

1 Timothy A. La Sota, Ariz. Bar No. 020539

2 **TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC**

3 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305

4 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

(602) 515-2649

5 tim@timlasota.com

6 *Attorney for Plaintiffs/Contestants*

7 Alexander Kolodin (030826)

8 Veronica Lucero (030292)

9 Arno Naeckel (026158)

10 James C. Sabalos (*pro hac vice*)

11 **Davillier Law Group, LLC**

12 4105 North 20th Street, Suite 110

13 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

14 T: (602) 730-2985

15 F: (602) 801-2539

16 akolodin@davillierlawgroup.com

17 vlucero@davillierlawgroup.com

18 anaeckel@davillierlawgroup.com

19 jsabalos@davillierlawgroup.com

20 phxadmin@davillierlawgroup.com

Jennifer J. Wright (027145)

JENNIFER WRIGHT ESQ., PLC

4350 E. Indian School Road Ste #21-105

Phoenix, Arizona 85018

T: (602) 842-3061

jen@jenwesq.com

Sigal Chattah Esq. (*pro hac vice*)

CHATTAH LAW GROUP

5875 S. Rainbow Blvd #204

Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

Tel: (702) 360-6200

Fax: (702) 643-6292

Chattahlaw@gmail.com

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiff/Contestant Abraham Hamadeh*

22 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

23 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE**

24 JEANNE KENTCH, an individual; TED BOYD,
25 an individual; ABRAHAM HAMADEH, an
26 individual; and REPUBLICAN NATIONAL
27 COMMITTEE, a federal political party
28 committee

Plaintiffs/Contestants,

v.

KRIS MAYES,

Defendant/Contestee,

and

ADRIAN FONTES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. S8015CV202201468

**NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A
NEW TRIAL**

(assigned to Hon. Lee F. Jantzen)

(ORAL ARGUMENT
REQUESTED)

1 Plaintiffs provide notice of supplemental authority from the Arizona Supreme Court
2 in support of Section II (pages 12 through 14) of the Reply In Support Of Plaintiffs' Motion
3 For A New Trial.

4 In *Lake v. Hobbs*, the Supreme Court held that “it was erroneous to dismiss” one of
5 Lake’s claims and thus remanded to the trial court to determine issues that may require an
6 evidentiary hearing. *Lake v. Hobbs, et al.*, Ariz. Sup. Ct. No. CV-23-0046-PR Order (Mar.
7 22, 2023) at 3 (“Order”). The Supreme Court specifically remanded to the trial court to
8 determine whether “Petitioner can prove her claim as alleged pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-672
9 and establish that ‘votes [were] affected “in sufficient numbers to alter the outcome of the
10 election”’ based on a ‘competent mathematical basis to conclude that the outcome would
11 plausibly have been different, not simply an untethered assertion of uncertainty.’” *Id.* at 3-
12 4. The Supreme Court’s Order supports Plaintiffs’ argument in this case that the rules of
13 civil procedure not only apply to election contests, but that the time provisions in A.R.S.
14 § 16-676 do not conflict to prevent this Court from granting a new trial. The Order further
15 supports Plaintiffs’ argument that, based on the narrow recount vote deficit that Secretary
16 Hobbs revealed *after* the initial trial and fact-intensive arguments provided in Plaintiffs’
17 pending motion, Plaintiffs’ “competent mathematical basis to conclude that the outcome
18 would plausibly have been different” provides a basis for a new trial and relief in this Court.
19 *Id.* at 3.

20 It is worth noting that the Arizona Supreme Court found that the Maricopa County
21 Superior Court erred in dismissing Lake’s claims related to Maricopa County’s signature
22 verification procedures *under laches*. Plaintiffs thus request that this Court vacate the non-
23 final order entered on December 20, 2022 dismissing Count V of Plaintiffs’ complaint. As
24 in *Lake*, Plaintiffs allege that Maricopa County did not comply with A.R.S. § 16-550(A).
25 According to the Supreme Court, “[c]ontrary to the ruling of the trial court and the Court of
26 Appeals Opinion, this signature verification challenge is to the application of the policies,
27 not to the policies themselves. Therefore, it was erroneous to dismiss this claim under the
28 doctrine of laches because Lake could not have brought this challenge before the election.”

1 *Id.* The same rationale applies here to resume Plaintiffs' as-applied challenge concerning
2 2022 election issues that could not have been brought before the 2022 election occurred,
3 consistent with the Supreme Court's directives in *Lake*.

4 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 23rd day of March, 2023.

5 By: /s/ Jennifer J. Wright

6 Jennifer J. Wright (027145)

7 **JENNIFER WRIGHT ESQ., PLC**

8 4350 E. Indian School Road Ste #21-105
9 Phoenix, AZ 85018

10 /s/ Alexander Kolodin (with permission)

11 Alexander Kolodin (030826)

12 Veronica Lucero (030292)

13 Arno Naeckel (026158)

14 James C. Sabalos (*pro hac vice*)

15 **Davillier Law Group, LLC**

16 4105 North 20th Street, Suite 110
17 Phoenix, AZ 85016

18 /s/ Sigal Chattah (with permission)

19 Sigal Chattah Esq. (*pro hac vice*)

20 **CHATTAH LAW GROUP**

21 5875 S. Rainbow Blvd #204
22 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff/Contestant Abraham*
24 *Hamadeh*

25 /s/ Timothy La Sota (with permission)

26 Timothy A La Sota, SBN # 020539

27 **TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC**

28 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Attorney for Plaintiffs/Contestants

24 ORIGINAL efiled and served via electronic means
25 this 23rd day of March, 2023, upon:

26 Honorable Lee F. Jantzen
27 Mohave County Superior Court c/o
28 Danielle Lecher
division4@mohavecourts.com

1 D. Andrew Gaona (028414)
2 Kristen Yost (034052)
3 COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC
4 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
6 T: (602) 381-5478
7 agaona@cblawyers.com

8 Maithreyi Ratakondan (*pro hac vice pending*)
9 STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER
10 1 Liberty Plaza
11 165 Broadway, 23rd Floor, Office 2330
12 New York, NY 10006
13 T: (202) 999-9305
14 mai@statesuniteddemocracy.org

Attorneys for Defendant Secretary of State Adrian Fontes

11 Paul F. Eckstein
12 Alexis E. Danneman
13 Matthew R. Koerner
14 Margo R. Casselman
15 Samantha J. Burke
16 Perkins Coie LLP
17 2901 North Central Avenue
18 Suite 2000
19 Phoenix, AZ 85012
20 peckstein@perkinscoie.com
21 adanneman@perkinscoie.com
22 mkoerner@perkinscoie.com
23 mcasselman@perkinscoie.com
24 sburke@perkinscoie.com
25 docketphx@perkinscoie.com
26 *Attorneys for Defendant Kris Mayes*

27 Thomas P. Liddy
28 Joseph J. Branco
Joseph E. LaRue
Karen J. Hartman-Tellez
Jack L. O'Connor III
Sean Moore
Rosa Aguilar
Maricopa County Attorney's Office
225 West Madison St.
Phoenix, AZ 85003
liddy@mcao.maricopa.gov

1 brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov

2 laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov

3 hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov

4 oconnorj@mcao.maricopa.gov

5 moores@mcao.maricopa.gov

6 aguilarr@mcao.maricopa.gov

7 Emily Craiger

8 The Burgess Law Group

9 3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224

10 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

11 Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com

12 *Attorneys for Defendant, Stephen Richer, Maricopa County Recorder,*

13 *And Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*

14 Celeste Robertson

15 Joseph Young

16 Apache County Attorney's Office

17 245 West 1st South

18 St. Johns, AZ 85936

19 crobertson@apachelaw.net

20 jyoung@apachelaw.net

21 *Attorneys for Defendant, Larry Noble, Apache County Recorder,*

22 *and Apache County Board of Supervisors*

23 Christine J. Roberts

24 Paul Correa

25 Cochise County Attorney's Office

26 Bisbee, AZ 85603

27 croberts@cochise.az.gov

28 pcorrea@cochise.az.gov

Attorneys for Defendant, David W. Stevens, Cochise County Recorder,

and Cochise County Board of Supervisors

Bill Ring

Coconino County Attorney's Office 110

East Cherry Avenue

Flagstaff, AZ 86001

wring@coconino.az.gov

Attorney for Defendant, Patty Hansen, Coconino County Recorder,

and Coconino County Board of Supervisors

1 Jeff Dalton
2 Gila County Attorney's Office 1400
3 East Ash Street
4 Globe, AZ 85551
5 jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov
Attorney for Defendant, Sadie Jo Bingham, Gila County Recorder,
and Gila County Board of Supervisors

6 Jean Roof
7 Graham County Attorney's Office
8 800 West Main Street
9 Safford, AZ 85546
10 jroof@graham.az.gov
Attorneys for Defendant, Wendy John, Graham County Recorder,
and Graham County Board of Supervisors

11 Scott Adams
12 Greenlee County Attorney's Office
13 P.O. Box 1717
14 Clifton, AZ 85533
15 sadams@greenlee.az.gov
Attorney for Defendant, Sharie Milheiro, Greenlee County Recorder,
and Greenlee County Board of Supervisors

16 Ryan N. Dooley
17 La Paz County Attorney's Office
18 1320 Kofa Avenue
19 Parker, AZ 85344
20 rdooley@lapazcountyaz.org
Attorney for Defendant, Richard Garcia, La Paz County Recorder,
and La Paz County Board of Supervisors

21 Ryan Esplin
22 Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division
23 P.O. Box 7000
24 Kingman, AZ 86402-7000
25 esplinr@mohave.gov
Attorney for Defendant, Kristi Blair, Mohave County Recorder,
and Mohave County Board of Supervisors

1 Jason Moore
2 Navajo County Attorney's Office
3 P.O. Box 668
4 Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668
5 jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov
6 *Attorney for Defendant, Michael Sample, Navajo County Recorder,*
7 *and Navajo County Board of Supervisors*

8 Daniel Jurkowitz
9 Ellen Brown
10 Javier Gherna
11 Pima County Attorney's Office
12 32 N. Stone #2100
13 Tucson, AZ 85701
14 Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov
15 Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov
16 Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov
17 *Attorney for Gabriela Cázares-Kelley, Pima County Recorder,*
18 *and Pima County Board of Supervisors*

19 Craig Cameron
20 Scott Johnson
21 Allen Quist
22 Jim Mitchell
23 Pinal County Attorney's Office
24 30 North Florence Street
25 Florence, AZ 85132
26 craig.cameron@pinal.gov
27 scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov
28 allen.quist@pinal.gov
29 james.mitchell@pinal.gov
30 *Attorneys for Defendant, Dana Lewis, Pinal County Recorder,*
31 *and Pinal County Board of Supervisors*

32 Kimberly Hunley
33 Laura Roubicek
34 Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office
35 2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201
36 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090
37 khunley@santacruzcountyaz.gov
38 lroubicek@santacruzcountyaz.gov
39 *Attorneys for Defendant, Suzanne Sainz, Santa Cruz County Recorder,*
40 *and Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors*

1 Thomas M. Stoxen
2 Michael J. Gordon
3 Yavapai County Attorney's Office
4 255 East Gurley Street, 3rd Floor
5 Prescott, AZ 86301
6 Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov
7 michaelgordon@yavapaiaz.gov
8 *Attorney for Defendant, Michelle M. Burchill, Yavapai County Recorder,*
9 *and Yavapai County Board of Supervisors*

10 Bill Kerekes
11 Yuma County Attorney's Office
12 198 South Main Street
13 Yuma, AZ 85364
14 bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov
15 *Attorney for Defendant, Richard Colwell, Yuma County Recorder,*
16 *and Yuma County Board of Supervisors*

17 /s/ Jennifer J. Wright

SUPREME COURT OF ARIZONA

KARI LAKE,	)	Arizona Supreme Court
	)	No. CV-23-0046-PR
Plaintiff/Appellant,	)	
	)	Court of Appeals
v.	)	Division One
	)	No. 1 CA-CV 22-0779
KATIE HOBBS, et al.,	)	1 CA-SA 22-0237
	)	(Consolidated)
Defendants/Appellees.	)	
KARI LAKE,	)	Maricopa County
	)	Superior Court
	)	No. CV2022-095403
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
THE HONORABLE PETER THOMPSON,	)	
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF	)	
THE STATE OF ARIZONA, in and for	)	
the County of Maricopa,	)	
	)	
Respondent Judge,	)	
	)	
KATIE HOBBS, personally as	)	
Contestee; ADRIAN FONTES, in his	)	
official capacity as Secretary	)	
of State; STEPHEN RICHER, in his	)	
official capacity as Maricopa	)	
County Recorder, et al.,	)	
	)	
Real Parties in Interest.	)	
	)	FILED 03/22/2023

O R D E R

On December 24, 2022, the trial court issued its Under Advisement Ruling rejecting Petitioner Lake's challenge and "confirming the election of Katie Hobbs as Arizona Governor-elect pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-676(B)." The Court of Appeals affirmed in an Opinion issued February 16, 2023.

Petitioner Lake filed her Petition for Review and request for Expedited Consideration on March 1, 2023. The Court, *en banc*, granted Petitioner's Motion for Expedited Consideration of her Petition for Review on March 3, 2023.

The Court has considered Petitioner Lake's Petition for Review and responses filed by Governor Katie Hobbs, Secretary of State Adrian Fontes, and the Maricopa County defendants. The Court has also considered the record, the trial court ruling, and the Court of Appeals' Opinion affirming the trial court. The Court has also considered briefing of amici curiae in support of Petitioner.

Upon consideration of the Court, *en banc*,

IT IS ORDERED denying review of issues one through five and seven. The Court of Appeals aptly resolved these issues, most of which were the subject of evidentiary proceedings in the trial court, and Petitioner's challenges on these grounds are insufficient to warrant the requested relief under Arizona or federal law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting review of issue number six to the extent count three of the complaint challenges the Maricopa County Recorder's application of signature-verification policies during the election. Issue number six asks, "Did the panel err in dismissing the signature-verification claim on laches[,] mischaracterizing Lake's claim as a challenge to existing signature verification policies, when Lake in fact alleged that Maricopa failed to follow these

policies during the 2022 general election?" In Count three of her complaint, which alleged a violation of A.R.S. § 16-550(A), Petitioner alleged in paragraph 151, "Upon information and belief, a material number of early ballots cast in the November 8, 2022 general election were transmitted in envelopes containing an affidavit signature that the Maricopa County Recorder or his designee determined did not match the signature in the putative voter's 'registration record.' The Maricopa County Recorder nevertheless accepted a material number of these early ballots for processing and tabulation." Contrary to the ruling of the trial court and the Court of Appeals Opinion, this signature verification challenge is to the application of the policies, not to the policies themselves. Therefore, it was erroneous to dismiss this claim under the doctrine of laches because Lake could not have brought this challenge before the election.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED vacating ¶¶ 26-30 of the Court of Appeals Opinion.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED remanding to the trial court to determine whether the claim that Maricopa County failed to comply with A.R.S. § 16-550(A) fails to state a claim pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for reasons other than laches, or, whether Petitioner can prove her claim as alleged pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-672 and establish that "votes [were] affected 'in sufficient numbers to alter the outcome of the election'" based on a "competent mathematical basis to

conclude that the outcome would plausibly have been different, not simply an untethered assertion of uncertainty.” (Opinion ¶ 11.)

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Petitioner may file a response and Respondents may file a reply to Respondents’ Motions for Sanctions in accordance with ARCAP Rule 6(a)(2). The parties shall address as a basis for sanctions only Petitioner’s factual claims in her Petition for Review (i.e., that the Court of Appeals should have considered “the undisputed fact that 35,563 unaccounted for ballots were added to the total of ballots at a third party processing facility”), and not legal arguments (i.e., pertaining to the burden of proof or purported conflict in the lower courts). The record does not reflect that 35,563 unaccounted ballots were added to the total count. The motions for sanctions will be considered in due course.

DATED this 22nd day of March, 2023.

/s/
ROBERT BRUTINEL
Chief Justice

TO:

Bryan James Blehm
Kurt Olsen
Alexis E Danneman
Abha Khanna
Lalitha D Madduri
Christina Ford
Elena Rodriquez Armenta
Shayna Gabrielle Stuart
Jake Tyler Rapp
Craig A Morgan
Thomas P Liddy
Joseph Eugene La Rue
Joseph Branco
Karen J Hartman-Tellez
Jack O'Connor
Sean M Moore
Rosa Aguilar
Emily M Craiger
Hon Peter A Thompson
Amy M Wood
David T Hardy
Ryan L Heath