and RNC and NRSC,

Defendant-Intervenors.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

2 3

1

4 5

6 7

8 9

11 12

10

14

15

13

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27 28

Plaintiff-Intervenors DSCC and DCCC hereby respectfully move to voluntarily withdraw as parties from this case and dismiss their remaining pending claims. This case was initiated by Plaintiffs Mi Familia Vota, Arizona Coalition for Change, Living United for Change in Arizona, and Chispa Arizona (collectively, "Plaintiffs") in August 2021. ECF No. 1. In September 2021, DSCC and DCCC moved to intervene, primarily to protect their interests in other litigation that was then ongoing. Mot. to Intervene, ECF No. 50. This Court granted that motion on October 4, 2021, but limited Plaintiff-Intervenors' participation, allowing them to file briefs only if they "believe[] that an issue affecting [them] has not been briefed." Order Granting Mot. to Intervene, ECF No. 53.

Plaintiff-Intervenors now seek to withdraw from the case and dismiss their remaining claims. There is no procedural rule that expressly addresses how a party may withdraw as a plaintiff in a multi-plaintiff case, but the power to dismiss some—but not all—plaintiffs is undoubtedly within the power of the federal courts. In these circumstances, courts have generally applied the standards set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(2), which permits a plaintiff to voluntarily dismiss an action after the opposing party serves an answer "by court order, on terms the court considers proper." See, e.g., North Dakota v. U.S. Env't Prot. Agency, No. 3:15-cv-059, Order Dismissing State of Colorado, New Mexico State Engineer, & New Mexico Environment Dep't as Plaintiffs, ECF No. 280; Loose v. N. Wildwood City, No. 10-6587, 2012 WL 480025, at \*1 (D.N.J. Feb. 14, 2012). The key question in considering such a motion is whether it will prejudice the remaining parties. See, e.g., Loose, 2012 WL 48005, at \*1.

Here, granting Plaintiff-Intervenors' motion is proper and their withdrawal will not prejudice the rights of the other parties—materially or otherwise. The original Plaintiffs continue to pursue their claims in this case and Plaintiff-Intervenors' withdrawal will not impact those claims. Nor are there any pending claims or counterclaims against Plaintiff-Intervenors. As a result, this is a non-dispositive motion that will not dispense with any of the claims at issue in this case; the only impact will be that Plaintiff-Intervenors will no longer be parties to the case. In addition, counsel for Plaintiff-Intervenors have informed

Case 2:21-cv-01423-DWL Document 307 Filed 01/13/25 Page 3 of 3
counsel for all other parties of Plaintiff-Intervenors' intent to withdraw; no party opposes.  Plaintiff-Intervenors accordingly request dismissal as Plaintiffs in this case and that
each party bear their own costs.
Dated: January 13, 2025 Respectfully Submitted,
/s/ Daniel A. Arellano Roy Herrera (Bar No. 032901) Daniel A. Arellano (Bar. No. 032304) HERRERA ARELLANO LLP 1001 North Central Avenue Suite 404 Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Telephone: (602) 567-4820 roy@ha-firm.com daniel@ha-firm.com
Elisabeth C. Frost* Renata O'Donnell* ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP 250 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Suite 400 Washington, DC 20001 Phone: (202) 968-4490 Facsimile: (202) 968-4498 efrost@elias.law rodonnell@elias.law
Ben Stafford*  ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP  1700 Seventh Ave. Suite 2100

1700 Seventh Ave, Suite 2100 Seattle, WA 98101 Phone: (206) 656-0176 bstafford@elias.law

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenors \*Admitted Pro Hac Vice