1 Matthew J. Smith, Mohave County Attorney Ryan H. Esplin, No. 029235 2 Chief Civil Deputy County Attorney P O Box 7000 3 Kingman, AZ 86402-7000 Telephone: (928) 753-0770, Fax No.: (928) 753-429 4 EspliR@mohave.gov CAOcivil.court@mohave.gov Attorney for Mohave County Recorder (Kristi Blair) 5 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 8 Mi Familia Vota, et. al., No.: CV-21-1423-PHX-DWL 9 Plaintiffs, 10 ANSWER OF DEFENDANT MOHAVE COUNTY RECORDER, VS. 11 KRISTI BLAIR 12 Katie Hobbs; et al. 13 Defendants. 14 15 Defendant Mohave County Recorder, Kristi Blair, by and through undersigned 16 counsel, affirmatively alleges that she is not a proper or necessary party to this action, 17 and she takes a nominal position on the issues presented. Recorder Blair takes no 18 position on the substantive questions concerning the laws that Plaintiffs challenge in their 19 Complaint. Recorder Blair is only a party to this lawsuit because Plaintiffs have named 20 her in the lawsuit, she has been served with the Complaint, and she has a statutory duty to 21 implement the laws being challenged. Recorder Blair will comply with any Orders of 22 this Court, including any Orders from appellate Courts. 23 24 25

Page **1** of **6**

Answer Mohave County Recorder: CV-21-1423-PHX-DWL

26

Kristi Blair should be dismissed from the lawsuit, or in the alternative, be designated as a nominal party. Every allegation made by Plaintiffs in their Complaint, which is not expressly admitted in this Answer, is denied.

Defendant Blair answers the Complaint as follows:

- 1. Defendant admits the allegations contained in paragraphs 6-9, 21-24, 26-41, and 86 of Plaintiffs' Complaint.
- 2. Regarding paragraph 1 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that the Arizona legislature passed Senate Bill 1485 which, among other things, made changes to the early voting list. Further, Defendant admits that the Arizona legislature passed Senate Bill 1003 that made changes to the curing process of unsigned early ballot envelopes. As to the remaining parts of paragraph 1, Defendant denies the same.
- 3. Regarding paragraph 4 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that Plaintiffs are seeking to obtain a judgment declaring the Voter Purge Law and Cure Period Law illegal and unenforceable, but does not take a position as to the substantive merits of their lawsuit.
- 4. Regarding paragraph 5 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that Plaintiffs are filing this Action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983 and 1988, but denies the remaining parts of the paragraph.
- 5. Regarding paragraph 25 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that SB 1485 requires the County Records to remove a voter from the early voting list if certain criteria are met, but denies that Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 16-168(K) imposes that duty. Instead, the statutory duty referenced herein is found at Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 16-544(K). As to the remaining part of the paragraph, Defendant admits that she is being sued in Answer Mohave County Recorder: CV-21-1423-PHX-DWL

her official capacity. Whether she is a person within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and acts under color of state law are legal in nature, and no response is necessary.

- 6. Regarding paragraph 57 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that ten of Arizona's fifteen counties completed hand counts of a sample of ballots to confirm the accuracy of the vote tabulation equipment, and each confirmed the accuracy of the results. Further, Defendant admits that Maricopa County retained two independent auditing firms to conduct forensic audits of the tabulation equipment's software and hardware used for the 2020 election. Regarding the results of the audits Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations, and therefore denies the same.
- 7. Regarding paragraph 81 of the Complaint, if the voter wishes to remain on the active early voting list, the voter shall both (1) confirm in writing the voter's desire to remain on the active early voting list, and (2) return the completed notice to the county recorder or other officer in charge of elections within ninety days after the notice is sent to the voter. As to the remaining parts of the paragraph, Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations, and therefore denies the same.
- 8. Regarding paragraph 85 of the Complaint, Defendant admits that early vote ballots must be accompanied by a signed affidavit, but lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to whether election officials in other counties receive unsigned ballots and mismatching signatures for every election, and therefore

deny the same.	As to the changes	to subsequent	changes to	the law	and its	effect,
and the remaini	ing parts of the para	graph, Defend	dant denies	the same	e.	

- 9. Regarding paragraph 87 of the Complaint, early-voting ballots, in order to be counted and valid, must be received by the County Recorder or other officer in charge of elections or deposited at any polling place in the county no later than 7:00pm on election day, but as to the remaining parts of the paragraph, Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations, and therefore denies the same.
- 10. Defendant denies the allegations in paragraphs 2, 3, 64, 66, 67, 68, 127, 136, and 142 of Plaintiffs' complaint.
- 11. Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations contained in paragraphs 10-20, 42, 44-56, 58-63, 65, 69-71, 73-80, 82-84, 88-126, 132-135, 140-141, and 144-145, and therefore denies the same.
- 12. Defendant asserts that the allegations in paragraphs 43, 72, 128-131, 137-139, and 143 state legal conclusions to which no response is required.

RESPONSE TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Mohave County Recorder takes no position on the substantive questions concerning the laws that Plaintiffs challenge, and so takes no position concerning whether the Court should grant the relief that Plaintiffs request.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1. Defendant affirmatively alleges that she is not a proper or necessary party to this action, and her role in this action is nominal.

- 2. Defendant affirmatively alleges that even if she is a necessary party for purposes of injunctive relief, her role in this action would remain nominal.
- 3. Defendant affirmatively alleges that she has qualified immunity for performing her official duties as required by law. See Pierson v. Ray, 386 U.S. 547 (1967); Luchunski v. Congrove, 193 Ariz. 176, 971 P.2d 636 (App. 1998).
- 4. Additional facts may be revealed by future discovery which support affirmative defenses available to, but presently unknown to, this Defendant. Accordingly, Defendant hereby incorporates by reference all applicable affirmative defenses pursuant to Rule 8 and 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure as though set forth fully herein.

RELIEF

A. Mohave County Recorder hereby requests this Court to dismiss the Complaint with Prejudice as to this Defendant; or in the alternative, designate her as a nominal party, and granting such other and further relief as the Court deems proper. Further, Mohave County Recorder requests the Court to deny any efforts by Plaintiffs or any other parties to seek the reimbursement of attorneys fees and court costs against her.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 15th day of November, 2021.

MOHAVE COUNTY ATTORNEY

/s/ Ryan H. Esplin RYAN H. ESPLIN. Attorney for Defendant County Recorder Kristi Blair

26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on November 15, 2021, I electronically transmitted the foregoing

Answer of Defendant Mohave County Recorder, Kristi Blair to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to

the CM/ECF registrants on record.

By: /s/ Ryan H. Esplin

Answer_Mohave County Recorder: CV-21-1423-PHX-DWL

Page **6** of **6**