

**SUPERIOR COURT, STATE OF ARIZONA
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF YAVAPAI**

ARIZONA FREE ENTERPRISE CLUB,
an Arizona nonprofit corporation, and
MARY KAY RUWETTE, individually,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

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

Defendant,

ARIZONA ALLIANCE OF RETIRED
AMERICANS; and MI FAMILIA VOTA,

Intervenors-Defendants.

ARIZONA FREE ENTERPRISE CLUB,
an Arizona nonprofit corporation;
RESTORING INTEGRITY AND TRUST
IN ELECTIONS, a Virginia nonprofit
corporation; and DWIGHT KADAR, an
individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

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

Defendant.

Case No. S1300CV202300872
S1300CV202300202

**UNDER ADVISEMENT
RULING AND ORDER**

HONORABLE JOHN NAPPER
DIVISION 2

BY: Felicia L. Slaton, Judicial Assistant
DATE: April 25, 2024

The Court has received and reviewed the parties' cross-*Motions for Summary Judgment*, *Motions to Dismiss*, the *Responses*, and the *Replies*. The Court also held oral arguments and reviewed supplemental pleadings and evidentiary submissions. The Court has reviewed the files in both cause numbers. In both cases, the Court finds the 2023 Elections Procedures Manual complies with Arizona law. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs' *Motions for Summary Judgment* are **denied**, and the Defendants' *Motions for Summary Judgment* are **granted**.

Facts and Procedural History

The Arizona Legislature is responsible for passing laws controlling elections. *Ariz. Const. Art. VII §1, Moore v. Harper*, 143 S. Ct. 2065, 2090 (2023). Conducting elections is a complicated process and the Legislature has required the Secretary of State (the elections officer for the State)(“Secretary”), to draft an election procedures manual (“EPM”). *A.R.S. § 16-452(A)*. The purpose of this manual is to “achieve and maintain the maximum degree of correctness, impartiality, uniformity and efficiency on the procedures for early voting and voting, and of producing, distributing, collecting, counting, tabulating and storing ballots.” *Id.* Once signed by the Governor, the Attorney General, and the Secretary, the EPM is binding and violating its requirements is a criminal offense. *A.R.S. §16-452(C)*. However, any section of the EPM which violates an election statute does “not have the force of law.” *Leibsohn v. Hobbs*, 254 Ariz. 1, ¶22 (2022).

The issues before the court are: (1) did the Legislature intend for a prior ballot envelope to be a part of a voter’s registration record pursuant to A.R.S. §16-550 and §16-550.01 (Cause # P1300CV202300202); and (2) does the use of unmonitored drop-boxes to collect early ballots violate Arizona law. (Cause # P1300CV202200872)

Application of Law

Registration Record

This part of the litigation involves how early ballots are verified based on the definition of the phrase “registration record” in A.R.S. §16-550 and §16-550.01. In a prior ruling on a Motion to Dismiss, the Court found the signature on a previous ballot envelope did not meet the definition of a registration record in A.R.S. §16-550. Since this ruling, a new EPM has been adopted and the Arizona Legislature has relied on the new EPM when reenacting and amending the relevant statute. As explained below, based on these changes, the Court finds the Legislature intends for a previous ballot envelope to be included in a voter’s registration record.

Verification

In order to have his/her early vote counted, a voter must fill out their ballot and place it in a pre-printed envelope. *A.R.S. §16-547(A)*. The outside of this envelope contains an affidavit indicating the voter is: (1) registered to vote in the county; (2) has not voted and will not vote anywhere else; and (3) personally filled out the ballot within the envelope. *Id.* The voter signs the envelope attesting to these facts under penalty of perjury. *Id.*

When the early ballot is received by the county recorder, they then go about trying to determine if the signature on the envelope is the signature of the registered voter. *A.R.S. § 16-550(A)*. This is done by comparing the ballot envelope to the signature “on the elector’s registration record.” If the two signatures are clearly consistent, then the vote is counted. *A.R.S. §16-550.01(B)*. If the two signatures are not consistent, the voter is notified and given the opportunity to confirm the signature. *Id.*

The current EPM allows a county recorder to compare the signature on the current voter envelope to the signature on the envelope from prior early votes. The signature from the prior early vote envelopes being a part of the “registration record.” Meaning, the 2023 EPM includes in the definition of “registration record” the previous act of early voting.

Legislative Reenactment

When this litigation began, the 2019 EPM remained in effect. The 2019 EPM did not include this method for verifying a signature. However, the parties do not dispute the Secretary told recorders that a prior verified vote was a proper tool for comparison. The 2023 EPM formally adopts this process and includes “prior early ballot affidavits” as part of the registration record. *Ariz. Sec. State. 2023 Elec. Pro. Man. VI.(A)(1)*.

As mentioned above, the Legislature recently amended several elections statutes. These include changes to A.R.S. §16-550 and the addition of A.R.S. §16-550.01. These statutory amendments came after the 2023 EPM was implemented. The amendments rely heavily on the text from the 2023 EPM. In some places the statutes outright adopt language directly from the 2023 EPM. The new statutes also use the phrase “registration record” multiple times.

The Legislature had every opportunity to eliminate “prior early ballot affidavits” as a comparison tool but chose not to do so. Nothing in these amendments suggests the Legislature found the EPM’s working definition of registration record was improper. The Legislature also chose not to provide a definition of registration record in the amended or newly enacted statutes.

The Legislature is presumed “to know how an administrative department interprets the statutes it is responsible to administer.” *State, ex rel., Arizona Dept. Revenue v. Short*, 192 Ariz. 322, 325 ¶14 (App. 1998). In a different context, the Arizona Supreme Court has held courts can infer that the legislature approves of another body’s definition of a statute when there, “is some reason to believe that the legislature has considered and declined to reject that interpretation.” *Lowing v. Allstate Ins. Co.*, 176 Ariz. 101, 106 (1993). More directly, when the, “legislature re-enacts a statute after uniform construction by the officers required to act under it, the presumption is that the legislature knew of such construction and adopted it in re-enacting the statute.” *Jenny v. Arizona Express, Inc.*, 89 Ariz. 343, 346 (1961) (*see also, Mummert v. Thunderbird Lanes, Inc*, 107 Ariz. 244 (1971)).

This is exactly what has happened here. The Arizona Legislature tasked the Secretary of State, the Attorney General and the Governor with constructing the EPM. When they did so in 2023, they included prior ballot envelopes in the working definition of “registration record.” There can be little doubt the Legislature was aware of this definition because they included much of the language from the EPM into this new legislation, including the phrase registration record.

This Court may or may not have been correct about the definition of registration record when it ruled on the previous Motion to Dismiss. However, its prior reasoning is no longer sound based on the Legislature’s adoption of the definition of registration record from the 2023 EPM when reenacting A.R.S. §16-550(A) and enacting of A.R.S. §16-550.01. Regardless of the prior ruling of this Court, it is now presumed from these legislative changes that the Legislature intended to adopt the EPM’s use of prior ballot envelopes to verify signatures.

Off the Rolls

This reading of registration record also complies with Arizona statute in other ways. Intervenor *Mi Familia Vota* points out: a person that requests to vote by early ballot must actually do so or they will be removed from the early voting rolls. *A.R.S. §16-544(H)(4)*. This failure to early vote could ultimately cause a

voter to be dropped from the voting rolls altogether. Meaning, the act of early voting keeps an individual registered to vote in future elections. In Arizona, early voting is simultaneously registering.

Plaintiffs acknowledge the failure to early vote across time can result in a person no longer being able to vote. They argue this path to being off the rolls is so byzantine that it could not have been on the Legislature's mind when they used the phrase "registration record." However, there is no factual record before the Court substantiating this argument. Even though somewhat convoluted, in the system constructed by the Legislature, the act of early voting operates to ensure a voter remains registered.

While not conclusive of legislative intent, this voting/registration paradigm is consistent with the Legislature adopting the 2023 EPM's use of prior ballot envelopes to verify signatures as registration records. Courts are to "harmonize and give effect" to all provisions of a statutory scheme. *Marsh v. Atkins*, 256 Ariz. 233, ¶14 (App. 2023). Including prior ballot envelopes in the definition of registration accomplishes this goal.

Database Argument

The Secretary argues signatures on prior ballot envelopes are registration records because they are kept in a database containing other records related to voters and elections. This database must be kept pursuant to federal statute. The Court is not compelled by this argument. Where or how something is stored does not define the item. Whether or not a record is a "registration record" can only be determined by the content of its character, as defined by the Legislature, and not by the company it keeps.

Conclusion

The Court finds the Legislature intended to adopt the 2023 EPM's use of prior voting envelopes in the definition of registration record when it reenacted A.R.S. §16-550 and adopted A.R.S. §16-550.01. Using this definition also harmonizes other portions of the Arizona elections statutes. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs' *Motion for Summary Judgment* is **denied**. The cross-*Motions for Summary Judgment* are **granted**.

Drop Boxes

Staffed vs. Monitored

When this litigation began, the 2019 EPM was also still in effect. The prior version of the EPM allowed for "unstaffed drop-boxes." The Plaintiffs objected to this portion of the EPM arguing unstaffed drop boxes were not allowed by Arizona statute. The direction of this litigation was also impacted by the enactment of the 2023 EPM and the Legislature amending several voting statutes.

The 2023 EPM creates a process for counties to use drop boxes for the collection of early ballots. *2023 Elections Procedures Manual II(I) pg. 71*. A county recorder may opt to use drop-boxes and the location of the drop-boxes must be approved by the board of supervisors for the county. *Id.* Any county choosing to utilize drop-boxes must comply with the EPM's drop-box requirements. *Id.*

The EPM requires that, "a ballot drop-box shall be located in a secure location such as inside or in front of a federal, state, local or tribal government building." *Id.* At issue here are drop-boxes that are placed outside government buildings. As to these drop-boxes, the EMP states, "A drop-box staffed by elections officials may be placed outdoors and shall be securely fastened in a manner to prevent moving or tampering." *Id.* at II(I)(1)(a).

The section of the EPM matches A.R.S. §16-1005(E) which states, “a person or entity that knowingly solicits the collection of voted or unvoted” that is found “to be serving as a ballot drop off site, other than those established and staffed by certain election officials” is guilty of a class 5 felony. The text of the 2023 EPM does not deviate from Arizona statute.

The issue before the Court is: what is the definition of the word “staffed” as used in the EPM and Arizona statute. The Arizona code states, “in order to be valid and counted, the ballot affidavit must be delivered to the office of the county recorder or other officer in charge of elections or may be deposited at any polling place in the county not later than 7:00 p.m. on election day.” *A.R.S. §16-547(D)*. From this, Plaintiffs argue “staffed” must mean the ballot must be delivered to a drop-box which is monitored by an officer in charge of elections. Plaintiffs appear to be arguing “staffed” and “monitored” are equivalents.

While not defining the term “staffed,” the EPM does not require that staffed drop-boxes always be monitored by an election worker. For instance, the EPM mandates that a fire suppression device be placed inside all ballot drop-boxes, “that are placed outdoors or not within the sight of elections officials.” *2023 Elections Procedures Manual Sec. I(5) pp. 7*. Therefore, the definition of staffed in the EPM clearly does not require a drop-box to be indoors or be monitored at all times.

The Arizona Legislature recently amended A.R.S. §16-547(D). This amendment occurred after the creation of the 2023 EPM. As outlined above, the Legislature is presumed to be aware of the EPM’s use of staffed but unmonitored drop-boxes. *State, ex rel., Arizona Dept. Revenue v. Short*, 192 Ariz. 322, 325 ¶14 (App. 1998). Further, the reenactment of A.R.S. §16-547(D) without providing an alternative definition for deliver or staffed, indicates the Legislature was adopting the use of these types of drop-boxes for the delivery of ballots. *Jenny v. Arizona Express, Inc.*, 89 Ariz. 343, 346 (1961) (*see also, Mummert v. Thunderbird Lanes, Inc.*, 107 Ariz. 244 (1971).) The leaving of item for another to pick up later is also consistent with the dictionary definition of deliver. (*See, Merriam Dictionary* <https://www.merriam-webster.com/Dictionary/Deliver>, searched 4/23/2024 “to take and hand over to or leave for another.”).

The Legislature has delegated to the Secretary the responsibility to “prescribe rules to achieve and maintain the maximum degree of correctness, impartiality, uniformity and efficiency on the procedures for early voting,” including the “collecting of ballots.” *A.R.S. §16-452(A)*. In this instance, the Secretary has included as a method for collecting ballots the use of drop-boxes that are not always monitored by elections officials. After the reenactment of the A.R.S. §16-547(D), the use of these drop-boxes to collect ballots is well within the discretion of the Secretary.

Standing

The 2019 EPM contained a definition of “unstaffed” drop-box and outlined the requirements for their use. Plaintiffs argued these drop-boxes violated the text of Arizona statute. Therefore, the Plaintiffs sought to force the Secretary to perform the non-discretionary act of following Arizona law. A writ of mandamus may be an appropriate tool in these circumstances. *State Board of Technical Registration v. Bauer*, 84 Ariz. 237, 239 (1958).

The 2019 EPM is no longer in effect and the 2023 EPM no longer uses unstaffed drop-boxes. The 2023 EPM requires all drop-boxes to be staffed. The 2023 EPM does not require the staffed drop-boxes to always be monitored. As outlined above, the Legislature was aware of the use of this type of drop-box when it reenacted A.R.S. §16-457(D). At a very minimum, the reenactment of this statute indicates the legislative intent that the

use of these drop-boxes is well within the discretion of the Secretary. While mandamus is a tool to require a government official to, “compel a public officer to perform a discretionary act” it cannot be used to require the official “to exercise that discretion in a particular manner.” *Blankenbaker v. Marks*, 231 Ariz. 575, 577 ¶7 (App. 2013).

The Secretary, the Attorney General and the Governor exercised their discretion in the defining of drop-boxes in the 2023 EPM. The Legislature adopted this definition when it reenacted and amended the statute at issue. Accordingly, Plaintiffs do not have standing to require the Secretary to exercise his discretion in a particular manner. *Blankenbaker*, at ¶ 7.

Conclusion

It is within the Secretary’s discretion to allow counties to choose to use drop-boxes. The Legislature has not required that these drop-boxes always be monitored. The decision to use staffed but unmonitored drop-boxes is within the discretion of the Secretary. Accordingly, the Plaintiffs’ *Motion for Summary Judgment* is **denied**. The cross-*Motions for Summary Judgment* are **granted**.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, in Cause # P1300CV202300202, the Plaintiffs’ *Motion for Summary Judgment* is **denied**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, in Cause # P1300CV202300202, the Defendant and Intervenor’s *Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment* is **granted**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, in Cause # P1300CV202200872, the Plaintiffs’ *Motion for Summary Judgment* is **denied**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, Cause # P1300CV202200872, the Defendants’ *Motion for Summary Judgment and Intervenor’s Motion to Dismiss* are **granted**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, Defendants are to file a form of Judgment with the Court within 10 days of this Order. The Judgment shall contain the appropriate language from Rule 54 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure.

DATED this 25th day of April, 2024.



eSigned by NAPPER, JOHN 04/25/2024 13:23:35 118T1OaJ

cc: Timothy A. LaSota – Timothy A. LaSota, PLC, 2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305, Phoenix, AZ 85016
Thomas G. Olp/Nathan Lloyd – Thomas More Society, 309 W. Washington St., Ste. 1250,
Chicago, IL 60606

Kara Karlson/Karen J. Hartman-Tellez/Kyle Cummings – Arizona A.G.’s Office (e)

D. Andrew Gaona/Austin C. Yost – Coppersmith Brockelman PLC (e)

Abha Khanna/Makeba Rutahindurwa/Marlyn Gabriela Robb/Elena A. Rodriguez Armenta – Elias Law Group LLP (e)

David B. Rosenbaum/Joshua J. Messer – Osborn Maledon, P.A. (e)

Kory Langhofer/Thomas Basile – Statecraft PLLC (e)

Craig A. Morgan/Shayna Stuart/Jake Tyler Rapp – Sherman & Howard L.L.C. (e)

Roy Herrera/Daniel A. Arellano/Jillian L. Andrews/Austin T. Marshall – Herrera Arellano LLP (e)