

1 D. Andrew Gaona (028414)
Austin C. Yost (034602)
2 **COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**
2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900
3 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
T: (602) 381-5486
4 agaona@cblawyers.com
ayost@cblawyers.com

5 Lalitha D. Madduri*
6 Melinda Johnson*
Tyler L. Bishop*
7 Renata O'Donnell*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
8 250 Massachusetts Ave NW, Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20001
9 T: (202) 968-4330
lmadduri@elias.law
10 mjohanson@elias.law
tbishop@elias.law
11 rodonnell@elias.law

12 *Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor-Defendants*
Arizona Alliance for Retired Americans and Voto Latino

13 **Admitted Pro Hac Vice*

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

16 Scot Mussi, Gina Swoboda, in her capacity as
Chair of the Republican Party of Arizona, and
17 Steven Gaynor,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 v.

20 Adrian Fontes, in his official capacity as Arizona
Secretary of State,

21 Defendant.

No. CV-24-01310-PHX-DWL

**PROPOSED INTERVENORS
ARIZONA ALLIANCE FOR
RETIRED AMERICANS AND
VOTO LATINO'S
OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION TO
STRIKE PROPOSED
INTERVENORS' MOTION TO
DISMISS**

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INTRODUCTION

1
2 Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Proposed Intervenors’ Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 19)
3 should be denied. Parties seeking to intervene as defendants pursuant to Federal Rule of
4 Civil Procedure 24(a) regularly submit proposed motions to dismiss before being granted
5 intervention, and courts regularly consider these motions both on the merits once
6 intervention is granted and to assess the appropriateness of intervention under Rule 24. As
7 Proposed Intervenors explained in their Motion to Intervene, ECF No. 15 (“MTI”), they
8 filed their proposed Motion to Dismiss in accordance with the existing Defendant’s deadline
9 and in the spirit of ensuring the case proceeds efficiently. Because Plaintiffs offer no
10 persuasive reason to strike Proposed Intervenors’ Motion to Dismiss and Proposed
11 Intervenors do not object to Plaintiffs’ request that the Court hold Proposed Intervenors’
12 Motion to Dismiss in abeyance until it has ruled upon the pending Motion to Intervene, the
13 Motion to Strike should be denied.

RELEVANT BACKGROUND

14
15 Plaintiffs filed suit against the Arizona Secretary of State on June 3, 2024, alleging
16 that the Secretary is violating his obligation to conduct “reasonable” voter roll maintenance
17 under Section 8 of the National Voter Registration Act. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 101–07, ECF No. 1
18 (citing 52 U.S.C. §20507(a)(4)). As relief, Plaintiffs ask this Court to order an overhaul of
19 Arizona’s list-maintenance procedures in the runup to the 2024 general election. *See id.* at
20 19 (Prayer for Relief).

21 On June 10, 2024, Proposed Intervenors moved to intervene as defendants under
22 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24 to protect their significant interests—their members’
23 and constituents’ fundamental right to vote, as well as mission-critical resources—that are
24 implicated by Plaintiffs’ claims. *See generally* MTI. Proposed Intervenors’ motion stated
25 that they would abide by all existing deadlines and any scheduling orders of the Court. *Id.*
26 at 9.

27 Proposed Intervenors filed a Proposed Answer to comply with Rule 24(c)’s
28 requirement that a motion to intervene “be accompanied by a pleading that sets out [the

1 intervenor’s] claim or defense,” but also noticed their intent “to move for dismissal . . . by
2 no later than Defendant’s [June 25, 2024] deadline.” MTI 8 n.4. They requested that the
3 motion be treated as filed before their Answer should they be granted intervention. *Id.*

4 On June 25, 2024, both the Proposed Intervenors and the Secretary filed their
5 Motions to Dismiss. ECF Nos. 19, 20.

6 ARGUMENT

7 Plaintiffs’ Motion to Strike Proposed Intervenors’ Motion to Dismiss should be
8 denied because it fails to articulate any persuasive basis upon which to strike. Local Civil
9 Rule 7.2(m)(1), in relevant part, provides that “a motion to strike may be filed only . . . if it
10 seeks to strike any part of a filing or submission on the ground that it is prohibited (or not
11 authorized) by a statute, rule, or court order,” and the “proponent of [the] motion to strike
12 bears the burden of persuasion,” *Guzman v. Veraz Servs. LLC*, No. 22-CV-00507, 2022 WL
13 3027997, at *2 (D. Ariz. Aug. 1, 2022). The “determination to strike is in the discretion of
14 the trial court.” *Id.* (citation omitted).

15 Because Plaintiffs do not argue that Proposed Intervenors’ Motion to Dismiss was
16 “prohibited,” and they offer no relevant support for their argument that it was “not
17 authorized,” the Court should deny their Motion to Strike. *See, e.g., Karlsson v. Ronn Motor*
18 *Grp. Inc.*, No. CV-19-04510, 2020 WL 2615972, at *2 (D. Ariz. May 22, 2020) (denying
19 plaintiffs’ motion to strike a motion to dismiss filed by a defendant in default because
20 plaintiffs failed to show the motion was not “authorized”); *Rolle v. Robel*, No. 23-CV-
21 00336, 2024 WL 342457, at *1-*2 (D. Ariz. Jan. 30, 2024) (denying motion to strike
22 because moving party failed to support argument that filing was “deficient” under local
23 rules).

24 Plaintiffs claim that allowing a party to file a proposed dispositive motion would
25 effectively “nullif[y] the intervention requirements of Rule 24,” but such proposed motions
26 are routinely filed and considered on the merits if intervention is granted. *E.g., Americans*
27 *for Prosperity v. Meyer*, No. 23-CV-00470, 2024 WL 1195467, at *1, *4 (D. Ariz. Mar. 20,
28 2024) (considering political action committee’s motion to intervene together with its

1 proposed motion to dismiss, which was filed and briefed on the same schedule as the named
2 defendants, and granting both motions); *Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Wheeler*, No. 18-
3 CV-00050, 2018 WL 11447079, at *2, *5 (D. Ariz. Oct. 29, 2018) (granting intervenor’s
4 motion to dismiss, which was originally filed as a proposed motion alongside motion to
5 intervene). Moreover, courts often consider motions to dismiss submitted by proposed
6 intervenor-defendants as part of their assessment of the propriety of intervention. *See, e.g.,*
7 *Alturas Indian Rancheria v. Cal. Gambling Control Comm’n*, No. CIV. S-11-2070, 2011
8 WL 5118974, at *3 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2011) (granting intervention and considering
9 arguments in proposed motion to dismiss to assess relationship between intervenor’s
10 asserted interests and the claims at issue in the case); *Maverick Gaming LLC v. United*
11 *States*, No. 3:22-CV-05325, 2022 WL 3586995, at *3 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 22, 2022)
12 (similar); *San Diego Cnty. Lodging Ass’n v. City of San Diego*, No. 20-CV-2151, 2021 WL
13 1733383, at *2 (S.D. Cal. May 3, 2021) (similar). Plaintiffs’ argument that Proposed
14 Intervenors’ Motion to Dismiss should be stricken thus contradicts common practice under
15 Rule 24.

16 Plaintiffs also argue that under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 17(a), Proposed
17 Intervenors are not real parties in interest and thus cannot “prosecute” the “action” by filing
18 a motion to dismiss. Mot. to Strike 2. But Rule 17(a) applies only to plaintiffs, not
19 defendants—and because Proposed Intervenors are not plaintiffs “seeking to prosecute an
20 action in this court or in any other,” their “status as real parties in interest . . . is not at issue.”
21 *Charov v. Bank of Am.*, No. CV-10-00512, 2010 WL 2629419, at *2 (D. Ariz. June 30,
22 2010); *see also Simpson v. Alaska State Comm’n for Hum. Rts.*, 608 F.2d 1171, 1173 n.2
23 (9th Cir. 1979) (“The real party in interest concept is correctly applied only to those persons
24 prosecuting an action, not to a defendant.”).

25 Proposed Intervenors do not object to Plaintiffs’ request to hold Proposed
26 Intervenors’ Motion to Dismiss in abeyance pending the Court’s ruling on their Motion to
27 Intervene. Proposed Intervenors filed their Motion to Dismiss according to the deadline
28 applicable to the Secretary precisely to avoid any possible delay Plaintiffs proclaim (without

1 any support) intervention would cause. *See, e.g.*, Opp. to Mot. to Intervene 12, ECF No. 18.
2 If Plaintiffs prefer that Proposed Intervenors' Motion to Dismiss be briefed on a later
3 schedule than the Secretary's, Proposed Intervenors do not oppose that preference. Should
4 the Court grant Proposed Intervenors' Motion to Intervene, Proposed Intervenors request
5 that their Motion to Dismiss be heard and decided alongside the Secretary's Motion to
6 Dismiss.

7 **CONCLUSION**

8 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should deny Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike.

9 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 11th day of July, 2024.

10 **COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC**

11 By: /s/ D. Andrew Gaona

12 D. Andrew Gaona
13 Austin C. Yost

14 **ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP**

15 Lalitha D. Madduri*
16 Melinda Johnson*
17 Tyler L. Bishop*
18 Renata O'Donnell*

19 *Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor-Defendants*

20 **Admitted Pro Hac Vice*