

1 **WO**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

8  
9 Miriam Mendiola-Martinez,  
10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 Joseph M. Arpaio, Maricopa County  
13 Sheriff, et al.,  
14 Defendants.

No. CV11-2512 PHX DGC

**ORDER**

15 Defendant Maricopa County Board of Supervisors (“Board”) has filed a motion to  
16 dismiss. Doc. 22. Plaintiff has filed a response, and the Board has filed a reply.  
17 Docs. 23, 24. No party has requested oral argument. For the reasons that follow, the  
18 Court will grant the motion.

19 **I. Non-Jural Entity.**

20 The Board claims that it is a non-jural entity not subject to suit. In addressing this  
21 argument, neither the Board nor Plaintiff mentions the numerous cases from this Court  
22 holding that the Board is a jural entity subject to suit. *See, e.g., Barrett v. Maricopa*  
23 *County Sheriff's Office*, No. CV 08-2095, 2010 WL 46786 (D. Ariz. Jan. 4, 2010);  
24 *Fabricius v. Maricopa County*, No. CV 06-1105, 2008 WL 2001264 (D. Ariz. May 7,  
25 2008); *Morgal v. Arpaio*, No. CV07-670, 2007 WL 4200760 (D. Ariz. Nov. 27, 2007);  
26 *Thomas v. Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*, No. CV 07-0258, 2007 WL 2995634  
27 (D. Ariz. Oct. 12, 2007). For reasons stated in these cases, the Court rejects the Board’s  
28 argument that it is a non-jural entity.

