

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA**

COMMON CAUSE, *et al.*,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

ROBERT A. RUCHO, in his official capacity as  
Chairman of the North Carolina Senate  
Redistricting Committee for the 2016 Extra  
Session and Co-Chairman of the Joint Select  
Committee on Congressional Redistricting,  
*et al.*,

DEFENDANTS.

CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 1:16-CV-1026-WO-JEP

THREE-JUDGE COURT

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF NORTH  
CAROLINA, *et al.*,

PLAINTIFFS,

v.

ROBERT A. RUCHO, in his official capacity as  
Chairman of the North Carolina Senate  
Redistricting Committee for the 2016 Extra  
Session and Co-Chairman of the 2016 Joint  
Select Committee on Congressional  
Redistricting, *et al.*,

DEFENDANTS.

CIVIL ACTION  
NO. 1:16-CV-1164-WO-JEP

THREE JUDGE PANEL

**JOINT RULE 26(f) REPORT**

1. Pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f) and LR16.1(b), a meeting was held between the parties on November 2, 2016. The parties were unable to agree on a discovery plan, and Plaintiffs and Defendants in the now consolidated cases submitted separate reports.

The Court held a pretrial conference on February 6, 2017 in these consolidated cases, and the parties, after observations from the Court, conferred and agreed to jointly present the following discovery matters and dates to the Court for its consideration.

2. **Discovery Plan.** The parties propose to the Court the following discovery plan:

a) Discovery will be needed on the following subjects: (i) the allegations and prayer for relief in Plaintiffs' Complaints; and (ii) the defenses and allegations in Defendants' Answers, when filed.

- Specifically, Plaintiffs in *League of Women Voters of North Carolina, et al., v Rucho, et al.*, No. 1:16-cv-1164, will need discovery to satisfy the following three-prong test for partisan gerrymandering to prove their Fourteenth Amendment claim:

- i. Discriminatory Intent: (1) Whether the 2016 Congressional Redistricting Plan was enacted to engage in intentional discrimination against an identifiable political group; and (2) whether the purpose motivating the 2016 Congressional Redistricting Plan was to benefit one party or disadvantage another party;

- ii. Discriminatory Effect: (1) Whether the 2016 Congressional Redistricting Plan exhibits a high and durable level of partisan asymmetry relative to historical norms; and (2) whether the efficiency gap as a measure of partisan symmetry demonstrates that the 2016 Congressional Redistricting Plan had the effect of giving one political party a systematic advantage in converting votes into actual seats; and

- iii. Justification: Whether the State can prove that the 2016

Congressional Redistricting Plan's high and durable asymmetry can be justified by the State's political geography or legitimate redistricting objectives.

- Plaintiffs in *Common Cause et al., v. Rucho, et al.*, No. 16-1026, will inform Defendants and the Court by February 15, 2017 of the legal standards that the Court should apply in evaluating the evidence.
- b) Discovery should be placed on a case-management track established in LR 26.1. The parties propose that the appropriate plan for this case (with the modifications set forth below) is that designated in LR 26.1(a) as Standard.
  - c) Modifications to the case management track should include: (i) all discovery, including expert discovery, shall be completed by April 28, 2017; (ii) depositions shall be limited to 40 depositions, excluding experts, by Plaintiffs (collectively), and 40 depositions, excluding experts, by Defendants (collectively); (iii) Plaintiffs (collectively) and Defendants (collectively) may serve up to 150 requests for admission; and (iv) Plaintiffs (collectively) may serve up to 25 interrogatories on Defendants, and Defendants (collectively) may serve up to 25 interrogatories on each individual Plaintiff (provided that interrogatories directed to plaintiffs as individuals are consistent as among plaintiffs).
  - d) Reports required by Rule 26(a)(2)(B) and disclosures required by Rule 26(a)(2)(C) shall be due during the discovery period, from Plaintiffs on or before March 1, 2017, and from Defendants on or before April 3, 2017.
  - e) Supplementations will be as provided in Rule 26(e) or as otherwise ordered by the court.
  - f) Any dispositive motions will be filed by May 12, 2017, with responses due May 26, 2017, and any replies due May 31, 2017.

3. **Mediation.** Mediation is not required under LR 16.4 for this case. The parties request that the Court enter an order providing that the parties need not participate in mediation in this case.

4. **Preliminary Deposition Schedule.** The parties agree that all depositions will be completed by the close of discovery on April 28, 2017. To the extent possible, dates and locations for depositions shall be set by mutual agreement.

5. **Other Items.**

- a) Plaintiffs and Defendants should be allowed until February 10, 2017 to request leave to join additional parties or amend pleadings.
- b) Defendants will file their Answers to the Complaints by March 3, 2017.
- c) After these dates, the Court will consider, *inter alia*, whether the granting of leave to join additional parties or amend pleadings would delay trial.
- d) With regard to the possibility of special procedures for managing this case, including reference of the case to a Magistrate Judge on consent of the parties under 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), or appointment of a master, the parties state that they do not wish to use any such procedures.
- e) The parties agree the trial should be set for June 26, 2017 for five (5) days. A jury trial has not been demanded.
- f) Plaintiffs and Defendants in both cases have served initial disclosures.
- g) Defendants filed motions to dismiss in both cases, and those motions have been fully briefed.
- h) Plaintiffs in both cases deposed Thomas B. Hofeller, Robert A. Rucho, and David R. Lewis on January 24, January 25, and January 26, 2017, respectively, with the depositions of Thomas B. Hofeller and David R. Lewis to be concluded at a later date by agreement of the parties.

Respectfully submitted, this 14th day of February, 2017.

By: /s/ Anita S. Earls  
Anita S. Earls (State Bar # 15597)  
Allison J. Riggs (State Bar # 40028)  
Emily Seawell (State Bar # 50207)  
Southern Coalition for Social Justice  
anitaearls@southerncoalition.org  
allisonriggs@southerncoalition.org  
emilyseawell@southerncoalition.org  
1415 Highway 54, Suite 101  
Durham, NC 27707  
Telephone: 919-323-3380 ext. 115  
Facsimile: 919-323-3942

By: /s/ Edwin M. Speas, Jr.  
Edwin M. Speas, Jr.  
North Carolina Bar No. 4112  
Caroline P. Mackie  
North Carolina Bar No. 41512  
POYNER SPRUILL LLP  
301 Fayetteville Street, Suite 1900  
Raleigh, NC 27601  
espeas@poynerspruill.com  
cmackie@poynerspruill.com  
Telephone: 919-783-6400  
Facsimile: 919.783-1075

By: /s/ J. Gerald Hebert  
J. Gerald Hebert\*  
Ruth Greenwood\*  
Annabelle Harless\*  
Danielle Lang\*  
Campaign Legal Center  
1411 K Street NW, Suite 1400  
Washington, DC 20005  
Telephone (202) 736-2200  
ghebert@campaignlegalcenter.org  
rgreenwood@campaignlegalcenter.org  
aharless@campaignlegalcenter.org  
dlang@campaignlegalcenter.org

By: /s/ Emmet J. Bondurant  
Emmet J. Bondurant  
Georgia Bar No. 066900  
Jason J. Carter  
Georgia Bar No. 141669  
Benjamin W. Thorpe  
Georgia Bar No. 874911  
BONDURANT, MIXSON &  
ELMORE, LLP  
1201 W. Peachtree Street, NW, Suite  
3900  
Atlanta, GA 30309  
Telephone (404) 881-4100  
Facsimile (404) 881-4111  
bondurant@bmelaw.com  
carter@bmelaw.com  
bthorpe@bmelaw.com

By: /s/ Nicholas O. Stephanopoulos  
Nicholas O. Stephanopoulos\*  
University of Chicago Law School  
1111 E 60th St.  
Chicago, IL 60637  
Telephone: (773) 702-4226  
nsteph@uchicago.edu

***Counsel for Plaintiffs in League of  
Women Voters of North Carolina v.  
Rucho, No. 1:16-cv-1164***

By: /s/ Gregory L. Diskant  
Gregory L. Diskant  
New York Bar No. 1047240  
Susan Millenky  
New York Bar No. 5045570  
PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB &  
TYLER LLP  
1133 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10036  
Telephone: (212) 336-2000  
Facsimile: (212) 336-2222  
gldiskant@pbwt.com  
smillenky@pbwt.com

***Counsel for Plaintiffs in Common  
Cause v. Rucho, No. 1:16-cv-1026***

OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH  
SMOAK & STEWART, P.C.

/s/ Thomas A. Farr  
Thomas A. Farr  
N.C. State Bar No. 10871  
Phillip J. Strach  
N.C. State Bar No. 29456  
Michael D. McKnight  
N.C. State Bar No. 36932  
thomas.farr@ogletreedeakins.com  
phil.strach@ogletreedeakins.com  
michael.mcknight@ogletreedeakins.com  
4208 Six Forks Road, Suite 1100  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27609  
Telephone: (919) 787-9700  
Facsimile: (919) 783-9412  
*Co-counsel for Defendants*

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT  
OF JUSTICE

By: /s/ Alexander McC. Peters  
Alexander McC. Peters  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
N.C. State Bar No. 13654  
apeters@ncdoj.gov  
James Bernier, Jr.  
Assistant Attorney General  
N.C. State Bar No. 45869  
jbernier@ncdoj.gov  
N.C. Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 629  
Raleigh, NC 27602  
Telephone: (919) 716-6900  
Facsimile: (919) 716-6763  
*Counsel for Defendants*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that I have this day electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all counsel and parties of record.

This the 14th day of February, 2017.

/s/ Anita S. Earls

Anita S. Earls