

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Maria M. Gonzalez, et al.,)	No. CV 06-1268-PHX-ROS
)	No. CV 06-1362-PHX-ROS (cons)
Plaintiffs,)	No. CV 06-1575-PHX-ROS (cons)
vs.)	ORDER
)	
State of Arizona, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
<hr style="width: 100%;"/>		

This case consists of three consolidated actions. Each group of Plaintiffs has filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction. The Court held a two-day hearing on August 30 and August 31, 2006. Election cases are different from ordinary injunction cases. "Interference with impending elections is extraordinary and interference with an election after voting has begun is unprecedented." Southwest Voter Registration Educ. Project v. Shelley, 344 F.3d 914, 919 (9th Cir. 2003). In cases involving the public interest, such as cases impacting elections, the preliminary injunction test has been formulated to require Plaintiffs to "establish (1) a strong likelihood of success on the merits, (2) the possibility of irreparable injury to plaintiff[s] if preliminary relief is not granted, (3) a balance of hardships favoring the plaintiff[s], and (4) advancement of the public interest." Id. at 917-18. Plaintiffs have not shown a strong likelihood of success on the merits, the balance of hardships favors the

1 Defendants, and the public interest would not be advanced by granting the injunction. The
2 Motions for Preliminary Injunction will be denied. Detailed findings of fact and conclusions
3 of law will follow.

4 Accordingly,

5 **IT IS ORDERED** the Motions for Preliminary Injunction (06-1268: Doc. 7, 146, 149)
6 are **DENIED**.

7 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Motion to
8 Expedite (06-1575: Doc. 2, 14) are **DENIED**.


9 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Motion to Exceed Page Limits (06-1268: Doc.
10 166) is **GRANTED**.

11 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the parties are to submit simultaneous briefing on
12 whether the identification requirements for registration constitute a poll tax by September 18,
13 2006. Simultaneous responses are due September 25, 2006. No replies are allowed.

14 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** the Navajo Nation Plaintiffs are to submit additional
15 briefing on their Voting Rights Act and Civil Rights Act claims by September 25, 2006.
16 Defendants' response is due October 2, 2006. The reply is due October 6, 2006. A hearing
17 for the Court to consider additional facts on the Voting Rights Act and Civil Rights Act
18 claims will be held October 19, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

19 DATED this 11th day of September, 2006.

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



Roslyn O. Silver
United States District Judge