FILED Christina Spurlock CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT 06/07/2022 6:56PM BY: MVIGIL Alexander M. Kolodin (SBN 030826) Alan Dershowitz (*Pro hac vice* to be submitted) 1 Veronica Lucero (SBN 030292) 1575 Massachusetts Avenue Roger Strassburg (SBN 016314) Cambridge, MA 02138 2 Arno T. Naeckel (SBN 026158) adersh@gmail.com Michael Kielsky (SBN 021864) Proposed Additional Counsel Pro Hac Vice 3 Davillier Law Group, LLC 4 Akolodin@davillierlawgroup.com Vlucero@davillierlawgroup.com 5 Rstrassburg@davillierlawgroup.com Anaeckel@davillierlawgroup.com 6 Mkielsky@davillierlawgoup.com Phxadmin@davillierlawgroup.com (file copies) 7 4105 North 20th Street Ste 110 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 8 Telephone: (602) 730-2985 Facsimile: (602) 801-2539 9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 10 11 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA 12 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE 13 Case No. S8015CV202200594 14 ARIZONA REPUBLICAN PARTY; et al.; 15 PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTION TO Plaintiffs, PROPOSED FORM OF JUDGMENT 16 v. 17 KATIE HOBBS; et al.; 18 Defendants. 19 Plaintiffs have reviewed the proposed form of judgment submitted by the Secretary. 20 Without waiving any ability to object to this Court's rulings on appeal, other than the minor 21 change set forth below, Plaintiffs agree that the proposed form of judgment appears to 22 properly reflect this Court's decision in this matter and ask that final judgment be speedily 23 entered. 24 The Secretary's proposed form of final judgment states "Plaintiffs' Verified 25 Complaint raises the purely legal question whether the Arizona Constitution prohibits the 26

Arizona legislature from enacting laws that allow no-excuse early voting". This contains

a minor error. Final judgment should read: "Plaintiffs' Verified Complaint raises the purely

Davillier Law Group, LLC 4105 North 20th Street Suite 110 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: (602) 730-2985 / Facsimile: (602) 801-2339

> 27 28

1

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

legal question whether the Arizona Constitution prohibits the Arizona legislature from enacting laws that allow no-excuse mail-in voting". Plaintiffs request that change be made 3 in the final judgment. See e.g. Ruling pg. 2 (This case "is about one thing: Is the Arizona 4 legislature prohibited by the Arizona Constitution from enacting voting laws that include 5 no-excuse mail-in voting?"), Verified Compl. 48:18-20 ("WHEREFORE Plaintiffs 6 petition this Court: For a declaration that Arizona's post 1990 system of no-excuse mail-7 in voting is contrary to the Arizona Constitution."). Because this change is minor and 8 technical, Plaintiffs do not hereby submit an alternative form of judgment.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 8th day of June 2022

By: /s/Alexander Kolodin Alexander Kolodin Veronica Lucero Roger Strassburg Arno T. Naeckel Michael Kielsky Davillier Law Group, LLC 4105 North 20th Street Ste 110 Phoenix, AZ 85016 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Alan Dershowitz (Pro hac vice to be submitted) 1575 Massachusetts Avenue Cambridge, MA 02138 Proposed Additional Counsel Pro Hac Vice I CERTIFY that a copy of the forgoing will be served on the other party/parties to this matter in accordance with the applicable rule of procedure. By: /s/Yuka Bacchus

> Yuka Bacchus Davillier Law Group, LLC