20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT								
7									
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA								
9	VOTING RIGHTS DEFENSE PROJECT, No. C 16-02739 WHA								
10	AMERICAN INDEPENDENT PARTY, CLARA DAIMS, and SUZANNE								
11	BUSHNELL,								
12	Plaintiffs,								
13	v.								
14	ALEX PADILLA, in his official capacity as Secretary of State and an indispensable  ORDER DISMISSING ACTION								
15	as Secretary of State and an indispensable party, TIM DUPUIS, in his official capacity as chief of the Alameda County								
16	Registrar of Voters, JOHN ARNTZ, in his official capacity as Director of the San								
17	Francisco Board of Elections, and DOES I–X,								
18	Defendants.								
10									

Plaintiffs commenced this action seeking injunctive relief pertaining to the California presidential primary, which has come and gone as of June 7. The specific relief sought pertained to the dissemination of information regarding the availability of so-called "crossover ballots" to voters that had declined to affiliate with a political party upon registering to vote (or who had later withdrawn such an affiliation). Crossover ballots allowed these no-partypreference voters to vote in the presidential primaries of the Democratic Party, the American Independent Party, or the Libertarian Party, each of which had elected to accept crossover ballots. (The Republican Party did not.) Plaintiffs contend the information disseminated by certain election officials, including our defendants, inadequately informed no-party-preference voters of the availability of crossover ballots and other related procedures.

	At a hearing	g on June 1, t	he Court	denied	plaintiffs'	motion	for a pr	eliminary	injunctio	on
A mer	norandum o	pinion followe	ed the nex	xt day (l	Dkt. No. 4	<del>1</del> 6).				

Defendants now move to dismiss the action because (i) the relief sought is now moot, (ii) plaintiffs lack standing, and (iii) plaintiffs fail to state a claim. Plaintiffs do not respond to any of the arguments raised in the motions to dismiss, but instead seek to amend their complaint.

This action is plainly moot — the primary has already occurred. To the extent plaintiffs seek to amend their complaint to address the 2020 presidential primaries, any claim based thereon is far from ripe. We do not yet know if *any* political party will allow crossover ballots, nor do we know if our defendants will reinstate the practices complained of herein.

Thus, because the action is moot and any proposed amendment would be futile, defendants' motions to dismiss are **GRANTED**.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 26, 2016.

WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE