

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

DONALD J. TRUMP FOR PRESIDENT, INC.; Civil Action No. 2:20-CV-966  
GLENN THOMPSON; MIKE KELLY;  
JOHN JOYCE; GUY RESCHENTHALER;  
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE; Honorable Judge J. Nicholas Ranjan  
MELANIE STRINGHILL PATTERSON; and  
CLAYTON DAVID SHOW,

Plaintiffs,

*Filed Electronically*

v.

KATHY BOOCKVAR, in her capacity as  
Secretary of the Commonwealth of  
Pennsylvania; WASHINGTON COUNTY  
BOARD OF ELECTIONS; *et al.*,

Defendants.

**DEFENDANT WASHINGTON COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS’  
MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS’ AMENDED COMPLAINT, OR,  
ALTERNATIVELY, MOTION FOR A MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT  
AND/OR MOTION TO STRIKE**

AND NOW, comes the Defendant, Washington County Board of Elections, by and through its attorneys, Robert J. Grimm, Esquire, Ryan M. Joyce, Esquire, and the law firm of Swartz Campbell, LLC, and files the instant Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint, or, alternatively, Motion for a More Definite Statement and/or Motion to Strike, setting forth and averring in support thereof the following:

**I. FACTS & PROCEDURE**

1. The Plaintiffs—the President’s reelection campaign, the Republican National Committee, and various elected officials and registered electors (collectively, “the Plaintiffs”)—have filed an Amended Complaint against the Defendants—Kathy Boockvar, the Secretary

and Chief Elections Officer of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the Boards of Elections of Pennsylvania's 67 Counties, including the Washington County Board of Elections ("Washington County").

2. The Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint again recounts purported election irregularities surrounding Pennsylvania's June 2, 2020 Primary Election and raises the specter of the same plaguing the November 3, 2020 General Election.
3. The Plaintiffs continue to insist that these irregularities are a direct result of the inconsistent and imperfect implementation of Act 77, the mail-in voting law enacted by the General Assembly in the fall of 2019.
4. The Plaintiffs renew their challenge to specific practices, including the return of ballots to locations other than the offices of the Counties' Boards of Elections; the counting of ballots lacking a secrecy envelope; and residency requirements imposed on poll watchers.
5. The Plaintiffs promote an additional challenge to some Counties' Boards of Elections' alleged mishandling of voters who, despite applying for and receiving mail-in ballots, ultimately opted to vote in person rather than submit their ballot through the mail.
6. Washington County filed a Motion to Dismiss the Plaintiffs' original Complaint because the Complaint contained no allegations specific to Washington County, especially with reference to any of the above-identified practices.
7. The Plaintiffs, in their Amended Complaint, have again failed to allege any election-related misconduct or wrongdoing on the part of Washington County.
8. The Plaintiffs persist in failing to state any claims against Washington County upon which relief can be granted and their Amended Complaint against it should be dismissed.
9. In the alternative, the Plaintiffs must be ordered to file an amended pleading that once and for all supplies a more definite statement of their allegations against Washington

County, while also eliminating certain allegations which Washington County submits should be struck by the Court.

## **II. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS**

10. In reviewing a motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), “[t]he applicable standard of review requires the court to accept as true all allegations in the complaint and all reasonable inferences that can be drawn therefrom, and view them in the light most favorable to the non-moving party.” Rocks v. City of Philadelphia, 868 F.2d 644, 645 (3d Cir. 1989).
11. Under the United States Supreme Court's decision in Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, dismissal of a complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) is proper where the averments of the complaint demonstrably fail to raise directly or inferentially the material elements necessary to obtain relief under a viable legal theory of recovery. 550 U.S. 544 (2007).
12. The allegations of the complaint must be grounded on adequate factual and legal bases such as to move the claim from the realm of mere possibility to one that shows entitlement by presenting “a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” Id. at 570.
13. The Amended Complaint is no different than the original Complaint in that Washington County receives only passing reference in it, appearing in the caption and listed as a Defendant under the “Parties” section of the Complaint, along with 66 other Counties. **See Pls.’ Am. Compl. (ECF-232), at ¶ 17.**
14. The Amended Complaint remains absolutely devoid of any allegations implicating Washington County in the practices of which the Plaintiffs complain.
15. The Amended Complaint contains the same discrete and substantive allegations leveled against Allegheny County and Philadelphia County as in the original Complaint, but none against Washington County. **Id. at ¶¶ 2, 126-127, 135-136, 150-151, 158.**

16. The Amended Complaint, in lieu of referring to twenty (20) unidentified Counties as the original Complaint had, now enumerates nineteen (19) different Counties that allegedly permitted the return of absentee and mail-in ballots to locations other than the offices of the Boards of Elections, such as shopping centers, parking lots, fairgrounds, parks, retirement homes, college campuses, fire halls, municipal government buildings, and elected officials' offices. **Id.** at ¶ 126.
17. Washington County is notably absent from the list of nineteen (19) Counties, which include Allegheny, Bedford, Bucks, Chester, Cameron, Carbon, Centre, Chester, Clinton, Crawford, Dauphin, Delaware, Elk, Erie, Luzerne, Montgomery, Philadelphia, Venango, and York. **Id.**
18. In point of fact, the Amended Complaint does not cure the legal insufficiency of the Plaintiffs' claim(s) against Washington County, in that it does not include any additional or novel allegations against Washington County.
19. The Plaintiffs have had their second bite at the apple and should not be permitted a third or even fourth. See Milton Reg'l Sewer Auth. v. Travelers Cas. & Sur. Co. of Am., No. 4:13-CV-2786, 2014 WL 5529169, at \*8, n. 2 (M.D. Pa. Nov. 3, 2014) ("For instance, where the plaintiff had already amended plaintiff's complaint and yet failed to allege sufficient facts, the courts may find that '[t]hree bites at the apple is enough,' and conclude that it is proper to deny leave to replead."), aff'd, 648 F. App'x 215 (3d Cir. 2016); and see Jones v. Philadelphia Parking Auth., No. CIV.A. 11-4699, 2015 WL 1378737, at \*3 (E.D. Pa. Mar. 26, 2015) ("Here, where plaintiff has been permitted to file at least four versions of his Complaint, each one failing to properly and sufficiently allege a claim for relief, dismissal of his Third Amended Complaint is with prejudice, in light of his 'repeated failure to cure deficiencies

by amendments previously allowed,’ as well as the futility of giving plaintiff a fifth bite at the apple.”).

20. The Plaintiffs, in both their original Complaint and now their Amended Complaint, neglect to charge Washington County with deviating from or violating Act 77 or any other election laws. Specifically, the Plaintiffs do not allege that Washington County endorsed or engaged in the collection of absentee and mail-in ballots at locations other than the office of the Board of Elections; improperly counted absentee and mail-in ballots that should not have been counted for want of a secrecy envelope; excluded poll watchers who were not residents of Washington County; or, prevented eligible voters from casting an in-person ballot rather than voting by the absentee or mail-in ballot they had applied for and received.
21. It only stands to reason that if the Plaintiffs had evidence of Washington County committing any of these practices, then they would have now pleaded in their Amended Complaint that Washington County committed these practices. This is especially so given that the Plaintiffs were “put on notice” by virtue of Washington County’s Motion to Dismiss their original Complaint for want of any such allegations.
22. Therefore, even accepting as true the allegations and inferences of the Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint, it remains very much the case that these allegations and inferences still do not elevate the Plaintiffs’ claims against Washington County from the realm of possibility to that of plausibility.
23. Simply stated, the Plaintiffs still have not stated any claims against Washington County upon which the Court can grant relief, and, as such, Washington County should be dismissed.

**III. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT**

24. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(e) authorizes a party to make a motion for a more definite statement if a pleading is “so vague or ambiguous that the party cannot reasonably prepare a response.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(e).
25. “Motions for more definite statements arise in . . . ‘cases where because of the vagueness and ambiguity of the pleading the answering party will not be able to frame a responsive pleading.’” Schaedler v. Reading Eagle Publ’ns, Inc., 370 F.2d 795, 798 (3d Cir. 1967).
26. In the event the Court declines to grant dismissal, it should, in the alternative and at a minimum, grant the Plaintiffs one (and only one) further opportunity to file an amended pleading that remedies the ongoing insufficiency of their allegations with respect to Washington County.
27. The Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint is somehow longer and more verbose than the original Complaint, stretching 72 pages and topping out at 267 paragraphs—16 pages and 63 paragraphs more than the original Complaint.
28. Notwithstanding all of its additional verbiage, the Amended Complaint is still remarkable for the absence of any concrete factual allegations directed at Washington County. Indeed, the Amended Complaint (like the original Complaint before it) does not include a solitary allegation that Washington County permitted ballots to be returned to locations other than the office of the Board of Elections; processed and counted ballots returned without a secrecy envelope; barred poll watchers from Counties other than Washington County; or, turned away voters who had applied for and received absentee or mail-in ballots but, instead, chose to vote in person on election day.
29. Moreover, the Plaintiffs continue to “lump” together practically of the Defendants—in particular, the Counties—which is a practice that this and many other federal courts have

admonished against time and again. See Henderson v. Bickel, No. CV 17-98, 2018 WL 692095, at \*3 (W.D. Pa. Feb. 2, 2018) (criticizing plaintiff's habit of "lumping multiple Defendants together"); Watkins v. ITM Records, No. CIV.A. 14-CV-01049, 2015 WL 4505954, at \*3 (E.D. Pa. July 24, 2015) ("What's more, this lumping of different defendants together makes demonstrating a plausible claim for relief impossible."); and see Pagan v. Medina, No. 2:13-CV-01850 WJM, 2013 WL 3096916, at \*3 (D.N.J. June 18, 2013) ("Instead, the Complaint lumps all of the Defendants together and merely recites the elements of the cause of action. This is insufficient to survive a motion to dismiss.").

30. In view of the dearth of allegations against Washington County, coupled with the vague, ambiguous, non-differentiated, and insufficiently specific character of the Plaintiffs' allegations overall, the Court should order the Plaintiffs to file an amended pleading supplying a more definite statement of the Plaintiffs' claims against Washington County.

#### **IV. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STRIKE**

31. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f) permits a motion to strike, whereby a party may move the Court to "strike from a pleading . . . any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f).
32. Motions to strike find additional support under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, which requires a plaintiff to make "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2).
33. In Wallace v. Fed. Employees of U.S. Dist. Court, the Eastern District Court observed:

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2), a complaint setting forth a claim for relief must contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief," and the plaintiff is limited to a "short and plain statement" in order to give the defendant fair notice of the plaintiff's claims and the bases thereof. Where plaintiffs have filed

voluminous complaints containing arguments, recitations of the law, and otherwise unnecessary detail, courts have dismissed their complaints pursuant to Rules 8 and 12(f), which provides that the court, on its own or pursuant to a motion by a party, “may order stricken from any pleading . . . any redundant, immaterial, impertinent, or scandalous matter.”

Wallace v. Fed. Employees of U.S. Dist. Court, No. CIV.A. 07-1132 NLH, 2008 WL 1886107, at \*3, n. 4 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 28, 2008).

34. The Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint, which is 72 pages in length and features 267 paragraphs, is rife with anecdotal and unsubstantiated accounts of election irregularities which fit the very definition of immaterial or impertinent. See Hoffer v. Grange Ins. Co., No. 1:14-CV-0262, 2014 WL 2177589, at \*3 (M.D. Pa. May 23, 2014) (“Impertinent matter consists of statements that do not pertain, and are not necessary, to the issues in question.”).
35. Furthermore, the Amended Complaint presents needless argumentation and is peppered with an inordinate number of citations to state and federal cases, state and federal statutes, and the Pennsylvania and United States Constitutions.
36. The Court, under the auspices of Rule 12(f), should strike from the Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint the allegations it deems contrary to the pleading standard prescribed by Rule 8(a)(2).

**V. JOINDER IN AND INCORPORATION OF OTHER DEFENDANTS’ MOTIONS**

37. Washington County joins in and incorporates by reference the Motions to Dismiss and other Motions of the various Defendants, including but not limited to the Motions filed by Secretary Boockvar, Allegheny County, Philadelphia County (and other Counties jointly represented along with it), and Centre County (and other Counties jointly represented along with it).

38. Washington County joins in and incorporates these Motions to Dismiss and other Motions both to the extent they align with Washington County's own Motions and to the extent they introduce additional and/or alternative grounds for relief, including but not limited to those relating to the Plaintiffs' standing, the existence of jurisdiction, the propriety of venue, the applicability of the Pullman abstention doctrine, and immunity.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

39. Washington County moves the Court to dismiss the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint against it for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

40. Alternatively, Washington County moves the Court to order the Plaintiffs to file an amended pleading curing the pleading deficiencies discussed above and omitting all allegations struck by the Court.

WHEREFORE, the Defendant, Washington County Board of Elections, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court **GRANT** the within Motion, thereby dismissing the Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and all claims set forth therein against the Defendant, Washington County Board of Elections, in their entirety and with prejudice.

Respectfully submitted,

SWARTZ CAMPBELL, LLC

By: /s/Robert J. Grimm  
Robert J. Grimm, Esquire  
PA ID No. 55381  
Ryan M. Joyce, Esquire  
PA ID No. 309053  
436 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., Floors 7 & 8  
Koppers Building  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
(412) 232-9800  
[rgrimm@swartzcampbell.com](mailto:rgrimm@swartzcampbell.com)  
Attorneys for the Defendant,  
Washington County  
Board of Elections

**CERTIFICATE OF MEET-AND-CONFER**

I, Ryan M. Joyce, Esquire, hereby certify that I contacted and spoke with Plaintiffs' counsel, Ronald L. Hicks, Jr., Esquire, by telephone on Tuesday, July 28, 2020, for the purpose of meeting and conferring with Plaintiffs' counsel in a good-faith effort to identify deficiencies in Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint relative to the Defendant, the Washington County Board of Elections. Despite this good-faith effort, the undersigned and Plaintiffs' counsel were unable to resolve their differences and agree on amendments to cure said deficiencies.

SWARTZ CAMPBELL, LLC

By: /s/Ryan M. Joyce  
Ryan M. Joyce, Esquire  
PA ID No. 309053

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Robert J. Grimm, Esquire, hereby certify that true and correct copies of the foregoing **Defendant Washington County Board of Elections' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint, or, alternatively, Motion for a More Definite Statement and/or Motion to Strike** have been served this 31<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2020, by ECF, to:

*All Counsel of Record*

Respectfully submitted,

SWARTZ CAMPBELL, LLC

By: /s/Robert J. Grimm  
Robert J. Grimm, Esquire  
PA ID No. 55381  
Ryan M. Joyce, Esquire  
PA ID No. 309053  
436 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., Floors 7 & 8  
Koppers Building  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
(412) 232-9800  
[rgrimm@swartzcampbell.com](mailto:rgrimm@swartzcampbell.com)  
Attorneys for the Defendant,  
Washington County  
Board of Elections

