## **Multiple Documents**

Part	Description
1	Main Document
2	Proposed Order

**Bloomberg Law**<sup>®</sup>

	Case 2:22-cv-01901-SRB	Document 19	Filed 12/07/22	Page 1 of 5			
1 2	MARK BRNOVICH ATTORNEY GENERAL Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 015 <i>Chief Deputy &amp; Chief of Staff</i> Drew C. Ensign (No. 025463)	838) f					
3	Deputy Solicitor General Robert J. Makar (No. 033579)						
4 5	Assistant Attorney General 2005 N. Central Avenue						
6	Phoenix, Arizona 85004 Telephone: (602) 542-5200 Email: <u>Drew.Ensign@azag.gov</u>						
7	Email: <u>Drew.Ensign@azag.gov</u> Email: <u>Robert.Makar@azag.gov</u>						
8	FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C. Douglas C. Northup (No. 013987)						
9	Timothy J. Berg (No. 004170) Emily Ward (No. 029963) 2394 E. Camelback Road, Suite 600 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: (602) 916-5000 Email: <u>dnorthup@fennemorelaw.com</u> Email: <u>tberg@fennemorelaw.com</u>						
10							
11							
12	Email: tberg@fennemorelaw.com Email: eward@fennemorelaw.com						
13	Attorneys for Defendant Attorney General Mark Brnovich						
14							
15							
16 17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA						
18	Tohono O'odham Nation and	l Gila River					
19	Indian Community,		Case No: 2:22-c	v-1901-SRB			
20	Plaintiff	s,	STATE'S MO				
21	VS.		CONSOLIDA	ГЕ			
22	Mark Brnovich in his official capacity as						
23	Attorney General of Arizona	, et al.,					
24	Defendan	ts.					
25							
26							
27							
28							
	1						

1

## MOTION TO CONSOLIDATE

Defendant Mark Brnovich (the "State") hereby moves pursuant to Federal Rule of 2 Civil Procedure 42(a) and LRCiv 42.1(b) to consolidate Tohono O'odham Nation v. 3 Brnovich ("Tohono O'odham"), No. 2:22-cv-01901-ESW, with consolidated matter Mi 4 Familia Vota v. Hobbs, 2:22-cv-00509-PHX-SRB (the "Consolidated Matter"), which has 5 already been consolidated with six other suits: Living United for Change in Arizona v. 6 Hobbs, 2:22-cv-00519-PHX-SRB; Poder Latinx v. Hobbs, 2:22-cv-01003-PHX-SRB; 7 United States v. Arizona, 2:22-cv-01124-PHX-SRB; DNC v. Hobbs, 2:22-cv-01369-PHX-8 SRB; Promise Arizona v. Hobbs, No. 2:22-cv-01602-SRB; and Arizona Asian American 9 Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander for Equity Coalition v. Hobbs, No. 2:22-cv-01381-10 SRB. 11

12 Counsel for the State have conferred with counsel for Plaintiffs, and they have13 indicated that they consent to consolidation.

The Consolidated Matter and *Tohono O'odham* involve overlapping challenges to the same recently enacted Arizona election law—HB 2492—under the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 ("NVRA") and the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Plaintiffs have also recognized this overlap in seeking a motion to transfer their action on November 11, 2022, (Doc. 11), and marking it as a related case, (Doc. 1-1). Specifically, Plaintiffs assert two claims that involve similar or virtually identical legal theories and factual questions as the Consolidated Matter.

Plaintiffs' first claim is that HB 2492 violates the NVRA because it requires proof
of residence when registering to vote with the federal form while Plaintiffs assert the federal
form does not. (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 44–53.) Plaintiffs in five of the actions in the Consolidated Matter
include a similar claim that HB 2492 violates the NVRA because HB 2492 purportedly
includes requirements for voter registration that the federal form does not (specifically, the

- 26
- 27
- 28

proof of citizenship and/or proof of residence requirement).<sup>1</sup> Thus, these claims have overlapping legal and factual questions.

Their second claim is that HB 2492 violates the First and Fourteenth Amendment by creating an unconstitutional burden on the right to vote based on the proof of residence requirement. (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 54–57.) Five of the actions in the Consolidated Matter also assert claims that HB 2492 creates an undue burden on the right to vote that violates the Constitution.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs' second claim and claims in the Consolidated Matter therefore raise virtually identical questions of law and fact.

Accordingly, the Consolidated Matter and this case plainly involve "common
question[s] of law [and] fact." *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a). Consolidation will promote
efficiency and conserve the resources of this Court and the parties, as well as protecting the
parties from the potential prejudice that could result from separate resolutions.

Indeed, given that this Court has already consolidated *six* other actions asserting
NVRA challenges to HB 2492,<sup>3</sup> it would be deeply anomalous to leave a seventh such action
unconsolidated. Such an approach would pointlessly combine the drawbacks of both
consolidation and non-consolidation while foregoing many of the corresponding benefits.
Put simply, it would be the worst of all worlds. Moreover, the appropriateness of

18

1

2

19

These claims are raised in *Mi Familia Vota*, No. 2:22-cv-00509-SRB (Doc. 65 ¶ 97);
 *Living United for Change in Arizona*, 2:22-cv-00519-PHX-SRB (No. 22-cv-00509, Doc. 67 ¶¶ 352, 358–59); *Poder Latinx*, 2:22-cv-01003-PHX-SRB (No. 22-cv-00509, Doc. 106 ¶¶ 147–53); *United States v. Arizona*, 2:22-cv-01124-PHX-SRB (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 63–64); *DNC*, 2:22-cv-01369-PHX-SRB (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 70–72); and *Arizona Asian American Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander for Equity Coalition*, No. 2:22-cv-01381-SRB (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 160, 165).

<sup>2</sup> These claims are asserted in: *Mi Familia Vota*, No. 2:22-cv-00509-SRB (Doc. 65 ¶¶
 77–80); *Living United for Change in Arizona*, 2:22-cv-00519-PHX-SRB (No. 22-cv-00509, Doc. 67, ¶¶ 312, 316); *Poder Latinx*, 2:22-cv-01003-PHX-SRB (No. 22-cv-00509, Doc. 106 ¶¶ 121–32); *DNC*, 2:22-cv-01369-PHX-SRB (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 44–52); and *Arizona Asian American Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander for Equity Coalition*, No. 2:22-cv-01381 SRB (Doc. 1 ¶¶ 115–17).

## 28 <sup>3</sup> *Promise Arizona* solely involves a challenge to HB 2243.

## Case 2:22-cv-01901-SRB Document 19 Filed 12/07/22 Page 4 of 5

	Case 2.22-CV-01901-SRB Document 19 Filed 12/07/22 Page 4 01 5		
1	consolidation is recognized by the fact that nearly all Plaintiffs <sup>4</sup> have affirmatively sought		
1			
2	consolidation here and no Defendant has opposed it.		
3	CONCLUSION		
4	For the foregoing reasons, the State's motion to consolidate should be granted. <sup>5</sup>		
5	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 7th day of December, 2022.		
6	MARK BRNOVICH		
7	ATTORNEY GENERAL		
8	By: <u>s/ Drew C. Ensign</u>		
9	Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 15838) Chief Deputy & Chief of Staff		
	Drew C. Ensign (No. 25463)		
10	Deputy Solicitor General Robert J. Makar (No. 33579)		
11	Assistant Attorney General		
12	2005 N. Central Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85004		
12	Telephone: (602) 542-5200		
13	Drew.Ensign@azag.gov		
14	Attorneys for Defendant Mark Brnovich,		
15	Arizona Attorney General		
16	FENNEMORE CRAIG, P.C.		
17	Douglas C. Northup (No. 013987)		
18	Timothy J. Berg (No. 004170) Emily Ward (No. 029963)		
	2394 E. Camelback Road, Suite 600		
19	Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: (602) 916-5000		
20	DNorthup@fennemorelaw.com		
	TBerg@fennemorelaw.com		
21	EWard@fennemorelaw.com		
22	Attorneys for Defendant Mark Brnovich, Arizona Attorney General		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27 28	<ul> <li>Only Arizona Asian American Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander for Equity Coalition and the Plaintiffs in <i>Promise Arizona</i> opposed consolidation.</li> <li>An equivalent motion is being filed in both the Consolidated Matter and the <i>Tohono</i></li> </ul>		
	O'odham action. - 4 -		

1	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
2	I hereby certify that on this 7th day of December, 2022, I caused the foregoing
3	document to be electronically transmitted to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System
4	for Filing, which will send notice of such filing to all registered CM/ECF users.
5	<u>s/ Drew C. Ensign</u> Attorneys for Defendant Mark Brnovich,
6	Arizona Attorney General
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
26	
27 28	
20	5
	- 5 -

	Case 2:22-cv-01901-SRB Document 19-	1 Filed 12/07/22 Page 1 of 1		
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT		
7	DISTRICT	OF ARIZONA		
8	Tohono O'odham Nation and Gila River			
9	Indian Community,	Case No: 2:22-cv-1901-SRB		
10	Plaintiffs,	ORDER		
11	VS.	UKDEK		
12	Mark Brnovich in his official capacity as Attorney General of Arizona, et al.,			
13	Defendants.			
14				
15	Upon Defendant Mark Brnovich's Motion to Consolidate, and good cause shown,			
16	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED granting Defendant Mark Brnovich's Motion			
17	to Consolidate.			
18	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED dire	ecting the Clerk of Court to consolidate the		
19	above-captioned case into Mi Familia Vota	v. Hobbs and that the parties shall make all		
20	future filings under Case No. CV-22-00509-PHX-SRB.			
21	<b>IT IS FURTHER ORDERED</b> that there will be no further filings in CV-22-1901-			
22	PHX-SRB.			
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				