

1 Daniel C. Barr (#010149)  
Paul F. Eckstein (#001822)  
2 Alexis E. Danneman (#030478)  
Austin C. Yost (#034602)  
3 Samantha J. Burke (#036064)  
**PERKINS COIE LLP**  
4 2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788  
5 Telephone: 602.351.8000  
Facsimile: 602.648.7000  
6 DBarr@perkinscoie.com  
PEckstein@perkinscoie.com  
7 ADanneman@perkinscoie.com  
AYost@perkinscoie.com  
8 SBurke@perkinscoie.com  
DocketPHX@perkinscoie.com

9 *Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes*

10 ARIZONA SUPERIOR COURT

11 MOHAVE COUNTY

12 TED BOYD, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs/Contestants,

14 v.

15 KRIS MAYES,

16 Defendant/Contestee,

17 and

18 KATIE HOBBS, et al.,

19 Defendants.

No. S8015CV202201468

**CONTESTEE KRIS MAYES' NOTICE  
OF FILING CITED, UNPUBLISHED  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS'  
RESPONSE TO COURT'S WRITTEN  
ORDER REGARDING ISSUES ON  
WHICH NO AGREEMENT HAS BEEN  
REACHED**

(Assigned to the Hon. Lee F. Jantzen)

20  
21 Attorney General Elect Kris Mayes respectfully submits the following unpublished  
22 authorities, which were cited in her Response to Plaintiffs' response to the Court's written order  
23 regarding issues on which no agreement has been reached, filed earlier today:  
24

1 A. 12/16/2022 Order from Thompson, J, *Lake v. Hobbs*, CV 2022-095403<sup>1</sup>

2 B. 12/19/2022 Order from Thompson, J, *Lake v. Hobbs*, CV 2022-095403

3 For the Court's convenience, copies of these authorities are attached hereto as **Exhibits A and**  
4 **B**, respectively.

5  
6 Dated: December 21, 2022

**PERKINS COIE LLP**

7  
8 By: s/ Daniel C. Barr

Daniel C. Barr  
Paul F. Eckstein  
Alexis E. Danneman  
Austin C. Yost  
Samantha J. Burke  
2901 North Central Avenue, Suite 2000  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788

11  
12 *Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes*

13 Original efiled with the Mohave County Superior  
14 Court and served on the following parties through  
15 AZTurboCourt on this 21st day of December 2022:

16 David A. Warrington  
17 Gary Lawkowski  
18 DHILLON LAW GROUP, INC.  
19 2121 E. Eisenhower Ave., Ste. 608  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
DWarrington@dhillonlaw.com  
GLawkowski@dhillonlaw.com

20 Timothy A. La Sota  
21 TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC  
22 21 E. Camelback Rd., Ste. 305  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
tim@timlasota.com

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants*

24 <sup>1</sup> This 12/16/2022 Order is erroneously cited with the date "12/19/2022" on page 2 of the Response.

1 D. Andrew Gaona  
Coppersmith Brockelman PLC  
2 2800 N. Central Ave., Ste. 1900  
Phoenix, AZ, 85004  
3 agaona@cblawyers.com

4 Sambo (Bo) Dul  
State United Democracy Center  
5 8205 S. Priest Dr., #10312  
Tempe, AZ 95284  
6 bo@stateuniteddemocracy.org

7 *Attorneys for Defendant Arizona Secretary  
of State Katie Hobbs*

8 Thomas P. Liddy  
9 Joseph La Rue  
Joe Branco  
10 Karen Hartman-Tellez  
Jack L. O'Connor III  
11 Sean M. Moore  
Rosa Aguilar  
12 Maricopa County Attorney's Office  
225 West Madison St.  
13 Phoenix, AZ 85003  
liddy@mcao.maricopa.gov  
14 laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov  
brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov  
15 hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov  
oconnorj@mcao.maricopa.gov  
16 moores@mcao.maricopa.gov  
raguilar@mcao.maricopa.gov  
17 c-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov

18 Emily Craiger  
THE BURGESS LAW GROUP  
19 3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224  
Phoenix, AZ 85016  
20 emily@theburgesslawgroup.com

21 *Attorneys for Maricopa County*

22

23

24

1 Celeste Robertson

Joseph Young

2 Apache County Attorney's Office

245 West 1st South

3 St. Johns, AZ 85936

crobertson@apachelaw.net

4 jyoung@apachelaw.net

5 *Attorneys for Defendants Larry Noble, Apache*  
County Recorder, and Apache County Board of  
6 Supervisors

7 Christine J. Roberts

Paul Correa

8 Cochise County Attorney's Office

P.O. Drawer CA

9 Bisbee, AZ 85603

croberts@cochise.az.gov

10 pcorrea@cochise.az.gov

11 *Attorneys for Defendants David W. Stevens,*  
Cochise County Recorder, and Cochise County  
12 Board of Supervisors

13 Bill Ring

Coconino County Attorney's Office

14 110 East Cherry Avenue

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

15 wring@coconino.az.gov

16 *Attorney for Defendants Patty Hansen, Coconino*  
County Recorder, and Coconino County Board of  
17 Supervisors

18 Jeff Dalton

Gila County Attorney's Office

19 1400 East Ash Street

Globe, AZ 85501

20 jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov

21 *Attorney for Defendants Sadie Jo Bingham, Gila*  
County Recorder, and Gila County Board of  
22 Supervisors



1 Jean Roof  
Graham County Attorney's Office  
2 800 West Main Street  
Safford, AZ 85546  
3 jroof@graham.az.gov

4 *Attorneys for Defendants Wendy John, Graham*  
*County Recorder, and Graham County Board of*  
5 *Supervisors*

6 Rob Gilliland  
Greenlee County Attorney's Office  
7 P.O. Box 1717  
Clifton, AZ 85533  
8 rgilliland@greenlee.az.gov

9 *Attorney for Defendants Sharie Milheiro,*  
*Greenlee County Recorder, and Greenlee County*  
10 *Board of Supervisors*

11 Ryan N. Dooley  
La Paz County Attorney's Office  
12 1320 Kofa Avenue  
Parker, AZ 85344  
13 rdooley@lapazcountyaz.org

14 *Attorney for Defendants Richard Garcia, La Paz*  
*County Recorder, and La Paz County Board of*  
15 *Supervisors*

16 Ryan Esplin  
Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division  
17 P.O. Box 7000  
Kingman, AZ 86402-7000  
18 EspliR@mohave.gov

19 *Attorney for Defendants Kristi Blair, Mohave*  
*County Recorder, and Mohave County Board of*  
20 *Supervisors*

1 Jason Moore  
Navajo County Attorney's Office  
2 P.O. Box 668  
Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668  
3 jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov

4 *Attorney for Defendants Michael Sample, Navajo*  
*County Recorder, and Navajo County Board of*  
5 *Supervisors*

6 Daniel Jurkowitz  
Ellen Brown  
7 Javier Gherna  
Pima County Attorney's Office  
8 32 N. Stone #2100  
Tucson, AZ 85701  
9 Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov  
Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov  
10 Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov

11 *Attorney for Defendants Gabriella Cázares-*  
*Kelley, Pima County Recorder, and Pima County*  
12 *Board of Supervisors*

13 Craig Cameron  
Scott Johnson  
14 Allen Quist  
Jim Mitchell  
15 Pinal County Attorney's Office  
30 North Florence Street  
16 Florence, AZ 85132  
craig.cameron@pinal.gov  
17 scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov  
allen.quist@pinal.gov  
18 james.mitchell@pinal.gov

19 *Attorneys for Defendants Dana Lewis, Pinal*  
*County Recorder, and Pinal County Board of*  
20 *Supervisors*

1 Kimberly Hunley  
Laura Roubicek  
2 Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office  
2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201  
3 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090  
khunley@santacruzcountyaz.gov  
4 lroubicek@santacruzcountyaz.gov

5 *Attorneys for Defendants Suzanne Sainz, Santa*  
6 *Cruz County Recorder, and Santa Cruz County*  
*Board of Supervisors*

7 Colleen Connor  
Thomas Stoxen  
8 Yavapai County Attorney's Office  
255 East Gurley Street, 3rd Floor  
9 Prescott, AZ 86301  
Colleen.Connor@yavapaiaz.gov  
10 Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov

11 *Attorney for Defendants Michelle M. Burchill,*  
12 *Yavapai County Recorder, and Yavapai County*  
*Board of Supervisors*

13 Bill Kerekes  
Yuma County Attorney's Office  
14 198 South Main Street  
Yuma, AZ 85364  
15 bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov

16 *Attorney for Defendants Richard Colwell, Yuma*  
17 *County Recorder, and Yuma County Board of*  
*Supervisors*

18 *s/ Susan Carnall*  
19 \_\_\_\_\_  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

# Exhibit A

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

12/16/2022

HONORABLE PETER A. THOMPSON

CLERK OF THE COURT

V. Felix

Deputy

KARI LAKE

BRYAN JAMES BLEHM

v.

KATIE HOBBS, et al.

DAVID ANDREW GAONA

THOMAS PURCELL LIDDY  
COURT ADMIN-CIVIL-ARB DESK  
DOCKET CV TX  
JUDGE THOMPSON

**MINUTE ENTRY**

Plaintiff Kari Lake's verified petition to inspect ballots pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-677(B) was conditionally granted in part by Order of this Court filed on December 15, 2022 ("Order"). Specifically, subject to the conditions described in that order, the Court granted Plaintiff the opportunity to inspect the following:

- 1) Fifty randomly selected "ballot-on-demand" (BOD) printed ballots cast on Election Day from six vote centers in Maricopa County chosen by her representative;
- 2) Fifty randomly selected early ballots cast in the 2022 general election from six separate Maricopa County batches chosen by her representative;
- 3) Fifty randomly selected BOD printed ballots that were marked spoiled on Election Day from six separate Maricopa County vote centers chosen by her representative.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

12/16/2022

Plaintiff then filed a “motion to clarify” in which she further requested the following as to the ballot inspection granted in the Order (with (b) as clarified in her reply):

- a) That her representative be allowed to copy and photograph the inspected ballots and
- b) That, for Sample (1), Maricopa County make available for random selection tabulator-rejected BOD-printed ballots that were left by voters in Door 3 at the vote center to be counted later (“Door 3 ballots”).

The County Defendants filed a response to the motion, objecting to any copying or photographing of ballots and requesting advance notice of Plaintiff’s selected vote centers from which to draw the ballot samples. Nor is surprise a consideration or form of relief contemplated under A.R.S. § 16-677. Defendant Katie Hobbs in her capacities as Secretary of State and governor-elect joined in the portion of the County Defendants’ response objecting to the copying or photographing of ballots, and Plaintiff filed a reply. The Court has considered the motion to clarify, the response, and reply.

The Court first notes that the inspection items conditionally granted in its Order did not specify who would perform the random selection of fifty ballots for each sample. The Court clarifies that Plaintiff’s representative, as requested in the petition to inspect, will make that selection.

As to her request to allow the copying and photographing of ballots, Plaintiff seeks a modification of the Court’s Order rather than a clarification. Plaintiff made no request regarding the photographing or copying of ballots in her petition to inspect. Even if she had, the Court could not grant the request because the statute authorizing her ballot inspection provides only for an “inspection of ballots” “made in the presence of the legal custodian of the ballots.” A.R.S. § 16-677(C).

The County Defendants in their response did not object to Plaintiff’s sampling “only door 3 ballots.” Plaintiff clarified in her reply that she did not want the samples limited to such ballots but only that they be available for inclusion in the samples. Although the County Defendants specify in their response that they do not object to *all* sample ballots being drawn from tabulator-rejected Door 3 ballots, the clarification in Plaintiff’s reply is consistent with the terms of the original Order, and the County Defendants’ response does not indicate any objection to making available tabulator-rejected Door 3 ballots as at least part of the inspection samples.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

12/16/2022

In their response, the Maricopa County Defendants notified the Court and other parties that they needed to know Plaintiff's representative's choice of vote centers from which to draw the inspection samples by 5:00 p.m. today, December 16, 2022, to ensure that inspection could begin at 8:00 a.m. on Tuesday, December 20, 2022, as ordered. Plaintiff objects to this request, arguing that "provid[ing] Maricopa County a list of vote centers in advance of this inspection[]" would defeat the purpose of taking a random sample without advance notice to Defendant."

First, Plaintiff is not asking for "random samples." She is controlling the choice of voting locations from which to sample and *then* randomly selecting ballots from her designated preferred sample. Complying with the custodian's request does not appear to impair but would actually promote inspection of the ballots. Second, the petition to inspect and resulting Order mentioned nothing about preventing "advance notice to Defendant" about the choosing of voting centers from which to draw the ballot samples. In any case, notifying the County of the chosen ballot centers will not impair Plaintiff's representative's random selection of fifty ballots from among all originating from each chosen location. To be clear, Plaintiff's right to inspect the ballots is not contingent on advance notification of which or all ballots she wishes to inspect. The Court is not able to determine at this point whether the advance notice requested by the custodian is truly necessary to comply with this Court's Order for inspection of the ballots. However, if Plaintiff does not complete the inspection and/or argues at trial that the custodian of ballots prevented adequate discovery, the Court will consider any failure of Plaintiff to accommodate reasonable requests of the custodian in determining whether the custodian complied with the Order.

**IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to clarify is DENIED as to her request to copy and photograph ballots and GRANTED as to her request that the Maricopa County Defendants make available for inclusion in Sample (1), tabulator-rejected BOD-printed ballots left by voters at the vote center to be counted later.

# Exhibit B



SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

12/19/2022

HONORABLE PETER A. THOMPSON

CLERK OF THE COURT

V. Felix

Deputy

KARI LAKE

BRYAN JAMES BLEHM

v.

KATIE HOBBS, et al.

DAVID ANDREW GAONA

THOMAS PURCELL LIDDY  
COURT ADMIN-CIVIL-ARB DESK  
DOCKET CV TX  
JUDGE THOMPSON

**MINUTE ENTRY**

Plaintiff Kari Lake filed a Motion to Expedite Discovery pursuant to Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure 26(f) and 34(b)(3)(A). Defendants Maricopa County and Katie Hobbs have filed responses opposing the motion, and Plaintiff has filed a reply. Defendants have filed motions to quash subpoenas issued to Secretary of State Katie Hobbs and Maricopa County Recorder Stephen Richer, Plaintiff filed a response. Defendant Hobbs in her personal capacity joined the Motion to Quash. The Court has read and considered the filings and rules as follows.

I. Plaintiff's Email Discovery Request

Plaintiff requests expedition of a request for production under Rule 34 of any emails Defendants sent to, and/or received from, a single email address in relation to Count I of their verified statement of election contest. At the outset, the Court notes that the only relevance such emails could have to the instant action is to Count I of the complaint. Because this Count was dismissed, the request is moot and could be denied on that basis alone. The Court continues its analysis to offer clarity concerning discovery in this action.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

12/19/2022

II. Application of the Civil Rules

Defendants argue that the Rules of Civil Procedure do not govern an election contest. This is not so.

Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 1 provides that the Rules cover all “proceedings in the superior court of Arizona.” Without question, a verified statement of election contest – which must be filed in superior court – is just such an action. A.R.S. § 16-672(B). Thus, absent a conflict with the governing statute, this court must apply the civil rules to election contests. This is why election contests are subject to motions to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6). *See e.g. Griffin v. Buzard*, 86 Ariz. 166, 169-70 (1959) (applying Rule 12(b)(6)); *Hancock v. Bisnar*, 212 Ariz. 344, 348, ¶ 17 (2006) (applying Rule 8(a)); *see also Finchem v. Fontes*, CV2022053927, December 16, 2022 Under Advisement Ruling at \*3-4.

III. Harmonizing the Rules and the Statutes

This broader point does not merit granting Lake’s motion. In the case of an election contest, the timelines of which are compressed far beyond an ordinary civil contest, it is not merely difficult to comply with both the statute and civil rules – it is conceptually impossible to do so. An answer must be filed within five days a statement of contest is filed. A.R.S. § 16-675(A). The Court must hold a trial no later than ten days following the filing of the statement of contest, or fifteen days with a showing of good cause. A.R.S. § 16-676(A). A court must render judgment within five days of trial. *Id.* at (B). The Court agrees with Plaintiff that the statute is irreconcilable with the timelines permitted for discovery under Rules 26, and 34.

But, in a case where a constitutionally enacted substantive statute conflicts with a procedural rule, the statute prevails. *Albano v. Shea Homes Ltd. P’ship*, 227 Ariz. 121, 127, ¶ 26 (2011). Accordingly, the tight timelines and absence of opportunity for discovery – without which a dispute of this type could not conclude on-time – prevail over the ordinary civil rule of procedure.

Moreover, to arbitrarily reduce deadlines, modify or waive procedural safeguards in discovery and discovery disputes, and to do so for the duration for an entire action, would be an exercise in amending the civil rules. This is forbidden territory for a trial court, as only the Arizona Supreme Court may amend the Rules of Civil Procedure. *Cullen v. Auto Owners Ins. Co.*, 218 Ariz. 417, 420, ¶¶ 11-12 (2008).

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

12/19/2022

To grant the requested discovery of emails would also go beyond the discovery that is expressly contemplated by the governing statutes, i.e. ballot inspection, and would drastically expand the scope of litigation. *See* A.R.S. § 16-677. Reading the provision for ballot inspection alongside the timelines imposed on the parties and court to hold a trial, the Court finds that the legislature did not intend for parties to have the right to discovery attendant with other civil actions. The Court is also mindful of the potential for transforming election contests of limited scope into a lighting-round of discovery disputes.

This Court reiterates that it must harmonize conflicting rules and statutes. *State v. Fell*, 249 Ariz. 1, 3, ¶ 10 (App. 2020) (citation omitted). And in this instance the substantive statute – with its strict timelines and limited room for discovery that define the parameters of an election challenge – must prevail over civil rules which simply do not fit in these cramped confines.

IV. Defendants' Motions to Quash

Plaintiff seeks testimony at the upcoming evidentiary hearing on the election contest from Secretary Hobbs and Recorder Richer.

All Defendants urge the Court to quash the depositions on apex doctrine grounds. Apex doctrine “provides some protection from depositions to high-level executives and government officials.” *Tierra Blanca Ranch High Cntry. Youth Program v. Gonzales*, 329 F.R.D. 694, 696 (D.N.M. 2019). While adopted by a number of federal district courts as an interpretation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b)(2)(C) and (b)(1), Arizona courts have never applied apex doctrine under the analogous Arizona Rule of Civil Procedure 26. While the Court is sensitive to the need to have discovery be proportional to the needs of the case, the Court is not inclined to apply a blanket rule that high-level government officials can never be called to testify.

Defendant Hobbs in her capacity as Secretary of State argues that the subpoena must be quashed or modified if it subjects a person to “undue burden or expense.” Ariz. R. Civ. P. 45(e)(2)(A)(iv). The Court finds, given the nature of the case – where the questions of fact range from technical minutiae to broader issues of election manual interpretation – the Court cannot say that the burden on the Secretary would be undue, or that the testimony is “completely irrelevant or marginally relevant.” *See Arkansas St. Conf. NAACP v. Arkansas Bd. of Apportionment*, 2022No. 4:21-CV-01239-LPR, 2022 WL 300917, at \*8 (E.D. Ark. Jan. 31, 2022). This is the only form of discovery that can be done to conduct a two-day trial in a single week. The imposition on the Secretary’s time as a public official, while regrettable – *see id.* (“Requiring a high-level government official to testify in any form takes that official away from doing the public’s business.”) – is minimal. It is also discovery concerning an activity wholly within her wheelhouse: the conduct of elections.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

12/19/2022

Similarly, while the Recorder is burdened by the inconvenience of travel, he nonetheless has relevant knowledge concerning the application of Maricopa County's Election Manual over the entire county, and the methodology for maintaining chain of custody. This is similarly within his expertise as a public official.

It is unclear whether Plaintiff seeks Katie Hobbs's testimony in her personal capacity as well. It is not clear what for, as it is only in her capacity as Secretary of State that she has any knowledge relevant to any claims, even prior to the partial dismissal this afternoon. Consequently, this denial of the motion to quash is limited to testimony in Defendant Hobbs's capacity as Secretary of State.

Therefore:

**IT IS ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion to expedite discovery is DENIED.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants' motions to quash subpoenas issued to Secretary of State Katie Hobbs and Maricopa County Recorder Stephen Richer are DENIED.