourians from around the state to create a fair bill and a fair map. This is a map that keeps communities of interest intact, that abides by our constitution, and that provides a fair and accurate representation of voters in Missouri.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 42 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

43. When the House-approved map then arrived in the Senate for consideration in January 2022, Senate Majority Leader Caleb Rowden publicly supported it, stating that “[i]n a 6-2 map, if that is in fact where we’re heading, I wouldn’t imagine a scenario where the 5th [district] is carved up any different.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 43 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

44. However, portions of the Republican caucus refused to vote on the map when it came time to do so. The congressional redistricting process was stalled by a faction of Senate

Republicans who effectuated a 31-hour filibuster in February 2022. Their ultimate goal was to enact a 7-1 Republican-majority map that broke up CD 5 and Kansas City.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 44 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

45. After months of negotiations, the House and Senate finally passed the House-approved map in May 2022 by a vote of 101-47 in the House and 22-11 in the Senate. Senator Bernskoetter lauded the final map as balancing the interests of all sections of the state and achieving as few county splits as possible. He also noted that the 7-1 map options would have lumped Kansas City voters into districts with large numbers of rural voters, which would "bust up . . . communities of interest" in a way that "just never made any sense" to him.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri General Assembly enacted new congressional maps in May 2022 and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 45 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

46. On May 18, 2022, Governor Mike Parson signed the new map into law ("the 2022 Map"), declaring that the 2022 Map "meets our constitutional requirements" and ultimately "is fair to the people of Missouri." Parson further remarked that he believed "a majority of legislators" felt similarly, commenting "that's the way democracy works."

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Governor Parson signed the 2022 Map into law and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 46 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

47. The 2022 Map was subsequently used in Missouri's 2022 and 2024 congressional elections.

ANSWER: Admitted.

48. Since enactment of the 2022 Map, no new federal census has been conducted, and no judicial order has required Missouri's congressional districts to be redrawn.

ANSWER: Admitted.

II. In 2025, the Missouri Legislature launched unprecedented mid-cycle redistricting at President Trump’s direction.

49. On June 9, 2025, in the midst of a trial challenging Texas’s 2021 congressional map, the *New York Times* reported that President Donald Trump was pressuring Texas Republicans to re-draw Texas’s congressional map to more heavily favor Republicans.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 49 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

50. A month later, after public reports reflected that a majority of Texas’s Republican congressional delegation opposed mid-decade redistricting, Harmeet Dhillon, the Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, wrote to Texas Governor Greg Abbott and Attorney General Ken Paxton purporting to raise “serious concerns regarding the legality” of Texas’s congressional districts. Dhillon specifically asserted that certain Texas congressional districts were unconstitutional “coalition districts” and urged officials in Texas to rectify these “race-based considerations” for specific districts.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 50 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

51. On July 9, 2025, Governor Abbott called a special session of the Texas Legislature to consider, among other items, “[L]egislation that provides a revised congressional redistricting plan in light of constitutional concerns raised by the U.S. Department of Justice.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 51 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

52. In the weeks that followed, President Trump turned his attention from Texas to Missouri. He began pressuring Missouri Republican leaders to engage in similar redistricting efforts to draw a more favorable congressional map. President Trump specifically urged Missouri to target CD 5 and increase Republican control to seven of the state’s eight districts.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 52 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

53. Initially, reaction among Missouri legislative leaders was decidedly negative. Representative Chad Perkins, then-Speaker of the House, publicly stated: "We do redistricting every 10 years. We've already done that. To do it again would be out of character with the way Missouri operates." Asked about whether there was a push for redistricting from the White House, Senate President Pro Tem Cindy O'Laughlin responded with a "horror emoji."

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 53 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

54. In response to these comments, President Trump's team began pressuring Speaker Perkins as well as the GOP members of the Missouri congressional delegation and Governor Mike Kehoe to push for new congressional districts ahead of the 2026 elections.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 54 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

55. The pressure worked: On August 21, 2025, President Trump announced on the social media platform Truth Social that Missouri was "IN" for redistricting and that as a result Republicans would "win the Midterms in Missouri again, bigger and better than ever before!"

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 55 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

56. Kansas City residents understood right away that the goal of this unprecedented mid-cycle redistricting effort would be to split up CD 5. The day after President Trump's announcement, the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce and the Civil Council of Greater Kansas City issued a joint statement opposing "any effort to redraw Missouri's congressional districts in a way that divides the Kansas City region—particularly proposals that would dismantle Missouri's 5th Congressional District" because of the "vital role" that the city plays in Missouri's

economy and the likelihood that division would “disrupt[] important regional initiatives.” Notably, those organizations had previously endorsed Governor Kehoe in his gubernatorial bid.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 56 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

57. On August 27, 2025, the Missouri Association of County Clerks and Election Authorities (“MACCEA”) sent a letter to the Governor, the Speaker of the House, the President Pro Tern of the Senate, and the Secretary of State, expressing concerns that this mid-decade redistricting effort would negatively impact the administration of the 2026 elections. The letter warned that election officials would have a narrow window of time between the end of the state’s special elections in November 2025 and the statutory start to the state’s municipal elections in January 2025 to make the necessary street-by-street, house-by-house map adjustments, noting that if a congressional map is not finalized by the end of January 2025, “the downstream effects on elections will be significant.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 57 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

58. Despite these warnings, on August 29, 2025, Governor Kehoe issued a proclamation to convene the General Assembly for a special session to enact legislation redrawing the state’s congressional districts.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 58 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

59. The proclamation stated that “Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution authorizes the General Assembly to divide the state into districts for the United States House of Representatives.” The proclamation then stated (without citation or legal basis) that the state’s current congressional district map is allegedly “vulnerable to a legal challenge under the Voting Rights Act and the Fourteenth Amendment, due to a lack of compactness in certain districts.”

Governor Kehoe instructed the General Assembly to “enact legislation to establish new congressional districts for the State of Missouri.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 59 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

60. Alongside his proclamation, Governor Kehoe unveiled a “Missouri First Map,” which he described as “a more compact, contiguous proposed map” to be considered by the General Assembly.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 60 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

61. In response to this proclamation, President Trump commended the Missouri First Map as providing “the incredible people of Missouri the tremendous opportunity to elect an additional MAGA Republican in the 2026 Midterm Elections.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 61 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

62. Some Republican lawmakers continued to express reservations as the special session approached. Representative Bill Falkner said, for example, “I’m not real crazy about revisiting the maps. I really think we need to stick with when the census is done.” Others said they were “awaiting more clarification on the legal questions surrounding” an attempt at mid-cycle redistricting.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 62 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

63. Nevertheless, the special session began on September 3, 2025. Representative Dirk Deaton introduced HB 1, the mid-cycle redistricting bill, which proposed a 7-1 map reflecting Governor Kehoe’s Missouri First Map on August 29.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 63 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

64. The House Special Redistricting Committee held its first hearing on September 4, 2025. At the five-hour hearing, the committee heard from dozens of Missourians opposing the mid-cycle redistricting, and only one in support of it. One voter stated that he was a “Republican and a conservative” and that he believed HB 1 was “a bunch of hogwash.” Another voter told the committee that she has lived in the heart of Kansas City, within CD 5, for almost thirty years, but under the new maps she would consider herself a “rural voter,” because she would be “in a district that goes down to nearly Arkansas.” Another voter pointed out that “three years ago, 89% of House Republicans voted for the current map.” HB 1’s sponsor Rep. Dirk Deaton left the hearing before any of the witnesses testified against the bill.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 64 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

65. The House Legislative Rules Committee held a hearing on HB 1 the next day. During that hearing, Representative Ken Ingle, representing Jackson County, pointed out that Kansas City had been placed in a single congressional district since the Civil War.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 65 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

66. Two days of floor debate on the bill began on September 8, 2025.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 66 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

67. Thousands of Missourians from Kansas City and across the state traveled to the State Capitol to testify against the proposed map. The House received more than 2,500 pages worth of public comments on the bill.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 67 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

68. Lawmakers also expressed their disapproval of the mid-decade redistricting and the resulting map during the floor debates. For instance, Representative Wick Thomas from Kansas

City asked, “[A]re we just going to redraw the lines every year if we don’t like the results?” Representative Pattie Mansur from Jackson County noted that the map’s nonsensical division of Kansas City would carve up Kansas City University’s medical campus such that its administrative building is in one congressional district, its parking lot in another district, and the land behind it in a third district. And Republican Representative Tony Harbison from Iron, Missouri, lamented, “[O]ur plate is full of the things we need to be doing for the people of this state, and this ain’t one of them.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 68 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

69. On September 9, 2025, the Missouri House passed HB 1 by a vote of 90 to 65, with 13 Republicans voting no, including House Speaker Jonathan Patterson. Speaker Patterson explained that his “role is to try and build consensus and compromise” and on HB 1 it “just wasn’t possible.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri House passed HB 1 by a vote of 90 to 65 and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 69 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

70. Hours later, President Trump took to Truth Social to share his “Congratulations to Missouri’s Incredible Republican State Legislators.” President Trump said, “This new Map will give the Wonderful people of Missouri the opportunity to elect an additional MAGA Republican in the 2026 Midterm Elections.” He continued, “The Missouri Senate must pass this Map now, AS IS, to deliver a gigantic Victory for Republicans in the ‘Show Me State’ and across the Country. I will be watching closely.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 70 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

71. The Missouri Senate followed the President’s orders. It took up HB 1 on September 10, 2025. Senate President Pro Tem Cindy O’Laughlin offered changes to the Senate rules that

would allow the special session bills to move more quickly through the legislative process, over the objection of Senate Democrats. The Republican majority employed a “previous question” motion to cut off debate.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 71 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

72. The next day, the Senate Committee on Local Government, Elections and Pensions held a hearing on HB 1. U.S. Representative Emanuel Cleaver, the longtime representative of CD 5, testified against the map’s changes to Kansas City. Nevertheless, the committee voted to send HB 1 to the full Senate.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 72 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

73. Once again, lawmakers expressed concern about the unprecedented mid-cycle redistricting and about the underlying map. One Republican Senator explained that he would vote no because he was “not a yes man” and did not have an opportunity to understand the decisions underlying the map.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 73 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

74. On September 12, 2025, the Missouri Senate passed HB 1 by 21 to 11, with two Republican Senators voting no.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri Senate passed HB 1 by a vote of 21 to 11 and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 74 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

75. One week later, in a letter dated September 17, 2025, the Governor’s office issued a “Media Statement” indicating that the bill would “receive[] a thorough review by Governor Kehoe and his team before it is signed,” but that the Governor “look[ed] forward to signing HB 1 into law.”

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 75 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

76. Governor Kehoe signed HB 1 into law on Sunday, September 28, 2025.

ANSWER: Admitted.

77. This Petition followed the same day.

ANSWER: Admitted.

III. HB 1 upends the 2022 Map by splitting Kansas City across three districts.

78. HB 1 drastically reshapes CD 5, which has historically contained Kansas City.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that the 2022 Map and HB 1's Missouri First Map speak for themselves and deny any allegations of Paragraph 78 that are inconsistent with the 2022 Map and the Missouri First Map.

79. HB 1 splits Kansas City across three separate congressional districts (CDs 4, 5, and 6) that extend into northern, central, and southern Missouri. The map turns CD 5 into a sprawling behemoth that extends well over 200 miles from Missouri's western border all the way to central Missouri.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 79 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

80. Since Missouri first became a state on August 20, 1821, the General Assembly has always placed the central business district of Kansas City in a single district.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 80 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

81. That central district—that is, the area bounded by 31st Avenue to the south, the Missouri River to the north, the Kansas border to the west, and Woodland Avenue to the east—has been part of CD 5 for as long as Missouri has had a CD 5.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 81 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

82. Even as Kansas City grew in population and annexed additional territory over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the boundaries of CD 5 shifted accordingly. Every redistricting plan since the 1950s has placed as much of the Jackson County portion of Kansas City as possible in a single district, and more recently, also brought in a substantial portion of the Clay County parts of Kansas City as well. In fact, the Jackson County portion of Kansas City has not been split in more than fifty years.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 82 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

83. The 2022 Map was no exception. Like the congressional maps enacted and used by Missouri for decades before it, the 2022 Map maintained the entirety of Kansas City's central business district in CD 5, and indeed the entirety of the Jackson County segment of Kansas City in CD 5.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that the 2022 Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 83 that are inconsistent with the 2022 Map.

84. HB 1 marks a sharp departure from Missouri's historical redistricting maps. Among other things, HB 1 rips CD 5 and Kansas City into three portions and distributes those fragments into neighboring, largely rural districts.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 84 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

85. HB 1 splits Kansas City's central business district across three congressional districts. The map carves part of the core of downtown Kansas City off from the rest of the city, placing a narrow corridor less than two miles wide into CD 4, which stretches south over 200 miles away to Fort Leonard Wood, nearly a four-hour drive away.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 85 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

86. HB 1 places the eastern portions of Kansas City in a sprawling, rural-oriented district that reaches 200 miles across the state, almost reaching Rolla.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 86 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

87. The remaining portion of Kansas City's central business district is placed in CD 6, which now for the first time in 200 years crosses the Missouri River into Kansas City. HB 1 thus places historic Kansas City neighborhoods such as Pendleton Heights and Scarritt Point into CD 6, which reaches over 200 miles east, all the way to Missouri's eastern border and the Mississippi River.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 87 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

88. In splitting Kansas City across three congressional districts, HB 1 cuts through the historic heart of the city, splitting the following neighborhoods along the way: Holmes Park, Tower Homes, Santa Fe Hills, Boone Hills, Willow Creek, Fairlane, Stratford Estates, Hickman Mills, Crossgates, Kirkside, Columbus Park Industrial, Columbus Park, North Indian Mound, South Indian Mound, Sheffield, Independence Plaza, Forgotten Homes, Parkview, Passeo West, and Hospital Hill.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 88 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

89. HB 1 also splits historic neighborhoods in the heart of Kansas City, such as Independence Plaza, Forgotten Homes, and Parkview. The map places fragments of these neighborhoods into District 4 via a narrow, winding corridor that heads west to the Kansas border before turning south and eventually linking these Kansas City residents with rural Missourians over 200 miles away in the south-central part of the state. It places other parts of those same

neighborhoods in CD 5, which extends over 200 miles away to central Missouri, splitting Jefferson City and Columbia along the way.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1’s Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 89 that are inconsistent with HB 1’s Missouri First Map.

90. In short, HB 1 dramatically reduces the compactness of CDs 4, 5, and 6, including by slicing across natural boundary lines, political subdivision boundaries, and historical boundaries.¹

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1’s Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 90 that are inconsistent with HB 1’s Missouri First Map.

91. Plaintiffs will be impacted by the changes made by HB 1 to their respective congressional districts. For example, HB 1 moves Plaintiff Elizabeth Healey out of CD 5 and into CD 6, and Plaintiffs Giselle Anatol and Mary Sapp out of CD 5 and into CD 4.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 91 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

CLAIMS FOR RELIEF

COUNT I

**Violation of Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution
Unconstitutional Mid-Cycle Redistricting**

92. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all prior paragraphs of this Petition as though fully set forth herein.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants reassert their answers to the preceding paragraphs as their answer to Paragraph 92 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

¹ After HB 1 was enacted, Boone County Clerk Brianna Lennon further commented that the new map was “very unspecific” and it was not clear, for instance, how the new district lines cut up Boone County, which is at the heart of changes to Districts 3, 4, and 5. Clerk Lennon noted that based on the enacted map, it was unclear whether the lines follow any census tracts, district lines or precinct lines, and if they do not, election officials would not only have to reconfigure addresses to go with congressional districts, but they may also have to change precinct boundaries. Clerk Lennon emphasized that there is great concern that election officials will be hamstrung in making these updates if a map is finalized too late.

93. Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution provides that the General Assembly “shall” redraw the state’s congressional districts “[w]hen the number of representatives to which the state is entitled in the House of the Congress of the United States under the census of 1950 and each census thereafter is certified to the governor.” Mo. Const. art. III, § 45.

ANSWER: Paragraph 93 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 93 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

94. As the Missouri Supreme Court has recognized, the General Assembly’s authority to engage in congressional redistricting is thus “triggered when the results of the . . . United States Census [are] revealed.” *Pearson I*, 359 S.W.3d at 37. Once the state enacts congressional district boundaries, as it did after the 2020 nationwide census, “[t]he new districts will take effect . . . and remain in place for the next decade or until a Census shows that the districts should change.” *Id.* at 37-38.

ANSWER: Paragraph 94 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 94 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

95. In contrast, the section of the Missouri Constitution that addresses the apportionment of General Assembly districts provides that “[s]uch districts may be altered from time to time as public convenience may require.” Mo. Const. art. III, § 10. The provision governing congressional redistricting contains no such allowance.

ANSWER: Paragraph 95 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 95 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

96. The Supreme Court of Missouri has recognized, in the context of redistricting, that “the legislative power [of] the General Assembly [is] subject to the limitations contained in the Constitution.” *State ex rel. Gordon v. Becker*, 49 S.W.2d 146, 147 (Mo. banc 1932).

ANSWER: Paragraph 96 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 96 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

97. No federal census has occurred since 2020.

ANSWER: Admitted.

98. Nevertheless, in 2025, the Missouri General Assembly voluntarily redrew the state’s congressional district lines in a special session, based upon the data from the 2020 Census.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that the Missouri General Assembly enacted a congressional redistricting map in 2025 and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 98 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

99. In doing so, the General Assembly ignored the state constitution’s procedural limitation authorizing congressional redistricting to take place only when new decennial census results are certified to the governor.

ANSWER: Paragraph 99 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 99 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

100. Because the Missouri General Assembly has no authority under the state’s constitution to redraw the state’s congressional district between decennial censuses, HB 1 violates Article III, Section 45, and is unconstitutional.

ANSWER: Paragraph 100 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 100 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

101. Plaintiffs seek declaratory judgment that HB 1 is unconstitutional because the General Assembly may draw congressional maps only when the census is certified to the Governor, which is once every ten years. *See* Mo. Const. art. III, § 45.

ANSWER: Paragraph 101 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 101 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

102. Plaintiffs also request a permanent injunction barring Defendants and anyone acting in concert with them from implementing, enforcing, or giving any effect to HB 1, including an injunction barring Defendants from conducting any congressional elections under HB 1. *See* Mo. S. Ct. R. 92.02.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Plaintiffs request a permanent injunction and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 102 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

103. If an injunction does not issue, Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm because “being subject to an unconstitutional statute, ‘for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.’” *Rebman v. Parson*, 576 S.W.3d 605, 612 (Mo. banc 2019) (quoting *Elrod v. Burns*, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976)).

ANSWER: Paragraph 103 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 103 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

104. Plaintiffs lack an adequate remedy at law to protect their interests.

ANSWER: Paragraph 104 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 104 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

COUNT II

Violation of Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution

Non-compactness

105. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference all prior paragraphs of this Petition as though fully set forth herein.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants reassert their answers to the preceding paragraphs as their answer to Paragraph 105 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

106. Article III, Section 45 of the Missouri Constitution requires that after each decennial census, the General Assembly shall divide the state into districts that are as "compact . . . as may be." Mo. Const. art. III, § 45.

ANSWER: Paragraph 106 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 106 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

107. The Missouri Supreme Court has explained that the purpose of this requirement is "to guard, as far as practicable, under the system of representation adopted, against a legislative evil, commonly known as 'gerrymander.'" *Pearson I*, 359 S.W.3d at 38 (citing *State ex rel. Barrett v. Hitchcock*, 146 S.W. 40, 61 (1912)).

ANSWER: Paragraph 107 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 107 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

108. The compactness requirement is "mandatory and objective, not subjective," *id.* at 40, and "must be satisfied," *Pearson v. Koster*, 367 S.W.3d 36, 48 (Mo. banc 2012) ("*Pearson II*"). And "[a] claim that a district lacks compactness following redistricting is justiciable." *Pearson I*, 359 S.W.3d at 39.

ANSWER: Paragraph 108 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 108 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

109. The Missouri Supreme Court has explained that compactness assesses whether the district is a “closely united territory.” *Pearson II*, 367 S.W.3d at 48. The Missouri Constitution’s compactness requirement “implicitly permits consideration” of the following factors: “population density; natural boundary lines; the boundaries of political subdivisions, including counties, municipalities, and precincts; and the historical boundary lines of prior redistricting maps.” *Id.* at 50.

ANSWER: Paragraph 109 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 109 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

110. The Missouri Supreme Court has specified that “[c]onsideration of historical district boundaries allows residents of a district to continue any relationships such residents may have established with their elected representatives and to avoid the detriment to residents of having to reestablish relationships when district boundaries change.” *Id.* at 50 n.12.

ANSWER: Paragraph 110 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 110 of Plaintiffs’ Petition.

111. The configuration of congressional districts in the Kansas City area under HB 1 violates the mandatory compactness requirement on nearly every level. While the previous version of CD 5 was comprised of “closely united territory” of Kansas City, HB 1 splits Kansas City into three fragments: one that stretches over 200 miles from Missouri’s western border to the central counties (CD 5); another that extends another 200 miles to southern Missouri (CD 4); and another that extends north to Missouri’s border with Iowa and Illinois (CD 6).

ANSWER: Paragraph 111 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that HB 1’s Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 111 that are inconsistent with HB 1’s Missouri First Map.

112. HB 1 disregards differences in population density. In past decades, CD 5 was drawn to contain as much of the densely-populated portions of Jackson County as possible. Following the 2010 and 2020 federal censuses, the General Assembly kept the densely populated areas south of the Missouri River contained in CD 5 as well. HB 1, by contrast, carves up the densely-populated Kansas City metropolitan area across three congressional districts and pairs them with sparsely-populated, rural areas hundreds of miles away.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 112 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

113. HB 1 also disregards natural boundary lines. For example, CD 6 crosses the Missouri River down into Kansas City's central business district for the first time in Missouri's history.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 113 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

114. The new CD 5 also blatantly cuts across political subdivision lines, carving a haphazard path that winds up, down, and across Jackson County. It divides Kansas City, as well as its neighboring suburbs, across three different districts.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants state that HB 1's Missouri First Map speaks for itself and deny any allegations of Paragraph 114 that are inconsistent with HB 1's Missouri First Map.

115. HB 1—and in particular its configuration of CDs 4, 5, and 6—thus violates the Missouri Constitution's compactness requirement in Article III, Section 45.

ANSWER: Paragraph 115 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that the Missouri Constitution speaks for itself and are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 115 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

116. Plaintiffs seek declaratory judgment that HB 1 and its individual districts are unconstitutional because they violate the Missouri Constitution's mandatory compactness requirement. *See* Mo. Const. art. III, § 45.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Plaintiffs seek a declaratory judgment. The KCEB Defendants further state Paragraph 116 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the allegations of Paragraph 116 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

117. Plaintiffs also request a permanent injunction barring Defendants and anyone acting in concert with them from implementing, enforcing, or giving any effect to HB 1, including an injunction barring Defendants from conducting any congressional elections under HB 1. *See* Mo. S. Ct. R. 92.02.

ANSWER: The KCEB Defendants admit that Plaintiffs request a permanent injunction and state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations in Paragraph 117 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

118. If an injunction does not issue, Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm because "being subject to an unconstitutional statute, 'for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury.'" *Rebman*, 576 S.W.3d at 612 (quoting *Elrod*, 427 U.S. at 373).

ANSWER: Paragraph 118 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 118 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

119. Plaintiffs lack an adequate remedy at law to protect their interests.

ANSWER: Paragraph 119 constitutes a legal conclusion and not a statement of fact, so that no answer is required. To the extent an answer is required, the KCEB Defendants state that they are without sufficient knowledge or information to admit or deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 119 of Plaintiffs' Petition.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ David Raymond

David B. Raymond #35633

Mitchell J. Perne #77194

Husch Blackwell LLP

4801 Main Street

Kansas City, MO 64112

T: (816) 980-8000

F: (816) 983-8080

David.Raymond@huschblackwell.com

Mitchell.Perne@huschblackwell.com

/s/Charles Renner

Charles Renner #49868

Husch Blackwell LLP

4801 Main Street

Kansas City, MO 64112

T: (816) 980-8000

F: (816) 983-8080

Charles.Renner@huschblackwell.com

Attorneys for Defendants Kansas City Election Board

Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICES

I certify that a copy of the foregoing was filed on case.net and also served by email on November 10, 2025, to the following:

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

JACKSON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTION COMMISSIONERS; MICHAEL K. WHITEHEAD, HENRY R. CARNER, COLLEEN M. SCOTT, and LYLE K. QUERRY, in their official capacities as commissioners of the Jackson County Board of Election Commissioners; TAMMY BROWN and SARAH ZORICH, in their official capacities as directors of the Jackson County Board of Election Commissioners

bconstance@scmlaw.com
jdwilliamson@comecast.net

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

/s/ David Raymond
Attorney

Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document Not an Official Court Document

