| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11 | Karin Scherner Aldama (Bar No. 023816) Kristine J. Beaudoin (Bar No. 034843) Isabella Stoutenburg (Bar No. 038642) Barry G. Stratford (Bar No. 029923) Christopher D. Thomas (Bar No. 010482) PERKINS COIE LLP 2525 East Camelback Road, Suite 500 Phoenix, Arizona 85016-4227 Telephone: 602.351.8000 Facsimile: 602.648.7000 KAldama@perkinscoie.com KBeaudoin@perkinscoie.com IStoutenburg@perkinscoie.com BStratford@perkinscoie.com CThomas@perkinscoie.com DocketPHX@perkinscoie.com  Attorneys for Plaintiffs  [ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGE] |  |
|---|---|--|
| 12  | ARIZONA SUPI  | ERIOR COURT  |
| 13  |   |  |
| 14  | MARICOPA  | COUNTY   |
|   | Eric M. Reuss, M.D., M.P.H., on behalf of   | No   |
| 15  | himself, his staff, and his patients; Paul A.   |  |
| 16  | Isaacson, M.D., on behalf of himself, his staff, and his patients; and Planned Parenthood   | WEDLEVED COMPLAINTEEOD                                   |
| 17  | 1 1 10 00 10 10   | VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF |
| 18  |   |  |
| 19  | Plaintiffs,   |  |
|   | V.  |  |
| 20  | State of Arizona, a body politic,   |  |
| 21  |   |  |
| 22  | Defendant.  |  |
|   |   |  |
| 23  |   |  |
| 24  |   |  |
|   |   |  |

Plaintiffs Dr. Eric M. Reuss, M.D., M.P.H.; Dr. Paul A. Isaacson, M.D.; and Planned Parenthood Arizona, Inc., allege as follows:

# INTRODUCTION

- 1. On November 5, 2024, Arizonans voted overwhelmingly in favor of adopting article II, section 8.1 of the Arizona Constitution ("the Amendment"), establishing and protecting "a fundamental right to abortion" in the Arizona Constitution. Ariz. Const. art. II, § 8.1. The Amendment became effective upon proclamation of the Governor on November 25, 2024. See Ariz. Const. art. IV, pt. 1, § 5. A copy of the Amendment is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- 2. This is a challenge to A.R.S. §§ 36-2321–2326 ("the Ban" or "15-Week Ban"), which violates the individual autonomy of pregnant Arizonans by denying their fundamental right to end a pre-viability pregnancy after 15 weeks, as dated from the first day of a patient's last menstrual period ("LMP"), and penalizes health care providers for assisting their patients in exercising that fundamental right, both in violation of article II, section 8.1 of the Arizona Constitution. A copy of the Ban is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
- 3. Plaintiffs are institutional and individual health care providers who provide a broad range of reproductive health care services, including abortions, in Arizona. But for the threat of criminal, civil, and licensure penalties imposed by the Ban, Plaintiffs would provide pre-viability abortion to Arizonans after 15 weeks, as they did before the Ban took effect in 2022.

<sup>1</sup> Adrian Fontes, Arizona Secretary of State, 2024 General Election, Tuesday, November 5, 2024, Unofficial Results, https://results.arizona.vote/#/ballotmeasure/47/0 (last updated November 22, 2024).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Sejal Govindarao & Gabriel Sandoval, *Legal challenges loom as abortion is enshrined in Arizona's Constitution*, AP News (Nov. 25, 2024, 8:21 PM), https://apnews.com/article/arizona-election-canvass-abortion-0a899d1a78fc8e8b76bf8f75e 868e249.

- 4. As the Arizona Supreme Court has recognized, by criminalizing pre-viability abortion after 15 weeks LMP, the Ban violates the fundamental right to abortion guaranteed by article II, section 8.1 of the Arizona Constitution. Decision Order, *Ariz. Right to Life v. Fontes*, No. CV-24-0190-AP/EL, 2024 WL 3887061, at \*2 (Ariz. Aug. 20, 2024) (stating that "a reasonable person would necessarily understand" that the 15-Week Ban "would be invalid" under the Amendment).
- 5. The Ban radically curtails the ability of Arizonans to make their own autonomous decisions about whether or not to continue a pregnancy and bear a child, depriving them of agency, bodily autonomy, and the right to control their own reproductive futures in violation of their rights under the Arizona Constitution. As explained below, the Ban cannot be justified by any compelling state interest.
- 6. The Ban also flouts the Amendment's prohibition on penalizing any individual or entity for assisting an individual in exercising their constitutional right to abortion by imposing severe criminal, civil, and licensure penalties on those who provide pre-viability abortion after 15 weeks LMP.
- 7. Since the Ban took effect in 2022, it has had devastating consequences across the state—forcing many Arizonans to carry pregnancies to term and give birth against their will. In so doing, the Ban inflicts serious, irreparable harm to the physical, psychological, and dignitary well-being of pregnant Arizonans, as well as that of their families.
- 8. Absent relief from the Ban, Arizonans will continue to suffer the irreparable deprivation of their fundamental rights and serious, irreparable harm to their physical, psychological, and dignitary well-being. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to address these harms. Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court grant declaratory and

injunctive relief, declaring the Ban unconstitutional under the Arizona Constitution, and preventing its enforcement.

# PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

- 9. Plaintiff Dr. Eric M. Reuss, M.D., M.P.H., is a licensed, board-certified obstetrician-gynecologist. Since 2001, he has operated a private, solo obstetrics and gynecology ("OB-GYN") practice, Scottsdale Obstetrics & Gynecology, P.C., where he provides his patients with the full range of general obstetric and gynecological care, including preventive care, prenatal care, labor and delivery care, and abortion care. He cares for hundreds of prenatal patients each year, and provides medication and procedural abortions to his patients, either in his office or at the hospital where he has privileges. Until the Ban took effect, Dr. Reuss provided pre-viability abortion services after 15 weeks LMP. Dr. Reuss brings this suit on his own behalf and on behalf of his staff and his patients.
- 10. Plaintiff Dr. Paul A. Isaacson, M.D., is a licensed, board-certified obstetrician-gynecologist. Dr. Isaacson has been providing high-quality and safe abortion care in Arizona for more than 20 years. Dr. Isaacson is the co-owner of, and one of two physicians at, Family Planning Associates Medical Group, an independent licensed abortion clinic located in Phoenix which offers procedural and medication abortion services. Until the Ban took effect, Dr. Isaacson provided pre-viability abortion services after 15 weeks LMP. Dr. Isaacson teaches in one of the abortion-training programs available to Arizona's OB-GYN resident physicians. Dr. Isaacson brings this suit on his own behalf and on behalf of his staff and his patients.
- 11. Planned Parenthood Arizona, Inc. ("PPAZ") is a not-for-profit corporation organized under the laws of Arizona and is the largest provider of reproductive health services in Arizona, operating seven health centers, including licensed abortion clinics, throughout the state and providing a broad range of reproductive and sexual health services. PPAZ's services

include procedural and medication abortion services and related care, cervical cancer screening, breast and annual gynecological exams, family planning counseling, pregnancy testing and counseling and referral for prenatal care, reproductive health education, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, contraception, and health care related to miscarriage. PPAZ also provides training in abortion care to Arizona OB-GYN resident physicians. Until the Ban took effect, PPAZ provided pre-viability abortion services to patients after 15 weeks LMP. PPAZ brings this suit on its own behalf and on behalf of its physicians, staff, and patients.

- 12. The Ban forces Plaintiffs to choose between turning away patients who need abortion care after 15 weeks LMP and risking criminal prosecution and severe civil and licensing penalties. In addition to causing irreparable physical, psychological, and dignitary harms to their patients, the Ban directly undermines Plaintiffs' ability to provide pre-viability abortion in accordance with their ethical duties and their commitment to providing essential medical care to their patients.
  - 13. Defendant State of Arizona is a body politic.
- 14. This Court has jurisdiction under A.R.S. §§ 12-123, 12-1831, and the Arizona Constitution.
  - 15. Venue is proper under A.R.S. § 12-401.

# **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

# A. The Abortion Amendment

- 16. The Amendment establishes and protects "a fundamental right to abortion" in Arizona. Ariz. Const. art. II, § 8.1.
- 17. By the terms of the Amendment, "the State shall not enact, adopt or enforce any law, regulation, policy or practice that . . . denies, restricts or interferes with" the fundamental

- 18. By the terms of the Amendment, a "'[c]ompelling state interest' means a law, regulation, policy or practice that meets *both* of the following:"
  - a. First, that it "is enacted or adopted for the limited purpose of improving or maintaining the health of an individual seeking abortion care, consistent with accepted clinical standards of practice and evidence-based medicine."
  - b. Second, that it "[d]oes not infringe on that individual's autonomous decision making."

Ariz. Const. art. II,  $\S 8.1(B)(1)(a)$ —(b) (emphasis added).

- 19. Thus, the Amendment permits only those regulations of pre-viability abortion that *both* respect patient autonomous decision making *and* make the abortion safer for the person seeking an abortion, using the least restrictive means.
- 20. The Amendment further prohibits the State from "enact[ing], adopt[ing] or enforc[ing] any law, regulation, policy or practice that . . . penalizes any individual or entity for aiding or assisting a pregnant individual in exercising the individual's right to abortion." Ariz. Const. art. II, § 8.1(A)(3) (emphasis added).

# B. Abortion in Arizona

21. The decision to have an abortion is one of the most personal and intimate decisions a person can make about their body, their health, and their life. That decision is informed by a combination of diverse, complex, and interrelated factors that are intimately related to an individual's values, beliefs, culture, religion, health status, reproductive history, familial situation, resources, economic stability, and life plans.

- 22. Approximately one in four women in this country will have had an abortion by age forty-five.<sup>3</sup>
- 23. Some people have abortions because they decide it is not the right time to have a child or to add to their existing families. Others have abortions because they do not wish to have a child at all.
- 24. Most people who seek an abortion already have at least one child, so many pregnant people and families must consider how another child will impact their ability to care for the children they already have.<sup>4</sup> For some, an additional child can place economic and emotional strain on a family that they are simply unable to bear.
- 25. For some people, continuing a pregnancy and having a child will make it too difficult for them to pursue educational or career goals and support themselves and their families going forward. Indeed, nationwide, new mothers' earnings drop after they give birth, and they do not fully return to their pre-pregnancy earnings paths.<sup>5</sup>
- 26. Others seek an abortion because continuing their pregnancies would threaten their health or life, because of a diagnosed fetal medical condition, or because they conclude that pregnancy, childbirth, and an additional child may exacerbate an already difficult and dangerous situation with an abusive partner.

*Incidence of Abortion: United States, 2008 - 2014, 107 Am. J. Pub. Health 1904, 1907 (2017).* 

Morbidity & Mortality Weekly Report (Nov. 26, 2021), https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/ss/ss7009a1.htm (last visited Nov. 22, 2024) (almost 60% of women who obtained an

abortion in 2019 already had at least one child).

<sup>3</sup> Rachel K. Jones & Jenna Jerman, Population Group Abortion Rates and Lifetime

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Katherine Kortsmit et al., Abortion Surveillance - United States, 2019, CDC

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See Danielle H. Sandler & Nicole Szembrot, New Mothers Experience Temporary Drop in Earnings, U.S. Census Bureau (June 16, 2020), https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2020/06/ cost-of-motherhood-on-womens-employment-and-earnings.html (last visited Nov. 22, 2024).

- 27. Forcing someone to remain pregnant against their will poses risks to their physical and mental health, as well as to the stability and well-being of their family, including their existing children.
- 28. Abortion is extremely safe. In fact, it is one of the safest medical interventions in the United States.
- 29. Serious complications from abortion are extremely rare, occurring in fewer than 1% of abortions.<sup>6</sup>
- 30. The risk of death associated with abortion is also exceedingly low. For example, it is far lower than the risks associated with other routine medical procedures, such as colonoscopies and tonsillectomies.<sup>7</sup>
- 31. Abortion is also far safer than its only alternative—trying to continue a pregnancy to term and childbirth. Every pregnancy-related complication is more common among women giving birth than among those having an abortion.
- 32. Nationally, the risk of death associated with childbirth is far higher—between three and ten times higher—than that associated with abortion at and after 14 weeks LMP.<sup>8</sup>
- 33. The starkest risk of carrying a pregnancy to term is death, and pregnancy is growing more dangerous. In Arizona, women died from pregnancy-related causes at a ratio of 26.3 per 100,000 live births in 2018–2019, the most recent years for which the Arizona

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Nat'l Academies of Sciences, Eng'g, & Med., The Safety and Quality of Abortion Care in the United States, 77 (2018), https://nap.nationalacademies.org/catalog/24950/the-safety-and-quality-of-abortion-care-in-the-united-states.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> See id. at 75.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See Suzanne Zane et al., Abortion-Related Mortality in the United States: 1998-2010, 126 Obstetrics & Gynecology 258, 260 (2015) (reporting 2.5 deaths per 100,000 abortions at 14–17 weeks LMP, and 6.7 deaths per 100,000 abortions at 18 or more weeks LMP).

Department of Health Services has published data.<sup>9</sup> In 2018–2019 alone, 43 women died of pregnancy-related causes in Arizona.<sup>10</sup>

- 34. Pregnancy is significantly more dangerous for American Indian/Alaska Native<sup>11</sup> and Black or African American women in Arizona. In Arizona, American Indian/Alaska Native women account for 5.8% of live births in the state, but 15.1% of pregnancy-associated deaths. Black or African American women account for 5.9% of live births in the state, but 14.3% of pregnancy-related deaths.<sup>12</sup>
- 35. Serious long-term medical and physical consequences short of death may arise from carrying a pregnancy to term and giving birth, even for those who are healthy and have uncomplicated pregnancies. Pregnancy stresses most major organs and involves profound and long-lasting physiological changes, including on a pregnant person's health and ability to have children in the future. For someone with a medical condition caused or exacerbated by pregnancy, the risks of complications are increased.
- 36. Due to structural barriers to accessing reproductive health care, the vast majority of abortion patients are poor or low-income. <sup>13</sup> Furthermore, approximately two-thirds of abortion

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> See Ariz. Dept. of Health Servs., *Maternal Mortality in Arizona, 2018-2019*, 19 (Jan. 2024), https://www.azdhs.gov/documents/prevention/womens-childrens-health/reports-fact-sheets/mm-2018-2019.pdf; see also id. at 11 (women died from pregnancy-related causes in Arizona at a ratio of 18.3 per 100,000 live births in 2016-2017).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 15.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Plaintiffs use the term "American Indian/Alaska Native" here because that is the term used in Arizona Department of Health Services statistics.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 28.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Jenna Jerman et al., *Characteristics of U.S. Abortion Patients in 2014 and Changes Since 2008*, 7 (May 2016), https://www.guttmacher.org/sites/default/files/report\_pdf/characteristics-us-abortion-patients-2014.pdf.

patients in Arizona are American Indian/Alaska Native and/or people of color, though these populations account for approximately half of Arizona's total population.<sup>14</sup>

- 37. Many patients who seek abortion care after 15 weeks of pregnancy do so because they were unable to access abortion earlier in pregnancy. It can be extremely difficult for many patients to raise the necessary funds for an abortion and related expenses (such as transportation and childcare) and obtain time off work, secure childcare, and arrange transportation to and from their appointments.
- 38. The Ban therefore disproportionately impacts Indigenous people, people of color, people with low incomes, young people, and people living in rural areas—that is, those who already face barriers to accessing health care.

#### C. The 15-Week Ban

- 39. Until 2022, pre-viability abortion had been legal in Arizona for nearly a half century.
- 40. In 2022, the Arizona Legislature passed S.B. 1164, which criminalized all abortion care after 15 weeks LMP, except in medical emergencies, as narrowly defined by the Ban. S.B. 1164, 55th Leg., 2nd Reg. Sess. (Ariz. 2022), codified at A.R.S. § 36-2322. The Ban took effect on September 25, 2022.
  - 41. The Ban prohibits abortions at a pre-viability stage of pregnancy.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Ariz. Dept. of Health Servs., *Abortions in Arizona: 2022 Abortion Report*, 8 (Dec. 5, 2023), https://www.azdhs.gov/documents/preparedness/public-health-statistics/abortions/2022-arizona-abortion-report.pdf; U.S. Census Bureau, *QuickFacts: Arizona*, https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/AZ (last visited Nov. 22, 2024).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Under the Ban, an abortion may be provided after 15 weeks LMP in cases of "medical emergency," which is defined as "a condition that, on the basis of the physician's good faith clinical judgment, so complicates the medical condition of a pregnant woman as to necessitate the immediate abortion of her pregnancy to avert her death or for which a delay will create serious risk of substantial and irreversible impairment of a major bodily function." A.R.S. §§ 36-2321(7), 36-2322.

- 43. As the State has previously conceded, in a typical pregnancy, viability does not occur until approximately 23 or 24 weeks LMP, at the earliest, and no fetus is viable at 15 weeks LMP. Some fetuses do not become viable until later in pregnancy, and some fetuses never become viable.
- 44. A "physician who intentionally or knowingly violates the prohibition in § 36-2322, subsection B is guilty of a class 6 felony." A.R.S. § 36-2324. The Ban also imposes severe civil and licensing penalties on physicians, including civil fines and license revocation. A.R.S. § 36-2325.
- 45. The Ban expressly delegates enforcement authority to the Attorney General, who may bring enforcement action on behalf of the Director of the Arizona Department of Health Services, the Arizona Medical Board, and the Arizona Board of Osteopathic Examiners in Medicine and Surgery. A.R.S. § 36-2326.
- 46. Moreover, county attorneys are authorized to "conduct all prosecutions for public offenses," A.R.S. § 11-532(A)(1), subject to the Attorney General's supervisory authority to enforce the laws of Arizona, *see* A.R.S. § 41-193(A)(4) (the attorney general "shall . . . [e]xercise

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Isaacson v. Horne, 716 F.3d 1213, 1225 (9th Cir. 2013) (noting that it was "undisputed that viability usually occurs between twenty-three and twenty-four weeks gestation"); *id.* ("The parties here agree that no fetus is viable at twenty weeks gestational age."); *see also Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Org.*, 597 U.S. 215, 230 (2022) (recognizing that a law banning abortion after 15 weeks LMP bans abortion weeks before viability).

- 47. In addition, the Arizona Medical Board is authorized to initiate independent investigations, separate from any criminal process, to determine if a physician has engaged in unprofessional conduct, which includes "[v]iolating any federal or state laws, rules or regulations applicable to the practice of medicine" and "[c]ommitting a felony," A.R.S. §§ 32-1401(27)(a)(d), 32-1403(A)(2), 32-1451(A), and to discipline licensed physicians based on their findings, which can include suspension or revocation of a medical license, public censure, and civil penalties of at least \$1,000 and up to \$10,000 for each violation found, A.R.S. §§ 32-1403(A)(5), 32-1403.01(A), 32-1451(D)–(E), (I), and (K).
- 48. The Director of the Arizona Department of Health Services is independently authorized to suspend or revoke the license of any abortion clinic that fails to "adher[e] to" "any [] law or rule concerning abortion." *See* A.R.S. § 36-449.02.
- 49. The Ban denies, restricts, and interferes with Arizonans' fundamental right to previability abortion after 15 weeks LMP.
- 50. The Ban penalizes Arizona health care providers who assist their patients in exercising their constitutionally protected right to pre-viability abortion after 15 weeks LMP, forcing them to stop providing the critical care their patients seek in accordance with their best medical judgment under threat of criminal prosecution, severe civil sanctions, and revocation of their medical licenses.
- 51. By prohibiting pre-viability abortion after 15 weeks LMP, the Ban by definition infringes on an individual's autonomous decision making.
- 52. The Ban does not improve or maintain the health of an individual seeking abortion care.

1 2 3

4

5

7 8

9

1011

12

14

13

15

16 17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

53. The Ban therefore cannot be justified by a compelling state interest as defined by the Amendment, let alone one that is achieved by the least restrictive means. *See* Ariz. Const. art. II, § 8.1(A).

# **COUNT I**

# (Declaratory Judgment – Fundamental Right to Abortion)

- 54. Plaintiffs incorporate all previous allegations as if set forth herein.
- 55. Under article II, section 8.1 of the Arizona Constitution, "the State shall not enact, adopt or enforce any law, regulation, policy or practice that . . . denies, restricts or interferes with" the fundamental right to abortion "before fetal viability unless justified by a compelling state interest that is achieved by the least restrictive means."
- 56. By outright prohibiting virtually all abortions after 15 weeks LMP, the Ban plainly denies, restricts, and interferes with the right to pre-viability abortion, forcing continued pregnancy and childbirth upon many Arizonans.
- 57. To be justified by a compelling state interest under the Amendment, the Ban must meet two requirements: (1) it must be "enacted or adopted for the limited purpose of improving or maintaining the health of an individual seeking abortion care, consistent with accepted clinical standards of practice and evidence-based medicine," *and* (2) it must "not infringe on that individual's autonomous decision making." Ariz. Const. art. II, § 8.1(B)(1)(a)–(b).
  - 58. The Ban fails both parts of this two-part test.
- 59. By banning abortion months prior to viability, the Ban denies individuals' autonomous decision making and is therefore per se unconstitutional.
- 60. The Ban does not improve or maintain the health of an individual seeking abortion care.

- 1 | tl 2 | tl 3 | u
- 45
- 6 7
- 8
- 9

12 13

14

15

1617

18

1920

21

22

23

24 l

- 61. The Ban therefore cannot be justified by a compelling state interest as defined by the Amendment, let alone one that is achieved by the least restrictive means, and thus it is unconstitutional. Ariz. Const. art. II, § 8.1(A)(1).
- 62. The Ban deprives Plaintiffs' patients of their fundamental right to abortion under the Arizona Constitution, causing them to suffer significant constitutional, physical, psychological, and other harms.
  - 63. There is no adequate remedy at law to address these harms.
- 64. For all these reasons, Plaintiffs' patients' rights, status, and other legal relations are directly affected by the Ban, and they are thus entitled to a "declaration of rights, status or other legal relations thereunder." *See* A.R.S. § 12-1832.

# **COUNT II**

# (Declaratory Judgment—Prohibition on Penalizing an Individual for Assisting a Pregnant Individual in Exercising Their Right to Abortion)

- 65. Plaintiffs incorporate all previous allegations as if set forth herein.
- 66. Article II, section 8.1 of the Arizona Constitution provides: "[T]he State shall not enact, adopt or enforce any law, regulation, policy or practice that . . . penalizes any individual or entity for aiding or assisting a pregnant individual in exercising the individual's right to abortion." Ariz. Const. art. II, § 8.1(A)(3).
- 67. By prohibiting Plaintiffs from providing pre-viability abortions under threat of severe criminal, civil, and licensing penalties, the Ban penalizes individuals and entities for aiding or assisting a pregnant individual in exercising the individual's right to abortion in direct defiance of the Amendment, causing Plaintiffs to suffer significant constitutional, psychological, and other harms.
  - 68. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to address these harms.

| 1  | 1 69. For all these   | reasons, Plaintiffs' rights, status, and other legal relations are directly |  |  |
|----|---|---|--|--|
| 2  | 2 affected by the Ban, and t  | hey are thus entitled to a "declaration of rights, status or other legal    |  |  |
| 3  | 3 relations thereunder." See  | relations thereunder." See A.R.S. § 12-1832.                                |  |  |
| 4  | 4   | PRAYER FOR RELIEF   |  |  |
| 5  | 5 WHEREFORE, Pla  | intiffs respectfully request the following relief against Defendant:        |  |  |
| 6  | 6 A. That the C   | ourt issue a declaratory judgment declaring that the Ban is                 |  |  |
| 7  | unconstitutional in violation of article II, section 8.1 of the Arizona Constitution; |   |  |  |
| 8  | B. For a permar   | nent injunction enjoining Defendant from enforcing the Ban;                 |  |  |
| 9  | 9 C. For an order   | awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees under the private attorney        |  |  |
| 10 | general doctrine or any applicable statute or common law doctrine;                    |   |  |  |
| 11 | 11 D. For an order  | awarding Plaintiffs their taxable costs under A.R.S. §§ 12-341 and          |  |  |
| 12 | 12   12-1840; and   |   |  |  |
| 13 | E. For any other  | r relief as may be appropriate.   |  |  |
| 14 | Dated: December 3, 2024   | PERKINS COIE LLP  |  |  |
| 15 | 15  | By: /s/ Karin Scherner Aldama   |  |  |
| 16 | 16  | Karin Scherner Aldama<br>Kristine J. Beaudoin                               |  |  |
| 17 |   | Isabella Stoutenburg Barry G. Stratford                                     |  |  |
| 18 |   | Christopher D. Thomas 2525 East Camelback Road, Suite 500                   |  |  |
| 19 |   | Phoenix, Arizona 85016-4227<br>Telephone: 602.351.8000                      |  |  |
| 20 |   | Facsimile: 602.648.7000<br>KAldama@perkinscoie.com                          |  |  |
| 21 |   | KBeaudoin@perkinscoie.com IStoutenburg@perkinscoie.com                      |  |  |
| 22 |   | BStratford@perkinscoie.com<br>CThomas@perkinscoie.com                       |  |  |
| 23 |   | Attorneys for Plaintiffs  |  |  |
| 24 | <sup>24</sup>   |   |  |  |
| '  | •••   |   |  |  |

1 Jared Keenan Lauren Beall 2 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION FOUNDATION OF ARIZONA 3 P. O. Box 17148 Phoenix, Arizona 85011 4 Telephone: 602.650.1854 jkeenan@acluaz.org 5 lbeall@acluaz.org 6 Rebecca Chan\* Johanna Zacarias\* 7 AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION **FOUNDATION** 8 125 Broad Street, 18th Floor New York, New York 10004 9 Telephone: 212.549.2633 10 rebeccac@aclu.org jzacarias@aclu.org 11 Attorneys for Eric M. Reuss, M.D., M.P.H. 12 Gail Deady\* Olivia Roat\* 13 CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS 14 199 Water Street, 22nd Floor New York, New York 10038 15 Telephone: 917.637.3600 gdeady@reprorights.org 16 oroat@reprorights.org 17 Cici Coquillette\* 18 **CENTER FOR REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS** 19 1634 I Street NW Washington, DC 20006 20 Telephone: 917.637.3651 ccoquillette@reprorights.org 21 Attorneys for Paul A. Isaacson, M.D. 22 23 24

Catherine Peyton Humphreville\*
Valentina De Fex\*
PLANNED PARENTHOOD
FEDERATION OF AMERICA

123 William Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor New York, New York 10038 Telephone: 929.561.9668 catherine.humphreville@ppfa.org valentina.defex@ppfa.org

Attorneys for Planned Parenthood Arizona, Inc.

\*Pro hac vice forthcoming

# Verification I, Eric M. Reuss, M.D., M.P.H., state as follows: I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, and I am acquainted with the facts stated therein. To the best of my knowledge, the facts set forth in the foregoing Complaint are true and accurate. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 23rd day of November, 2024. En fem mo Eric M. Reuss, M.D., M.P.H.

# Verification

I, Paul A. Isaacson, M.D., state as follows:

I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, and I am acquainted with the facts stated therein. To the best of my knowledge, the facts set forth in the foregoing Complaint are true and accurate.

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

Executed this John of MOKMBer, 2024.

Paul A. Isaacson, M.D.

# Verification

I, April Donovan, state as follows:

I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief, and I am acquainted with the facts stated therein. To the best of my knowledge, the facts set forth in the foregoing Complaint are true and accurate.

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

Executed this 21 day of November, 2024.

April Donovan, Interim President and Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operating Officer, for Planned Parenthood Arizona, Inc.