

1 Tyler Green*
 2 Cameron T. Norris*
 3 James P. McGlone*
 4 CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
 5 1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700
 6 Arlington, VA 22209
 7 (703) 243-9423
 8 tyler@consovoymccarthy.com
 9 cam@consovoymccarthy.com
 10 jim@consovoymccarthy.com

11 Kory Langhofer, Ariz. Bar No. 024722
 12 Thomas Basile, Ariz. Bar. No. 031150
 13 STATECRAFT PLLC
 14 649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor
 15 Phoenix, Arizona 85003
 16 (602) 382-4078
 17 kory@statecraftlaw.com
 18 tom@statecraftlaw.com

19 *Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendant*

20 *admitted pro hac vice

21 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 22 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

23 Mi Familia Vota,

24 Plaintiff,

25 v.

26 Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as
 27 Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,

28 Defendants.

Case No: 2:22-cv-00509-SRB (Lead)

INTERVENOR DEFENDANT'S
ANSWER TO PODER LATINX, ET
AL.'S SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT

AND CONSOLIDATED CASES

1 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8, Defendant-Intervenor Republican
2 National Committee (“RNC”) answers the complaint of Plaintiffs Poder Lantinx, Chicanos
3 Por La Causa, Inc., and Chicanos Por La Causa Action Fund (the “Complaint”). Unless
4 expressly admitted below, every allegation in the Complaint is denied. When the RNC
5 says a factual allegation “speaks for itself,” it means it lacks sufficient information to admit
6 or deny the allegation; it does not admit that the referenced material exists, is accurate, is
7 relevant and admissible for the truth of the matter asserted or otherwise, or is placed in the
8 proper context. Subject to the foregoing, the RNC states as follows:

9 1. Paragraph 1 consists of legal conclusions and arguments to which no
10 response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the
11 allegations in paragraph 1.

12 2. Paragraph 2 consists of legal conclusions and arguments to which no
13 response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the
14 allegations in paragraph 2.

15 3. The first sentence of paragraph 3 consists of legal conclusions and arguments
16 to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC
17 denies the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 3. The provisions of H.B. 2492
18 and H.B. 2243 speak for themselves.

19 4. The provisions of H.B. 2492 and H.B. 2243 speak for themselves.

20 5. The provisions of H.B. 2492 and H.B. 2243 speak for themselves.

21 6. The provisions of H.B. 2617 and the contents of Governor Ducey’s
22 explanation for his veto of H.B. 2617 speak for themselves. The RNC denies the remaining
23 allegations in paragraph 6.

24 7. The provisions of H.B. 2592 and the amended A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speak for
25 themselves. The RNC denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 7.

26
27
28

1 8. The RNC admits that Arizona adopted Proposition 200 in 2004. The RNC
2 is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations in
3 paragraph 8 concerning the voter registration laws of the other 49 states. The RNC denies
4 the remaining allegations in paragraph 8.

5 9. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 9.

6 10. Paragraph 10 consists of legal conclusions and arguments to which no
7 response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies that
8 H.B. 2492 or H.B. 2243 is inconsistent with the National Voter Registration Act or the
9 Supreme Court's opinion in *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona*, 570 U.S. 1 (2013).

10 11. Paragraph 11 consists of legal conclusions and arguments to which no
11 response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies that
12 H.B. 2492 or H.B. 2243 is inconsistent with any provision of the Fourteenth Amendment,
13 the National Voter Registration Act or the Civil Rights of 1964, and denies that the
14 Plaintiffs are entitled to relief in any form.

15 12. Paragraph 12 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

16 13. Paragraph 13 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

17 14. Paragraph 14 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

18 15. Paragraph 15 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

19 16. The RNC admits that Defendants Hobbs and Brnovich were state officials at
20 the time this action commenced and that Defendants Richer, Cazares-Kelly and Colwell
21 are county officials. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or
22 deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 16.

23 17. Paragraph 17 states legal conclusions to which no response is required.

24 18. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
25 the allegations in paragraph 18.

26 19. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
27 the allegations in paragraph 19.

28

1 20. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
2 the allegations in paragraph 20.

3 21. The RNC admits that Katie Hobbs was the Secretary of State of Arizona at
4 the time the Complaint was filed. A.R.S. §§ 16-142 and 16-452 and the opinion in *Arizona*
5 *Democratic Party v. Reagan*, No. CV-16-03618-PHX-SPL, 2016 WL 6523427 (D. Ariz.
6 Nov. 3, 2016), speak for themselves.

7 22. The RNC admits that Mark Brnovich was the Attorney General of Arizona
8 at the time the Complaint was filed. The provisions of H.B. 2492 speak for themselves.

9 23. The provisions of A.R.S. § 16-168 and other applicable laws defining the
10 responsibilities of the county recorders speak for themselves.

11 24. The RNC admits the allegations in paragraph 24.

12 25. The RNC admits the allegations in paragraph 25.

13 26. The RNC admits the allegations in paragraph 26.

14 27. A.R.S. § 16-166(F) speaks for itself.

15 28. The provisions of the 2019 Elections Procedures Manual and the Arizona
16 Department of Transportation Guidance cited in footnote 8 speak for themselves. The
17 RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations in
18 the final sentence of paragraph 28.

19 29. The Supreme Court’s opinion in *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Arizona,*
20 *Inc.*, 570 U.S. 1 (2013), speaks for itself.

21 30. The RNC admits that Arizona has maintained a “dual track voter
22 registration” system and states that the sources cited in paragraph 30 speak for themselves.
23 The RNC denies that any provision of H.B. 2492 is “arbitrar[y]” and denies the remaining
24 allegations in paragraph 30.

25 31. The provisions of the 2019 Elections Procedures Manual and the consent
26 decree in *LULAC v. Reagan*, 2:17-cv-04102-DGC (D. Ariz. Jun. 18, 2018), speak for
27 themselves. The RNC denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 31.

28

1 32. A.R.S. §§ 16-121.01(C) and 16-134(B) speak for themselves.

2 33. The provisions of H.B. 2492 and H.B. 2243 speak for themselves. The RNC
3 denies that the statutes “constitute an end run around the federal voter registration form”
4 and deny any remaining allegations in paragraph 33.

5 34. The provisions of H.B. 2494 speak for themselves. The RNC denies the
6 remaining allegations in paragraph 34.

7 35. A.R.S. § 16-121.01(E) speaks for itself. The RNC denies the remaining
8 allegations in paragraph 35.

9 36. A.R.S. § 16-121.01(F) speaks for itself.

10 37. A.R.S. § 16-143 speaks for itself. The RNC denies the remaining allegations
11 in paragraph 37.

12 38. Paragraph 38 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
13 is required.

14 39. The provisions of H.B. 2243 speak for themselves. The RNC denies that
15 H.B. 2243 imposes “vague, restrictive, and arbitrary voter list maintenance procedures,”
16 and denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 39.

17 40. The provisions of A.R.S. § 16-165 speak for themselves.

18 41. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speaks for itself. The RNC denies that the statute “invites
19 county recorders to treat registered voters in a non-uniform and/or discriminatory manner,”
20 and denies all remaining allegations in paragraph 41.

21 42. A.R.S. § 16-165(J) speaks for itself.

22 43. A.R.S. § 16-165(K) speaks for itself.

23 44. Paragraph 44 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
24 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
25 in paragraph 44.

26

27

28

1 45. The provisions of H.B. 2617 and the contents of Governor Ducey’s veto
2 statement speak for themselves. The RNC denies the remaining allegations in paragraph
3 45.

4 46. Paragraph 46 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
5 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
6 in paragraph 46.

7 47. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 47.

8 48. The statements in the legislative record referenced in paragraph 48 and
9 accompanying footnotes speak for themselves. The remaining allegations in paragraph 48
10 are legal arguments and conclusions to which no response is required.

11 49. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 49.

12 50. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
13 the allegations in paragraph 50.

14 51. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
15 the allegations in paragraph 51.

16 52. The sources cited in paragraph 52 and the accompanying footnotes speak for
17 themselves. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the
18 remaining allegations in paragraph 52.

19 53. The U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services Policy Manual cited in
20 paragraph 53 speaks for itself. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient
21 to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 53.

22 54. The U.S. Citizenship & Immigration Services Policy Manual cited in
23 paragraph 54 speaks for itself. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient
24 to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 54.

25 55. The final sentence of paragraph 55 states a legal argument or conclusion to
26 which no response is required. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient
27 to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 55.

28

1 56. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 56.

2 57. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 57.

3 58. The provisions of H.B. 2492 speak for themselves.

4 59. The provisions of H.B. 2492 and A.R.S. § 16-579 speak for themselves.

5 60. A.R.S. § 16-123 speaks for itself.

6 61. 52 U.S.C. § 20505 and the National Mail Voter Registration Form speak for
7 themselves.

8 62. Paragraph 62 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
9 is required.

10 63. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
11 the allegations in paragraph 63.

12 64. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
13 the allegations in paragraph 64.

14 65. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
15 the allegations in paragraph 65.

16 66. The provisions of the *LULAC* consent decree speak for themselves. The
17 RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the remaining
18 allegations in paragraph 66.

19 67. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
20 the allegations in paragraph 67.

21 68. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 68 to the extent they allege that
22 H.B. 2492 and H.B. 2243 will result in the “arbitrary and disparate” or otherwise unlawful
23 treatment of eligible registrants. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient
24 to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 68.

25

26

27

28

1 69. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 69 to the extent they allege that
2 H.B. 2492 and H.B. 2243 will result in the “arbitrary and disparate” or otherwise unlawful
3 treatment of eligible registrants. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient
4 to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 69.

5 70. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
6 the allegations in paragraph 70.

7 71. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 71 to the extent they allege that
8 H.B. 2492 and H.B. 2243 will result in the “arbitrary” or otherwise unlawful treatment of
9 eligible registrants. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or
10 deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 71.

11 72. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
12 the allegations in paragraph 72.

13 73. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
14 the allegations in paragraph 73.

15 74. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
16 the allegations in paragraph 74.

17 75. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
18 the allegations in paragraph 75.

19 76. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
20 the allegations in paragraph 76.

21 77. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
22 the allegations in paragraph 77.

23 78. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
24 the allegations in paragraph 78.

25 79. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
26 the allegations in paragraph 79.

27
28

1 80. The RNC denies the allegations in the first sentence of paragraph 80 and
2 allegations that H.B. 2492 or H.B. 2243 “violate federal statutes and the U.S.
3 Constitution.” The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
4 the remaining allegations in paragraph 80.

5 81. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
6 the allegations in paragraph 81.

7 82. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
8 the allegations in paragraph 82.

9 83. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
10 the allegations in paragraph 83.

11 84. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
12 the allegations in paragraph 84.

13 85. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
14 the allegations in paragraph 85.

15 86. The RNC realleges and incorporates by reference its responses to the
16 foregoing paragraphs.

17 87. 52. U.S.C. § 20507(b) speaks for itself.

18 88. Paragraph 88 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
19 is required. *Project Vote v. Blackwell*, 455 F. Supp. 2d 694 (S.D. Ohio 2006), speaks for
20 itself.

21 89. Paragraph 90 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
22 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
23 in paragraph 89.

24 90. Paragraph 90 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
25 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
26 in paragraph 90. The provisions of H.B. 2492 and H.B. 2243 speak for themselves.

27
28

1 91. Paragraph 91 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
2 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
3 in paragraph 91.

4 92. Paragraph 92 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
5 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
6 in paragraph 92.

7 93. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speaks for itself. The RNC is without knowledge or
8 information sufficient to admit or deny the allegation that the SAVE Program is
9 “notoriously outdated and unreliable.” The RNC denies the remaining allegations in
10 paragraph 93.

11 94. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speaks for itself. The RNC denies the remaining
12 allegations in paragraph 94.

13 95. Exhibit A and Exhibit B speak for themselves. The RNC is without
14 knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny the allegations in the first sentence
15 of paragraph 95. The RNC denies any remaining allegations in paragraph 95.

16 96. Paragraph 96 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
17 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
18 in paragraph 96.

19 97. Paragraph 97 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
20 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
21 in paragraph 97.

22 98. Paragraph 98 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
23 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC admits that the named
24 Defendants act under color of state law and denies the remaining allegations in paragraph
25 98.

26 99. The RNC realleges and incorporates by reference its responses to the
27 foregoing paragraphs.

28

1 100. 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) speaks for itself.

2 101. 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) and A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speak for themselves.
3 The remaining allegations in paragraph 101 state legal arguments and conclusions to which
4 no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies
5 the remaining allegations in paragraph 101.

6 102. 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) and A.R.S. § 16-165(A)(10) speak for
7 themselves. The remaining allegations in paragraph 102 state legal arguments and
8 conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed
9 necessary, the RNC denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 102.

10 103. 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(A) speaks for itself. The remaining allegations in
11 paragraph 103 state legal arguments and conclusions to which no response is required. To
12 the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the remaining allegations in
13 paragraph 103.

14 104. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
15 the allegations in paragraph 104.

16 105. Paragraph 105 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
17 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC admits that the named
18 Defendants act under color of state law.

19 106. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 106.

20 107. The RNC realleges and incorporates by reference its responses to the
21 foregoing allegations.

22 108. The text of the Fourteenth Amendment, *Davis v. Schnell*, 81 F. Supp. 872
23 (S.D. Ala. 1949), and *Hernandez v. State of Texas*, 347 U.S. 475 (1954), speak for
24 themselves.

25 109. The text of the Fifteenth Amendment speaks for itself.

26 110. *Louisiana v. United States*, 380 U.S. 145 (1965), speaks for itself.
27
28

1 111. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speaks for itself. The RNC is without knowledge or
2 information sufficient to admit or deny the allegation that the SAVE Program is
3 “notoriously outdated and unreliable.” The RNC denies the remaining allegations in
4 paragraph 111.

5 112. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speaks for itself.

6 113. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 113.

7 114. Paragraph 114 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
8 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
9 in paragraph 114.

10 115. Paragraph 115 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
11 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
12 in paragraph 115.

13 116. Paragraph 116 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
14 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
15 in paragraph 116.

16 117. Paragraph 117 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
17 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC admits that the named
18 Defendants act under color of state law.

19 118. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 118.

20 119. The RNC realleges and incorporates by reference its responses to the
21 foregoing allegations.

22 120. *Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98 (2000), and *Hunter v. Hamilton Cnty. Bd. Of*
23 *Elections*, 635 F.3d 219 (6th Cir. 2011), speak for themselves.

24 121. *Louisiana v. United States*, 380 U.S. 145 (1965), and *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S.
25 186 (1962), speak for themselves.

26 122. A.R.S. § 16-166(F) and the provisions of H.B. 2492 speak for themselves.
27 The RNC denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 122.

28

1 123. The provisions of H.B. 2492 speak for themselves.

2 124. The provisions of H.B. 2492 speak for themselves. The RNC denies the
3 remaining allegations in paragraph 124.

4 125. A.R.S. § 16-143 speaks for itself.

5 126. The provisions of H.B. 2243 speak for themselves. The RNC denies the
6 remaining allegations in paragraph 126.

7 127. The RNC is without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny
8 the allegations in the first two sentences of paragraph 127. The RNC denies the remaining
9 allegations in paragraph 127.

10 128. A.R.S. § 16-165(I) speaks for itself. The RNC denies the remaining
11 allegations in paragraph 128.

12 129. Paragraph 129 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
13 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
14 in paragraph 129.

15 130. Paragraph 130 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
16 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC admits that the named
17 Defendants act under color of state law.

18 131. The RNC denies the allegations in paragraph 131.

19 132. The RNC realleges and incorporates by reference its responses to the
20 foregoing allegations.

21 133. The text of the Fourteenth Amendment, *Armstrong v. Reynolds*, 22 F.4th
22 1058 (9th Cir. 2022), and *Miranda v. City of Casa Grande*, 15 F.4th 1219 (9th Cir. 2021),
23 speak for themselves.

24 134. *Shinault v. Hawks*, 782 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2015), speaks for itself.
25
26
27
28

1 135. *Power Rd.-Williams Field, LLC v. Gilbert*, 14 F. Supp. 3d 1304 (D. Ariz.
2 2014), *Foss v. NMFS*, 161 F.3d 584 (9th Cir. 1998), *Ching v. Mayorkas*, 725 F.3d 1149
3 (9th Cir. 2013), and *Mendoza v. Blodgett*, 960 F.3d 1425 (9th Cir. 1992), speak for
4 themselves.

5 136. *Harper v. Virginia State Board of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663 (1966), *Burdick*
6 *v. Takushi*, 504 U.S. 428 (1992), and *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), speak for
7 themselves. The RNC denies any remaining allegations in paragraph 136.

8 137. There is no such provision as “§ 2(A)” of the Arizona Constitution. To the
9 extent Plaintiffs were purporting to cite Article VII, § 2(A) of the Arizona Constitution,
10 that provision speaks for itself. A.R.S. §§ 16-101, 16-121, and 16-163 speak for
11 themselves. The RNC denies any remaining allegations in paragraph 137.

12 138. A.R.S. §§ 16-101, 16-121, and 16-121.01 speak for themselves. The RNC
13 denies any remaining allegations in paragraph 138.

14 139. *Griffeth v. Detrich*, 603 F.2d 118 (9th Cir. 1979), *Holohan v. Massanari*,
15 246 F.3d 1195 (9th Cir. 2001), *Stivers v. Pierce*, 71 F.3d 732 (9th Cir. 1995), and *Ressler*
16 *v. Pierce*, 692 F.3d 1212 (9th Cir. 1982), speak for themselves. The RNC denies any
17 remaining allegations in paragraph 139.

18 140. Paragraph 140 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
19 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
20 in paragraph 140.

21 141. A.R.S. § 16-121.01(E) speaks for itself. The RNC denies any remaining
22 allegations in paragraph 141.

23 142. *Fuentes v. Shevin*, 407 U.S. 67 (1972), speaks for itself. The RNC denies
24 any remaining allegations in paragraph 142.

25 143. Paragraph 143 states legal arguments and conclusions to which no response
26 is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, the RNC denies the allegations
27 in paragraph 143.

28

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

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17th day of March, 2023.

Tyler Green*
Cameron T. Norris*
James P. McGlone*
CONSOVOY MCCARTHY PLLC
1600 Wilson Blvd., Ste. 700
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 243-9423
tyler@consovoymccarthy.com
cam@consovoymccarthy.com
jim@consovoymccarthy.com

By: /s/ Thomas Basile
Kory Langhofer, Ariz. Bar No. 024722
Thomas Basile, Ariz. Bar. No. 031150
STATECRAFT PLLC
649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
(602) 382-4078
kory@statecraftlaw.com
tom@statecraftlaw.com

*admitted pro hac vice

Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendant