

1 MICHAEL G. RANKIN  
 2 City Attorney  
 3 Michael W.L. McCrory  
 4 Principal Assistant City Attorney  
 5 P.O. Box 27210  
 6 Tucson, AZ 85726-7210  
 7 Telephone: (520) 791-4221  
 8 State Bar 3899  
 9 PCC No. 37268  
 10 Attorneys for City of Tucson

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 8 DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

9 **MARTIN H. ESCOBAR,**  
 10 **Plaintiff,**

11 **vs.**

12 **JAN BREWER, Governor of the**  
 13 **State of Arizona, in her Official and**  
 14 **Individual Capacity; THE CITY OF**  
 15 **TUCSON, a municipal corporation,**  
 16 **and BARBARA LaWALL, County**  
 17 **Attorney, Pima County,**

18 **Defendants.**

17 **THE CITY OF TUCSON, a municipal**  
 18 **corporation,**

19 **Cross-plaintiff,**

20 **vs.**

21 **THE STATE OF ARIZONA, a body**  
 22 **politic; and JAN BREWER, in her**  
 23 **capacity as Governor of the State**  
 24 **of Arizona,**

25 **Cross-defendants.**

**No. CV 10-249 TUC DCB**

**JOINDER IN MOTION TO  
 CONSOLIDATE**

**No. CV 10-249 TUC DCB**

**No. CV 10-951 PHX ROS**

26 Defendant/Cross-plaintiff, City of Tucson (hereafter "City"), notifies the  
 27 Court that it has no objection to the Plaintiff's Request for Transfer and

1 Consolidation which seeks to have this case consolidated with the *Salgado*,  
2 *et. al. v. Brewer, et al.*, CIV 10-951 PHX ROS. Both cases address the same  
3 issues and have very similar pleadings. Both cases also include  
4 municipalities as defendants and thus raise the specific issues regarding the  
5 impact of SB 1070 on municipalities. The Plaintiffs in both cases are  
6 represented by the same attorneys and similar motions for preliminary  
7 injunctive relief have been filed in both cases. The City has also filed its  
8 motion for preliminary injunctive relief which both complements and  
9 supplements the briefs filed by the two Plaintiffs.  
10  
11

12 The City submits that such consolidation is appropriate regardless of  
13 the outcome of the two separate motions to transfer this case and the  
14 *Salgado* case to another Phoenix case, *Frisancho v. Brewer, et al.*, 10-cv-  
15 00926-SRB. Once the two similar cases of *Escobar* and *Salgado* are  
16 combined it will be simpler to determine whether further transfer is  
17 appropriate among the Phoenix cases.  
18

19 Since those motions have been filed seeking a hearing before SB 1070  
20 takes effect on July 29, 2010, the City further supports an expedited decision  
21 on the transfer and consolidation.  
22

23 . . .

24 . . .

25 . . .



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

Mary R. O'Grady  
Solicitor General  
Christopher A. Munns  
Assistant Attorney General  
1275 W. Washington  
Phoenix, AZ 85007-2997  
Counsel for Cross-defendant State of Arizona

/s/ Michelle Gensman