

1 Kory Langhofer (#024722)  
2 Thomas Basile (#031150)  
3 STATECRAFT LAW PLLC  
4 649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor  
5 Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
6 Telephone: 602.382.4078  
7 E-Mail: kory@statecraftlaw.com  
8 tom@statecraftlaw.com

9 Joseph Kanefield (#015838)  
10 Tracy A. Olson (#034616)  
11 Vanessa Pomeroy (#037673)  
12 SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.  
13 One East Washington Street  
14 Suite 2700  
15 Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
16 Telephone: 602.382.6000  
17 E-Mail: jkanefield@swlaw.com  
18 tolson@swlaw.com  
19 vpomeroy@swlaw.com

20 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

WARREN PETERSEN, in his official  
capacity as President of the Arizona Senate;  
BEN TOMA, in his official capacity as  
Speaker of the Arizona House of  
Representatives,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ADRIAN FONTES, in his official capacity  
as Arizona Secretary of State,

Defendant.

No.

**VERIFIED SPECIAL ACTION  
COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

Plaintiffs bring this verified special action complaint and hereby allege as follows:

**SUMMARY OF THE CASE**

1. "The legislature has the exclusive power to declare what the law shall be."

*State v. Prentiss*, 163 Ariz. 81, 85 (1989); *see also* Ariz. Const. art. IV.



1           8.       The Legislature has institutional interests in defending the proper scope of  
2 authority delegated to other branches of government, including the Secretary. *See Biggs v.*  
3 *Cooper*, 236 Ariz. 415, 418 ¶ 11 (2014) (citing with approval U.S. Supreme Court reasoning  
4 that found the Legislature had an interest in “maintaining the effectiveness” of a vote); *see*  
5 *also* A.R.S. § 12-1832; *Ariz. Pub. Integrity Alliance v. Fontes*, 250 Ariz. 58, 62 ¶¶ 10–11  
6 (2020); *Ariz. State Legislature v. Ariz. Indep. Redistricting Comm’n*, 576 U.S. 787, 803–04  
7 (2015); *Priorities USA v. Nessel*, 978 F.3d 976, 980–81 (6th Cir. 2020) (“Denying the  
8 legislature standing to defend its own law would allow the state executive to nullify a state  
9 statute without any ultimate judicial determination.”).

10           9.       By acting in excess of his statutory authority or acting in conflict with  
11 statutory provisions, the Secretary’s promulgation of the EPM causes the Legislature  
12 institutional injury because it impedes the implementation of a validly enacted law and  
13 purports to exercise power that the Constitution entrusts exclusively to the legislative  
14 branch. *See Biggs*, 236 Ariz. 415, ¶ 9 (reasoning institutional legislative injury is present if  
15 an executive action, a veto, “improperly overrides a validly enacted law”). Courts have  
16 described institutional injuries to the Legislature to include “disruption of the legislative  
17 process,” “a usurpation of [legislative] authority,” “nullification of votes” or an intrusion  
18 into the Legislature’s constitutionally assigned role. *See Tenn. Gen. Assembly v. United*  
19 *States Dep’t of State*, 931 F.3d 499, 508, 514 (6th Cir. 2019); *Ariz. State Legislature*, 576  
20 U.S. at 803–04; *see also Coleman v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 433, 438 (1939); *U.S. House of*  
21 *Representatives v. Burwell*, 130 F. Supp. 3d 53, 67 (D.C. Cir. 2015); *Cochise Cnty. v.*  
22 *Kirschner*, 171 Ariz. 258, 261–62 (App. 1992); (“Any excursion by an administrative body  
23 beyond the legislative guidelines is treated as an usurpation of constitutional powers vested  
24 only in the major branch of government.”).

25           10.       As leaders of the Arizona Legislature, the Speaker and President have  
26 authority to take legal action to prevent institutional injuries to the Legislature. State of  
27 Arizona, *Senate Rules*, 56th Legislature 2023-2024, Rule 2(N), <https://bit.ly/3WXFLDv>  
28 (authorizing the President “to bring or assert in any forum on behalf of the Senate any claim

1 or right arising out of any injury to the Senate’s powers or duties under the constitution or  
2 laws of this state”); State of Arizona, *Rules of the Ariz. House of Representatives*, 56th  
3 Legislature 2023-2024, Rule 4(K), <https://bit.ly/3HuL9bz> (authorizing the Speaker to do  
4 the same on behalf of the Arizona House of Representatives); Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 2, § 8  
5 (authorizing each house of the Legislature to “determine its own rules of procedure”).

6 11. There is a controversy between the parties concerning the lawfulness of  
7 certain provisions of the Secretary’s 2023 EPM and a judgment of the Court will resolve  
8 that controversy. The Secretary’s 2023 EPM poses an existing and ongoing threat to the  
9 application of existing conflicting statutes. Thus, Plaintiffs have a real and present need to  
10 know whether the offending provisions of the 2023 EPM are facially valid.

11 12. Plaintiffs lack an equally plain, speedy and adequate remedy at law to compel  
12 the Secretary to act consistent with controlling statutory law. In the alternative, special  
13 action relief thus is necessary to ensure that the EPM aligns with the statutes that created it.  
14 *See* Ariz. R. Spec. Action P. 3(b).

### 15 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

16 13. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Article 6, § 14 of the  
17 Arizona Constitution, A.R.S. §§ 12-123, 12-1801, 12-1831, and Arizona Rule of Special  
18 Action Procedure 3(a)–(b).

19 14. Venue lies in Maricopa County pursuant to A.R.S. § 12-401(16) and Arizona  
20 Rule of Special Action Procedure 4(b) because Defendant resides and holds office in  
21 Maricopa County.

22 15. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant.

### 23 GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

24 16. The Arizona Legislature is constitutionally vested with the authority to enact  
25 “laws to secure the purity of elections and guard against abuses of the elective franchise.”  
26 Ariz. Const. art. 7, § 12.

27 17. To that end, the Legislature has enacted laws in Title 16 and 19 related to  
28 elections, electors, and initiative, referendum, and recall measures.



1           25. On August 14, 2023, Plaintiffs submitted a public comment objecting to  
2 various provisions of the EPM on grounds that those provisions were in conflict with  
3 Arizona statutes or otherwise exceeded the Secretary’s authority.<sup>2</sup>

4           26. On September 30, 2023, the Secretary published a 268-page updated draft  
5 EPM and transmitted the same to the Governor and Attorney General for their review and  
6 approval under A.R.S. § 16-452.

7           27. On Saturday, December 30, 2023, (the penultimate day to finalize a draft),  
8 the Secretary published the “final” EPM, now 385 pages, which includes multiple  
9 provisions that were not present in the July or September drafts, with the approval of the  
10 Governor and Attorney General. On January 11, 2024, the Secretary published an updated  
11 “final” EPM, correcting and adding dates in Chapter 15 (hereinafter referred to as the “2023  
12 EPM”).

13           28. A true and accurate copy of the 2023 EPM is attached as **Exhibit 1**.

14           29. Several provisions of the 2023 EPM are problematic, including ones that were  
15 never published for public comment and added last minute, on information and belief by  
16 request of the Governor and/or Attorney General.

17           30. The 2023 EPM includes several references to ongoing litigation. In instances  
18 where rulings align with the Secretary’s policy’s preferences, the EPM incorporates non-  
19 final and non-injunctive rulings from ongoing legal proceedings. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1 at 3 n.5,  
20 12 n.8–9, 14 n.11, 15 n.13–15, 22 n.19–20, 40 n.25–26, 41 n.27 (rulings in *Mi Familia Vota*  
21 *v. Fontes*, D. Ariz. docket no. CV-22-00509-PHX-SRB). In other instances, the Secretary  
22 merely cites to the existence of litigation, without incorporating the rulings. *See, e.g.*, Ex. 1  
23 at 83 n.42 (not incorporating substantive rulings in *Arizona Free Enterprise Club v. Fontes*,  
24 Yavapai County Super. Ct. docket no. S1300CV2023-00202, stating only that “litigation is  
25 pending on this issue”).

26  
27  
28 <sup>2</sup> [https://www.azsenaterepublicans.com/\\_files/ugd/2f3470\\_68a6d97b7c1645bd985057ffde62836b.pdf](https://www.azsenaterepublicans.com/_files/ugd/2f3470_68a6d97b7c1645bd985057ffde62836b.pdf)



1 the person is not a resident of the county. *Before the county recorder cancels*  
2 *a registration pursuant to this subdivision*, the county recorder shall send  
3 the person notice by forwardable mail and a postage prepaid preaddressed  
4 return form requesting the person confirm by signing under penalty of  
5 perjury that the person is a resident of the county and is not knowingly  
6 registered to vote in another county or another state. *The notice shall inform*  
7 *the person that failure to return the form within thirty-five days will result*  
8 *in the person's registration being canceled. If the person fails to return the*  
9 *notice within thirty-five days the county recorder shall cancel the person's*  
10 *registration.*

7 (emphasis added).

8 36. Thus, the 2023 EPM's direction in Chapter 1, Section 9, Subsection C(1)  
9 directly conflicts with the plain language of A.R.S. § 16-165(A)(9).

### 10 **Investigations of Citizenship Status Rule**

11 37. In Chapter 1, Section 9, Subsection C(2)(a) (County Recorders' Duty to  
12 Cancel Registrant Information: Information that a Person Registered Is Not a United States  
13 Citizen – Obtaining Non-Citizenship Information), the 2023 EPM states that although there  
14 are “several ways in which a County Recorder may obtain information pursuant to A.R.S.  
15 § 16-165 that a registrant is not a U.S. Citizen[. . .] third-party allegations of non-  
16 citizenship are not enough to initiate this process.” Ex. 1 at 42.

17 38. However, A.R.S. § 16-165(I) states that the county recorder should initiate  
18 this process when he or she “has reason to believe [the person is] not [a] United States  
19 citizen[.]”

20 39. The plain language of this provision does not exclude third-party allegations  
21 if the allegation provides the county recorder with a reason to believe the applicant is not a  
22 U.S. citizen.

23 40. Thus, the 2023 EPM's direction in Chapter 1, Section 9, Subsection C(2)(a)  
24 directly conflicts with the plain language of A.R.S. § 16-165(I).

### 25 **AEVL Effective Date Rule**

26 41. In Chapter 2 (Early Voting), Section 1 (Ballot-by-Mail), Subsection B(7)  
27 (Requests to be Placed on the Active Early Voting List: Removal from the AEVL), the 2023  
28 EPM discusses Senate Bill (“S.B.”) 1485's new statutory requirement (A.R.S. § 16-



1 544(H)(4)) that requires the county recorder to send Active Early Voting List (“AEVL”) removal notices after the voter fails to vote in any election in two consecutive election cycles. Ex. 1 at 61–62.

2  
3  
4 42. The 2023 EPM directs that “[b]ecause the 2022 election cycle began before 5 S.B. 1485 (2022)[<sup>3</sup>] took effect and S.B. 1485 does not apply retroactively, the first two full 6 election cycles after S.B. 1485’s effective date are the 2024 and 2026 election cycles. 7 Therefore, the first AEVL removal notices must be sent out by January 15, 2027 to AEVL 8 voters who vote by early ballot in zero eligible elections in the 2024 and 2026 election 9 cycles.” Ex. 1 at 61 n.34.

10 43. However, because A.R.S. § 16-544(H)(4) became effective during the 2022 11 election cycle, the registrant’s subsequent voting (or non-voting) in the 2022 and 2024 12 election cycles must be given full effect and the AEVL removal notices must be sent out in 13 2025.

14 44. Thus, the 2023 EPM’s direction in Chapter 2, Section 1, Subsection B(7) 15 directly conflicts with the plain language of A.R.S. § 16-544.

### 16 **Validity of Circulator Registrations Rule**

17 45. In Chapter 6 (Regulation of Petition Circulators), Section 2 (Circulator 18 Registration Procedures), Subsection C (Circulator Registration Procedures), the 2023 EPM 19 states that “[t]he requirement to list certain information on the circulator portal does not 20 mean that a circulator’s signatures shall be disqualified if the circulator makes a mistake or 21 inconsistency in listing that information (e.g., a phone number or email address that is 22 entered incorrectly; a residential address that doesn’t match the residential address listed on 23 that circulator’s petition sheets; etc.).” Ex. 1 at 119 n.58.

24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>3</sup> Although the 2023 EPM indicates that S.B. 1485 was passed in 2022, it was actually 28 passed by the Fifty-Fifth Legislature, First Regular Session in 2021 and signed by Governor Ducey on May 11, 2021. 2021 Ariz. Legis. Serv. Ch. 359 (2021). S.B. 1485 became effective on September 29, 2021. <https://www.azleg.gov/general-effective-dates/>.





1 *the person that failure to return the form within thirty-five days will result*  
2 *in the person's registration being canceled. If the person fails to return the*  
3 *notice within thirty-five days the county recorder shall cancel the person's*  
4 *registration.*

(emphasis added).

5 58. This provision of the 2023 EPM conflicts with A.R.S. § 16-165(A)(9) because  
6 under the same circumstances, the 2023 EPM allows the county recorder to place a voter  
7 on the inactive list while the statute *requires* that the county recorder cancel the registration.

8 59. If an “EPM provision . . . directly conflicts with the express and mandatory  
9 provisions of” a statute, “it exceeds the scope of its statutory authorization and is therefore  
10 void.” *Ariz. All. for Retired Ams., Inc. v. Crosby*, 537 P.3d 818, 823–24 (Ariz. App. 2023);  
11 *see also Leibsohn v. Hobbs*, 254 Ariz. 1, 7 ¶ 22 (2022) (“[A]n EPM regulation that  
12 contradicts statutory requirements does not have the force of law.”); Ariz. R. Special Action  
13 Proc. 3(b).

14 60. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that this Court declare Non-Residency of Juror  
15 Questionnaire Rule void, and award special action and injunctive relief to enjoin the  
16 implementation of the same.

## 17 COUNT II

### 18 **Investigations of Citizenship Status Rule Conflicts with Statute (Special Action, Declaratory, and Injunctive Relief)**

19 **(Ariz. R. Special Action P. 3; A.R.S. §§ 12-1831, 16-165; Ariz. R. Civ. P. 65)**

20 61. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set  
21 forth herein.

22 62. Chapter 1, Section 9, Subsection C(2)(a) of the 2023 EPM states that although  
23 there are “several ways in which a County Recorder may obtain information pursuant to  
24 A.R.S. § 16-165 that a registrant is not a U.S. Citizen[, . . .] third-party allegations of non-  
25 citizenship are not enough to initiate this process.” Ex. 1 at 42.

26 63. However, A.R.S. § 16-165(I) states that the county recorder should initiate  
27 this process when he or she “has reason to believe [the person is] not [a] United States  
28 citizen[.]”



1           71. Chapter 2, Section 1, Subsection B(7) of the 2023 EPM directs that “[b]ecause  
2 the 2022 election cycle began before S.B. 1485 (2022) took effect and S.B. 1485 does not  
3 apply retroactively, the first two full election cycles after S.B. 1485’s effective date are the  
4 2024 and 2026 election cycles. Therefore, the first AEVL removal notices must be sent out  
5 by January 15, 2027 to AEVL voters who vote by early ballot in zero eligible elections in  
6 the 2024 and 2026 election cycles.” Ex. 1 at 61 n. 34.

7           72. A.R.S. 16-544(H)(4) requires the recorder to send an early ballot by mail to a  
8 voter who has registered for the AEVL, unless the voter “fails to vote an early ballot in all  
9 elections for two consecutive elections cycles.”

10          73. The term “‘election’ means any regular primary or regular general election  
11 for which there was a federal race on the ballot or for which a city or town candidate primary  
12 or first election or city or town candidate second, general or runoff election was on the  
13 ballot” and does not apply to special taxing district elections under A.R.S. § 16-191 or  
14 special district mail ballot elections under title 16, chapter 4, article 8.1. A.R.S. § 16-  
15 544(H)(4).

16          74. A.R.S. § 16-544(H)(4) became effective in September of 2021, mid-way  
17 through the 2022 election cycle.

18          75. However, upon the law’s effective date, several qualifying elections remained  
19 outstanding, most notably, the 2022 primary and general elections.<sup>4</sup>

20          76. Accordingly, voters still had an opportunity to vote in any one of the several  
21 elections in 2022 and 2024 after the law’s effective date to avoid receiving an AEVL  
22 removal notice in 2025.

23          77. “In Arizona, it is conclusively settled that laws are not retroactive simply  
24 because they relate to past events.” *Anderson v. Indus. Comm’n of Ariz.*, 306 Ariz. 411, 413  
25 ¶ 9 (App. 2003).

26  
27  
28 <sup>4</sup> <https://www.azcleanelections.gov/arizona-elections/past-election-list>

1 78. Rather, “any right conferred by statute may be taken away by statute before  
2 it has become vested.” *Id.* ¶¶ 9-12 (reasoning that so long as individual had notice to change  
3 conduct before losing rights, a law can change the consequences of a future event on a  
4 vested right).

5 79. Moreover, the voter is not removed from the AEVL list until he or she fails  
6 to respond to the notice triggered by the voter’s absence in two election cycles.

7 80. Thus, predicating the issuance of an AEVL renewal notice on a registrant’s  
8 subsequent voting (or non-voting) in the 2022 and 2024 election cycles does not constitute  
9 a “retroactive” application of the statute and the AEVL removal notices must be sent out no  
10 later than January 15, 2025.

11 81. As a result, the 2023 EPM’s direction in Chapter 2, Section 1, Subsection  
12 B(7) directly conflicts with the plain language of A.R.S. § 16-544.

13 82. If an “EPM provision . . . directly conflicts with the express and mandatory  
14 provisions of” a statute, “it exceeds the scope of its statutory authorization and is therefore  
15 void.” *Ariz. All. for Retired Ams., Inc.*, 537 P.3d at 823–24 ¶ 18; *see also Leibsohn*, 254  
16 *Ariz.* at 7 ¶ 22 (“[A]n EPM regulation that contradicts statutory requirements does not have  
17 the force of law.”); *Ariz. R. Special Action Proc.* 3(b).

18 83. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that this Court declare the AEVL Effective  
19 Date Rule void, and award special action and injunctive relief to enjoin the implementation  
20 of the same.

21 **COUNT IV**  
22 **Validity of Circulator Registrations Rule Conflicts with Statute**  
23 **(Special Action, Declaratory, and Injunctive Relief)**  
24 **(Ariz. R. Special Action P. 3; A.R.S. §§ 12-1831, 19-102.01, 19-118; Ariz. R. Civ. P.**  
25 **65)**

26 84. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set  
27 forth herein.

28 85. Chapter 6, Section 2, Subsection C of the 2023 EPM states that “[t]he  
requirement to list certain information on the circulator portal does not mean that a

1 circulator’s signatures shall be disqualified if the circulator makes a mistake or  
2 inconsistency in listing that information (e.g., a phone number or email address that is  
3 entered incorrectly; a residential address that doesn’t match the residential address listed on  
4 that circulator’s petition sheets; etc.)” Ex. 1 at 119 n.58.

5 86. However, A.R.S. § 19-118(B) requires that the circulator must submit his or  
6 her “full name, residence address, telephone number and email address” and an affidavit  
7 that “all of the information provided *is correct* to the best of my knowledge.” (emphasis  
8 added).

9 87. “[S]tatutory requirements for statewide initiative measures must be strictly  
10 construed and persons using the initiative process must strictly comply with those []  
11 statutory requirement.” A.R.S. § 19-102.01(A).

12 88. The 2023 EPM’s direction in Chapter 6, Section 2, Subsection C that the  
13 Secretary may overlook mistakes in a circulator’s registration, directly conflicts with the  
14 plain language of A.R.S. §§ 19-102.01(A) and 19-118(B).

15 89. If an “EPM provision . . . directly conflicts with the express and mandatory  
16 provisions of” a statute, “it exceeds the scope of its statutory authorization and is therefore  
17 void.” *Ariz. All. for Retired Ams., Inc.*, 537 P.3d at 823–24 ¶ 18; *see also Leibsohn*, 254  
18 *Ariz.* at 7 ¶ 22 (“[A]n EPM regulation that contradicts statutory requirements does not have  
19 the force of law.”); *Ariz. R. Special Action Proc.* 3(b).

20 90. Accordingly, Plaintiffs request that this Court declare the Validity of  
21 Circulator Registrations Rule void, and award special action and injunctive relief to enjoin  
22 the implementation of the same.



1 **COUNT V**  
2 **Duty to Canvass Rules Are Ultra Vires and Conflict with Statute**  
3 **(Special Action, Declaratory, and Injunctive Relief)**  
4 **(Ariz. R. Special Action P. 3; A.R.S. §§ 12-1831, 16-642, 16-643, 16-646; Ariz. R. Civ.**  
5 **P. 65)**

6 91. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the foregoing allegations as if fully set  
7 forth herein.

8 92. Chapter 13, Section 2, Subsection A(2) of the 2023 EPM states that “the  
9 Board of Supervisors has a non-discretionary duty to canvass the returns as provided by the  
10 County Recorder or other officer in charge of elections and has no authority to change vote  
11 totals, reject the election results, or delay certifying results without express statutory  
12 authority or court order.” Ex. 1 at 248.

13 93. Moreover, Chapter 13, Section 2, Subsection B(2) of the 2023 EPM states  
14 that “Secretary of State has a non-discretionary duty to canvass the returns” but “[i]f the  
15 official canvass of any county has not been received by [the] deadline, the Secretary of State  
16 must proceed with the state canvass without including the votes of the missing county.” Ex.  
17 1 at 252.

18 94. The canvassing, or the scope of a legislative or executive official’s duty to  
19 canvass, an election is not a topic that the Secretary is statutorily authorized to include in  
20 the EPM. *See* A.R.S. § 16-452.

21 95. “[A]n EPM regulation that exceeds the scope of its statutory authorization or  
22 contravenes an election statute’s purpose does not have the force of law.” *Leach*, 250 Ariz.  
23 at 576 ¶ 20.

24 96. Thus, these provisions of the EPM are outside the statutory delegation and  
25 cannot carry the force of law.

26 97. To hold otherwise would empower the Secretary to prescribe entirely new  
27 criminal requirements, equivalent to lawmaking. *See* A.R.S. § 16-452(C) (establishing that  
28 violations of the EPM constitutes a class 2 misdemeanor); *see also Prentiss*, 163 Ariz. at 85

1 (“The legislature has the exclusive power to declare what the law shall be . . . . [and]  
2 determines what is a crime . . . .”).

3 98. Making matters worse, these provisions conflict with the plain language of  
4 Arizona law.

5 99. Arizona law requires the Board to conduct a canvass by a certain deadline.  
6 A.R.S. §§ 16-642, 16-646.

7 100. Related to the county board’s duty to canvass, while canvass is not defined,  
8 the statute does indicate that the duty to canvass empowers the Board to “determin[e] the  
9 vote of the county.” A.R.S. § 16-643.

10 101. By empowering the Board to “determin[e] the vote,” the statute contemplates  
11 that there may be circumstances in which the Board is not necessarily required to accept the  
12 returns in the form provided by the elections director or vote in a certain way regarding  
13 accuracy of returns.

14 102. To be sure, a Board cannot *abuse* its discretion and reject otherwise valid and  
15 accurate results, but its duty to canvass does not require it to blindly accept the returns if  
16 legitimate concerns are present.

17 103. Thus, the 2023 EPM’s direction in Chapter 13, Section 2, Subsection A(2)  
18 directly conflicts with the plain language of A.R.S. §§ 16-642, 16-643, 16-646.

19 104. Related to the Secretary’s duty to canvass, A.R.S. § 16-648(C) states that “[i]f  
20 the official canvass of any county has not been received on the fourth Monday following  
21 the general election, the canvass shall be postponed from day to day, *not to exceed thirty*  
22 *days from the date of the election, until canvasses from all counties are received.*”  
23 (emphasis added)

24 105. Because the statute requires both a timely and complete canvass, the 2023  
25 EPM’s unilateral instruction in Chapter 13, Section 2, Subsection B(2) that the Secretary  
26 can or should proceed without an entire county’s votes (and disenfranchise potentially  
27 millions of voters) directly conflicts with the plain language of A.R.S. § 16-648(C).

28





1           B.     A declaration under A.R.S. §§ 12-1831, 12-1832 and special action relief  
2 pursuant to Arizona Rule of Special Action Procedure 3(b) or other applicable law  
3 providing that, to the extent the 2023 EPM purports to override statutory requirements based  
4 on non-final rulings in ongoing legal proceedings, that the 2023 EPM's adoption of such  
5 rulings: (i) exceed the Secretary's lawful authority; (ii) do not carry the force of law; and  
6 (iii) are non-binding unless and until the underlying legal rulings themselves become  
7 binding.

8           C.     A preliminary and permanent injunction pursuant to Ariz. R. Civ. P. 65 or  
9 other applicable law prohibiting the Secretary from enforcing or implementing the 2023  
10 EPM's Non-Residency of Juror Questionnaire Rule, Investigations of Citizenship Status  
11 Rule, AEVL Effective Date Rule, Validity of Circulator Registrations Rule, and Duty to  
12 Canvass Rules, *See* Ex. 1 at Chapter 1, Section 9, Subsections C(1) and C(2)(a), Chapter 2,  
13 Section 1, Subsection B(7), Chapter 6, Section 2, Subsection C, Chapter 13, Section 2,  
14 Subsections A(2) and B(2).


15           D.     An award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 12-  
16 341, 12-348.01, 12-1840, 12-2030, the private attorney general doctrine, and other  
17 applicable law.

18           E.     Such other relief as the Court deems necessary, equitable, proper, and just.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


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

DATED this \_\_\_\_ day of January, 2024.

STATECRAFT PLLC

By:  For \_\_\_\_\_  
Kory Langhofer  
Thomas Basile  
649 North Fourth Avenue, First Floor  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.

By:  \_\_\_\_\_  
Joseph Kanefield  
Tracy A. Olson  
Vanessa Pomeroy  
One East Washington Street  
Suite 2700  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
  
*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

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

**VERIFICATION**

I, Warren Petersen, certify that I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint and know the contents thereof by personal knowledge. I know the allegations of the Verified Complaint to be true, except the matters therein on information and belief, which I believe to be true.

Executed under penalty of perjury this 31st day of January 2024.



---

Warren Petersen