

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

Bette Eakin, *et al.*,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

Adams County Board of Elections, *et al.*,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 1:22-cv-0340-SPB

**INTERVENOR-DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO PENNSYLVANIA  
COMMONWEALTH COURT'S DECISION IN *BLACK POLITICAL  
EMPOWERMENT PROJECT V. SCHMIDT***

This lawsuit is merely the latest chapter in a multi-year crusade against the General Assembly's date requirement for mail ballots. *See, e.g., Ball v. Chapman*, 289 A.3d 1 (Pa. 2023) (holding that date requirement is mandatory and enforceable despite contrary lower-court rulings); *Pa. State Conf. of NAACP Branches v. Sec'y*, 97 F.4th 120 (3d Cir. 2024). Various litigants have offered a host of failed arguments against the date requirement, with many of the same litigants trying to improve their odds by pursuing separate theories in federal and state court. Indeed, the Democratic Party, represented by the DSCC and DCCC in this case, is also a party in the ongoing lawsuit in *Black Political Empowerment Project v. Schmidt*, *see* 2024 WL 4002321, at \*2 (Pa. Commw. Ct. Aug. 30 2024) (noting involvement there of Democratic National Committee and Pennsylvania Democratic Party).

Instead of pleading their various challenges to the date requirement in one court, opponents of the date requirement have chosen to shop out different theories in different courts, hoping something will stick. On August 30, a divided panel of the Commonwealth Court rewarded that gambit and held that the date requirement violates the Pennsylvania Constitution's Free and Equal

Elections Clause. *Id.* at \*1-2. Intervenor-Defendants, as parties to that case, have appealed to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Intervenor-Defendants are confident the Pennsylvania Supreme Court will reverse that ruling.

It is simply too late for this Court to grant Plaintiffs any relief on their claims for the imminent 2024 general elections. *See Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U.S. 1 (2006). Moreover, when this Court does proceed to the merits, it should enter summary judgment in favor of Intervenor-Defendants for all the reasons previously explained. *See* ECF Nos. 378, 388, and 393. The Commonwealth Court's (now-appealed) ruling, of course, does not bind this Court. This Court remains bound by the rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court and Third Circuit, which clearly foreclose ruling for Plaintiffs in this case. *See, e.g., Pa. State Conf. of NAACP*, 97 F.4th at 133-35.

For at least two reasons, however, this Court may choose to wait to rule on the pending summary judgment motions until the Pennsylvania Supreme Court issues its ruling. *First*, there are issues that may overlap between this case and *Black Political Empowerment Project*. Plaintiffs' argument there, as here, is that the date requirement imposes a significant burden on the right to vote and is not supported by adequate government interests to justify its legality. *See Black Political Empowerment Project*, 2024 WL 4002321, at 32-35. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court will weigh in on those disputed issues, and this Court may find that court's reasoning helpful in adjudicating this case.

*Second*, waiting for the Pennsylvania Supreme Court to rule would not prejudice Plaintiffs. All parties filed their merits briefs for the Pennsylvania Supreme Court by September 4, 2024. Given that court's extremely expedited briefing schedule, *see* No. 662, *In re: Temporary Modification and Suspension of the Rules of Appellate Procedure and Judicial Administration for*

*Appeals Arising Under the Pennsylvania Election Code* (Aug. 27, 2024),<sup>1</sup> it can be expected to rule quite quickly.

In all events, the Court should deny Plaintiffs' motions for summary judgment and grant Intervenor-Defendants' motions.

Dated: September 13, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kathleen A. Gallagher  
Kathleen A. Gallagher  
PA I.D. #37950  
THE GALLAGHER FIRM, LLC  
436 Seventh Avenue, 30th Floor  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Phone: (412) 717-1900  
kag@gallagherlawllc.com

John M. Gore (*pro hac vice*)  
E. Stewart Crosland  
Louis J. Capozzi III  
JONES DAY  
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Phone: (202) 879-3939  
jmgore@jonesday.com  
scrosland@jonesday.com

Thomas W. King, III  
Thomas E. Breth  
DILLON, McCANDLESS, KING,  
COULTER & GRAHAM, LLP  
128 W. Cunningham St.  
Butler, PA 16001  
Phone: (724) 283.2200  
tking@dmkcg.com  
tbreth@dmkcg.com

*Counsel for Intervenor-Defendants*

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.pacourts.us/assets/opinions/Supreme/out/Order%20Entered%20-%20106052097278965811.pdf?cb=1](http://www.pacourts.us/assets/opinions/Supreme/out/Order%20Entered%20-%20106052097278965811.pdf?cb=1)