

Exhibit A

CASE NO. 60CV-22-1849



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
CENTRAL DIVISION

FILED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT ARKANSAS

APR 22 2022

TAMMY H. DOWNS, CLERK

DEBORAH SPRINGER SUTTLAR, JUDY GREEN, FRED LOVE
in his individual and official capacity as State Representative,
KWAMI ABDUL-BEY, CLARICE ABDUL-BEY, and
PAULA WITHERS,

By: _____
DEP CLERK

PLAINTIFFS

vs.

CASE NO. 4:22-cv-368-KGB

JOHN THURSTON, in his official capacity
as the Secretary of State of Arkansas and in his official capacity
as the Chairman of the Arkansas State Board of Election Commissioners;
and SHARON BROOKS, BILENDA
HARRIS-RITTER, WILLIAM LUTHER,
CHARLES ROBERTS, WENDY BRANDON, JAMIE CLEMMER and
JAMES HARMON SMITH III, in their official capacities
as members of the Arkansas State Board of
Election Commissioners

This case assigned to District Judge Baker
and to Magistrate Judge Finley

DEFENDANTS

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Defendants hereby remove this action from the Circuit Court of Pulaski County,
Arkansas, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441, 1443 and, in support, state:

1. Plaintiffs are Arkansans residing in Pulaski County. On March 21, 2022, they
filed a complaint in the Circuit Court of Pulaski County, Arkansas, claiming that the Arkansas
General Assembly's 2021 reapportionment of the State's four congressional districts following
the 2020 Census violates the Arkansas Constitution. See Complaint, *Suttlar v. Thurston*, No.
60CV-22-1849; Ark. Code Ann. 7-2-101 *et seq.* Defendants were served with the Complaint and
Summons on March 24, 2022.

2. This civil action is removable under 28 U.S.C. 1443. Under that provision, a civil
action "commenced in State court may be removed by the defendant to the district court of the

United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending,” if the defendant is either “act[ing] under color of authority derived from any law providing for equal rights, or . . . refusing to do any act on the ground that it would be inconsistent with such law.” *Id.* 1443(2).

3. Plaintiffs claim that Arkansas’s congressional districts dilute the voting power of black Arkansans. They ask the state court to order the General Assembly to adopt new congressional maps using a race-based litmus test. Such a requirement would run afoul of the Voting Rights Act and the Equal Protection Clause. *See, e.g., Wis. Legislature v. Wis. Elections Comm’n*, 142 S. Ct. 1245 (2022) (“Under the Equal Protection Clause, districting maps that sort voters on the basis of race ‘are by their very nature odious.’”) (quoting *Shaw v. Reno*, 509 U.S. 630, 643 (1993)).

4. “This presents a colorable conflict between state and federal law sufficient to justify removal under § 1443(2).” *Alonzo v. City of Corpus Christi*, 68 F.3d 944, 946 (5th Cir. 1995). “The purpose of [1443(2)’s] ‘refusal clause’ is to provide a federal forum for state officials who uphold equal protection in the face of” state-law suits. *Greenberg v. Veteran*, 889 F.2d 418, 421 (2d Cir. 1989) (reversing order that remanded claim removed under Section 1443(2) on the ground that the defendant invoked an equal-protection defense); *accord White v. Wellington*, 627 F.2d 582, 584-88 (2d Cir. 1980). The refusal clause also applies to “law[s] providing for equal rights,” 28 U.S.C. 1443(2), including the Voting Rights Act. *See Sexton v. Servaas*, 33 F.3d 799, 803-04 (7th Cir. 1994); *Cavanagh v. Brock*, 577 F. Supp. 176, 180 (E.D.N.C. 1983) (three-judge court) (sustaining removal under Section 1443(2) in an apportionment suit asserting only state constitutional claims on the basis of Voting Rights Act and Equal Protection Clause defenses).

5. For purposes of removal, all that Defendants must allege is a “colorable” allegation that a “state court might force [them]—against their will—to violate the Voting Rights Act” or the Equal Protection Clause, even if that allegation might potentially be disproved at a later stage in this case. *Sexson*, 33 F.3d at 803-04 (7th Cir. 1994); accord *Greenberg*, 889 F.2d at 421 (requiring defendants to merely “make a colorable claim that they are being sued for not acting pursuant to a state law, which, though facially neutral, would produce or perpetuate a racially discriminatory practice as applied”) (internal quotation marks omitted) (quoting *White*, 627 F.2d at 586). Because of the potential for a state court to reach a result in Plaintiffs’ suit that creates a conflict between Defendants’ state-law duties and the Equal Protection Clause or Voting Rights Act, this civil action is removable under 28 U.S.C. 1443(2).

6. Plaintiffs’ claims under the Arkansas Constitution are also part of a “civil action[] arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. 1331. Their claims, challenge the Arkansas General Assembly’s exercise of its enumerated powers under the U.S. Constitution: “The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof[.]” U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 4, cl. 1; see *Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98, 112 (2000) (Rehnquist, C.J., concurring) (“[T]here are a few exceptional cases in which the Constitution imposes a duty or confers a power on a particular branch of a State’s government. This is one of them.”).

7. This Notice of Removal is timely filed within 30 days’ receipt of the Complaint, which is “the initial pleading setting forth the claim for relief upon which such action or proceeding is based.” 28 U.S.C. 1446(b)(1).


8. True and correct copies of all process, pleadings, and orders served upon Defendants are attached to this notice of removal as required by 28 U.S.C. 1446(a).

9. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1446(d), Defendants will promptly serve upon Plaintiffs' counsel and file with the Circuit Court of Pulaski County, Arkansas, a true and correct copy of this Notice of Removal.

WHEREFORE, Defendants remove this action from the Circuit Court of Pulaski County, Arkansas, to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441, 1443.

Respectfully submitted,

LESLIE RUTLEDGE
Arkansas Attorney General



Dylan L. Jacobs (2016167)
Deputy Solicitor General
Office of the Arkansas Attorney General
323 Center Street, Suite 200
Little Rock, AR 72201
Ph: (501) 682-2007
Fax: (501) 682-2591
Email: Dylan.Jacobs@ArkansasAG.gov

Counsel for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE


I, Dylan L. Jacobs, hereby certify that on April 22, 2022, I served a copy of the foregoing by electronic mail upon the following:

Jess Askew III
KUTAK ROCK LLP
124 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 2000
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3740
jess.askew@kutakrock.com

Alexander T. Jones
200 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 2300
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3699
alexandertaylorjones@gmail.com

Abha Khanna
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100
Seattle, WA 98101
akhanna@elias.law

Joshua L. Harris
Aaron M. Mukerjee
Marilyn Gabriela Robb
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G Street NE
Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002
jharris@elias.law
amukerjee@elias.law
mrobb@elias.law



Dylan L. Jacobs