FILED
Christina Spurlock
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT
12/29/2022 10:06AM
BY: GHOWELL
DEPUTY

		DEFOII
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 8	ADanneman@perkinscoie.com AYost@perkinscoie.com SBurke@perkinscoie.com	
9	DocketPHX@perkinscoie.com	
10	Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes	EDIOD COUNT
11	ARIZONA SUP	
12	MOHAVE	
13	TED BOYD, et al.,	No. S8015CV202201468
14	Plaintiffs/Contestants,	DEFENDANT KRIS MAYES'
15	V. KRIS MAYES,	RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR AN ORDER REFLECTING
16	Defendant/Contestee,	ADDITIONAL RULINGS OF THE COURT
17	and	
18	KATIE HOBBS, et al.,	(Assigned to the Hon. Lee F. Jantzen)
19	Defendants.	
20	Defendants.	
21		
22		
23		
~ 4		
24		

Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes respectfully responds to Plaintiffs' post-trial "Motion for an Order Reflecting Additional Rulings of the Court" ("Motion" or "Mot."). In this Motion (at 3), Plaintiffs urge the Court to repeat rulings it already made, to revamp the record on a motion Plaintiffs never made, and to prop open the door for "subsequent motions" that Plaintiffs perhaps might make—"in regard to the December 23, 2022" trial that has already concluded. But this case is over. And Plaintiffs' Motion should be denied, for at least three reasons.

First, Plaintiffs' Motion (at 3)—seeking to document "the happenings in front of this Court"—is neither necessary nor appropriate. The record is sufficiently captured in this Court's December 20 order, the December 22 minute entry, the hearing transcripts, and the Court's (post-trial) order yesterday denying Plaintiffs' claims. Despite this record, Plaintiffs request a ruling denying "[their] motion to for [sic] expedited discovery." [Proposed Order at 3] But this Court already rejected it by limiting "discovery in th[is] case[] by way of ballot inspection." [12/20/2022 Order at 3] Similarly, Plaintiffs request a ruling on their "motion to continue the trial" that finished six days ago. [Proposed Order at 3] But even assuming this "suggestion"—as Plaintiffs' counsel called it at the December 22 hearing—was a motion, the Court resolved it at that hearing and before trial. [12/22/2022 Min. Entry at 4 ("The Court notes the Evidentiary Hearing shall go forward tomorrow, Friday, December 23, 2022, starting at 9:00 a.m.")]

Second, Plaintiffs' proposed order is not, as they contend, "simply an accurate rendition" of the record. [Mot. at 3] Plaintiffs request an order denying "[their] motion to continue inspecting ballots." [Proposed Order at 3 (emphasis added)] But Plaintiffs did not make any such motion. Certainly, the record reflects that on December 12 Plaintiffs filed their Verified Petition to Inspect Ballots and that at the December 22 hearing Plaintiffs reiterated their "request . . . to conduct the ballot inspection." [12/22/2022 Min. Entry at 3] But this (repeat) request was not a motion—or, at least, not a motion to "continue" an inspection into the next week. See Ariz. R.

Civ. P. 7.1(a)(1) ("An application to the court for an order must be by motion which, unless made during a hearing or trial, must be in writing, state with particularity the grounds for granting the motion, and set forth the relief or order sought."). In any event, at the December 23 trial "Counsel La[]Sota state[d] that they will renew their petition to inspect ballots." [12/22/2022 Min. Entry] But Plaintiffs did not file any such petition "to continue inspecting ballots," as they claim. [See Proposed Order at 3] Plaintiffs cannot now revamp the record to reserve this issue for appeal.

Third, though Plaintiffs' (post-trial) Motion (at 3) promises "not [to] inhibit the ability of any other party to make further motions to this Court," Plaintiffs' Proposed Order (at 3) is not so limited, attempting to prop open the door for any "subsequent motions of the parties." But, again, this case is over. And, as of now, not much else remains except to rule on any attorneys' fees motion and to enter judgment, as Arizona law directs. See A.R.S. § 16-676(B) ("After hearing the proofs and allegations of the parties [in an election contest], and within five days after the submission thereof, the court shall file its findings and immediately thereafter shall pronounce judgment, either confirming or annulling and setting aside the election.").

Accordingly, this Court should deny Plaintiffs' Motion and should enter judgment, as A.R.S. § 16-676(B) directs.

Dated: December 22, 2022 PERKINS COIE LLP By: <u>s/Alexis E. Danneman</u> 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 Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Kris Mayes

	I .
1	Original efiled with the Mohave County Superior
2	Court and served on the following parties through AZTurboCourt on this 22nd day of December 2022:
3	David A. Warrington
4	Gary Lawkowski DHILLON LAW GROUP, INC.
5	2121 E. Eisenhower Ave., Ste. 608 Alexandria, VA 22314
6	DWarrington@dhillonlaw.com GLawkowski@dhillonlaw.com
7	Timothy A. La Sota
8	TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC 21 E. Camelback Rd., Ste. 305
9	Phoenix, AZ 85016 tim@timlasota.com
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs/Contestants
11	D. Andrew Gaona
12	Coppersmith Brockelman PLC 2800 N. Central Ave., Ste. 1900
13	Phoenix, AZ, 85004 agaona@cblawyers.com
14	Sambo (Bo) Dul
15	State United Democracy Center 8205 S. Priest Dr., #10312
16	Tempe, AZ 95284 bo@stateuniteddemocracy.org
17	Attorneys for Defendant Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs
18	
19	Thomas P. Liddy Joseph La Rue
20	Joe Branco Karen Hartman-Tellez
21	Jack L. O'Connor III Sean M. Moore
22	Rosa Aguilar Maricopa County Attorney's Office
	225 West Madison St.
23	Phoenix, AZ 85003 liddyt@mcao.maricopa.gov
24	laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov
I	I

1	brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov
2	hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov oconnorj@mcao.maricopa.gov
3	moores@mcao.maricopa.gov raguilar@mcao.maricopa.gov c-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov
4	
5	Emily Craiger THE BURGESS LAW GROUP 3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224
6	Phoenix, AZ 85016 emily@theburgesslawgroup.com
7	Attorneys for Maricopa County
8	Celeste Robertson
9	Joseph Young
10	Apache County Attorney's Office 245 West 1st South St. Johns, AZ 85936
11	crobertson@apachelaw.net jyoung@apachelaw.net
12	Attorneys for Defendants Larry Noble, Apache
13	County Recorder, and Apache County Board of Supervisors
14	Christine J. Roberts
15	Paul Correa Cochise County Attorney's Office
16	P.O. Drawer CA Bisbee, AZ 85603
17	croberts@cochise.az.gov pcorrea@cochise.az.gov
18	Attorneys for Defendants David W. Stevens,
19	Cochise County Recorder, and Cochise County Board of Supervisors
20	Bill Ring
21	Coconino County Attorney's Office 110 East Cherry Avenue
22	Flagstaff, AZ 86001 wring@coconino.az.gov
23 24	Attorney for Defendants Patty Hansen, Coconino
24	County Recorder, and Coconino County Board of Supervisors
	I

	l .
1	Jeff Dalton
2	Gila County Attorney's Office 1400 East Ash Street
3	Globe, AZ 85501 jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov
4	Attorney for Defendants Sadie Jo Bingham, Gila County Recorder, and Gila County Board of
5	Supervisors
6	Jean Roof Graham County Attorney's Office
7	800 West Main Street Safford, AZ 85546
8	jroof@graham.az.gov
9	Attorneys for Defendants Wendy John, Graham County Recorder, and Graham County Board of
10	Supervisors
11	Rob Gilliland Greenlee County Attorney's Office
12	P.O. Box 1717 Clifton, AZ 85533
13	rgilliland@greenlee.az.gov
14	Attorney for Defendants Sharie Milheiro, Greenlee County Recorder, and Greenlee County
15	Board of Supervisors
16	Ryan N. Dooley La Paz County Attorney's Office
17	1320 Kofa Avenue Parker, AZ 85344
18	rdooley@lapazcountyaz.org
19	Attorney for Defendants Richard Garcia, La Paz County Recorder, and La Paz County Board of
20	Supervisors
21	
22	
23	
24	

1	Ryan Esplin Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division
2	P.O. Box 7000
3	Kingman, AZ 86402-7000 EspliR@mohave.gov
4	Attorney for Defendants Kristi Blair, Mohave
5	County Recorder, and Mohave County Board of Supervisors
6	Jason Moore Navajo County Attorney's Office
7	P.O. Box 668 Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668
8	jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov
9	Attorney for Defendants Michael Sample, Navajo County Recorder, and Navajo County Board of
10	Supervisors
11	Daniel Jurkowitz Ellen Brown
12	Javier Gherna Pima County Attorney's Office
13	32 N. Stone #2100 Tucson, AZ 85701
14	Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov
15	Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov
16	Attorney for Defendants Gabriella Cázares- Kelley, Pima County Recorder, and Pima County
17	Board of Supervisors
18	Craig Cameron Scott Johnson
19	Allen Quist Jim Mitchell
20	Pinal County Attorney's Office 30 North Florence Street
21	Florence, AZ 85132 craig.cameron@pinal.gov
22	scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov allen.quist@pinal.gov
23	james.mitchell@pinal.gov
24	

Attorneys for Defendants Dana Lewis, Pinal County Recorder, and Pinal County Board of
Supervisors
Kimberly Hunley
Laura Roubicek Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office
2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090
khunley@santacruzcountyaz.gov lroubicek@santacruzcountyaz.gov
Attorneys for Defendants Suzanne Sainz, Santa
Cruz County Recorder, and Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors
Colleen Connor Thomas Stoxen
Yavapai County Attorney's Office
255 East Gurley Street, 3rd Floor Prescott, AZ 86301
Colleen.Connor@yavapaiaz.gov Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov
Attorney for Defendants Michelle M. Burchill, Yavapai County Recorder, and Yavapai County
Board of Supervisors
Bill Kerekes Yuma County Attorney's Office
198 South Main Street Yuma, AZ 85364
bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov
Attorney for Defendants Richard Colwell, Yuma County Recorder, and Yuma County Board of
Supervisors
s/ Susan Carnall
Susair Carriage