

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

Louis Agre, William Ewing,	)	
Floyd Montgomery, Joy Montgomery,	)	
Rayman Solomon, John Gallagher,	)	
Ani Diakatos, Joseph Zebrowitz, Shawndra	)	
Holmberg, Cindy Harmon, Heather Turnage,	)	
Leigh Ann Congdon, Reagan Hauer, Jason	)	
Magidson, Joe Landis, James Davis, Ed	)	Civil Action No. 2:17-cv-4392
Gragert, Ginny Mazzei, Dana Kellerman,	)	
Brian Burychka, Marina Kats, Douglas	)	
Graham, Jean Shenk, Kristin Polston,	)	
Tara Stephenson, and Barbara Shah,	)	The Honorable D. Brooks Smith
	)	The Honorable Patty Schwartz
Plaintiffs,	)	The Honorable Michael D. Baylson
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
Thomas W. Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania,	)	
Robert Torres, Secretary of State of	)	
Pennsylvania, and Jonathan Marks,	)	
Commissioner of the Bureau of Elections,	)	
in their official capacities,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT – INJUNCTIVE RELIEF REQUESTED**

**Introduction**

1. In violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the defendant Pennsylvania Governor and other State officer defendants are engaged in implementing a Congressional districting plan (“2011 Plan”) which was beyond the authority of the General Assembly to adopt under the Elections Clause of the Constitution, Article I, Section 4. By continuing to implement the 2011 Plan, the State officer defendants have deprived the plaintiffs of their rights under the Privileges and Immunities Clause and the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and of their rights under the First Amendment of the Constitution. The 2011 Plan adopted by the General Assembly seeks to influence or control the party affiliations of those who will represent the

people of Pennsylvania in the Congress. Because the Elections Clause is a source of only neutral procedural rules, it does not give the General Assembly the authority to draw Congressional districts based on the likely voting preferences of plaintiffs and other citizens. By doing so, the 2011 Plan has deprived plaintiffs of their constitutional rights as set forth below.

2. As set out in Article I, Section 4, the Elections Clause reads as follows:

The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of Chusing Senators.

3. The Elections Clause is a limited grant of authority to enact neutral procedural rules. As Justice Kennedy stated in his concurring opinion in *Cook v. Gralike*, 531 U.S. 510, 527 (2010):

A State is not permitted to interpose itself between the people and their National Government. . . [T]he Elections Clause is a grant of authority to issue procedural regulations, and not a source of power to dictate electoral outcomes, to favor or disfavor a class of candidates . . . [This] dispositive principle . . . is fundamental to the Constitution.

4. Under the Tenth Amendment the States cannot purport to have or “reserve” a power to intentionally influence the outcome of U.S. House elections, since no such “reserved” power could have logically existed before adoption of the Constitution. Nor did Congress confer a power upon state legislatures to engage in political gerrymandering of any kind when it enacted 2 U.S.C. § 2, requiring the states to create single member districts and precluding at-large elections.

5. Plaintiffs recognize that *Gill, et al. v. Whitford, et al.* (16-1161) is now pending before the United States Supreme Court. The present action raises a different type of legal claim not at issue in *Whitford*. While plaintiffs support the holding of the three-judge court in *Whitford*,

that holding does not consider the effect of the Elections Clause on elections to the United States Congress. None of the three counts set out below duplicates the particular issue pending before the Court in *Whitford*.

6. As set out in Count I, the 2011 Plan denies the rights of plaintiffs as federal citizens to be free of this intentional interference by the General Assembly in choosing the party affiliations of their Representatives in the Congress. The 2011 Plan thereby deprives plaintiffs of their rights of federal citizenship under the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The 2011 Plan seeks to interfere with this free choice and right of federal citizenship by concentrating plaintiffs and other likely Democratic voters in the fewest possible Congressional districts. It also seeks to strategically place likely Republican voters in all other districts so as to constitute effective voting majorities for Republican candidates for Congress. In violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the defendant State officers are continuing to implement this 2011 Plan which unlawfully deprives or interferes with their decisions as federal citizens as to the party affiliation of their Representatives to Congress.

7. As set out in Count II, the 2011 Plan denies plaintiffs' right to free speech under the First Amendment by burdening their right to vote on the basis of the content and viewpoint of their speech. Moreover, such burden cannot be justified by the State's power to engage in time, place, and manner regulations under the Elections Clause because it is a content regulation with a partisan purpose that is not authorized by the Elections Clause. The 2011 Plan limits where and in what forum voters and candidates can speak based on the viewpoint they have expressed in past elections and that which they are likely to express in future elections. The 2011 Plan also attempts to stifle the effectiveness of some voters' speech, namely Democrats, including many of the plaintiffs, based on their viewpoint.

8. Plaintiffs seek injunctive relief, prior to the Congressional elections scheduled for 2018, to bar defendants from implementing the 2011 Plan.

9. Plaintiffs also seek an order requiring the State officer defendants to submit for review by this Court any proposed revision of the 2011 Plan designed to confine it to procedural regulations in compliance with the Elections Clause.

### **Parties**

10. Plaintiff Louis Agre is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 2nd Congressional district.

11. Plaintiff William Ewing is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 2nd Congressional district.

12. Plaintiff Floyd Montgomery is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 16<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

13. Plaintiff Joy Montgomery is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 16<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

14. Plaintiff Rayman Solomon is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional district.

15. Plaintiff John Gallagher is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional district.

16. Plaintiff Ani Diakatos is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional district.

17. Plaintiff Joseph Zebrowitz is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional district.

18. Plaintiff Shawndra Holmberg is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 3<sup>rd</sup> Congressional district.

19. Plaintiff Cindy Harmon is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 3<sup>rd</sup> Congressional district.

20. Plaintiff Heather Turnage is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 4<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

21. Plaintiff Leigh Ann Congdon is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 5<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

22. Plaintiff Reagan Hauer is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 6<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

23. Plaintiff Jason Magidson is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 7<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

24. Plaintiff Joe Landis is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

25. Plaintiff James Davis is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 9<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

26. Plaintiff Ed Gragert is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 10<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

27. Plaintiff Ginny Mazzei is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 11<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

28. Plaintiff Dana Kellerman is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 12<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

29. Plaintiff Brian Burychka is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 13<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

30. Plaintiff Marina Kats is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 13<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

31. Plaintiff Douglas Graham is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 14<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

32. Plaintiff Jean Shenk is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 15<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

33. Plaintiff Kristin Polston is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 17<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

34. Plaintiff Tara Stephenson is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 17<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

35. Plaintiff Barbara Shah is a citizen of Pennsylvania and a resident of Pennsylvania's 18<sup>th</sup> Congressional district.

36. Defendant Thomas W. Wolf is the Governor of Pennsylvania and is charged with execution of its laws.

37. Defendant Robert Torres<sup>1</sup> is the Acting Secretary of State of Pennsylvania and is charged with administration of the election laws.

38. Defendant Jonathan Marks, is the Commissioner of the Bureau of Elections of Pennsylvania and is charged with administration of the election laws.

39. The Defendants are all sued in their official capacities.

### **Jurisdiction and Venue**

40. The Court has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because plaintiffs' claims arise under the Constitution and laws of the United States, namely the First and

---

<sup>1</sup> Since the filing of plaintiffs' original complaint, Defendant Torres has taken over the office of the previously named Defendant Pedro Cortes as Acting Secretary of State and has been substituted as a defendant pursuant to Rule 25(d), Fed. R. Civ. P.

Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution, and 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The Court also has jurisdiction over the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1343 because plaintiffs seek relief from the deprivation of civil rights, including the right to vote, the right to equal protection of the laws, and the right to free speech. The Court has jurisdiction over this case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284 because it is a challenge to the constitutionality of the apportionment of congressional districts. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2284(a), plaintiffs request the appointment of a three-judge district court.

41. Venue is proper in this judicial district because some of the defendants reside in this district and many of the events and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district.

### **Facts**

42. There has been a long history of gerrymandering in Pennsylvania and as demonstrated by past legal court challenges. The practice has become part of the political culture of the state.

43. In 2011, following the 2010 National Census, the Republican National Committee sponsored and launched a nationwide project known as REDMAP, to be undertaken by national and state Republican party leaders and officials, including some or all of the defendants, to draw up and adopt Congressional districting plans that favored the election of Republicans over Democrats.

44. As explained on the home page of REDMAP, as a result of 2010 state legislative victories, Republican-dominated state legislatures had “an opportunity to create 2025 new Republican Congressional Districts through the redistricting process . . . solidifying a Republican majority [in the U.S. House].”

45. REDMAP employed election-related data and projected demographic trends likely to be more successful in ensuring Republican victories than previous such efforts, because digital or computer models available by 2011 that employ voter registration and other data indicating the political preferences of citizens were more sophisticated than previous models in projecting population growth and population movement of likely Democratic and likely Republican voters over a ten-year period.

46. REDMAP focused on states such as and including Pennsylvania where relatively even vote totals for Democratic and Republican state-wide candidates afforded the largest prospective partisan gains to be obtained from Congressional redistricting.

47. On information and belief, officials in the state Republican party in Pennsylvania and legislative leaders in the General Assembly in Pennsylvania, including the Republican defendants, actively participated in deploying and implementing REDMAP in Pennsylvania, employing the sophisticated digital or computer models that used voter registration and other data indicating the political preferences of citizens. Defendants' efforts resulted in the Congressional districting plan set out in Senate Bill 1249, adopted by the Pennsylvania General Assembly on December 14, 2011, that is the Plan which is the subject of this Complaint.

48. Based upon the use of such sophisticated digital or computer models that use voter registration and other data indicating the political preferences of citizens, the Plan divides Pennsylvania into 18 Congressional districts with the intent, purpose and effect of maximizing the number of Republican candidates elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from Pennsylvania.

49. A number of the 18 Congressional districts, such as the Sixth and Seventh Districts, have bizarre or crazy-quilt shapes that cannot be explained by districting criteria such

as continuity, community of interest, historical division, or political or governmental boundaries, or by computer models employing criteria other than partisan data.

50. Based upon the use of such sophisticated digital or computer models that use voter registration and other data indicating the political preferences of citizens, a number of such 18 Congressional districts were drawn with the use of “packing” and “cracking” techniques, “packing” or concentrating likely Democratic voters in the smallest number of districts and “cracking” or spreading out likely Republican voters in the largest number of districts.

51. As found by various experts, such as Professor Sam Wang of Princeton University, no computer model using neutral or criteria other than partisan intent could have randomly produced the district boundaries in 2011 Plan.

52. The Plan was introduced—without notice by amendment to Senate Bill 1249, with no opportunity for review or comment by the citizens of the State or the Democratic members of the Assembly—on December 20, 2011, on which day the Plan was adopted.

53. Since then, the 2011 Plan has achieved its intended effect and made more likely the election of Republican candidates to Congress.

54. In both the 2014 and 2016 elections, the 2011 Plan secured the election of 13 Republican candidates to Congress in the 18 Congressional districts of the State, or 72% of the congressional seats.

55. At the same time, the votes for the Democratic and Republican candidates for Congress on a state wide basis were divided nearly equally, with Republicans winning just 55.5% of the statewide congressional vote in 2014, and 53.9% in 2016 .

**Count I**

**Section 1983: Violation of Privileges and Immunities Clause**

56. In violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and by implementing the 2011 Plan which was beyond the authority of the General Assembly to adopt under the Elections Clause, the defendant State officers have deprived the plaintiffs and other citizens of their rights as federal citizens to be free of State interference in the election of their Representatives to the National Legislature. In so doing, the defendant State officers have denied plaintiffs their rights under the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment and the Supremacy Clause of Article VI, section 2

57. Neither Clause permits the State to interpose itself between the citizens of the State and their Representatives in the National Legislature or otherwise to act beyond its authority under the Elections Clause.

58. The Elections Clause itself is a source of only neutral procedural rules.

59. In violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and by continuing to implement the State's 2011 Plan, which seeks to determine the party affiliation of Representatives in the National Legislature, the State officer defendants have deprived plaintiffs of their rights of federal citizenship to be free of such interference under the Privileges and Immunities Clause

60. Furthermore, the Supremacy Clause prohibits the States from encroaching on the sovereignty of the United States or interfering with the fundamental design of the Constitution..

61. Under the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, the General Assembly had no reserved power to influence or control the party affiliation of the Representatives to the National Legislature.

62. No such “reserved” power could have existed prior to the adoption of the Constitution and no such power can be “reserved.”

63. Nor does 2 U.S.C. § 2 which requires single member Congressional districts confer any authority upon the State of Pennsylvania or the defendant State officers to influence or control the political viewpoint of persons elected to the Congress.

WHEREFORE plaintiffs pray this Court to:

- A. Declare and adjudge that in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 by continuing to implement the 2011 Plan beyond the authority of the State to adopt under the Elections Clause, the defendant State officers have deprived plaintiffs of their rights as federal citizens to have Representatives of their own choosing without the interference of the State and of their rights of federal citizenship under the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment
- B. Direct and order that prior to the 2018 Congressional elections the defendant State officers will submit for approval of the General Assembly one or more alternative districting plans within the authority of the General Assembly under the Elections Clause and is consistent with plaintiffs' rights of federal citizenship under the the Privileges and Immunities Clause and the Supremacy Clause
- C. Direct and order that defendant State officers develop such plans through a process that has reasonable safeguards against partisan influence, including the consideration of voting preferences.
- D. Retain continuing jurisdiction over the state defendants to comply with these requirements.
- E. Grant plaintiffs their legal fees and costs and such other relief as may be appropriate.

**Count II**  
**Section 1983: Violation of the First Amendment**

64. In the conduct of elections to Congress, the Elections Clause allows the state to pass “time, place, and manner” regulations that limit how plaintiffs and other citizens may vote.

65. The Elections Clause is a limited grant of authority for procedural regulations.

66. The Elections Clause is not a source of authority to dictate electoral outcomes, or favor or disfavor a class of candidates.

67. This authority is further circumscribed by the First Amendment, which subjects to strict judicial scrutiny any content based regulation of speech or any law like the 2011 Plan which discriminates against citizens based on their political viewpoints.

68. Both the Elections Clause and the First Amendment separately and together express a constitutional principle that in conducting federal elections, the states must use or employ procedural regulations that give the widest possible scope to plaintiffs and other citizens to elect their representatives and have the least possible interference in their choices.

69. When First Amendment rights are violated, the courts have broad equitable authority to remedy such constitutional violations.

70. Furthermore, in determining the remedy for First Amendment violations, the courts may and should consider the particular limits on state authority under the Elections Clause, and the rights to direct election of members of Congress under Article I.

71. With respect to Congressional districting, plaintiffs are entitled to the use of a neutral or least restrictive process consistent with the limits on state authority under the Elections Clause to secure the rights of federal citizenship and the limits placed by the First Amendment to ensure the broadest possible freedom of choice without interference by any government.

72. Gerrymandering unlawfully interferes with rights of self-government and thereby undermines the purposes of both the Elections Clause and the First Amendment, and is inimical to both.

73. Gerrymandering like the 2011 Plan restricts the majority political processes and has the intent of making it harder for plaintiffs and other citizens to remove or replace their representatives in Congress or to hold those representatives accountable to them directly.

74. Furthermore, the 2011 Plan uses the techniques of packing and cracking to place certain plaintiffs in super Democratic districts where they are less likely to replace Republican incumbents or reduce the Republican representation in the state Congressional delegation or they are spread out into other districts where they are unlikely to have any outcome determinative effect.

75. Such isolating techniques limit or deny other less invidious combinations of plaintiffs with other citizens of the state, and impede their right to associate with each other and communicate and act in concert together without being segregated based on political viewpoints.

76. Such isolating techniques are intended to discourage electoral competition and competitive electoral races and necessarily discourage the robust political debate which both the Elections Clause in federal elections and the First Amendment generally seeks to protect.

77. Such isolating techniques to ensure the same results are intended to or necessarily have the effect of discouraging participation in elections.

78. Gerrymandering like the 2011 Plan thereby deprives or diminishes the right of self government protected by First Amendment and the particular robust form of federal citizenship independent of state interference that is contemplated by the Elections Clause and Article I of the Constitution.

79. While any scheme of districting necessarily has some political effect and in that respect is inherently political process, it is therefore all the more necessary under the Elections Clause and the First Amendment to limit the state to neutral procedural regulations when it regulates federal elections.

80. Accordingly, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983, by continuing to implement the 2011 Plan, and thereby enforcing a specific type regulation or speech-related districting scheme which is inherently destructive of plaintiffs' right of self-government protected in a particular way by the Elections Clause and more generally by the First Amendment, the defendant State officers have unlawfully deprived plaintiffs of their rights under the First Amendment

WHEREFORE plaintiffs pray this Court to:

- A. Declare and adjudge that in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and by continuing to implement the 2011 Plan, the defendant State officers have deprived plaintiffs of their rights under the First Amendment.
- B. Direct and order that prior to the 2018 Congressional elections the State defendants will submit for approval of the General Assembly one or more alternative districting plans that will affect the time place and manner for political speech under neutral rules that are within the authority of the State to adopt under the Elections Clause.
- C. Direct and order that the defendant State officers develop such process for creating alternative plans with safeguards to ensure that they are within the authority of the State to adopt under the Elections Clause.
- D. Retain continuing jurisdiction of this case for purposes of approval of the process described above.

E. Grant plaintiffs their legal fees and costs and such other relief as may be appropriate.

Dated: November 17, 2017

By: s/ Thomas H. Geoghegan  
One of Plaintiffs' Attorneys

Thomas H. Geoghegan (*pro hac vice*)  
Michael P. Persoon (*pro hac vice*)  
Sean Morales-Doyle (*pro hac vice*)  
Despres, Schwartz & Geoghegan, Ltd.  
77 West Washington Street, Suite 711  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
312-372-2511

Alice W. Ballard, Esquire  
Law Office of Alice W. Ballard, P.C.  
123 S. Broad Street, Suite 2135  
Philadelphia, PA 19109  
215-893-9708  
Fax: 215-893-9997  
Email: [awballard@awballard.com](mailto:awballard@awballard.com)  
<http://awballard.com>

Brian A. Gordon  
Gordon & Ashworth, P.C.  
One Belmont Ave., Suite 519  
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004  
610-667-4500

Lisa A. Mathewson  
The Law Offices of Lisa A. Mathewson, LLC  
123 South Broad Street, Suite 810  
Philadelphia, PA 19109  
(215) 399-9592 (phone)  
(215) 600-2734 (e-fax)  
[lam@mathewson-law.com](mailto:lam@mathewson-law.com)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have served the attached Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint through the ECF System on all Counsel as follows:

Gregory G. Schwab  
Deputy General Counsel  
Governor's Office of General Counsel  
333 Market Street, 17th Floor  
Harrisburg, PA 17101  
Tel: (717) 783-6563  
Fax: (717) 787-1788  
Email: gschwab@pa.gov  
Counsel for the Governor of Pennsylvania, Thomas W. Wolf,  
in his official capacity as Governor

Timothy E. Gates  
Deputy Chief Counsel  
PA Department of State  
306 North Office Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
Tel: 717-783-0736  
Fax: 717-214-9899  
Email: tgates@pa.gov  
Counsel for Pedro A. Cortés, the Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and Jonathan M. Marks, Commissioner of the Bureau of Commissions, Elections and Legislation of the Pennsylvania Department of State, in their official capacities

Mark A. Aronchick  
Hangley Aronchick Segal Pudlin & Schiller  
One Logan Square, 27th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 568-6200  
Email: maronchick@hangley.com  
Counsel for Defendants Thomas W. Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania; Pedro A. Cortés, Secretary of State of Pennsylvania; and Jonathan M. Marks, Commissioner for the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation, in their official capacities

Michele D. Hangley  
Hangley Aronchick Segal Pudlin & Schiller  
One Logan Square, 27th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 568-6200  
Email: mhangley@hangley.com

Counsel for Defendants Thomas W. Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania; Pedro A. Cortés, Secretary of State of Pennsylvania; and Jonathan M. Marks, Commissioner for the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation, in their official capacities

Claudia De Palma  
Hangley Aronchick Segal Pudlin & Schiller  
One Logan Square, 27th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 568-6200  
Email: cdepalma@hangley.com

Counsel for Defendants Thomas W. Wolf, Governor of Pennsylvania; Pedro A. Cortés, Secretary of State of Pennsylvania; and Jonathan M. Marks, Commissioner for the Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and Legislation, in their official capacities

Brian S. Paszamant  
Blank Rome LLP  
One Logan Square  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Phone: 215-569-5791  
Fax: 215-832-5791  
Email: paszamant@blankrome.com  
Counsel on behalf of Defendant-Intervenor Joseph B. Scarnati, III, in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore

John P. Wixted  
Blank Rome LLP  
One Logan Square  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Phone: 215-569-5649  
Fax: 215-832-5649  
Email: jwixted@blankrome.com  
Counsel on behalf of Defendant-Intervenor Joseph B. Scarnati, III, in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore

Jason A. Snyderman  
Blank Rome LLP  
One Logan Square  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Phone: 215-569-5774  
Fax: 215-832-5774  
Email: snyderman@blankrome.com  
Counsel for Defendant-Intervenor Joseph B. Scarnati, III,  
in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore

Daniel S. Morris  
Blank Rome LLP  
One Logan Square  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Phone: 215-569-5411  
Fax: 215-832-5411  
Email: Morris-D@blankrome.com  
Counsel on behalf of Defendant-Intervenor Joseph B. Scarnati, III, in  
his official capacity as Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore

Kathleen A. Gallagher  
Cipriani & Werner  
650 Washington Road Suite 700  
Pittsburgh, PA 15228  
Phone: 412-564-2500  
Email: kgallagher@c-wlaw.com  
Counsel for Defendant-Intervenor Michael Turzai,  
in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Speaker of the House

Jason Torchinsky  
Holtzman Vogel Josefiak Torchinsky PLLC  
45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100  
Warrenton, Virginia 20186  
Phone: (540) 341-8808  
Fax: (540) 341-8809  
Email: jtorchinsky@hvjt.law  
Counsel for Defendants-Intervenors Joseph B. Scarnati, III,  
in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore, and  
Michael Turzai, in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Speaker of the House

Shawn T. Sheehy  
Holtzman Vogel Josefiak Torchinsky PLLC  
45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100  
Warrenton, Virginia 20186  
Phone: (540) 341-8808  
Fax: (540) 341-8809

Counsel for Defendants-Intervenors Joseph B. Scarnati, III,  
in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore, and  
Michael Turzai, in his official capacity as Pennsylvania Speaker of the House

Mark Erik Elias, Bruce Spiva, Alexander Tischenko, Aria Christine Branch, and  
Amanda Rebecca Calais  
Perkins Coie LLP  
700 13th Street NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
Counsel for Proposed Intervenor Plaintiffs

Dated: November 17, 2017

s/ Thomas H. Geoghegan  
One of Plaintiffs' Attorneys