Raymond v. Thur Doc. 21

```
1
2
                     IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3
4
                    FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
5
    Robert RAYMOND,
                                            2:12-cv-02215-GEB-EFB and
6
                                            related cases:
                   Plaintiff,
                                            2:12-cv-02217-GEB-EFB
7
                                            2:12-cv-02219-GEB-EFB
              v.
                                            2:12-cv-01407-GEB-EFB
8
                                            2:12-cv-01408-GEB-EFB
    Barbara HOWARD, Sheldon D.
                                            2:12-cv-01412-GEB-EFB
9
                                            2:12-cv-02220-GEB-EFB
    Johnson, Jim McCauley, Kammi
    Foote, Lee Lundigran, Ken Baird,
                                            2:12-cv-02221-GEB-EFB
10
    Sheryl Thur, Austin Erdman,
                                            2:12-cv-02222-GEB-EFB
    Kathy Darling Allen, Beverly
                                            2:12-cv-02223-GEB-EFB
11
    Ross, Freddie Oakley, and
                                            2:12-cv-02225-GEB-EFB
    Kathleen Williams,
                                            2:12-cv-02259-GEB-EFB
12
                   Defendants.
                                            CERTIFICATION THAT THE
13
                                            CONSTITUTIONALITY OF STATUTES
                                            ARE CHALLENGED; AND ORDER
14
                                            CONTINUING HEARINGS AND CASE-
                                            MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE
15
              The undersigned United States District Judge certifies under
16
   28 U.S.C. § 2403(b) to the Attorney General of the State of California,
17
   THE HONORABLE KAMALA D. HARRIS, that Plaintiff challenges in each above
18
   action the constitutionality of California Election Code §§ 102, 104,
19
   and 9022. Plaintiff sues various county-clerk registrars, alleging that
20
   these statutes are unconstitutional under the First and Fourteenth
21
   Amendments to the United States Constitution "to the extent the statutes
22
   require those who circulate nominating petitions on behalf of political
23
   candidates to be qualified to vote in the [S]tate of California."
24
    (Compl. \P 2, ECF No. 2.)
25
              28 U.S.C. § 2403(b) prescribes:
26
              In any action . . . in a court of the United States to which
27
              a State or any agency, officer, or employee thereof is not a
              party, wherein the constitutionality of any statute of that
28
```

State affecting the public interest is drawn in question, the

court shall certify such fact to the attorney general of the State, and shall permit the State to intervene for presentation of evidence . . . and for argument on the question of constitutionality.

Further, to ensure that the Attorney General receives this certification, the Clerk of Court shall serve a copy of this certification on the Attorney General under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5.1(a)(2), which is applicable to such service by a party, as follows: "either by certified or registered mail or by sending it to an electronic address designated by the attorney general for this purpose."

Further, the hearing on each Defendant's motion for compulsory joinder scheduled to commence at 9:00 a.m. on December 3, 2012, is continued to February 25, 2013 commencing at 9:00 a.m. The hearing on Plaintiff's motions for judgments on the pleadings scheduled to commence at 9:00 a.m. on December 3, 2012, is continued to June 3, 2013, commencing at 9:00 a.m. Lastly, the Status Conference scheduled in each above action is continued to August 5, 2013, commencing at 9:00 a.m; a joint status report shall be filed fourteen days before this hearing.

Dated: November 20, 2012

GARLAND E. BURREIL, JR.

Senior United States District Judge