

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

**ARIZONA CENTER FOR LAW
IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST**
202 E. McDowell Rd., Suite 153
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
(602)258-8850

Timothy M. Hogan (004567)
thogan@aclpi.org
Joy E. Herr-Cardillo (009718)
jherrcardillo@aclpi.org
Attorneys for Amici Curiae

Joe P. Sparks (002383)
The Sparks Law Firm, P.C.
7503 First Street
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
joesparks@sparkslawaz.com
*Attorneys for Amicus Inter
Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| ARIZONA STATE LEGISLATURE, |) | No.: 2:12-CV-01211-PGR-MMS-GMS |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE |
| vs. |) | BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE |
| |) | |
| ARIZONA INDEPENDENT |) | |
| REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, et al., |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendants. |) | |
| |) | |
| |) | |

1 Amici Curiae¹ move the Court for permission to file the attached Amici Curiae
2 Brief. Counsel for the parties to this action have consented to the filing.

3 **I. DESCRIPTION OF AMICI**

4 Amici consist of individuals and organizations who seek to defend Proposition
5 106, which was approved by Arizona voters in 2000 to amend Arizona's Constitution.
6 The Proposition removed primary responsibility for redistricting from the Arizona
7 legislature and transferred that authority to the Arizona Independent Redistricting
8 Commission (IRC), a Defendant in this case. The Amici are as follows:

9 Dennis Burke and Bart Turner - - Mssrs. Burke and Turner were two of the three
10 principal drafters of Proposition 106 in 2000. At that time, Mr. Burke was Executive
11 Director of Arizona Common Cause and Mr. Turner was Executive Director of the
12 Valley Citizens League.

13 League of Women Voters of Arizona - - The League is a non-profit organization
14 that works to encourage the informed and active participation of citizens in government.
15 Since 1967, LWVAZ has supported the retention of an independent commission to
16 redistrict legislative and congressional districts at regular intervals, subject to judicial
17 review.

18 Arizona Advocacy Network - - Arizona Advocacy Network is a non-profit
19 organization that supports the voter established Independent Restricting Commission and
20 its purpose to create more legitimate legislative and congressional districts for Arizona
21 than had been historically designed by the legislature. The voters of Arizona created the
22 IRC because they believed the legislature was incapable of removing its self-interests
23 when drawing new boundaries. During the last redistricting process, Arizona Advocacy
24 Network and its members were active in supporting efforts to respect all redistricting
25

26 ¹ Dennis Burke, Bart Turner, League of Women Voters of Arizona, Arizona Advocacy
Network, and Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.

1 criteria in the redistricting process. Because the IRC is a more independent body than the
2 legislature and has no re-election or political self-interests in mind while redistricting,
3 Arizona Advocacy Network supports its establishment by the voters and believes it was
4 established appropriately under the constitutional powers reserved for voters to legislate
5 at the ballot box.

6 Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc. - - The Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.
7 (ITCA) is a private, non-profit Arizona corporation established to provide its 21 Member
8 Tribes with reservation lands in Arizona with a means for action on matters that affect
9 them collectively and individually. ITCA's mission is to provide its Member Tribes with
10 a united voice and the means for united action on matters that affect them collectively or
11 individually; to be the voice of the Member Tribes in bringing about Indian involvement
12 and self-determination in order to improve their general welfare; to eliminate prejudice
13 and discrimination against Indians and to improve the image of Indians held by non-
14 Indians; to promote community development and enhance the quality of life for its Tribal
15 Members; to empower Indian youth to be healthy in body, mind, and spirit and to make
16 positive contributions for the well being of Indian communities; to defend human and
17 civil rights as protected by law; to educate Indians and non-Indians about matters of
18 concern to the Tribes' in Arizona through public discussion groups, forums, panels,
19 lectures, or any means possible and appropriate.

20 ITCA's Member Tribes include 21 Arizona Indian Tribes, Nations, Communities,
21 and Bands. Each Tribe is represented in ITCA by its highest elected official. The Tribes
22 have a direct "government to government" relationship with the United States. The
23 Tribes are recognized by the United States under the Constitution, and by Treaties,
24 Statutes, Executive Orders, the Secretary of the Interior and other actions by the United
25 States. ITCA Member Tribes, together with the Navajo Nation, occupy Reservations
26 with land areas totaling approximately one-third of Arizona, or about 25 million acres.

1 The ITCA manages projects and programs to assist with the formulation of public
2 policy designed to strengthen the self-determination of Indian Tribal Governments.
3 Indians were recognized as citizens of the United States by the Act of June 2, 1924, 43
4 Stat. 253, 8 USC§ 3. For decades, ITCA has promoted Native American voting rights in
5 Arizona and provided voter education programs for its Members. The Reservations of
6 ITCA Tribes often cross state boundaries, and frequently over lay several Arizona
7 counties. In the past, actions by the Arizona Legislature have attempted to split Tribal
8 Reservations into multiple Legislative and Congressional districts, which would result in
9 confusion of Indian voters and dilution of the potential power of their votes. The
10 Legislature has also attempted to dilute or divide Indian communities of interest by
11 placement of Legislative and Congressional boundaries. ITCA has a direct interest in the
12 process and integrity of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

13 **II. INTEREST OF AMICI IN THIS CASE**

14 All Amici are vitally interested in preserving Arizona’s constitutional provision on
15 redistricting. *See* Ariz. Const., Art. 4, Pt. 2 § 1. Additionally, all Amici have a vital
16 interest in preserving the integrity of the Voter Protection Act. It is that provision of the
17 Arizona Constitution (which was also approved by Arizona voters) that bars the
18 legislature’s action in this case. *See* Ariz. Const., Art. 4, Pt. 1 § 1(6)(B) and (C).

19 It is well settled that a trial court may, in the exercise of its discretion, permit the
20 filing of an amicus curiae brief. *British Airways Bd. v. Port Authority of N.Y. & N.J.*, 71
21 F.R.D. 583, 585 (S. D. N.Y. 1976); *see also Gerritsen v. de la Madrid Hurtado*, 819 F.2d
22 1511, 1514 (9th Cir. 1987). “A court may grant leave to appear as an amicus if the
23 information offered is timely and useful.” *Waste Management of Pennsylvania, Inc.*, 162
24 F.R.D. 34, 36 (M. D. PA. 1995). “District courts frequently welcome amicus briefs from
25 non-parties...if the amicus has 'unique information or perspective that can help the court
26 beyond the help that the lawyers from the parties are able to provide.’” *Sonoma Falls*

1 *Developers L.L.C. v. Nev. Gold & Casinos, Inc.*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 919, 925 (N. D. Cal.
2 2003) (quoting *Cobell v. Norton*, 246 F. Supp. 2d 59, 62 (D.D.C. 2003).

3 In this case, one or more of the Amici wrote portions of Proposition 106,
4 circulated petitions to get the Proposition on the ballot, and worked to secure approval of
5 the Proposition from Arizona voters in the 2000 election. None of the parties in this case
6 represents Arizona voters or their perspective on the legislature's attempt to invalidate a
7 portion of Arizona's Constitution. This is a perspective that should be helpful to the
8 Court in this case.

9 For the reasons contained in the Amici Curiae brief, Amici believe that the
10 legislature lacks the authority under Arizona's Constitution to even file this lawsuit. The
11 people of Arizona, through initiative, have imposed an outright prohibition on the
12 legislature repealing any measure approved by voters in the 1998 election or thereafter.
13 The legislature clearly violates the Arizona Constitution when it seeks the invalidation of
14 Proposition 106 in this case.

15 Based on the foregoing and the consent of the parties, Amici request that the Court
16 allow their attached brief to be filed and considered.

17 DATED this 5th day of December, 2013.

18
19 ARIZONA CENTER FOR LAW IN
20 THE PUBLIC INTEREST

21 By: /s/Timothy M. Hogan
22 Timothy M. Hogan
23 Joy Herr-Cardillo
24 202 E. McDowell Rd., Suite 153
25 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
26 Attorney for Amici

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

THE SPARKS LAW FIRM, P.C.

By: /s/ Joe P. Sparks
Joe P. Sparks
7503 First Street
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
Attorneys for ITCA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 5, 2013, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's office using the CM/ECF system for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF to the following:

Mary R. O'Grady
Osborn Maledon, P.A.
2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
Phoenix, AZ 85012
mogrady@omlaw.com
kwindtberg@omlaw.com
jroth@omlaw.com

Joseph A. Kanefield
Ballard Spahr LLP
1 E. Washington Street, Suite 2300
Phoenix, AZ 85004
kanefield@ballardspahr.com
roysdenb@ballardspahr.com

*Attorney for Arizona Independent Redistricting
Commission and Commissioners Named in Their
Official Capacities*

Michele L. Forney
Arizona Attorney General
1275 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Attorney for Defendant Ken Bennett

Gregory G. Jernigan
1700 W. Washington Street, Suite S
Phoenix, AZ 85007
gjernigan@azleg.gov

1 Peter A. Gentala
2 Pele Peacock Fisher
3 1700 W. Washington Street, Suite H
4 Phoenix, AZ 85007
5 pgentala@azleg.gov

6 Joshua W. Carden
7 80 E. Rio Salado Parkway, Suite 401
8 Tempe, AZ 85281
9 jcarden@davismiles.com
10 efile.dockets@davismiles.com

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Arizona State*
12 *Legislature*

13 /s/Sonya Batten _____
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 Ariz. Const, Art. 4, Pt. 2 § 1, and the provisions enacted through the Voter Protection
2 Act, Ariz. Const., Art. 4, Pt. 1, § 1, (6)(B) and (C).

3 Amici in this case¹ include the drafters of the Arizona Independent Redistricting
4 Initiative (Proposition 106) which amended the Arizona Constitution to reposit authority
5 for redistricting in the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission. Proposition 106
6 was approved by Arizona voters in 2000. Ariz. Const, Art. 4, Pt. 2 § 1.

7 Other Amici supported the enactment of Proposition 106 on numerous grounds,
8 including that it would open the redistricting process to public scrutiny and remove the
9 responsibility for redrawing district boundaries from legislators who have “the ultimate
10 conflict of interest” in doing so. Arizona Sec’y of State, 2000 Publicity Pamphlet, p.57
11 (2000), available at

12 <http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pubpamphlet/englis/prop106.pdf>. (Argument
13 for Proposition 106 by Miriam Neiman, Treasurer, Arizona Common Cause, Sun City
14 and Dennis Burke, Executive Officer, Arizona Common Cause, Phoenix).

15 The individuals and organizations that appear as Amici in this case do so not only
16 to defend Proposition 106 but also to vindicate the Voter Protection Act (Proposition
17 105) which was approved by Arizona voters in 1998. The Voter Protection Act amended
18 the Arizona Constitution to establish that Arizona initiatives approved in the 1998
19 election or thereafter could not be repealed by the Arizona legislature, nor could they be
20 amended unless the amendment furthered the purposes of the initiative and was passed
21 with a three-fourths vote in each house of the Arizona legislature. Ariz. Const., Art. 4,
22 Pt. 1, § 1, (6)(B) and (C).

23
24
25 ¹ Dennis Burke, Bart Turner, League of Women Voters of Arizona, Arizona Advocacy
26 Network, and Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc.

1 In the view of Amici, the Voter Protection Act bars this lawsuit by the Arizona
2 state legislature to invalidate Proposition 106.

3
4 **II. PROPOSITION 106 WAS INTENDED TO TRANSFER RESPONSIBILITY**
5 **FOR REDISTRICTING FROM THE LEGISLATURE TO THE ARIZONA**
6 **INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION**

6 To be clear, Proposition 106 was intended to remove responsibility for
7 redistricting from the Arizona legislature and establish an independent body with no
8 vested interest to “oversee the mapping of fair and competitive congressional and
9 legislative districts.” Ariz. Sec’y of State, 2000 Publicity Pamphlet, p. 54 (2000),
10 available at <http://www.azsos.gov/election/2000/Info/pubpamphlet/englis/prop106.pdf>.
11 Proposition 106 was initiated by Arizona voters because both major political parties, for
12 too long, drew legislative and congressional districts for the purpose of protecting
13 incumbents. *Id.* at 57 (Argument for Proposition 106 by Grant Woods, Phoenix, former
14 Attorney General and Susan Gerard, Phoenix Representative, District 18). Proposition
15 106 removed the responsibility of redrawing of legislative and congressional district
16 boundaries from those with the greatest conflict of interest, incumbent legislators. *Id.*
17 (Argument for Proposition 106 by Myrna Shepherd, President, Arizona School Boards
18 Association, Phoenix and Harry Garewal, Vice President, Arizona School Boards
19 Association, Phoenix). The objective was to create competitive districts to encourage
20 citizens to vote, people to run for office, and representatives to respond to constituents’
21 concerns. *Id.* at 58 (Argument for Proposition 106 by Anne Eschinger, President, League
22 of Women Voters of Arizona, Phoenix and Willi Waltrip, 2nd Vice President, League of
23 Women Voters of Arizona, Phoenix).

24 Arizona law requires that Legislative Council prepare an analysis of each
25 proposition approved for the ballot. A.R.S. § 19-124(B). If there had been any question
26 about the constitutionality of Proposition 106, it would have been identified by

1 Legislative Council. However, no such issue was ever identified by Legislative Council.
2 Nor was the Election Clause issue, now advanced by the legislature, ever mentioned or
3 discussed in the Publicity Pamphlet for the 2000 election or at any time during the
4 campaign prior to the election.

5 Defendants have more than adequately addressed the Elections Clause argument
6 advanced by the legislature in this case and Amici will not duplicate that discussion.
7 Instead, Amici address issues of Arizona constitutional law that divest the Arizona
8 legislature of the authority to even pursue its claim in this case.

9
10 **III. THE VOTER PROTECTION ACT CHANGED THE BALANCE OF**
11 **POWER BETWEEN THE LEGISLATURE AND THE PEOPLE IN**
12 **ARIZONA**

13 Arizona has a long and rich tradition of direct democracy that took root in the
14 progressive era when Arizona was admitted to the Union. The Making of the Arizona
15 Constitution, John O. Leshy, Ariz. St. L. J. 20; 1 at 46. Arizona's Constitution provides
16 that legislative authority is jointly shared between the legislature and the people. The
17 Constitution specifically provides that:

18 The legislative authority of the state shall be vested in the legislature,
19 consisting of a senate and a house of representatives, but the people reserve
20 the power to propose laws and amendments to the Constitution and to enact
21 or reject such laws and amendments at the polls, independently of the
22 legislature; and they also reserve, for use at their own option, the power to
23 approve or reject at the polls any act, or item, section, or any part of any
24 act, of the legislature.

25 Ariz. Const., Art. 4, Pt. 1, § 1(1).

26 Unlike the federal constitution, the Arizona Constitution does not grant
enumerated legislative power but instead limits its exercise and scope. *Earhart v.*
Frohmler, 65 Ariz. 221, 224, 178 P.2d 436, 437-38 (1947). The legislature and the
people can enact any law that is not prohibited by the U.S. or Arizona Constitutions. The

1 legislative authority of the people is coextensive (and even greater under the Voter
2 Protection Act) with that of the legislature. *Tilson v. Mofford*, 153 Ariz. 468, 470, 737
3 P.2d 1367, 1369 (1987) (“[T]he legislative power of the people is as great as that of the
4 legislature.”); Ariz. Const., Art. 22, § 14 (“Any law which may be enacted by the
5 legislature under this constitution may be enacted by the people under the initiative.”).

6 Arizona’s Constitution has always prohibited the legislature from repealing or
7 amending an initiative measure approved by voters under certain circumstances. From
8 1914 until 1998 when the Voter Protection Act was approved, the Arizona
9 Constitution provided that:

10 The veto power of the governor or the power of the legislature, to repeal or
11 amend shall not extend to initiative or referendum measures approved by a
12 majority vote of the qualified electors.

13 Ariz. Const., Art. 4, Pt.1 § 1(6).

14 In 1952, the Arizona Supreme Court interpreted this provision to mean that
15 initiative measures were insulated from repeal or amendment by the legislature only if the
16 measure had been approved by a majority of registered voters as opposed to a majority of
17 voters casting ballots. *Adams v. Bolin*, 74 Ariz. 269, 247 P.2d 617 (1952). As a practical
18 matter, the Court’s decision meant that no voter approved initiative was safe from
19 legislative repeal or amendment because the number of affirmative votes would rarely, if
20 ever, equal or exceed the majority of registered voters.

21 The Supreme Court’s decision in *Adams v. Bolin* meant that the legislature could
22 repeal or amend voter approved initiatives without legal limitation. To the consternation
23 of Arizona voters, the legislature did so with increasing frequency. Things came to a boil
24 in the late 1990s. A number of citizen measures dealing with campaign finance, health
25 care, and the environment were threatened and one measure was actually repealed by the
26

1 legislature. Voters were chagrined at the relative indifference with which the legislature
2 had subverted initiatives that required substantial resources to circulate the necessary
3 number of petitions to qualify for the ballot and then be approved by the voters in the
4 general election.

5 As a result, in 1998, voters circulated initiative petitions for a ballot proposition
6 that would significantly constrain the legislature's ability to repeal or amend voter
7 approved initiatives. In fact, the voters had two similar such initiatives from which to
8 choose at the 1998 election. They approved Proposition 105. The relevant constitutional
9 provision now provides that:

10 The legislature shall not have the power to repeal an initiative measure
11 approved by a majority of the votes cast thereon or to repeal a referendum
12 measure decided by a majority of the votes cast thereon.

13 Ariz. Const., Art. 4, Pt. 1 § 1 (6)(B).

14 Proposition 105 also included a new provision that prohibits the legislature from
15 amending an initiative measure:

16 Unless the amending legislation furthers the purposes of such measure and
17 at least three-fourths of the members of each house of the legislature, by a
roll call of ayes and nays, vote to amend such measure.

18 Ariz. Const., Art. 4, Pt. 1 § 1(6)(C).

19 With these provisions, Arizona voters reversed the holding of the *Adams v. Bolin*
20 decision and limited amendments of voter approved measures in such a way that the
21 legislature could not subvert them.

22 Despite the enactment of the Voter Protection Act in 1998, the legislature
23 continued to interfere with voter approved measures and test the limits of the Voter
24 Protection Act. In 2009, the legislature enacted legislation to divert funding from the
25 Early Childhood Development and Health Fund intended for early childhood programs.
26 The Arizona Supreme Court rejected that effort. *Ariz. Early Childhood Dev. & Health*

1 *Bd. v. Brewer*, 221 Ariz. 467, 469, 212 P.3d 805, 807 (2009). In 2011, the legislature
2 refused to provide the necessary funding to insure Medicaid eligibility as required by
3 Proposition 204. *Fogliano v. Brain*, 229 Ariz. 12, 270 P.3d 839 (Ariz. App. 2011)
4 (holding that legislature is required to comply with voter-approved measure but that the
5 action was non-reviewable as a political question) *rev. denied* 2012 Ariz. LEXIS 56 (Feb.
6 15, 2012).

7 This year, the Arizona Supreme Court rebuffed yet another effort of the legislature
8 to circumvent the Voter Protection Act. *Cave Creek Unified School District v. Ducey*,
9 308 P.3d 1152, 1213 Ariz. Lexis 207 (2013). In *Cave Creek*, the legislature had ignored
10 a voter approved measure requiring that the funding for the public school system be
11 annually inflated. Even though the legislature had not affirmatively repealed or amended
12 the voter approved statute requiring inflationary funding, the court held that it is the
13 legislation's effect on the fundamental purposes underlying the Voter Protection Act that
14 is critical. *Id.* at ¶ 23 (citing *Caldwell v. Bd. of Regents*, 54 Ariz. 404, 410, 96 P.2d 401,
15 403 (1939) (“[T]he legislature may not do indirectly what it is prohibited from doing
16 directly.”)).

17 The legislature's lawsuit in this case is nothing less than an attempt to circumvent
18 the Voter Protection Act and should be rejected by the Court.

19
20 **A. Before Filing this Lawsuit, the Legislature Should Have Complied with
the Voter Protection Act**

21 Although Amici do not believe any additional legislative involvement is required
22 by the Elections Clause, if it did, Proposition 106 could have been supplemented through
23 legislation in numerous different ways to achieve what the legislature now regards as
24 compliance with the U.S. Constitution. For example, the legislature could have enacted
25 supplemental legislation that required congressional maps be reviewed by the legislature
26

1 in a formal process or put to the voters for their approval. Such legislation would have
2 required a three-fourths vote in each house and a determination that the amendment
3 furthered the purposes of Proposition 106. The legislature's justification for such
4 supplemental legislation would presumably be that it was necessary to bring the
5 Proposition into compliance with the U.S. Constitution. Whether such legislation would
6 actually further the purpose of Proposition 106 under the Voter Protection Act is certainly
7 arguable, but it is an issue that should be decided by Arizona courts first. Instead, the
8 legislature simply disregarded the Voter Protection Act and proceeded directly to this
9 Court in an effort to invalidate the entire Proposition.

10
11 **B. This Lawsuit Represents Legislative Action to Repeal Proposition 106
and, Therefore, it Violates the Voter Protection Act**

12 As noted above and by the Commission, the legislature had other alternatives
13 available to it. It could have attempted to amend Proposition 106 in compliance with the
14 Voter Protection Act. Similarly, it could have referred to Arizona voters for their
15 approval a different set of maps than those adopted by the Commission. It chose neither
16 course of action, but proceeded directly to this Court seeking an indirect repeal of
17 Proposition 106.

18 This lawsuit was filed in the name of the Arizona State Legislature. On May 2,
19 2012, both houses of the legislature authorized the filing of this action by majority vote.
20 First Amended Complaint at 2, ¶ 2. The Complaint seeks the invalidation of Proposition
21 106 by this Court on the grounds that it is unconstitutional.

22 To the extent the complaint in this case was authorized by a majority of each
23 house of the legislature, it constitutes legislative action to repeal Proposition 106 no less
24 than if the legislature had enacted repealing legislation. However, the legislature "may
25 not do indirectly what it is prohibited from doing directly." *Caldwell*, 54 Ariz. at 410, 96
26

1 P.2d at 403. The Voter Protection Act prohibits the legislature from repealing
2 Proposition 106. It cannot avoid that prohibition by invoking this Court’s jurisdiction to
3 do what Arizona’s voters, through a constitutional amendment, have prohibited it from
4 doing.

5 “The Voter Protection Act altered the balance of power between the electorate and
6 the legislature, which share law making power under Arizona’s system of government.”
7 *Ariz. Early Childhood Dev. & Health Bd.*, 221 Ariz. at 469, 212 P.3d at 807. The
8 legislature’s overarching obligation is to comply with the Arizona Constitution including
9 the Voter Protection Act. Had it done so, it would not have filed this lawsuit.

10 **IV. CONCLUSION**

11 Amici are individuals and groups in Arizona who support fair, impartial, and
12 robust elections through a transparent redistricting process. The legislature’s lawsuit in
13 this case undermines those objectives, thwarts the will of the people, and violates the
14 Arizona Constitution.
15

16 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 5th day of December, 2013.

17 ARIZONA CENTER FOR LAW IN
18 THE PUBLIC INTEREST

19 By /s/Timothy M. Hogan

20 Timothy M. Hogan
21 Joy Herr-Cardillo
22 202 E. McDowell Rd., Suite 153
23 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
24 Attorney for Plaintiffs
25
26

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

THE SPARKS LAW FIRM, P.C.

By: /s/ Joe P. Sparks
Joe P. Sparks
7503 First Street
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
Attorneys for ITCA

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 5, 2013, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's office using the CM/ECF system for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the CM/ECF to the following:

Mary R. O'Grady
Osborn Maledon, P.A.
2929 N. Central Avenue, Suite 2100
Phoenix, AZ 85012
mogrady@omlaw.com
kwindtberg@omlaw.com
jroth@omlaw.com

Joseph A. Kanefield
Ballard Spahr LLP
1 E. Washington Street, Suite 2300
Phoenix, AZ 85004
kanefield@ballardspahr.com
roysdenb@ballardspahr.com

*Attorney for Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission
and Commissioners Named in Their Official Capacities*

Michele L. Forney
Arizona Attorney General
1275 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Attorney for Defendant Ken Bennett

Gregory G. Jernigan
1700 W. Washington Street, Suite S
Phoenix, AZ 85007
gjernigan@azleg.gov

Peter A. Gentala
Pele Peacock Fisher
1700 W. Washington Street, Suite H
Phoenix, AZ 85007
pgentala@azleg.gov

1 Joshua W. Carden
2 80 E. Rio Salado Parkway, Suite 401
3 Tempe, AZ 85281
4 jcarden@davismiles.com
5 efile.dockets@davismiles.com

6 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Arizona State*
7 *Legislature*

8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

/s/Sonya Batten _____