

1 Geoffrey S. Kercksmar (#20528)
 2 Gregory B. Collins (#023158)
 3 KERCSMAR & FELTUS PLLC
 4 6263 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 320
 5 Scottsdale, AZ 85250
 6 Tel: (480) 421-1001
 7 gsk@kflawaz.com
 8 gbc@kflawaz.com

9 Paul J. Orfanedes
 10 (Motion for admission *pro hac vice* to be filed)
 11 James F. Peterson
 12 (Motion for admission *pro hac vice* to be filed)
 13 Michael Bekesha
 14 (Motion for admission *pro hac vice* to be filed)
 15 JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.
 16 425 Third Street, S.W., Suite 800
 17 Washington, DC 20024
 18 Tel: (202) 646-5172

19 *Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor/Defendant Russell Pearce*

20 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 21 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

22 The United States of America, 23 24 Plaintiff, 25 v. 26 The State of Arizona; and Janice K. 27 Brewer, Governor of the State of Arizona, 28 in her Official Capacity, 29 30 Defendants.) Case No.: 2:10-cv-01413-SRB)))) STATE SENATOR RUSSELL) PEARCE’S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF) MOTION FOR INTERVENTION AS) DEFENDANT AND REQUEST FOR) EXPEDITED RULING)))
---	--

31 State Senator Russell Pearce, by counsel, respectfully submits this Reply in
 32 support of his Motion for Intervention as Defendant and Request for Expedited Ruling
 33 (the “Motion”). As grounds therefor, Senator Pearce states as follows:

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. Senator Pearce is entitled to intervene as a matter of right.**

3 The Court of Appeals for this Circuit has recognized that a motion for intervention
4 is to be “broadly construed in favor of applicants for intervention.” *United States ex rel.*
5 *McGough v. Covington Technologies Co.*, 967 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1992); *United*
6 *States v. Stringfellow*, 783 F.2d 821, 826 (9th Cir. 1986) (“In applying this test we are
7 guided primarily by practical considerations.”). Since Senator Pearce is the sole
8 legislative author and chief sponsor of Senate Bill 1070, as amended by House Bill 2162
9 (“SB 1070”), it makes practical sense and is well within this Court’s discretion for
10 Senator Pearce to be permitted to intervene. As the author and chief sponsor of SB 1070,
11 Senator Pearce has a unique interest in and perspective on SB 1070, and he is entitled to
12 assist in its defense. Plaintiff moreover does not contest Senator Pearce’s assertion that
13 Plaintiff itself recognized his unique interest when it singled out Senator Pearce in its
14 motion. *See* “Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Memorandum of Law in
15 Support Thereof” at 38, fn. 34.

16 **A. Senator Pearce has demonstrated that courts allow legislators to**
17 **intervene in defense of a statute.**

18 As Senator Pearce demonstrated in his motion, it is not unusual for a court to
19 allow legislators to intervene in defense of a statute. *See, e.g., Yniguez v. State of*
20 *Arizona*, 939 F.2d 727, 732 (9th Cir. 1991) (“[T]he Supreme Court held that state
21 legislators who intervened in their official capacities to defend a lawsuit challenging the
22 constitutionality of a statute” only lacked standing after they left office). While Plaintiff
23
24
25

1 attempts to distinguish the numerous cases cited by Senator Pearce in which state
2 legislators were granted leave to intervene by focusing on the varying factual
3 circumstances of those cases, Plaintiff's reliance on simply one case is particularly inapt.
4 *See* Plaintiff's Response at 3 (citing *Center for Biological Diversity v. Brennan*, 571 F.
5 Supp. 2d 1105 (N.D. Cal. 2007). In that case, which Plaintiff claims occurred in a "very
6 similar context" to that of the instant Motion, U.S. Senator John Kerry and Congressman
7 Jay Inslee attempted to intervene as plaintiffs and sought a declaration that government
8 officials were "in violation of the Global Change Research Act" and to compel the
9 officials to issue a report. *Id.* at 1113. They did not move to intervene to defend the
10 constitutionality of a statute. In sharp contrast, Senator Pearce has cited cases in which
11 legislators successfully intervened as defendants to *defend* the constitutionality of a
12 statute. Senator Pearce in this case has a unique and undisputed interest as the sole
13 legislative author and chief sponsor of SB 1070, and it is well within this Court's
14 discretion to grant Senator Pearce's motion on that basis.

15
16
17
18 **B. Senator Pearce has shown that representation of his interests may be inadequate.**

19 To establish intervention as a matter of right, a proposed intervenor must show
20 that his interest is "inadequately represented" by the parties to the action. Plaintiff
21 mischaracterizes this burden. As the Ninth Circuit has held, the requirement of
22 "inadequacy of representation is satisfied if the applicant shows that representation of its
23 interests 'may be' inadequate and that the burden of making this showing is minimal."
24 *Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt*, 713 F.2d 525, 528 (9th Cir. 1983). Senator Pearce
25

1 demonstrated that defendants *may not* adequately represent his interests, by noting that,
2 among other things, the Governor’s likely legal defense of SB 1070 does not address
3 certain aspects of the law that Senator Pearce views as critical, such as severability.
4

5 Plaintiff asserts that Senator Pearce must show that the defendants “cannot, or will
6 not, adequately defend the constitutionality of S.B. 1070 due to their adversity of interest,
7 collusion, or nonfeasance.” Response at 6. This is simply incorrect. The Ninth Circuit
8 addressed precisely this point and explained:

9 We also agree that thus far in this litigation, the government,
10 through the United States Attorney, has continued
11 professionally and diligently to defend the actions of
12 Secretary Andrus; there is no indication in this record of
13 collusion or of any other conduct detrimental to the
14 applicant's interest. *Nevertheless, such a showing is not
15 required.*

16 *Sagebrush Rebellion*, 713 F.2d at 528 (emphasis added). Senator Pearce has met his
17 burden under this Circuit’s precedent.

18 **II. Permissive intervention should be granted.**

19 Plaintiff argues that Senator Pearce does not qualify for permissive intervention
20 because he cannot show that he has Article III standing. Response at 7. But no such
21 requirement exists in this Circuit.

22 A party does not need independent standing to intervene in existing litigation
23 under Rule 24(b), as long as another party on its side meets the requirements of Article
24 III standing. “[T]he requirement of a legally protectable interest applies only to
25 intervention as of right under Rule 24(a), not permissive intervention under Rule 24(b).”

Employee Staffing Services, Inc., v. Aubry, 20 F. 3d 1038, 1042 (9th Cir. 1994); *see also*

1 *Yniguez v. Arizona*, 939 F. 2d 727, 731 (9th Cir. 1991) (noting that a potential intervenor
2 requires standing only when no other party with standing remains in the litigation).

3 Permissive intervention without Article III standing also is common in other circuits.

4 *See, e.g., Dillard v. Baldwin County Comm'rs*, 225 F.3d 1271, 1277-78 (11th Cir. 2000)

5 (“[A] party seeking to intervene into an already existing justiciable controversy need not
6 satisfy the requirements of standing as long as the parties have established standing
7 before the court.”); *Chiles v. Thornburgh*, 865 F.2d 1197, 1213 (11th Cir. 1989) (“[A]

8 party seeking to intervene need not demonstrate that he has standing in addition to
9 meeting the requirements of Rule 24 as long as there exists a justiciable case and
10 controversy between the parties already in the lawsuit”); *San Juan County v. U.S.*, 503

11 F.3d 1163, 1171-72 (10th Cir. 2007) (reasoning that the Supreme Court has on many
12 occasions found an intervenor’s lack of standing unimportant as long as another party in
13 the case did have standing, and thus “parties seeking to intervene under Rule 24(a) or (b)
14 need not establish Article III standing ‘so long as another party with constitutional
15 standing on the same side as the intervenor remains in the case.’” (*citing San Juan*

16 *County v. U.S.*, 420 F.3d 1197, 1205 (10th Cir. 2005)); *Shaw v. Hunt*, 154 F.3d 161, 165
17 (4th Cir. 1997) (“[A] party who lacks standing can nonetheless take part in a case as a
18 permissive intervenor.”); *U.S. Postal Service v. Brennan*, 579 F.2d 188, 190 (2nd Cir.
19 1978) (“The existence of a case or controversy having been established as between the

20 [parties], there was no need to impose the standing requirement upon the proposed
21 intervenor.”). Hence, contrary to Plaintiff’s claim, Senator Pearce satisfies the threshold
22 requirement for permissive intervention.

23
24
25

1 Plaintiff also does not contest that Senator Pearce has a defense that shares with
2 the main action a common question of law or fact. As asserted in his motion, Senator
3 Pearce, from his unique position as author and chief sponsor of SB 1070, has a defense to
4 the main action that shares both common questions of law and fact, albeit with a different
5 perspective. The Court will need to examine the same law and the same facts to
6 adjudicate these claims.
7

8 Finally, Plaintiff asserts that Senator Pearce should not be granted intervention
9 because “there are already a number of related actions and numerous additional filings by
10 non-parties.” Response at 8. Plaintiff does not, however, cite any case law or otherwise
11 explain why this fact should deprive Senator Pearce of the opportunity to defend SB
12 1070. Notably, Plaintiff does not contest Senator Pearce’s assertions that his intervention
13 will neither prejudice nor delay this case in any way. Thus, at a minimum, Senator
14 Pearce is entitled to permissive intervention.
15

16 **VII. Conclusion**

17 For the foregoing reasons, Senator Pearce respectfully requests that this Court
18 grant leave to Senator Pearce to intervene as a Defendant in this action.
19

20 Dated: July 20, 2010

Respectfully Submitted,

21 KERCSMAR & FELTUS PLLC

22 By: /s/ Geoffrey S. Kerksmar
23 Geoffrey S. Kerksmar (#20528)
24 Gregory B. Collins (#023158)
25 6263 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 320
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
Tel: (480) 421-1001

1 Paul J. Orfanedes
2 (Motion for admission *pro hac vice* to be filed)
3 James F. Peterson
4 (Motion for admission *pro hac vice* to be filed)
5 Michael Bekesha
6 (Motion for admission *pro hac vice* to be filed)
7 JUDICIAL WATCH, INC.
8 425 Third Street, S.W., Suite 800
9 Washington, DC 20024
10 Tel: (202) 646-5172

*Attorneys for Proposed Intervenor/Defendant
Russell Pearce*

11 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

12 I hereby certify that on July 20, 2010, I electronically transmitted the foregoing to
13 the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of

14 Electronic Filing to the following:

15 Plaintiff United States of America
16 Represented by Joshua Wilkenfeld
17 joshua.i.wilkenfeld@usdoj.gov

18 Edwin S. Kneedler
19 Edwin.S.Kneedler@usdoj.gov

20 Varu Chilakamarri
21 varudhini.chilakamarri@usdoj.gov

22 Defendant State of Arizona and Janice K.
23 Brewer, Governor of the State of Arizona
24 Represented by John J. Bouma
25 jbouma@swlaw.com

Joseph G. Adams
jgadams@swlaw.com

Joseph Andrew Kanefield
jkanefield@az.gov

Robert Arthur Henry

1 bhenry@swlaw.com

2 Amicus Center on the
3 Administration of Criminal Law
4 Represented by Anne Milgram
5 anne.milgram@nyu.edu

6 Anthony S. Barkow
7 anthony.barkow@nyu.edu

8 Ellen London
9 elondon@fklaw.com

10 Jessica Alexandra Murzyn
11 jmurzyn@fklaw.com

12 Ricardo Solano, Jr.
13 rsolano@kflaw.com

14 Timothy J. Casey
15 SCHMITT, SCHNECK, SMYTH & HERROD, P.C.
16 Special Assistant Attorney General for Michigan
17 For *Amici Curiae* Michigan, Florida, Alabama,
18 Nebraska, Northern Mariana Islands, Pennsylvania,
19 South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas and Virginia
20 timcasey@azbarristers.com

21 Carolyn B. Lamm (*pro hac vice*)
22 Stephen N. Zack (*pro hac vice*)
23 Sara Elizabeth Dill (*pro hac vice*)
24 Andrew Silverman (*pro hac vice*)
25 American Bar Association
clamm@whitecase.com
szack@bsfllp.com
sdill@pkjlaw.com

Joseph M. Livermore
University of Arizona
James E. Rogers
College of Law
silverman@law.arizona.edu

Barnaby W. Zall

1 American Unity Legal Defense Fund, Inc.
2 bzall@aol.com

3 Stephen G. Montoya
4 stephen@montoyalawgroup.com
5 april@montoyalawgroup.com

6 Donald M. Peters
7 Kristin Mackin
8 Jeffrey T. Murray
9 Attorneys for Arizona Municipal
10 Risk Retention Pool
11 dpeters@lasotapeters.com
12 kmackin@lasotapeters.com
13 jtmurray@lawms.com

14 D. Q. Mariette Do-Nguyen
15 Kingdom of Heaven
16 D.Q_Mariette@wdcic.org

17 In addition a COURTESY COPY was mailed this day to:
18 HONORABLE SUSAN R. BOLTON
19 United States District Court
20 Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 522
21 401 West Washington Street
22 SPC 50
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85003-2153

24 Notice will be sent by other means to those listed below if they are affected by this filing:

25 B. Eric Restuccia
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 30212
Lansing, MI 48909

James F. Peterson
Judicial Watch Inc.
425 3rd St SW
Ste. 800
Washington, DC 20024

1 Mark Sands
2 Office of the Attorney General
3 P.O. Box 30212
4 Lansing, MI 48909

4 Paul J. Orfanedes
5 Judicial Watch Inc.
6 425 3rd St SW
7 Ste. 800
8 Washington, DC 20024

8 Ray Elbert Parker
9 P.O. Box 320636
10 Alexandria, VA 22320

11 By s/ Geoffrey S. Kerksmar

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25