

1 Timothy A. La Sota, Ariz. Bar No. 020539

2 **TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC**

3 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305

4 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

5 (602) 515-2649

6 tim@timlasota.com

7 *Attorney for Plaintiffs/Contestants*

8 Alexander Kolodin (030826)

9 Veronica Lucero (030292)

10 Arno Naeckel (026158)

11 James C. Sabalos (*pro hac vice*)

12 **Davillier Law Group, LLC**

13 4105 North 20th Street, Suite 110

14 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

15 T: (602) 730-2985

16 F: (602) 801-2539

17 akolodin@davillierlawgroup.com

18 vlucero@davillierlawgroup.com

19 anaeckel@davillierlawgroup.com

20 jsabalos@davillierlawgroup.com

21 phxadmin@davillierlawgroup.com

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiff/Contestant Abraham Hamadeh*

Jennifer J. Wright (027145)

JENNIFER WRIGHT ESQ., PLC

4350 E. Indian School Road Ste #21-105

Phoenix, Arizona 85018

T: (602) 842-3061

jen@jenwesq.com

Sigal Chattah Esq. (*pro hac vice*)

CHATTAH LAW GROUP

5875 S. Rainbow Blvd #204

Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

Tel: (702) 360-6200

Fax: (702) 643-6292

Chattahlaw@gmail.com

16 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

17 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MOHAVE**

18 JEANNE KENTCH, an individual; TED BOYD,
19 an individual; ABRAHAM HAMADEH, an
20 individual; and REPUBLICAN NATIONAL
COMMITTEE, a federal political party committee

21 Plaintiffs/Contestants,

22 v.

23 KRIS MAYES,

24 Defendant/Contestee,

25 and

26 ADRIAN FONTES, *et al.*,

27 Defendants.

No. S8015CV202201468

**PLAINTIFFS' FIFTH NOTICE
OF SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITY**

(assigned to Hon. Lee F. Jantzen)

1 As referenced at the May 16, 2023 oral arguments on Plaintiffs’ Motion for a New
2 Trial, Plaintiffs hereby give notice of supplemental authority. Maricopa County Superior
3 Court Judge Peter Thompson issued the attached Under Advisement Ruling in *Lake v.*
4 *Hobbs* that specifically determined that where “the civil rules can apply without
5 contradiction to an election challenge, they do apply” in relation to contestant Lake’s Rule
6 60 Motion for Relief from Judgement. Case No. CV 2022-095403 (May 15, 2023) (“Lake
7 Ruling”) at 5. The Lake Ruling supports arguments advanced in Plaintiffs’ Reply in
8 Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for a New Trial that Arizona courts have long-since resolved
9 that motions are allowed, and the civil rules apply, in election contests. Reply in Support
10 of Plaintiffs’ Motion for a New Trial at 12:26-13:3 and 13:9-14 (“Plaintiffs’ Reply”).

11 The Under Advisement Ruling also addressed the court’s ability to grant relief
12 despite Governor Hobbs having been in office for five months, reasoning that “A.R.S. § 16-
13 676 imposes no time limit on when, assuming all other procedural requirements are met,
14 the Court may grant relief” before affirming the previously ordered trial date of May 17,
15 2023. Lake Ruling at 5. The Lake Ruling as noted that relief available was provided for in
16 statute where “if the court determines ‘that a person other than the contestee has the highest
17 number of legal votes, the court shall declare that person elected’ and further nullify the
18 certificate of election of the person whose office is contested.” *Id.* The court’s reasoning
19 aligns with the both the constitutional provisions and statutory procedures for election
20 contests as described in *Campbell v. Hunt* as referenced in Plaintiffs’ Reply at 17:20-18:7
21 and at oral arguments. 18 Ariz. 442, 447 (1917) (“[T]he person who received the largest
22 number of legal votes cast for the office of Governor is the lawful Governor of this state.
23 Such person is now and always will be such until the term prescribed by law expires or a
24 vacancy occurs. Under the Constitution and laws of this state, *the real right or title to the*
25 *office comes from the will of the voters as expressed at the election.* If the office was in fact
26 given by the voters to another, the mere canvass of the returns and declaration of the result
27 and *the issuance of a certificate of election -- any or all these things -- do not and cannot*
28 *invest one with the right which belongs to another.”*)(emphasis added).

1 Critically, the Lake Ruling is not distinguishable from the case before this court and
2 provides guidance to this court regarding its authority to reach the merits of the Plaintiffs’
3 Rule 59 Motion. To the extent that Contestees have argued that the subsequently added
4 recount provisions foreclose further proceedings, that would be an absurd result. It does
5 not reckon that the constitutional provisions demanding only the “person having the highest
6 number of the votes cast for the office voted for shall be elected” are statutorily abrogated
7 when elections are so close that a recount is triggered, but election contests can maintain
8 and new trials ensue where there is a *much* greater margin.¹ Ariz. Const. art. V, § 1(B).

9 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 18th day of May, 2023.

10 By: /s/ Jennifer J. Wright

11 Jennifer J. Wright (027145)
12 **JENNIFER WRIGHT ESQ., PLC**
13 4350 E. Indian School Road Ste #21-105
14 Phoenix, AZ 85018

15 /s/ Alexander Kolodin (with permission)

16 Alexander Kolodin (030826)
17 Veronica Lucero (030292)
18 Arno Naeckel (026158)
19 James C. Sabalos (*pro hac vice*)
20 **Davillier Law Group, LLC**
21 4105 North 20th Street, Suite 110
22 Phoenix, AZ 85016

23 /s/ Sigal Chattah (with permission)

24 Sigal Chattah Esq. (*pro hac vice*)
25 **CHATTAH LAW GROUP**
26 5875 S. Rainbow Blvd #204
27 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118

28 *Attorneys for Plaintiff/Contestant Abraham Hamadeh*

/s/ Timothy La Sota (with permission)

Timothy A La Sota, SBN # 020539
TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC
2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305
Phoenix, Arizona 85016

¹ In *Lake v. Hobbs*, contestant Kari Lake trails contestee Katie Hobbs by 17,117 votes whereas Mr. Hamadeh trails contestee Kris Mayes by just 280 votes.

1
2
3 ORIGINAL efiled and served via electronic means
this 18th day of May, 2023, upon:

4 Honorable Lee F. Jantzen
5 Mohave County Superior Court c/o
6 Danielle Lecher
division4@mohavecourts.com

7
8 Craig Alan Morgan (AZ Bar No. 023373)
9 Shayna Stuart (AZ Bar No. 034819)
10 Jake T. Rapp (AZ Bar No. 036208)
LAW OFFICES SHERMAN & HOWARD L.L.C.
11 2555 East Camelback Road, Suite 1050
12 Phoenix, Arizona 85018
Telephone: (602) 240-3000
13 Fax: (602) 240-6600
CMorgan@ShermanHoward.com
SStuart@shermanhoward.com
14 JRapp@ShermanHoward.com

15 Maithreyi Ratakondan (*pro hac vice pending*)
16 STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER
17 1 Liberty Plaza
18 165 Broadway, 23rd Floor, Office 2330
New York, NY 10006
19 T: (202) 999-9305
mai@statesuniteddemocracy.org
Attorneys for Defendant Secretary of State Adrian Fontes

20 Paul F. Eckstein
21 Alexis E. Danneman
22 Matthew R. Koerner
23 Margo R. Casselman
24 Samantha J. Burke
Perkins Coie LLP
25 2901 North Central Avenue
Suite 2000
Phoenix, AZ 85012
26 peckstein@perkinscoie.com
27 adanneman@perkinscoie.com
mkoerner@perkinscoie.com
28 mcasselman@perkinscoie.com

1 sburke@perkinscoie.com
2 docketphx@perkinscoie.com
3 *Attorneys for Defendant Kris Mayes*

4 Thomas P. Liddy
5 Joseph J. Branco
6 Joseph E. LaRue
7 Karen J. Hartman-Tellez
8 Jack L. O'Connor III
9 Sean Moore
10 Rosa Aguilar
11 Maricopa County Attorney's Office
12 225 West Madison St.
13 Phoenix, AZ 85003
14 liddyt@mcao.maricopa.gov
brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov
laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov
hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov
oconnorj@mcao.maricopa.gov
moores@mcao.maricopa.gov
aguilar@mcao.maricopa.gov

15 Emily Craiger
16 The Burgess Law Group
17 3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85016
19 Emily@theburgesslawgroup.com
*Attorneys for Defendant, Stephen Richer, Maricopa County Recorder,
And Maricopa County Board of Supervisors*

20 Celeste Robertson
21 Joseph Young
22 Apache County Attorney's Office
23 245 West 1st South
24 St. Johns, AZ 85936
25 crobertson@apachelaw.net
jyoung@apachelaw.net
*Attorneys for Defendant, Larry Noble, Apache County Recorder,
and Apache County Board of Supervisors*

26 Christine J. Roberts
27 Paul Correa
28 Cochise County Attorney's Office
Bisbee, AZ 85603

1 croberts@cochise.az.gov
2 pcorrea@cochise.az.gov
3 *Attorneys for Defendant, David W. Stevens, Cochise County Recorder,*
4 *and Cochise County Board of Supervisors*

4 Bill Ring
5 Coconino County Attorney's Office 110
6 East Cherry Avenue
7 Flagstaff, AZ 86001
8 wring@coconino.az.gov
9 *Attorney for Defendant, Patty Hansen, Coconino County Recorder,*
10 *and Coconino County Board of Supervisors*

9 Jeff Dalton
10 Gila County Attorney's Office 1400
11 East Ash Street
12 Globe, AZ 85551
13 jdalton@gilacountyaz.gov
14 *Attorney for Defendant, Sadie Jo Bingham, Gila County Recorder,*
15 *and Gila County Board of Supervisors*

14 Jean Roof
15 Graham County Attorney's Office
16 800 West Main Street
17 Safford, AZ 85546
18 jroof@graham.az.gov
19 *Attorneys for Defendant, Polly Merriman, Graham County Recorder,*
20 *and Graham County Board of Supervisors*

19 Scott Adams
20 Greenlee County Attorney's Office
21 P.O. Box 1717
22 Clifton, AZ 85533
23 sadams@greenlee.az.gov
24 *Attorney for Defendant, Sharie Milheiro, Greenlee County Recorder,*
25 *and Greenlee County Board of Supervisors*

24 Ryan N. Dooley
25 La Paz County Attorney's Office
26 1320 Kofa Avenue
27 Parker, AZ 85344
28 rdooley@lapazcountyaz.org
29 *Attorney for Defendant, Richard Garcia, La Paz County Recorder,*
30 *and La Paz County Board of Supervisors*

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
28

Ryan Esplin
William Davis
Mohave County Attorney's Office Civil Division
P.O. Box 7000
Kingman, AZ 86402-7000
esplir@mohave.gov
davisw@mohave.gov
caocivil.court@mohave.gov
*Attorney for Defendant, Kristi Blair, Mohave County Recorder,
and Mohave County Board of Supervisors*

Jason Moore
Navajo County Attorney's Office
P.O. Box 668
Holbrook, AZ 86025-0668
jason.moore@navajocountyaz.gov
*Attorney for Defendant, Michael Sample, Navajo County Recorder,
and Navajo County Board of Supervisors*

Daniel Jurkowitz
Ellen Brown
Javier Gherna
Pima County Attorney's Office
32 N. Stone #2100
Tucson, AZ 85701
Daniel.Jurkowitz@pcao.pima.gov
Ellen.Brown@pcao.pima.gov
Javier.Gherna@pcao.pima.gov
*Attorney for Gabriela Cázares-Kelley, Pima County Recorder,
and Pima County Board of Supervisors*

Craig Cameron
Scott Johnson
Allen Quist
Jim Mitchell
Pinal County Attorney's Office
30 North Florence Street
Florence, AZ 85132
craig.cameron@pinal.gov
scott.m.johnson@pinal.gov
allen.quist@pinal.gov
james.mitchell@pinal.gov
Attorneys for Defendant, Dana Lewis, Pinal County Recorder,

1 *and Pinal County Board of Supervisors*

2 Robert F. May
3 Kimberly Hunley
4 Santa Cruz County Attorney's Office
5 2150 North Congress Drive, Suite 201
6 Nogales, AZ 85621-1090
7 khunley@santacruzcountyaz.gov
8 *Attorneys for Defendant, Suzanne Sainz, Santa Cruz County Recorder,*
9 *and Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors*

10 Thomas M. Stoxen
11 Michael J. Gordon
12 Yavapai County Attorney's Office
13 255 East Gurley Street, 3rd Floor
14 Prescott, AZ 86301
15 Thomas.Stoxen@yavapaiaz.gov
16 Michael.Gordon@yavapaiaz.gov
17 *Attorney for Defendant, Michelle M. Burchill, Yavapai County Recorder,*
18 *and Yavapai County Board of Supervisors*

19 Bill Kerekes
20 Yuma County Attorney's Office
21 198 South Main Street
22 Yuma, AZ 85364
23 bill.kerekes@yumacountyaz.gov
24 *Attorney for Defendant, Richard Colwell, Yuma County Recorder,*
25 *and Yuma County Board of Supervisors*

26 /s/ _____

27

28

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

HONORABLE PETER A. THOMPSON

CLERK OF THE COURT

I. Ostrander

Deputy

KARI LAKE

BRYAN JAMES BLEHM

v.

KATIE HOBBS, ET AL.

CRAIG A MORGAN

THOMAS PURCELL LIDDY

JUDGE THOMPSON

UNDER ADVISEMENT RULING

The Court has considered the filings of the parties: Governor Katie Hobbs Renewed Motion to Dismiss, the Maricopa County Defendants' Memorandum of Law Supplementing Their Motion to Dismiss, and Secretary of State Adrian Fontes' Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss, along with the associated response and replies. The Court has also considered Plaintiff Kari Lake's Motion for Relief from Judgment, along with the associated responses and reply. The Court has considered the arguments of the parties at the hearing on May 12, 2023.

The Court considers each request for relief in turn.

BACKGROUND

This case was returned on remand from the Arizona Supreme Court. This Court's dismissal of Counts I, II, and IV – X were affirmed, and this Court's dismissal of Count III on the ground of laches was vacated and remanded. The mandate of the Arizona Supreme Court, as relevant here, states:

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

It is further ordered remanding to the trial court to determine whether the claim that Maricopa County failed to comply with A.R.S. § 16-550(A) fails to state a claim pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) for reasons other than laches, or, whether Petitioner can prove her claim as alleged pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-672 and establish that “votes [were] affected ‘in sufficient numbers to alter the outcome of the election’” based on a “competent mathematical basis to conclude that the outcome would plausibly have been different, not simply an untethered assertion of uncertainty.

(alterations in original) (quoting *Lake v. Hobbs*, 525 P.3d 664, 668, ¶ 11 (App. 2023)). It is with this mandate in mind that the Court proceeds.

I. Motions to Dismiss

This Court will grant a motion to dismiss based on a Plaintiff’s failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted when, as a matter of law, the Plaintiff is not “entitled to relief under any interpretation of the facts susceptible of proof.” *Coleman v. City of Mesa*, 230 Ariz. 352, 356, ¶ 8 (2012). In determining whether a complaint states a claim, the Court must assume all well-plead allegations are true and “indulge all reasonable inferences from those facts, but mere conclusory statements are insufficient.” *State ex rel. Brnovich v. Ariz. Bd. of Regents*, 250 Ariz. 127, 130, ¶ 7 (2020) (citation omitted).

A Plaintiff need only provide a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Ariz. R. Civ. P. 8. Arizona follows a notice pleading standard, meaning that the opponent need only be given “fair notice of the nature and basis of the claim and indicate generally the type of litigation involved.” *Cullen v. Auto-Owners Ins. Co.*, 218 Ariz. 417, 419, ¶ 6 (2008).

Defendants raise problems with Count III that broadly fall into three (loosely) defined areas. First, Defendants challenge the form of the allegations. The Secretary raises the issue of whether the verification of the Complaint was proper. This argument was waived by not being raised on the initial motion to dismiss and by proceeding to trial in December. *Michael Weller, Inc. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.*, 126 Ariz. 323, 326 (App. 1980). After a full trial and appeals process, Defendants cannot now raise the issue of a defective verification for the first time on remand.

Similarly, the Governor argues that Lake fails to allege that any specific mail-in ballots were illegally counted. This argument fails first because Arizona is a notice pleading state, as noted above, and the Complaint generally alleges a violation of the EPM and A.R.S. § 16-550 by

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

failure to cure or reconcile signatures. In her Response to the Motion to Dismiss, Plaintiff concedes that she is not contesting the signature verification process for specific ballots. Lake now clarifies for the first time that, under the widest possible reading of Count III, she is contending that election officials failed to comply with the EPM and A.R.S. § 16-550 by not performing ANY steps to comply with level 2 or level 3 screening or notification of electors to cure ballots where level 1 screeners found signatures were inconsistent. Lake argues those ballots were counted in sufficient numbers to affect the outcome of the election. While the wording of Count III does not state this allegation clearly, it can be read broadly enough that Lake's argument fits under notice pleading requirements. The response and oral argument have further narrowed this claim sufficient for the Defendants to be on notice as to what violation Lake is arguing.

The second area Defendants attack is the legal sufficiency of the allegations. Maricopa County makes the compelling argument that Lake's challenge to signatures on mail-in ballot envelopes seeks relief beyond that which the legislature has provided. Simply put, the County argues that because a party representative can challenge ballot signature reconciliation as it is taking place, the legislature has provided an exclusive remedy for the challenge that Lake brings. See A.R.S. § 16-552. It is true that where the legislature has provided for a right "and also provides a complete and valid remedy for the right created the remedy thereby given is exclusive." *Valley Drive-In Theatre Corp. v. Super. Ct. In and For Pima Cnty.*, 79 Ariz. 396, 400 (1955). The Court agrees with the County that the legislature statutorily limited a party's recourse for challenging individual signatures for consistency – which would otherwise completely cripple the election system. But this relief at the level of individual ballots does not preclude a claim that the County Recorder failed entirely to perform ANY level 2 or level 3 signature verification on ballots where level 1 screeners found signatures were not similar. See *Reyes v. Cuming*, 191 Ariz. 91 (App. 1997). This is in sharp contrast to an allegation that the Recorder or designee improperly exercised his or her discretion within the policy.

Additionally, the Governor argues that it is now simply too late to litigate Count III because Governor Hobbs has been in office for five months. But A.R.S. § 16-676 imposes no time limit on when, assuming all other procedural requirements are timely met, the Court may grant relief. Granted, the statute as written does not appear to take into consideration a fulsome appeals process resulting in a trial on remand – but the Court must give effect to each word of the statute as written. See *McCaw v. Ariz. Snowbowl Resort*, 254 Ariz. 221, 226, ¶ 16 (App. 2022). Subsection (C) states simply that if the court determines "that a person other than the contestee has the highest number of legal votes, the court shall declare that person elected" and further nullify the certificate of election of the person whose office is contested. The Court sees no requirement that appeal and remand take place within a certain time for Lake to be eligible for this relief, and cannot read such a requirement into the statute so as to expand its provisions. *City of Tempe v. Fleming*, 168 Ariz. 454, 457 (App. 1991); see also *Lake*, 525 P.3d at 667, ¶ 5 ("We are not permitted to read into the election contest statute what is not there.") (quoting *Grounds v. Lawe*, 67 Ariz. 176, 187 (1948)).

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

In this second area, Maricopa County argues that because Lake does not simultaneously allege both misconduct *and* illegal vote grounds under Count III that she cannot prevail. *See* A.R.S. § 16-672(A)(1), (4). But this argument is not persuasive. If Maricopa County is right, any challenger under Section 16-672 would be required to double-up and allege (A)(4) grounds whenever they bring any challenge under (A)(1), (A)(3), or (A)(5) as these grounds rest on the assumption that some number of ballots were illegally placed in or out of the correct column. The Court reads the statute as providing five discrete reasons that a challenger may seek relief. It may have been more prudent to allege more than one ground for each set of facts that Lake brings in her complaint, but the Court will not dismiss the Count on the grounds that her failure to do so leaves Defendants lacking notice as to what her claims are. Indeed, her complaint at Paragraph 151 specifically notes that “[t]o be *lawful and eligible for tabulation*, the signature on the affidavit accompanying an early ballot must match the signature featured on the elector’s registration record.” A.R.S. § 16-550. This is sufficient to put Maricopa County on notice of Lake’s objections.

The third and last area focuses on the substance or completeness of the allegations. The Secretary objects that Lake has not stated in her complaint exactly how many ballots were improperly admitted. But Lake is not required to do so in her complaint: Arizona is a notice pleading state, and the Court finds that while she must raise the nature of the violation of election rules for which she seeks relief, she does not need to plead a precise number of ballots. Put another way, Lake must prove a competent mathematical basis to win at trial, but she need not plead a specific number of votes in her complaint under notice pleading. *See Verduzco v. Amer. Valet*, 240 Ariz. 221, 225, ¶ 9 (App. 2016) (“Under Arizona’s notice pleading rules, ‘it is not necessary to allege the evidentiary details of plaintiff’s claim for relief.’”) (quoting Daniel J. McAuliffe & Shirley J. McAuliffe, Arizona Civil Rules Handbook at 21 (2015 ed.)).

The Defendants also argue that these claims are at least in part based on reports and allegations related to the 2020 election. This is an evidentiary argument for trial rather than a basis to dismiss Plaintiff’s claim wholesale. Any expert opinions based on the 2020 election analysis must be based upon adequate foundation for not only their reliability but their relevance to the 2022 election. Even where admitted at trial, such opinions would only be entitled to the weight deemed appropriate based upon their foundation.

In her response and at oral argument, Lake conceded that she is not challenging the process of signature review as to any specific ballot(s), whether any given signature matches a voter’s record, or that the process was effective. She is instead alleging misconduct by the Maricopa County Defendants through a wholesale failure at the “higher-tier signature verification process” to reconcile non-conforming signatures, or to cure signatures pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-550. She alleges that Maricopa County entirely failed to perform the signature matching required by statute. As Lake put it in her response, she “brings a *Reyes* claim, not a *McEwen* claim. She challenges

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

Maricopa's failure to act, not its action on any particular ballot." (citing *McEwen v. Sainz*, No. CV-22-163 (Santa Cruz Super. Ct. Aug. 8, 2022)). Taking Lake's concession, she has stated a claim.

As was said in this Court's order of December 19, 2022, whether Maricopa County complied with the EPM and statutes governing elections is a question of fact. Lake has narrowed her claim to that complained of in *Reyes*, and she must demonstrate at trial pursuant to her concessions that Maricopa County's higher level signature reviewers conducted no signature verification or curing and in so doing had systematically failed to materially comply with the law. This is, of course, in addition to the requirement that she prove that this alleged complete failure to conduct signature verification resulted in a change in the outcome of the gubernatorial election proven by "competent mathematical basis." All of this must be done by clear and convincing evidence. *Lake*, 525 P.3d at 668, ¶ 10.

The renewed motions to dismiss as to Count III are denied.

II. Motion for Relief from Judgment

Lake moves for Rule 60 relief as to Counts II, V, and VI on grounds of newly discovered evidence that, with reasonable diligence, could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b)(1), fraud on the court, and the catch-all "any other reason justifying relief." Ariz. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(2), (3), (6).

To the extent that the civil rules can apply without contradiction to an election challenge, they do apply. This includes Rule 60. The Court will not rehash arguments going back to the motion to dismiss order. While, admittedly, the election challenge statutes do not show a great deal of consideration for post-trial rules of civil procedure, had the legislature wanted to abrogate or accelerate the rules for an election challenge so as to preclude Rule 60 relief they would have done so. The Court finds the motion is timely.

However, the merits of the motion are another matter. The dismissed Count II alleged that "[t]he [Ballot on Demand] *printers* involved in the tabulator problems . . . are not certified and have vulnerabilities that render them susceptible to hacking" Lake attempts to rescue Count II by arguing that evidence now shows that Maricopa County reinstalled software on memory cards used in the ballot *tabulators* without performing logic and accuracy testing. Assuming that this evidence could not have been discovered before trial, it goes to a completely different set of election day processes than that alleged in Count II – suggesting that the tabulators were maliciously configured to not *read* ballots is different in kind from alleging that the printers could not *write* the ballots correctly. The time to amend a complaint is before the matter goes to trial, not after. In fact, the law does not permit amendments of election contest complaints at any time after the contest filing deadline has passed, even to conform to the evidence. *See Kitt v. Holbert*,

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

30 Ariz. 397, 406 (1926) (holding “a statement of contest in an election contest may not be amended, after the time prescribed by law for filing such contest has expired” to fix the failure to allege the contestant was a proper elector).

While the difference between a tabulator-based claim and a printer-based claim may seem like a subtle distinction, it is not. Count II was fully litigated at trial and this Court’s disposition was affirmed by both the Court of Appeals and Arizona Supreme Court. This is not newly discovered evidence that goes to the claim as presented to the Court in December and reviewed on appeal, it is a wholly new claim, and therefore Count II remains unrevived.

Lake also takes issue with the testimony of Scott Jarrett, who testified that the voting center difficulties faced on election day were minor in scope. Lake, needless to say, disagrees, and offers additional evidence in an attempt to demonstrate fraud or misconduct. Lake took this same position at trial and even recalled Scott Jarrett in her case in chief. But evidence that is merely cumulative that would not have changed the result is not sufficient to revive a claim under Rule 60. *Ruesga v. Kindred Nursing Ctrs., L.L.C.*, 215 Ariz. 589, 595, ¶ 17 (App. 2007). Nor is it enough to disagree with a witness or find evidence contradicting a witness to prevail under Rule 60. Scienter – a knowing falsehood – is what is required to find fraud. *See Est. of Page v. Litzenburg*, 177 Ariz. 84, 94 (App. 1993) (affirming Rule 60 grant on basis of “conspicuous inference that [non-movant] engaged in knowing or deliberate misconduct”). Mere contradiction is not enough to prevail on grounds of fraud or misrepresentation, and this is all Lake offers now.

The allegation of fraud also leaps over a substantial gap in the evidence presented. The Court notes that counsel’s representation of what the McGregor report would show is 180 degrees from what the report actually says. Rather than demonstrating that Mr. Jarrett lied, it actually supports his contention that the machine error of the tabulators and ballot printers was a mechanical failure not tied to malfeasance or even misfeasance. At trial in December 2022, Plaintiff presented the purely technical evaluation of Clay Parikh which found the only possible cause of the malfunctions on election day could be willful and intentional systemic manipulation to create the errors encountered. However, those conclusions were undermined completely by the very next witness at trial, David Betencourt. The testimony of Mr. Betencourt, who was called by Plaintiff, was summarized previously by this Court:

“Mr. Betencourt testified that there were, in fact, multiple technical issues experienced on election day. He testified that these were solved by means such as: 1) taking out toner and/or ink cartridges and shaking them, 2) cleaning the corona wire, 3) letting the printers warm up, 4) cleaning the tabulators, and 5) adjusting settings on the printer. It is of note that, apart from 5), none of these solutions implicates the ballot in a manner suggesting intent. Mr. Betencourt testified that each of these on-site actions were successful to varying degrees, with shaking the

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

toner cartridge being the most effective. It is worth repeating that ballots that could not be read by the tabulator immediately because of printer settings – or anything else – could be deposited in Door 3 of the tabulator and counted later after duplication by a bipartisan adjudication board.

Mr. Betencourt testified that, not only did he lack knowledge of any T-Tech (or anyone else) engaging in intentional misconduct, but further testified that the T-Techs he worked with diligently and expeditiously trouble-shot each problem as they arose, and they did so in a frenetic Election Day environment. Plaintiff's own witness testified before this Court that the BOD printer failures were largely the result of unforeseen mechanical failure."

Interestingly, months later after extensive review, testing, and evaluation of the equipment involved under secure conditions, the report by Former Arizona Supreme Court Chief Justice Ruth McGregor came to the same conclusions. Plaintiff now seeks to allege fraud based upon the same type of purely technical evaluations presented in the first trial. This is not evidence of fraud, but additional evidence offered to support the view that error codes can prove intent and state of mind, exclusive of all other theories. The Court is not required to accept that premise, especially on remand after a full trial and appeal.

Ignoring Defendants' view of the testimony and taking all inferences in favor of Plaintiff, even if Lake may have demonstrated that Mr. Jarrett was mistaken on the first day of trial, that is not sufficient for Rule 60 relief. Even Mr. Parikh conceded that ballots which were not read by tabulators at the voting centers were transposed to new ballots and counted at Maricopa County's downtown central facility later.

Additionally, the Court notes that counsel's representation in the Motion to the effect that the Parikh Declaration supports a finding that 8,000 ballots "maliciously misconfigured to cause a tabulator rejection, *were not counted*" is not supported by a Declaration that 8,000 ballots were "affected" by an error. The oral arguments presented on May 12, 2023, clarified that error codes do not correspond to votes not counted. Counsel cannot leap a gap in proof with unsupported bare assertions.

Finally, the Court notes with respect to Lake's request to reconsider dismissal of Counts V and VI – pertaining to alleged equal protection and due process violations – the motion does not grapple at all with the reason the Court dismissed those claims in its December 19, 2022, minute entry. These counts are simply bootstrapped constitutional arguments "tak[ing] the verified statement beyond the remedies provided by the election contest statute, which is impermissible." (citing *Donaghey v. Att'y Gen.*, 120 Ariz. 93, 95 (1978)). The reply's suggestion that the "issues"

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2022-095403

05/15/2023

be revived independent of the “counts” does not remedy this issue. Reconsideration of them is not warranted.

This is a claim which was fully litigated at trial and on appeal over seven months since the November 8, 2022, election. The evidence presented falls far below what is needed to establish a basis for fraud. It is important to remember that this is an election challenge and focuses on votes affected which would change the outcome of the election. Plaintiff has not established a basis for relitigating the previously adjudicated counts.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED denying Plaintiff’s Motion for Relief from Judgment.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED reaffirming the trial dates set forth in this court’s May 8, 2023, minute entry setting the matter for trial on Count III.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED denying the Motion to File Amicus Curae Brief submitted by a third party and opposed by all parties to this litigation.

The Court notes the Amicus Brief is essentially a refile of the Amicus Curae Briefs filed at the Arizona Court of Appeal and Arizona Supreme Court. Those issues have been ruled upon by those courts.