IN THE SUPREME COURT OF KANSAS

SCOTT SCHWAB, Kansas Secretary)
of State, in his official capacity,)
)
and)
)
MICHAEL ABBOTT, Wyandotte)
County Election Commissioner,)
in his official capacity,)
)
Petitioners,)
)
V.	Case No. 124849
) (Original Action)
THE HONORABLE BILL KLAPPER,)
in his official capacity as a District)
Court Judge, Twenty-Ninth Judicial	,
District,	,
Dogwoodout) `
Respondent.)
) \
FAITH RIVERA, DIOSSELYN TOT-	,
VELASQUEZ, KIMBERLY WEAVER,	,
PARIS RAITE, DONNAVAN DILLON,)
and LOUD LIGHT,	,
	,
Plaintiffs in Wyandotte)
County District Court Case	<u>,</u>
2022-CV-89 and Respondents)
under Kansas Supreme Court)
Rule 9.01(a)(1),)
and)
)
TOM ALONZO, SHARON AL-UQDAH,)
AMY CARTER, CONNIE BROWN)
COLLINS, SHEYVETTE DINKENS,)
MELINDA LAVON, ANA MARCELA)
MALDONADO MORALES, LIZ)
MEITL, RICHARD NOBLES, ROSE)
SCHWAB, and ANNA WHITE,)

Plaintiffs in Wyandotte County District Court Case 2022-CV-90 and Respondents under Kansas Supreme Court Rule 9.01(a)(1).

REPLY TO RESPONDENTS' RESPONSE AND OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR A STAY OF DISTRICT COURT PROCEEDINGS

Respondents ask this Court to allow the litigation in the district court to proceed as it considers Petitioners' challenge. But simultaneous litigation in this Court and the district court would be improper and imprudent for three primary reasons.

First, allowing the litigation of political and racial gerrymandering claims in the district court to continue is inappropriate because that court lacks jurisdiction to entertain both claims under the Elections Clause and the Kansas Constitution. There is no precedent for a Kansas court to review political or racial gerrymandering claims lodged against a congressional redistricting map adopted by the Kansas Legislature. Under the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution, Kansas courts—including the district court in Wyandotte County—lack the authority to adjudicate such claims. And the fact that the Kansas Constitution provides a specific procedure for judicial review of state legislative maps, but not congressional maps, demonstrates that the Kansas Constitution does not contemplate state court judicial review of congressional redistricting. This Court cannot permit unconstitutional litigation to proceed in the district court.

Second, even if jurisdiction exists, simultaneous litigation remains imprudent. While no court has recognized that political gerrymandering claims are justiciable under the Kansas Constitution, Respondents ask the district court—in a condensed timeline—to discern a cognizable standard by which a court can judge whether a congressional map adopted by a political branch of government is too political to pass constitutional muster. Despite "considerable efforts" over decades, the U.S. Supreme Court could find no such standard even under a normal briefing schedule. Rucho v. Common Cause, 139 S. Ct. 2484, 2497-98 (2019) (quoting Gill v. Whitford, 138 S. Ct. 1916, 1929 (2018)). The district court should not be tasked to render a legal decision that will inevitably reach this Court and garner no legal deference. E.g. Tillman v. Goodpasture, 313 Kan. 278, 282, 485 P.3d 656 (2021) (the interpretation of the Kansas Constitution is an issue of law subject to unlimited appellate review). Time and resources would be better spent in this Court.

Third, it would also be imprudent to allow district court litigation because—to the extent Respondents allege cognizable claims—the contours of those claims are unknown. Respondents suggest in the alternative that this Court could address the legal issues raised in the Petition but order the district court to conduct fact-finding on Respondents' political and racial gerrymandering claims. But this Court has not before provided guidance on those types of claims. As a result, the type and scope of discovery, if any is warranted, remains uncertain. See Food & Water Watch, Inc. v. EPA, 302 F. Supp. 3d 1058, 1070 (N.D. Cal. 2018) (explaining that the type and scope of discovery depends on "the elements of the claim"); cf. Bell Atl. Corp. v.

Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 558 (2007) ("[A] district court must retain the power to insist upon some specificity in pleading before allowing a potentially massive factual controversy to proceed." (citation omitted)). And, as Petitioners argue, it is highly uncertain that any discovery would be warranted when this Court has historically limited the record in reapportionment cases to the record before the Legislature at the time of enactment. Memo. at 25.

For these reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that this Court stay the district court proceedings in *Rivera v. Schwab*, No. 22-CV-89 (Wyandotte County D. Ct.), and *Alonzo v. Schwab*, No. 22-CV-90 (Wyandotte County D. Ct.).

Respectfully submitted,

OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL DEREK SCHMIDT

By: /s/Brant M. Laue
Derek Schmidt, #17781
 Attorney General of Kansas
Jeffrey A. Chanay, #12056
 Chief Deputy Attorney General
Brant M. Laue, #16857
 Solicitor General of Kansas
Dwight R. Carswell, #25111
 Deputy Solicitor General
Shannon Grammel, #29105
 Deputy Solicitor General
Kurtis K. Wiard, #26373
 Assistant Solicitor General

Memorial Bldg., 2nd Floor 120 SW 10th Avenue Topeka, Kansas 66612-1597

Tel: (785) 296-2215 Fax: (785) 291-3767 Email: jeff.chanay@ag.ks.gov brant.laue@ag.ks.gov dwight.carswell@ag.ks.gov shannon.grammel@ag.ks.gov kurtis.wiard@ag.ks.gov

Attorneys for Petitioners Scott Schwab and Michael Abbott

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that on February 23, 2022, a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing was served as per Kan. Sup. Ct. R. 1.11(a) and K.S.A. 60-205(b)(2)(C) by depositing a copy in the U.S. mail to the following mailing addresses, and electronic copies were also sent to the following email addresses:

Judge Bill Klapper
Wyandotte County Courthouse
710 N. 7th St.
Kansas City, KS 66101
kcoulter@wycokck.org (administrative aide)

Respondent

Sharon Brett
Josh Pierson
Kayla DeLoach
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation of Kansas
6701 W. 64th St. Suite 201
Overland Park, KS 66202
sbrett@aclukansas.org
ipierson@aclukansas.org
kdeloach@aclukansas.org

Mark P. Gaber
Kevin Hancock
Sam Horan
Christopher Lamar
Orion de Nevers
Campaign Legal Center
1101 14th St. NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
mgaber@campaignlegalcenter.org

khancock@campaignlegalcenter.org shoran@campaignlegalcenter.org clamar@campaignlegalcenter.org odenevers@campaignlegalcenter.org

Elisabeth S. Theodore
R. Stanton Jones
John A. Freedman
Arnold & Porter Kaye Scholer LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20001
elisabeth.theodore@arnoldporter.com
stanton.jones@arnoldporter.com
john.freedman@arnoldporter.com

Rick Rehorn
Tomasic & Rehorn
P.O. Box 171855
Kansas City, KS 66117-0855
rick@tomasicrehorn.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs in Alonzo v. Schwab, 2022-CV-90 (Wyandotte County D. Ct.)

Barry Grissom
Jake Miller
Grissom Miller Law Firm LLC
1600 Genessee St., Suite 460
Kansas City, MO 64102
barry@grissommiller.com
jake@grissommiller.com

Abha Khanna Elias Law Group LLP 1700 Seventh Ave., Suite 2100 Seattle WA 98101 akhanna@elias.law

Lalitha D. Madduri Henry J. Brewster Spencer Klein Elias Law Group LLP 10 G. Street NE, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20002 <u>lmadduri@elias.law</u> <u>hbrewster@elias.law</u> <u>sklein@elias.law</u>

Attorneys for Plaintiffs in Rivera v. Schwab, 2022-CV-89 (Wyandotte County D. Ct.)

/s/ Brant M. Laue
Brant M. Laue