DANIEL C. CEDERBORG County Counsel – State Bar No. 124260 2 CATHERINE E. BASHAM Chief Deputy County Counsel – State Bar No. 128408 3 KATWYN T. DELAROSA – State Bar No. 267157 **Deputy County Counsel** 4 FRESNÓ COUNTY COUNSEL 2220 Tulare Street, Suite 500 5 Fresno, California 93721 Telephone: (559) 600-3479 6 Facsimile: (559) 600-3480 7 Attorneys for Defendant 8 BRANDI L. ORTH. Fresno County Clerk/Registrar of Voters 9 10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT** 11 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 FRESNO DIVISION 13 14 THE UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST Case No. 1:19-CV-00808-AWI-BAM 15 CHURCH OF FRESNO 16 Plaintiff, FRESNO COUNTY **CLERK/REGISTRAR OF VOTERS** 17 **BRANDI L. ORTH'S ANSWER TO** ٧. COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY 18 BRANDI L. ORTH, Fresno County AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND Clerk/Registrar of Voters **DAMAGES** 19 20 Defendant. 21 Defendant BRANDI L. ORTH, Fresno County Clerk/Registrar of Voters and sued 22 herein in her official capacity (hereinafter "Registrar") hereby submits the following 23 Answer to Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and Damages (hereinafter 24 "Complaint") of plaintiff Unitarian Universalist Church of Fresno (hereinafter "Plaintiff"). 25 The Registrar answers the Complaint as follows: 26 111 27 111 28 Brandi L. Orth's Answer to Complaint 1 Case No. 1:19-CV-00808-AWI-BAM

#### **RESPONSE TO ALLEGATIONS**

- 1. The Registrar denies that Plaintiff "sues to address deprivations, under color of state authority, of rights, privileges and immunities secured by the United States Constitution." The Registrar admits that Plaintiff purports to state causes of action under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983. The Registrar further admits the Court has personal jurisdiction over the parties to this lawsuit. Except as so specifically admitted and denied, the Registrar denies each and every allegations contained in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint.
- 2. The Registrar avers that neither the Fresno Housing Authority nor the relevant Commissioner of the Authority are County of Fresno officers, agents or entities. The Registrar further avers that she lacks information or belief sufficient to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 2 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every said allegation.
- 3. The Registrar avers that she lacks information or belief sufficient to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 3 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every said allegation.
- 4. The Registrar avers that she lacks information or belief sufficient to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 4 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every said allegation.
- 5. The Registrar admits that in this lawsuit Plaintiff purports to challenge the Registrar's decision not to use Plaintiff's facilities as a polling place. Except as so specifically admitted the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 5 of the Complaint.
- 6. The Registrar admits that Plaintiff is seeking the relief requested in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint. Except as so specifically admitted the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 6 of the Complaint and further denies that Plaintiff is entitled to any of the relief requested.

- 7. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 7 of the Complaint.
- 8. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 8 of the Complaint.
- 9. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 9 of the Complaint.
- 10. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 10 of the Complaint.
- 11. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 11 of the Complaint.
- 12. The Registrar admits that at all times alleged in the Complaint, the Registrar acted lawfully within her authority as County Clerk/Registrar of Voters and in compliance with all state and federal laws. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 12 of the Complaint.
- 13. The Registrar admits that Plaintiff's facilities were used a polling place on the November 2016 and June 2018 election dates. Except as so specifically admitted the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 13 of the Complaint.
- 14. The Registrar denies the allegations contained in Paragraph 14 of the Complaint.
- 15. The Registrar lacks sufficient information and belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 15 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every said allegation.
- 16. The Registrar admits that some polling places are eligible to receive a \$35 stipend for serving as a polling place but denies that Plaintiff as a non-profit, tax-exempt entity subject to California Elections Code 12282 is entitled to receive any stipend or reimbursement. Except as so specifically admitted or denied, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 16 of the Complaint.

- 17. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 17 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in the paragraph.
- 18. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 18 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in the paragraph.
- 19. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 19 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 20. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 20 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 21. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 21 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph
- 22. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 22 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 23. The Registrar admits that at some point the Plaintiff displayed banners with the message "Black Lives Matter" on Plaintiff's property. Except as so specifically admitted, the County avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 23 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 24. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 24 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.

- 25. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 25 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 26. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 26 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 27. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 27 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 28. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 28 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 29. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 29 of the Complaint.
- 30. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 30 of the Complaint.
- 31. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 31 of the Complaint.
- 32. The Registrar admits that the Plaintiff's banners were displayed more than 100 feet from the polling place on Plaintiff's facilities during the June 2018 election date. The Registrar further admits that said banners would not have constituted a misdemeanor under California Elections Code §18370. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 32 of the Complaint.
- 33. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 33 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.

- 34. The Registrar admits that the banners at issue were on the Plaintiff's private property. Except as so specifically admitted the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 34 of the Complaint.
- 35. The Registrar denies the legal conclusion that the small signs referred to in Paragraph 35 of the Complaint were "not electioneering." Except as so specifically denied, the Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 35 of the Complaint.
- 36. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 36 of the Complaint.
- 37. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 37 of the Complaint.
- 38. The Registrar admits that both before the June 2018 election date and after the Registrar of Voters Office received several complaints from voters concerning the banners at the front of Plaintiff's facility housing the polling place including the complaint detailed in Paragraph 38 of the Complaint. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 38 of the Complaint.
- 39. The Registrar admits that due to the several complaints received by the Registrar of Voters office concerning the polling place at Plaintiff's facility the emails referenced in Paragraph 39 of the Complaint were exchanged between the Registrar and various staff in the Registrar of Voters office. In addition the Registrar avers that these complaints from concerned citizens caused the Registrar and staff in the Registrar of Voter's Office to communicate with each other over the complaints received about the polling place at Plaintiff's facility. Except as so specifically admitted or averred, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 39 of the Complaint.
- 40. The Register admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 40 of the Complaint.
- 41. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 41 of the Complaint.

- 42. The Registrar admits that Plaintiff's facilities have not been used as a polling site by the Registrar of Voter's Office since June of 2018. The Registrar further admits making the statement quoted in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 42 of the Complaint.
- 43. The Registrar admits that on or about September 5, 2018, Registrar of Voters staff informed one of the voters who had complained about using the Plaintiff's facility as a polling place that the Registrar of Voters would not use the Plaintiff's facility as a polling place on the upcoming November 2018 election date. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 43 of the Complaint.
- 44. The Registrar admits that for the November 2018 election date, the precinct that had been served by Plaintiff's location for the June 2018 election date voted at a polling location at the Cross City Christian Church in Fresno. The Registrar avers that Cross City Christian Church in Fresno had served for several years as a polling place without complaint from voters for one or more precincts including the precinct which had been placed at Plaintiff's location for the June 2018 election date. Except as so specifically admitted and averred, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 44 of the Complaint.
- 45. The Registrar admits that a few days prior to the November 2018 election date and continuing for a few days after the November 2018 election date, the Registrar began receiving several complaints almost of all of which self-identified as members or supporters of the Plaintiff concerning the polling location at Cross City Christian Church. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 45 of the Complaint.
- 46. The Registrar admits that several complaints were received in November 2018 concerning the use of the Cross City Christian Church within a few days of the November 2018 election date almost of all of which self-identified as members or

28

supporters of the Plaintiff. Except as so specifically admitted or averred, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 46 of the Complaint

- 47. The Registrar admits that Cross City Christian Church served as a polling place for two precincts during the November 2018 election date including the precinct which had been located at Plaintiff's facilities during the June 2018 election date. The Registrar avers that complaints received during November of 2018 concerning the Cross City Christian Church were received too close to the election date to change the polling location, even if such a change was warranted. The Registrar avers that the statutorily required Voter Information Guide had been mailed to voters identifying the Cross City Christian Church as the November 2018 polling place weeks prior to the election date and any change to the polling site at that late date would have caused substantial disruption to the voting process on election day. The Registrar further admits that for the March 2019 special election date the Cross City Christian Church served as a polling place for two precincts including the precinct that was located at Plaintiff's location for the June 2018 election date. The Registrar avers that no complaints were received concerning the use of the Cross City Christian Church polling place during its use for the March 2019 special election date. Except as so specifically admitted or averred, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 47 of the Complaint.
- 48. The Registrar admits that a number of churches throughout Fresno County have served as polling places for elections in the past. The Registrar avers that for at least as long as her tenure in office, it is very unusual to receive complaints concerning polling places due to any symbols, signs or banners on the polling place property. The Registrar denies that she "remove[d]" Plaintiff or any other church as a polling place for the November 2018 or March 2019 election dates but admits that it did not utilize Plaintiff's location during the November 2018 election date because Plaintiff would not cover or take down its banners for the single election day in November 2018. Except as so specifically admitted, averred or denied, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 48 of the Complaint.

- 49. The Registrar admits that on or about October 22, 2018 Plaintiff requested that the Registrar meet with an inter-faith group of concerned clergy to discuss the utilization of Plaintiff's facilities as a polling place and that the meeting took place on January 16, 2019. The Registrar denies that she "remove[d]" Plaintiff's facilities as a polling place. Except as so specifically admitted and denied, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in the Complaint.
- 50. The Registrar admits to stating that the Plaintiff's facilities were not utilized as a polling place for the November 2018 election date because she wanted to ensure safe and neutral polling places for the voters of Fresno County or words to that effect. The Registrar admits that she stated that the considerations that go into making a determination of whether a polling place is safe and neutral enough depends on all the circumstances in any given situation and that there were no specific or written guidelines for making such a determination or words to that effect. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 50 of the Complaint.
- 51. The Registrar admits that clergy at the January 2019 meeting made the statements contained in Paragraph 51 of the Complaint or words to that effect.
- 52. The Registrar admits that clergy at the January 2019 meeting made the statements contained in Paragraph 52 of the Complaint or words to that effect.
- 53. The Registrar admits that the Reverend Tim Kutzmark, at the January 2019 meeting, made the statements contained in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint or words to that effect. The Registrar denies that there is any "reinstate[ment]" to be made of any polling place as that term is apparently used in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint. Except as so specifically admitted or denied, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 53 of the Complaint.
- 54. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 54 of the Complaint.

- 55. The Registrar admits that the Reverend Kutzmark at the January 2019 meeting, made the statements contained in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint or words to that effect. The Registrar further admits that she indicated that no polling place had been chosen yet to be used as vote centers once Fresno County fully implemented the Voter's Choice Act in 2020 and that those considerations were ongoing. Except as specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 55 of the Complaint
- 56. The Registrar admits that Plaintiff's facilities were not utilized as a polling location for the March 2019 election date. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 56 of the Complaint.
- 57. The Registrar admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 57 of the Complaint.
- 58. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 58 of the Complaint.
- 59. The Registrar avers that she lacks sufficient information or belief to determine the truth or falsity of the allegations contained in Paragraph 59 of the Complaint and on that basis denies each and every allegation contained in said paragraph.
- 60. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 60 of the Complaint.
- 61. The Registrar admits that the United States Constitution and cases referenced in Paragraph 61 of the Complaint contain the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 61 of the Complaint
- 62. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 62 of the Complaint.
- 63. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 63 of the Complaint.

- 64. The Registrar admits that the case referenced in Paragraph 64 of the Complaint contains the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 64 of the Complaint
- 65. The Registrar admits that the case referenced in Paragraph 65 of the Complaint contains the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 65 of the Complaint
- 66. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 66 of the Complaint.
- 67. The Registrar admits that some polling places throughout Fresno County may have symbols, signs, banners or other messages located on the property owned by the entity on whose property there is also a polling place. The Registrar denies that any polling places other than Plaintiff's facility during the June 2018 had symbols, signs, banners or other messages containing a politically charged message either within the polling place as that is defined under the California Elections Code, or on the owner of the polling place's other property in close enough proximity to the polling site to cause concerns among the voting population regarding the neutrality of the polling place. With respect to the specific messages quoted in Paragraph 67 of the Complaint, the Registrar avers that she lacks information or belief sufficient to determine the truth or falsity of such allegations and on that basis denies said allegations. The Registrar further avers that besides the complaints received concerning the banners on Plaintiff's property during the June 2018 election and the complaints generated by Plaintiff's members and supporters concerning unspecified symbols and signs on the property of Cross City Christian Church during the November 2018 election, she has received no complaints concerning any symbol, sign, banner, messages or communications located on the property hosting any other polling site. Except as so specifically admitted, denied and averred, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 67 of the Complaint.

- 68. The Registrar admits that the case referenced in Paragraph 68 of the Complaint contain the language quoted in said paragraph. The Registrar denies that she has denied any benefit to any person in violation of any law. Except as so specifically admitted or denied, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 68 of the Complaint.
- 69. The Registrar admits that the case referenced in Paragraph 69 of the Complaint contain the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 69 of the Complaint
- 70. The Registrar admits that the cases referenced in Paragraph 70 of the Complaint contain the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 70 of the Complaint.
- 71. The Registrar admits that the cases referenced in Paragraph 65 of the Complaint contain the language quoted or referred to in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 71 of the Complaint.
- 72. The Registrar admits that Plaintiff's display of the banners is constitutionally protected speech so long as done in compliance with all legal time, space and manner restrictions to which such display may be subject. The Registrar further admits that the subject matter expressed in the banners is a matter of serious and political public concern. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 72 of the Complaint.
- 73. The Registrar admits that the case referenced in Paragraph 73 of the Complaint contain the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 73 of the Complaint

- 74. The Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 74 of the Complaint.
- 75. The Registrar denies each and every allegation and legal conclusion contained in Paragraph 75 of the Complaint.
- 76. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 76 of the Complaint.
- 77. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 77 of the Complaint.
- 78. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 78 of the Complaint.
- 79. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 79 of the Complaint.
- 80. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 80 of the Complaint.
- 81. The Registrar admits that California Elections Code §18370 provides for misdemeanor criminal penalties for electioneering within 100 feet of a polling place. The Registrar further admits that the <u>Burson v. Freeman</u> (1992) 504 U.S. 191 decision of the United States Supreme Court has approved such restrictions and imposition of criminal penalties for such actions near polling places. The Registrar further admits that Plaintiff's banners were not within 100 feet of the polling place itself as defined under California law. Except as so specifically admitted, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 81 of the Complaint.
- 82. The Registrar denies each and every factual allegation contained in Paragraph 82 of the Complaint. The Registrar further denies that the legal conclusions presented in Paragraph 82 of the Complaint are applicable to the facts and circumstances at issue in this action and on that basis denies each and every legal conclusion.
- 83. The Registrar admits that the cases referenced in Paragraph 83 of the Complaint contain the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically

admitted, the County denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 83 of the Complaint.

- 84. The Registrar admits that the case referenced in Paragraph 84 of the Complaint contains the language quoted in said paragraph. Except as so specifically admitted, the County denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 84 of the Complaint.
- 85. Based on the responses contained above in this Answer, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 85 of the Complaint.
- 86. The Registrar avers that Paragraph 86 of the Complaint contains only a statement of legal conclusion and requires no specific response.
- 87. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 87 of the Complaint.
- 88. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 88 of the Complaint.
- 89. Based on the responses contained above in this Answer, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 89 of the Complaint.
- 90. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 90 of the Complaint.
- 91. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 91 of the Complaint.
- 92. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 92 of the Complaint.
- 93. Based on the responses contained above in this Answer, the Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 93 of the Complaint.
- 94. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 94 of the Complaint.
- 95. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 95 of the Complaint.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

96. The Registrar denies each and every allegation contained in Paragraph 96 of the Complaint.

## **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

#### Failure to State a Claim

As a First and separate affirmative defense, the Registrar alleges that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

### **Qualified Immunity**

As a Second and separate affirmative defense, the Registrar alleges that she acted in good faith and pursuant to her reasonable understanding of existing law and is not liable for any damages nominal or otherwise nor subject to any other relief requested in the Complaint.

### **Tenth Amendment Immunity**

As a Third and separate affirmative defense, the Registrar alleges that in implementing the California Voter's Choice Act pursuant to state law she is a state actor and the Court is without jurisdiction to issue any order or declaration that would interfere with the implementation of this important state law governing elections.

# RESPONSE TO PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Registrar respectfully prays for judgment as follows:

- (a) That Plaintiff take nothing on its Complaint;
- (b) That Plaintiff's requests for injunctive or declaratory relief be denied;
- (c) That Plaintiff's request for attorneys' fees and costs be denied; and
- (d) Any other additional relief or judgment that the Court may deem just and proper.

26 | /// 27 | ///

28 | ///

# Case 1:19-cv-00808-LJO-BAM Document 6 Filed 06/28/19 Page 16 of 16

1			
2	Dated: June 28, 2019		Respectfully Submitted,
3			DANIEL C. CEDERBORG
4			County Counsel
5		Ву:	/S/ Daniel C. Cederborg
6			Attorneys for Defendant
7			Attorneys for Defendant BRANDI L. ORTH, County Clerk/Registrar of Voters for the County of Fresno
8			of Fresno
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21 22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			