FILED Gary Harrison CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT 4/12/2022 9:57:02 AM

BY: ARTHUR ROBLES /S/ DEPUTY

Case No. C20221370 HON. INTERIM DIVISION 1

Timothy A. La Sota, SBN 020539 TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC

2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305

Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Telephone: (602) 515-2649 Email: tim@timlasota.com

Attorney for Plaintiff

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

### SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA

#### **PIMA COUNTY**

RAFAEL "RAY" A. IHLY, individually; CHERYL CASWELL, individually, ANASTASIOS TSATSAKIS, individually, SUZANNE JENKINS, individually, EILEEN WILSON, individually, LEIANN ANDERSON, individually, ROBERT MONTGOMERY, individually, ELIZABETH SPECK, individually, RONALD HART, individually, PAULINE HART, individually, and BOBBY WILSON, individually,

No.

APPLICATION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Plaintiffs,

VS.

SHELLY KAIS, individually,

Defendant.

### I. APPLICATION

Pursuant to Rule 65 of the Arizona Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs respectfully move this Court for a temporary restraining order enjoining the Defendant, Shelly Kais, from taking any action to hold an unlawful purported organizational meeting of the Legislative District 19 Republican Party committee. The proper organizational meeting has already held, pursuant to A.R.S. § 16-823.

The following memorandum of points and authorities supports this Application and Motion.

# II. DEFENDANT IS UNLAWFULLY ATTEMPTING TO USURP THE POWERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT 19 REPUBLICAN PARTY COMMITTEE

As stated in the Verified Complaint, Defendant Kais is attempting to usurp powers that are assigned to Plaintiff Rafael Ihly under Arizona statutory law as the chairman of the Legislative District 19 Republic Party committee. The Plaintiffs are entitled to relief.

## III. A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER WITH NOTICE IS WARRANTED

"The purpose of a temporary restraining order is to preserve the status quo before a preliminary injunction hearing may be held ...." *Lokosky v. Gass in and for County of Maricopa*, 2018 WL 3150499, at \*2 (Ariz.App. 2018).

In our case, a temporary restraining order is necessary to preserve the status quo. This is not a complicated legal issue and the law is clear, as outlined in the Verified Complaint. That is, under the statute the district chairman is responsible for calling the meeting to reorganize a legislative district committee after a redistricting by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission. A.R.S. § 16-823. There is no role under the statute for a county party chairman. And having two different people call meetings is exactly why the statute only specifies one person, the district chairman, to call the meeting. If two people call two separate meetings then it is unclear which is the lawful meeting that "counts" in terms of transaction business.

If Defendant Kais is permitted to proceed with her scheduled April 18, 2022 unlawful meeting, it will sow confusion. There will be two separate slates of officers elected and then a decision will have to be made as to which one to recognize. And it is unclear who would make such a decision, although it would likely be the Court.

This problem can be avoided with a minimally burdensome temporary restraining order that simply puts Defendant Kais' plans to hold a meeting on hold until this matter can be adjudicated pursuant to Plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction. The ruling on that will likely end this matter. This is matter involves strictly a question of law, and there is no reason the preliminary injunction hearing cannot be combined with trial on the merits.

### V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff asks that this Court enter the proposed temporary restraining order.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 12th day of April, 2022.

TIMOTHY A. LA SOTA, PLC

Bv:

Timothy A. La Sota, SBN 020539

2198 East Camelback Road, Suite 305

Phoenix, Arizona 85016

Telephone: (602) 515-2649 Email: <u>tim@timlasota.com</u>

Attorney for Plaintiff