

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

IN RE GEORGIA SENATE BILL 202 :  
: CIVIL ACTION FILE NO.  
:  
: 1:21-mi-55555-JPB  
:

---

SIXTH DISTRICT OF THE :  
AFRICAN METHODIST :  
EPISCOPAL CHURCH, a Georgia : CIVIL ACTION FILE NO.:  
nonprofit organization, et al. :  
: 1:21-cv-01284-JPB  
:

Plaintiffs,

vs.

BRIAN KEMP, Governor of the State :  
of Georgia in his official capacity, et :  
al., :

Defendants.

---

**COBB COUNTY DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES  
AND ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT**

COME NOW, Defendants COBB COUNTY BOARD OF ELECTIONS;  
TORI SILAS, STEPHEN F. BRUNING, JENNIFER MOSBACHER,<sup>1</sup> DEBBIE

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs originally named as Defendants, Phil Daniell, Fred Aiken, and Daryl Wilson, Jr., who were each members of the Cobb County Board of Elections and Registration at the time of the First Amended Complaint. Effective as of July 1, 2021, those three members were replaced by the appointment of Tori Silas, Stephen F. Bruning, and Jennifer Mosbacher to the Board. Plaintiffs and Cobb County

FISHER, and STACY EFRAT,<sup>2</sup> in their official capacities as Members of the Cobb County Board of Elections and Voter Registration (collectively, the “Cobb Defendants”) and file their Affirmative Defenses and Answer to Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint [Doc. 877]<sup>3</sup> showing the Court as follows:

### **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

#### **FIRST DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs lack standing to bring all or a portion of their claims against the Cobb Defendants.

---

Defendants requested an order substituting Tori Silas, Stephen F. Bruning, and Jennifer Mosbacher.

<sup>2</sup> In their First Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs named as Defendants, Pat Gartland and Jessica M. Brooks, who were each members of the Cobb County Board of Elections and Registration at that time. Effective as of July 1, 2023, those members were replaced by the appointment of Debbie Fisher and Stacy Efrat to the Board. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint replaces Pat Gartland and Jessica M. Brooks with Debbie Fisher and Stacy Efrat.

<sup>3</sup> Cobb County Defendants note that both Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint [1:21-cv-01284-JPB, Doc. 219] and the Court’s Order granting that motion [1:21-cv-01284-JPB, Doc. 220] state that no response is required from Defendants to the Second Amended Complaint. However, Cobb County Defendants file this Answer primarily to preserve its defenses and to object to Plaintiffs continuing to misidentify the roles of its election officials in Paragraphs 98-100 of the Second Amended Complaint. [1:21-mi-55555-JPB, Doc. 877].

## **SECOND DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted against the Cobb Defendants.

## **THIRD DEFENSE**

Cobb Defendants were not responsible for the drafting or enactment of S.B. 202 and do not have discretion over whether to comply with validly passed state election laws. Cobb Defendants show that they will abide by any order of this Court regarding the constitutionality of S.B. 202 or injunctive relief granted as to the enforcement of its provisions and would have done so without being named as defendants in this litigation.

## **FOURTH DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs' claims are not ripe for review or are moot.

## **FIFTH DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs' claims are barred by the doctrines of estoppel or waiver.

## **SIXTH DEFENSE**

Plaintiffs have failed to join indispensable parties.

## **ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**

Cobb Defendants respond to the numbered allegations of Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint as follows:

## **INTRODUCTION**

1.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 1, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

2.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 2, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

3.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 3, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

4.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 4, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

5.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 5, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

6.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 6, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

7.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 7, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

8.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 8, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

9.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 9, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

10.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 10, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

11.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 11, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

12.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 12, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

13.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 13, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

14.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 14, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

15.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 15, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

16.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 16, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

17.

Cobb Defendants admit individuals within Cobb County voted in person, by early voting, by mail, by absentee ballots in secure drop boxes and by mail but lack

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 17 of the Amended Complaint.

18.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 18, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

19.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 19, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial

20.

Cobb Defendants make no answer to the allegations in Paragraph 20, as these allegations are not directed against these Defendants.

21.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 21, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



22.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 22, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

23.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 23, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

24.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 24, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

25.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 25, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

26.

Paragraph 26 of the Second Amended Complaint is a statement of Plaintiffs' case and does not require a response. To the extent that a response is required, Cobb Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 26.

27.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 27, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

28.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 28, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

29.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 29, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

30.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 30, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

31.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 31, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

## **PARTIES**

32.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 32 of the Second Amended Complaint.

33.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 33, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

34.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 34, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those

allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

35.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 35, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

36.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 36, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

37.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 37, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

38.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 38, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

39.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 39, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

40.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 40, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

41.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 41, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

42.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 42, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

43.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 43, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

44.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 44, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

45.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 45, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

46.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 46, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

47.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 47, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

48.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 48, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

49.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 49, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

50.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 50, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

51.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 51, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

52.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 52, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

53.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 53, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial

54.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 54, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



55.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 55, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

56.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 56, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

57.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 57, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial

58.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 58, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

59.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 59, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

60.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 60, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

61.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 61, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

62.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 62, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

63.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 63, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

64.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 64, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

65.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 65, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

66.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 66, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

67.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 67, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

68.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 34, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

69.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 69, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

70.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 70, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

71.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 71, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

72.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 72, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

73.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 73, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

74.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 74, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

75.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 75, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

76.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 76, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

77.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 77, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

78.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 78, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

79.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 79, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

80.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 80, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

81.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 81, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

82.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 82, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

83.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 83, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

84.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 84, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

85.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 85 of the Second Amended Complaint.

86.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 86 of the Second Amended Complaint.

87.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 87 of the Second Amended Complaint.



88.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 88 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Rick Jeffares and Janelle King succeeded Matthew Mashburn and Edward Lindsey.

89.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 89 of the Second Amended Complaint.

90.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 90 of the Second Amended Complaint.

91.

Cobb Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 91 of the Second Amended Complaint.

92.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 92 of the Second Amended Complaint.

93.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 93 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Nancy Jester, Karli Swift and Vasu Abhiraman have succeeded Samuel E. Tillman, Baoky N. Vu and Dele Lowman Smith.

94.

Cobb Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 94 of the Second Amended Complaint.

95.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 95 of the Second Amended Complaint.

96.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 96 of the Second Amended Complaint.

97.

Cobb Defendants admit that Wandy Taylor is the Chairwoman of the Gwinnett County Board of Registrations and Elections but have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in Paragraph

97, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

98.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 98 of the Second Amended Complaint.

99.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 99 of the Second Amended Complaint, but note that Plaintiff failed to identify Tori Silas as a member of the Board of Elections and Registration in this Paragraph. While she is identified in the next Paragraph as the Chairwoman, the list of members in Paragraph 99 is incomplete.

100.

Cobb Defendants admit that Tori Silas is the Chairwoman of the Cobb County Board of Elections and Registration but denies the remaining allegations in Paragraph 100 of the Second Amended Complaint, showing the Court that Janine Eveler is no longer the Director of Elections in Cobb County.

101.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 101 of the Second Amended Complaint.

102.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 102 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Jack Noa and Johnny Varner have succeeded Tom Smiley and Craig Lutz.

103.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 103 of the Second Amended Complaint.

104.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 104 of the Second Amended Complaint.

105.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 105 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Diane Givens and Patricia Pullar are no longer members of the Clayton County Board of Elections and Registration.

106.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 106 of the Second Amended Complaint.

107.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 107 of the Second Amended Complaint.

108.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 108 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Isaac McAdams and Betty Reece succeeded Bob Finnegan and Terence Dicks.

109.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 109 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that W. Travis Doss, Jr. has succeeded Lynn Bailey.

110.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 110 of the Second Amended Complaint.

111.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 111 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Karen Evans-Daniel, Joel Hazard, Robert Abbott and Thomas Ellington succeeded Henry Ficklin, Rinda Wilson, Herbert Spangler and Cassandra Powell.

112.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 112 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Thomas Gillon has succeeded Jeanetta R. Watson.

113.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 113 of the Second Amended Complaint.

114.

Cobb Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 114 of the Second Amended Complaint.

115.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 115 of the Second Amended Complaint.

116.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 116 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Malinda Hodge and Antan Lang were succeeded by Trish Brown, James Hall, and Glynda Jones.

117.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 117 of the Second Amended Complaint.

118.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 118 of the Second Amended Complaint with the exception that Katherine Durso and Debra Geiger have succeeded John Pannell and Randolph Slay.

119.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 119 of the Second Amended Complaint.

120.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 120 of the Second Amended Complaint.

121.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 121 of the Second Amended Complaint.

122.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 122 of the Second Amended Complaint.

123.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 123 of the Second Amended Complaint.

124.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 124 of the Second Amended Complaint.

125.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 125 of the Second Amended Complaint.

### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

126.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 126 of the Second Amended Complaint.

127.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 127 of the Second Amended Complaint.

128.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 128 of the Second Amended Complaint.



129.

To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 129 refers to Cobb Defendants, Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 129. Cobb Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations regarding other Defendants in Paragraph 129 of the Second Amended Complaint.

130.

Cobb Defendants admit that venue is proper in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia pursuant to the relevant statutes. Cobb Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 130 of the Second Amended Complaint.

### **FACUTAL ALLEGATIONS**

131.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 131, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

132.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 132, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

133.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 133 of the Second Amended Complaint.

134.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations in Paragraph 134 of the Second Amended Complaint.

135.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 135, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

136.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 136, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

137.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 137, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

138.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 138, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

139.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 139, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

140.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 140, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

141.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 141, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

142.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 142, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

143.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 143, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

144.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 144, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

145.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 145, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

146.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 146, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

147.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 147, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

148.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 148, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

149.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 149, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

150.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 150, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

151.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 151, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

152.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 152, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

153.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 153, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

154.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 154, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

155.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 155, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

156.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 156, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

157.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 157, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

158.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 158, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

159.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 159, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

160.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 160, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



161.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 161, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

162.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 162, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

163.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 163, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

164.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 164, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

165.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 165, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

166.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 166, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

167.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 167, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

168.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 168, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

169.

Cobb Defendants admit that the number of early voting sites were reduced from 11 to 7 before the 2020 Runoff Election, but Cobb Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 169 of the Second Amended Complaint.

170.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 170, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

171.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 171, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

172.

Cobb Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 172 of the Second Amended Complaint.

173.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 173, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

174.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 174, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

175.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 175, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

176.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 176, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

177.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 177, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

178.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 178, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

179.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 179, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

180.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 180, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

181.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 181, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

182.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 182, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

183.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 183, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

184.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 184, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

185.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 185, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

186.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 186, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

187.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 187, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

188.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 188, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

189.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 189, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

190.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 190, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

191.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 191, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

192.

Cobb Defendants admit that the stated population percentages for Cobb County are substantially correct, but Cobb Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 192 of the Second Amended Complaint.

193.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 193, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



194.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 194, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

195.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 195, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

196.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 196, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

197.

Cobb Defendants admit that no Black candidate has ever been elected as Georgia's Governor. Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 197, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

198.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 198, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

199.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 199, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

200.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 200, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

201.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 201, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

202.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 202, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

203.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 203, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

204.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 204, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

205.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 205, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

206.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 206, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

207.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 207, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

208.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 208, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

209.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 209, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

210.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 210, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

211.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 211, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

212.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 212, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

213.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 213, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

214.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 214, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

215.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 215 of the Second Amended Complaint.

216.

Cobb Defendants admit the allegations of Paragraph 216 of the Second Amended Complaint.

217.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 217, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

218.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 218, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

219.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 219, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

220.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 220, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

221.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 221, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

222.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 222, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

223.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 223, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

224.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 224, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

225.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 225, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

226.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 226, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



227.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 227, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

228.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 228, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

229.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 229, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

230.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 230, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

231.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 231, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

232.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 232, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

233.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 233, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

234.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 234, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

235.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 235, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

236.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 236, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

237.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 237, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

238.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 238, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

239.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 239, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

240.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 240, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

241.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 241, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

242.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 242, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

243.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 243, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

244.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 244, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

245.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 245, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

246.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 246, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

247.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 247, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

248.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 248, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial

249.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 249, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

250.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 250, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

251.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 251, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

252.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 252, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

253.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 253, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

254.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 254, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

255.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 255, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

256.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 256, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

257.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 257, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

258.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 258, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



259.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 259, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

260.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 260, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

261.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 261, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

262.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 262, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

263.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 263, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

264.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 264, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

265.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 265, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

266.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 266, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

267.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 267, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

268.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 268, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

269.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 269, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

270.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 270, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

271.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 271, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

272.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 272, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

273.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 273, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

274.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 274, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

275.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 275, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

276.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 276, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

277.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 277, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

278.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 278, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

279.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 279, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those

allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

280.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 280, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

281.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 281, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

282.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 282, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

283.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 283, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations

also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

284.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 284, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

285.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 285, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

286.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 286, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

287.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 287, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

288.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 288, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

289.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 289, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

290.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 290, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

291.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 291, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

292.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 292, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those



allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

293.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 293, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

294.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 294, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

295.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 294, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

296.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 296, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

297.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 297, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

298.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 298, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

299.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 299, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

300.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 300, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

301.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 301, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

302.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 302, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

303.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 303, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

304.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 304, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

305.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 305, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

306.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 306, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

307.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 307, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

308.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 308, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

309.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 309, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

310.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 310, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

311.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 311, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

312.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 312, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

313.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 313, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

314.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 314, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

315.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 315, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

316.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 316, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

317.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 317, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

318.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 318, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

319.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 319, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act  
52 U.S.C. § 10301, *et seq.*; 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
(Intentional Racial Discrimination & Discriminatory Results)**

320.

In response to Paragraph 320 of the Second Amended Complaint, Cobb Defendants restate and incorporate by reference all prior responses.

321.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 321, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

322.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 322, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

323.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 323, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



324.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 324, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments  
U.S. Const. amend., XIV, XV; 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
(Intentional Race Discrimination)**

325.

In response to Paragraph 325 of the Second Amended Complaint, Cobb Defendants restate and incorporate by reference all prior responses.

326.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 326, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

327.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 327, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

328.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 337, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

**THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Freedom of Speech / Expression  
U.S. Const. amend. I; 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

329.

In response to Paragraph 329 of the Second Amended Complaint, Cobb Defendants restate and incorporate by reference all prior responses.

330.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 330, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

331.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 331, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

332.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 332, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

333.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 333, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

334.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 334, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

335.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 335, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

**FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act  
42 U.S.C. §§ 12131, et seq.  
(Discrimination on the Basis of Disability by State and Local Government  
Entities)**

336.

In response to Paragraph 336 of the Second Amended Complaint, Cobb Defendants restate and incorporate by reference all prior responses.

337.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 337, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent a response is required from Cobb Defendants, Cobb Defendants deny they have violated Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and state that they will comply with Georgia law, deferring questions of constitutionality to the Court.

338.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 338, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

339.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 339, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

340.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 340, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

341.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 341, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

342.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 342, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

343.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 343, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

344.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 344, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

345.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 345, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

346.

Cobb Defendants deny that they have not provided reasonable modifications to individuals with disabilities. Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 346, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

347.

Cobb Defendants deny that they have not provided reasonable modifications to individuals with disabilities. Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 347, and, therefore, neither admits nor denies those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

**FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act**

**29 U.S.C. § 794**

**(Discrimination on the Basis of Disability by Recipients of Federal Financial Assistance)**

348.

In response to Paragraph 348 of the Second Amended Complaint, Cobb Defendants restate and incorporate by reference all prior responses.

349.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 349, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

350.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 350, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

351.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 351, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

352.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 352, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

353.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 353, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.



354.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 354, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

355.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 355, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

356.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 356, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

357.

Cobb Defendants have insufficient knowledge to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations in Paragraph 357, and, therefore, neither admit nor deny those allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial. To the extent these allegations also contain statements or conclusions of law, Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

358.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 358, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

**SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

**Violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964  
52 U.S.C. § 10101, 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

359.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 359, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

360.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 360, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

361.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 361, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

362.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 362, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

363.

Cobb Defendants neither admit nor deny the allegations in Paragraph 363, as these allegations contain statements or conclusions of law, but demand strict proof of them at trial.

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

1.

Paragraph 1 contains a request for relief that requires no response. To the extent a response is required from Cobb Defendants, Cobb Defendants state that they will comply with Georgia law and defer questions of constitutionality to the Court.

2.

Paragraph 2 contains a request for relief that requires no response. To the extent a response is required from Cobb Defendants, Cobb Defendants state that they will comply with Georgia law and defer questions of constitutionality to the Court.

3.

Paragraph 3 contains a request for relief that requires no response. To the extent a response is required from Cobb Defendants, Cobb Defendants deny that the requested relief is justified or appropriate.

4.

Paragraph 4 contains a request for relief that requires no response. To the extent a response is required from Cobb Defendants, Cobb Defendants deny that the requested relief is justified or appropriate.

5.

Paragraph 5 contains a request for relief that requires no response. To the extent a response is required from Cobb Defendants, Cobb Defendants deny that the requested relief is justified or appropriate.

WHEREFORE, having answered Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint and stated defenses and objections, Cobb Defendants respectfully request that Plaintiffs' claims be dismissed, Plaintiffs' prayers for relief be denied in each and every particular with all costs taxed to the Plaintiffs, and Cobb Defendants be granted such other relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

Respectfully submitted this 1<sup>st</sup> day of August, 2024.

HAYNIE, LITCHFIELD & WHITE, PC

*/s/ Daniel W. White*

\_\_\_\_\_  
DANIEL W. WHITE

Georgia Bar No. 153033

*Attorneys for Cobb County Defendants*

222 Washington Avenue  
Marietta, GA 30060  
(770) 422-8900  
[dwhite@hlw-law.com](mailto:dwhite@hlw-law.com)

**CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH LOCAL RULE 7.1**

The undersigned hereby certifies that the foregoing document has been prepared in accordance with the font type and margin requirements of Local Rule 5.1 of the Northern District of Georgia, using a font type of Times New Roman and a point size of 14.

/s/ Daniel W. White

DANIEL W. WHITE

Georgia Bar No. 153033

*Attorney for Cobb County Defendants*

HAYNIE, LITCHFIELD & WHITE, PC

222 Washington Avenue

Marietta, GA 30060

(770) 422-8900

[dwhite@hlw-law.com](mailto:dwhite@hlw-law.com)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on August 1, 2024, I electronically filed the foregoing COBB COUNTY DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES AND ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will automatically send email notification of such filing to the following attorneys of record:

/s/ Daniel W. White  
DANIEL W. WHITE  
Georgia Bar No. 153033  
*Attorney for Cobb County Defendants*

HAYNIE, LITCHFIELD & WHITE, PC  
222 Washington Avenue  
Marietta, GA 30060  
(770) 422-8900  
[dwhite@hlw-law.com](mailto:dwhite@hlw-law.com)