

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TALLAHASSEE DIVISION**

**FLORIDA STATE CONFERENCE
OF THE NAACP, DISABILITY
RIGHTS FLORIDA, et al.,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**LAUREL M. LEE, in her official
capacity as Florida Secretary of State,
et al.,**

Defendants.

**Case No. 4:21-cv-00186-MW-MAF
(Lead Consolidated Case)
Case No. 4:21-cv-00187**

**CHRISTINA WHITE’S ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE
DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFFS’ FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Defendant Christina White, in her official capacity as Supervisor of Elections for Miami-Dade County, (“Defendant” or “Supervisor White”), pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 8, hereby answers Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint, D.E. 45, as follows:

1. The case cited in Paragraph 1 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.
2. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of the Amended Complaint.
3. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of the Amended Complaint.

4. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Amended Complaint.

5. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 5 of the Amended Complaint.

6. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 6 of the Amended Complaint.

7. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the Amended Complaint.

8. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Amended Complaint.

9. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of the Amended Complaint.

10. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 of the Amended Complaint.

11. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of the Amended Complaint.

12. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 12 of the Amended Complaint.

13. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 13 of the Amended Complaint.

14. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of the Amended Complaint.

15. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of the Amended Complaint.

16. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 16 of the Amended Complaint.

17. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of the Amended Complaint.

18. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 18 of the Amended Complaint.

19. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of the Amended Complaint.

20. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of the Amended Complaint.

21. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 21 of the Amended Complaint.

22. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of the Amended Complaint.

23. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of the Amended Complaint.

24. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of the Amended Complaint.

25. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of the Amended Complaint.

26. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of the Amended Complaint.

27. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 27 of the Amended Complaint.

28. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 28 of the Amended Complaint.

29. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 29 of the Amended Complaint.

30. Defendant admits the allegation in Paragraph 30 that Supervisor White is the Supervisor of Elections of Miami-Dade County and the named Supervisors of Elections are the Supervisors of Elections for their respective counties. The statutes cited in Paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint speaks for themselves and thus no answer is required. Defendant denies or is without knowledge as to all other allegations contained in Paragraph 30 of the Amended Complaint.

31. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 31 of the Amended Complaint.

32. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 32 of the Amended Complaint.

33. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 33 of the Amended Complaint.

34. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 34 of the Amended Complaint.

35. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 35 of the Amended Complaint.

36. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 36 of the Amended Complaint.

37. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 37 of the Amended Complaint.

38. The case cited in Paragraph 38 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

39. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 39 of the Amended Complaint.

40. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of the Amended Complaint.

41. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 41 of the Amended Complaint.

42. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 42 of the Amended Complaint.

43. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 43 of the Amended Complaint.

44. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 44 of the Amended Complaint.

45. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 45 of the Amended.

46. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 46 of the Amended Complaint.

47. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 47 of the Amended Complaint.

48. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 48 of the Amended Complaint.

49. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 49 of the Amended Complaint.

50. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 50 of the Amended Complaint.

51. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 51 of the Amended Complaint.

52. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 52 of the Amended Complaint.

53. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 53 of the Amended Complaint.

54. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 54 of the Amended Complaint.

55. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 55 of the Amended Complaint.

56. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 56 of the Amended Complaint.

57. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 57 of the Amended Complaint.

58. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 58 of the Amended Complaint.

59. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 59 of the Amended Complaint.

60. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 60 of the Amended Complaint.

61. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 61 of the Amended Complaint.

62. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 62 of the Amended Complaint.

63. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 63 of the Amended Complaint.

64. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 64 of the Amended Complaint.

65. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 65 of the Amended Complaint.

66. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 66 of the Amended Complaint.

67. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 67 of the Amended Complaint.

68. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 68 of the Amended Complaint.

69. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 69 of the Amended Complaint.

70. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 70 of the Amended Complaint.

71. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 71 of the Amended Complaint.

72. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 72 of the Amended Complaint.

73. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 73 of the Amended Complaint.

74. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 74 of the Amended Complaint.

75. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 75 of the Amended Complaint.

76. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 76 of the Amended Complaint.

77. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 77 of the Amended Complaint.

78. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 78 of the Amended Complaint.

79. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 79 of the Amended Complaint.

80. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 80 of the Amended Complaint.

81. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 81 of the Amended Complaint.

82. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 82 of the Amended Complaint.

83. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 83 of the Amended Complaint.

84. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 84 of the Amended Complaint.

85. Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 85 of the Amended Complaint.

86. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 86 of the Amended Complaint.

87. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 87 of the Amended Complaint.

88. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 88 of the Amended Complaint.

89. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 89 of the Amended Complaint.

90. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 90 of the Amended Complaint.

91. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 91 of the Amended Complaint.

92. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 92 of the Amended Complaint.

93. Defendant admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 93 of the Amended Complaint.

94. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 94 of the Amended Complaint.

95. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 95 of the Amended Complaint.

96. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 96 of the Amended Complaint.

97. The statute cited in Paragraph 97 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

98. The statute cited in Paragraph 98 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

99. The statute cited in Paragraph 99 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

100. The statute cited in Paragraph 100 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

101. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 101 of the Amended Complaint.

102. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 102 of the Amended Complaint.

103. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 103 of the Amended Complaint.

104. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 104 of the Amended Complaint.

105. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 105 of the Amended Complaint.

106. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 106 of the Amended Complaint.

107. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 107 of the Amended Complaint.

108. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 108 of the Amended Complaint.

109. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 109 of the Amended Complaint.

110. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 110 of the Amended Complaint.

111. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 111 of the Amended Complaint.

112. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 112 of the Amended Complaint.

113. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 113 of the Amended Complaint.

114. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 114 of the Amended Complaint.

115. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 115 of the Amended Complaint.

116. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 116 of the Amended Complaint.

117. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 117 of the Amended Complaint.

118. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 118 of the Amended Complaint.

119. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 119 of the Amended Complaint.

120. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 120 of the Amended Complaint.

121. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 121 of the Amended Complaint.

122. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 122 of the Amended Complaint.

123. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 123 of the Amended Complaint.

124. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 124 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT I

125. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

126. The statute cited in Paragraph 126 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

127. The case cited in Paragraph 127 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

128. The case cited in Paragraph 128 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

129. The statute cited in Paragraph 129 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no answer is required.

130. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 130 of the Amended Complaint.

131. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 131 of the Amended Complaint.

132. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 132 of the Amended Complaint.

133. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 133 of the Amended Complaint.

134. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 134 of the Amended Complaint.

135. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 135 of the Amended Complaint.

136. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 136 of the Amended Complaint.

137. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 137 of the Amended Complaint.

138. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 138 of the Amended Complaint.

139. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 139 of the Amended Complaint.

140. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 140 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 140 of the Amended Complaint.

141. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 141 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 141 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT II

142. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

143. The U.S. Constitution provision contained in Paragraph 143 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no response is required.

144. The case cited in Paragraph 144 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and thus no response is required.

145. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 145 of the Amended Complaint.

146. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 146 of the Amended Complaint.

147. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 147 of the Amended Complaint.

148. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 148 of the Amended Complaint.

149. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 149 of the Amended Complaint.

150. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 150 of the Amended Complaint.

151. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 151 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT III

152. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

153. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 153 of the Amended Complaint.

154. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 154 of the Amended Complaint.

155. The case cited in Paragraph 155 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and therefore no answer is required.

156. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 156 of the Amended Complaint.

157. The case cited in Paragraph 157 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and therefore no answer is required.

158. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 158 of the Amended Complaint.

159. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 159 of the Amended Complaint.

160. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 160 of the Amended Complaint.

161. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 161 of the Amended Complaint.

162. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 162 of the Amended Complaint.

163. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 163 of the Amended Complaint.

164. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 164 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 164 of the Amended Complaint.

165. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 165 of the Amended Complaint.

166. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 166 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT IV

167. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

168. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 168 of the Amended Complaint.

169. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 169 of the Amended Complaint.

170. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 170 of the Amended Complaint.

171. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 171 of the Amended Complaint.

172. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 172 of the Amended Complaint.

173. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 173 of the Amended Complaint.

174. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 174 of the Amended Complaint.

175. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 175 of the Amended Complaint.

176. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 176 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 176 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT V

177. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

178. The U.S. Constitution provision cited in Paragraph 178 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and as such no response is necessary.

179. The case cited in Paragraph 179 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and as such no response is necessary.

180. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 180 of the Amended Complaint.

181. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 181 of the Amended Complaint.

182. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 182 of the Amended Complaint.

183. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 183 of the Amended Complaint.

184. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 184 of the Amended Complaint.

185. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 185 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 185 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT VI

186. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

187. The U.S. Constitution provision cited in Paragraph 187 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and as such no response is necessary.

188. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 188 of the Amended Complaint.

189. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 189 of the Amended Complaint.

190. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 190 of the Amended Complaint.

191. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 191 of the Amended Complaint.

192. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 192 of the Amended Complaint.

193. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 193 of the Amended Complaint.

194. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 194 of the Amended Complaint.

195. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 195 of the Amended Complaint.

196. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 196 of the Amended Complaint.

197. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 197 of the Amended Complaint.

198. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 198 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 198 of the Amended Complaint.

199. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 199 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 199 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT VII

200. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

201. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 201 of the Amended Complaint.

202. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 202 of the Amended Complaint.

203. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 203 of the Amended Complaint.

204. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 204 of the Amended Complaint.

205. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 205 of the Amended Complaint.

206. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 206 of the Amended Complaint.

207. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 207 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 207 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT VIII

208. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

209. The statute cited in Paragraph 209 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and as such no response is required.

210. The case cited in Paragraph 210 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and as such no response is required.

211. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 211 of the Amended Complaint.

212. The statute cited in Paragraph 212 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and as such no response is required.

213. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 213 of the Amended Complaint.

214. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 214 of the Amended Complaint.

215. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 215 of the Amended Complaint.

216. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 216 of the Amended Complaint.

217. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 217 of the Amended Complaint.

218. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 218 of the Amended Complaint.

219. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 219 of the Amended Complaint.

220. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 220 of the Amended Complaint.

221. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 221 of the Amended Complaint.

222. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 222 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 222 of the Amended Complaint.

223. As to Miami-Dade County, Defendant denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 223 of the Amended Complaint. Defendant is without knowledge as to the remaining allegations contained in Paragraph 223 of the Amended Complaint.

COUNT IX

224. Defendant re-allege all responses to preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth herein.

225. The statute cited in Paragraph 225 of the Amended Complaint speaks for itself and as such no response is required.

226. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 226 of the Amended Complaint.

227. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 227 of the Amended Complaint.

228. Defendant is without knowledge as to the allegations contained in Paragraph 228 of the Amended Complaint.

229-241. Paragraphs 229-241 of the Amended Complaint do not contain any allegations and only set forth Plaintiffs' request for relief. As such, no response is required.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. The Amended Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
2. This Court lacks subject-matter jurisdiction over this action.
3. Plaintiffs are not entitled to declaratory relief for past conduct.
4. Plaintiffs have not suffered an injury in fact because of any action by Supervisor White and, therefore, do not possess the requisite standing to bring this cause of action against Supervisor White.
5. Plaintiffs do not possess the requisite standing to raise the claim in Count I that the alleged Drop-Box Restrictions, Vote-by-Mail Application Restrictions, Voluntary Assistance Ban and Voting Line Relief Restrictions violates Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act against Supervisor White because the alleged violation is not likely to be redressed by the requested relief of enjoining Supervisor White from acting in concert with the identified provisions.
6. Plaintiffs have failed to raise a claim in Count I and VIII because there is no private right of action under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.
7. Plaintiffs do not possess the requisite standing to request a declaration in Counts II, VI and VII that the alleged Drop-Box Restrictions, Vote-by-Mail Application Restrictions, Voluntary Assistance Ban and Voting Line Relief Restrictions violates the U.S. Constitution against Supervisor White because the alleged violation is not likely to be redressed by the requested relief of enjoining Supervisor White from acting in concert with the identified provision.

8. Plaintiffs do not possess the requisite standing to request a declaration in Count III that the alleged Drop-Box Restrictions, Vote-by-Mail Application Restrictions, Voluntary Assistance Ban and Voting Line Relief Restrictions violates the Americans with Disabilities Act against Supervisor White because the alleged violation is not likely to be redressed by the requested relief of enjoining Supervisor White from acting in concert with the identified provisions.

9. Plaintiffs' claims as to the Drop-Box Restrictions, Vote-by-Mail Application Restrictions, Voluntary Assistance Ban and Voting Line Relief Restrictions are not yet ripe for adjudication against Supervisor White because Plaintiffs provide no allegations that Supervisor White has taken any action that has resulted in any injury-in-fact to Plaintiffs.

10. Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim in Counts III and IX because Plaintiffs have not alleged that Supervisor White has failed to make a reasonable accommodation on account of disability.

11. As to any claims relating to the Voluntary Assistance Ban and Voting Line Relief Restrictions, Plaintiffs have failed to satisfy Article III's redressability requirement because other relevant statutes and regulations remain unchallenged.

12. As to the Drop Box Restrictions, Plaintiffs lack standing to seek declaratory relief because the Drop Box Restrictions place restrictions on Supervisors of Elections, and Plaintiffs cannot rest a claim to relief on the legal rights or interests of third parties.

13. Plaintiffs do not possess the requisite standing to request a declaration in Counts IV and V that the alleged Voting Line Relief Restrictions violates the U.S. Constitution against Supervisor White because the alleged violation cannot be fairly traced to any action by Supervisor White.

14. Plaintiffs do not possess the requisite standing to request a declaration in Counts IV and V that the alleged Voting Line Relief Restrictions violates the U.S. Constitution against Supervisor White because the alleged violation is not likely to be redressed by the requested relief of enjoining Supervisor White from acting in concert with the identified provision.

15. Plaintiffs do not possess the requisite standing to request a declaration in Count IX that the alleged Voting Line Relief Restrictions violates Section 208 of the Voting Rights Act against Supervisor White because the alleged violation is not likely to be redressed by the requested relief of enjoining Supervisor White from acting in concert with the identified provision.

16. Plaintiffs have failed to state a cause of action against Supervisor White in Counts VI and VII because Plaintiffs have failed to allege any act of intentional discrimination against Supervisor White.

17. To the extent Plaintiffs' claims relate to the potential for arrest for a violation of the Voluntary Assistance Ban, Plaintiffs have failed to join an appropriate law enforcement agency as a required party.

18. Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint does not state a cause of action against Supervisor White for which relief can be granted because Florida Statutes provide

that the Secretary of State is the “chief election officer of the state” with “responsibility to ... [o]btain and maintain uniformity in the interpretation and implementation of the election laws ... [and] may ... adopt by rule uniform standards for the proper and equitable interpretation and implementation of the requirements of chapters 97 through 102 and 105 of the Election Code.” See § 97.012, Fla. Stat.

19. Plaintiffs cannot establish that no set of circumstances exists under which the challenged election laws would be valid.

20. Supervisor White is not liable in this action because their actions were not deliberately indifferent to Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights.

21. Plaintiffs fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted because the challenged election laws are supported by a sufficient state interest in Miami-Dade County which outweighs any burden such laws may impose.

22. Supervisor White adopts all affirmative defenses asserted by the other Defendants and incorporates them by reference as if fully set forth herein.

23. Supervisor White reserves the right to assert additional defenses as appropriate.

WHEREFORE, Supervisor White demands that the Amended Complaint be dismissed with prejudice, that judgment be entered in its favor, that it be awarded attorney’s fees, litigation expenses, and costs in accordance with applicable federal and state law, and that it be awarded such other relief as the Court deems proper, equitable, and just.

Date: July 20, 2021

Respectfully submitted,
GERALDINE BONZON-KEENAN
MIAMI-DADE COUNTY ATTORNEY

By: /s/ Oren Rosenthal

Oren Rosenthal
Assistant County Attorney
Florida Bar No. 86320
Michael B. Valdes
Assistant County Attorney
Florida Bar No. 93129

Miami-Dade County Attorney's Office
111 N.W. 1st Street, Suite 2810
Miami, Florida 33128
Phone: (305) 375-5151
Fax: (305) 375-5634
E-mail: orosent@miamidade.gov
mbv@miamidade.gov

Counsel for Christina White

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served to all counsel of record through the Court's CM/ECF system on July 20, 2021.

/s/ Oren Rosenthal

Oren A. Rosenthal
Assistant County Attorney

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing complies with the size, font, and formatting requirements of Local Rule 5.1(C).

/s/ Oren Rosenthal

Oren A. Rosenthal
Assistant County Attorney