

1 TERRY GODDARD
 Attorney General
 2 Firm Bar No. 14000
 3 Mary O’Grady, No. 011434
 Solicitor General
 4 Steven A. LaMar, No. 004140
 Senior Litigation Counsel
 5 Carrie J. Brennan, No. 018250
 6 Barbara A. Bailey, No. 018230
 Assistant Attorneys General
 7 1275 West Washington Street
 Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926
 8 Tel: (602) 542-3333
 9 Fax: (602) 542-8308
 Attorneys for State of Arizona and
 10 Arizona Secretary of State Janice Brewer

11 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 12 **DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

13 MARIA M. GONZALEZ, et al.,
 14 Plaintiffs,
 15 v.
 16 STATE OF ARIZONA, et al.
 17 Defendants.

No. CV06-01268 PHX ROS
 No. CV06-1362 PCT ROS (Cons)
 No. CV06-1575 PCT ROS (Cons)

**RESPONSE TO GONZALEZ
 PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION FOR
 RECONSIDERATION OF PORTION
 OF ORDER EXCLUDING TRIAL
 WITNESSES**

(Assigned to the Honorable
 Roslyn O. Silver)

23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 Pursuant to the Court's order dated July 9, 2008, dkt. 932, Defendants State of
2 Arizona and Arizona Secretary of State ("State Defendants") hereby respond to
3 Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration of Portion of Order Excluding Trial
4 Witnesses ("Motion for Reconsideration"). As explained below, permitting the
5 declarations and depositions of untimely disclosed witnesses would be highly
6 prejudicial to Defendants, who have had no opportunity to take discovery on or
7 depositions of those witnesses and who would have no opportunity to cross-examine
8 them at trial.

9 A motion for reconsideration should be granted only if (1) the Court has patently
10 misunderstood a party; (2) the Court has made a decision outside the adversarial issues
11 presented to it; (3) the Court has made an error not of reasoning but of apprehension; or
12 (4) where there has been a controlling or significant change in the law or facts since the
13 submission of the issue to the Court. *Saini v. I.N.S.*, 64 F. Supp. 2d 923, 925 (D. Ariz.
14 1999).

15 **Luz Sarmina and Sal Martinez**

16 None of the above four factors weighs in favor of granting the Motion for
17 Reconsideration. Although Defendants in their Motion in Limine Re Late Disclosure
18 of Witnesses, dkt. 821, specifically named Luz Sarmina and Sal Martinez as persons
19 who were disclosed late, Gonzalez Plaintiffs failed to address them in their Gonzalez
20 Plaintiffs' Consolidated Response to Motions in Limine ("Consolidated Response").
21 (Dkt. 867) Thus, the Court did not misunderstand or make a decision outside the
22 adversarial issues presented to it, because nothing regarding these witnesses was
23 presented by Plaintiffs.

24 Moreover, Gonzalez Plaintiffs have the burden to show why they did not timely
25 disclose these witnesses by January 18, 2008. Gonzalez Plaintiffs admit that they knew
26 of Sal Martinez and Luz Sarmina replacing Edmondo Hidalgo and Anita Luera by at
27 least November 8, 2007 (Motion at 7). Gonzalez Plaintiffs do not explain why it was
28

1 impossible for them to disclose these persons by the fact discovery deadline two
2 months later. Defendants' decisions regarding which of Plaintiffs' witnesses to depose
3 are substantially dependent on who Plaintiffs disclose. Gonzalez Plaintiffs did not
4 disclose these witnesses in a timely manner, have given no justification for not timely
5 disclosing them, and because they were disclosed in an untimely manner, Defendants
6 did not have an opportunity to depose them. Those individuals should not be allowed
7 to testify.

8 **Martha Higuera, Herta Weber, Barbara Corke, Steve and Donna Fulton,**
9 **Karen Lewsader, and Brenda Rogers**

10 Gonzalez Plaintiffs propose to introduce testimony through the declarations of
11 seven untimely disclosed individuals whom Defendants had, and will have, no
12 opportunity to cross-examine. Neither Defendants nor the Court will have any
13 opportunity to learn all of the facts regarding the circumstances of their statements.
14 Admission of such testimony would be patently unfair and unduly prejudicial to
15 Defendants.

16 Gonzalez Plaintiffs could have and should have disclosed these witnesses earlier.
17 Plaintiffs do not dispute that they received the rejected voter registration forms by at
18 least late 2007. They also acknowledge that they received all of the conditional
19 provisional ballot documents by March 2008. Plaintiffs were sending out letters to
20 many individuals on *May 28, 2008*, and therefore cannot argue that they used diligence
21 in attempting to locate witnesses. *See* Letters, attached as Exhibit A hereto. Notably,
22 Plaintiffs do not inform the Court when they actually first contacted the seven
23 individuals.

24 Accordingly, Plaintiffs' argument regarding those witnesses (Martha Higuera,
25 Herta Weber, and Barbara Corke) testifying about their voter registration experience is
26 unsupported. Similarly, Plaintiffs have offered no justification for their failure to
27 disclose those witnesses offering statements about their voting experiences (Steve and
28

1 Donna Fulton, Karen Lewsader and Brenda Rogers).

2 In addition, Gonzalez Plaintiffs' argument on these witnesses in their Motion for
3 Reconsideration is virtually a word-by-word rehash of their argument in their
4 Consolidated Response, and is therefore improper under the motion for reconsideration
5 standard set forth above.

6 **Michael Quinn and Gerri Ratliff**

7 Once again, Gonzalez Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration offers nothing new
8 on these witnesses. It is merely a reiteration of their argument in their Consolidated
9 Response. Gonzalez Plaintiffs do not dispute that the depositions of these witnesses
10 were taken months after the close of fact discovery and that they made no attempt to
11 reopen discovery for those depositions. Defendants should be entitled to rely on the
12 Court's orders regarding discovery deadlines, and in declining to attend the depositions
13 of Quinn and Ratliff, they were doing just that. Defendants will be prejudiced by the
14 introduction of the deposition testimony of these witnesses.

15 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 9th day of July, 2008.

16 TERRY GODDARD
17 Arizona Attorney General

18 s/ Carrie J. Brennan
19 Mary O'Grady, Solicitor General
20 Steven A. LaMar, Senior Litigation Counsel
21 Carrie J. Brennan, Assistant Attorney General
22 Barbara A. Bailey, Assistant Attorney General
23 Attorneys for Defendants State of Arizona
24 and Arizona Secretary of State Janice Brewer

25 WILENCHIK AND BARTNESS, P.C.

26 s/ Carrie J. Brennan for Kathleen Rapp
27 Dennis I. Wilenchik
28 Kathleen Rapp
Attorneys for the Twelve County Recorders and
Twelve County Elections Directors

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2 I hereby certify that on this 9th day of July, 2008, I electronically transmitted the
3 attached document to the Clerk's Office using the ECF System for filing, and
4 transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following ECF registrants:
5

6 David J. Bodney
7 Karen J. Hartman-Tellez
8 Steptoe & Johnson LLP
9 201 East Washington St., Ste. 1600
10 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2382
11 dbodney@steptoe.com
12 khartman@steptoe.com

13 David B. Rosenbaum
14 Thomas L. Hudson
15 Sara S. Greene
16 Osborn Maledon, P.A.
17 2929 N. Central, 21st Floor
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793
19 drosenbaum@omlaw.com
20 thudson@omlaw.com
21 sgreene@omlaw.com

22 Jon Greenbaum
23 Benjamin Blustein
24 Lawyers' Committee For
25 Civil Rights Under Law
26 1401 New York Avenue, Ste. 400
27 Washington, D.C. 20005
28 jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org

29 Neil Bradley
30 ACLU Southern Regional Office
31 2600 Marquis One Tower
32 245 Peachtree Center Avenue
33 Atlanta, Georgia 30303
34 nbradley@aclu.org

1 Elliot M. Mincberg
2 People for the American
3 Way Foundation
4 2600 M Street, NW, Ste. 400
5 Washington, DC 20036
6 eminberg@pfaw.org

7 Daniel B. Kohrman
8 AARP Foundation Litigation
9 601 E Street, N.W., Ste. A4-240
10 Washington, DC 20049
11 dkohrman@aarp.org

12 Joe P. Sparks
13 Susan B. Montgomery
14 Sparks, Tehan & Ryley PC
15 The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.
16 7503 First Street
17 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
18 joe-sparks@qwest.net

19 David J. Becker
20 People for the American Way Foundation
21 2000 M Street, NW, Suite 400
22 Washington, D.C. 20036
23 dbecker@pfaw.org

24 Daniel R. Ortega, Jr.
25 Roush McCracken Guerrero
26 Miller & Ortega
27 650 N. 3rd Avenue
28 Phoenix, Arizona 85003
danny@rmgmoinjurylaw.com

Nina Perales
Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
110 Broadway, Ste. 300
San Antonio, Texas 78205
nperales@maldef.org

1 M. Colleen Connor
2 MCAO Division of County Counsel
3 222 N. Central Avenue, Ste. 1100
4 Phoenix, Arizona 85003
connorc@mcao.maricopa.gov

5 Dennis I. Wilenchik
6 Kathleen Rapp
7 Wilenchik and Bartness, P.C.
8 2810 N. Third Street
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
diw@wb-law.com
kathleenr@wb-law.com

10 Judith M. Dworkin
11 Marvin S. Cohen
12 Patricia Ferguson-Bohnee
13 SACKS TIERNEY P.A.
14 4250 N. Drinkwater Blvd. 4th
15 Scottsdale, Arizona 85251-3693
Judith.Dworkin@sackstierney.com

16 Criss E. Candelaria
17 Bradley Carlyon
18 Apache County Attorneys Office
19 PO Box 637
20 St. Johns, Arizona 86025
bcarlyon@apachelaw.net

21 Melvin R. Bowers, Jr.
22 Lance B. Payette
23 Navajo County Attorneys Office
24 PO Box 668
25 Holbrook, Arizona 86025
lance.payette@co.navajo.az.us

26 Brenna L. Clani
27 Navajo County Department of Justice
28 PO Box 2010
Window Rock, Arizona 86515
brennalclani@navajo.org

1 Jean E. Wilcox
2 Coconino County Attorney's Office
3 110 East Cherry Ave.
4 Flagstaff, Arizona 86001
5 jwilcox@coconino.az.gov

6 **COPY** served the 9th day of July, 2008, via U.S. mail, with Notice of Electronic
7 Filing, on:

8 The Honorable Roslyn O. Silver
9 United States District Court
10 Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 624
11 401 West Washington Street, SPC 59
12 Phoenix, AZ 85003-2158

13 /s Elizabeth Stark

14
15 242714
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28