1 2 3 4	David B. Rosenbaum, 009819 Thomas L. Hudson, 014485 Sara S. Greene, 022706 OSBORN MALEDON, P.A. 2929 North Central Avenue, 21st Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793 (602) 640-9000 E-mail: thudson@omlaw.com		
5	E-mail: drosenbaum@omlaw.com E-mail: sgreene@omlaw.com		
7	David J. Bodney, 06065 Karen J. Hartman-Tellez, 021121		
8	STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP Collier Center		
9	201 East Washington Street Suite 1600		
10	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2382 E-mail: dbodney@steptoe.com		
11	E-mail: khartman@steptoe.com		
12	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
13	IN THE UNITED STATE	ES D	DISTRICT COURT
14	FOR THE DISTRIC	ст О	F ARIZONA
15			1711120111
16	THE INTER TRIBAL COUNCIL OF ARIZONA, INC., THE LEAGUE OF)	No.
17	WOMEN VOTERS OF ARIZONA, THE)	
18	HOPI TRIBE, THE LEAGUE OF)	COMPLAINT FOR
19	UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS ARIZONA, THE ARIZONA)	DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
20	ADVOCACY NETWORK, THE PEOPLE)	INJOINETTY E RELIEI
21	FOR THE AMERICAN WAY FOUNDATION, and REP. STEVE M.)	
22	GALLARDO,)	
23	Plaintiffs,)	
24	vs.)	
25	JAN BREWER, in her official capacity as)	
26	Secretary of State of Arizona,)	
27	Defendant.)	
28		_)	

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

This is an action to have the documentary proof of citizenship and polling place identification requirements of the "Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act" (which appeared on the ballot in November 2004 as Proposition 200 and is referred to herein as "the Act"), amended Sections 16-152, 16-166, and 16-579 of the Arizona Revised Statutes, declared unconstitutional both facially and as applied, and to enjoin the further enforcement of these provisions of the Act on the ground that they impose an unauthorized and unnecessary burden on the fundamental right to vote in violation of the Fourteenth and Twenty-Fourth Amendments to the U.S.

Constitution; the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 1971(a)(2)(A) and (a)(2)(B); and Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, 42.U.S.C. § 1983(a). In addition, this action seeks declaratory and injunctive relief to enforce compliance with the National Voter Registration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-4(a), which mandates that states "shall use and accept" the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form to register voters.

II. PARTIES

A. <u>Plaintiffs</u>

1. Plaintiff **Hopi Tribe** is a federally recognized Indian Tribe exercising powers which the Tribe now has under existing law or which were recognized by Congress by the Act of June 18, 1934. The Tribal Council is the governing body of the Hopi Tribe, duly recognized by the Secretary of Interior. The Council represents and speaks for the Hopi Tribe on all matters for the benefit and general welfare of the

Tribe and its Members. The Board of Elections of the Hopi Tribe conducts voter registration, educates Tribal Members about voter registration, encourages Tribal Members to exercise their right to vote, and works to ensure the voting rights of Hopi people in State, Federal and County elections. Voter registration is conducted in large part on the Hopi reservation, which is in an isolated, rural area. Many Hopi Tribal Members lack the identification required by the Act for registration and voting at the polling place. Moreover, obtaining the necessary identification will cause financial hardship because Tribal Members will have to expend time and money procuring the identification from designated agencies, most of which are at a great distance from the Hopi reservation. The Hopi Board of Elections uses the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form required by the National Voter Registration Act.

- 2. Plaintiff League of Women Voters of Arizona ("LWVAZ") is a nonpartisan political organization whose mission includes encouraging the informed and active participation by citizens in government at all levels, including the protection of the right of all citizens to vote and the education of voters about voting rights and procedures. LWVAZ has engaged and will engage in registering voters in Arizona. LWVAZ's voter registration efforts include registering voters at public events (such as street fairs), school events (such as parents' night at schools) and door-to-door.
- 3. Plaintiff Inter Tribal Council of Arizona, Inc. ("ITCA") is a private, non-profit Arizona corporation established to provide its 20 member Tribes in Arizona with a means for action on matters that affect them collectively and

individually. ITCA's mission is to provide its member tribes with a united voice and the means for united action on matters that affect them collectively or individually; to be the voice of the Member Tribes in bringing about Indian involvement and selfdetermination in order to improve the general welfare; to eliminate prejudice and discrimination against Indians and to improve the image of Indians held by non-Indians; to promote community development and enhance the quality of life for our Tribal members living in our communities; to empower our youth to be healthy in body, mind, and spirit and to make positive contributions for the well being of our communities; to defend human and civil rights as protected by law; to educate Indians and non-Indians about matters of concern to the Indians in Arizona through such means as public discussion groups, forums, panels, lectures, or any means possible and appropriate. ITCA's members include 20 Arizona Indian Tribes, Nations, and Communities, and each Tribe is represented in ITCA by its highest elected official. The Tribes are recognized by the United States under the Constitution by Treaties, Statutes, Executive Orders, the Secretary of the Interior and other actions by the United States. ITCA member Tribes occupy Reservations with land areas (including the Navajo Nation) of approximately a third of Arizona, or about 25 million acres. Indians were recognized as citizens of the United States by the Act of June 2, 1924, 43 Stat. 253, 8 U.S.C. § 3. The ITCA operates projects and facilitates the formulation of public policy designed to strengthen the self-determination of Indian Tribal governments. For decades, ITCA has been involved in promoting Native American voting rights in Arizona and providing voter education programs for its Members.

4

Many individuals in the ITCA's member Tribes cannot register to vote because they lack the identification required by the Act. Moreover, many individuals in the member Tribes cannot cast a ballot on election day because they lack the polling place identification required by the Act. Moreover, obtaining the necessary identification will cause financial hardship because individuals in ITCA's member Tribes will have to expend time and money procuring the identification from various agencies, some of which are at a great distance from the reservations of the member Tribes.

- 4. Plaintiff League of United Latin American Citizens ("LULAC")

 Arizona is an Arizona-based branch of the organization founded in 1929 to advance the economic condition, educational attainment, political influence, health and civil rights, including voting rights, of the Hispanic population of the United States.

 LULAC's activities in the state of Arizona include voter education and registration.

 LULAC registers voters in Arizona at registration drives outside of retail stores, sporting venues, nightclubs, and at community parades and events. LULAC members will be affected by the Act's identification requirements.
- 5. Plaintiff **Arizona Advocacy Network** ("AzAN") is a coalition of nonprofit public interest organizations dedicated to increasing citizen participation in the political process. AzAN promotes social, economic, racial and environmental justice by connecting and building power among activists and leaders in those fields, and by leading efforts for electoral justice and increased civic participation. Towards that end, AzAN's scope of work includes, among other goals, protecting and improving citizen access to voting by working to diminish limitations and restrictions

8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

24

23

25 26

27 28 on registration and voting, extending registration to vote up to and including election days, promoting voting by mail, and ending the requirement of documentary proof of citizenship at polling places and for voter registration. AzAN has conducted and will conduct voter registration in Arizona, and is particularly focused on registering underrepresented communities and thereby engaging those communities in civic participation.

- 6. Plaintiff People For the American Way ("PFAWF") Foundation is a nonpartisan non-profit corporation committed to promoting values and institutions that sustain a diverse democratic society and an informed electorate, and whose efforts include voter education and registration in Arizona through a project focused on Hispanic citizens. PFAWF has conducted and will conduct voter registration in Arizona.
- 7. Plaintiff **Steve M. Gallardo** is an Arizona State House Representative for District 13. Mr. Gallardo was elected in 2002. Mr. Gallardo engages in election campaigns, seeks the votes of eligible, registered voters, and seeks to ensure that the voting rights of all eligible citizens are protected, and that no eligible voters are discouraged or prevented from registering to vote or casting a ballot. Mr. Gallardo seeks to correctly inform eligible citizens about the identification required to register to vote, and to correctly inform registered voters about the identification necessary to cast a ballot. Voters who would vote for Mr. Gallardo in upcoming elections, but lack the registration and/or polling place identification required by the Act, will not be able to cast their vote for Mr. Gallardo. As a result, Mr. Gallardo will receive fewer votes.

6

Some of Mr. Gallardo's constituents cannot register because they lack the identification required by the Act. Some of Mr. Gallardo's constituents cannot cast a ballot because they lack the polling place identification required by the Act.

Obtaining the necessary identification will cause financial hardship because such constituents will have to expend time and money procuring the identification required by the Act from various designated agencies. Finally, some of Mr. Gallardo's constituents, who have secured or could secure the identification required by the Act, through inadvertence, may prove unable to present the identification required by the Act at the time of voting.

8. ITCA, the Hopi Tribe, and LULAC have members who would have standing to sue in their individual right for the allegations set forth in the Complaint, the interests that ITCA, the Hopi Tribe, LULAC and their members seek to protect in the Complaint are germane to the purpose of each of each organization, and neither the claim nor the relief sought requires participation by the individual members of ITCA, the Hopi Tribe, and LULAC.

C. <u>Defendant</u>

9. **Secretary of State Jan Brewer** is in her official capacity as the Secretary of State of Arizona, in which capacity she is the chief state election officer under A.R.S. § 16-142.

III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

10. This case arises under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. §§

1331, 1343(a)(3) and (4) § 1361, and 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), and 42 U.S.C. §§ 1971(d), 1973j(f) and 1983. This Court has jurisdiction to grant both declaratory and injunctive relief under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

11. Venue in this district and division is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because defendant Brewer resides and may be found in this district, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred in this district.

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Pre-Existing Arizona Law

- 12. Arizona has a history of widespread and persistent discrimination in voting through practices and procedures that unconstitutionally interfere with the fundamental right to vote guaranteed by the Constitution. In 1975, Congress recognized Arizona's discriminatory by requiring Arizona to prove that proposed voting changes do not deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race, color, or membership in a language minority group pursuant to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. 42 U.S.C. § 1973c.
- 13. Prior to the enactment of the Act, a person registering to vote in Arizona was required to sign a statement declaring that he or she is a United States citizen and acknowledging that executing a false registration is a class 6 felony. Registrants were not required to submit other documentary proof of United States citizenship with their registration applications. A.R.S. § 16-152 (amended 2004).

- 14. Prior to 2003, registered voters in Arizona were not required to present any form of identification at the polls as a condition of casting a ballot. A.R.S. § 16-579 (amended 2004).
- 15. Effective November 2003, A.R.S. §16-579 was amended in order to comply with the requirements of the Help American Vote Act. The amendments provided that if a statewide voter registration database was not yet operational at the time of an election, certain identification requirements would apply to voters who registered by mail after January 1, 2003 or reregistered by mail after that date after moving from one Arizona county to another.

B. The Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act ("Proposition 200")

16. In November 2004, Arizona voters approved the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act ("Proposition 200"), a ballot initiative which, according to the "findings and declaration" section of the initiative, was designed to "discourage illegal immigration." The Act in large measure addresses issues unrelated to voting, namely: requiring that state and local governments verify the identity of applicants for certain public benefits, and requiring that government employees report alleged violations of immigration law by applicants for public benefits. The Act also amended three sections of the Arizona Revised Statutes pertaining to voting: A.R.S. §§ 16-152, 16-166, and 16-579. The Act imposed a new proof of citizenship requirement for voter registration, as well as new requirements for presenting identification at the polling place in order to receive and cast a ballot.

The New Proof of Citizenship Requirement for Voter Registration

- 17. The Act amended A.R.S. §§ 16-152 and 16-166 to require that an individual who applies to register to vote must submit proof of United States citizenship with the application, and that a county recorder must reject any application for registration that is not accompanied by "satisfactory evidence" of citizenship as specified by A.R.S. § 16-166(F). Such "satisfactory evidence" includes:
- a) The number of the applicant's driver's license or non-operating identification license if issued after October 1, 1996 by the Department of Transportation or the equivalent governmental agency of another state within the United States if the agency indicates on the applicant's driver's license or non-operating identification license that the person has provided satisfactory proof of United States citizenship.
- b) A legible photocopy of the applicant's birth certificate that verifies citizenship to the satisfaction of the county recorder.
- c) A legible photocopy of pertinent pages of the applicant's United States passport identifying the applicant and the applicant's passport number or presentation to the county recorder of the applicant's United States passport.
- d) A presentation to the county recorder of the applicant's United States naturalization documents or the number of certificate of naturalization. If only the number of the certificate of naturalization is provided, the applicant shall not be included in the registration rolls until the number of the certificate of naturalization is

verified with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service by the County

Other documents or methods of proof that are established

The applicant's Bureau of Indian Affairs card number, Tribal

The Act includes a "grandfather" clause that provides that a person who

was registered to vote in Arizona on the effective date of the amendment to A.R.S. §

16-166 is deemed to have provided satisfactory evidence of citizenship, and is not

Recorder.

e)

f)

18.

1

8

9

1112

13

1415

16

1718

19

2021

23

22

2425

2627

28

required to resubmit evidence of citizenship unless he or she changes voter registration from one county to another. A.R.S. § 16-166(G).

19. A.R.S. § 16-166(F), as amended by the Act, further provides that proof

pursuant to the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.

treaty number or Tribal enforcement number. A.R.S. § 16-166(F).

of voter registration from another state or Arizona county is not satisfactory evidence of citizenship. Therefore, an individual who moves from one Arizona county to another Arizona county must resubmit "satisfactory evidence" of United States citizenship in order to register to vote in his or her new county of residence. A.R.S. §§ 16-166(H).

20. Because Arizona is covered under § 5 of the Voting Rights Act, it cannot implement a change in voting absent federal preclearance. Arizona's proof of citizenship requirement for voter registration was precleared by the U.S. Department of Justice on January 24, 2005, and the Arizona Voter Registration Form was precleared on May 6, 2005. Preclearance does not bar a subsequent action to enjoin

enforcement of a voting qualification, standard, practice or procedure. 42 U.S.C. § 1973(c).

The New Polling Place Identification Requirements

- Arizona voters appearing at the polls to vote must satisfy new identification requirements before they will be allowed to cast a ballot. A voter who appears at a polling place to cast a ballot must present either one form of identification that bears the name, current address, and photograph of the voter, or two other forms of identification that bear the name and current address of the voter. A.R.S. § 16-579(A).
- 22. Defendant Brewer has promulgated rules to implement the polling place identification requirements of the Act. These regulations were precleared by the Department of Justice on October 7, 2005.
- 23. In a document entitled, "Procedure for Proof of Identification at the Polls," dated September 6, 2005, posted on the Secretary of State's website, the forms of polling place identification deemed "acceptable" by the Secretary of State are identified as follows:

Acceptable forms of identification with photograph, name, and address of the elector

- Valid Arizona driver license
- Valid Arizona nonoperating identification license
- Tribal enrollment card or other form of Tribal identification
- Valid United States federal, state, or local government issued identification

Acceptable forms of identification without a photograph that bear the name and address of the elector (two required)

- Utility bill of the elector that is dated within ninety days of the date of the election. A utility bill may be for electric, gas, water, solid waste, sewer, telephone, cellular phone, or cable television
- Bank or credit union statement that is dated within ninety days of the date of the election
- Valid Arizona Vehicle Registration
- Indian Census Card
- Property tax statement of the elector's residence
- Tribal enrollment card or other form of Tribal identification
- Vehicle insurance card
- Recorder's Certificate
- Valid United States federal, state, or local government issued identification, including a voter registration card issued by the county recorder.

The identification set forth above is "valid" unless it can be determined on its face that it has expired.

According to the above-referenced document, "Procedure for Proof of Identification at the Polls," the foregoing list of "acceptable" proof of identification is not exhaustive. However, other forms of identification not on the foregoing list must be deemed acceptable by the county official in charge of elections and must establish the identity of the elector in accordance with the requirements of A.R.S. § 16-579(A).

24. According to the Secretary of State's regulations, electors who do not provide the identification required by A.R.S. § 16-579(A) must be issued a provisional ballot, and must be instructed by a poll worker that, in order for the provisional ballot to be processed and counted, the elector must provide the identification required by A.R.S. § 16-579(A) to the county recorder's office by 5:00

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

p.m. on the fifth business day after a general election that includes an election for federal office or 5:00 p.m. on the third business day after any other election.

- 25. The new identification requirements imposed by the Act apply only to registered voters who vote *in person* on Election Day. The Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act did not affect Arizona's early voting provisions.
- 26. All Arizona elections must provide for early voting and any qualified elector may vote by early ballot. A.R.S. § 16-541. Except for first-time voters as set forth in A.R.S. § 16-542(A), electors who vote by early ballot are not required to satisfy the identification requirements imposed by the Act. Rather, to obtain an early ballot, a voter is required only to submit along with his or her request for an early ballot "the date of birth and state or country of birth or other information that if compared to the voter registration information on file would confirm the identity of the elector." A.R.S. § 16-542(A). After the voter completes the early ballot and executes an affidavit on an accompanying envelope that attests to the voter's identity, the early voter may deliver or mail the ballot to the county recorder or other officer in charge of elections. A.R.S. § 16-547, 16-548. The county recorder is required to review the signature on the completed affidavit to ensure that it corresponds to the signature of the elector on his or her registration form, and if the voter's affidavit is sufficient, the vote shall be allowed. A.R.S. § 16-550, 16-552(A). Except as noted above, an early voter is not required to satisfy the polling place identification requirements imposed by the Act. Moreover, according to the Secretary of State's

regulations, "[a]n elector who is dropping off his or her early ballot at a precinct voting location is not required to show identification."

C. <u>Proposition 200's Proof of Citizenship and Polling Place Identification</u> <u>Requirements Impose an Unnecessary and Undue Restriction on the</u> <u>Fundamental Right to Vote</u>

- 27. The proof of citizenship requirement of the Act, A.R.S. §§ 16-152 and 16-166, as amended, imposes an unnecessary and undue burden on the exercise of the fundamental right to vote of thousands of citizens of Arizona who are fully eligible and qualified to register to vote, but who either do not possess or are unable to access the documents specified as "satisfactory evidence" of citizenship by A.R.S. § 16-166(F), as amended, and, accordingly, will be disenfranchised. Individual members of LULAC, the Hopi Tribe, and individuals in ITCA's member Tribes will be injured by the Act's proof of citizenship requirements, for the reasons discussed below.
- 28. Indian reservations in Arizona, including the reservation of ITCA Member Tribes, encompass approximately 25 million acres. Thousands of individual Members of the ITCA's Member Tribes who are residents of the reservations live in remote areas, and many have no running water, electricity, telephone, gas services, bank accounts, home addresses, drivers' licenses, automobiles, or access to public transportation. The ITCA Tribes have the highest unemployment rates in the nation. Unemployment ranges up to 82% on some reservations. Many Members of the ITCA's Member Tribes live in such poor housing conditions that paper documents proving citizenship are difficult to impossible to preserve.

- 29. Thousands of citizens of Arizona are eligible and qualified to register to vote, but do not have one of the items required by § 16-166(F): a driver's license or non-operating identification license issued after October 1, 1996 by Arizona or another state indicating citizenship; a photocopy of a birth certificate or a passport; naturalization or other documents established pursuant to the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1996; or Tribal documentation. Many U.S. citizens, by necessity or choice, do not have driver's licenses. Moreover, many citizens do not have passports, either because their health or financial situation makes it difficult for them to travel abroad, or simply because they choose not to. Many citizens, furthermore, either do not possess or do not have access to a copy of their birth certificate. In addition, the naturalization or Tribal documentation referenced in § 16-166(F) may not be applicable to many Arizona citizens.
- 30. While the new voter registration provisions of the Act will burden all registrants, compliance with these provisions will impose an especially difficult obstacle for citizens who are eligible and qualified to register, but who are: (a) poor and therefore do not own a vehicle, do not have a passport because they cannot afford to travel abroad, and do not have possess or have access to a birth certificate; (b) elderly and no longer drive, no longer have a passport because they do not travel abroad, and do not possess or have access to a birth certificate; (c) physically disabled and therefore do not drive, and either by necessity or choice do not travel abroad on a passport, and do not possess or have access to a birth certificate; (d) residents of retirement and nursing homes who, by choice or necessity, do not have driver's

licenses or passports, and do not possess or have access to a birth certificate; (e) married women who have changed their names; and (f) individuals who live in rural areas for whom providing a photocopy of the required documentation would impose a hardship.

- 31. Moreover, the Act's requirement that citizens provide documentary proof of citizenship in order to register will significantly hamper the voter registration efforts of organizations that conduct voter registration in Arizona, including plaintiffs the Hopi Tribe, LWVAZ, LULAC, AzAN, PFAWF, and ITCA. The Act's citizenship documentation requirement will make it extremely difficult for voter registration organizations to register individuals in public places (such as shopping malls, fairs, etc.) because individuals typically do not carry birth certificates or passports on their persons, and because of the general unavailability of photocopying machines at such public places. Moreover, the Act's citizenship documentation requirement will make it extremely difficult for voter registration organizations to conduct door-to-door voter registration drives because households typically do not have photocopying machines, and such machines cannot be moved from house to house. In sum, the Act limits the number of persons who can be registered, and hinders the organizations' ability to conduct voter registration.
- 32. The Act will deplete the resources of voter registration organizations who will be forced to copy, assist in copying, and transport for copying documentation establishing citizenship, such as birth certificates and passports. The Plaintiff organizations, including the ITCA, Hopi Tribe, LWVAZ, LULAC, AzAN,

PFAWF, and ITCA will be required to shift limited resources away from their respective existing programs and voting outreach efforts and apply such resources to helping their members comply with the Act's identification requirements. Plaintiff organizations, including the Hopi Tribe, LWVAZ, LULAC, AzAN, PFAWF, and ITCA's have an interest in accurately informing their members and constituencies of the identification required to register to vote and to cast a ballot. This ability is hindered by the Act's requirements, and by Secretary Brewer's refusal to use the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form prescribed by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission for registration of voters in federal elections, as described more fully below.

- 33. The new polling place identification requirements of A.R.S. § 16-579, as amended, as well as the Secretary of State's implementing regulations, also impose an unnecessary and undue burden on the exercise of the fundamental right to vote of thousands of qualified voters in Arizona who do not possess or are unable to access the documents deemed "acceptable" proof of identification, including members of LULAC, the Hopi Tribe, and the individual members of the ITCA's member Tribes.
- 34. Thousands of Arizona citizens are eligible and qualified voter registrants but have neither a form of photo identification with a current address, nor two forms of non-photo identification with a current address, that have been deemed "acceptable" by defendant Brewer or their county election official. Many registered and qualified electors do not have a driver's license, or do not have a driver's license with a current address. Moreover, many qualified electors do not possess photo

identification issued by the federal, state or local government with a current address. With respect to non-photo identification, many electors – including those who are poor and/or elderly, who live in assisted living facilities, who live on reservations and/or in rural areas without conventional addresses, who do not possess a vehicle or real property, and who do not have a bank account or utility account in their own name – will be unable to present the identification required at the polling place and, accordingly, will be disenfranchised.

- 35. The burdens imposed by the polling place identification requirement affect a wide spectrum of Arizona's registered voters, such as:
 - 1) Voters who are poor, do not own a vehicle, and lack a driver's license or other government-issued photo identification, and therefore are very unlikely to have a vehicle insurance card or Arizona vehicle registration, and are less likely to have two recent utility bills or bank statements in their names;
 - 2) Residents of assisted living facilities who may not have driver's licenses, either because they are unable to drive or simply choose not to, and are less likely to have vehicle insurance cards, vehicle registration documents, or recent utility bills in their names.
 - 3) Registered voters who do not drive and whose household utility bills and other documents are in the name of the voter's spouse;
 - 4) Native American voters, particularly those who live on reservations and/or in rural areas, and who may not have conventional addresses or documents

bearing their address, and who may not have bank statements or utility bills in their name;

- 5) Students who do not drive and whose student identification cards lack addresses and/or are issued by private colleges or universities, and who do not have utility bills in their names because they share such costs with parents and/or roommates; and
- 6) Women who recently married and changed their name but whose identification documents do not yet reflect that change.

D. The Fees Necessary to Obtain the Documents Deemed To Be "Satisfactory Evidence" of Citizenship by A.R.S. § 16-166(F), and "Acceptable" Proof of Identification Pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-579 Are a Poll Tax On the Right to Vote

- 36. The fees necessary to obtain the documents deemed to be "satisfactory evidence" of citizenship by A.R.S. § 16-166, as amended, and "acceptable" proof of identification under A.R.S. § 16-579, as amended, constitute a poll tax on the right to vote because, for individuals lacking these documents, including members of the Hopi Tribe, LULAC and individuals in the ITCA's member Tribes, such fees are a financial condition for the right to vote.
- 37. Arizona citizens who are qualified and eligible and desire to register to vote, but who lack one of the documents evidencing citizenship required by A.R.S. § 16-166, and for whom the naturalization, immigration and Tribal documents referenced in that provision are inapplicable, will be required to either: (a) apply for an Arizona driver's license or state identification card by traveling to a Motor Vehicle Division office, presenting required identification (such as an original birth certificate

or Social Security card), and paying a fee that ranges from ten dollars (\$10.00) to twenty-five dollars (\$25.00), depending on the applicants age; (b) apply for a birth certificate copy from the Arizona Division of Public Health Services (or the equivalent agency of the person's state of birth), which application must include a copy of government-issued photo identification (such as a driver's license) and payment of fifteen dollars (\$15.00) for births occurring prior to 1990; or (c) apply for a U.S. passport by traveling to a designated office, presenting appropriate documentation (such as a birth certificate), and two photographs, and paying ninety-seven dollars (\$97.00) in fees and surcharges.

- 38. Arizona citizens who are registered to vote and desire to cast a ballot at the polling place on election day, but who lack one of the polling place identification documents deemed "acceptable" under A.R.S. 16-579, will be required to either: (a) apply for an Arizona driver's license or state identification card by undergoing the process and paying the fees described above; or (b) open a utility account or bank account in their name and paying the associated fees. Even registered voters who have driver's licenses or non-operating licenses may not have updated the cards to reflect their current address, as this is not required by Arizona law; doing so will require payment of a four dollar (\$4.00) fee.
- 39. The new voting registration and voting provisions of the Act impose an undue burden on the right of voters, including individual members of LULAC, the Hopi Tribe, and ITCA's member Tribes, who will be required to expend time and

1

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 money in order to obtain the specified documents needed to register to vote and cast a ballot.

E. Arizona's Asserted Interest in "Discouraging Illegal Immigration" Does Not Justify the Severe Burden on the Fundamental Right to Vote Imposed by the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act

40. The Supreme Court has held that:

A court considering a challenge to a state election law must weigh "the character and magnitude of the asserted injury to the rights protected by the [Constitution] that the plaintiff seeks to vindicate" against "the precise interests put forward by the State as justifications for the burden imposed by the rule," taking into consideration "the extent to which those interests make it necessary to burden the plaintiff's rights."

Burdick v. Takushi, 504 U.S. 428, 434 (1992)(quoting Anderson v. Celebrezze, 460 U.S. 780, 789 (1983); Tashjian v. Republican Party of Connecticut, 479 U.S. 208, 213-14 (1986)).

- 41. The state interest put forward by the proponents of the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act in the ballot measure's "findings and declaration" section relate to the purported economic hardship to the State caused by the provision of public benefits to undocumented immigrants. The "findings and declaration" section of the Act asserts: "Therefore, the people of this state declare that the public interest of this state requires all public agencies within this state to cooperate with federal immigration authorities to discourage illegal immigration." Nowhere in its "findings and declaration" section does Proposition 200 mention voting.
- 42. The burden upon Arizona citizens' right to vote imposed by the Act's new proof of citizenship requirement for voter registration is unnecessary, and

unjustified by evidence of significant voting by "illegal immigrants" or non-citizens in Arizona.

- 43. There is no evidence that the procedures in place prior to the enactment of the Act for preventing undocumented immigrants or non-citizens from voting were inadequate. In this regard, the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form ("Federal Registration Form" or "Federal Form") prescribed by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission ("EAC"), which states are required to use and accept for the registration of voters in elections for federal office pursuant to the National Voter Registration Act ("NVRA"), 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-4(a), does not require a registrant to provide documentary evidence of citizenship.
- 44. Arizona law already protects against the unauthorized voter registration of undocumented immigrants or non-citizens. Arizona law, both prior to the enactment of Proposition 200 as well as currently, criminalizes the false voter registration of persons not entitled to register. Under A.R.S. § 16-182, "[a] person who knowingly causes, procures or allows himself to be registered as an elector of any county, city, town, district or precinct, knowing that he is not entitled to such registration, or any person who knowingly causes or procures another person to be registeredknowing that such other person is not entitled to such registration,is guilty of a class 6 felony." A.R.S. § 16-183. The term of imprisonment for a class 6 felony is one year. A.R.S. § 13-701(C)(5).
- 45. There is no evidence that the procedures in place prior to the Act for preventing undocumented immigrants or non-citizens from registering to vote resulted

in substantial numbers of undocumented immigrants or non-citizens on the voting

rolls. Moreover, to the extent that undocumented immigrants or non-citizens were registered to vote as a result of procedures in effect prior to the enactment of the Act (which plaintiffs dispute), the Act is a wholly ineffective and inappropriate solution due, in part, because of the Act's "grandfather" clause. Pursuant to the Act, a person who was registered to vote in Arizona on the effective date of the amendment to A.R.S. § 16-166 is deemed to have provided satisfactory evidence of citizenship, and is not required to resubmit evidence of citizenship. A.R.S. § 16-166(G). If the procedures in place prior to the enactment of the Act resulted in undocumented immigrants and non-citizens being included on the voter registration rolls, it makes no sense for the State to grandfather in these alleged undocumented immigrants and non-citizens by specifically exempting them from the requirement of producing documentation of citizenship.

46. Even if the citizenship documentation provision of the Act had been truly intended to prevent undocumented immigrants or non-citizens from registering to vote, the citizenship documentation provision is overbroad and not narrowly tailored. It is overbroad because it applies to and burdens the right to vote of the overwhelming majority of qualified and eligible citizens who attempt to register to vote in order to prevent a hypothetical miniscule fraction of people from illegally registering. Moreover, it is not narrowly tailored to prevent or deter continued voting by any alleged undocumented immigrants or non-citizens who were registered prior to the effective date of Proposition 200.

- 47. The burden upon Arizona citizens' right to vote imposed by the Act's new polling place voter identification provisions is unnecessary, and unjustified by evidence of significant voting by undocumented immigrants or non-citizens in Arizona, or other fraudulent voting.
- 48. There is no evidence of substantial numbers of undocumented immigrants or non-citizens voting in Arizona elections. Even if such evidence existed (which Plaintiffs dispute), the Act's polling place voter identification requirements are not an effective or appropriate solution to prevent such illegal voting because many of the documents deemed acceptable proof of identification under A.R.S. § 16-579 (e.g., utility bills, bank statements), do not establish U.S. citizenship.
- 49. To the extent that the State attempts to justify the polling place voter identification requirements of the Act on the grounds that they are necessary to prevent voter fraud in general, there is no evidence of such fraud in Arizona that would justify the disenfranchisement of Arizona citizens caused by the polling place identification requirements. Specifically, there is no evidence of substantial numbers of voters in Arizona appearing at polling places and impersonating registered voters, such that the restrictive and disenfranchising identification requirements of the Act are justified.
- 50. There is no evidence that existing provisions of Arizona law have been ineffective in deterring and preventing imposters from fraudulently obtaining and casting ballots at the polls by misrepresenting their true identities to election officials and passing themselves off as registered voters whose names appear on the official

voter registration list. Pursuant to Arizona law, a person who, not being entitled to vote, knowingly votes, is guilty of a class 5 felony, punishable by imprisonment for one and one-half years. A.R.S. § 16-1016, § 13-701. Thus, fraudulent voting was already prohibited by existing Arizona law without unduly burdening the right of a citizen to vote.

- 51. Even if there were evidence in Arizona of significant voter fraud by impersonation of registered voters (which plaintiffs dispute), the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act is not an effective or appropriate solution to prevent such fraud because it creates a loophole for early voters. With the exception of first-time voters as set forth in A.R.S. § 16-542(A), electors who vote by early ballot in Arizona are not required to satisfy the identification requirements imposed by the Act, and thus the Act is ineffective at preventing fraudulent voting by imposters.
- 52. Even if the polling place voter identification provision of the Act had been truly intended to prevent fraudulent voting by imposters (which plaintiffs dispute), the polling place identification provision is overbroad and not narrowly tailored. It is overbroad because it applies to and burdens the right to vote of the overwhelming majority of citizens who cast their ballots in person at the polling place in order to prevent a hypothetical miniscule fraction of people from fraudulently casting ballots by misrepresenting their identities to poll workers. Moreover, it is not narrowly tailored to prevent or deter fraudulent voting by early voting.
- 53. In summary, the amendments to Arizona's election laws brought about by the Act do nothing to further the State's purported interest in "discouraging illegal

immigration." Nor is there evidence of unauthorized voting by undocumented immigrants or non-citizens, or voter fraud generally, that would justify these substantial burdens on the fundamental right to vote. Even if the proof of citizenship and polling place voter identification provisions of the Act had been truly intended to effect legitimate state interests relating to voter registration and voting, those provisions are overbroad and are not narrowly tailored.

F. The Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act Will Have A Disparate Impact on Native American and Latino Voters

54. The voter registration and voting provisions of the Act will have a disparate impact on the ability of voter registrants and voters who are Latino or Native American, because Latinos and Native Americans in Arizona, on average, are (a) less affluent than whites, when evaluated through a number of statistical measures, including median household income, per capita income, and percent of persons below the poverty line and (b) are less likely to own or have access to a motor vehicle than whites according to recent data published by the U.S. Census Bureau. Moreover, Native Americans are more likely to live in rural locations at a greater distance to the polls, and have unconventional addresses or no formal street address at all.

G. The National Voter Registration Act Requires States to Accept the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form, and Does Not Permit A State to Condition Acceptance of the Form on Submission of Supplemental Evidence of Citizenship

55. States are required by the National Voter Registration Act ("NVRA"), 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-4(a), to accept and use the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form ("Federal Registration Form" or "Federal Form") prescribed by the U.S. Election

Assistance Commission ("EAC") for the registration of voters in elections for Federal office. 42 U.S.C. §1973gg-4(a). The Federal Registration Form prescribed by the EAC requires that a registrant attest that he or she is a United States citizen, but does not require the registrant to supplement the Federal Form with documentary evidence of citizenship.

- Executive Director, Thomas R. Wilkey, the U.S. Election Assistance Commission rejected a request by defendant Brewer's office to apply the proof of citizenship requirements derived from the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act to the Federal Form registration process. The EAC advised defendant Brewer that "[n]o state may condition acceptance of the Federal Form upon receipt of additional proof" of voter qualification. Accordingly, the EAC advised defendant Brewer that "Arizona may not refuse to register individuals to vote in a Federal election for failing to provide supplemental proof of citizenship, if they have properly completed and timely submitted the Federal Registration Form," and that Arizona's refusal to register such individuals would violate the NVRA.
- 57. Notwithstanding the EAC's rejection of defendant Brewer's request that Arizona be permitted to condition acceptance of the Federal Form upon submission of supplemental evidence of citizenship, defendant Brewer subsequently advised the EAC Chairman, Paul S. DeGregorio, by letter dated March 13, 2006, that she "will instruct Arizona's county recorders to continue to administer and enforce the requirement that all voters provide evidence of citizenship when registering to vote as

specified in A.R.S. § 16-166(F)." On March 13, 2006, State Election Director Joseph Kanefield stated via email to all County Recorders that "Secretary Brewer's position [is] that the proof of citizenship requirement set forth in A.R.S. § 16-166(F) must continue to be enforced for all newly registered voters and voters moving from one county to another. Secretary Brewer made this decision after consulting with the Arizona Attorney General."

- 58. By letter dated March 22, 2006, counsel for plaintiffs LULAC, PFAWF and Rep. Gallardo notified defendant Brewer pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1973gg- 9(b) of plaintiffs' intent to bring a civil action on behalf of aggrieved persons under the National Voter Registration Act, based upon defendant Brewer's refusal to accept, and her instructions to Arizona's county recorders not to accept, the Federal Registration Form.
- 59. A civil action may be brought in an appropriate district court for declaratory or injunctive relief with respect to a violation of the NVRA if a state's chief election officer fails to correct the violation within 90 days after receiving notice of such violation. If the violation occurs within 120 days after the date of an election for federal office, an action may be brought within 20 days after the chief election officer's receipt of notice of the violation. 42 U.S.C. §1973gg- 9(b).
- 60. On August 10, 2006 less than 120 days before the filing of this complaint early voting will begin for federal primary election in Arizona.

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	

61. The Office of the Attorney General, in any event, has advised undersigned counsel that the defendant Secretary Brewer will waive the 90 day notice requirement set forth in 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg- 9(b).

V. CAUSES OF ACTION

Count One

Undue Burden on the Right to Vote in Violation of Equal Protection of the <u>Law</u>

- 62. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 61 above are hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.
- 63. The proof of citizenship and polling place identification requirements impose undue burdens on the fundamental right of Arizona residents who are eligible to vote, and are neither justified by, nor necessary to promote, interests put forward by the State that were not already being adequately protected by existing criminal laws and election procedures or that could not have been accomplished by other, less restrictive alternatives. *Dunn v. Blumstein*, 405 U.S. 330 (1972); *Harper v. Virginia Board of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663 (1972).

Count Two

<u>Unconstitutional Poll Tax on the Right to Vote In Violation of Both the</u> <u>Fourteenth and the Twenty-Fourth Amendments</u>

- 64. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 63 above are hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.
 - 65. Section 1 of Twenty-fourth Amendment provides that:

ers who did not plan [] far [enough] ahead." *Id.* at 539-4

67. Conditioning the right to vote on the production of the

The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or general election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay a poll tax or other tax.

By virtue of its prohibition of *abridgment* as well as denial of the right to vote, "the Twenty-fourth nullifies sophisticated as well as simpleminded modes of impairing the right to vote." *Harman v. Fossenius*, 380 U.S. 528, 540-41 (1965).

- 66. The repugnant results of the poll tax that prompted passage of the Twenty-fourth amendment are imminent in Arizona as a result of the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act: "disenfranchisement of the poor occasioned by failure to pay the tax," as well as disenfranchisement of "a substantial number of voters who did not plan []far [enough] ahead." *Id.* at 539-40.
- 67. Conditioning the right to vote on the production of certain forms of identification impairs the ability of Arizona's poor -- who are disproportionately minority and who historically have been disenfranchised -- to exercise that right. The requirements amount to a poll tax on Arizona citizens that do not have these forms of identification. Qualified Arizona citizens who are poor are the most likely to need to obtain these documents for the first time as a result of amended A.R.S. §16-166, and are also the least likely to have internet access (the fastest way to find out about how to obtain these documents and often to request them is online), least likely to be able to take time away from work and family to visit offices of public agencies in person during business hours, and least likely to be able to afford these documents.

Count Three

Violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1971(a)(2)(A)

- 68. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 67 above are hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.
- 69. The polling place identification requirements of the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act, as set forth in A.R.S. §16-579 and the implementing regulations, violate the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §1971(a)(2)(A), which provides that:

No person acting under color of law shall-

- (A) in determining whether any individual is qualified under State law or laws to vote in any election, apply any standard, practice, or procedure different from the standards, practices, or procedures applied under such law or laws to other individuals within the same county, parish, or similar political subdivision who have been found by State officials to be qualified to vote...
- 70. The polling place identification requirements violate 42 U.S.C. § 1971(a)(2)(A) because different standards with respect to identification requirements are applied to individuals within the same county who vote in person at the polling place as compared to those who vote by early ballot. Electors who vote by early voting are not required to satisfy the identification requirements imposed by the Act.

Count Four

Violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1971(a)(2)(B)

71. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 70 above are hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

26 27

28

72. The polling place identification requirements of the Act violate the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 1971(a)(2)(B), which provides that:

No person acting under color of law shall-

- (B) deny the right of an individual to vote in any election because of an error or omission on any record or paper relating to any application, registration, or other act requisite to voting, if such error or omission is not material in determining whether such individual is qualified under State law to vote in such election;...
- 73. The polling place identification requirements violate 42 U.S.C. § 1971(a)(2)(B) because the requirements deny citizens who are lawfully registered and fully qualified the right to vote in person at a polling place based solely on whether they have identifying documents deemed acceptable, regardless of whether their identity may be established by other means, such as matching signatures, or if they are personally known to election officials to be the same person as the person whose name appears on the official list of registered voters.
- 74. Proposition 200's proof of citizenship requirement for voter registration violates 42 U.S.C. § 1971(a)(2)(B) because the requirement denies citizens who are fully eligible and qualified to register to vote the opportunity to register based solely on whether or not they have identifying documents deemed satisfactory evidence of citizenship, regardless of whether their citizenship status may be established by other means.

Count Five

75. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 74 above are hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.

76. Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. § 1973(a)) provides:

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act

No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgment of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color.

77. Latino and Native American citizens of Arizona, as a group, have lower family and personal incomes than citizens of Arizona who are white and are less likely, as a group, to have Arizona driver's licenses or passports deemed to be

"satisfactory evidence" of U.S. citizenship than are white citizens.

78. Latino and Native American citizens of Arizona, as a group, have lower

family and personal incomes than citizens of Arizona who are white and are less

likely, as a group, to have Arizona driver's licenses, bank or credit union statements,

utility bills in their name, vehicle registration and insurance cards, or other government-issued identification deemed "acceptable" to establish identity at the

polling place.

79. Native Americans on reservations are more likely to live in remote, rural locations at a greater distance to the polls, have unconventional addresses or no formal street address at all.

80. The Act's requirement of proof of citizenship, and its polling place identification requirements, are qualifications or prerequisites to voting that have resulted and will continue to result in the denial or abridgment of the right to vote to individual plaintiffs and others on account of race or color in violation of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973(a). As a result of the Act's new voter registration and voting requirements, under the totality of circumstances, the political process is not equally open to participation by Native American or Latino citizens in that such citizens have less opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect representatives of their choice. *Id.*, § 1973(b).

Count Six

National Voter Registration Act

- 81. The allegations of paragraphs 1 through 80 above are hereby incorporated as though fully set forth herein.
- 82. The National Voter Registration Act of 1993, 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-4(a), mandates that States "shall accept and use the mail registration application" proscribed by the U.S. Election Assistance Commission pursuant to section 9(a)(2) for the registration of voters in elections for Federal Office.
- 83. Defendant's actions, as chief elections officer of the State of Arizona, in refusing to accept, and instructing Arizona's county recorders not to accept, the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form without supplemental documentation of citizenship violate the National Voter Registration Act.

Irreparable Harm/ Inadequate Remedy at Law

- 84. Congressional and statewide elections that will be subject to the new proof of citizenship and polling place identification requirements are scheduled for September 12, 2006 (primary) and November 7, 2006 (general).
- 85. The plaintiffs and the members of the organizational plaintiffs who do not have one of the forms of identification required by A.R.S. § 16-166 to establish proof of citizenship or required at the polls by the procedure for implementing A.R.S. § 16-579 will be irreparably harmed if they are forced, between now and the next election to either (a) obtain new identification, or (b) forfeit their rights as Arizona citizens qualified to register and vote in the next and subsequent elections or referenda in their respective voting districts or political subdivisions for which they cannot be adequately compensated in an action at law for money damages.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray that:

- (a) the Court enter a declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201 declaring A.R.S. §§ 16-152, 16-166, 16-579 as amended by the Arizona Taxpayer and Citizen Protection Act, unconstitutional, unlawful, null and void;
- (b) the Court order that defendant and her agents, servants and employees are immediately restrained from refusing to register voters who timely submit a properly completed Federal Mail Voter Registration Form (the "Federal Form"), but do not submit "satisfactory evidence of citizenship" as defined by A.R.S. § 16-166(F).

- (c) the Court enter a preliminary and permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1973gg-9(a)(2) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 restraining and enjoining defendant from refusing to accept the Federal Mail Voter Registration Form without "satisfactory evidence of citizenship" as defined in A.R.S. § 16-166;
- (d) the Court enter a preliminary and permanent injunction pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 restraining and enjoining defendant from enforcing or applying A.R.S. §§ 16-152, 16-166, 16-579 to deny plaintiffs or any other qualified Arizona resident the right to register voters, register to vote, obtain a ballot, cast a ballot, and have their ballots counted in any primary, general, special, run off or referenda election in Arizona because of their inability to provide documentary proof of citizenship as required by A.R.S. §§ 16-152 and 16-166, or to comply with the polling place identification requirements as set forth in the guidelines for implementing A.R.S. § 16-579;
- (e) Plaintiffs recover their reasonable attorney's fees and costs; and
- (f) Plaintiffs have such other and further relief as may be just and equitable.

 Respectfully submitted this 24th day of May, 2006

OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.

ву	s/ David B. Rosenbaum
•	Thomas L. Hudson
	David B. Rosenbaum
	Sara S. Greene
	2929 North Central
	21st Floor
	Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793
Coope	erating Attorneys for American Civil
_	ies Union Foundation

1	
2	STEPTOE & JOHNSON LLP
3	David J. Bodney Karen J. Hartman-Tellez
	Collier Center
4	201 East Washington Street, Suite 1600
5	Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2382
6	Telephone: 602-257-5212 Fax: 602-257-5299
7	E-mail: <u>dbodney@steptoe.com</u>
8	LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL
9	RIGHTS UNDER LAW
9	Jon Greenbaum
10	Benjamin Blustein Monica Saxena
11	1401 New York Avenue, Suite 400
1.0	Washington, D.C. 20005
12	Telephone: 202-662-8315
13	Fax: (202) 628-2858 (fax)
1.4	E-mail: jgreenbaum@lawyerscommittee.org
14	PRO HAC VICE APPLICATION TO BE FILED
15	ACLU Southern Regional Office
16	Neil Bradley
17	2600 Marquis One Tower
	245 Peachtree Center Avenue
18	Atlanta, GA 30303
19	Telephone: 404-523-2721
	Fax: 404-653-0331 E-mail: <u>nbradley@aclu.org</u>
20	PRO HAC VICE APPLICATION TO BE FILED
21	
22	PEOPLE FOR THE AMERICAN WAY FOUNDATION
23	Elliot M. Mincberg
24	2000 M Street, NW, Suite 400
	Washington, DC 20036
25	Telephone: 202-467-4999 Fax: 202-293-2672
26	E-mail: <u>emincberg@pfaw.org</u>
27	PRO HAC VICE APPLICATION TO BE FILED
28	

Case 3:06-cv-01362-ROS Document 1 Filed 05/24/06 Page 38 of 39

	Case 3:06-cv-01362-ROS	Document 1 Filed 05/24/06 Page 39 of 39		
1	THE LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN			
2	AMERICAN CITIZENS Luis Roberto Vera, Jr.			
3		TX State Bar No. 20546740		
4		111 Soledad, Suite 1325 San Antonio, TX 78205-2260		
5		Telephone: 210-225-3300 Fax: 210-225-2060		
6		E-mail: <u>lrvlaw@sbcglobal.net</u>		
7		PRO HAC VICE APPLICATION TO BE FILED		
8		AARP FOUNDATION LITIGATION		
9		Daniel B. Kohrman (DC Bar No. 394064) 601 E Street, N.W., Suite A4-240		
10		Washington DC 20049 Telephone: 202-434-2064		
11		Fax: 202-434-6424		
12		E-mail: <u>dkohrman@aarp.org</u> PRO HAC VICE APPLICATION TO BE FILED		
13				
14		THE INTER TRIBAL COUNCIL OF ARIZONA, INC.		
15		Joe P. Sparks, No. 002383 Susan B. Montgomery, No. 020595		
16		Sparks, Tehan & Ryley PC		
17		7503 First St, Scottsdale AZ 85251 Telephone: 480-949-1339		
18		Fax: 480-949-7587		
19		ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS		
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	1			