

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
 CASE NO. 1:13CV660

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF NORTH)
 CAROLINA, *et al.*,)
)
 Plaintiffs,)
)
and)
)
 LOUIS M. DUKE, *et al.*,)
)
 Plaintiffs-Intervenors)
)
 v.)
)
 THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, *et al.*,)
)
 Defendants.)
 _____)

DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO
 COMPLAINT IN
 INTERVENTION OF
 LOUIS M. DUKE, *et al.*

Defendants answer plaintiffs-intervenors' Complaint as follows:

NATURE OF ACTION

1. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations related to plaintiffs' intentions for bringing this lawsuit. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 1.

2. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations related to plaintiffs or their intentions for bringing this lawsuit. Defendants admit that the provisions of 2013 N.C. SESS. LAWS 381, known as the Voter Information Verification Act ("VIVA") and sometimes cited by its bill designation, House Bill 589, speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 2.

3. Defendants admit that in their Complaint, plaintiffs seek what they allege they seek. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations related to plaintiffs' intentions for bringing this lawsuit. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 3.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

4. Defendants admit that the cited statutes speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 4.

5. Defendants admit that this Court has the authority to enter declaratory and injunctive relief. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 5.

6. Defendants admit that the Court has personal jurisdiction over the individually named defendants in their official capacities and that those individually named defendants work and reside in North Carolina. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 6.

7. Defendants consent to venue in this judicial district. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 7.

PARTIES

8. Defendants admit that plaintiff Louis M. Duke is 20 years old and is registered to vote in Harnett County. Defendants further admit that when plaintiff Duke attempted to utilize one-stop absentee voting for the 2012 general election, he was not shown on the records of the Harnett County Board of Elections because when he had previously attempted to register, he had given an inaccurate address that could not be verified by the Harnett County Board of Elections, and that as a result, he utilized same-day registration. Defendants further admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Duke has been or will

be harmed by the challenged legislation. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes, and that plaintiffs appear to consider to be different from "one-stop" absentee voting. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 8.

9. Defendants admit that plaintiff Asgod Barrantes is 20 years old, is registered to vote in Mecklenburg County, has identified himself as Hispanic to elections officials, and voted one-stop absentee in the 2012 primary and general elections. Defendants further admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Barrantes has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes, and that plaintiffs appear to consider to be different from one-stop absentee voting. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 9.

10. Defendants admit that plaintiff Josue E. Berduo is 20 years old, is registered to vote in Wake County, has identified himself as Hispanic to elections officials, and voted one-stop absentee in the 2013 local elections in Wake County. Defendants further admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Berduo has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes, and that plaintiffs appear to

consider to be different from one-stop absentee voting. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 10.

11. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Gray has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 11.

12. Defendants admit that plaintiff Nancy J. Lund is registered to vote in Rowan County and has used one-stop absentee voting in 14 elections since 2004. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Lund has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 12.

13. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Miller has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 13.

14. Defendants admit that plaintiff Becky Hurley Mock is registered to vote in Alamance County, has been a candidate for local office and has used one-stop absentee voting in four elections since 2004. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term

defined in North Carolina's election statutes, and that plaintiffs appear to consider to be different from one-stop absentee voting. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Mock has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 14.

15. Defendants admit that plaintiff Mary-Wren Ritchie is registered to vote in Mecklenburg County, is 21 years old and used one-stop absentee voting in the 2012 general election. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Ritchie has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 15.

16. Defendants admit that plaintiff Lynne M. Walter is registered to vote in Wake County and has used one-stop absentee voting in two elections since 2005. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff Walter has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 16.

17. Defendants admit that plaintiff Ebony N. West is 19 years old, is registered to vote in Pitt County, has identified herself as African American to elections officials, and voted

one-stop absentee in the 2012 general election and the 2013 local election. Defendants further admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants deny that plaintiff West has been or will be harmed by the challenged legislation. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 17.

18–22. Defendants admit that defendants Joshua B. Howard, Rhonda K. Amoroso, Joshua D. Malcolm, Paul J. Foley and Maja Kricker are members of the North Carolina State Board of Elections ("NCSBE"), that their duties and responsibilities are established by statutes enacted by the General Assembly of North Carolina and by the United States Congress, that these statutes speak for themselves, and that they have been sued in their official capacities. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraphs 18–22.

23. Defendants admit that defendant Patrick L. McCrory is the Governor of North Carolina, that he has been sued in his official capacity, that his duties and responsibilities are established under the North Carolina Constitution and statutes enacted by the General Assembly of North Carolina, and that the laws of the State of North Carolina speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 23.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

24. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about any data relied on for plaintiffs' allegations concerning voter participation in North Carolina compared to the rest of the country in 1991. Defendants further admit that the election laws of

North Carolina, including all election laws enacted since 1991, speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 24.

25. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about how groups of people tend to vote in a partisan election, as opposed to how they are registered to vote. Defendants admit that the challenged provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. Defendants also admit that Republicans currently have a majority in both the North Carolina Senate and the North Carolina House of Representatives. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 25.

26. Defendants admit that all legally cast votes in North Carolina are important and significant. Defendants also admit that *Symm v. United States*, 439 U.S. 1105 (1979), speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations of paragraph 26.

A. History of HB 589

27. Defendants admit the allegations of paragraph 27.

28. Defendants admit that the original form of HB 589 when filed speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 28.

29. Defendants admit that the original form of HB 589 when filed speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 29.

30. Defendants admit that the original form of HB 589 when filed speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 30.

31. Defendants admit that the original form of HB 589 when filed speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 31.

32. Defendants admit that HB 589 passed Third Reading in the House of Representatives on 24 April 2013 and was received by the Senate on 25 April 2013, where it was referred to the Committee on Rules and Operations of the Senate. Defendants also admit that the form of HB 589 when it passed Third Reading in the House of Representative and was received by the Senate speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 32.

33. Defendants admit that the legislative record of HB 589 speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 33.

34. Defendants admit the allegations of paragraph 34.

35. Defendants admit that, prior to the decision in *Shelby County*, which speaks for itself, 40 North Carolina counties were “covered jurisdictions” under § 5 of the Voting Rights Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1973c, which also speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 35.

36. Defendants admit that the decision in *Shelby County* speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 36.

37. Defendants admit that the decision in *Shelby County* speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 37.

38. Defendants admit that the legislative record of HB 589 speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 38.

39. Defendants admit that the legislative record of HB 589 speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 39.

40. Defendants admit that the legislative record of HB 589 speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 40.

41. Defendants admit that the legislative record of HB 589 speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 41.

42. Defendants admit that the legislative record of HB 589 speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 42.

43. Defendants admit that HB 589 passed Third Reading in the Senate on 25 July 2013, that the House of Representatives concurred with the Senate on that same date, and that the legislative record of votes in the Senate and in the House of Representatives speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 43.

44. Defendants admit that HB 589 was ratified on 26 July 2013 and was presented to the Governor on 29 July 2013. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 44.

45. Defendants admit that Governor McCrory signed HB 589 on 12 August 2013 and that HB 589 was enacted as 2013 N.C. SESS. LAWS 381 on that date. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 45.

B. The Law's Challenged Provisions

Voter ID Requirements

46. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 46.

47. Defendants admit that laws applicable to elections in North Carolina prior to the enactment of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 47.

48. Defendants admit that HB 589 as introduced in the House of Representatives speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 48.

49. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 49.

50. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 50.

51. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 51.

52. The allegations of paragraph 52 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 52.

53. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations concerning unidentified studies or what any such studies might or might not show. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 53.

Reduction in Early Voting

54. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants admit that prior to the enacted legislation challenged by plaintiffs, county boards of elections were given the discretion to schedule one-stop absentee voting sites and hours that each site could be opened for up to 17 days, including three Saturdays and two Sundays. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 54.

55. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in

North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 55.

56. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations concerning unidentified research or what any such research might or might not show. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 56.

57. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA and of all laws relevant to the financing of elections speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 57.

58. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 58.

59. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes, or what plaintiffs mean by "extremely large numbers." Defendants admit that the number of voters who voted using one-stop absentee voting in 2008, 2010 and 2012 is a matter of public record. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 59.

60. The allegations of paragraph 60 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 60.

61. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 61.

62. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations concerning unidentified experiences in other states may or may not have “conclusively shown.” In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 62.

63. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 63.

Elimination of Same-Day Voter Registration

64. Defendants admit that before the enactment of VIVA, and beginning in 2007, the General Statutes prescribed a process for in-person registration and voting at one-stop sites and that these statutes speak for themselves. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations concerning lobbying for bills enacted in 2007. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 64.

65. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs’ definition of “early voting,” a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina’s election statutes. Defendants admit that statutes in effect beginning in 2007 regarding in-person registration and voting at one-stop sites speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 65.

66. Defendants admit that the number of voters who registered or updated their registration using same-day registration in 2008 is a matter of public record. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 66.

67. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about what plaintiffs mean by “last fall.” Defendants admit that the number of voters who registered or updated their registration using same-day registration in the 2012 general election and the 2013 general election is a matter of public record. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 67.

68. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations concerning unidentified studies or what any such studies might or might not show. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 68.

69. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 69.

70. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 70.

71. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of allegations concerning “many” students. Further, the allegations of paragraph 71 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 71.

72. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 72.

Elimination of Out-of-Precinct Voting

73. Defendants admit that before the enactment of VIVA, and beginning in 2004, the General Statutes prescribed a process for out-of-precinct provisional voting and that the statutes that governed this process speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 73.

74. Defendants admit that the statutes that governed the process of out-of-precinct provisional voting, including the cited legislation, speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 74.

75. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 75.

76. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about what plaintiffs mean by “last November.” Defendants admit that the number of voters who cast out-of-precinct provisional ballots in the 2012 general election and the 2013 general election is a matter of public record. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 76.

77. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 77.

Elimination of Discretion to Keep the Polls Open One Extra Hour on Election Day

78. Defendants admit that starting in 2002 and prior to the enactment of VIVA, county boards of elections could, in “extraordinary circumstances,” allow polls to stay one extra hour, or until 8:30 p.m. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 78.

79. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 79.

80. Defendants admit that the provisions of VIVA speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 80.

Elimination of Pre-Registration For 16- and 17-Year Olds

81. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about which demographic groups may or may not have the lowest voter registration rate as of some undefined date.

82. The allegations of paragraph 82 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, defendants admit that before VIVA was enacted, and beginning in 2010, the General Statutes prescribed a process by which North Carolina residents between the ages of 16 and 18 were permitted to pre-register to vote at public high schools, drivers license offices and certain other public agencies, and that the statutes that governed this process speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 82.

83. Defendants admit that the statutes that provided for pre-registration speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 83.

84. Defendants admit that the statutes that provided for pre-registration speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 84.

85. Defendants admit that the statutes that provided for pre-registration speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 85.

86. The allegations of paragraph 86 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, defendants admit that the statutes that provided for pre-registration speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 86.

87. Defendants admit that the statutes that provided for pre-registration speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 87.

88. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 88.

C. Post-Enactment Targeting of Young Voters

89. The allegations of paragraph 89 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 89.

90. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about plaintiffs' definition of "early voting," a term that is neither a term of art nor a term defined in North Carolina's election statutes. Defendants admit that action of the Watauga County Board of Elections, which is not a defendant in this action, concerning one-stop absentee voting sites in Boone is a matter of public record. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 90.

91. Defendants admit that the proceedings of the NCSBE are matters of public record, and that statements made in hearings before the NCSBE speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 91.

92. Defendants admit that action of the Pasquotank County Board of Elections, which is not a party to this action, concerning voter rolls is a matter of public record. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 92.

93. Defendants admit that the proceedings of the Pasquotank County Board of Elections, which is not a party to this action, are matters of public record, and that statements made by members of the Pasquotank County Board of Elections speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 93.

94. Defendants admit that statements made by the chairman of the Forsyth County Board of Elections, who is not a part to this action, speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 94.

CAUSES OF ACTION

COUNT I

95. Defendants reallege and incorporate their answers to paragraphs 1–94.

96. The allegations of paragraph 96 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required.

97. Defendants admit that the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 97.

98. Defendants admit that the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and the cases cited speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 98.

99. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 99.

100. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 100.

101. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 101.

COUNT II

(Violation of the Twenty-Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983)

102. Defendants reallege and incorporate their answers to paragraphs 1–101.

103. Defendants admit that the Twenty-Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution speaks for itself. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 103.

104. Defendants admit that the Twenty-Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution and the cases cited speak for themselves. In all other respects, defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 104.

105. The allegations of paragraph 89 are legal arguments or contentions to which no response is required.

106. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 105.

106. Defendants deny the allegations of paragraph 106.

SECOND DEFENSE

Any allegations in paragraphs 1–106 of the Complaint not specifically admitted are denied.

THIRD DEFENSE

Plaintiffs-Intervenors' Complaint, in whole or in part, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted and should be dismissed pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), Fed. R. Civ. P.

FOURTH DEFENSE

On 13 August 2013, the case of *Currie, et al., v. State of North Carolina, et al.*, No. 13-CV-1419, was filed in Orange County, North Carolina Superior Court. This complaint challenges under the North Carolina Constitution those portions of VIVA that deal with voter identification. Because resolution of this case may moot or modify the federal issues in this case, this Court should abstain from considering plaintiffs' federal claims regarding voter identification pending resolution of the State case.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, defendants pray the Court:

1. that plaintiffs-intervenors' Complaint be dismissed and that judgment be entered for defendants on all claims;
2. that defendants be awarded their attorneys' fees and costs; and

3. that defendants be awarded such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

This the 18th day of February 2014.

ROY COOPER
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH
CAROLINA

By: /s/ Alexander McC. Peters

Alexander McC. Peters

Senior Deputy Attorney General

N.C. State Bar No. 13654

apeters@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 North Carolina and State
Board of Election Defendants.*

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

thomas.farr@ogletreedeakins.com

phil.strach@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 and
State Board of Election Defendants.*

BOWERS LAW OFFICE LLC

By: /s/ Karl S. Bowers, Jr.

Karl S. Bowers, Jr.*

Federal Bar #7716

P.O. Box 50549

Columbia, SC 29250

Telephone: (803) 260-4124

E-mail: butch@butchbowers.com

*appearing pursuant to Local Rule 83.1(d)

Counsel for Governor Patrick L. McCrory

By: /s/ Robert C. Stephens

Robert C. Stephens (State Bar #4150)

General Counsel

Office of the Governor of North Carolina

20301 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, North Carolina 27699

Telephone: (919) 814-2027

Facsimile: (919) 733-2120

E-mail: bob.stephens@nc.gov

Counsel for Governor Patrick L. McCrory

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Alexander McC. Peters, hereby certify that I have this day electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will provide electronic notification of the same to the following:

Counsel for the Intervening Plaintiffs:

John M. Davaney

jdevaney@perkinscoie.com

Marc E. Elias

melias@perkinscoie.com

Kevin J. Hamilton

khamilton@perkinscoie.com

PERKINS COIE, LLP

700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 600

Washington, D.C. 20005-3960

Edwin M. Speas, Jr.

espeas@poynerspruill.com

John W. O'Hale

johale@poynerspruill.com

Caroline P. Mackie

cmackie@poynerspruill.com

POYNER SPRUILL, LLP

301 Fayetteville St., Suite 1900

Raleigh, NC 27601

Counsel for League of Women Voter Plaintiffs:

Anita S. Earls

Allison J. Riggs

Southern Coalition for Social Justice

1415 Hwy. 54, Suite 101

Durham, NC 27707

anita@southerncoalition.org

Laughlin McDonald

ACLU Voting Rights Project

2700 International Tower

229 Peachtree Street, NE

Atlanta, GA 30303

lmcdonald@aclu.org

Dale Ho

Julie A. Ebenstein

ACLU Voting Rights Project

125 Broad Street

New York, NY 10004

dale.ho@aclu.org

Christopher Brook

ACLU of North Carolina Legal Foundation

PO Box 28004

Raleigh, NC 27611-8004

cbrook@acluofnc.org

This, the 18th day of February, 2014.

/s/ Alexander McC. Peters

Alexander McC. Peters

Senior Deputy Attorney General