FILED SUPREME COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON 8/3/2022 4:18 PM BY ERIN L. LENNON CLERK

No. 100921-6

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

GERALD HANKERSON, Appellant,

v.

STEVE HOBBS,¹ in his official capacity as Secretary of State of Washington,

Respondent.

APPELLANT'S ANSWER TO MEMORANDUM OF AMICUS CURIAE WASHINGTON COMMUNITY ACTION NETWORK

Thomas F. Ahearne, WSBA No. 14844 Foster Garvey PC 1111 Third Avenue, suite 3000 Seattle, WA 98101 Telephone: (206) 447-8934/447-4400

Telefax: (206) 749-1902/447-9700 E-mail: ahearne@foster.com Attorneys for Appellant

FG:100520967.4

¹ Former Secretary of State Kim Wyman was the original plaintiff below; current Secretary of State Steve Hobbs substituted in as plaintiff/respondent after he succeeded Secretary Wyman on November 22, 2021.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TAB	LE OF AUTHORITIES i	ii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	THE SECRETARY'S EDICT	1
III.	PA-TAY-TOE	4
IV.	PA-TAH-TOE	4
V	CONCLUSION	5

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CONSTITUTION

Washington State Constitution, Article I, §4	passim
Washington State Constitution, Article II, §1	passim
Washington State Constitution, Article IV, §4	2-3
CASES	
Seattle School District No. 1 v. State, 90 Wn.2d 476, 503, 269 P.3d 227 (1978)	7-8
State v. Huntley, 175 Wn.2d 901, 914, 287 P.3d 584 (2012)	8
COURT RULES	
RAP 18.17	9
OTHER AUTHORITIES	
Pa-tay-toe/pa-tah-to Saturday Night Live <u>full</u> segment at https://iheartjimmy.wordpress.com/tag/christop	1
her-walken/ Pa-tay-toe/pa-tah-to Saturday Night Live <u>partial</u> segment at https://youtu.be/3a9BO_BN0Ro	

I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

There's more than one way to say the same word.

Potato can be said "pa-tay-toe" or "pa-tah-toe". Tomato can be said "ta-may-toe" or "ta-mah-toe". (This situation is so common there's even a Saturday Night Live skit about it.²)

Similarly here, the Washington Community Action Network's *amicus* memorandum shows there's more than one way to describe the plaintiff Secretary of State's violation of rights guaranteed by Article II, §1 and Article I, §4 of our Washington State Constitution.

II. THE SECRETARY'S EDICT

The plaintiff Secretary of State never examined the DocuSign system at issue to learn how it requires each voter's initiative petition signature to be handwritten or how DocuSign

² See https://youtu.be/3a9BO_BN0Ro (partial segment); https://iheartjimmy.wordpress.com/tag/christopher-walken/ (full segment).

prints the signed initiative petition for the initiative sponsor to submit to the Secretary of State.³

Instead, the Secretary of State sued initiative sponsor Hankerson for a declaratory judgment that the Secretary has the "discretion" to summarily refuse to consider the handwritten signature of any Washington voter seeking to exercise his or her constitutional right to petition if that voter uses the DocuSign handwritten signature system in this case.

And then the Secretary blocked initiative sponsor Hankerson's attempts to secure a judicial resolution of the Secretary's "discretion" claim before the deadline for submitting signatures: First, by successfully opposing the initiative sponsor's request for timely resolution in this Supreme Court (the direct action suit he had promptly filed).⁴ Then, by

³ Indeed, the Secretary's sworn testimony confirms that her office never even looked at the DocuSign signature system before summarily rejecting it. CP 291:21-292:17, 318:6-326:9.

⁴ Less than 24 hours after receiving the Secretary's rejection, initiative sponsor Hankerson filed an Article IV, §4 Petition Against State Officer in this Court. CP 558 at ¶12; CP 456-518

successfully opposing the initiative sponsor's request for timely resolution in the trial court (his motion for an expedited summary judgment schedule).⁵

Put bluntly, the Secretary's preemptive impairment and suppression of Washington voters' exercising their constitutional right to petition was <u>blind</u> – for that preemptive edict was issued without the Secretary's bothering to see how the DocuSign system requires a voter's initiative petition signature to be handwritten or how DocuSign prints the signed petitions for the initiative sponsor to submit to the Secretary of State.

⁽Supreme Court no. 99050-6). This Court dismissed his direct action suit based on the Secretary's argument that her declaratory judgment lawsuit in the superior court provided him a "plain, speedy, adequate remedy at law." CP 398-399 (Secretary's demanding dismissal on the grounds that her declaratory judgment suit provided a "Plain, Speedy, and Adequate Remedy at Law"); CP 164-165 (Supreme Court Commissioner granting dismissal on the grounds that the Secretary's declaratory judgment suit provided Petitioner "a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law").

⁵ CP 596-598.

III. <u>PA-TAY-TOE</u>

Initiative sponsor Hankerson does not repeat his prior filings here. But using the terminology noted in Part I above, he says *pa-tay-toe*. He describes the Secretary's blindly impairing and suppressing Washington voters' constitutional right to petition for the enactment of legislation by initiative as a failure to actually exercise discretion — for a government official's rejecting something without even looking at it is not giving due consideration to the facts in that situation. Petition For Review By The Washington Supreme Court, Parts III, IV, & VI.

IV. <u>*PA-TAH-TOE*</u>

The Washington Community Action Network describes the legal flaw in the Secretary's "discretion" claim another way. Its *amicus* memorandum describes the unlawfulness of the Secretary's blind impairment and suppression of Washington voters' constitutional right to petition as failing to survive the strict scrutiny required when a State officer infringes upon a

fundamental constitutional right.⁶ That point makes sense, for neither the Secretary of State nor the lower court applied any scrutiny to the Secretary's summary rejection of the DocuSign system - choosing instead ignore how the DocuSign system requires a voter's initiative petition signature to be handwritten, how the Secretary's sworn testimony confirmed that the verification standard used to evaluate the validity of a voter's initiative petition signature can be equally applied to a wet ink signature collected *on paper* or a handwritten signature collected on line with the DocuSign system in this case, or how DocuSign prints the signed petitions for the initiative sponsor to submit to the Secretary of State. No scrutiny is not any scrutiny – strict or otherwise.

V. CONCLUSION

Marginalized citizens – be they initiative sponsor Hankerson, his fellow NAACP members, or disadvantage

⁶ Amicus Memorandum at 9-16.

individuals represented by the *amicus* Washington Community Action Network – are an electoral minority in our State's democracy. And unfortunately, they are therefore familiar with their rights being summarily marginalized, disregarded, and infringed by "discretionary" decisions of elected officials.

But in a <u>constitutional</u> democracy, the constitutional rights of disadvantaged citizens are supposed to matter more than money, expedience, or political power.

Yes, the plaintiff Secretary could prevail if Washington law empowers a State officer to suppress a disadvantaged voter's constitutional right to petition for the enactment of legislation by initiative based on that officer's blind speculation about the DocuSign system summarily rejected in this case.

But the initiative sponsor in this case agrees with the Washington Community Action Network that Washington law does <u>not</u> empower State officers to blindly impair or infringe upon fundamental constitutional rights.

Failure to <u>exercise</u> discretion. Failure to satisfy strict <u>scrutiny</u>. *Pa-tay-toe*. *Pa-tah-toe*. In this situation, the constitutional violation of voters' first, foremost, and fundamental right to petition under the unique guarantee of Washington Article II, §1 and Article I, §4 is the same.

And as this Court has long recognized, it is this Court's duty to uphold our State Constitution. E.g., Seattle School District No. 1 v. State, 90 Wn.2d 476, 503, 269 P.3d 227 (1978) ("the judiciary has the ultimate power and the duty to interpret, construe and give meaning to words, sections, and articles of the constitution" – even "when an interpretation serves as a check on the activities of another branch of government or is contrary to the view of the constitution taken by another branch", and reiterating that this Court's ultimate power and duty to interpret the Washington Constitution invokes "a judicial issue rather than a matter to be left to legislative discretion"); State v. Huntley, 175 Wn.2d 901, 914, 287 P.3d 584 (2012) ("The legislature may

change a <u>statutory</u> interpretation, but it cannot modify or impair a judicial interpretation of the <u>constitution</u>") (underlines added).

Initiative sponsor Hankerson accordingly agrees with the Washington Community Action Network that this Court should not silently sit on the sidelines in this case. The petitioning initiative sponsor in this case agrees with the Washington Community Action Network that this Court should not abdicate its ultimate power and duty to review and rule upon the constitutional issue noted in the pending Petition For Review.

RAP 18.17(b) & (c)(9) Word Limit Certification:

I certify that this Answer, exclusive of words contained in the appendices, the title sheet, the table of contents, the table of authorities, the certificate of compliance, the certificate of service, signature blocks, and pictorial images (e.g., photographs, maps, diagrams, and exhibits), contains 1122 words (less than 2500).

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 3rd day of August, 2022.

Foster Garvey PC

<u>s/ Thomas F. Ahearne</u>Thomas F. Ahearne, WSBA No. 14844Attorneys for the Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington, that on this date I served a true and correct copy of the attached document, via electronic mail, on the following:

Attorneys for Secretary of State	
Karl David Smith Tera M. Heintz Deputy Solicitors General Cristina Sepe Assistant Attorney General Karl.smith@atg.wa.gov Tera.Heintz@atg.wa.gov Cristina.Sepe@atg.wa.gov Leena.Vanderwood@atg.wa.gov	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service ECF
Attorney for Michael McKee Joel B. Ard ARD LAW GROUP PLLC PO Box 11633 Bainbridge Island, WA 98110 Phone: (206) 701-9243 Joel@ard.law	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF
Attorney for Kan Qiu Arthur A. Simpson DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE 920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300 Seattle, WA 98104-1610 Phone: (206) 622-3150 arthursimpson@dwt.com margaretsinnott@dwt.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF

Attorney for Julia Bobadilla-Melby		
Salvador A. Mungia		
Robert C. Wilke		Via U.S. Mail
GORDON THOMAS HONEYWELL,		Via Certified
LLP	H	Mail Via Massangar
One Union Square	H	Via Messenger Via Email
600 University, Suite 2100		Via E-Service /
Seattle, WA 98101-4185		ECF
Phone: (206) 676-7500		
smungia@gth-law.com		
rwilke@gth-law.com		
tzumach@gth-law.com		
scampbell@gth-law.com		
Co-Sponsor of Initiative 1234		
Jesse Wineberry, Sr.		Via U.S. Mail
10223 59th Ave. South		Via Certified Mail
Seattle, WA 98178		Via Messenger Via Email
jcwlawman@yahoo.com		Via Email
		Via E-Service / ECF
Sponsor of Initiatives 1115 and 1116		
Tim Eyman		Via U.S. Mail
PO Box 6151		Via Certified Mail
Olympia, WA 98507		Via Messenger Via Email
Phone: (425) 590-9363		Via Email
tim.eyman@gmail.com		Via E-Service / ECF
		LCI
Sponsor of Initiatives 1234 and 1252		
Livio De La Cruz		Via U.S. Mail
6189 NE Redford Dr. #1911	H	Via Certified
Seattle, WA 98115		Mail Via Messenger
Phone: (206) 617-6786		Via Email
livio@blacklivesseattle.org		Via E-Service /
_		ECF

Sponsor of Initiative 1113 Karim Ali 11303 30th Street Northeast Lake Stevens, WA 98258 Phone: (425) 344-6262 Karim@equalityrealty.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF
Sponsor of Initiatives 1097, 1098, 1099, 1100, 1101, 1102, 1103, 1104, 1105, 1107, and 1108 Larry Jensen 15356 Produce Ln Mount Vernon, WA 98273 Phone: (360) 466-8249 lrayjensen@hotmail.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF
Sponsor of Initiatives 1106 and 1109 Georgene Faries 4628 226th Pl NE Arlington, WA 98223 Phone: (425) 232-3092 scottandgeorgene@gmail.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF
sponsor of Initiative 1118 Demond Johnson 1520 N Laventure Rd Apt 215 Mount Vernon, WA 98273 Phone: (716) 474-6252 johnson.demond2017@gmail.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF

Sponsor of Initiatives 1243, 1244,	
1245, and 1246 April Featherkile 1430 2nd St Wenatchee, WA 98801 Phone: (509) 667-0867 afeatherkile@gmail.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF
Sponsor of an unassigned initiative Clint Rhoades 4603 NE 18th Cir Renton, WA 98059 Phone: (253) 350-9702 caboosesix@gmail.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF
Sponsor of Initiatives 1117, 1119, and 1123 Regis Costello 14462 58th Ave So Tukwila, WA 98168 Phone: (206) 246-3147 regiscostello@comcast.net	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF
Sponsor of Initiatives 1120, 1200, and 1234 Dr. Terryl Ross 20221 Aurora Ave. N #114 Shoreline, WA 98133 Phone: (541) 740-6457 terrylross2020@gmail.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service / ECF

Co-sponsor of Initiative 1234 Lynn French 37610 30th Pl S Federal Way, WA 98003 Phone: (206) 786-2780 lynndfrench@live.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service ECF
Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Washington Community Action Network Donald V. Scaramastra Miller Nash LLP 2801 Alaskan Way, Ste 300 Seattle, WA 98121 Phone: (206) 624-8300 don.scaramastra@millernash.com	Via U.S. Mail Via Certified Mail Via Messenger Via Email Via E-Service ECF

DATED this 3rd day of August, 2022 at Tacoma, Washington.

/s/McKenna Filler McKenna Filler, Legal Practice Assistant

FOSTER GARVEY PC

August 03, 2022 - 4:18 PM

Transmittal Information

Filed with Court: Supreme Court

Appellate Court Case Number: 100,921-6

Appellate Court Case Title: Kim Wyman v. Gerald Hankerson, et al.

Superior Court Case Number: 20-2-02054-8

The following documents have been uploaded:

1009216_Briefs_20220803161705SC156668_7441.pdf

This File Contains:

Briefs - Answer to Amicus Curiae

The Original File Name was Appellant s Answer to Memorandum of Amicus Curiae Washington

Community Action Network .pdf

A copy of the uploaded files will be sent to:

- Alicia.Mendoza@atg.wa.gov
- Don.Scaramastra@MillerNash.com
- Karim@equalityrealty.com
- MNGD-7563@millernash.com
- afeatherkile@gmail.com
- · alicia.mendoza@ago.wa.gov
- arthursimpson@dwt.com
- caboosesix@gmail.com
- cristina.sepe@atg.wa.gov
- jcwlawman@yahoo.com
- joel@ard.law
- johnson.demond2017@gmail.com
- karl.smith@atg.wa.gov
- litdocket@foster.com
- livio@blacklivesseattle.org
- lrayjensen@hotmail.com
- megangalloway@dwt.com
- regiscostello@comcast.net
- rwilke@gth-law.com
- scottandgeorgene@gmail.com
- sgoolyef@atg.wa.gov
- smungia@gth-law.com
- sweger@gth-law.com
- tera.heintz@atg.wa.gov
- terrylross2020@gmail.com
- tim.eyman@gmail.com

Comments:

Appellant s Answer to Memorandum of Amicus Curiae Washington Community Action Network

Sender Name: Thomas Ahearne - Email: ahearne@foster.com

Address:

1111 3RD AVE STE 3000 SEATTLE, WA, 98101-3296

Phone: 206-447-8934

Note: The Filing Id is 20220803161705SC156668