ATTACHMENT A

The Honorable JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

WASHINGTON STATE REPUBLICAN PARTY, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

WASHINGTON STATE DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE, et al.,

Plaintiff Intervenors,

LIBERTARIAN PARTY OF WASHINGTON STATE, et al.,

Plaintiff Intervenors.

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, et al.,

Defendant Intervenors,

WASHINGTON STATE GRANGE, et al.,

Defendant Intervenors.

NO. CV05-0927-JCC

SUPPLEMENTAL AND AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT AND FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF REGARDING INITIATIVE 872 AND PRIMARY ELECTIONS

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

NATURE OF ACTION

1. The First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution guarantee the right of individuals to associate in a political party, the right of that party and its adherents to select their nominees for partisan political office, and the right of that party and its adherents to limit participation in the process of selecting nominees to those voters the party and its adherents identify as sharing their interests and persuasions. As the Ninth Circuit noted in striking down Washington's blanket primary, " ... the Washington statutory scheme prevents those voters who share their affiliation from selecting their party's nominees. The right of people adhering to a political party to freely associate is not limited to getting together for cocktails and canapés. Party adherents are entitled to associate to choose their party's nominees for public office." *Democratic Party of Washington v. Reed*, 343 F.3d 1198 (9th Cir. 2003), *cert. denied,* 540 U.S. 1213, *cert. denied sub nom., Washington State Grange v. Washington State Democratic Party*, 541 U.S. 957 (2004) ("*Reed*").

2. One of the fundamental purposes of the First Amendment is to provide for and promote competition between ideas in American civilization. This purpose is advanced by requiring the selection of a political party's candidates and nominees by its adherents rather than by those opposed to or indifferent to the party.

3. The State of Washington ("the State") has enacted and implemented Initiative 872, attempting to prevent the Washington State Republican Party ("the Party") and its adherents from selecting their nominees, and to force the Party to be associated publicly with candidates who have not been nominated by the Party, who will alter the political message and agenda the Party seeks to advance, and who will confuse the voting public with respect to what the Party and its adherents stand for. The State seeks to appropriate the use of the Republican Party's name in primaries and general elections and in political advertising in order to protect the political interests of the incumbent and the well-known at the expense of the committed and the innovative. Acting under

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

color of law, state and local officials force the Party and its adherents to include supporters of other parties and political interests in determining which, or whether any, candidate will carry the Republican Party name in the general election.

4. Initiative 872, as set forth in both Sections 2 and 18, was expressly intended to defeat the First Amendment rights of the Party and its adherents, recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court in *California Democratic Party v. Jones*, 530 U.S. 567 (2000) and *Reed* ("In the event of a final court judgment invalidating the blanket primary, this People's Choice Initiative will become effective...."). The Initiative, as implemented by State and local officials, eliminates mechanisms previously enacted by the state to protect these rights and provides no effective substitute mechanisms for the Party and its adherents to protect their rights of association and of determining the Party's message.

5. I-872 impairs the common-law rights of the Republican Party to control the use of its name and prevent the misappropriation of its name, nicknames and symbols by persons who are not affiliated with the Party, its principles or programs. By so doing, the State interferes with the Party's ability to speak clearly on issues of public importance and authorizes competing and potentially dissonant and confusing messages to be advanced under the Party's banner.

6. This is an action to protect the First Amendment rights of the Party and its adherents to advocate and promote their vision for the future without censorship or interference by the State and County Auditors acting under color of the laws of the State of Washington. Initiative 872 is unconstitutional.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

7. Plaintiffs' rights of political association and political expression are guaranteed against abridgement by the State and those acting under color of its laws by the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and by 42 U.S.C. § 1983. This case presents a federal question involving federally-protected rights, including freedom of speech and protection

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

against state-imposed burdens upon the associational rights of the Party and its adherents, as set forth in *Jones* and *Reed*. Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343(a)(3), 2201 and 2202.

8. Defendants reside in the Western District of the State of Washington (the "Western District") and the conduct that gives rise to Plaintiffs' claims substantially occurred and threatens to occur within the Western District. Venue for this action lies within the Western District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

PARTIES

9. The Party is a "major political party" as defined in RCW 29A.04.086 and is organized for the purposes of promoting the political beliefs of its adherents, selecting and supporting candidates who support the political beliefs of the Party's adherents and electing public officials who will conduct government affairs in a manner consistent with the Party's philosophy. The Party has all the powers inherent in a political organization and is empowered to perform all functions inherent in a political party.

10. Plaintiff Luke Esser is a resident of the Western District. He is the elected Chairman of the Republican State Committee, the governing body of the Party, and is the political and administrative head of the Party pursuant to its Bylaws and RCW 29A.80.020 *et seq.*

11. Plaintiff Marcy Collins is a resident of Washington.

12. Plaintiff Steve Neighbors is a resident of the Western District and a registered voter in Snohomish County.

13. Plaintiff Michael Young is a resident of the Western District and a registered voter in King County.

14. The Defendant are Sam Reed in his capacity as Secretary of State of the State of Washington, Robert McKenna in his capacity as Attorney General of Washington and the State of Washington. Secretary Reed is the chief officer in the State, having the overall responsibility to

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

conduct primary elections within respective counties, including providing and tabulating ballots for such elections consistent with the rules established by the Secretary of State ("the Secretary"). The County Auditors, except Vicky Dalton, reside in the Western District. Secretary Reed and Attorney General McKenna intervened as defendants. The State was substituted as a defendant for the original defendants, the "County Auditors," by an agreed order of the Court on July 13, 2005.

WASHINGTON'S PARTISAN PRIMARY

15. Defendant-Intervenor Grange filed Initiative 872 in January 2004. The Initiative text amended and referred to provisions of the former blanket primary, which had the Ninth Circuit had declared unconstitutional the prior year. In March 2004, Washington adopted a "Montana" primary system, to address constitutional defects in the prior blanket primary. Following adoption of the "Montana" primary, Defendant-Intervenor Grange began soliciting signatures and campaigning on behalf of I-872 without any alteration of its text to reflect the changes in Washington law from the 2004 legislative session. Washington voters adopted I-872 at the general election in November 2004. Defendants first sought to implement Initiative 872 in Spring 2005 by means of emergency rules. The proposed implementation was enjoined by this Court in July 2005 and thereafter repealed by Defendants. Defendants appealed the injunction. Instead, to comply with the injunction, Defendants implemented the "Montana" primary, adopted by the Legislature in March 2004. In 2006 and 2007 the State reviewed and amended the Montana primary system but did not amend or refine Initiative 872. In 2008, Defendants deployed a new implementation of Initiative 872 by means of emergency rule-making power. Defendants' new implementation ignored statutes adopted by the Legislature or unilaterally declared the statutes impliedly repealed by Initiative 872's passage in November 2004, including statutes re-adopted by the Legislature after 2004. Defendants' implementation in 2008, and planned future implementation, forces political parties to be associated

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

with candidates in political advertising without regard to whether the political parties agreed to be associated with the candidates, forced political parties to allow non-adherents of the parties to participate in the election of party officials and, indirectly, in the selection of party nominees to fill vacancies in partisan political office, and encouraged the impression among media and voters that candidates who were not nominated by the parties were nevertheless candidates of the parties.

16. Defendants-Intervenors Washington State Grange filed Initiative 872 in January 2004 seeking to convert the State's then blanket primary election system, pursuant to which voters nominated candidates of the major parties, into a Top Two partisan primary system in which candidates stated a partisan preference but two candidates of the same party preference could advance to the general election ballot . Despite lobbying by the Grange for the adoption of a "top two" system by the Legislature, Washington instead repealed the blanket primary that Initiative 872 sought to amend and adopted a "Montana" partisan primary. In a Montana partisan primary, voters who indicate their affiliation with a political party by privately choosing its primary ballot select the candidates of that party who will advance to the general election.

17. After repeal of the blanket primary and adoption of the Montana primary system, the Grange nevertheless initiated a signature gathering campaign to place Initiative 872, with its proposed amendments to the blanket primary, on the November 2004 ballot. Initiative 872 made no mention or reference to the Montana primary that had been adopted prior to initiation of the signature gathering campaign. Promotional materials represented to voters that the Initiative would "restore the kind of choice that voters enjoyed for seventy years under the blanket primary." The promotional materials in connection with both the signature-gathering and election campaign also represented that "minor parties would continue to select candidates the same way they do under the

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

blanket primary. Their candidates would appear on the ballot for each office (as they do now)." On April 19, 2004, counsel for the Washington's Democratic Party wrote to the Grange, noting that petitions for Initiative 872 being circulated for signature contained material inaccuracies because the Initiative was drafted and filed prior to a major change in the election laws of the State. Despite this warning, the Grange continued to pursue signatures for Initiative 872 as filed in January 2004.

18. The Grange did not seek a referendum on the Montana primary system that the State adopted; it only sought to amend the previous blanket primary to convert it to a top two partisan primary. Initiative 872 qualified for the ballot and was adopted by the voters in November 2004.

19. Under the laws of the State, including the Montana primary system adopted by the Legislature and RCW 29A.04.311, 29A.20.121, and 29A.52.116, the Party is required to advance its candidates for Congressional, State and County offices by means of partisan political primaries administered by the Secretary of State ("the Secretary") and the County Auditors. RCW 29A.52.116 states: "Major political party candidates for all partisan elected offices, except for president and vice-president ... must be nominated at primaries held under this chapter." The mandatory notice of the primary must contain "the proper party designation" of each candidate in the primary. RCW 29A.52.311. RCW 29A.36.106(1)(a), enacted in 2007, requires that unless party ballots are used, each ballot must contain a statement that for partisan offices the voter may vote for candidates of only one party. RCW 29A.04.311, enacted in 2006, requires that on the third Tuesday in August the State hold elections of precinct committee officers for the parties and nominating primaries for the general elections in November.

20. Sections 5, 7 and 8 of I-872, filed in January 2004, call for a Top Two primary to be held on the third Tuesday in September prior to the November general elections. Section 6 of I-872

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

limits appearance on the general election ballot to the two candidates who receive the most votes in the September primary. Section 7 of I-872 also provides that "For partisan office, if a candidate has expressed a party or independent preference on the declaration of candidacy, then that preference will be shown after the name of the candidate on the primary and general election ballots …." The same statute also provides that the "top two" vote-getters in the primary required by I-872 will advance to the general election.

21. Neither the laws of the State as applied by the Secretary in both his first implementation and his current implementation of I-872's qualifying primary in lieu of the nominating primary required by Washington law nor the rules proposed by the Secretary provide any mechanism for the Party to effectively exercise its right of association in connection with the partisan primary in which its candidates are forced by State law to participate in order to advance to the general election. Any individual may appropriate the Party's name, regardless of whether the Party desires affiliation with that person, and the party is not permitted to limit the use of its name on the ballot and in political advertising to only those candidates selected through the party's nomination process.

22. The State, through its filing and campaign advertising statutes, also compels the Party to associate with any person who files a declaration of candidacy expressing a "preference" for the Party, regardless whether the Party desires association with the person. In addition, the State through its Voter's Pamphlet propagates to all voters claims of Party endorsement or nomination by candidates without regard to whether the Party has in fact endorsed or nominated the candidates. Indeed, the laws of the State require that even if a Party seeks to clarify for voters that a candidate using the Party's name does not support the Party's issues, it must nevertheless repeat in all its advertising the candidate's assertion of Party preference.

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

23. In addition to requiring the Party to accept as one of its candidates any individual without regard to the individual's political philosophy or participation in Party affairs, implementation of RCW 29A.04.127 forces the Party to permit any voter to participate in selection of the Party's standard-bearer without regard to the voter's partisan affiliation or beliefs. The State thus forces the Party and its adherents to associate with those who do not share their beliefs or are openly antagonistic to them.

24. Pursuant to Article II, Section 15 of the Washington State Constitution, when any vacancy occurs in a partisan office it must be filled with one of three people nominated by the same political party as the official whose office has been vacated. The nominations are to be made by the county central committee of that party for the county in which the official whose office has been vacated resides. Pursuant to RCW 29A.80.030, the county central committee of a major political party consists of the precinct committee officers from the several voting precincts of the county. Pursuant to RCW 29A.80.041, in order to be eligible to file for the office of precinct committee officer ("PCO") of a party, a candidate must be a member of that political party. Pursuant to RCW 29A.80.051, the PCO from a precinct is the candidate receiving the most votes for the office at the primary and must receive at least 10% of the votes cast for the candidate of the PCO candidate's party receiving the most votes in the precinct.

25. In addition to having a constitutional role in the filling of vacancies in partisan office, Republican PCOs elect the county chair and vice-chair of the Party within their county under RCW 29A.80.030. Moreover, Republican PCOs in each county, pursuant to RCW 29A.80.020, elect two members of the state committee of the Party. In turn, the members of the Republican State Committee elect a Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Party, and elect Washington's representatives to the Republican National Committee.

26. As implemented by the Defendants, any primary voter, without regard to that voter's party affiliation, may participate in the election of the Republican PCO in the voter's precinct. As

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

implemented by the Defendants, a candidate for the office of PCO need not be a member of the Republican Party in order to file for the office of Republican PCO. Moreover, Defendants permit candidates to stand for election to the office of Republican PCO by means of write-in candidacies, again without regard to whether the candidates are members of the Republican Party. Under WAC 434-262-075, Defendants declare candidates elected to the position of Republican PCO without regard to whether the candidates have received the 10% required by RCW 29A.80.051. In July 2008, the Party adopted a resolution requiring that PCO candidates receive more than 10% of the votes received by the top Republican vote-getting candidate on the ballot in the PCO candidate's precinct in order to be elected.

27. On November 25, 2008, the Secretary publicly released advice from the Attorney General regarding implementation of the PCO election provisions. The State's interpretation of the effect of I-872 in WAC 434-262-075 is that partisan primary "candidates for public office do not represent a political party." This interpretation denies the effectiveness of party nominations, and is consistent with official statements made by elections officials during the initial implementation of I-872 denying the right of the Party to nominate candidates. Former Defendants Logan, Kimsey, Dalton and Terwilliger all asserted in 2005: "At this time, I am not aware of any language associated with the Initiative that contemplates a partisan nomination process separate from the primary."

28. In 2008, the Republican Party nominated candidates for statewide partisan office and congressional office. The State permitted candidates who did not receive the nomination of the Party to appear on the primary ballot, using names and abbreviations traditionally associated with the Party's nominees. Political advertising produced by candidates who were not Party nominees used the Party's name and traditional abbreviations or nicknames, without distinction from Party nominees. Newspaper articles and other materials provided to voters both before and after the

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

primary made no distinction between Party-nominated candidates and those who had appropriated the Party name and symbols without authorization.

29. In August 2008, the Party circulated, exclusively to its members, information identifying its nominated candidate for governor and calling for his support and the support of the rest of the Republican-nominated state slate in the August primary. Multiple candidates who were not the Party's nominee had filed for office under the Party name and would appear on the ballot under the Party name. In September 2008, the State Public Disclosure Commission found the communication to the party's members violated Washington's campaign finance laws, and commenced civil proceedings seeking penalties. The State's implementation of I-872, in the context of its administration of its campaign finance laws, materially impairs the associational and speech rights of the Party by restricting its ability to communicate to its members the identity of Party nominees.

DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION OF LAWS

30. In contrast to the State's invasion of the associational rights of the Party and its adherents by denying their right to nominate candidates, minor parties are expressly authorized to nominate candidates through a convention process under RCW 29A.20.121, re-adopted by the legislature in 2006, after this Court's issuance of an injunction against I-872 on other grounds.

31. The State also affords minor political parties a mechanism to protect themselves from individuals or groups who attempt to hijack the party name or force an association with the minor political party. RCW 29A20.171(1) recognizes that there can be only one nominee of a minor political party. RCW 29A.20.171(2) provides for "a judicial determination of the right to the name of a minor political party." The Defendants intend to administer the State's partisan primary in a manner that denies the Party the right to nominate its candidates and control the use of its name. In doing so, the State protects the First Amendment right of association to minor political parties and their adherents while denying the same protection to the Party and its adherents.

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF WASHINGTON V. REED

32. In *Reed*, the Ninth Circuit held that Washington cannot force a political party and its adherents to adulterate their nomination process. The *Reed* decision overturned Washington's blanket primary system, which – like I-872 – prevented the Party from controlling its own nomination process. The court, rejecting a litany of "compelling interests" advanced by the State to justify the invasion of political parties' First Amendment rights, stated that "[t]he remedy available to the Grangers and the people of the State of Washington for a party that nominates candidates carrying a message adverse to their interests is to vote for someone else, not to control whom the party's adherents select to carry their message." *Reed*, 343 F.3d at 1206-1207.

33. In *Jones*, the Supreme Court noted that forced political association violates the principles set forth in its earlier cases by forcing "political parties to associate with – to have their nominees, and hence their positions, determined by – those who, at best, have refused to affiliate with the party, and, at worst, have expressly affiliated with a rival." *Jones*, 530 U.S. at 577. The Supreme Court also noted that

> a corollary of the right to associate is the right not to associate. Freedom of association would prove an empty guarantee if associations could not limit control over their decisions to those who share the interests and persuasions that underlie the association's being.
>
> In no area is the political association's right to exclude more important than in the process of selecting its nominee.

530 U.S. at 574-75 (citations and quotation marks omitted). The Ninth Circuit's *Reed* decision followed the Supreme Court's *Jones* decision. *See Reed*, 343 F.3d at 1201.

34. There is no constitutionally significant difference between Washington's new "People's Choice" primary system and the previous blanket primary system, which was held unconstitutional by the Ninth Circuit. Indeed, the Voter's Pamphlet statement prepared by I-872's

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

proponents stated that "I-872 will restore the kind of choice in the primary that voters enjoyed for seventy years with the blanket primary."

DEPRIVATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS BY STATE OFFICIALS UNDER COLOR OF LAW

35. The Party has adopted rules governing the nomination of its candidates and prohibiting candidates not qualified under Party rules to represent themselves as candidates of the Party. The Party has provided those rules to the Defendants.

36. The conduct of any partisan primary by State officials in which the State promotes, permits or encourages claims by candidates in or on widely distributed State election materials, including ballots and Voter's Pamphlets, to be associated with, members of, endorsed by or nominated by the Party without regard to whether such candidates are in fact associated with, members of, endorsed by or nominated by the Party modulates and alters, and thus interferes with, the political message of the Party. The conduct of any partisan primary by State officials in which the Party is required to repeat in its own materials unwanted claims of association by candidates unconstitutionally compels political speech from the Party. As evidenced by the 2008 election cycle, candidates who express a "preference" for the Party are indistinguishable from party nominees in common political discourse, and are *de facto* affiliated with the Party in a manner that is confusing to voters.

37. If the Defendants are permitted to continue to conduct a "qualifying" partisan primary with multiple "Republican" candidates listed and not chosen by the Party, Plaintiffs will be irreparably harmed by the denial of their First Amendment rights. Moreover, if the Defendants conduct partisan primaries pursuant to procedures which are known to be unconstitutional, then there is a substantial risk that the results of those primaries will be invalid. Requiring that the officers of the Party be selected in a process that permits voters who are not affiliated with the Party to determine the outcome unconstitutionally interferes with the internal affairs of the Party. These actions by Defendants, acting under color of law, deprive plaintiffs of their civil rights.

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: CONDUCTING AN INVALID PRIMARY

38. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1-37 above.

39. An actual controversy exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants with regard to the exercise of Plaintiffs' federally protected rights. Plaintiffs are entitled to declaratory judgment establishing the unconstitutionality of the State's primary system.

40. RCW 29A.04.127 and RCW 29A.52.112 are unconstitutional to the extent that they authorize the County Auditors to permit non-affiliates of the Party to participate in the Party's nominee selection process.

41. RCW 29A.04.127 and RCW 29A.52.112 are unconstitutional to the extent that they authorize the Secretary and County Auditors to facilitate cross-over voting and ticket-splitting by placing Republican primary races on the same ballot as primary races for other political parties or affiliations over the objection of the Party and without requiring mechanisms to prevent voting in violation of the Party's associational rights.

42. Initiative 872 is unconstitutional because, both in isolation and in conjunction with other laws governing elections and election campaigns, it will confuse voters regarding whether candidates identified with the Republican Party are affiliated with the Republican Party or represent its views, and will further confuse voters regarding whether messages advanced by candidates bearing the Republican Party name on ballots are those of the Republican Party. Initiative 872 constitutes a misappropriation by the Defendants and unauthorized candidates of the Republican Party's name, its symbols, abbreviations and nicknames, all of which are associated in the mind of the public with the Party and its positions on important issues of the day.

43. In conjunction with the State's administration of its campaign finance laws, I-872 materially impairs core political speech and association by restricting the Party's ability to communicate with its members to identify to them the candidates who have been nominated by the Party outside the "top two" primary system.

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

44. Initiative 872 lacks a severability clause. Therefore, if any portion of I-872 is unconstitutional, the entire enactment is void.

45. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *et seq.*, Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaratory judgment regarding their rights under the First Amendment and to their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in this case.

46. The primary system implemented by the Defendants is invalid under Washington law, because it was superseded by statutes readopting the Montana primary system in 2006 and 2007. In 2006, the Legislature readopted the minor party convention provisions. As part of the same legislation, provisions for special elections and nominations by both minor and major political parties in advance of such special elections were readopted. In 2007, the Legislature adopted legislation requiring separate party ballots, or a consolidated ballot with a party "check-off" system for voters to affiliate with a party before nominating candidates of the Party. The Legislature was aware of the option to adopt a revised "top two" system, but did not do so. In 2008, a bill was introduced in the Washington legislature to adopt a "top two" system, including amendments to repeal minor party convention, nomination and name control statutes, but was not adopted.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: FORCED ASSOCIATION

47. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1-46 above.

48. RCW 29A.24.030, RCW 29A.24.031 and RCW 29A.36.010 are unconstitutional under the First Amendment to the extent that they permit the State to compel the Party during a primary to publicly affiliate with candidates other than those who are qualified under Party rules to represent themselves as candidates of the Party.

49. The State's primary system, including RCW 29A.36.170, is unconstitutional under the First Amendment to the extent that it places upon the general election ballot as a candidate of the Party for any office the name of an individual who has been selected though a voting system that

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

deprives the Party of the ability to limit participation in nominee selection to those the Party has determined should be included.

50. Initiative 872 is unconstitutional because, both in isolation and in conjunction with other laws governing elections and election campaigns, it confuses voters as to whether candidates publically affiliated with the Party are, in fact, affiliated with the Party or represent its views, and will further confuse voters regarding whether messages advanced by candidates bearing the Party name on ballots, in the voter's pamphlet, and in political advertising are those of the Party. Initiative 872 constitutes a misappropriation by the Defendants and potentially by unauthorized candidates of the Party's name, which is associated in the mind of the public with the Party and its positions on important issues of the day.

51. Initiative 872, as implemented by Defendants, is unconstitutional because it permits voters who are not adherents of the Party, and may in fact be adherents of rival political parties, to elect directly officers of the Party and indirectly to select higher officials of the Party and its nominees to fill vacancies in partisan office.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: DENIAL OF EQUAL PROTECTION UNDER LAW

52. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1-51.

53. The State, through RCW 29A.20.171 and other provisions of state law, protects minor political parties from forced association with candidates who may not share the goals or objectives of the minor political parties and their adherents. Through the convention process and the statutory procedures to resolve competing claims to the use of a minor political party's name, that party and its adherents may prevent misrepresentations of affiliation on primary ballots prepared by the Defendants. The State discriminates among political parties by providing a mechanism for minor political parties to protect themselves from forced affiliation with candidates, but denying the same right to the Party and its adherents under RCW 29A.24.030 and RCW 29A.24.031.

54. Plaintiffs are entitled to their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *et seq.*

55. The readoption of the minor party convention system in 2006 supersedes the implied

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

repeal of the 2004 statute by I-872 and is a new claim for violation of equal protection.

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF WASHINGTON STATE CONSITUTION

56. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1-54. In January 2004, the Washington State Grange announced the filing of Initiative 872. During the 2004 legislative session, the Grange lobbied aggressively for the Washington legislature to adopt a primary election system that was substantially similar to Initiative 872. Washington's legislature adopted a "Top Two" primary in 2004, along with a backup, open primary. The legislature adopted the replacement primary system, and the bill was forwarded to the Governor. On April 1, 2004, Governor Locke vetoed the "Top Two" components of the legislation, leaving the open primary provisions of the law to become effective. The I-872 sponsors brought court action seeking to overturn the Governor's veto and reinstitute the vetoed "top two" primary. The sponsors did not seek a referendum on the replacement primary system, but intervened in litigation related to another person's referendum filing.

57. Following the veto, I-872's sponsors launched a signature-gathering campaign. The sponsors' promotional materials, both during the signature-gathering phase and during the election campaign, represented to voters that the initiative would "restore the kind of choice that voters enjoyed for seventy years with the blanket primary." The initiative sponsors' promotional materials also represented that "minor parties would continue to select candidates the same way they do under the blanket primary. Their candidates would appear on the primary ballot for each office (as they do now)." On April 19, 2004, the initiative sponsors were advised in writing that petitions for Initiative 872, being circulated for signature, contained material inaccuracies. The initiative sponsors made no change to the text of the initiative.

58. Initiative 872 identified the portions of Washington's primary and election laws that it amended, that it repealed, and the new provisions added to the existing statutory scheme.

59. Initiative 872 did not include in its text the provisions of existing state law (or prior

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

state law) regarding minor party convention rights or protections for unauthorized use of minor party political names by candidates. Nor did Initiative 872 include such statutory provisions in its list of sections of the law to be repealed.

60. Initiative 872 made no reference to the provisions requiring PCO candidates to achieve at least 10% of the vote received by the top candidate of the Party in the precinct in order to be elected. Nor did it include the text of the PCO statute in its body, showing its repeal.

61. Initiative 872's text violates the provisions of Article II, Section 37 of the Washington State Constitution and is void.

62. The text of Initiative 872 and the initiative sponsor's materials presented to voters in the course of the signature-gathering campaign and during the election campaign confused and misled voters regarding the effect of the initiative, violating Article II, Section 37 of the State Constitution.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION: INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

63. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference Paragraphs 1-61 above.

64. There exists an imminent and ongoing threat by State officials to deprive Plaintiffs of their civil rights by selectively enforcing laws and permitting the Defendants to blur the candidates and nominees of the Party through a primary process in which Plaintiffs are not permitted to exercise their First Amendment rights of association, as well as to invade core associational rights of the Party by permitting nonaffiliates to select its leaders.

65. Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable injury if the Party's candidates and nominees are selected in a process in which the Party is deprived of its right to define participation.

66. Plaintiffs are entitled to preliminary and permanent injunctive relief restraining the County Auditors from:

a) conducting any partisan primary without affording the Party reasonable opportunity in advance of that primary to exercise its right to define participation in that primary;

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

b) conducting any partisan primary without implementing a reasonable mechanism to effectuate the Party's right to select the candidates who will carry the Party's name in that primary;

c) encouraging or facilitating, directly or indirectly, cross-over voting or ticket-splitting in connection with any partisan primary except to the extent expressly authorized by the Party for that primary; and

d) placing on a primary ballot the name of any candidate carrying the Party's name who is not qualified under the rules of the Party to stand for office as a candidate of the Party;

67. Plaintiffs are entitled to their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in connection with this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 *et seq.*

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court enter judgment:

1. Declaring RCW 29A.04.127 unconstitutional;

2. Declaring RCW 29A. 24.030 and RCW 29A24.031 unconstitutional to the extent they authorize placing on a primary ballot the name of any candidate carrying the Party's name who is not qualified under the rules of the Party to stand for office as a candidate of the Party;

3. Declaring RCW 29A.36.010 unconstitutional;

4. Declaring RCW 29A.36.170 unconstitutional;

5. Declaring RCW 29A.52.112 unconstitutional;

6. Declaring Initiative 872 unconstitutional under the Constitution of the United States and declaring that the primary system in effect immediately before the passage of I-872 remains in effect;

7. Declaring Initiative 872 unconstitutional for violating Article II, Section 37 of the Washington State Constitution, and declaring that the primary system in effect immediately before the passage of I-872 remains in effect;

LIVENGOOD, FITZGERALD & ALSKOG
121 THIRD AVENUE
P.O. BOX 908
KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98083-0908
TELEPHONE: (425) 822-9281
FACSIMILE: (425) 828-0908

8. Permanently restraining the Defendants and all those acting in active concert and participation with them from:

a) conducting any partisan primary without affording the Party reasonable opportunity in advance of that primary to exercise its right to define participation in that primary;

b) conducting any partisan primary without implementing a reasonable mechanism to effectuate the right to select the candidates who will carry the Party's name in that primary;

c) encouraging or facilitating, directly or indirectly, cross-over voting or ticket-splitting in connection with any partisan primary except to the extent expressly authorized by the Party for that primary; and

d) placing on a primary ballot the name of any candidate carrying the Party's name who is not qualified under the rules of the Party to stand for office as a candidate of the Party.

8. Awarding Plaintiffs their reasonable attorneys' fees and costs; and

9. Granting such further relief as the Court deems appropriate.

DATED this 3rd day of December, 2008.

/s/ John J. White, Jr.
John J. White, Jr., WSBA #13682
Kevin B. Hansen, WSBA #28349
of Livengood, Fitzgerald & Alskog, PLLC
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
121 Third Avenue, P.O. Box 908
Kirkland, WA 98083-0908
Ph: 425-822-9281 Fax: 425-828-0908
E-mail: white@lfa-law.com
hansen@lfa-law.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on December 3, 2008, I caused to be electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the following:

James Kendrick Pharris

Richard Dale Shepard

Thomas Ahearne

David T. McDonald

/s/ John J. White, Jr.
John J. White, Jr., WSBA #13682
Kevin B. Hansen, WSBA #28349
of Livengood, Fitzgerald & Alskog, PLLC
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
121 Third Avenue, P.O. Box 908
Kirkland, WA 98083-0908
Ph: 425-822-9281 Fax: 425-828-0908
E-mail: white@lfa-law.com
hansen@lfa-law.com