

1 RACHEL H. MITCHELL
2 MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

3 By: THOMAS P. LIDDY (Bar No. 019384)
4 JOSEPH J. BRANCO (Bar No. 031474)
5 JOSEPH E. LA RUE (Bar No. 031348)
6 KAREN J. HARTMAN-TELLEZ (Bar No. 021121)
7 JACK. L. O'CONNOR (Bar No. 030660)
8 SEAN M. MOORE (Bar No. 031621)
9 ROSA AGUILAR (Bar No. 037774)
10 Deputy County Attorneys
11 liddy@mcao.maricopa.gov
12 brancoj@mcao.maricopa.gov
13 laruej@mcao.maricopa.gov
14 hartmank@mcao.maricopa.gov
15 oconnorj@mcao.maricopa.gov
16 moores@mcao.maricopa.gov
17 aguilarr@mcao.maricopa.gov
18 Deputy County Attorneys
19 MCAO Firm No. 0003200

20 CIVIL SERVICES DIVISION

21 225 West Madison Street
22 Phoenix, Arizona 85003
23 Telephone (602) 506-8541
24 Facsimile (602) 506-4316
25 ca-civilmailbox@mcao.maricopa.gov

26 Emily Craiger (Bar No. 021728)
27 emily@theburgesslawgroup.com
28 THE BURGESS LAW GROUP
3131 East Camelback Road, Suite 224
Phoenix, Arizona 85016
Telephone: (602) 806-2100

Attorneys for Maricopa County Defendants

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MARICOPA

KARI LAKE,

Contestant/Petitioner,

vs.

KATIE HOBBS, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV2022-095403

**MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA OF
STEPHEN RICHER**

(Expedited Election Matter)

(Honorable Peter Thompson)

1 On December 15, 2022, at 2:02 pm, a process server delivered to the office of
2 Maricopa County Recorder Stephen Richer a Subpoena for Appearance at Hearing (the
3 “Subpoena”) issued by counsel for Plaintiff/Contestant Kari Lake (“Lake” or “Plaintiff”).
4 The Subpoena commands Recorder Richer’s attendance at the trial of this election contest
5 on December 21 and 22, 2022, beginning at 9:00 am. Because (1) Recorder Richer will be
6 out of the country on a long-planned vacation on December 21 and 22, 2022, (2) other
7 employees of the Maricopa County Recorder’s Office are well-situated to testify regarding
8 the claims in this action that concern the County Recorder’s election-related duties, and
9 (3) Plaintiff’s claims regarding a violation of the First Amendment are not properly before
10 this Court in an election contest, the Maricopa County Defendants move to quash the
11 Subpoena.

12 First, being required to appear for the trial of this election contest will unduly burden
13 Recorder Richer. *See* Ariz. R. Civ. P. 45(e)(2)(A)(4). Beginning the week of December 19,
14 2022, Recorder Richer will be out of the country on a long-planned family vacation, his first
15 since taking office in January 2021. [Declaration of Stephen Richer, ¶ 4 (attached as Exhibit
16 A)] Recorder Richer will have limited internet access while outside the United States, and
17 it will be very difficult, if not impossible, for him to testify remotely in this matter on
18 December 21 or 22, 2022. [*Id.*]

19 Second, even if Recorder Richer were available to testify, under the “apex” doctrine,
20 he should not be required to appear to testify when other county employees are similarly or
21 better situated to respond to questions regarding the operations of the Recorder’s Office. *See*
22 *Kyle Eng’g Co. v. Kleppe*, 600 F.2d 226, 231 (9th Cir. 1979) (noting that “[h]eads of
23 government agencies are not normally subject to deposition”).

24 Neither the Arizona Supreme Court nor the Arizona Court of Appeals has yet
25 considered whether to adopt the apex doctrine in Arizona. However, this Court may consider
26 the federal cases cited herein, which interpret the Rules of Evidence. As the Arizona
27 Supreme Court recognized, “[a]lthough the federal courts’ interpretation of the Federal
28 Rules of Evidence does not control our interpretation of our own evidentiary rules, federal

1 precedent is particularly persuasive given that we have expressly sought to conform our rules
2 to the federal rules.” *State v. Winegardner*, 243 Ariz. 482, ¶8, 413 P.3d 683, ¶8 (2018).

3 Federal courts have regularly held that elected to top-level government offices
4 warrant apex protection. *See, e.g., Hernandez v. Tex. Dep’t of Aging & Disability Servs.*, No.
5 A-11-CV-856 LY, 2011 WL 6300852, at *2 (W.D. Tex. Dec. 16, 2011) (governor); *Thomas*
6 *v. Cate*, 715 F. Supp. 2d 1012, 1049 (E.D. Cal. 2010); *New York v. Oneida Indian Nation of*
7 *N.Y.*, No. 95-CV0554 (LEK/RFT), 2001 WL 1708804 at *3 (N.D.N.Y. Nov. 9, 2001);
8 *Fitzpatrick v. Sec’y of State*, 440 N.W.2d 45, 46-47 (Mich. Ct. App. 1989) (per curiam)
9 (noting that “there [was] no doubt” that the Secretary of State was a high-ranking official,
10 because (1) the office was established by the state constitution and (2) the Secretary was the
11 head of the department of state). As in *Fitzpatrick*, so here: the office of the Maricopa
12 County Recorder is established by the Arizona Constitution, Ariz. Const. art. XII, § 3, 4; *see*
13 *also* A.R.S. Title 11, Ch. 3, Art. 3 (setting forth the duties of the County Recorder). Because
14 “lesser officials in the Department . . . presumably [could] supply plaintiff with the
15 information he seeks,” the Court should quash the Subpoena. *Id.* at 47 (concluding that the
16 “defendant Secretary of State should not be required to personally give testimony”).

17 Although the apex doctrine is most often used to prevent depositions of high-ranking
18 government officials, its underlying principles also prevent high-ranking government
19 officials from being compelled to testify at trial. *See, e.g., Simplex Time Recorder Co. v.*
20 *Sec’y of Labor*, 766 F.2d 575, 586 (D.C. Cir. 1985) (affirming ALJ’s refusal to allow plaintiff
21 to call “top” Labor Department officials as witnesses); *Bogan v. City of Boston*, 489 F.3d
22 417, 423 (1st Cir. 2007) (noting that “other courts [had] concluded that top executive
23 department officials should not, absent extraordinary circumstances, be called to testify or
24 [be] deposed regarding their reasons for taking official action.”) (citations omitted).

25 Plaintiff’s Complaint includes a claim regarding Maricopa County’s process for
26 conducting signature verification of early ballots. [Compl. ¶¶ 150-55] Early ballots, and the
27 signature verification thereof, are within the purview of the Recorder. Like all the other
28

1 claims in Plaintiff’s Complaint, the Maricopa County Defendants have moved to dismiss
2 that claim because:

3 (a) Even if true, it would not alter the outcome of the election, A.R.S. § 16-
4 672(A)(5); *Wenc v. Sierra Vista Unified Sch. Dist. No. 68*, 210 Ariz. 183, 186 ¶ 10 (App.
5 2005);

6 (b) Plaintiff’s claims are wholly speculative because they relate to an analysis of
7 early ballots from 2020, not those actually cast in the 2022 general election, which falls far
8 below the “clear and satisfactory proof” standard required of an election contestant, *see Hunt*
9 *v. Campbell*, 19 Ariz. 254, 268 (1917); and

10 (c) Laches bars the Court from determining claims about the signature verification
11 process after an election. *Sherman v. City of Tempe*, 202 Ariz. 339, 342 ¶ 9 (2002) (citation
12 omitted) (“Challenges concerning alleged procedural violations of the election process must
13 be brought prior to the actual election.”); [See Maricopa County Defendants’ Motion to
14 Dismiss, at 7-9]

15 As such, no testimony regarding signature verification should be required. If the
16 Court declines to dismiss Count III, however, employees of the Maricopa County Recorder’s
17 Office with long experience of the signature verification process can be made available to
18 testify. *See Fitzpatrick*, 440 N.W.2d at 47.

19 Third, to the extent that Plaintiff seeks testimony from Recorder Richer related to
20 her allegations regarding his participation in the March 29, 2022 CISA Cybersecurity
21 Advisory Committee Protecting Critical Infrastructure from Misinformation &
22 Disinformation Subcommittee meeting or his involvement with a political action committee,
23 which relate to her First Amendment claim, such claim is wholly inappropriate in an election
24 contest. [See Mot. to Dismiss, at 3-4] It would unduly burden Recorder Richer to require
25 him to cancel his vacation in order to testify about a meeting held nearly nine months ago or
26 his own personal First Amendment activity that could not possibly constitute evidence of
27 (1) misconduct by election boards, (2) illegal votes, or (3) an erroneous count of votes. *See*

28

1 A.R.S. § 16-672(A). Because this claim is outside the strict statutory confines of an election
2 contest, the Subpoena should be quashed.

3 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should enter an order quashing the Subpoena to
4 Stephen Richer.

5
6 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 16th day of December, 2022.

7 RACHEL H. MITCHELL
8 MARICOPA COUNTY ATTORNEY

9 BY: /s/ Joseph E. La Rue
10 Thomas P. Liddy
11 Joseph J. Branco
12 Joseph E. La Rue
13 Karen J. Hartman-Tellez
14 Jack L. O'Connor
15 Sean M. Moore
16 Rosa Aguilar
17 Deputy County Attorneys

18 THE BURGESS LAW GROUP

19 Emily Craiger

20 *Attorneys for Maricopa County Defendants*

21 ORIGINAL of the foregoing E-FILED
22 this 16th day of December 2022 with
23 AZTURBOCOURT, and copies e-served / emailed to:

24 HONORABLE PETER THOMPSON
25 MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT
26 Sarah Umphress, Judicial Assistant
27 Sarah.Umphress@JBAZMC.Maricopa.Gov

28 Bryan J. Blehm
BLEHM LAW PLLC
10869 North Scottsdale Road Suite 103-256
Scottsdale Arizona 85254
bryan@blehmlegal.com

Kurt Olsen

1 OLSEN LAW, P.C.
2 1250 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 700
3 Washington, DC 20036
4 ko@olsenlawpc.com

5 *Attorneys for Contestant/Plaintiff*

6 D. Andrew Gaona
7 COPPERSMITH BROCKELMAN PLC
8 2800 North Central Avenue, Suite 1900
9 Phoenix, Arizona 85004
10 agaona@cblawyers.com

11 Sambo Dul
12 STATES UNITED DEMOCRACY CENTER
13 8205 South Priest Drive, #10312
14 Tempe, Arizona 85284
15 bo@statesuniteddemocracycenter.org

16 *Attorneys for Defendant*
17 *Arizona Secretary of State Katie Hobbs*

18 Daniel C. Barr
19 Alexis E. Danneman
20 Austin C. Yost
21 Samantha J. Burke
22 PERKINS COIE LLP
23 2901 North Central Avenue Suite 2000
24 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2788
25 DBarr@perkinscoie.com
26 ADanneman@perkinscoie.com
27 AYost@perkinscoie.com
28 SBurke@perkinscoie.com
DocketPHX@perkinscoie.com

Abha Khanna
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100
Seattle, WA 98101
akhanna@elias.law

Lalitha D. Madduri
Christina Ford
Elena A. Rodriguez Armenta
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP

1 250 Massachusetts Ave NW, Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20001

2 lmadduri@elias.law

3 cford@elias.law

4 erodriguezarmenta@elias.law

5 *Attorneys for Defendant/Contestee Katie Hobbs*

6 James E. Barton II
7 BARTON MENDEZ SOTO PLLC
8 401 West Baseline Road Suite 205
9 Tempe, Arizona 85283
10 James@bartonmendezsoto.com

11 E. Danya Perry (pro hac vice forthcoming)
12 Rachel Fleder (pro hac vice forthcoming)
13 Joshua Stanton (pro hac vice forthcoming)
14 Lilian Timmermann (pro hac vice forthcoming)
15 PERRY GUHA LLP
16 1740 Broadway, 15th Floor
17 New York, NY 10019
18 dperry@perryguha.com

19 *Attorneys for Amici Curiae*
20 *Helen Purcell and Tammy Patrick*

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29 /s/ Joseph E. La Rue

RETRIEVED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET.COM