

1 ANDREW P. THOMAS  
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY  
2 By: Colleen Connor (# 015679)  
Deputy County Attorney  
3 MCAO Firm No. 00032000

CIVIL DIVISION  
4 222 North Central Avenue, Suite 1100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2206  
5 Telephone (602) 506-0128  
[connorc@mcao.maricopa.gov](mailto:connorc@mcao.maricopa.gov)

6 Dennis I. Wilenchik (# 05350)  
7 Kathleen Rapp (# 023982)  
WILENCHIK AND BARTNESS, P.C.  
8 The Wilenchik & Bartness Building  
2810 North Third Street  
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
Telephone (602) 606-2810  
10 [DIW@wb-law.com](mailto:DIW@wb-law.com); [KatheenR@wb-law.com](mailto:KatheenR@wb-law.com)  
Attorneys for Thirteen County Defendants

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

13 **MARIA M. GONZALEZ; JESUS M.  
GONZALES; BERNIE ABEYTIA;  
14 LUCIANO VALENCIA; DEBBIE  
LOPEZ, SOUTHWEST VOTER  
15 REGISTRATION EDUCATION  
PROJECT; VALLE DEL SOL;  
16 FRIENDLY HOUSE; CHICANOS POR  
LA CAUSA, INC.; and ARIZONA  
17 HISPANIC FORUM,**

18 **Plaintiffs,**

19 **v.**

20 **STATE OF ARIZONA, JAN BREWER,  
in her official capacity as the Secretary of  
21 State of the State of Arizona, et al.,**

22 **Defendants.**

**No. CV06-1268-PHX ROS (Lead)  
No. CV06-1362-PCT-JAT  
No. CV06-1575-PHX-EHC**

**STATE AND THIRTEEN  
COUNTY DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT  
OF INDEPENDENT EXPERT  
AND APPROVAL OF FINAL  
SCRIPT**

**(Expedited Ruling Requested)**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

COME NOW Defendants State of Arizona, Secretary of State Jan Brewer, Maricopa County Recorder Helen Purcell and Maricopa County Elections Director Karen Osborne; Apache County Recorder LeNora Johnson and Apache County Elections Director Penny L. Pew; Cochise County Recorder Christine Rhodes and Cochise County Elections Director Thomas Schelling; Gila County Recorder Linda Haught Ortega and Gila County Elections Director Dixie Mundy; Graham County Recorder Wendy John and Graham County Elections Director Judy Dickerson; Greenlee County Recorder Berta Manuz and Greenlee County Elections Director Yvonne Pearson; La Paz County Recorder Shelly Baker and La Paz County Elections Director Donna Hale; Mohave County Recorder Joan McCall and Mohave County Elections Director Allen Tempert; Pima County Recorder F. Ann Rodriguez and Pima County Elections Director Brad R. Nelson; Pinal County Recorder Laura Dean-Lytle and Pinal County Elections Director Gilberto Hoyos; Santa Cruz County Recorder Suzie Sainz and Santa Cruz County Elections Director Melinda Meek; Yavapai County Recorder Ana Wayman-Trujillo and Yavapai County Elections Director Lynn A. Constabile; and Yuma County Recorder Susan Hightower Marler and Yuma County Elections Director Patti Madrill (collectively “Defendants”), by and through undersigned counsel and submit this MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT EXPERT AND APPROVAL OF FINAL SCRIPT. This Motion is supported by the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities, exhibits, and the parties’ pleadings filed herein, together with any exhibits thereto, all of which are incorporated herein by this reference.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED** this 11th day of September, 2007.

ANDREW P. THOMAS  
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

BY: /s/ Dennis I. Wilenchik

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS, P.C.  
Dennis I. Wilenchik, Esq.  
Kathleen E. Rapp, Esq.  
The Wilenchik & Bartness Building  
2810 North Third Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

COLLEEN CONNOR  
Deputy County Attorney  
222 North Central Avenue, Suite 1100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2206  
Attorneys for County Defendants

/s/ Barbara A. Bailey  
Mary O'Grady  
Solicitor General  
Carrie J. Brennan  
Barbara A. Bailey  
Assistant Attorneys General  
1275 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926  
Attorneys for the State Defendants

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. Introduction**

3 Despite earnest and diligent efforts on the part of both plaintiff and defense  
4 counsel, the parties have been unable to agree on important details regarding the  
5 proposed contact of thousands of Arizona voters or prospective voters. As explained  
6 more fully below, the State and County Defendants respectfully request that the Court  
7 order the appointment of an independent and neutral expert pursuant to Fed. R. Evid.  
8 706 based upon the parties' joint submission of possible nominations.<sup>1</sup> Alternatively,  
9 Defendants request that the Court order that any contact of prospective interviewees, by  
10 either Plaintiffs' counsel or their retained expert(s), be governed by and limited to the  
11 applicable scripts attached to this motion as Exhibits A & B. At a minimum, any script  
12 that is used by Plaintiffs' counsel or their expert(s) should be presented to the Court,  
13 with an opportunity for objection by the Defendants.

14 **II. Need for Unbiased Collection of Data**

15 The State and Counties have a duty to protect individual's confidential, personal  
16 information. A.R.S. § 41-4172; A.R.S. § 16-168; *Phoenix Newspapers, Inc., v. Purcell*,  
17 187 Ariz. 74, 79, 927 P.2d 340, 345 (App. 1996) *cert. denied*, 188 Ariz. 257, 934 P.2d  
18 1349 (1997)(registration information used for purposes, unrelated to campaigns and  
19 elections, could lead to annoying situations for registered voters that might discourage  
20 some citizens from registering to vote while public policy strongly advocates greater  
21 voter registration and participation.) This is especially important in cases such as this  
22 one when the personal information was revealed in an attempt to exercise the  
fundamental right to vote. Whether or not an individual is ultimately qualified to vote  
under federal and state law, the government has a responsibility to protect that person  
from fraud and harassment.

---

1 The County Defendants do not include Coconino and Navajo County defendants.

1           The Court recognized these concerns during the August 30, 2007 discovery  
2 dispute hearing and addressed them with two separate, yet equally important orders.  
3 The first was specifically geared toward the possibility that volunteers with no training  
4 could have access to the personal, identifying information found on the voter registration  
5 forms and on the conditional provisional ballot receipts and ordered that **anyone** who  
6 had access to that information, would file a signed statement indicating, under penalty  
7 from the Court, that they understood the stipulation for confidentiality and would abide  
8 by it. The second was geared at both the possibility that untrained volunteers might be  
9 conducting this research, but also at the prevention of harassment or solicitation, and  
10 required the parties to stipulate to a script to be used when contacting these individuals.  
11 In fact, the Court indicated that were the information obtained through these telephone  
12 calls to be used by an expert or an agent of Plaintiffs, it would have to be done with “a  
13 court order and it will be kept under seal.” August 30, 2007 transcript 29:23-24.

14           Defendants agree that Plaintiffs’ experts should be allowed to use the data  
15 collected in whatever means they see fit to address Plaintiffs’ burden of proof within the  
16 confines of the Court’s order regarding the confidentiality of voter information.  
17 However, that data should be **collected** in a neutral fashion, with the least possible  
18 intrusion on the interviewees. Defendants’ proposal that the Court appoint a neutral  
19 expert to conduct and oversee the proposed contact would ensure that information is  
20 obtained fairly and that questions are asked even-handedly. Plaintiffs’ current proposal  
21 seeks free reign for Plaintiffs and their paid experts to modify the script called for by the  
22 Court and to contact thousands of Arizona citizens without any supervision as to what  
they would be asking or telling such citizens.

          Plaintiffs’ contend that their retained expert should be permitted to conduct  
unrestrained research because the State and Counties are free to hire their own expert  
and conduct research as well. This makes sense in other types of litigation, where any

1 disputes between experts or potential biases merely become a question of credibility for  
2 the jury to decide. However, Plaintiffs' solution overlooks the enormous intrusion into  
3 the private lives of the individuals being contacted. The normal route of each party  
4 conducting their own research means that many individuals could be contacted at least  
5 twice regarding their voting history and this litigation. Furthermore, considering the  
6 sheer number of parties in this case, the possibility exists that these individuals could be  
7 contacted up to six times or more. Obviously, this is of great concern and should not be  
8 permitted.

8 In attempting to reach the most reasonable solution to the issues regarding contact  
9 with voters and potential voters, Defendants proposed that a neutral research company,  
10 the cost of which would be shared by the parties, be the sole entity to place the telephone  
11 calls to the interviewees. That would ensure that the agreed-upon script is followed  
12 without any bias, harassment or pressure on the individuals being contacted. The neutral  
13 firm could provide the raw data to both sides to be used and interpreted however the  
14 parties and their experts saw fit. This solution protects the individuals being contacted  
15 while still allowing the parties and their experts freedom to independently interpret the  
16 data without intrusion of the other parties. As such, the Defendants request that the  
17 Court order the parties to contract with a neutral research firm, that will use a finalized  
18 script to be approved by the Court, to conduct the calling and distribute the raw data to  
19 all parties for their experts to use as necessary

### 18 **III. Need for Uniform Script**

19 Alternatively, the Court should require that any contact by Plaintiffs' counsel or  
20 their experts be strictly confined to the scripts attached as Exhibits A and B. The Court  
21 indicated at the August 30, 2007 hearing that the parties should attempt to work together  
22 and agree on such a script. Although counsel for all parties to this dispute have worked  
substantially together since last week, they have been unable to agree on a script.

1 Accordingly, Defendants propose those scripts at Exhibits A and B, which were drafted  
2 in substantial collaboration with Plaintiffs' counsel.

3 Placing unsolicited calls to Arizonans regarding on-going litigation may be  
4 considered, by many, an unacceptable intrusion into their privacy. Defendants submit  
5 that the proposed scripts reasonably address this concern while simultaneously affording  
6 Plaintiffs the ability to obtain the information they need to put on their case. There is the  
7 very real possibility, under any scenario, that Defendants may be faced with an  
8 onslaught of angry Arizonans whose private information has been shared and who have  
9 been contacted about their voting history – a topic that is considered taboo in polite  
10 society. However, if Plaintiffs' experts are permitted to make significant changes to the  
11 script without consultation with Defendants or approval from the Court, Defendants are  
12 left without any answer for complainants. Moreover, Defendants are either effectively  
13 left in the dark as to what communication was had, with whom, or are faced with the  
14 possibility of contacting the same individuals regarding the same issues. At least with a  
15 stipulated final script, and even more so with a neutral firm conducting the calls,  
16 Defendants would have all the information necessary to address the potential concerns of  
17 the individuals who will be contacted. At a minimum, any proposed communication  
18 made by Plaintiffs' counsel or experts should be submitted to the Court for approval,  
19 with an opportunity for objection by Defendants.

#### 17 **IV. Conclusion**

18 Defendants respectfully request that the Court order the parties to contract with a  
19 neutral research firm, that will use a finalized script to be approved by the Court, to  
20 conduct the calling and distribute the raw data to all parties for their experts to use as  
21 necessary. In the alternative, Defendants request that the Court approve the scripts  
22 submitted by Defendants as Exhibits A and B. At a minimum, the Court should order  
the parties to consult on a finalized script, after input from their individual experts, and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

have that script approved by and filed with the Court prior to any contact is made with the interviewees.

**RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED** this 11th day of September, 2007.

ANDREW P. THOMAS  
MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

BY:  /s/ Dennis I. Wilenchik

WILENCHIK & BARTNESS, P.C.  
Dennis I. Wilenchik, Esq.  
Kathleen E. Rapp, Esq.  
The Wilenchik & Bartness Building  
2810 North Third Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

COLLEEN CONNOR  
Deputy County Attorney  
222 North Central Avenue, Suite 1100  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2206  
Attorneys for County Defendants

/s/ Barbara A. Bailey  
Mary O'Grady  
Solicitor General  
Carrie J. Brennan  
Barbara A. Bailey  
Assistant Attorneys General  
1275 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926  
Attorneys for the State Defendants

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2 I hereby certify that on the 11th day of September, 2007, I caused the foregoing  
3 document to be electronically transmitted to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF  
4 System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following

5 CM/ECF Registrants:

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

David B. Rosenbaum  
Thomas L. Hudson  
Sara S. Greene  
Osborn Maledon, P.A.  
2929 N. Central Ave., 21<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793  
[drosenbaum@omlaw.com](mailto:drosenbaum@omlaw.com)  
[thudson@omlaw.com](mailto:thudson@omlaw.com)  
[sgreene@omlaw.com](mailto:sgreene@omlaw.com)

11 Jon Greenbaum  
12 Benjamin Blustein  
13 Lawyers' Committee For  
14 Civil Rights Under Law  
15 1401 New York Avenue, Ste. 400  
16 Washington, D.C. 20005  
17 [jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org](mailto:jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org)

Neil Bradley  
ACLU Southern Regional Office  
2600 Marquis One Tower  
245 Peachtree Center Avenue  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
[nbradley@aclu.org](mailto:nbradley@aclu.org)

15 Elliot M. Minberg  
16 People for the American  
17 Way Foundation  
18 2600 M Street, NW, Ste. 400  
19 Washington, DC 20036  
20 [eminberg@pfaw.org](mailto:eminberg@pfaw.org)

Luis Roberto Vera, Jr.  
League of United Latin  
American Citizens  
111 Soledad, Ste. 1325  
San Antonio, Texas 78205-2260  
[Irvlaw@sbcglobal.net](mailto:Irvlaw@sbcglobal.net)

19 Daniel B. Kohrman  
20 AARP Foundation Litigation  
21 601 E Street, N.W., Ste. A4-240  
22 Washington, DC 20049  
[dkohrman@aarp.org](mailto:dkohrman@aarp.org)

Joe P. Sparks  
Susan B. Montgomery  
Sparks, Tehan & Ryley PC  
The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc  
7503 First Street  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251  
[joe-sparks@qwest.net](mailto:joe-sparks@qwest.net)

1 David J. Becker  
People for the American Way Foundation  
2 2000 M Street, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
3 [dbecker@pfaw.org](mailto:dbecker@pfaw.org)

4  
5 Nina Perales  
Mexican American Legal Defense  
and Education Fund  
6 110 Broadway, Ste. 300  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
7 [nperales@maldef.org](mailto:nperales@maldef.org)

8  
9 Judith M. Dworkin  
Marvin S. Cohen  
10 Patricia Ferguson-Bohnee  
SACKS TIERNEY P.A.  
11 4250 N. Drinkwater Blvd. 4<sup>th</sup>  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251-3693  
12 [Judith.Dworkin@sackstierney.com](mailto:Judith.Dworkin@sackstierney.com)

13 Melvin R. Bowers, Jr.  
Lance B. Payette  
14 Navajo County Attorneys Office  
PO Box 668  
15 Holbrook, Arizona 86025  
[lance.payette@co.navajo.az.us](mailto:lance.payette@co.navajo.az.us)

16  
17 Jean E. Wilcox  
Coconino County Attorney's Office  
110 East Cherry Avenue  
18 Flagstaff, Arizona 86001  
[jwilcox@coconino.az.gov](mailto:jwilcox@coconino.az.gov)

Daniel R. Ortega, Jr.  
Roush McCracken Guerrero  
Miller & Ortega  
650 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
[danny@rmgmoinjurylaw.com](mailto:danny@rmgmoinjurylaw.com)

Mary O'Grady  
Solicitor General  
Carrie J. Brennan  
Barbara A. Bailey  
Assistant Attorneys General  
1275 West Washington Street  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926  
[Mary.OGrady@azag.gov](mailto:Mary.OGrady@azag.gov)

Criss E. Candelaria  
Bradley Carlyon  
Apache County Attorneys Office  
PO Box 637  
St. Johns, Arizona 86025  
[bcarlyon@apachelaw.net](mailto:bcarlyon@apachelaw.net)

Brenna L. Clani  
Navajo County Department of Justice  
PO Box 2010  
Window Rock, Arizona 86515  
[brennalclani@navajo.org](mailto:brennalclani@navajo.org)

19  
20  
21  
22

1 COPY of the foregoing filed electronically  
this 11th day of September, 2007.

2  
3 COPY of the foregoing mailed with Notice of  
Electronic Filing this 11th day of September, 2007 to:

4 The Honorable Roslyn O. Silver  
United States District Court  
5 Sandra Day O'Connor U.S. Courthouse, Suite 624  
401 West Washington Street, SPC 59  
6 Phoenix, AZ 85003-2158

7

8           /s/ S. Bame          

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22