	Case 2:21-cv-01568-MTL Document 39	Filed 10/22/21 Page 1 of 5	
1 2	MARK BRNOVICH ATTORNEY GENERAL (Firm State Bar No. 14000)	WILENCHIK & BARTNESS PC	
3		Jack Wilenchik (No. 029353)	
4	Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 15838) Brunn (Beau) W. Roysden III (No. 28698)	The Wilenchik & Bartness Building	
5	Drew C. Ensign (No. 25463)	2810 North Third Street	
6	James K. Rogers (No. 27287) 2005 N. Central Ave	Phoenix, AZ 85004 Phone (602) 606-2816	
° 7	Phoenix, AZ 85004-1592 Phoene: (602) 542 8540	JackW@wb-law.com	
	Phone: (602) 542-8540 Joseph.Kanefield@azag.gov		
8	Beau.Roysden@azag.gov	Attorney for Plaintiff John Doe	
9	<u>Drew.Ensign@azag.gov</u> James.Rogers@azag.gov		
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Mark Brnovich and the State of Arizona		
11	U U	DISTRICT COURT	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
13	Mark Brnovich, in his official capacity as Attorney General of Arizona; the State of	No. 2:21-cv-01568-MTL	
14	Arizona; and John Doe,	STATE PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN	
15	Plaintiffs,	PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR EXPEDITED BRIEFING	
16	v. Joseph R. Biden in his official capacity		
17	as President of the United States;		
18	Alejandro Mayorkas in his official		
19	capacity as Secretary of Homeland Security; United States Department of		
20	Homeland Security; Troy Miller in his		
	official capacity as Senior Official Performing the Duties of the		
21	Commissioner of U.S. Customs and		
22	Border Protection; Tae Johnson in his		
23	official capacity as Senior Official		
24	Performing the Duties of Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs		
25	Enforcement; Ur M. Jaddou in her		
26	official capacity as Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services;		
	United States Office of Personnel		
27	Management; Kiran Ahuja in her official		
28	capacity as director of the Office of Personnel Management and as co chair		
	Personnel Management and as co-chair of the Safer Federal Workforce Task		
		u la	

1	Force; General Services Administration; Robin Carnahan in her official capacity	
2	as administrator of the General Services	
3	Administration and as co-chair of the Safer Federal Workforce Task Force;	
4	Office of Management and Budget;	
5	Shalanda Young in her official capacity as Acting Director of the Office of	
6	Management and Budget and as a	
7	member of the Safer Federal Workforce Task Force; Safer Federal Workforce	
8	Task Force; and Jeffrey Zients in his official capacity as co-chair of the Safer	
9	Federal Workforce Task Force and	
10	COVID-19 Response Coordinator Defendants.	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

Plaintiffs Mark Brnovich, in his official capacity as Attorney General of Arizona and the State of Arizona (hereinafter, the "State") respectfully submit this reply in support of Plaintiffs' motion for an expedited briefing schedule (Doc.36) for Plaintiffs' Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Doc. 34).¹ This Reply addresses only the Contractor Claims, while John Doe may reply separately regarding the Employee Claims.

7 With respect to the Contractor Mandate, Federal Defendants claim (at 4) that 8 "any exigency that exists here is of Plaintiff's own making." Not so. The scope of the 9 State's harms only became clear when the Biden Administration revealed how 10 sweepingly it intends to apply the Contractor Mandate to State agencies, subdivisions, 11 and other entities. It was only announced last Friday that Arizona universities would be 12 implementing vaccination mandates as a *direct result* of Biden Administration pressure.² 13 In that, Arizona universities are hardly unique: it only became clear throughout the 14 nation that the Biden Administration intended to use the Contractor Mandate to usurp 15 from States lawmaking authority over their own state universities and other agencies: 16 "Some [colleges] are still trying to confirm how the executive order applies, others are 17 still figuring out implementation, and some might be weighing whether to challenge the 18 order in court."³ And universities are but one aspect of the sweeping assertion of federal 19 power over state entities. The Biden Administration, for example, apparently intends to

20

21

1

2

3

4

5

6

22

26

¹ This Reply is not submitted on behalf of John Doe, who is separately represented, and may also file a reply.

² See, e.g., <u>https://tucson.com/news/local/ducey-reviewing-mask-mandates-at-arizona-universities/article_a21bc826-305d-11ec-a262-633b4b233a94.html;</u>

 ^{23 &}lt;u>https://mohavedailynews.com/news/135023/arizona-universities-to-require-covid-19-</u>
 24 <u>shots-for-employees/; https://kjzz.org/content/1726081/gov-doug-ducey-isnt-happy-</u>
 24 <u>about-universities-requiring-vaccines-what-can-he-do-about.</u>

^{25 &}lt;u>https://www.mcclatchydc.com/news/nation-world/national/article255090947.html</u> (Oct. 29, 2021).

apply its Contractor Mandate to the State's own Civil Rights Division. See First Amended Complaint ¶4.

The State of Arizona has a law that prohibits "this state and any city, town or county of this state ... from establishing a COVID-19 vaccine passport or requiring ... the following 1. Any person to be vaccinated for COVID-19." A.R.S. §36-681(A). The State will be arguing on November 2 at the Arizona Supreme Court whether this law was validly passed as part of the budget. The federal contractor mandate is preventing the State from effectuating its laws by purporting to override them. The State is entited to expedited consideration of that harm.

Defendants' diminishment of the State's harms is further belied by their own
position: if little will occur in the window between when expedited and ordinary briefing
would be complete, respectively, why are they completely unwilling to stay the
Mandates in that time period? It is precisely *because* so many of the harms at issue will
occur in that window of time that Defendants are unwilling to agree to a short stay.

But if Defendants intend to press full-speed ahead with their Mandates, they can
hardly expect courts to give them non-expedited briefing schedules to address the
legality of those mandates.

18 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 22nd of October, 2021.

MARK BRNOVICH ATTORNEY GENERAL	
By: <u>/s/ Brunn W. Roysden III</u>	
Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 15838)	
Brunn W. Roysden III (No. 28698)	
Drew C. Ensign (No. 25463)	
James K. Rogers (No. 27287)	
Attorneys for Plaintiffs Mark Brnovich, in his official capacity as Attorney General of Arizona; and the State of Arizona	

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 22nd day of October, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the District of Arizona using the CM/ECF filing system. Counsel for all parties are registered CM/ECF users and will be served by the CM/ECF system pursuant to the notice of electronic filing.

/s/ Brunn W. Roysden III

Attorney for Plaintiff Mark Brnovich, in his official capacity as Attorney General of Arizona; and the State of Arizona