1	D. Andrew Gaona (028414)				
2	Kristen Yost (034052) COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC				
	2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900 Phoenix, Arizona 85004				
	T: (602) 381-5478				
	agaona@cblawyers.com kyost@cblawyers.com				
5	Sambo (Bo) Dul (030313)				
6	STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER 8205 South Priest Drive, #10312 Tempe, Arizona 85284				
7					
8	T: (480) 253-9651 bo@statesuniteddemocracy.org				
9	9 Christine Bass *				
10	STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER 506 S. Spring Street, Suite #13308				
	Los Angeles, California 90013				
	T: (309) 242-8511 <a href="mailto:christinebass@statesuniteddemocracy.org">christinebass@statesuniteddemocracy.org</a> * Admitted Pro Hac Vice				
12					
13	Attorneys for Defendant				
14	Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs				
15					
16	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT			
17	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA				
18	Mi Familia Vota, et al.,	) No. 2:22-cv-00509-SRB			
19	Plaintiffs,	) ) DEFENDANT SECRETARY OF			
20		) STATE KATIE HOBBS' ANSWER			
21	V.	) TO PLAINTIFFS MI FAMILIA ) VOTA AND VOTO LATINO'S			
22	Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,	) SECOND AMENDED			
23	Defendants.	) COMPLAINT			
24					
25					
26					

1100036.4

1	Living United for Change in Arizona, et al.,	
2	Plaintiffs,	)
3	V.	)
4	Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as	)
5	Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,	)
6	Defendants.	)
7	Poder Latinx, et al.,	_)
8	Plaintiffs,	ĺ
9	ŕ	)
10	V.	)
11	Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,	)
12	Defendants.	)
13	II '4 1 C4 4 C A '	
14	United States of America,	
15	Plaintiff,	)
16	V.	)
17	Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as	)
18	Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,  Defendants.	)
19	Defendants.	)
20	Democratic National Committee, et al.,	
21	Plaintiffs,	)
22	v.	)
23	Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as	)
24	Arizona Secretary of State, et al.,	
25	Defendants.	ĺ
26		_)

Defendant Katie Hobbs, in her official capacity as Arizona Secretary of State ("Secretary") answers Plaintiffs Mi Familia Vota and Voto Latino (collectively "Plaintiffs") Second Amended Complaint ("SAC") [Doc. 65] as follows:

4

1

#### NATURE OF THE CASE

Responding to Paragraph 1 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs quote

5

1.

8

9

11

12 13

15

17

18 19

20

22 23

24

25

26

Wesberry v. Sanders, 376 U.S. 1, 17 (1964) and generally describe the nature of their claims in this action. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 1.

- 2. Responding to Paragraph 2 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that certain of Arizona's laws have been held in violation of federal law; that the State of Arizona has entered into an ongoing consent decree; that the categories of registered voters in Arizona include the following, among others: (1) those who registered pre-December 2004 and did not have to show documentary proof of citizenship who can vote in all elections, (2) those who registered post-December 2004 using either the state form or the federal form required by the NVRA and did not show documentary proof of citizenship who can vote only in federal elections, and (3) those who registered post-December 2004 and showed adequate proof of citizenship who can vote in all elections; that Arizona has allowed all voters to vote by mail for any reason since 1991; and that Plaintiffs describe some of the provisions in the consent decree in LULAC v. Reagan, No. 2:17-cv-04102-DGC (D. Ariz. June 18, 2018).
- 3. Responding to Paragraph 3 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that H.B. 2492 will prohibit registered voters who have not provided proof of citizenship as defined under Arizona law from voting in presidential elections or receiving an early ballot by mail, except registered voters who qualify as an absent uniformed service voter under UOCAVA. The Secretary also admits that H.B. 2492 requires the Attorney General to investigate and potentially prosecute registered voters who have not provided proof of citizenship; and that H.B. 2492 becomes effective on January 1, 2023. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form

a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 3.

- 4. Responding to Paragraph 4 of the SAC, the Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in the first three sentences. Responding to the remaining allegations in Paragraph 4, the Secretary admits that approximately 88% of Arizona voters who voted in the 2020 General Election voted early (either by mail or early in-person); that approximately 2 million voters voted early (either by mail or early in-person) in the 2016 General Election (about 75% of voters who voted in that election); that over one million Arizonans, or around half of the voters who participated in the election, used early mail voting in the 2008 General Election; and that in-person polling places have decreased over the last decade, but the Secretary affirmatively alleges that, while the number of polling places may have decreased, more counties now utilize a "vote center" model, under which larger voting locations are used and voters can vote at any voting location in the county, rather than only at their assigned polling place.
- 5. Responding to Paragraph 5 of the SAC, the Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in the first sentence. Responding to the remaining allegations in Paragraph 5, the Secretary admits that Arizona's early voting system is well tested and well established; that there is no evidence of widespread fraud in Arizona's elections, including the 2020 General Election; that the Secretary and other elected officials have publicly rejected false claims about the legitimacy of Arizona's 2020 General Election; and that Plaintiffs quote a portion of Governor Ducey's November 30, 2020 tweet.
- 6. Responding to Paragraph 6 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that multiple lawsuits and contests were brought by the Republican Party, former President Donald Trump's campaign, and their supporters that sought to cast doubt on the outcome of the 2020 General Election; that Arizona's state and federal courts rejected all those suits for many reasons; and that, in a case brought by the Arizona Republican Party to challenge the legitimacy of Maricopa

County's hand count audit, the Maricopa County Superior Court ordered the plaintiff and its counsel to pay the Secretary's attorneys' fees under A.R.S. § 12-349.

7. Responding to Paragraph 7 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that after H.B. 2492 takes effect many Arizonans will be required to submit additional documentation to continue voting in presidential elections and to continue receiving early ballots by mail; that Arizona already has numerous safeguards in place to limit voting in Arizona to United States citizens and to prevent fraud; and that Plaintiffs generally describe the relief they are seeking in this action. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 7.

#### **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

- 8. Responding to Paragraph 8 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs generally describe the nature of their claims, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the remaining allegations in Paragraph 8.
- 9. Responding to the allegations in Paragraph 9 of the SAC, The Secretary admits that Plaintiffs sent the Secretary notice of alleged violations of the NVRA on April 7, 2022, and Exhibit A to the SAC contains the notice provided to the Secretary and all correspondence between the parties thereafter.
  - 10. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 10.
  - 11. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 11.
- 12. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 12.
- 13. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 13.
  - 14. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 14.
  - 15. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 15.

# 

#### **PARTIES**

- 16. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 16.
- 17. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 17.
- 18. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 18.
- 19. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 19.
- 20. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 20.
- 21. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 21.
- 22. Responding to Paragraph 22 of the SAC, the Secretary denies that she "is charged with enforcing the new statutory provisions at issue here" and denies that she has taken any unlawful actions under color of state law. The Secretary admits that she is the Secretary of State of Arizona and the Chief Elections Officer for Arizona; that she is "responsible for coordination of state responsibilities under the national voter registration act of 1993"; and that she has the authority to promulgate certain rules and procedures for elections, including rules and regulations pertaining to voter registration through the Elections Procedures Manual, which is subject to approval by the Governor and Attorney General. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 22.
- 23. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 23.
  - 24. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about

1	the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 24.		
2	25.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 25.	
3	26.	Responding to Paragraph 26 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that David W.	
4	Stevens is the Cochise County Recorder.		
5	27.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 27.	
6	28.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 28.	
7	29.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 29.	
8	30.	Responding to Paragraph 30 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Sharie	
9	Milheiro is the Greenlee County Recorder.		
10	31.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 31.	
11	32.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 32.	
12	33.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 33.	
13	34.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 34.	
14	35.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 35.	
15	36.	The Secretary denies the allegations in Paragraph 36.	
16	37.	The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 37.	
17	38.	The Secretary denies the allegations in Paragraph 38.	
18	39.	The Secretary denies the allegations in Paragraph 39.	
19		STATEMENT OF FACTS	
20	40.	Responding to Paragraph 40 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Arizona has	
21	a history of restrictions and impediments on the right to vote and that Arizona's election laws		
22	have been the subject of repeated litigation. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information		
23	sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 40.		
24	41.	Responding to Paragraph 41 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that in 2004	

Arizona voters adopted Proposition 200, which amended the state's election code to require

county recorders to "reject any application for registration that is not accompanied by

25

satisfactory evidence of United States citizenship"; that the U.S. Supreme Court held in 2013 that the NVRA precluded Arizona from requiring applicants who used the NVRA's federal form to submit information beyond that required by the form itself; and that Plaintiffs quote portions of *Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U.S. 1, 2 (2006) and *Arizona v. Inter Tribal Council of Ariz.*, *Inc.*, 570 U.S. 1, 15 (2013).

- 42. Responding to Paragraph 42 of the SAC, the Secretary admits the allegations in the first sentence. Responding to the second sentence in Paragraph 42, the Secretary admits that Arizona's bifurcated voter registration system as implemented by then-Secretary of State Ken Bennett was in place from 2013 until it was modified pursuant to the LULAC consent decree in 2018.
- 43. Responding to Paragraph 43 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Arizona has the following categories of registered voters, among others: (1) those who registered pre-December 2004 and did not have to show documentary proof of citizenship who can vote in all elections, (2) those who registered post-December 2004 using the state form or the federal form required by the NVRA and did not show documentary proof of citizenship who can vote only in federal elections, and (3) those who registered post-December 2004 and showed adequate proof of citizenship who can vote in all elections. The Secretary also admits that Arizona has allowed all voters to vote by mail for any reason since 1991.
- 44. Responding to Paragraph 44 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that litigation over Arizona's voter registration laws and procedures was filed in *LULAC v. Reagan*, No. 2:17-cv-04102-DGC, and that Plaintiffs generally describe certain facts set forth in the consent decree in that case. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 44.
- 45. Responding to Paragraph 45 of the SAC, the Secretary admits the allegations in the first sentence. Responding to the remaining allegations in Paragraph 45, the Secretary admits that the parties in *LULAC v. Reagan*, No. 2:17-cv-04102-DGC entered into a consent

decree to end the litigation and that Plaintiffs generally describe some of the terms of the consent decree. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 45.

- 46. Responding to Paragraph 46 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that, as of August 2, 2022, approximately 35,000 Arizonans are registered to vote as "federal-only" voters without having provided documentary proof of citizenship. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 46.
- 47. Responding to Paragraph 47 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that early voting is popular among Arizona voters; that Arizona has allowed all voters to vote early by mail without a reason or "excuse" for doing so since 1991; that over one million Arizonans, or around half of the voters who participated in the election, used early mail voting in the 2008 General Election; that approximately 2 million voters voted early (either by mail or early inperson) in the 2016 General Election (about 75% of voters who voted in that election); and that approximately 3 million voters voted early (either by mail or early in-person) in the 2020 General Election (about 88% of Arizona voters who voted in that election). The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 47.
- 48. Responding to Paragraph 48 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs describe the findings in the cited report that Arizona has 320 fewer polling places than it did in 2012 and has had "the most widespread reduction" in polling places. The Secretary notes, however, that while the number of polling places may have decreased, more counties now utilize a "vote center" model, under which larger voting locations are used and voters can vote at any voting location in the county, rather than only at their assigned polling place. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 48.

50. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 50.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 51. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 51.
- 52. Responding to Paragraph 52 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs quote a portion of a letter from Clint Hickman of the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors.
  - 53. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 53.
- 54. Responding to Paragraph 54 of the SAC, the Secretary admits the allegations in the first three sentences, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the last sentence.
  - 55. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 55.
  - 56. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 56.
  - 57. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 57.
- 58. Responding to Paragraph 58 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that some Republican officials in Arizona have animated disproven claims of fraud in Arizona's elections that undermine confidence in the elections process, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 58.
- 59. Responding to Paragraph 59 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that the 26 Legislature passed S.B. 1003 and S.B. 1485 during the 2021 legislative session, and lacks

knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 59.

- 60. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 60.
- 61. Responding to Paragraph 61 of the SAC, the Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in the first sentence. Responding to the remaining allegations in Paragraph 61, admits that Plaintiffs generally describe certain provisions in H.B. 2492.
- 62. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 62.
- 63. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 63.
- 64. Responding to Paragraph 64 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Arizona has allowed voters to vote by mail for any reason since 1991, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 64.
- 65. Responding to Paragraph 65 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that H.B. 2492 contains notice provisions only for new voter registration applicants who register without providing documentary proof of citizenship, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 65.
- 66. Responding to Paragraph 66 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Arizona's bifurcated voter registration system has resulted in allegations of disenfranchisement and an ongoing consent decree, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 66.
- 67. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 67.
- 68. Responding to Paragraph 68 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that H.B. 2492 subjects potential voters to referral for investigation by the Attorney General or County

- 69. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 69.
- 70. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 70.
- 71. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 71.
- 72. Responding to Paragraph 72 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs quote a portion of a statement attributed to Rep. Jake Hoffman in the cited article, and lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 72.
- 73. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 73.
- 74. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 74.
- 75. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 75.

## 

### 

# 

## 

## 

# 

## 

## 

## 

#### 

### 

### 

## 

#### **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

#### **COUNT I**

# Unjustifiable Burden on the Right to Vote U.S. Const. Amend. I, XIV, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (As to all Defendants)

- 76. The Secretary incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 77. Responding to Paragraph 77 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs generally describe the test set forth in *Burdick v. Takushi*, 504 U.S. 428, 434 (1992) and *Anderson v. Celebrezze*, 460 U.S. 780, 789 (1983).
- 78. Responding to Paragraph 78 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs quote portions of *Crawford v. Marion Cnty. Election Bd.*, 553 U.S. 181, 191 (2008).
- 79. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 79.
- 80. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 80.

#### **COUNT II**

# Denial of Procedural Due Process U.S. Const. Amend. XIV, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (As to all Defendants)

- 81. The Secretary incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 82. Responding to Paragraph 82 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs generally describe the procedural due process test set forth in *Ariz. Democratic Party v. Hobbs*, 18 F.4th 1179, 1195 (9th Cir. 2021).
- 83. Responding to Paragraph 83 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that the right to vote is a fundamental constitutional right and that Plaintiffs quote various cases. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining

allegations in Paragraph 83.

- 84. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 84.
- 85. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 85.

#### COUNT III

# Disparate Treatment in Violation of the Right to Equal Protection U.S. Const. Amend. XIV, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (As to all Defendants)

- 86. The Secretary incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 87. Responding to Paragraph 87 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs quote a portion of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.
- 88. Responding to Paragraph 88 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs quote portions of *City of Cleburne v. Cleburn Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432, 439 (1985) and *Bush v. Gore*, 531 U.S. 98, 104-05 (2000), and generally describe the test set forth in *Dudum v. Arntz*, 640 F.3d 1098, 1106 n.15 (9th Cir. 2011).
- 89. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 89.
- 90. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 90.
- 91. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 91.
- 92. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 92.

## 

## 

## 

## 

#### **COUNT IV**

#### National Voter Registration Act of 1993 52 U.S.C. §§ 20505, 20507, 20508, 20510 (As to Defendants Hobbs and the County Recorders)

- 93. The Secretary incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 94. Responding to Paragraph 94 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs generally describe portions of the NVRA.
- 95. Responding to Paragraph 95 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs quote a portion of the NVRA.
- 96. Responding to Paragraph 96 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that, in her view as the Chief Election Officer for the State of Arizona, certain provisions of H.B. 2492 conflict with the NVRA, including by prohibiting county election officials from registering otherwise eligible voters to vote in federal elections using the Federal Form unless they provide documentary proof of residence and documentary proof of citizenship. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 96.
- 97. Responding to Paragraph 97 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that, in her view as the Chief Election Officer for the State of Arizona, certain provisions of H.B. 2492 conflict with the NVRA, including by prohibiting voters who register with the Federal Form and do not provide proof of citizenship from voting in presidential elections. The Secretary further admits that Plaintiffs quote a portion of *Inter Tribal Council of Arizona*, 570 U.S. at 15. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 97.
- 98. Responding to Paragraph 98 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs generally describe Section 20510(b) of the NVRA. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 98.

99. Responding to Paragraph 99 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs sent the Secretary notice of alleged violations of the NVRA on April 7, 2022, and Exhibit A to the SAC contains the notice provided to the Secretary and all correspondence between the parties thereafter.

#### **COUNT V**

#### Materiality Provision of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(B) (As to all Defendants)

- 100. The Secretary incorporates by reference all preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
- 101. Responding to Paragraph 101 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that Plaintiffs generally describe portions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and qualifications for eligibility to vote under Arizona law.
- 102. Responding to Paragraph 102 of the SAC, the Secretary admits that when a voter registration application is accompanied by documentary proof of citizenship or the county recorder is able to acquire proof of citizenship for the applicant from Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) records, whether the applicant fails to mark the "yes" box next to the citizenship question "is not material to Arizona determining whether they qualify to vote under State law." Therefore, the Secretary admits that, in her view as the Chief Election Officer for the State of Arizona, H.B. 2492 conflicts with the Materiality Provision in 52 U.S.C. § 10101(a)(2)(B) to the extent that it requires rejection of a voter registration application if the applicant does not mark the "yes" box next to the citizenship question even where election officials already have adequate evidence of the applicant's citizenship.
  - 103. The Secretary admits the allegations in Paragraph 103.
- 104. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 104.
  - 105. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about

1	the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 105.			
2	106. The Secretary lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about			
3	the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 106.			
4	107. The Secretary denies each and every allegation in the SAC that is not specifically			
5	admitted herein, including (i) any implied allegations, inferences, or characterizations no			
6	specifically admitted, and (ii) any and all allegations stated or implied in unnumbere			
7	paragraphs, footnotes, and headings.			
8	PRAYER FOR RELIEF			
9	108. Responding to Plaintiffs' prayer for relief, the Secretary states that, other that			
0	providing her view on certain provisions as Arizona's Chief Election Officer, she takes no			
1	position regarding the ultimate merits of Plaintiffs' claims against the challenged laws an			
2	Plaintiffs' request for substantive relief in the form of a declaratory judgment and a permaner			
13	injunction. The Secretary denies that Plaintiffs should be entitled to an award of their cost			
4	expenses, and reasonable attorneys' fees as against her.			
5	Respectfully submitted this 16th day of September, 2022.			
6	COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC			
17	By /s/ D. Andrew Gaona			
8	By <u>/s/ D. Andrew Gaona</u> D. Andrew Gaona Kristen Yost			
9	Teriston 1 ost			
20	STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER			
21	Sambo (Bo) Dul Christine Bass *			
22	*Admitted Pro Hac Vice			
23				
24	Attorney for Defendant Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs			
25				
26				