

<p>Meryl Neiman, et al.,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>Secretary of State Frank LaRose, et al.,</p> <p>Respondents.</p>	<p>Case No. 2022-0298</p> <p>Original Action Filed Pursuant to Ohio Constitution, Article XIX, Section 3(A)</p>
<p>League of Women Voters of Ohio, et al.,</p> <p>Petitioners,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>Secretary of State Frank LaRose, et al.,</p> <p>Respondents.</p>	<p>Case No. 2022-0303</p> <p>Original Action Filed Pursuant to Ohio Constitution, Article XIX</p>

RESPONDENTS HUFFMAN, CUPP, MCCOLLEY, AND LARE’S RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS’ MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO FILE REBUTTAL EVIDENCE

Abha Khanna
Ben Stafford
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Ave, Suite 2100
Seattle, WA 98101
T: (206) 656-0176
F: (206) 656-0180
akhanna@elias.law
bstafford@elias.law

Jyoti Jasrasaria
Spencer W. Klein
Harleen K. Gambhir
Raisa Cramer
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G St NE, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20002
jjasrasaria@elias.law
sklein@elias.law
hgambhir@elias.law
rcramer@elias.law

David Yost (0059260)
Jonathan D. Blanton (0070035)
Julie M. Pfeiffer (0069762)*
*Counsel of Record
Michael A. Walton (0092201)
Allison D. Daniel (0096186)
OHIO ATTORNEY GENERAL
30 E. Broad Street, 16th Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215
T: (614) 466-2872
F: (614) 728-7592
Jonathan.Blanton@OhioAGO.gov
Julie.Pfeiffer@OhioAGO.gov
Michael.Walton@OhioAGO.gov
Allison.Daniel@OhioAGO.gov
Counsel for Respondent
Secretary of State Frank LaRose

Erik J. Clark (0078732)
Ashley Merino (0096853)
ORGAN LAW LLP

T: (202) 968-4490
F: (202) 968-4498

Donald J. McTigue* (0022849)
*Counsel of Record

Derek S. Clinger (0092075)

MCTIGUE & COLOMBO LLC

545 East Town Street
Columbus, OH 43215
dmctigue@electionlawgroup.com
dclinger@electionlawgroup.com
T: (614) 263-7000

Counsel for Neiman Petitioners

Robert D. Fram (PHV 25414-2022)

Donald Brown (PHV 25480-2022)

David Denuyl (PHV 25452-2022)

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Salesforce Tower
415 Mission Street, Suite 5400
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 591-6000
rfram@cov.com

Anupam Sharma (PHV 25480-2022)

Yale Fu (PHV 2519-2022)

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

Salesforce Tower
3000 El Camino Real, 5 Palo Alto Square
Palo Alto, CA 94306
(650) 632-4709
asharma@cov.com

James Smith (PHV 25241-2022)

Sarah Suwanda (PHV 25602-2022)

Alex Thomson (PHV 25462-2022)

COVINGTON & BURLING LLP

One City Center
850 Tenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 662-6000
jmsmith@cov.com

1330 Dublin Road
Columbus, Ohio 43215

T: (614) 481-0900

F: (614) 481-0904

ejclark@organlegal.com

Counsel for Respondent

Ohio Redistricting Commission

Phillip J. Strach (PHV 25444-2022)

phillip.strach@nelsonmullins.com

Thomas A. Farr (PHV 25461-2022)

tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com

John E. Branch, III (PHV 25460-2022)

john.branch@nelsonmullins.com

Alyssa M. Riggins (PHV 25441-2022)

alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com

**NELSON MULLINS RILEY &
SCARBOROUGH LLP**

4140 Parklake Avenue, Suite 200
Raleigh, NC 27612
Telephone: 919-329-3800

W. Stuart Dornette (0002955)

dornette@taftlaw.com

Beth A. Bryan (0082076)

bryan@taftlaw.com

Philip D. Williamson (0097174)

pwilliamson@taftlaw.com

TAFT STETTINUS & HOLLISTER LLP

425 Walnut St., Suite 1800
Cincinnati, OH 45202-3957
Telephone: 513-381-2838

*Counsel for Respondents Huffman, Cupp,
McColley, & LaRe*

Freda J. Levenson (0045916)
*Counsel of Record
ACLU of OHIO FOUNDATION, INC.
4506 Chester Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44103
(614) 586-1792
flevenson@acluohio.org

David J. Carey (0088787)
ACLU of OHIO FOUNDATION, INC.
1108 City Park Ave., Suite 203
Columbus, OH 43215
(614) 586-1972
dcarey@acluohio.org

Alora Thomas
Julie A. Ebenstein
**AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION
FOUNDATION**
125 Broad Street
New York, NY 10004
(212) 519-7866
athomas@aclu.org

Counsel for LWVO Petitioners

Legislative Respondents President Huffman, Speaker Cupp, Senator McColley, and Representative LaRe (hereinafter “Legislative Respondents”) file this joint response to Neiman Petitioners’ Motion for Leave to File Rebuttal Evidence and LWVO Petitioners’ Motion for Leave to File Rebuttal Evidence in Support of Petitioners’ Reply Brief, filed on June 1 and June 3, 2022, respectively. The Court should deny Petitioners’ Motions as it is not supported by good cause, and because Petitioners misconstrue Legislative Respondents’ arguments and the record in this case.

I. Petitioners’ Motions Misinterpret Legislative Respondents’ Argument that Petitioners’ Experts were not Subject to Meaningful Discovery.

Petitioners’ Motions both fundamentally misunderstand the nature of Legislative Respondents’ arguments regarding discovery in this case. First, Petitioners’ supplemental evidence is not rebuttal evidence because Legislative Respondents do not dispute the fact that written discovery occurred in this case. Contrary to Petitioners’ Motions, Legislative Respondents *recognize* that written discovery was served in this case. (*Cf.* Neiman Petitioners’ at Motion p 1; LWVO Petitioners’ Motion at p 1). Any contrary assertion is not rooted in fact or even an understanding of the case docket, considering that Legislative Respondents filed the written discovery as part of their evidence on April 25, 2022.

Instead, Legislative Respondents argue that Petitioners’ paid experts have not been subject to cross-examination via depositions, hearings, or other forms of meaningful discovery. *See* Legislative Respondents’ Br. at 15–16. A twenty-five-day discovery period does not give meaningful time to retain experts, have those experts thoroughly review Petitioners’ expert reports and accompanying complicated backup data, and produce a significant response. Such a schedule also does not allow for adequate time to conduct depositions, since depositions would need to take place after adequate evaluation of expert reports, and preparation of rebuttal reports. The twenty-

five-day discovery period here was made even more difficult by the timing: the month of April is the end of the year for most academics and experts that Legislative Respondents hoped to retain could not complete any, or a full scope of work in the time allotted, and in light of final exams and other end of the semester obligations.

Additionally, this is not the first time that Legislative Respondents have taken issue with the limited discovery timeframe provided by the Court as LWVO Petitioners claim. (*See* LWVO Petitioners' Motion at p 1). This issue was fully briefed in Legislative Respondents' Response to Petitioners' Motion for Scheduling Order, where Legislative Respondents specifically requested a full and fair opportunity to achieve meaningful discovery through a reasonable discovery period. (*See* Respondents Huffman and Cupp's Response to Motion for Scheduling Order at pp 6-9 (Mar. 22, 2022)). The Court denied Legislative Respondents' request and implemented the April 25, 2022 evidentiary submission deadline.¹ Legislative Respondents are particularly perplexed by the continued time constraints in the above-captioned consolidated matters in light of the fact that Petitioners have admitted that the 2022 congressional election is underway and cannot be altered. Legislative Respondents' concerns over the limited discovery in this action are not new and are properly before this Court.

¹ Petitioners also claim that Legislative Respondents violated this Court's April 25, 2022 deadline by submitting documents with Legislative Respondents' merits brief. (Neiman Petitioners' Motion at p 1; LWVO Petitioners' Motion at p 1). Not so. Exhibits 1 and 2 to Legislative Respondents' brief are matters of public record that could have merely been cited to, but were provided as exhibits for ease of review. This is no different than Petitioners filing copies of reports or other publicly available materials as appendices to their briefing, as both parties have routinely done. Furthermore, one of the exhibits, a tweet by Attorney Marc Elias was made only days before the briefing deadline. And as this Court has already made clear, it can rely on contemporaneous statements made during the course of this litigation. *See League of Women Voters of Ohio. v. Ohio Redistricting Commission*, Slip Opinion. No. 2022-Ohio-1727 ¶13 (O'Connor, C.J., concurring).

II. Under the Circumstances, Good Cause does not Exist and Petitioners' Motions Should be Denied.

Petitioners' request amounts to nothing more than a request to alter the current scheduling order. Generally, scheduling orders "may be modified only for good cause and with the court's consent" under Rule 16(B)(4) of the Ohio Rules of Civil Procedure. This Court has applied these principles to original actions that set evidentiary deadlines by which all evidence must be filed, requiring leave of Court to file supplemental evidence beyond that date. *See State ex rel. Gill-Llamas v. Hardin*, 164 Ohio St.3d 364, 2021-Ohio-1508, 172 N.E.3d 1998, ¶ 14.

Good cause does not exist to grant Petitioners' requested relief because, as previously explained *supra*, Petitioners fundamentally misinterpret Legislative Respondents' argument that Petitioners' experts were not subject to meaningful discovery. Petitioners' "rebuttal" evidence is mostly duplicative of evidence already submitted to this Court, and the only new evidence Petitioners offer, emails between counsel serving discovery, does not go to the merits of the constitutionality of the Second Plan. Therefore, Petitioners' "rebuttal" evidence is immaterial and unnecessary for the adjudication of this matter.

For the foregoing reasons, Respondents request that the Court deny Petitioners' Motion and disregard Petitioners' supplemental evidence.

Respectfully submitted this the 13th day of June, 2022

/s/ Phillip J. Strach
Phillip J. Strach (PHV 25444-2022)*
phillip.strach@nelsonmullins.com
Thomas A. Farr (PHV 25461-2022)*
tom.farr@nelsonmullins.com
John E. Branch, III (PHV 25460-2022)*
john.branch@nelsonmullins.com
Alyssa M. Riggins (PHV 25441-2022)*
alyssa.riggins@nelsonmullins.com
**NELSON MULLINS RILEY &
SCARBOROUGH LLP**

4140 Parklake Avenue, Suite 200
Raleigh, NC 27612
Telephone: 919-329-3800

W. Stuart Dornette (0002955)

dornette@taftlaw.com

Beth A. Bryan (0082076)

bryan@taftlaw.com

Philip D. Williamson (0097174)

pwilliamson@taftlaw.com

TAFT STETTINUS & HOLLISTER LLP

425 Walnut St., Suite 1800

Cincinnati, OH 45202-3957

Telephone: 513-381-2838

*Counsel for Respondents Huffman, Cupp,
McColley, and LaRe*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this the 13th day of June, 2022, I have served the foregoing document by email:

Abha Khanna
Ben Stafford
akhanna@elias.law
bstafford@elias.law

Jyoti Jasrasaria
Spencer W. Klein
Harleen K. Gambhir
Raisa Cramer
jjasrasaria@elias.law
sklein@elias.law
hgambhir@elias.law
rcramer@elias.law

Donald J. McTigue
Derek S. Clinger
dmctigue@electionlawgroup.com
dclinger@electionlawgroup.com

Counsel for Neiman Petitioners

Robert D. Fram
Donald Brown
David Denuyl
rfram@cov.com

Anupam Sharma
Yale Fu
asharma@cov.com
yfu@cov.com

James Smith
Sarah Suwanda
Alex Thomson
jmsmith@cov.com

Freda J. Levenson (0045916)
flevenson@acluohio.org

Julie M. Pfeiffer
Jonathan Blanton
Michael Walton
Allison Daniel
Jonathan.Blanton@OhioAGO.gov
Julie.Pfeiffer@OhioAGO.gov
Michael.Walton@OhioAGO.gov
Allison.Daniel@OhioAGO.gov

*Counsel for Secretary of State LaRose and
Auditor Faber*

Erik J. Clark
Ashley Merino
ejclark@organlegal.com
amerino@organlegal.com

*Counsel for Respondent
Ohio Redistricting Commission*

David Carey
dcarey@acluohio.org

Alora Thomas
Julie A. Ebenstein
athomas@aclu.org

Counsel for LWVO Petitioners

/s/ Phillip J. Strach
Phillip J. Strach (PHV 25444-2022)