

1 ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
2 SETH E. GOLDSTEIN
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 ANNE P. BELLOWS
MICHAEL S. COHEN
4 LISA C. EHRLICH
ANDREW E. KUSHNER
5 CHRISTINA M. MCCALL
Deputy Attorneys General
6 State Bar No. 234139
1300 I St.
7 Sacramento, CA 95814
Telephone: (916) 210-7890
8 E-mail: Christina.McCall@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Defendants,
9 *State of California and Shirley N. Weber, Ph.D., in*
her official capacity as the California Secretary of
10 *State*

11
12 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14

15
16 **UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA and**
20 **SHIRLEY N. WEBER, in her official**
21 **capacity as the California Secretary**
22 **of State, and DEAN C. LOGAN, in**
his official capacity as the County of
Los Angeles Registrar-Recorder /
County Clerk,

23 Defendants.
24

2:26-cv-12025

**STATE DEFENDANTS' NOTICE
OF RELATED CASE**

Date: Not Set
Time: Not Set
Courtroom: Not Set
Judge: Not Yet Assigned
Trial Date: Not Set
Action Filed: October 15, 2026

25 On October 15, 2026, the United States filed a single count Complaint,
26 alleging an unspecified violation of the Supremacy Clause apparently linked to a
27 criminal statute: [18 U.S.C. § 611](#). Complaint, [ECF No. 1 at 12-14](#). Pursuant to
28 Central District of California Local Civil Rules (L.R.) Rule 83-1.3.1, Defendants,

1 the State of California and Secretary of State Shirley N. Weber, Ph.D., hereby
2 notify the Clerk of the Court, and all parties and their counsel of record, of the
3 following related action in the Central District of California: *United States v.*
4 *Weber*, Case No. 2:25-cv-09149-DOC-ADS (related to *United States v. Page*, Case
5 No. 8:25-cv-01370-DOC-ADS). The instant case arises from closely related events
6 and calls for determination of substantially related questions of law and fact to
7 *United States v. Weber* and involves substantial duplication of labor if heard by
8 different judges. *See* L.R. Rule 83-1.3.1(a)-(c).

9 First, the instant case arises from a closely related transaction, happening, or
10 event to that in *Weber* because it arises from the United States government's
11 attempts to access and control the State of California's voter rolls, and the United
12 States government's allegations that there are non-citizen voters present on the
13 state's voter rolls. L.R. Rule 83-1.3.1(a). In *Weber*, the United States demanded
14 California's voter rolls while asking questions about cancellation of registration due
15 to non-citizenship. *See United States v. Weber*, [816 F. Supp. 3d 1168, 1176](#) & n.4
16 (C.D. Cal. 2026). In the instant case, the United States again alleges that it believes
17 there may be non-citizens whose registration has not been properly cancelled. *See*,
18 *e.g.*, Compl. ¶ 3. Moreover, both cases involve the federal government's attempts to
19 use questionable data matching to determine voter eligibility. *See Weber*, [816 F.](#)
20 [Supp. 3d at 1185](#) (discussing U.S. DOJ's efforts to screen voter eligibility in
21 conjunction with DHS); Compl. ¶¶ 33-39 (discussing DHS screening voter
22 eligibility in service of U.S. DOJ litigation). *See NMS 1539, LLC v. City of Santa*
23 *Monica*, No. 20-cv-11318-FLA (JPRx), [2021 WL 4776350](#), at *4 (June 3, 2021)
24 (cases "that arise from closely related transactions, happening, or events" should be
25 related).

26 Second, the instant case calls for determination of substantially related
27 questions of law and fact to those at issue in *Weber*. Both cases involve "the
28 Executive Branch of the United States government want[ing] to abridge the right of

1 many Americans to cast their ballots.” *Weber*, 816 F. Supp. 3d at 1174.
2 Specifically, in *Weber*, the “issue presented to this court is animated by a well-
3 established principle, long recognized by the Supreme Court: the right to vote is ‘a
4 fundamental political right, because [it is] preservative of all rights.’” *Id. citing Yick*
5 *Wo v. Hopkins*, 118 U.S. 356, 370 (1886). In the instant case, the United States
6 demands California segregate, and not count, Californians’ ballots, squarely
7 presenting the issue of protecting citizens’ fundamental right to vote. Additionally,
8 both cases turn on allegations by the United States that the supremacy of federal
9 law preempts state election laws, and the role of the Election Clause in election
10 administration. *See, e.g., Weber*, 816 F. Supp. 3d at 1175, 1188-89 (analyzing
11 Elections Clause and federal preemption claims relating to state election
12 administration); Compl. ¶¶ 50-61 (Claim for Relief – Violation of the Supremacy
13 Clause). Moreover, both cases involve similar data validity issues. *See, e.g., Weber*,
14 816 F. Supp. 3d at 1185-86 & n.22, (discussing DHS database use to allegedly
15 determine voter eligibility); Compl. ¶¶ 33-39 (same).

16 Third, proceeding before different judges would entail substantial duplication
17 of labor. Both cases require the Court to review the United States government’s
18 claims that federal law preempts California’s state laws in the context of election
19 administration, to understand and evaluate the federal government’s alleged
20 attempts to conduct voter roll data matching and detect alleged non-citizens on the
21 voter rolls, and to address the federal government’s unique and novel use of causes
22 of action to achieve ends not intended by Congress to control state election
23 administration. *See, e.g., Weber*, 816 F. Supp. 3d at 1181-82 (addressing federal
24 government’s novel attempts to use Civil Rights Act cause of action to require
25 special procedures); Compl. ¶¶ 50-61 (Claim for Relief – Violation of the
26 Supremacy Clause based on alleged violation of federal criminal statute). The Court
27 in *Weber* is already deeply familiar with these issues, and relating the cases would
28 eliminate the duplication of that substantial judicial labor. *See Integrated Concepts*,

1 *Inc. v. j2 Global, Inc.*, No. CV 12-3434-RMW, [2014 WL 2931125](#), at *3 (C.D. Cal.
2 June 27, 2014) (judicial economy preserved by relating cases with similar claims
3 and underlying factual issues).

4
5 Dated: October 15, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

6 ROB BONTA
7 Attorney General of California
8 SETH E. GOLDSTEIN
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

9 /s/ Christina M. McCall

10 CHRISTINA M. MCCALL
11 ANNE P. BELLOWS
12 MICHAEL S. COHEN
13 LISA C. EHRLICH
14 ANDREW E. KUSHNER
15 Deputy Attorneys General
16 *Attorneys for Defendants, State of*
17 *California and Shirley N. Weber,*
18 *Ph.D., in her official capacity as the*
19 *California Secretary of State*
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28