

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

Barbara Diamond, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	Civil Action No. 5:17-cv-05054
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
Robert Torres, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	
	:	

REPLY IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF MOTION TO STAY OR ABSTAIN

Having failed to file their complaint until November 9, 2017, six years and three elections after Pennsylvania’s 2011 Plan¹ was passed, Plaintiffs unsurprisingly find themselves last in line—4 years behind plaintiffs in *Benisek v. Lamone*, No. 13-cv-03233 (D. Md. Nov. 5, 2013); 2 years and 4 months behind plaintiffs in *Whitford v. Gill*, No. 15-cv-00421 (W.D. Wisc. July 8, 2015); 1 year and 3 months behind plaintiffs in *Common Cause v. Rucho*, No. 1:16-cv-1026 (M.D.N.C. Aug. 5, 2016); 5 months behind petitioners in *League of Women Voters v. Commonwealth*, No. 159 MM 2017 (Pa.) (“*LWV*”); and even a month behind plaintiffs in *Agre v. Wolf*, No. 2:17-cv-04392 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 2, 2017) (“*Agre*”). Dissatisfied with their place in line, Plaintiffs continue to demand that this Court completely overturn the efficient and orderly administration of justice and hear their claims immediately. But Plaintiffs (and their now-allies, Executive Defendants) offer no good reason for this Court to do so.

First, today the Pennsylvania Supreme Court struck down the 2011 Plan as unconstitutional and enjoined its use for the upcoming 2018 elections. Moreover, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court: (1) afforded the General Assembly and the Governor until

¹ Unless otherwise noted herein, capitalized terms shall have the meanings afforded such terms in Legislative Defendants’ Memorandum of Law in Support of their Motion to Stay or Abstain (ECF No. 69-2).

February 15, 2018 to present it with an alternative Congressional districting plan for use in the upcoming 2018 elections; and (2) ruled that absent a duly enacted plan being presented to the Court by February 15, 2018, the Court will craft its own plan based upon the record before it. Order, No. 159 MM 2017 (Jan. 22, 2018) (attached as **Exhibit A**). In other words, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's decision in *LWV* has, at least for the time being, mooted this case. This Court is required to defer to Pennsylvania's legislative, executive and judicial branches where they have "begun to address that highly political task itself." *Grove v. Emison*, 507 U.S. 25, 33 (1993).

Second, there is no reason for this Court to decide this case without the guidance of the U.S. Supreme Court's forthcoming decisions in *Gill v. Whitford*, No. 16-1161 (U.S.) and *Benisek v. Lamone*, No. 17-333 (U.S.), among others. While Plaintiffs devote extensive space in their Opposition (ECF No. 73, hereafter "Opp.") attempting to distinguish their Complaint from the claims in *Gill* and *Benisek*, they cannot. Moreover, that approach misses the forest for the trees. The simple, incontrovertible truth is that there are myriad ways in which the Supreme Court's decisions in *Gill* and *Benisek* could significantly affect the disposition of this case. The Supreme Court may rule that all partisan gerrymandering claims are nonjusticiable; it may articulate the appropriate standards to evaluate those claims; or it may simply announce general principles that lower courts should follow in fashioning their own standards.

A stay is further warranted in light of two additional pending U.S. Supreme Court appeals: *Common Cause v. Rucho*, No. 17A745 (U.S.) (stay order issued January 18, 2018) and *Agre*, No. 17-631 (U.S.) (appeal filed January 18, 2018). Like Plaintiffs here, plaintiffs in both of these cases advance claims under the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution. *Rucho* also involves claims under the First and Fourteenth Amendment that are substantially similar to the

claims here. A stay in the instant action is particularly appropriate in light of the U.S. Supreme Court's recent 7-2 vote implementing an emergency stay of *Rucho*. Order, No. 17-745 (Jan. 18, 2018) (attached as **Exhibit B**).

At bottom, Plaintiffs and Executive Defendants have nothing more than their repeated refrain that absent their preferred schedule, "the citizens of Pennsylvania will have to live under an unconstitutional map for yet another election." Opp. at 2. But that simply presupposes this case's outcome. Stripped of that assumption, there is no prejudice. And Plaintiffs' interests are not the only ones at stake. Legislative Defendants have a due process right to a fair trial, which requires them to have adequate time to prepare a substantive defense to Plaintiffs' claims. The weighty issues presented in this case deserve sufficient time to ensure the right result—not merely a hasty result, borne of a dubious, expedited process. Staying this matter will neither deny Plaintiffs their day in court nor prejudice them. But adopting Plaintiffs' proposed schedule will substantially prejudice Legislative Defendants, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and its voters.

For these additional reasons, more fully set forth below, the Court should stay this matter.

I. THE COURT SHOULD STAY AND ABSTAIN FROM PROCEEDING WITH THIS CASE PENDING *LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS*

Plaintiffs and Executive Defendants cannot dispute that, if the Pennsylvania Supreme Court invalidates the 2011 Plan in *LWV*, this case is moot. Counsel for Plaintiffs as well as Executive Defendants conceded as much at the Scheduling Conference in this matter:

THE COURT: [D]o you agree that that would moot this case?

MR. SPIVA: [I]f the Pennsylvania Supreme Court ... to answer your question directly, Your Honor, were to invalidate the map under the Pennsylvania Constitution and order a remedy then I think at that point it would make sense to -- for this court to reevaluate whether it wanted to stay this case until that process was completed and this case may go away. That's -- that is certainly possible, Your Honor.

...

MR. ARONCHICK: Well, first of all I think this case is separate from the *League of Women Voters* [case]....

THE COURT: True enough, but it's the same map at issue; right? So – I mean, it's unavoidable ... if there is a finding for the plaintiffs there on a liability side and some remedy is given we'd have to at a minimum we'd have to have everything on hold here, because we wouldn't know what map we were looking at; right?

MR. ARONCHICK: Well, that presupposes a certain outcome that may or may not occur.

(Trans. of 1/11/2018 at 11:13-14, 11:21-12:3, 16:22-23, 17:4-5, 17:7-14; *see Opp.* at 4).

This has now happened. Today the Pennsylvania Supreme Court struck down the 2011 Plan as unconstitutional and enjoined its use for the upcoming 2018 elections. Moreover, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court: (1) afforded the General Assembly and the Governor until February 15, 2018 within which to present it with an alternate Congressional districting plan for use in the upcoming 2018 elections; and (2) ruled that absent a duly enacted plan being presented to the Court by February 15, 2018, the Court will craft its own plan based upon the record before it. (*See Exhibit A*). In other words, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court's decision in *LWV* has, at least for the time being, mooted this case.

As such, this Court should adhere to the clear mandate of the U.S. Supreme Court: “the Court has **required** federal judges to defer consideration of disputes involving redistricting where the State, through its legislative *or* judicial branch, has begun to address that highly political task itself.” *Grove*, 507 U.S. at 33 (emphasis added). And, while Plaintiffs and Executive Defendants now contend that this mandate only applies where state courts “have *already invalidated a redistricting plan*,”² (*Opp.* at 5 (emphasis in original); *see also Exec.*

² Plaintiffs seem to be of two minds concerning the Plan's “invalidity.” On one hand, they claim that because no state court has invalidated the Plan, *Grove*'s mandate is inapplicable. (*Opp.* at 5). But, elsewhere Plaintiffs act as if

Defs.’ Resp. in Opp. To Legis. Defs.’ Mot. to Stay or Abstain (“EDs’ Resp.”) at 2-3), such contention not only ignores the plain language of *Grove* and that federal district courts have, in fact stayed federal litigation *before* state courts have invalidated a redistricting plan, *see, e.g., Rice v. Smith*, 988 F. Supp. 1437, 1438, 1440 (M.D. Ala. 1997) (twice staying federal litigation to allow state court to first consider constitutionality of state reapportionment plan), but is simply irrelevant given that the 2011 Plan has now been invalidated, *see also Lance v. Davidson*, No. Civ.A. 03-Z-2453(CBS), 2004 WL 2359555, at *1 (D. Colo. Oct. 14, 2004) (noting district court stayed redistricting challenge pending outcome of appeal to U.S. Supreme Court from state Supreme Court decision).

II. THE COURT SHOULD STAY THIS CASE PENDING *GILL* AND *BENISEK*

Additionally, the U.S. Supreme Court’s dispositions of *Gill* and *Benisek* in the coming months are highly likely to directly affect how this Court should address the claims advanced by Plaintiffs. Nothing in Plaintiffs’ or Executive Defendants’ Oppositions suggests otherwise.

First, Plaintiffs’ contention that the Supreme Court is “extraordinarily unlikely” to find all partisan gerrymandering claims nonjusticiable is curious given that a near-majority of the U.S. Supreme Court came to that very conclusion in *Vieth v. Jubelirer*, 541 U.S. 267, 281 (2004). And even Justice Kennedy, whom Plaintiffs cite approvingly, acknowledged in his concurring opinion that “[t]here are ... weighty arguments for holding cases like these to be nonjusticiable; and those arguments may prevail in the long run.” *Id.* at 309. Moreover, although the Supreme Court has yet to overturn its determination that partisan gerrymandering claims are justiciable in theory, it has continued to struggle to adopt any standard to evaluate such claims in practice. *See, e.g., League of United Latin Am. Citizens v. Perry*, 548 U.S. 399 (2006) (producing

the Plan has already been invalidated so as to argue that this Court must act quickly so that this case can be decided in advance of the 2018 elections. *See, e.g., id.* at 3 (“And, as other similarly situated courts have recognized, a delay that has the effect of subjecting voters to *unconstitutional districting plans for another election ...*”).

six separate opinions); *see also Raleigh Wake Citizens Ass'n v. Wake Cnty. Bd. of Elections*, 827 F.3d 333, 348 (4th Cir. 2016); *Shapiro v. McManus*, 203 F. Supp. 3d 579, 594 (D. Md. 2016); *Ala. Legislative Black Caucus v. Alabama*, 988 F. Supp. 2d 1285, 1296, (M.D. Ala. 2013). Given the above, a decision by the Supreme Court that partisan gerrymandering claims are nonjusticiable is hardly implausible or far-fetched.³

Second, Plaintiffs' attempts to distinguish their claims from those presented in *Gill* and *Benisek* are unpersuasive. For example, while Plaintiffs attempt to contrast their First Amendment claim with the First and Fourteenth Amendment standard adopted by the *Gill* district court, (*see Opp.* at 7-8), they neglect to mention that they also advance their own "Whitford-style First and Fourteenth Amendment claim," (Pls.' Mem. in Supp. of Mot. for Reconsideration ("Recon. Memo."), ECF No. 43-1, at 9)—a point that did not escape this Court when granting its initial stay in this action on November 22, 2017, (Order, ECF No. 40). Similarly, Plaintiffs strain to distinguish their First Amendment viewpoint discrimination claim from the First Amendment claim advanced in *Benisek*, but can do no better than to note that they will employ quantitative and statistical evidence and challenge more than one district. (*Opp.* at 8). But Plaintiffs cannot escape that they rely on the same basic legal theory suggested by Justice Kennedy's concurrence in *Vieth*. *Compare id.* ("Accordingly, Plaintiffs assert the same First Amendment framework set forth by Justice Kennedy in *Vieth*: 'if a court were to find that a State did impose burdens and restrictions on groups or persons by reason of their views, there

³ Plaintiffs suggest that this case should proceed because, in Plaintiffs' view, "[i]n elections cases, the Supreme Court has generally proceeded by articulating a workable principle that lends itself to a manageable test, while allowing the lower courts to adapt and refine that test over time." (*Opp.* at 11). But the U.S. Supreme Court has yet to articulate such a workable principle or manageable test for partisan gerrymandering claims. In the absence of such guidance, leaving it entirely in the hands of lower courts does not work. As the *Vieth* plurality observed, "lower courts were set wandering in the wilderness for 18 years not because the *Bandemer* majority thought it a good idea, but because five Justices could not agree upon a single standard, and because the standard the plurality proposed turned out not to work." 541 U.S. at 303.

would likely be a First Amendment violation, unless the State shows some compelling interest.”) with Second Am. Compl. ¶¶ 32-34, 37, *Benisek*, No. 1:13-cv-03233 (D. Md. Mar. 3, 2016) (quoting the same passage and articulating the same First Amendment framework).

Plaintiffs attempt to draw as many distinctions without a difference as they can between their purported standards and methodologies and those adopted by the district courts in *Gill* and *Benisek* is unavailing and disingenuous. As Legislative Defendants previously demonstrated, a side-by-side comparison of Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint and the *Gill* complaint demonstrates that their basic factual and constitutional claims *are identical*. (Legis. Defs.’ Mem. of Law in Supp. of Their Mot. to Stay or Abstain, ECF 69-2, at 8-9). Plaintiffs do not and cannot rebut this fact. And the brief redo above of this same exercise demonstrates that Plaintiffs’ First Amendment claim is substantially similar to the one advanced in *Benisek*.

The fact is that all partisan gerrymandering plaintiffs, including Plaintiffs here, start from substantially the same factual and constitutional claims. While each set of plaintiffs might rely on slightly different metrics or propose slightly different standards, the Supreme Court’s review is not confined to those metrics and standards. *See, e.g., Lopez v. Wilson*, 426 F.3d 339, 363 (6th Cir. 2005) (“Neither state supreme courts [n]or the Supreme Court of the United States exist merely to correct errors of the lower courts, but rather sit to address other matters of larger public import.”). In its review, the Supreme Court will inevitably engage with the basic factual and constitutional claims underpinning these partisan gerrymandering cases. As a result, the simple, incontrovertible truth is that there are myriad ways in which the Supreme Court’s upcoming decisions will impact the instant case: the Supreme Court may rule that all partisan gerrymandering claims are nonjusticiable; it may adopt one of the standards brought before it or

may articulate its own standards; or it may simply announce general principles that lower courts should follow in fashioning their own standards.⁴

As Plaintiffs acknowledge, “the Supreme Court has generally proceeded by articulating a workable principle that lends itself to a manageable test, while allowing the lower courts to adapt and refine that test over time.” Opp. at 11. And yet, Plaintiffs and Executive Defendants irrationally resist allowing the Supreme Court the few short months (at most) it needs to articulate that workable principle (if any) to guide this Court. There is simply no good reason why Legislative Defendants, this Court, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania should be compelled to litigate this case in the dark when the Supreme Court will have numerous opportunities in the next few months to illuminate the way.

III. THE COURT SHOULD ALSO STAY THIS CASE PENDING *AGRE* AND *RUCHO*

Plaintiffs and Executive Defendants make much ado about their contention that no pending U.S. Supreme Court case will address their Elections Clause claim. This contention is errant; two pending cases will likely impact this claim. *See Common Cause v. Rucho*, Nos. 1:16-CV-1026, 1:16-CV-1164, 2018 WL 341658, at *71-*72 (M.D.N.C. Jan. 9, 2018) (finding that the North Carolina General Assembly exceeded its delegated authority under the Elections Clause); Memorandum at 1, *Agre* (E.D. Pa. Jan. 10, 2018) (Smith, J.) (“Plaintiffs allege a direct violation of the ‘Elections Clause.’”); *see also* Order, ECF No. 40 (Nov. 22, 2017) (noting that Plaintiffs’ Elections Clause claim was duplicative of the claim in *Agre*).

⁴ Executive Defendants argue that neither case will affect “the need for discovery in this case”. (EDs’ Resp. at 4). Of course they will. Even setting aside the possibility that the Supreme Court finds all partisan gerrymandering claims nonjusticiable (obviating the need for discovery), *any* decision that defines the legal principles and standards to be employed in assessing claims predicated upon the Constitutional provisions underpinning Plaintiffs’ claims will necessarily affect the scope and contours of discovery required to determine whether Plaintiffs’ claims satisfy those principles and standards.

Moreover, *Rucho* also involves First Amendment claims similar to Plaintiffs', *compare* Opp. at 8 *with Rucho*, 2018 WL 341658, at *64 (setting forth a three-part test requiring plaintiffs to prove discriminatory intent, burden on plaintiffs' political speech and associational rights, and a causal connection between the intent and burden), and Fourteenth Amendment claims similar to Plaintiffs', *compare* Recon. Memo. at 4-5 ("Plaintiffs will demonstrate that the 2011 Plan was designed with discriminatory intent, that the 2011 Plan causes a large and durable discriminatory effect, and that there is no valid justification for the effect based upon legitimate state prerogatives") *with Rucho*, 2018 WL 341658, at *32, *55, *57 (adopting a "three-step framework governing partisan gerrymandering claims under the Equal Protection Clause" that requires plaintiffs to establish discriminatory intent, a "durable" discriminatory effect, and no "legitimate redistricting objective"). And *Rucho* even relies on the same "computer simulation methods" (and one of the same experts) that Plaintiffs tout. *See* 2018 WL 341658, at *36-*41.

Additionally, that the U.S. Supreme Court granted a stay in *Rucho* pending appeal only further compels a similar stay in the instant case. Order, No. 17-745 (Jan. 18, 2018) (**Exhibit B**); *see also Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 558 U.S. 183, 190 (2009) (holding that to qualify for a stay, applicant must show *inter alia* "a fair prospect that a majority of the Court will vote to reverse the judgment below" and irreparable harm). Plainly, the Supreme Court's stay in *Gill* was no fluke; at this point, it has stayed each lower court decision that has ordered relief on a partisan gerrymandering claim. *See id.*; *Gill*, 137 S. Ct. 2289 (Jun. 19, 2017). This Court should heed the U.S. Supreme Court's clear message and defer consideration of the case at hand until it receives further guidance.

IV. PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED SCHEDULE IS UNWORKABLE

In the face of these compelling reasons for a stay, Plaintiffs and Executive Defendants are left with nothing but their repeated refrain that delay will "subject[] voters to unconstitutional

districting plans for another election.” Opp. at 3. But, that presupposes this case’s outcome. Stripped of that assumption, Plaintiffs cannot identify any prejudice.

In contrast, Plaintiffs’ proposed schedule—which requires completing trial in early February—plainly leaves insufficient time to fully and fairly litigate this case. Just in terms of discovery: Plaintiffs’ Initial Disclosures (attached as **Exhibit C**) demonstrate that Plaintiffs seek extensive discovery from, *inter alia*, the Pennsylvania House Republican Caucus, Pennsylvania Senate Republican Caucus, and 32 named members and staff of the Pennsylvania General Assembly. (*See also* Subpoena, ECF No. 31-2). And less than two days after they claimed that they “are willing to reasonably limit the scope of discovery,” Plaintiffs have changed position and now insist that they “must be permitted to conduct full and robust discovery ... so that this Court can render its decision based on a complete record that encompasses all pertinent facts.” (*See* Mem. in Supp. of Plaintiffs’ Mot. to Compel Docs. Produced in *Agre v. Wolf*, ECF No. 79, at 2). Even if Plaintiffs ultimately seek only a fraction of what they have indicated previously, they will have gone far beyond what was sought and produced in *Agre* and *LWV*.⁵ Two weeks is simply not enough time to collect, review, and produce tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of potentially responsive documents, litigate the complex issues of legislative and attorney-client privilege that may flow from those productions, depose potentially dozens of witnesses (there are 18 plaintiffs in this case, plus the aforementioned potential witnesses disclosed by Plaintiffs), prepare and produce responsive expert reports, and depose the three experts Plaintiffs have already retained in this case.

Plaintiffs’ position on experts is particularly troubling. Plaintiffs contend that a hyper-abbreviated schedule for expert discovery is not prejudicial because Legislative Defendants

⁵ Plaintiffs in *Agre* only obtained discovery from Legislative Defendants, and petitioners in *LWV* were precluded from obtaining discovery from the General Assembly. Notice of Additional Authority, *Agre*.

engaged experts in other cases who are allegedly “familiar” with Plaintiffs’ experts’ academic work, but Plaintiffs know full well that a review of academic work is not the same as responding to an expert report prepared for litigation.⁶ (*See* Opp. at 16). No doubt Plaintiffs’ experts created sophisticated mathematical, statistical, and computer simulation models and analyzed a plethora of Pennsylvania-specific data. The analysis, data, process, and conclusions of those experts will no doubt be highly tailored for this case and require significant time to vet. What is worse, Plaintiffs produced their experts’ reports to the Executive Defendants in November 2017 but continue to withhold them from Legislative Defendants. (*See Exhibit D* (counsel communications)). Plaintiffs’ actions clearly demonstrate that their true goal is to prejudice Legislative Defendants’ ability to defend the 2011 Plan.

Plaintiffs’ position that Legislative Defendants should be forced to try this case on such a compressed timetable because two other courts required them to do so (in *Agre* and *LWV*) is similarly unavailing. The breakneck speed with which those cases progressed caused considerable harm to Legislative Defendants, not the least of which was leaving their experts without adequate time to prepare rebuttal opinions (only 15 days in *Agre* and just one week in *LWV*). Thus, rather than showing that expedited adjudication of partisan gerrymandering claims is workable, both *Agre* and *LWV* exemplify the problems with moving too quickly on claims that involve complicated expert analysis and testimony, difficult legal issues including privilege, and standards that have yet to be identified.

But it will not just be Legislative Defendants who will be prejudiced. Plaintiffs’ and Executive Defendants’ cavalier insistence that Pennsylvania’s 2018 Congressional elections be upended to accommodate Plaintiffs’ tardiness will greatly harm voter interests: Potential

⁶ Also, this assumes that Legislative Defendants will engage the same experts. Legislative Defendants are entitled time to find and retain the most appropriate experts for this case.

candidates will not know if and where to run; incumbents will not know who their constituents will be; political parties will be disrupted in their ability to manage endorsements and organize supporters; and voters will not know who their candidates are. *See Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U.S. 1, 4-5 (2006) (“Court order affecting elections ... can themselves result in voter confusion and consequent incentive to remain away from the polls. As an election draws closer, that risk will increase.”). Plaintiffs are not the only parties with an interest in this Congressional map. While they dawdled for six years, countless other parties were investing time, money, and other resources in the 2018 Congressional elections in reliance on the 2011 Plan.⁷ Plaintiffs should not be permitted to subordinate the interests of all those parties and compel them and the Court to participate in a fire drill of Plaintiffs’ creation.

Finally, Plaintiffs’ proposed schedule is not just difficult and prejudicial; it is almost certainly futile. Plaintiffs seek an expedited schedule in the hope of having the 2011 Plan declared unconstitutional and having a new map in place for the 2018 elections, but they are simply too late (and this was before today’s decision by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in *LWV*). Even if the Congressional primary was to be moved to later this summer (potentially costing the Commonwealth an additional \$20 million and considerably disrupting the election process and causing voter confusion⁸), Executive Defendants have indicated they would still need a map by the first week of April at the latest—in just over two months. (EDs’ Resp. at 5). In those two months: the parties must be able to conduct and complete extensive discovery, involving potentially hundreds of thousands of documents and dozens of depositions; the parties

⁷ Intervenor in *LWV* compellingly detail, at length, the impact that delaying and/or changing Pennsylvania’s Congressional districts will have on voters, political organizations, and candidates. (*See generally* Brief for Intervenor, *League of Women Voters v. Commonwealth*, No. 261 MD 2017 (Pa. Jan. 10, 2018)).

⁸ “Postponing the Congressional primary alone would require the administration of two separate primary elections ... [E]ach will cost approximately \$20 million.” Marks Affidavit, ECF No. 70, ¶¶ 26-27. Meanwhile, postponing the entire primary will upset not only the 2018 *Congressional* elections, but also Pennsylvania’s state and local elections as well.

and the Court must resolve numerous complicated discovery disputes and other pretrial motions and then conduct trial; the Court must then have reasonable time to render its decisions; and finally, assuming *arguendo* that it finds the 2011 Plan unconstitutional, there must be sufficient time for the General Assembly to go through the extensive process of drawing and passing a map through the House and Senate and securing the Governor's signature. It is unrealistic to expect all of that to occur in two months' time.

The only alleged harm to Plaintiffs by granting a stay is that the 2018 elections will proceed under the very same districts that Plaintiffs have failed to challenge for the last three election cycles. Even if *laches* does not bar Plaintiffs' claims entirely, it should bar their request for an expedited schedule. Because it is impracticable that any decision this Court renders could impact the 2018 elections, there is no reason not to grant a stay in light of today's Pennsylvania Supreme Court decision in *LWV* and pending the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in *Whitford*, *Benisek*, *Agre* and *Rucho*.

Date: January 22, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

BLANK ROME LLP

CIPRIANI & WERNER PC

/s/ Brian S. Paszamant

/s/ Kathleen Gallagher

BRIAN S. PASZAMANT
JASON A. SNYDERMAN
DANIEL S. MORRIS
One Logan Square
130 N. 18th Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
Phone: 215-569-5791
Facsimile: 215-832-5791
Email: paszamant@blankrome.com
snyderman@blankrome.com
Morris-D@blankrome.com

KATHLEEN GALLAGHER
CAROLYN BATZ MCGEE
JOHN E. HALL
JASON MCLEAN
RUSSELL D. GIANCOLA
(admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
650 Washington Road, Suite 700
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228
Phone: 412-563-4978
Email: kgallagher@c-wlaw.com
cmcgee@c-wlaw.com
jack@jackhallpc.com
jrmclean@c-wlaw.com
rgiancola@c-wlaw.com

*Attorneys for Legislative Defendant
Senator Joseph B. Scarnati, III*

*Attorneys for Legislative Defendant
Representative Michael C. Turzai*

**HOLTZMAN VOGEL JOSEFIAK
TORCHINSKY PLLC**

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

/s/ Jason Torchinsky

/s/ Patrick T. Lewis

JASON TORCHINSKY (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
SHAWN SHEEHY (*Pro Hac Vice* pending)
45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100
Warrenton, Virginia 20186
Phone: 540-341-8808
Facsimile: 540-341-8809
Email: jtorchinsky@hvjt.law
ssheehy@hvjt.law

PATRICK T. LEWIS
(admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Key Tower
127 Public Square
Suite 2000
Cleveland, OH 441144114
Phone: 216-621-0200
Email: plewis@bakerlaw.com

*Attorneys for Legislative Defendant
Senator Joseph B. Scarnati, III*

Robert J. Tucker
(admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 1200
Columbus, OH 43215
Phone: 614-462-2680
Email: rtucker@bakerlaw.com

*Attorneys for Legislative Defendant
Representative Michael C. Turzai*

EXHIBIT “A”

[J-1-2018]
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
MIDDLE DISTRICT

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF : No. 159 MM 2017
PENNSYLVANIA, CARMEN FEBO SAN :
MIGUEL, JAMES SOLOMON, JOHN :
GREINER, JOHN CAPOWSKI, :
GRETCHEN BRANDT, THOMAS :
RENTSCHLER, MARY ELIZABETH :
LAWN, LISA ISAACS, DON LANCASTER, :
JORDI COMAS, ROBERT SMITH, :
WILLIAM MARX, RICHARD MANTELL, :
PRISCILLA MCNULTY, THOMAS :
ULRICH, ROBERT MCKINSTRY, MARK :
LICHTY, LORRAINE PETROSKY, :

Petitioners

v.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF :
PENNSYLVANIA; THE PENNSYLVANIA :
GENERAL ASSEMBLY; THOMAS W. :
WOLF, IN HIS CAPACITY AS :
GOVERNOR OF PENNSYLVANIA; :
MICHAEL J. STACK III, IN HIS CAPACITY :
AS LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF :
PENNSYLVANIA AND PRESIDENT OF :
THE PENNSYLVANIA SENATE; :
MICHAEL C. TURZAI, IN HIS CAPACITY :
AS SPEAKER OF THE PENNSYLVANIA :
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; :
JOSEPH B. SCARNATI III, IN HIS :
CAPACITY AS PENNSYLVANIA SENATE :
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE; ROBERT :
TORRES, IN HIS CAPACITY AS ACTING :
SECRETARY OF THE :
COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA; :
JONATHAN M. MARKS, IN HIS :
CAPACITY AS COMMISSIONER OF THE :
BUREAU OF COMMISSIONS, :
ELECTIONS, AND LEGISLATION OF :

THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF :
STATE, :
 :
 :
 Respondents :

ORDER

PER CURIAM

DECIDED: January 22, 2018

AND NOW, this 22nd day of January, 2018, upon consideration of the Petition for Review, the Commonwealth Court’s proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law, the briefs of the parties, intervenors, and *amici curiae*, and the oral argument presented on January 17, 2018, the Court orders as follows:

First, the Court finds as a matter of law that the Congressional Redistricting Act of 2011 clearly, plainly and palpably violates the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and, on that sole basis, we hereby strike it as unconstitutional. Accordingly, its further use in elections for Pennsylvania seats in the United States House of Representatives, commencing with the upcoming May 15, 2018 primary, is hereby enjoined.

Second, should the Pennsylvania General Assembly choose to submit a congressional districting plan that satisfies the requirements of the Pennsylvania Constitution, it shall submit such plan for consideration by the Governor on or before **February 9, 2018**. If the Governor accepts the General Assembly’s congressional districting plan, it shall be submitted to this Court on or before **February 15, 2018**.

Third, should the General Assembly not submit a congressional districting plan on or before **February 9, 2018**, or should the Governor not approve the General Assembly’s plan on or before **February 15, 2018**, this Court shall proceed expeditiously to adopt a plan based on the evidentiary record developed in the Commonwealth Court. In anticipation of that eventuality, the parties shall have the opportunity to be heard; to

wit, all parties and intervenors may submit to the Court proposed remedial districting plans on or before **February 15, 2018**.

Fourth, to comply with this Order, any congressional districting plan shall consist of: congressional districts composed of compact and contiguous territory; as nearly equal in population as practicable; and which do not divide any county, city, incorporated town, borough, township, or ward, except where necessary to ensure equality of population.

Fifth, the Executive Branch Respondents are advised to anticipate that a congressional districting plan will be available by **February 19, 2018**, and are directed to take all measures, including adjusting the election calendar if necessary, to ensure that the May 15, 2018 primary election takes place as scheduled under that remedial districting plan.

Sixth, as acknowledged by the parties, the March 13, 2018 special election for Pennsylvania's 18th Congressional District, which will fill a vacancy in an existing congressional seat for which the term of office ends in 11 months, shall proceed under the Congressional Redistricting Act of 2011 and is unaffected by this Order.

Opinion to follow.

Jurisdiction is retained.

Justice Baer files a Concurring and Dissenting Statement.

Chief Justice Saylor files a Dissenting Statement in which Justice Mundy joins.

Justice Mundy files a Dissenting Statement.

Judgment Entered 1/22/2018

Handwritten signature of Amy Dreitelbis in black ink.

DEPUTY PROTHONOTARY

EXHIBIT “B”

(ORDER LIST: 583 U.S.)

THURSDAY, JANUARY 18, 2018

ORDER IN PENDING CASE

17A745 RUCHO, ROBERT A., ET AL. V. COMMON CAUSE, ET AL.

The application for stay presented to The Chief Justice and by him referred to the Court is granted, and it is ordered that the order of the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, case Nos. 1:16-CV-1026 and 1:16-CV-1164, entered January 9, 2018, is stayed pending the timely filing and disposition of an appeal in this Court.

Justice Ginsburg and Justice Sotomayor would deny the application for stay.

EXHIBIT “C”

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

Barbara Diamond, Steven Diamond, Samuel Bashioum, Tracy Baton, Nancy Chiswick, William Cole, Patrick Costello, Stephen Dupree, Ronald Fairman, Joseph Foster, Colleen Guiney, Robert Kefauver, Elizabeth King, Gillian Kratzer, James Landis, Matthew Munsey, Deborah Noel, Zachary Rubin, Thomas Spangler, Margaret Swoboda, Susan Wood, and Pamela Zidik,

Civil Action No. 5:17-cv-5054

Plaintiffs

v.

Robert Torres, Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and Jonathan Marks, Commissioner of the Bureau of Elections, in their official capacities,

Defendants

and

Michael C. Turzai, Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, and Joseph Scarnati III, Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore, in their official capacities,

Defendant-Intervenors.

PLAINTIFFS' INITIAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Plaintiffs Barbara Diamond, Steven Diamond, Samuel Bashioum, Tracy Baton, Nancy Chiswick, William Cole, Patrick Costello, Stephen Dupree, Ronald Fairman, Joseph Foster, Colleen Guiney, Robert Kefauver, Elizabeth King, Gillian Kratzer, James Landis, Matthew Munsey, Deborah Noel, Zachary Rubin, Thomas Spangler, Margaret Swoboda, Susan Wood, and Pamela Zidik ("Plaintiffs") make the following disclosures pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(1) based upon information reasonably available to them at this time.

Plaintiffs expressly reserve and maintain any and all objections they may have as to privilege, competency, relevancy, or admissibility with respect to any of the persons, documents, or other information described herein. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement this initial disclosure statement, including disclosures made and documents identified, as additional facts and witnesses are discovered and as documents become available.

A. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(i)—Disclosure of Individuals.

The following is a list of individuals likely to have discoverable information that Plaintiffs may use to support their claims and defenses:

1. It is expected that the Plaintiffs listed below will have discoverable information about the allegations and claims set forth in the Complaint, including information about their residence in each of Pennsylvania's Congressional districts, their registration as members of the Democratic Party, their support for Democratic candidates for Pennsylvania's Congressional delegation in the past, and their plans to support Democratic candidates in the future. All Plaintiffs should be contacted only through undersigned counsel. Persons in these categories include, but are not limited to:

NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION
Barbara Diamond	425 Center St., Bethlehem, PA 18018 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Steven Diamond	425 Center St., Bethlehem, PA 18018 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Samuel Bashioum	658 Lincoln Ave., Bentleyville, PA 15314 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Tracy Baton	586 East End Ave., Pittsburgh, PA 15221 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Nancy Chiswick	2443 Hickory Hill Dr., State College, PA 16803 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
William Cole	302 E 18th St., Erie, PA 16503 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Patrick Costello	119 Holly Dr., Pattboro, PA 19040 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Stephen Dupree	124 Huron St., Aliquippa, PA 15001 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Ronald Fairman	173 Oriole Ave., Indiana, PA 15701

	<i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Joseph Foster	348 Trevor Lane, Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Colleen Guiney	337 Dickinson Ave., Swarthmore, PA 19081 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Robert Kefauver	309 N Hartley St., York, PA 17401 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Elizabeth King	1702 Society Place, Newtown, PA 18940 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Gillian Kratzer	1009 25th Ave., Altoona, PA 16601 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
James Landis	124 Mayfield Dr., Lititz, PA 17543 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Matthew Munsey	737 Washington St., Easton PA 18042 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Deborah Noel	277 Timber Ridge Rd., Morgantown, PA 19543 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Zachary Rubin	1661 Covington Rd., Yardley, PA 19067 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Thomas Spangler	851 Clark Hill Rd., Mount Pleasant Mills, PA 17853 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Margaret Swoboda	172 Holtzinger Lane, Julian, PA 16844 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Susan Wood	204 Birch Ave., Mount Gretna PA 17064 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>
Pamela Zidik	1500 L A Carr Lane, Dauphin, PA 17018 <i>Contact Through Undersigned Counsel</i>

2. Plaintiffs anticipate that present and former staff, employees, or agents of Defendants **Robert Torres, Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania**, and **Jonathan Marks, Commissioner of the Bureau of Elections**, will have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint, including the administration of elections in Pennsylvania, including those elections administered for the districts created by the 2011 Congressional district plan (“the 2011 Plan”).

3. Plaintiffs anticipate that present and former staff, employees, or agents of Defendant Intervenor **Michael Turzai, Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives**, and **Joseph Scarnati, III, Pennsylvania Senate President Pro Tempore**, will

have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint including but not limited to the legislative intent behind the 2011 Plan, the effect of the 2011 Plan, and any justifications for the 2011 Plan.

4. Plaintiffs anticipate that present and former (1) **members of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives and the Pennsylvania Senate**, (2) their employees, representatives, agents, consultants; (3) the **Pennsylvania House Republican Caucus** and the **Pennsylvania Senate Republican Caucus**; and (4) their officers, members, employees, representatives, agents, consultants, and others acting on their behalf, will have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint, including but not limited to the legislative intent behind the 2011 Plan, the effect of the 2011 Plan, and any justifications for the 2011 Plan. Persons and entities in this category include, but are not limited to:

NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION
Pennsylvania House Republican Caucus	Administrator Kurt Masser 128 Main Capitol Building PO Box 202107 Harrisburg, PA 17120-2107
Pennsylvania Senate Republican Caucus	Administrator Charles McIlhinney 187 Main Capitol Senate Box 203010 Harrisburg, PA 17120
Representative Mike Folmer	337 Main Capitol Senate Box 203048 Harrisburg, PA 17120
Representative Dan Frankel	417 Main Capitol Building PO Box 202023 Harrisburg, PA 17120-2023
Representative Glenn Grell	5 N 5th Street Harrisburg, PA 17101-1905
Representative Babette Josephs	1939 Waverly St. Philadelphia, PA 19146
Representative Daryl Metcalfe	144 Main Capitol PO Box 202012 Harrisburg, PA 17120-2012
Representative Dave Millard	316 Main Capitol PO Box 202109 Harrisburg, PA 17120-2109

Representative Brad Roae	162B East Wing PO Box 202006 Harrisburg, PA 17120-2006
Speaker Sam Smith	826 Ridge Rd Punxsutawney PA 15767
Representative Greg Vitali	38B East Wing PO Box 202166 Harrisburg, PA 17120-2166
Senator Jay Costa	535 Main Capitol Senate Box 203043 Harrisburg, PA 17120-3043
Senator Andrew Dinniman	182 Main Capitol Senate Box 203019 Harrisburg, PA 17120-3019
Senator Charles McIlhinney	187 Main Capitol Senate Box 203010 Harrisburg, PA 17120
Senator Dominic Pileggi	201 West Front Street Media, PA 19063
Senator Christine Tartaglione	458 Main Capitol Senate Box 203002 Harrisburg, PA 17120-3002
Senator Anthony Williams	11 East Wing Senate Box 203008 Harrisburg, PA 17120-3008
Chad Horner	321 Ryan Office Building Harrisburg, PA 17120
Michael Hritz	329 Ryan Office Building Harrisburg, PA 17120
Robert Nye	146 Main Capitol Harrisburg, Pa 17120
Tom Weeter	628 Main Capitol Harrisburg, PA 17120
William Schaller	328 Ryan Office Building Harrisburg, PA 17120
Dave Thomas	1052 Brandt Ave Lemoyne, PA 17043
Tony Aliano	400 Main Capitol Harrisburg, PA 17120
Dave Reddecliff	29 Main Capitol Harrisburg, PA 17120
Krystjan Callahan	403 North 2nd Street, 2nd Floor Harrisburg, PA 17101

Sara Bresnahan Kennedy	139 Main Capitol Harrisburg, PA 17120
Tricia Graham	417 Walnut Street Harrisburg, PA 17101
John Memmi	519 W Areba Ave Hershey, PA 17033
Gail Reinard	187 Main Capitol Harrisburg, PA 17120
Heather Cevasco	22 South Main St, Suite 220 Doylestown, PA 18901
David Woods	PO Box 2087 Media, PA 19063
Erik Arneson	400 North St., Harrisburg, PA 1720
Drew Crompton	292 Main Capitol Harrisburg, PA 17120

5. Plaintiffs anticipate that present and former **members of the United States Congress** and their employees, representatives, agents, consultants, and others acting on his behalf will have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint, including but not limited to the legislative intent behind the 2011 Plan, the effect of the 2011 Plan, and any justifications for the 2011 Plan. Persons in this category include, but are not limited to:

NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION
Congressman Lou Barletta	2049 Rayburn House Office Building Washington, DC 20515
Congressman Charlie Dent	2082 Rayburn House Office Building Washington, DC 20515
Congressman Mike Fitzpatrick	514 Cannon House Office Building Washington, DC 20515
Congressman Jim Gerlach	1707 L St NW Suite 350 Washington, DC 20515
Congressman Pat Meehan	2305 Rayburn House Office Building Washington, DC 20515

Congressman Joe Pitts	905 Mitchell Farm Lane Kennet Square, PA 19348
Congressman Bill Shuster	204 Cannon House Office Building Washington, DC 20515
Gabe Neville	Covington & Burling LLP One CityCenter 850 Tenth St, NW Washington, DC 20001
Tom Tillett	3581 Sterling Way Columbia, PA 17512
Robert Simms	1000 Princess St. Alexandria, VA 22314

6. Plaintiffs anticipate that former **Governor Thomas Corbett** and his employees, representatives, agents, consultants, and others acting on his behalf will have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint, including but not limited to the legislative intent behind the 2011 Plan, the effect of the 2011 Plan, and any justifications for the 2011 Plan. Persons in this category include, but are not limited to:

NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION
Thomas Corbett	600 Forbes Ave. Pittsburgh, PA 15282
Annmarie Kaiser	10001 North 6th Street Harrisburg, PA 17101
Jim Cawley	1101 W. Montgomery Avenue Philadelphia, PA 1912
Luke Bernstein	77 East King Street Shippensburg, PA 17257
William Ward	310 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219

7. Plaintiffs anticipate that the **National Republican Congressional Committee** and its employees, representatives, agents, consultants, and others acting on its behalf will have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint, including but not limited to the legislative intent behind the 2011 Plan, the effect of the 2011 Plan, and any justifications for the 2011 Plan. Persons in this category include, but are not limited to:

NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION
National Republican Congressional Committee	320 1st St SE Washington, DC 20003
Adam Kincaid	3810 Usher Ct Alexandria, VA 22304

8. Plaintiffs anticipate that the **Republican National Committee** and its employees, representatives, agents, consultants, and others acting on its behalf will have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint, including but not limited to the legislative intent behind the 2011 Plan, the effect of the 2011 Plan, and any justifications for the 2011 Plan. Persons and entities in this category include, but are not limited to:

NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION
Republican National Committee	310 First Street SE Washington, DC 20003
Thomas Hofeller	310 First Street SE Washington, DC 20003

9. Plaintiffs anticipate that the **Republican State Leadership Committee**, the **State Government Leadership Foundation**, and/or **Project REDMAP** and their employees, representatives, agents, consultants, and others acting on their behalf will have discoverable information related to the allegations and claims as set forth in the Complaint, including but not limited to the legislative intent behind the 2011 Plan, the effect of the 2011 Plan, and any justifications for the 2011 Plan. Persons and entities in this category include, but are not limited to:

NAME	CONTACT INFORMATION
Republican State Leadership Committee	1201 F Street, NW, #675 Washington, DC 20004
State Government Leadership Foundation	1201 F Street, NW, #675 Washington, DC 20004
Project REDMAP	1201 F Street, NW, #675 Washington, DC 20004
Chris Jankowski	2310 W. Main Street, Suite 308 Richmond, VA 23220

Dalton Oldham	1119 Susan St. Columbia, SC 29210
----------------------	--------------------------------------

B. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(ii)—Disclosure of Documents.

Plaintiffs have in their possession, custody, or control the following documents, electronically stored information and tangible things that they may use to support their claims: documents related to Plaintiffs' voting activities; data about Pennsylvania precincts and Pennsylvania election districts; public documents reflecting the legislative history of the 2011 Plan; articles, studies, and other public documents reflecting the legislative intent, effect, and justifications for the 2011 Plan.

C. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(iii)—Damages Calculation.

Plaintiffs are not seeking money damages. Plaintiffs seek declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and any other relief the Court deems proper, including attorneys' fees and reasonable costs, in an amount to be determined at the conclusion of this litigation.

D. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A)(iv)—Insurance Coverage.

Plaintiffs are unaware of any insurance policy under which an insurance business may be liable to satisfy all or part of a possible judgment that may be entered in the action.

Dated: January 11, 2018

By: /s Alex G. Tischenko

Marc Erik Elias (*pro hac vice*)
Bruce V. Spiva (*pro hac vice*)
Brian Simmonds Marshall (*pro hac vice*)
Aria C. Branch (*pro hac vice*)
Amanda R. Callais (*pro hac vice*)
Alex G. Tischenko (*pro hac vice*)
Perkins Coie, LLP
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005-3960
Telephone: (202) 654-6200
Facsimile: (202) 654-6211
melias@perkinscoie.com
bspiva@perkinscoie.com
bmarshall@perkinscoie.com
abbranch@perkinscoie.com
acallais@perkinscoie.com
atischenko@perkinscoie.com

Caitlin M. Foley (*pro hac vice*)
Perkins Coie, LLP
131 South Dearborn Street, Suite 1700
Chicago, IL 60603-5559
Telephone: (312) 324-8400
Facsimile: (312) 324-9400
cfoley@perkinscoie.com

Adam C. Bonin, PA Bar No. 80929
The Law Office of Adam C. Bonin
30 South 15th Street
15th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Phone: (267) 242-5014
Facsimile: (215) 701-2321
adam@boninlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on January 11, 2018, I sent a true copy of the foregoing document via electronic mail.

Mark A. Aronchick
Michele D. Hanglely
Claudia De Palma
Ashton Lattimore
One Logan Square, 27th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 568-6200

Gregory G. Schwab
Governor's Office of General Counsel
333 Market Street, 17th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Timothy E. Gates
Kathleen M. Kotula
Pennsylvania Department of State
Office of Chief Counsel
306 North Office Building
Harrisburg, PA 17120

***Attorneys for Defendants Robert Torres,
Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth and
Jonathan Marks, Commissioner for the
Bureau of Commissions, Elections, and
Legislation, in their official capacities***

Brian S. Paszamant
Daniel Stephen Morris
Jason A. Snyderman
Blank Rome LLP
One Logan Square
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-569-5774

Jason B. Torchinsky
Holtzman Vogel Josefiak Torchinsky PLLC
45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100
Warrenton, VA 20186
540-341-8808
***Attorneys for Intervenor Defendant Joseph B.
Scarnati, III, Pennsylvania Senate President
Pro Tempore***

Carolyn Batz McGee
Jason R. McLean
John E. Hall
Kathleen A. Gallagher
Russell D. Giancola
Cipriani & Werner, P.C.
650 Washington Road, Suite 700
Pittsburgh, PA 15228
412-563-2500

Patrick T. Lewis
Baker & Hostetler LLP
Key Tower, 127 Public Square, Suite 2000
Cleveland, OH 44114
614-228-1541

Robert J. Tucker
Baker & Hostetler LLP
200 Civic Center Dr., Suite 1200
Columbus, OH 43215
614-228-1541
***Attorneys for Intervenor Defendant Michael
C. Turzai, Speaker of the Pennsylvania
House of Representatives***

Date: January 11, 2018

s/ Alex G. Tischenko

Alex G. Tischenko

EXHIBIT “D”

Yan, Huaou

From: Paszamant, Brian
Sent: Friday, January 19, 2018 12:13 PM
To: Yan, Huaou; Gorman, Bruce; Silberfarb, Michael D.
Subject: Fwd: Diamond/Torres (Plaintiffs' Experts' Reports; Collateral Estoppel)/REQUEST FOR POSITION ON DOCUMENTS AND DEPOSITIONS PRODUCED IN AGRE

Brian S. Paszamant, Esquire
Blank Rome LLP
One Logan Square
18th and Cherry Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103
(215) 569-5791
Paszamant@blankrome.com

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Spiva, Bruce V. (Perkins Coie)" <BSpiva@perkinscoie.com>
Date: January 19, 2018 at 12:04:46 PM EST
To: "Paszamant, Brian" <Paszamant@BlankRome.com>
Cc: "melias@perkinscoie.com" <'melias@perkinscoie.com'>, "bspiva@perkinscoie.com" <'bspiva@perkinscoie.com'>, "bmarshall@perkinscoie.com" <'bmarshall@perkinscoie.com'>, "abbranch@perkinscoie.com" <'abbranch@perkinscoie.com'>, "acallais@perkinscoie.com" <'acallais@perkinscoie.com'>, "atischenko@perkinscoie.com" <'atischenko@perkinscoie.com'>, "cfoley@perkinscoie.com" <'cfoley@perkinscoie.com'>, "adam@boninlaw.com" <'adam@boninlaw.com'>, "rtucker@bakerlaw.com" <'rtucker@bakerlaw.com'>, Kathleen Gallagher <KGallagher@c-wlaw.com>, Carolyn McGee <CMcgee@c-wlaw.com>, Jason R Mclean <JRMclean@c-wlaw.com>, Russell Giancola <RGiancola@c-wlaw.com>, Jack Hall <JHall@c-wlaw.com>, "plewis@bakerlaw.com" <'plewis@bakerlaw.com'>, "snyderman@blankrome.com" <'snyderman@blankrome.com'>, "morris-d@blankrome.com" <'morris-d@blankrome.com'>, "jtorchinsky@hvjt.law" <'jtorchinsky@hvjt.law'>, "ssheehy@hvjt.law" <'ssheehy@hvjt.law'>, "tgates@pa.gov" <'tgates@pa.gov'>, "grschwab@pa.gov" <'grschwab@pa.gov'>, "kkotula@pa.gov" <'kkotula@pa.gov'>, "cdepalma@hangle.com" <'cdepalma@hangle.com'>, "maa@hangle.com" <'maa@hangle.com'>, "Lattimore, Ashton R." <arl@hangle.com>
Subject: RE: Diamond/Torres (Plaintiffs' Experts' Reports; Collateral Estoppel)/REQUEST FOR POSITION ON DOCUMENTS AND DEPOSITIONS PRODUCED IN AGRE

Brian (and all counsel),

Thanks for your email. Let me add a third issue up front. We intend to file today a motion to compel production of all documents and deposition transcripts produced in the *Agre* litigation pursuant to the Court's Order that we address the issue of the effect of the protective order entered on the record in *Agre*. We assume the parties' positions have not changed since the scheduling conference last week, but we request that you confirm your position today so that we can note that in the motion.

With respect to the collateral estoppel issue, we do not think the doctrine of collateral estoppel applies to any of the findings in *Agre*. Please let us know if you disagree.

With respect to expert reports, we will produce our expert reports after the stay is lifted in accordance with whatever scheduling order the Court requires.

Best,

Bruce

Bruce V. Spiva | Perkins Coie LLP

Partner
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20005
D. +1.202.654.6203
F. +1.202.654.9664
E. Bspiva@perkinscoie.com

From: Paszamant, Brian [<mailto:Paszamant@BlankRome.com>]

Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2018 10:30 AM

To: Spiva, Bruce V. (WDC)

Cc: melias@perkinscoie.com; bspiva@perkinscoie.com; bmarshall@perkinscoie.com; abranh@perkinscoie.com; acallais@perkinscoie.com; atischenko@perkinscoie.com; cfoley@perkinscoie.com; adam@boninlaw.com; rtucker@bakerlaw.com; Kathleen Gallagher; Carolyn McGee; Jason R Mclean; Russell Giancola; Jack Hall; plewis@bakerlaw.com; snyderman@blankrome.com; morris-d@blankrome.com; jtorchinsky@hvjt.law; ssheehy@hvjt.law; tgates@pa.gov; grschwab@pa.gov; kkotula@pa.gov; cdepalma@hangley.com; maa@hangley.com; Lattimore, Ashton R.

Subject: RE: Diamond/Torres (Plaintiffs' Experts' Reports; Collateral Estoppel)

Bruce,

I am circling back about the below. Any update with regard to either issue?

BP

Brian S. Paszamant | Blank Rome LLP

One Logan Square 130 North 18th Street | Philadelphia, PA 19103-6998
Phone: 215.569.5791 | Fax: 215.832.5791 | Email: Paszamant@BlankRome.com

From: Spiva, Bruce V. (Perkins Coie) [<mailto:BSpiva@perkinscoie.com>]

Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 5:22 PM

To: Paszamant, Brian <Paszamant@BlankRome.com>

Cc: melias@perkinscoie.com <'melias@perkinscoie.com'>; bspiva@perkinscoie.com <'bspiva@perkinscoie.com'>; bmarshall@perkinscoie.com <'bmarshall@perkinscoie.com'>; abranh@perkinscoie.com <'abranh@perkinscoie.com'>; acallais@perkinscoie.com <'acallais@perkinscoie.com'>; atischenko@perkinscoie.com <'atischenko@perkinscoie.com'>; cfoley@perkinscoie.com <'cfoley@perkinscoie.com'>; adam@boninlaw.com <'adam@boninlaw.com'>; rtucker@bakerlaw.com <'rtucker@bakerlaw.com'>; Kathleen Gallagher <KGallagher@c-wlaw.com>; Carolyn McGee <CMcgee@c-wlaw.com>; Jason R Mclean <JRMclean@c-wlaw.com>; Russell Giancola <RGiancola@c-wlaw.com>; Jack Hall <JHall@c-wlaw.com>; plewis@bakerlaw.com <'plewis@bakerlaw.com'>; snyderman@blankrome.com <'snyderman@blankrome.com'>; morris-d@blankrome.com <'morris-d@blankrome.com'>; jtorchinsky@hvjt.law <'jtorchinsky@hvjt.law'>; ssheehy@hvjt.law <'ssheehy@hvjt.law'>; tgates@pa.gov <'tgates@pa.gov'>; grschwab@pa.gov <'grschwab@pa.gov'>; kkotula@pa.gov; cdepalma@hangley.com; maa@hangley.com; Lattimore, Ashton R. <arl@hangley.com>

Subject: Re: Diamond/Torres (Plaintiffs' Experts' Reports; Collateral Estoppel)

Thanks, Brian,

We'll get back to you shortly.

Bruce

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 11, 2018, at 5:17 PM, Paszamant, Brian <Paszamant@BlankRome.com> wrote:

Counsel,

I write to inquire about two items: (1) Plaintiffs' experts' reports; and (2) collateral estoppel. With regard to the former, could you please advise whether Plaintiffs will provide a copy of their experts' reports to counsel for Legislative Defendants and, if so, by when? In terms of collateral estoppel, Legislative Defendants believe that it makes the most sense for Plaintiffs to advise Legislative Defendants of those specific facts to which Plaintiffs' believe this doctrine applies and why. Legislative Defendants, in turn, will consider Plaintiffs' position, and revert to Plaintiffs.

I look forward to hearing from you.

BP

Brian S. Paszamant | Blank Rome LLP

One Logan Square 130 North 18th Street | Philadelphia, PA 19103-6998

Phone: 215.569.5791 | Fax: 215.832.5791 | Email: Paszamant@BlankRome.com

This message and any attachments may contain confidential or privileged information and are only for the use of the intended recipient of this message. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by return email, and delete or destroy this and all copies of this message and all attachments. Any unauthorized disclosure, use, distribution, or reproduction of this message or any attachments is prohibited and may be unlawful.

NOTICE: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.

NOTICE: This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on January 22, 2018, the foregoing was served upon the following Counsel of Record via the Court's ECF system:

Adam C. Bonin, Esquire
The Law Office of Adam C. Bonin
30 S. 15th Street, Floor 15
Philadelphia, PA 19102
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Alexander Tischenko, Esquire
Amanda Rebecca Callais, Esquire
Aria Branch, Esquire
Brian Simmonds Marshall, Esquire
Bruce V. Spiva, Esquire
Caitlin M. Foley, Esquire
Marc E. Elias, Esquire
Perkins Coie LLP
700 – 13th St. NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Mark A. Aronchick, Esquire
Ashton R. Lattimore, Esquire
Claudia DePalma, Esquire
Michele D. Hangle, Esquire
Hangle, Aronchick, Segal, Pudlin & Schiller
One Logan Square, 27th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Attorneys for Defendants Robert Torres, Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and Jonathan Marks, Commissioner of the Bureau of Elections, in Their Official Capacities

Gregory George Schwab, Esquire
Governor's Office of General Counsel
333 Market Street, 17th Floor
Harrisburg, PA 17101

Attorney for Defendants Robert Torres, Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and Jonathan Marks, Commissioner of the Bureau of Elections, in Their Official Capacities

Kathleen Marie Kotula
Timothy E. Gates
Pennsylvania Department of State – Office of Chief Counsel
306 North Office Building
401 North Street
Harrisburg, Pa, 17120

*Attorney for Defendants Robert Torres, Acting Secretary of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,
and Jonathan Marks, Commissioner of the Bureau of Elections, in Their Official Capacities*

Dated: January 22, 2018

/s/ Brian S. Paszamant