

GRAYCE ZELPHIN (SBN 279112)  
gzelphin@aclunc.org  
ANGELICA SALCEDA (SBN 296152)  
asalceda@aclunc.org  
SHILPI AGRWAL (SBN 270749)  
sagarwal@aclunc.org  
ACLU FOUNDATION OF  
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA  
39 Drumm Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 621-2493

JULIA A. GOMEZ (SBN 316270)  
jgomez@aclusocal.org  
PETER ELIASBERG (SBN 89110)  
peliasberg@aclusocal.org  
ACLU FOUNDATION OF  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
1313 West 8th Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
(213) 977-5232

Counsel for Proposed Intervenor-Defendant

*Additional counsel listed below*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.

SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of State of  
California, and the STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA  
Defendants.

CASE NO: 2:25-cv-09149-DOC  
(ADSx)

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION FOR INTERVENTION  
OF LEAGUE OF WOMEN  
VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR INTERVENTION  
OF LEAGUE OF WOMEN  
VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA**

DATE: November 17, 2025  
TIME: 9:00 AM  
COURTROOM: 10A, 10th Floor  
JUDGE: Hon. David O. Carter

1 THERESA J. LEE (NY 5022769)\*  
2 tlee@aclu.org  
3 SOPHIA LIN LAKIN (NY 5182076)\*  
4 slakin@aclu.org  
5 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
6 UNION FOUNDATION  
7 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
8 New York, NY 10004  
9 (212) 549-2500

7 PATRICIA J. YAN (NY 5499173)\*  
8 pyan@aclu.org  
9 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
10 UNION FOUNDATION  
11 915 15th Street NW  
12 Washington, DC 20005  
13 (202) 457-0800

14 \*Application for admission pro hac vice forthcoming

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO INTERVENE**

The League of Women Voters of California (the “League” or “Proposed Intervenor”) respectfully moves for this Court grant them leave to intervene as defendants in this case as a matter of right under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a)(2) or, alternatively, grant them permission to intervene under Rule 24(b).

In support of their Motion, Proposed Intervenor submits and incorporates the below Memorandum of Points and Authorities, declaration of Helen Hutchison (attached as Exhibit A), a Proposed Answer submitted pursuant to Rule 24(c) (attached as Exhibit B), and a Proposed Order (attached as Exhibit C). Pursuant to Local Rule 7-3, counsel for Proposed Intervenor made a good-faith effort to confer with counsel for the existing parties. On October 16, 2025, counsel for Proposed Intervenor contacted Plaintiff’s counsel requesting a call to discuss proposed intervention. On October 17, 2025, Plaintiff’s counsel responded by email and stated that their division is furloughed and that Plaintiff opposes the motion. Proposed Intervenor also met and conferred with Defendants’ counsel, and on October 17, 2025 counsel confirmed that the Defendants consent to Proposed Intervenor’s motion.

Proposed Intervenor recognizes that Plaintiff’s Motion to Stay this case due to the lapse in federal appropriations is currently pending. ECF No. 6. Proposed Intervenor does not oppose this stay request. However, the League requests that the Court set this motion for hearing on November 17, 2025, to be heard with the other pending motion to intervene. ECF No. 20. For the reasons below, the League’s motion should be granted.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO INTERVENE .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. Federal Law Entrusts States with the Responsibility to Collect, Maintain, and Protect Voter Data .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>II. The Department of Justice Demands Unwarranted Access to Voter Data from Jurisdictions Nationwide, Citing Questionable Rationale .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>III. The League has a Vested Interest in Protecting its Members and Preserving its Legislative Advocacy.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ARGUMENT.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>I. The League Is Entitled to Intervene as of Right Under Rule 24(a)(2) .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>A. Proposed Intervenor-Defendant’s Motion Is Timely.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>B. The League Has a Significantly Protectable Interest that Will be Impaired if Plaintiff DOJ Prevails.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>C. The League’s Interests Are Not Adequately Represented by the Existing Parties .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>II. In the Alternative, the League Should Be Granted Permissive Intervention Under Rule 24(b) .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>17</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Apache Stronghold v. U.S.</i> , <a href="#">2023 WL 3692937</a> (D. Ariz. May 29, 2023).....	9
<i>Associated Gen. Contractors of Am. v. Cal. Dep’t of Transp.</i> , <a href="#">2009 WL 5206722</a> (E.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2009).....	14
<i>Cal. Dep’t of Toxic Substances Control v. Jim Dobbas, Inc.</i> , <a href="#">54 F.4th 1078</a> (9th Cir. 2022).....	7
<i>Cal. Dump Truck Owners Ass’n v. Nichols</i> , <a href="#">275 F.R.D. 303</a> (E.D. Cal. 2011).....	13
<i>Callahan v. Brookdale Senior Living Communities, Inc.</i> , <a href="#">42 F.4th 1013</a> (9th Cir. 2022).....	15
<i>Citizens for Balanced Use v. Mont. Wilderness Ass’n</i> , <a href="#">647 F.3d 893</a> (9th Cir. 2011).....	9, 12, 13
<i>Est. of Toguri v. Pierotti</i> , <a href="#">2023 WL 8703417</a> (C.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2023).....	8
<i>Freedom from Religion Found., Inc. v. Geithner</i> , <a href="#">644 F.3d 836</a> (9th Cir. 2011).....	15
<i>GHP Mgmt. Corp. v. City of L.A.</i> , <a href="#">339 F.R.D. 621</a> (C.D. Cal. 2021) .....	14
<i>Greene v. U.S.</i> , <a href="#">996 F.2d 973</a> (9th Cir. 1993).....	10
<i>Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.</i> , <a href="#">584 U.S. 756</a> (2018) .....	3
<i>Idaho Farm Bureau Fed’n v. Babbitt</i> , <a href="#">58 F.3d 1392</a> (9th Cir. 1995).....	12
<i>Idaho v. Freeman</i> , <a href="#">625 F.2d 886</a> (9th Cir. 1980).....	12

1	<i>Issa v. Newsom</i> ,	
2	<a href="#"><u>2020 WL 3074351</u></a> (E.D. Cal. June 10, 2020).....	8, 10, 13
3	<i>Kalbers v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.</i> ,	
4	<a href="#"><u>22 F.4th 816</u></a> (9th Cir. 2021).....	8, 9, 10
5	<i>KOR Servs., LLC v. Thomson Int’l</i> ,	
6	<a href="#"><u>2022 WL 18278406</u></a> (C.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2022).....	9
7	<i>Nw. Env’t Def. Ctr. v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs</i> ,	
8	<a href="#"><u>2024 WL 3290349</u></a> (D. Or. July 2, 2024) .....	8
9	<i>Paher v. Cegavske</i> ,	
10	<a href="#"><u>2020 WL 2042365</u></a> (D. Nev. Apr. 28, 2020) .....	11, 14
11	<i>Republican Nat’l Comm. v. Aguilar</i> ,	
12	<a href="#"><u>2024 WL 3409860</u></a> (D. Nev. July 12, 2024).....	16
13	<i>Sable Offshore Corp. v. Cnty. of Santa Barbara</i> ,	
14	<a href="#"><u>2025 WL 2412147</u></a> (C.D. Cal. July 25, 2025) .....	12
15	<i>Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt</i> ,	
16	<a href="#"><u>713 F.2d 525</u></a> (9th Cir. 1983).....	12
17	<i>SEC v. Navin</i> ,	
18	<a href="#"><u>166 F.R.D. 435</u></a> (N.D. Cal. 1995).....	11
19	<i>Sierra Club v. EPA</i> ,	
20	<a href="#"><u>995 F.2d 1478</u></a> (9th Cir. 1993).....	7
21	<i>Smith v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist.</i> ,	
22	<a href="#"><u>830 F.3d 843</u></a> (9th Cir. 2016).....	8, 9
23	<i>Spangler v. Pasadena City Bd. of Educ.</i> ,	
24	<a href="#"><u>552 F.2d 1326</u></a> (9th Cir. 1977).....	15
25	<i>Sullivan v. Ferguson</i> ,	
26	<a href="#"><u>2022 WL 10428165</u></a> (W.D. Wash. Oct. 18, 2022) .....	16
27	<i>Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Berg</i> ,	
28	<a href="#"><u>268 F.3d 810</u></a> (9th Cir. 2001).....	10
	<i>U.S. v. Aerojet Gen. Corp.</i> ,	
	<a href="#"><u>606 F.3d 1142</u></a> (9th Cir. 2010).....	8

1	<i>U.S. v. City of L.A.</i> ,	
2	<a href="#"><u>288 F.3d 391</u></a> (9th Cir. 2002).....	7
3	<i>U.S. v. Oregon</i> ,	
4	<a href="#"><u>745 F.2d 550</u></a> (9th Cir. 1984).....	15
5	<i>W. States Trucking Ass’n v. Becerra</i> ,	
6	<a href="#"><u>2020 WL 1032348</u></a> (C.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2020) .....	8
7	<i>W. Watersheds Project v. Haaland</i> ,	
8	<a href="#"><u>22 F.4th 828</u></a> (9th Cir. 2022).....	8
9	<i>Wilderness Soc’y v. U.S. Forest Serv.</i> ,	
10	<a href="#"><u>630 F.3d 1173</u></a> (9th Cir. 2011).....	7, 10
11	<b>Statutes</b>	
12	<a href="#"><u>U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1</u></a> .....	3
13	<a href="#"><u>52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)</u></a> .....	3, 4
14	<a href="#"><u>52 U.S.C. § 20501(b)</u></a> .....	3
15	<a href="#"><u>52 U.S.C. § 20503(a)</u></a> .....	3
16	<a href="#"><u>52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)</u></a> .....	3
17	<a href="#"><u>Cal. Elec. Code §§ 2260-2277</u></a> .....	6
18	<b>Rules</b>	
19	<a href="#"><u>Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)</u></a> .....	<i>passim</i>
20	<a href="#"><u>Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)</u></a> .....	<i>passim</i>
21	<b>Other Authorities</b>	
22	7C Charles Alan Wright et al., <i>Fed. Prac. &amp; Proc.</i> § 1908 (3d ed. 1998 & Supp.	
23	2025).....	7
24	Devlin Barrett & Nick Corasaniti, Trump Administration Quietly Seeks to Build	
25	National Voter Roll, N.Y. Times (Sept. 9, 2025),	
26	<a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/09/us/politics/trump-voter-registration-data.html"><u>https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/09/us/politics/trump-voter-registration-</u></a>	
27	<a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/09/us/politics/trump-voter-registration-data.html"><u>data.html</u></a> .....	2

Kaylie Martinez-Ochoa, Eileen O’Connor & Patrick Berry, *Tracker of Justice Department Requests for Voter Information*, Brennan Center (Oct. 15, 2025), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/tracker-justice-department-requests-voter-information>.....1



## INTRODUCTION

Proposed Intervenor-Defendant the League of Women Voters of California (the “League”) moves to intervene in this action to protect its members from federal intrusion into the state’s management of elections and prevent the United States Department of Justice (“DOJ”) from collecting and misusing sensitive data California voters entrusted to the state when registering to vote. Concerned by the DOJ’s attempt to use this Court’s resources and authority to unlawfully extract sensitive and confidential voter data, and motivated by its mission to encourage civic participation and protect its members’ privacy, the League respectfully moves to intervene pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 24(a)(2).

This lawsuit arises from the DOJ’s legally baseless demand that the State of California provide it with blanket access to unredacted state voter data. Despite the federal government’s constitutionally limited role in managing federal elections, which extends only so far as Congress has specifically legislated, over the past several months the DOJ has repeatedly attempted to intrude upon states’ authority to manage elections by demanding extensive voter information from at least 39 states.<sup>1</sup> After several states declined to comply with these sweeping requests, citing state and federal laws protecting sensitive information, the DOJ sued eight of these states in an attempt to compel unlawful productions.<sup>2</sup> While the DOJ asserts that it is investigating “voter registration list maintenance” here

---

<sup>1</sup> Kaylie Martinez-Ochoa, Eileen O’Connor & Patrick Berry, *Tracker of Justice Department Requests for Voter Information*, Brennan Center (Oct. 15, 2025), <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/tracker-justice-department-requests-voter-information>.

<sup>2</sup> *U.S. v. Maine*, No. 1:25-cv-468 (D. Me. filed Sept. 25, 2025); *U.S. v. Benson*, No. 1:25-cv-01148 (W.D. Mich. filed Sept. 25, 2025); *U.S. v. Simon*, No. 0:25-cv-03761 (D. Minn. filed Sept. 25, 2025); *U.S. v. Bd. of Elections of the State of New York*, No. 1:25-cv-01338 (N.D.N.Y. filed Sept. 25, 2025); *U.S. v. Scanlan*, No. 1:25-cv-00371 (D.N.H. filed Sept. 25, 2025); *U.S. v. Pennsylvania*, No. 2:25-cv-01481 (W.D. Pa. filed Sept. 25, 2025).

1 in California, media reports and the national reach of its voter data requests suggest  
2 that the true motive is a broader quest to create a national voter roll.<sup>3</sup> In any case,  
3 the DOJ does not, and cannot, articulate a basis for the expansive collection of  
4 state-held voter data it seeks. Here, as in other states, the DOJ's requests go well  
5 beyond what is authorized by federal law, and complying with them would violate  
6 state and federal laws.

7 The League is a non-partisan grassroots organization with thousands of  
8 members across the state. It is one of the state's preeminent pro-democracy and  
9 pro-voter organizations and works to encourage civic participation in California  
10 and to register Californians to vote. The League has led many of California's  
11 efforts to expand voter registration opportunities and to pass legislation securing  
12 the confidentiality and privacy of voter information. The League seeks to  
13 intervene to safeguard its interests in conducting voter engagement and education  
14 work, maintaining the privacy of its members and the communities it serves, and  
15 defending the pro-voter policies it has helped to pass. The League's participation  
16 will not cause any delay and will provide the Court with important context that  
17 will aid in the swift and just resolution of this case. No other party can fully  
18 represent the League's unique interests here. The League's motion for mandatory  
19 intervention under Rule 24(a)—or in the alternative, for permissive intervention  
20 under Rule 24(b)—should accordingly be granted.<sup>4</sup>

---

23 <sup>3</sup> Devlin Barrett & Nick Corasaniti, *Trump Administration Quietly Seeks to Build*  
24 *National Voter Roll*, N.Y. Times (Sept. 9, 2025),  
25 [https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/09/us/politics/trump-voter-registration-](https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/09/us/politics/trump-voter-registration-data.html)  
26 [data.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/09/us/politics/trump-voter-registration-data.html).

27 <sup>4</sup> The League's motion is accompanied by a proposed Answer, pursuant to Rule  
28 24(c). If the League's motion is granted, the League reserves the right to move to  
dismiss the Complaint by the applicable deadline.

## BACKGROUND

### I. Federal Law Entrusts States with the Responsibility to Collect, Maintain, and Protect Voter Data

Under the Elections Clause of the U.S. Constitution, it is the responsibility of states to regulate the “Times, Places, and Manner” of federal elections, and only Congress can enact laws to “make or alter” those regulations. See U.S. Const. art. I, § 4, cl. 1. The Framers intentionally delegated the power to register voters and collect and maintain voter data to the states to avoid concentrated power in a single federal body.

Even where Congress has exercised its authority to alter states’ regulation of federal elections, it has made clear that it is the state’s responsibility to maintain voter data. In 1993, Congress enacted the National Voter Registration Act (“NVRA”) and directed states to establish voter registration procedures to increase registration and maintain accurate voter rolls. See 52 U.S.C. §§ 20501(b), 20503(a). The NVRA’s text clearly delegates “the administration of voter registration for elections for Federal office” to “each state.” See *id.* § 20507(a); *Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Inst.*, 584 U.S. 756, 761 (2018). It required *states* to maintain accurate voter rolls by conducting a “general program that makes a reasonable effort” to remove voters who are deceased or have changed their address. 52 U.S.C. § 20507(a)(4). While the NVRA created guidelines for states to follow and required states to have a program for list maintenance, the duty to safeguard voter data remained with the states, not the federal government. See *Husted*, 584 U.S. at 761-62.

In enacting the Help America Vote Act (“HAVA”) in 2002, Congress again made it clear that states are responsible for maintaining voter rolls. HAVA directs “each State” to implement a uniform computerized voter registration list “defined, maintained, and administered at the State level.” 52 U.S.C. § 21083(a)(1)(A). Like

1 the NVRA, HAVA created specific requirements for *states* to follow in maintaining  
2 accurate voter information and does not give this power to the federal government.  
3 *See id.* HAVA has no requirement that voter information be publicly disclosed.

4 **II. The Department of Justice Demands Unwarranted Access to Voter Data**  
5 **from Jurisdictions Nationwide, Citing Questionable Rationale**

6 In recent months, the DOJ has sought access to sensitive voter information  
7 from at least 39 states across the country, claiming to be investigating states’  
8 compliance with the NVRA or HAVA.<sup>5</sup> As part of these far-reaching requests,  
9 on July 10, 2025, the DOJ sent a letter to California demanding, among other  
10 things, a copy of “all fields” on California’s voter registration list within 14 days.  
11 Compl. ¶ 34. On August 8, California responded by explaining that the NVRA  
12 does not require total and unqualified access to a state’s voter registration list, and  
13 that California law prohibits making available for public inspection or disclosing  
14 an entirely unredacted voter file. Compl. ¶ 37. California offered DOJ the  
15 opportunity to inspect a copy of its redacted voter database, noting that unique  
16 identifier numbers used by the State for purposes of voter identification would be  
17 redacted. *Id.* On August 13, the DOJ again demanded full, unredacted access to  
18 California’s voter database, and California has refused to comply. Compl. ¶ 38,  
19 43. The DOJ then sued California, naming its Secretary of State, Shirley Weber,  
20 on September 25, citing the NVRA, HAVA, and the Civil Rights Act (“CRA”) of  
21 1960 as its basis for demanding California’s entire, unredacted voter database.

22 **III. The League has a Vested Interest in Protecting its Members and**  
23 **Preserving its Legislative Advocacy**

24 The League is the California affiliate of the League of Women Voters  
25 (“LWV”), which was founded in 1920 as an outgrowth of the struggle for voting  
26 rights for women. Declaration of Helen Hutchison (“Hutchison Decl.”) ¶ 4. LWV  
27

---

28 <sup>5</sup> *See* Kaylie Martinez-Ochoa, Eileen O’Connor & Patrick Berry, *supra* note 1.

1 has more than one million members and supporters and is organized in more than  
2 750 communities in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. *Id.* In California,  
3 the League serves as a large non-partisan grassroots membership organization that  
4 has approximately 7,000 dues-paying members in the state across 62 local chapters.  
5 *Id.* ¶¶ 5-6. Its mission is to engage all Californians in acting on the issues that  
6 matter to them, to build political power and voice in communities historically  
7 underrepresented in the halls of government, to enact solutions to some of the  
8 biggest challenges facing the state, and to drive every eligible voter to register and  
9 to cast their ballot. *Id.* ¶ 8.

10 League members and volunteers work year-round in their local communities  
11 as part of an integrated voter engagement model of organizing. *Id.* ¶¶ 6, 10-11.  
12 Through and in coordination with their local chapters, the League regularly  
13 conducts voter service projects, including efforts to register voters, get out the vote,  
14 and educate the public on elections. *Id.* ¶ 12. For example, during 2024, nearly  
15 3,000 League volunteers donated almost 35,000 hours of their time providing voter  
16 information to Californians. *Id.* These volunteer hours were applied at over 2,000  
17 individual activities, including voter registration drives at high schools, colleges,  
18 and local community events; hosting “pros and cons” speaking events to educate  
19 the public regarding upcoming ballot measures; hosting candidate forums; and  
20 conducting get out the vote events, often in partnership with other community  
21 organizations, to educate, engage, and turn out voters in the period leading up to an  
22 election. *Id.*

23 The vast majority of League members and volunteers, as well as members  
24 of the communities the League serves, are registered to vote or intend to register in  
25 California. *Id.* ¶ 7. This means these individuals have already provided or plan to  
26 provide Defendant Weber and the State of California with sensitive information in  
27 order to register—including date of birth, driver’s license number, nondriver  
28

1 identification card number, or the last four digits of their social security number—  
2 and they reasonably expect the State to keep this information private. *See id.*

3 The League also dedicates significant resources to support or oppose  
4 legislation on issues which its statewide membership has reached consensus. *Id.*  
5 ¶ 19. In this capacity, the League has supported AB 1461 (Gonzalez 2015), *id.*,  
6 California’s Motor Voter law which automatically registers eligible residents to  
7 vote when they complete a Department of Motor Vehicle (“DMV”) transaction  
8 unless they opt out. *See generally* [Cal. Elec. Code §§ 2260-2277](#). The law also  
9 includes enhanced privacy safeguards such as limits on data sharing, confidential  
10 voter categories, liability protections that shield mistakenly registered voters from  
11 fraud charges unless they knowingly vote while ineligible, and criminal penalties  
12 for unauthorized disclosure or misuse of DMV voter registration information. *See*  
13 *id.* §§ 2265(b)(4)(c), (f) (data use and sharing limits); *id.* § 2266 (confidentiality  
14 procedures and penalties for unauthorized disclosure); *id.* § 2269 (confidential  
15 voter categories); *id.* § 2271 (protections for inadvertent registration); *see also*  
16 Hutchison Decl. ¶ 19. The League currently sits on the California Motor Voter  
17 Task Force, created by AB 796 (Berman 2021), and has sponsored bills extending  
18 the Task Force. Hutchison Decl. ¶ 19. The League has also opposed legislation,  
19 like AB 25 (DeMaio 2025), which would have required voters to provide additional  
20 identification information to cast a ballot, creating both new risks of data exposure  
21 and barriers to participation. *Id.* ¶ 20.

22 If the DOJ succeeds in securing its requested relief, this will harm League  
23 members by disclosing their sensitive data and stripping them of the voter privacy  
24 rights the League has fought to bolster under California law. *Id.* ¶ 22. Specifically,  
25 the DOJ could compel California to violate protections enumerated under the  
26 California Motor Voter law, dismantling the confidentiality procedures and  
27 protections from liability promised to League members and volunteers, and League  
28



1 voters' information would be disclosed to a third party, the U.S. Government,  
2 which may seek to target politically active members. *Id.* Additionally, the  
3 League's voter outreach and registration efforts would be harmed, as Californians  
4 concerned by the prospect of their sensitive information being shared with the  
5 federal government may become less engaged and reluctant to register to vote or  
6 participate in the political process. *Id.* ¶ 23.

## 7 ARGUMENT

### 8 I. The League Is Entitled to Intervene as of Right Under Rule 24(a)(2).

9 Under Rule 24(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, a "timely" motion  
10 to intervene must be granted where the movant alleges (1) a "significantly  
11 protectable interest" relating to the subject matter of the lawsuit, (2) that  
12 "disposition of the action" will "as a practical matter impair or impede its ability to  
13 protect that interest[,]" and (3) that the interest will be "inadequately represented  
14 by the parties to the action." *Wilderness Soc'y v. U.S. Forest Serv.*, 630 F.3d 1173,  
15 1177 (9th Cir. 2011) (quoting *Sierra Club v. EPA*, 995 F.2d 1478, 1481 (9th Cir.  
16 1993)). Rule 24(a) must be construed "broadly in favor of proposed intervenors."  
17 *Id.* at 1179 (quoting *U.S. v. City of L.A.*, 288 F.3d 391, 397 (9th Cir. 2002)).  
18 Further, in the Ninth Circuit, intervenors "that seek the same relief sought by at  
19 least one existing party to the case need not" independently demonstrate Article III  
20 standing. *Cal. Dep't of Toxic Substances Control v. Jim Dobbas, Inc.*, 54 F.4th  
21 1078, 1085 (9th Cir. 2022); *see also* 7C Charles Alan Wright et al., *Fed. Prac. &*  
22 *Proc.* § 1908 (3d ed. 1998 & Supp. 2025). Thus, a party "must" be permitted to  
23 intervene when it satisfies the requirements of Rule 24(a). Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a).  
24 Here, the League satisfies each of the elements for intervention as of right.

### 25 A. Proposed Intervenor-Defendant's Motion Is Timely.

26 The League's motion is timely. There are three "primary factors" that courts  
27 consider in evaluating timeliness: "(1) the stage of the proceeding at which an  
28

1 applicant seeks to intervene; (2) the prejudice to other parties; and (3) the reason  
2 for and length of the delay.” *Kalbers v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.*, 22 F.4th 816, 822 (9th  
3 Cir. 2021) (quoting *Smith v. L.A. Unified Sch. Dist.*, 830 F.3d 843, 854 (9th Cir.  
4 2016)); *see also W. Watersheds Project v. Haaland*, 22 F.4th 828, 835-36 (9th Cir.  
5 2022). The Ninth Circuit interprets these factors “broadly in favor of intervention.”  
6 *W. Watersheds Project*, 22 F.4th at 835.

7 Here, the League has moved for intervention extremely early in the  
8 proceedings, just a few weeks from when the case was filed on September 25, 2025,  
9 and even before the Defendants have entered an appearance in this matter.  
10 Additionally, five days after filing this case, Plaintiff filed a motion to stay based  
11 on the lapse in federal appropriations, which is currently pending. ECF No. 6. On  
12 October 10, 2025, this case was reassigned, and the only date now set on this case’s  
13 schedule is a hearing on a different motion to intervene which is scheduled for  
14 November 17, 2025. ECF No. 19; ECF 20. The League is requesting that this  
15 Motion be heard on the same date.

16 Courts routinely find motions to intervene timely under these circumstances.  
17 *See, e.g., Kalbers*, 22 F.4th at 825 (finding that a delay of “just a few weeks” was  
18 a “short delay” that weighed “in favor of timeliness”); *U.S. v. Aerojet Gen. Corp.*,  
19 606 F.3d 1142, 1149 (9th Cir. 2010) (motion to intervene was timely where it was  
20 filed within four months of when applicants learned of proposed consent decree);  
21 *Nw. Env’t Def. Ctr. v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs*, 2024 WL 3290349, at \*2 (D. Or.  
22 July 2, 2024) (delay of five months constituted “minimal delay”); *Issa v. Newsom*,  
23 2020 WL 3074351, at \*2 (E.D. Cal. June 10, 2020) (finding motion timely where  
24 “no substantive proceedings ha[d] occurred”); *W. States Trucking Ass’n v. Becerra*,  
25 2020 WL 1032348, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2020) (finding motion timely where  
26 party intervenes “soon after a complaint, prior to any substantive proceedings”);  
27 *Est. of Toguri v. Pierotti*, 2023 WL 8703417, at \*6 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2023)



1 (finding delay of nearly a year was still timely because there had been no “rulings  
2 on the merits and the case is in its procedural infancy”).

3 Intervention at this early stage will not prejudice any of the existing parties.  
4 “The only prejudice that is relevant is that which flows from a prospective  
5 intervenor’s failure to intervene after he knew, or reasonably should have known,  
6 that his interests were not being adequately represented.” *Kalbers*, 22 F.4th at 825  
7 (quoting *Smith*, 830 F.3d at 857) (cleaned up). Here, given the early stage of this  
8 litigation and how quickly the League has sought to intervene, the parties will not  
9 be prejudiced by intervention. *See, e.g., Citizens for Balanced Use v. Mont.*  
10 *Wilderness Ass’n*, 647 F.3d 893, 897 (9th Cir. 2011) (granting motion to intervene  
11 because it was made “at an early stage of the proceedings, the parties would not  
12 have suffered prejudice from the grant of intervention at that early stage, and  
13 intervention would not cause disruption or delay in the proceedings”); *KOR Servs.,*  
14 *LLC v. Thomson Int’l*, 2022 WL 18278406, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2022) (granting  
15 motion to intervene because parties would not be prejudiced when the proceedings  
16 were “still in the early stages,” discovery was not closed, the parties had not taken  
17 depositions, and no dispositive motions had been filed); *Apache Stronghold v. U.S.*,  
18 2023 WL 3692937, at \*2 (D. Ariz. May 29, 2023) (finding that existing parties  
19 would not be prejudiced where the case was “still in the very early stages”). No  
20 substantive deadlines have passed, and the League will of course comply with any  
21 schedule adopted by the Court.

22 The League thus meets Rule 24(a)’s timeliness requirement.

23 **B. The League Has a Significantly Protectable Interest that Will be**  
24 **Impaired if Plaintiff DOJ Prevails.**

25 To demonstrate a “significantly protectable interest” relating to the subject  
26 matter of the action, the intervenor must (1) assert “an interest that is protected  
27 under some law,” and (2) show that “there is a relationship between its legally  
28

1 protected interest and the plaintiff's claims." *Kalbers*, 22 F.4th at 827. This is a  
2 "practical, threshold inquiry"; no "specific legal or equitable interest need be  
3 established." *Sw. Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. Berg*, 268 F.3d 810, 818 (9th Cir.  
4 2001) (quoting *Greene v. U.S.*, 996 F.2d 973, 976 (9th Cir. 1993)). Similarly, to  
5 satisfy the impairment requirement, an intervenor need only show that "it will  
6 suffer a practical impairment of its interests as a result of the pending litigation."  
7 *Wilderness Soc'y*, 630 F.3d at 1179. The League easily satisfies these  
8 requirements.

9 The League has a significantly protectable interest in ensuring its members'  
10 personal voter registration data is safeguarded and ensuring their data is not at risk  
11 of disclosure through the outcome of this action. *See* Hutchison Decl. ¶¶ 22-23.  
12 Like in *Kalbers*, the League's members have a "straightforward" interest in  
13 securing the non-disclosure of their sensitive information, and the disposition of  
14 this action could impede their ability to protect this interest. *See Kalbers*, 22 F.4th  
15 at 827; Hutchison Decl. ¶¶ 22-23. Most of the League's members are registered to  
16 vote in California and have already submitted sensitive information to the State for  
17 voter registration purposes. Hutchison Decl. ¶ 7. These members have legitimate  
18 concerns about their personal information being handed over by California to the  
19 federal government. *See id.* ¶¶ 7, 23.

20 Furthermore, the League has a significantly protectible interest in pursuing  
21 its core mission of increasing civic participation and encouraging all eligible  
22 Californians to vote, understand, and engage in the political process. *Id.* ¶¶ 23-25.  
23 The League's interests in (1) asserting the rights of its members to vote without  
24 risking their privacy, (2) advancing its non-partisan advocacy efforts, and (3)  
25 diverting its limited resources to educate members about increased privacy  
26 concerns, *see id.* ¶¶ 11, 22-25, are strikingly similar to interests courts have held  
27 are sufficient for intervention in other cases. *See, e.g., Issa*, 2020 WL 3074351, at  
28

\*3 (“[S]uch interests are routinely found to constitute significant protectable interests.”); *see also, e.g., Paher v. Cegavske*, [2020 WL 2042365](#), at \*2 (D. Nev. Apr. 28, 2020). The League, its members, and its volunteers have conducted voter registration drives and provided voters with information about how to register to vote and, when relevant to its voter education efforts, provided information about the confidentiality of voter data. Hutchison Decl. ¶ 12. The League has a vested interest in ensuring that this information remains valid, and that the significant resources it has devoted to education and outreach programs continue to be impactful and provide accurate information. *See id.* ¶¶ 22-25.

The League’s interest in carrying out its mission will be impaired as a practical matter if DOJ prevails. *Id.* ¶ 23. This is independently sufficient to satisfy the impairment requirement. *See, e.g., Paher*, [2020 WL 2042365](#), at \*2 (finding that intervenors’ interests in promoting the franchise and the election of the Democratic Party candidates would be impaired by plaintiff’s challenge to Nevada’s all mail election provisions); *see also SEC v. Navin*, [166 F.R.D. 435, 440](#) (N.D. Cal. 1995) (intervenor need only show “potential adverse impact” on the interest). The DOJ’s action directly threatens League’s legislative advocacy—including the guarantees in the California Motor Voter law and Motor Voter Task Force. Hutchison Decl. ¶ 22; *see also id.* ¶ 20 (League opposition to bills that threaten voter privacy). In these bills and others, the League advocates for legislation that reduces barriers to voter registration, protects voter data confidentiality, and limits laws, practices, and systems that risk the unnecessary or erroneous deactivation of voter registration—goals that directly conflict with the DOJ’s stated desire to collect sensitive voter data and purge voters. *Id.* ¶ 19. Such conflicting motivations bolster the League’s interest in intervention. In analogous cases, the Ninth Circuit has frequently held that “a public interest group is entitled as a matter of right to intervene in an action challenging the legality of a measure

1 it has supported.” *Idaho Farm Bureau Fed’n v. Babbitt*, 58 F.3d 1392, 1397 (9th  
2 Cir. 1995) (granting intervention to environmental group to defend agency’s action  
3 that the group had advocated); *see also, e.g., Sagebrush Rebellion, Inc. v. Watt*, 713  
4 F.2d 525, 526-27 (9th Cir. 1983) (granting intervention to wildlife organization to  
5 defend Department of Interior’s creation of a wildlife habitat area, where the group  
6 had participated in the administrative process); *Idaho v. Freeman*, 625 F.2d 886  
7 (9th Cir. 1980) (granting intervention to women’s rights organization to help a  
8 federal agency defend a policy that the organization had supported). In all these  
9 cases, the court had no “difficulty determining that the organization seeking to  
10 intervene had an interest in the subject of the suit.” *Sagebrush Rebellion*, 713 F.2d  
11 at 527.

12 There can be no doubt that the rights and legal interests of both the League  
13 and its members would be directly impeded by the relief Plaintiff seeks.

14 **C. The League’s Interests Are Not Adequately Represented by the**  
15 **Existing Parties.**

16 The League cannot rely on the existing parties to adequately represent its  
17 interests. Courts in this Circuit consider three factors in evaluating adequacy of  
18 representation: “(1) whether the interest of a present party is such that it will  
19 undoubtedly make all of a proposed intervenor’s arguments; (2) whether the  
20 present party is capable and willing to make such arguments; and (3) whether a  
21 proposed intervenor would offer any necessary elements to the proceeding that  
22 other parties would neglect.” *Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 898 (cleaned  
23 up); *Sable Offshore Corp. v. Cnty. of Santa Barbara*, 2025 WL 2412147, at \*5  
24 (C.D. Cal. July 25, 2025). This is a “minimal” burden, and the intervenor need  
25 only show that the existing parties’ representation of its interests “may be  
26 inadequate.” *Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 898.

27 Here, Secretary Weber will not adequately represent the League’s interests.  
28

1 As the Ninth Circuit has explained, “the government’s representation of the public  
2 interest may not be identical to the individual parochial interest of a particular  
3 group just because both entities occupy the same posture in the litigation.” *Id.* at  
4 899. Thus, while Secretary Weber and the League may share the same ultimate  
5 objective—defending against DOJ’s attempt to forcibly compel production of  
6 California’s unredacted state voter registration list—their “interests are neither  
7 ‘identical’ nor ‘the same.’” *Cal. Dump Truck Owners Ass’n v. Nichols*, 275 F.R.D.  
8 303, 308 (E.D. Cal. 2011). For example, while Secretary Weber is responsible for  
9 ensuring compliance with the Elections Code, the League has distinct and particular  
10 interests in protecting its members’ personal right to vote and privacy as well as  
11 ensuring that its organizational mission—including increasing voter participation  
12 and advancing pro-voter policies—is unimpeded. Government officials, like  
13 Secretary Weber, broadly represent the public interest, not the particular concerns  
14 of the League. Indeed, “the government’s representation of the public interest may  
15 not be ‘identical to the individual parochial interest’ of a particular group just  
16 because ‘both entities occupy the same posture in the litigation.’” *Citizens for*  
17 *Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 899; *see also Issa*, 2020 WL 3074351, at \*3 (finding  
18 Democratic party organizations had distinct interests from state officials in  
19 protecting voters’ interests, advancing electoral prospects, and allocating the  
20 organizations’ limited resources to inform voters).

21 No other party will represent the League’s particular interests in this case,  
22 and there is no reason to think that Secretary Weber will “undoubtedly make all of”  
23 the League’s arguments or that she will be “capable and willing to make such  
24 arguments.” *Citizens for Balanced Use*, 647 F.3d at 898. Indeed, the League has  
25 a particular interest not just in advancing merits arguments that deny the DOJ’s  
26 access to non-public information and confirm the legal validity of California’s  
27 privacy laws *but also* highlighting the need for clear voter-friendly data disclosure  
28

1 rules, protecting its members’ data security, and ensuring that voter registrations  
2 and turnout are not reduced as a policy matter. *See* Hutchison Decl. ¶¶ 10, 12, 19,  
3 21. The State, by contrast, may seek to settle due to its competing interests or take  
4 positions that the League would not support, like that public redacted data can only  
5 be made available on-site. *See id.* ¶ 21. These potential divergences are enough to  
6 find that the League’s interests may not be adequately protected by the existing  
7 parties. *See, e.g., Paher, 2020 WL 2042365*, at \*3 (“Proposed Intervenorors . . . have  
8 demonstrated entitlement to intervene as a matter of right” where they “may present  
9 arguments about the need to safeguard [the] right to vote that are distinct from  
10 Defendants’ arguments”); *GHP Mgmt. Corp. v. City of L.A.*, 339 F.R.D. 621, 624  
11 (C.D. Cal. 2021) (finding “[a]s an initial matter, Proposed Intervenorors’ very  
12 existence is premised on the notion that governmental policies have failed to secure  
13 economic or social justice, including housing stability, for Proposed Intervenorors’  
14 members.”); *cf. Associated Gen. Contractors of Am. v. Cal. Dep’t of Transp.*, 2009  
15 WL 5206722, at \*2-3 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2009) (granting intervention where  
16 defendant state agency’s “main interest is ensuring safe public roads and highways”  
17 and agency “is not charged by law with advocating on behalf of minority business  
18 owners” as intervenors would). The League has distinct interests in opposing the  
19 exposure of its members personal and private information and preserving its hard-  
20 fought successes in legislative and advocacy that increased voter security and  
21 engagement—these interests will only be adequately represented if the League’s  
22 motion to intervene is granted.

23 **II. In the Alternative, the League Should Be Granted Permissive**  
24 **Intervention Under Rule 24(b).**

25 In addition to the requirements for intervention as of right, the League also  
26 satisfies the requirements for permissive intervention. The Court may permit  
27 intervention by a proposed intervenor who files a timely motion and “has a claim  
28



1 or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.” Fed.  
2 R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(B). The court may utilize its broad discretion to grant  
3 permissive intervention when the movant files a “a timely motion” and raises a  
4 claim or defenses that shares “a common question of law and fact” with the “main  
5 action.” *Callahan v. Brookdale Senior Living Communities, Inc.*, 42 F.4th 1013,  
6 1022 (9th Cir. 2022) (quoting *Freedom from Religion Found., Inc. v. Geithner*, 644  
7 F.3d 836, 843 (9th Cir. 2011)). In exercising its discretion, a court must “consider  
8 whether the intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the  
9 original parties’ rights.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3). Courts also consider other  
10 factors, including, “the nature and extent of the intervenors’ interest,” the “legal  
11 position [the intervenors] seek to advance,” and “whether parties seeking  
12 intervention will significantly contribute to full development of the underlying  
13 factual issues in the suit and to the just and equitable adjudication of the legal  
14 questions presented.” *Callahan*, 42 F.4th at 1022 (quoting *Spangler v. Pasadena*  
15 *City Bd. of Educ.*, 552 F.2d 1326, 1329 (9th Cir. 1977)).

16 Here, all of these considerations favor granting permissive intervention.  
17 First, as explained above, the League timely sought intervention. *See supra*  
18 *Argument Part I.A.* The only difference between mandatory and permissive  
19 intervention when it comes to timeliness is that courts generally apply the factors  
20 “more leniently” when evaluating mandatory intervention. *See U.S. v. Oregon*, 745  
21 F.2d 550, 552 (9th Cir. 1984). However, that distinction makes no difference here  
22 because the League sought to intervene at the earliest possible stage of the  
23 proceedings.

24 Second, the League’s defenses share common questions of law and fact with  
25 the main action. “A common question of law and fact between an intervenor’s  
26 claim or defense and the main action arises when the intervenor’s claim or defense  
27 relates to the subject matter of the action before the district court,” or, put  
28

1 differently, “when such claims or defenses are clearly a critical part of the instant  
2 case.” *Republican Nat’l Comm. v. Aguilar*, [2024 WL 3409860](#), at \*2 (D. Nev. July  
3 12, 2024) (cleaned up). The League easily satisfies this requirement, as the  
4 applicable state and federal laws at issue are the same across parties, and the League  
5 seeks to protect its core mission and members’ voter registration data that, as a  
6 factual matter, Plaintiff DOJ is aiming to infringe by forcing unauthorized and  
7 unlawful disclosure.

8 Third, as explained above, there will be no prejudice to any existing party if  
9 the League is permitted to intervene, nor will there be any delay, because this case  
10 is still in the early stages, and there are still weeks to go before any responses are  
11 due.

12 The League has a unique and informed point of view that would not  
13 otherwise be before the Court and that will aid the Court in its consideration of the  
14 matter. As such, there is no question that the League “will significantly contribute  
15 to full development of the underlying factual issues in the suit and to the just and  
16 equitable adjudication of the legal questions presented.” *See Sullivan v. Ferguson*,  
17 [2022 WL 10428165](#), at \*4 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 18, 2022). The district court’s  
18 decision in *Republican National Committee v. Aguilar* is instructive on this point.  
19 There, various groups sought to intervene in a case where plaintiffs sought to  
20 “compel the State to remove from the [voter] rolls voters whom they claim[ed]  
21 were] ineligible” to vote. [2024 WL 3409860](#), at \*1, \*3. The court granted  
22 permissive intervention, finding that intervenors would “contribute to the just and  
23 equitable resolution of the issues before” it because they had a “singular purpose”  
24 of “ensur[ing] voters [were] retained on or restored to the rolls,” which provided a  
25 “counterbalance” to plaintiffs that the state-defendant could not provide due to its  
26 “split mission” of “easing barriers to registration and voting” and “protecting  
27 electoral integrity.” *Id.* at \*3. The same reasoning applies here. The League should  
28



1 be permitted to intervene under Rule 24(b) to advance its members' rights and the  
2 rights and interests of California voters, which Plaintiff's action threatens.

3 **CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant the League intervention  
5 as of right under Rule 24(a), or in the alternative, permissive intervention under  
6 Rule 24(b).

7  
8 Dated: October 20, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

9  
10 /s/ Grayce Zelphin

11 Grayce Zelphin

12 Counsel for Proposed Intervenor-  
13 Defendant  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 GRAYCE ZELPHIN (SBN 279112)

2 gzelphin@aclunc.org

3 ANGELICA SALCEDA (SBN 296152)

4 asalceda@aclunc.org

5 SHILPI AGRWAL (SBN 270749)

6 sagarwal@aclunc.org

7 ACLU FOUNDATION OF

8 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

9 39 Drumm Street

10 San Francisco, CA 94111

11 (415) 621-2493

12 JULIA A. GOMEZ (SBN 316270)

13 jgomez@aclusocal.org

14 PETER ELIASBERG (SBN 89110)

15 peliasberg@aclusocal.org

16 ACLU FOUNDATION OF

17 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

18 1313 West 8th Street

19 Los Angeles, CA 90017

20 (213) 977-5232

21 Counsel for Proposed Intervenor-Defendant

22 *Additional counsel listed below*

23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

29 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

30 Plaintiff,

31 vs.

32 SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official  
33 capacity as Secretary of State of  
34 California, and the STATE OF  
35 CALIFORNIA

36 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-09149-DOC (ADSx)

**DECLARATION OF HELEN  
HUTCHISON IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR INTERVENTION  
OF LEAGUE OF WOMEN  
VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA**

DATE: November 17, 2025

TIME: 9:00 AM

COURTROOM: 10A, 10th Floor

JUDGE: Hon. David O. Carter

1 THERESA J. LEE (NY 5022769)\*  
tlee@aclu.org  
2 SOPHIA LIN LAKIN (NY 5182076)\*  
slakin@aclu.org  
3 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
4 UNION FOUNDATION  
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
5 New York, NY 10004  
(212) 549-2500  
6

7 PATRICIA J. YAN (NY 5499173)\*  
pyan@aclu.org  
8 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
9 UNION FOUNDATION  
915 15th Street NW  
10 Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 457-0800

11 \*Application for admission pro hac vice forthcoming  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, I, Helen Hutchison, hereby declare as follows:

2 1. I am over the age of 18, and I am competent to make this declaration.  
3 I provide this declaration based on my personal knowledge. I would testify to the  
4 facts in this declaration under oath if called upon to do so.

5 2. I am the Interim Executive Director of the League of Women Voters  
6 of California (“LWVC” or “the League”). I have served on LWVC’s board for  
7 approximately 15 years, and previously served as LWVC’s President and held  
8 other board positions with LWVC, including Government Director and Second  
9 Vice President for Advocacy and Program. I have been active in the League’s  
10 activities related to strategic planning, initiative and referendum reform, human  
11 resources, training, legislation, ballot measures, and redistricting. In that capacity,  
12 I am familiar with the activities of the League.

13 3. In my current role as Executive Director, my responsibilities include  
14 supervising and directing staff; maintaining fiscal health and financial controls for  
15 LWVC; ensuring legal and regulatory compliance by LWVC; monitoring project  
16 and contractor performance; supporting governance and board operations; ensuring  
17 proper, timely deliverables and reporting to grantors per grant agreements; and  
18 other related activities.

19 4. LWVC is the California affiliate of the League of Women Voters of  
20 the United States (“LWV”), which was founded in 1920 as an outgrowth of the  
21 struggle for voting rights for women. LWV has more than one million members  
22 and supporters and is organized in more than 750 communities in all 50 states and  
23 the District of Columbia.

24 5. LWVC is a non-profit, non-partisan, grassroots membership  
25 organization. LWVC neither supports nor opposes any political party or candidate.

26 6. LWVC has approximately 7,000 members across the state of  
27 California, with 62 local League chapters. Each local League member is also a  
28 member of LWVC. Members pay dues annually and form the volunteer base for

1 the League's activities, both generally and especially around election times, when  
2 the number of active volunteers can double in size. The bulk of the work of LWVC  
3 and its local chapters is made possible by its member-volunteers.

4 7. The vast majority of LWVC members and volunteers, as well as  
5 members of the communities LWVC serves, are registered to vote in California or  
6 intend to register. This means that these individuals have already submitted or plan  
7 to submit sensitive information to the State for voter registration purposes—  
8 including their dates of birth, state identification and driver's license numbers, and  
9 the last four digits of their Social Security numbers—and they reasonably expect  
10 the State to keep this information private.

11 8. The mission of LWVC is to empower voters and defend democracy.  
12 LWVC strives to build a more equitable California for all who live there. We work  
13 to engage all Californians in acting on the issues that matter to them, to build  
14 political power and voice in communities historically underrepresented in the halls  
15 of government, to enact solutions to some of the biggest challenges facing our state,  
16 and to drive every eligible voter to register and to cast their ballot.

17 9. Many of the League's community-based activities, including its  
18 election-related work, are executed at the local chapter level. These activities are  
19 in turn coordinated at the state level by LWVC, which also provides strategic  
20 direction, training, physical and digital materials, and other forms of support.

21 10. LWVC uses an integrated voter engagement model, which research  
22 shows is one of the best ways to increase voter turnout and civic participation.  
23 Integrated voter engagement means that we work on the ground in our communities  
24 year-round to register voters and engage people in issue-based campaigns and  
25 advocacy efforts, and do not just reach out to our communities leading up to  
26 elections. LWVC ramps up our efforts in election years to fully engage people to  
27 register, turn out, vote, and use their power.

1           11. LWVC consistently operates in California communities as part of its  
2 integrated voter engagement model. Often, that involves extended, intricately  
3 planned campaigns, in concert with ally organizations, to engage and empower  
4 voters in issue-based campaigns on a local level, including through holding  
5 community workshops and attending local government meetings. These  
6 campaigns focus on a wide variety of issue areas, including four priority areas  
7 determined by the League's members: (1) Making Democracy Work, (2) Criminal  
8 Justice/Legal System Reform, (3) Housing/Homelessness, and (4) Climate  
9 Change/Sustainability. Such campaigns are planned in advance and require  
10 dedication and resources over time.

11           12. LWVC, through and in coordination with our local chapters, regularly  
12 conducts voter service projects, including efforts to register voters, get out the vote,  
13 and educate the public on elections. For example, during 2024, nearly 3,000  
14 League volunteers donated almost 35,000 hours of their time providing voter  
15 information to Californians. These volunteer hours were applied at over 2,000  
16 individual activities, including voter registration drives at high schools, colleges,  
17 and local community events; hosting "pros and cons" speaking events to educate  
18 the public regarding upcoming ballot measures; hosting candidate forums; and  
19 conducting get out the vote events, often in partnership with other community  
20 organizations, to educate, engage, and turn out voters in the period leading up to an  
21 election. At all of these events, both as part of any speaking program and in its  
22 print and digital materials, the League provides information to voters about how to  
23 register to vote and, when relevant to its voter education efforts, provides  
24 information on the confidentiality of voter data.

25           13. As one example of the written materials it uses to engage voters, in  
26 2024, LWVC produced and distributed 153,700 copies of its Easy Voter Guide in  
27 five different languages, educating voters on how to register to vote and how to  
28 update their voter registration. LWVC produced its Easy Voter Guide through

1 library-based focus group work with adult learners—an innovative approach  
2 designed to insure that LWVC’s written materials are maximally accessible,  
3 engaging, and effective for Californians who are new to the political process.

4 14. LWVC also promotes VOTE411.org, a national initiative of the  
5 League of Women Voters Education Fund (“LWVEF”), including by providing the  
6 URL in written materials like LWVC bookmarks and mentioning it during  
7 speaking programs at candidate forums. VOTE411.org is designed to provide all  
8 voters with the information they need to successfully participate in every election  
9 (local, state, and federal) because the League believes that laws and policies should  
10 reflect the values of the community. VOTE411.org also offers a Ballot Lookup  
11 Tool for voters to enter their addresses to find their local polling place and create a  
12 personalized voter guide.

13 15. VOTE411.org provides information to voters regarding the rules  
14 governing California elections, including how to register to vote and the deadline  
15 to register to vote.

16 16. LWVC, through and in coordination with our local chapters, also  
17 compiles voter guides for local, congressional, and statewide races by sending  
18 questionnaires to candidates, making telephone calls, and conducting research  
19 through electronic platforms.

20 17. LWVC and its local chapters throughout the state use social media,  
21 newsletters, and their websites to publicize information about how to register to  
22 vote and the deadline to register to vote.

23 18. LWVC and its local chapters plan to continue all of this voter outreach  
24 and registration work. This voter education is part and parcel of its integrated voter  
25 engagement model. LWVC’s work in this regard is already underway, both  
26 because of the upcoming special election, and in light of the 2026 federal midterm  
27 elections, which will involve a June primary and a November general election, and  
28 which will feature an open gubernatorial contest in addition to other federal and

1 state races. Over the summer, the LWVC engaged in an intensive round of  
2 planning for voter engagement in the 2026 election cycle. In June, LWVC also  
3 held a statewide convention that included workshops for local League leaders to  
4 discuss election-related planning.

5 19. LWVC organizes locally and at the state level and engages in issue  
6 advocacy based on the consensus positions and issues voted on by the members of  
7 the League. As part of its statewide advocacy work, the League works to support  
8 or oppose legislation on issues where its statewide membership has reached  
9 consensus. This includes legislative and policy advocacy to reduce barriers to voter  
10 registration and protect voter data confidentiality, while also limiting laws,  
11 practices, and systems that risk the unnecessary or erroneous deactivation of voter  
12 registrations. For example, LWVC supported AB 1461 (Gonzalez 2015),  
13 California's Motor Voter law, which automatically registers eligible residents to  
14 vote when they complete a Department of Motor Vehicle transaction unless they  
15 opt out. That law also includes enhanced privacy safeguards including limits on  
16 data sharing, confidential voter categories, liability protections that shield  
17 mistakenly registered voters from fraud charges unless they knowingly vote while  
18 ineligible, and criminal penalties for unauthorized disclosure or misuse of voter  
19 registration information. LWVC also sits on the California Motor Voter Task  
20 Force, created by AB 796 (Berman 2021), and has sponsored bills extending the  
21 Task Force.

22 20. In addition, LWVC has opposed legislation that would burden voters  
23 and threaten voter privacy. In 2025, LWVC opposed AB 25 (DeMaio), which  
24 would have required voters to provide additional identification to cast a ballot,  
25 creating new risks of data exposure and barriers to participation.

26 21. LWVC is also a strong proponent of government transparency and  
27 seeks to ensure that transparency measures are implemented in ways that balance  
28 public accountability with voters' privacy rights. In this way, LWVC's interests



1 might diverge from the State's if they take the position that redacted voter data that  
2 is otherwise public can only be reviewed on-site at its offices.

3 22. The claims made and the relief sought by the DOJ creates a severe risk  
4 of harm to LWVC members, volunteers, and the communities LWVC serves. If  
5 the DOJ succeeds, LWVC members' sensitive data could be disclosed,  
6 undermining voter privacy rights LWVC has long worked to protect under  
7 California law. In particular, the DOJ could compel California to violate  
8 protections enumerated under the California Motor Voter law, dismantling the  
9 confidentiality procedures and protections from liability for LWVC members and  
10 volunteers, and disclosing voter information to a third party, the U.S. Government,  
11 which could use it to target politically active members.

12 23. The suit also directly threatens LWVC's mission to register, empower,  
13 and educate voters and to ensure democratic participation. Californians concerned  
14 that the State might share their sensitive information with the federal government  
15 may become less engaged and reluctant to register to vote or otherwise participate  
16 in the political process.

17 24. Further, if the DOJ is successful, LWVC would need to expend  
18 significant resources, including on (1) updating all of its voter education materials  
19 to provide eligible voters with information on how their data might be shared and  
20 having all those materials re-translated into multiple different languages; (2)  
21 creating and fielding trainings and voter outreach to alert voters about how their  
22 data may be shared; and (3) revising voter engagement plans and communications  
23 to educate voters on how their data may be shared and how, if at all possible, voters  
24 can attempt to protect their data. VOTE411.org's educational offerings would also  
25 need to be overhauled, and LWVC and local Leagues would need to update their  
26 websites, social media profiles, and other digital materials to ensure accuracy and  
27 emphasize the change in law.  
28

1        25. Implementing these changes, and especially those changes occurring  
2 around the time close to the election when the League's resources are most  
3 stretched, would necessarily come at the expense of the League's existing plans for  
4 deploying its resources. A major change to the way voter data is handled would  
5 require LWVC to devote its finite resources to responding to the change and  
6 attempting to mitigate disenfranchisement. LWVC would need to shift its  
7 resources, including staff and volunteer hours, away from other voter outreach and  
8 education activities, including registering voters, especially (but not only) around  
9 the time of the election. And it would also need to shift resources, including staff  
10 and volunteer hours and bandwidth, away from its existing community-based  
11 organizing projects that it engages in as part of its integrated voter engagement  
12 model.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.  
2

3 Dated: Oct. 19, 2025

4 Helen L Hutchison

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

1 GRAYCE ZELPHIN (SBN 279112)

2 gzelphin@aclunc.org

3 ANGELICA SALCEDA (SBN 296152)

4 asalceda@aclunc.org

5 SHILPI AGRWAL (SBN 270749)

6 sagarwal@aclunc.org

7 ACLU FOUNDATION OF

8 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

9 39 Drumm Street

10 San Francisco, CA 94111

11 (415) 621-2493

12 JULIA A. GOMEZ (SBN 316270)

13 jgomez@aclusocal.org

14 PETER ELIASBERG (SBN 89110)

15 peliasberg@aclusocal.org

16 ACLU FOUNDATION OF

17 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

18 1313 West 8th Street

19 Los Angeles, CA 90017

20 (213) 977-5232

21 Counsel for Proposed Intervenor-Defendant

22 *Additional counsel listed below*

23 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
24 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

25 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

26 Plaintiff,

27 v.

28 SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of State of  
California, and the STATE  
OF CALIFORNIA,

Defendants.

Case No.: 25-cv-09149-DOC (ADSx)

**LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS  
OF CALIFORNIA'S PROPOSED  
ANSWER**

DATE: November 17, 2025

TIME: 9:00 AM

COURTROOM: 10A, 10th Floor

JUDGE: Hon. David O. Carter

1 THERESA J. LEE (NY 5022769)\*  
tlee@aclu.org  
2 SOPHIA LIN LAKIN (NY 5182076)\*  
slakin@aclu.org  
3 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
4 UNION FOUNDATION  
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
5 New York, NY 10004  
(212) 549-2500  
6

7 PATRICIA J. YAN (NY 5499173)\*  
pyan@aclu.org  
8 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
9 UNION FOUNDATION  
915 15th Street NW  
10 Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 457-0800

11 *\*Application for admission pro hac vice forthcoming*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 Proposed Intervenor-Defendant the League of Woman Voters of California  
2 (the “League” or “Intervenor-Defendant”), by and through its attorneys, for their  
3 Answer to Plaintiff’s Complaint, deny each and every allegation of the Complaint  
4 not specifically admitted herein, and further answer as follows:

5 The paragraphs before the first numbered paragraph of the Complaint  
6 constitute introductory material to which no response is required. To the extent a  
7 response is required, Intervenor-Defendant incorporates by reference the below  
8 paragraphs as their response, denies the allegations, and denies that Plaintiff is  
9 entitled to the requested relief in this action.

### 10 JURISDICTION

11 1. Paragraph 1 contains legal characterizations and conclusions to  
12 which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-  
13 Defendants admit this case is brought by the United States purporting violations  
14 of federal law, but otherwise deny the allegations.

15 2. Paragraph 2 contains legal characterizations and conclusions to which  
16 no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-  
17 Defendants admit that Defendants are located within California.

### 18 PARTIES

19 3. Paragraph 3 contains legal characterizations and conclusions to which  
20 no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-Defendant  
21 admits that the United States seeks declaratory and injunctive relief, but otherwise  
22 denies the allegations.

23 4. Paragraph 4 contains legal characterizations and conclusions to which  
24 no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-Defendant  
25 admits that the production of certain records and papers may be compelled by  
26 appropriate process under the Civil Rights Act, but otherwise denies the  
27 allegations.

1           5.     Admitted that California is a state of the United States of America.  
2     The remainder of paragraph 5 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
3     required. To the extent any further response is required, the remaining allegations  
4     are denied.

5           6.     Admitted that Shirley Weber is the Secretary of State of California  
6     and is sued in her official capacity. The remainder of paragraph 6 contains legal  
7     arguments to which no response is required. To the extent any further response is  
8     required, the remaining allegations are denied.

9           7.     This paragraph is duplicative of paragraph 5. Admitted that California  
10    is a state of the United States of America. The remainder of paragraph 7 contains  
11    legal arguments to which no response is required.

12          8.     Admitted.

## 13                               **STATUTORY BACKGROUND**

### 14           **A. The Civil Rights Act of 1960**

15          9.     Paragraph 9 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
16    required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-Defendant admits that  
17    the Civil Rights Act of 1960 gives the Attorney General certain powers to request  
18    records subject to certain requirements and conditions, but deny that it empowers  
19    her to do so as claimed in this lawsuit. To the extent any further response is  
20    required, the remaining allegations are denied.

21          10.    Paragraph 10 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
22    required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

23          11.    Paragraph 11 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
24    required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that 52 U.S.C. § 20703 begins with the  
25    quoted language. Intervenor-Defendant notes that § 20703 goes on to say: “This  
26    demand shall contain a statement of the basis and the purpose therefor.” To the  
27    extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the Civil Rights Act  
28

1 of 1960, Intervenor-Defendant refers to that Act for its full and complete contents  
2 and deny anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
3 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

4 **B. The National Voter Registration Act**

5 12. Paragraph 12 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
6 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
7 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
8 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
9 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
10 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

11 13. Paragraph 13 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
12 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
13 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
14 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
15 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
16 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

17 14. Paragraph 14 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
18 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
19 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
20 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
21 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
22 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

23 15. Paragraph 15 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
24 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
25 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
26 NVRA or legislative history, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA and the  
27 legislative history for their full and complete contents and denies anything  
28



1 inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is required, the  
2 remaining allegations are denied.

3 16. Paragraph 16 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
4 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
5 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
6 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
7 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
8 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

9 17. Paragraph 17 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
10 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
11 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
12 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
13 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
14 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

15 18. Paragraph 18 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
16 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that 52 U.S.C. § 20507(c) describes a safe  
17 harbor for state list maintenance programs. To the extent the averments in this  
18 paragraph purport to summarize the NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the  
19 NVRA for its full and complete contents and denies anything inconsistent  
20 therewith. To the extent any further response is required, the remaining allegations  
21 are denied.

22 19. Paragraph 19 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
23 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
24 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
25 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
26 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
27 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

1           20. Paragraph 20 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
2 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
3 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
4 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
5 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
6 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

7           21. Paragraph 21 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
8 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the NVRA includes the quoted  
9 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
10 NVRA, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the NVRA for its full and complete contents  
11 and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is  
12 required, the remaining allegations are denied.

### 13           **C. The Help America Vote Act**

14           22. Paragraph 22 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
15 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the House Report includes the quoted  
16 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
17 House Report, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the House Report for its full and  
18 complete contents and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any  
19 further response is required, the remaining allegations are denied.

20           23. Paragraph 23 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
21 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the House Report includes the quoted  
22 language. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the  
23 House Report, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the House Report for its full and  
24 complete contents and denies anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any  
25 further response is required, the remaining allegations are denied.

26           24. Paragraph 24 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
27 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that HAVA includes the quoted language.  
28

1 To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize HAVA,  
2 Intervenor-Defendant refers to HAVA for its full and complete contents and denies  
3 anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is required, the  
4 remaining allegations are denied.

5 25. Paragraph 25 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
6 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that HAVA includes the quoted language.  
7 To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize HAVA,  
8 Intervenor-Defendant refers to HAVA for its full and complete contents and denies  
9 anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is required, the  
10 remaining allegations are denied.

11 26. Paragraph 26 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
12 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that HAVA includes the quoted language.  
13 To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize HAVA,  
14 Intervenor-Defendant refers to HAVA for its full and complete contents and denies  
15 anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is required, the  
16 remaining allegations are denied.

17 27. Paragraph 27 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
18 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

19 28. Paragraph 28 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
20 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

21 29. Paragraph 29 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
22 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

23 30. Paragraph 30 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
24 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that HAVA includes the quoted language.  
25 To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to summarize HAVA,  
26 Intervenor-Defendant refers to HAVA for its full and complete contents and denies  
27 anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is required, the  
28

1 remaining allegations are denied.

2 31. Paragraph 31 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
3 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

4 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5 32. Paragraph 32 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
6 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the EAC's website includes the quoted  
7 language in the first sentence of this Paragraph. The last sentence of paragraph 32  
8 purports to quote a sentence from <https://www.eac.gov/about>. Intervenor-  
9 Defendant denies that this sentence appears on that webpage, and further notes that  
10 such language does appear on a different EAC webpage,  
11 <https://www.eac.gov/research-and-data/studies-and-reports>. To the extent the  
12 averments in this paragraph purport to summarize the EAC's website, Intervenor-  
13 Defendant refers to that website for its full and complete contents and denies  
14 anything inconsistent therewith. To the extent any further response is required, the  
15 remaining allegations are denied.

16 33. Paragraph 33 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
17 required. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the paragraph quotes language from  
18 the 2024 EAVS Report. To the extent the averments in this paragraph purport to  
19 summarize the EAC's website and/or the 2024 EAVS Report, Intervenor-  
20 Defendant refers to that website and report for their full and complete contents and  
21 denies anything inconsistent therewith. Intervenor-Defendant otherwise lacks  
22 knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the  
23 allegations in paragraph 33.

24 34. Admitted that lawyers from the U.S. Department of Justice sent a  
25 letter to Secretary Weber on July 10, 2025. Denied that "the Attorney General" sent  
26 the July 10 Letter. To the extent the averments in paragraph 34 purport to  
27 summarize the July 10 Letter, Intervenor-Defendant refers to the July 10 Letter for  
28

1 its full and complete contents and denies anything inconsistent therewith.  
2 Intervenor-Defendant otherwise lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form  
3 a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 34.

4 35. Intervenor-Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
5 form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 35, so therefore denies  
6 them.

7 36. Intervenor-Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
8 form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 36, so therefore denies  
9 them.

10 37. Admitted that Secretary Weber sent a letter dated August 8, 2025 to  
11 two attorneys at the U.S. Department of Justice. To the extent the averments in  
12 paragraph 37 purport to summarize the August 8 Letter, Intervenor-Defendant  
13 refers to the August 8 Letter for its full and complete contents and denies anything  
14 inconsistent therewith, and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 37.

15 38. Paragraph 38 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
16 required. To the extent a response is required, admitted that lawyers from the U.S.  
17 Department of Justice sent a letter to Secretary Weber on August 13, 2025. Denied  
18 that “the Attorney General” sent the August 13 Letter. To the extent the averments  
19 in paragraph 38 purport to summarize the August 13 Letter, Intervenor-Defendant  
20 refers to the August 13 Letter for its full and complete contents and denies anything  
21 inconsistent therewith, and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 38.

22 39. Paragraph 39 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
23 required. To the extent a response is required, admitted that the cited August 13  
24 Letter includes the quoted language; Intervenor-Defendant refers to the August 13  
25 Letter for its full and complete contents and denies anything inconsistent therewith,  
26 and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 39.

27 40. Paragraph 40 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
28

1 required. To the extent a response is required, admitted that the cited August 13  
2 Letter includes the quoted language; Intervenor-Defendant refers to the August 13  
3 Letter for its full and complete contents and denies anything inconsistent therewith,  
4 and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 40.

5 41. Paragraph 41 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
6 required. To the extent a response is required, admitted that the cited August 13  
7 Letter includes the quoted language; Intervenor-Defendant refers to the August 13  
8 Letter for its full and complete contents and denies anything inconsistent therewith,  
9 and otherwise denies the allegations in paragraph 41. To the extent paragraph 41  
10 alleges that the Department of Justice's demand for disclosure is pursuant to a  
11 lawful function of its enforcement authority, Intervenor-Defendant denies the  
12 allegation.

13 42. Paragraph 42 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
14 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

15 43. Intervenor-Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
16 form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 43, so therefore denies  
17 them.

18 44. Intervenor-Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
19 form a belief about the truth of the allegations in paragraph 44, so therefore denies  
20 them.

21 45. Paragraph 45 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
22 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

## 23 CAUSES OF ACTION

### 24 COUNT ONE – CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1960

25 46. Intervenor-Defendant incorporates by reference each of their  
26 preceding admissions, denials, and statements as if fully set forth herein.

27 47. Paragraph 47 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
28

1 required. To the extent a response is required, admitted that lawyers from the U.S.  
2 Department of Justice sent a letter to Secretary Weber on August 13, 2025. Denied  
3 that “the Attorney General” sent the August 13 Letter. Intervenor-Defendant  
4 otherwise denies the allegations.

5 48. Intervenor-Defendant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to  
6 form a belief about the truth of the allegation that Secretary Weber has not produced  
7 the state’s voter registration list in the manner requested by the Department of  
8 Justice, so therefore denies the allegation. Intervenor-Defendant denies the  
9 remaining allegations in paragraph 48 including that such refusal violates any  
10 federal or state law.

11 49. Paragraph 49 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
12 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

13 **COUNT TWO – THE NVRA**

14 50. Intervenor-Defendant incorporates by reference each of their  
15 preceding admissions, denials, and statements as if fully set forth herein.

16 51. Intervenor-Defendant admits that the Attorney General has  
17 enforcement authority under the NVRA. Intervenor-Defendant otherwise denies  
18 the allegations in Paragraph 51 to the extent they suggest that the Attorney  
19 General’s enforcement authority authorizes the Department of Justice’s demands  
20 here or the instant action, or that Secretary Weber has violated the law.

21 52. Paragraph 52 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
22 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

23 53. Paragraph 53 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
24 required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-Defendant admits the  
25 cited statute contains the quoted text, but otherwise the allegations are denied.

26 54. Paragraph 54 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
27 required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-Defendant admits the  
28



1 cited statute contains the quoted text, but otherwise the allegations are denied.

2 55. Intervenor-Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 55.

3 56. Intervenor-Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 56.

4 **COUNT THREE – VIOLATION OF HAVA**

5 57. Intervenor-Defendant incorporates by reference each of their  
6 preceding admissions, denials, and statements as if fully set forth herein.

7 58. Paragraph 58 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
8 required. To the extent a response is required, Intervenor-Defendant admits the  
9 cited statute contains the quoted text, but otherwise the allegations are denied.

10 59. Paragraph 59 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
11 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

12 60. Paragraph 60 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
13 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

14 61. Paragraph 61 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
15 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

16 62. Paragraph 62 contains legal arguments to which no response is  
17 required. To the extent a response is required, the allegations are denied.

18 63. Intervenor-Defendant denies the allegations in paragraph 63.

19 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

20 The remainder of the Complaint is Plaintiff's requested relief, to which no  
21 response is required. To the extent a response is required, the League denies that  
22 Plaintiff is entitled to the requested relief or any other relief.

23 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

24 The League asserts the following affirmative defenses:

- 25 1. The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.  
26 2. The relief sought is barred in whole or in part by equity, including on  
27 the basis of unclean hands and on the basis of laches.

1 3. Plaintiff has failed to establish entitlement to injunctive relief.

2 4. The authority claimed by Plaintiff as grounds for the relief sought is  
3 ultra vires.

4 5. The relief sought by Plaintiff is contrary to law.

5 **INTERVENOR-DEFENDANT'S REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

6 WHEREFORE, Intervenor-Defendants deny that the United States is  
7 entitled to judgment in its favor on any grounds, and Intervenor-Defendants  
8 respectfully request that the relief requested by the United States be denied in its  
9 entirety.

10  
11 Dated October 20, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

12 /s/ Grayce Zelphin

13 GRAYCE ZELPHIN (SBN 279112)

14 gzelphin@aclunc.org

15 ANGELICA SALCEDA (SBN 296152)

asalceda@aclunc.org

16 ACLU FOUNDATION OF NORTHERN  
17 CALIFORNIA

39 Drumm Street

18 San Francisco, CA 94111

(415) 621-2493

19 JULIA A. GOMEZ (SBN 316270)

20 jgomez@aclusocal.org

21 PETER ELIASBERG (SBN 89110)

22 peliasberg@aclusocal.org

23 ACLU FOUNDATION OF  
24 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

1313 West 8th Street

25 Los Angeles, CA 90017

(213) 977-5232

26 THERESA J. LEE (NY 5022769)\*

27 tlee@aclu.org

28 SOPHIA LIN LAKIN (NY 5182076)\*

1 slakin@aclu.org  
2 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
3 UNION FOUNDATION  
4 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
5 New York, NY 10004  
6 (212) 549-2500

7 PATRICIA J. YAN (NY 5499173)\*  
8 pyan@aclu.org  
9 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION  
10 FOUNDATION  
11 915 15th Street NW  
12 Washington, DC 20005  
13 (202) 457-0800

14 *\*Application for admission pro hac vice*  
15 *forthcoming*

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
Counsel for Intervenor-Defendant League of Women Voters of California

GRAYCE ZELPHIN (SBN 279112)  
gzelphin@aclunc.org  
ANGELICA SALCEDA (SBN 296152)  
asalceda@aclunc.org  
SHILPI AGRWAL (SBN 270749)  
sagarwal@aclunc.org  
ACLU FOUNDATION OF  
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA  
39 Drumm Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 621-2493

JULIA A. GOMEZ (SBN 316270)  
jgomez@aclusocal.org  
PETER ELIASBERG (SBN 89110)  
peliasberg@aclusocal.org  
ACLU FOUNDATION OF  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
1313 West 8th Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
(213) 977-5232

Counsel for Proposed Intervenor-Defendant

*Additional counsel listed below*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official  
capacity as Secretary of State of  
California, and the STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-09149-DOC (ADSx)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
MOTION FOR INTERVENTION  
OF LEAGUE OF WOMEN  
VOTERS OF CALIFORNIA**

DATE: November 17, 2025

TIME: 9:00 AM

COURTROOM: 10A, 10th Floor

JUDGE: Hon. David O. Carter

1 THERESA J. LEE (NY 5022769)\*  
tlee@aclu.org  
2 SOPHIA LIN LAKIN (NY 5182076)\*  
slakin@aclu.org  
3 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
4 UNION FOUNDATION  
125 Broad Street, 18th Floor  
5 New York, NY 10004  
(212) 549-2500  
6

7 PATRICIA J. YAN (NY 5499173)\*  
pyan@aclu.org  
8 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES  
9 UNION FOUNDATION  
915 15th Street NW  
10 Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 457-0800

11 *\*Application for admission pro hac vice forthcoming*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 On October 20, 2025 Proposed Intervenor, the League of Women Voters of  
2 California, moved to intervene in this matter. ECF No. [ ]. This Court, having  
3 considered Proposed Intervenor's motion and all other relevant information and  
4 evidence as was presented to this Court in support thereof, hereby GRANTS the  
5 Motion and ORDERS that Proposed Intervenor, the League of Women Voters of  
6 California, be entered as an Intervenor-Defendant and their counsel served with all  
7 relevant papers in the above-captioned action.

8  
9 IT IS SO ORDERED on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2025.

10  
11  
12  
13 \_\_\_\_\_  
14 United States District Court Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28