26

2 3

1

4 5

6

7

8 9 10

23

24

25

26

Consolidated Plaintiffs do not dispute that they did not raise the issue of whether the legislative privilege has been "overcome" using a five-factor balancing test in the weeks leading up to the Motion to Compel – not in their meet-and confer discussions, nor their written communications (Doc. 500-1 at p. 45-48), nor with the Court at the July 25 hearing. [See Response, Doc. 507.]

That is the critical issue, not undersigned counsel's awareness of case law applying the five-factor test or participation in a case involving legislative privilege issues in front of Judge Lanza. The point is that Consolidated Plaintiffs did not indicate in any communication with undersigned counsel that they were raising that issue *in this case* until their Motion to Compel (filed after the Speaker and President's brief).

To deflect from their failure to raise this issue, Consolidated Plaintiffs note that a July 10 letter from counsel for the Speaker and President quoted from a case applying the five-factor test, League of Women Voters of Florida, Inc. v. Lee, 340 F.R.D. 446, 458 (N.D. Fla. 2021). [Doc. 500-1, Ex. D, p. 52.] In context, it is clear the quote referred to the purpose behind the legislative privilege, as support for the Speaker and President's position on implied waiver. [Id.] That quote appeared in the section of the letter addressing Powell v. Ridge and Consolidated Plaintiffs' implied waiver argument; it was followed by citations to legislative privilege cases that do not use the five-factor balancing test; and the following paragraph stated: "Accordingly, we do not agree that the Speaker and the President have put their individual motives and actions at issue in this case or that their intervention effects a waiver of their legislative privilege." [Id.] A review of the July 10 letter and the July 5 letter to which it responded confirms that the five-factor test was not part of the parties' communications. [Id. at p. 45-54.] Thus, the Speaker and President reasonably did not brief an issue that the Consolidated Plaintiffs had never raised.

The Speaker and President respectfully request five pages to present argument on the Consolidated Plaintiffs' newly-raised issue if the Court decides to reach it. Consolidated

Plaintiffs do not oppose the requested relief if they are given a chance to reply. [Doc. 507] 1 2 at 5.] Although it does not appear necessary for Consolidated Plaintiffs to have five more pages on this specific issue, the Speaker and President leave that to the Court's discretion. 3 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 11th day of August, 2023. 4 5 GALLAGHER & KENNEDY, P.A. 6 7 By:/s/ Hannah H. Porter Kevin E. O'Malley 8 Hannah H. Porter 9 Ashley E. Fitzgibbons 2575 East Camelback Road 10 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-9225 11 Attorneys for Intervenor-Defendants Toma and Petersen 12 13 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 14 I hereby certify that on August 11, 2023, I electronically transmitted a PDF version 15 of this document to the Clerk of Court, using the CM/ECF System for filing and for 16 transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing. 17 18 /s/D. Ochoa 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26