FILED Electronically CV24-01437 2024-06-27 02:51:38 PM Alicia L. Lerud Clerk of the Court viloria

1	Mark H. Hutchings, Esq.	2024-06-27 02:51:38 PM Alicia L. Lerud
1	Nevada Bar No. 12783	Clerk of the Court
2	John B. Lanning, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 15585	Transaction # 10421181 : yvi
3	HUTCHINGS LAW GROUP	
0	400 South 4 th Street, Suite 550	
4	Las Vegas, Nevada 89101	
5	Phone: (702) 660-7700	
	Fax: (702) 552-5202	
6	<u>mhutchings@hutchingslawgroup.com</u> john@hutchingslawgroup.com	
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff	
0		
8	IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRIC	T COURT OF THE SATE OF NEVADA
9	IN AND FOR THE CO	
10	LILITH BARAN, an individual;	
	LILITTI DARAN, ali individual,	
11	Plaintiff,	Case No. CV24-01437
12		Dept. No. 15
10	v.	•
13	CARI ANN BURGESS, individually and in her	<i>EX PARTE</i> MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER ON ORDER
14	official capacity as Registrar of Voters; MIKKI	SHORTENING TIME
15	HUNTSMAN, individually and in her capacity as	ILEADING DEGUESTEDI
15	city clerk for the City of Reno; CITY OF RENO	[HEARING REQUESTED]
16	NEVADA, a political subdivision of the state of	
17	Nevada; WASHOE COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, a government agency; ERIC BROWN,	
17	individually and in his official capacity as	
18	Washoe County Manager; ALEXIS HILL,	
19	individually and in her official capacity as	
	Chairwoman of the Washoe County Board of Commissioners; WASHOE COUNTY, a political	
20	subdivision of the state of Nevada; FRANCISCO	
21	AGUILAR, individually and in his official	
าา	capacity as Secretary of State; NEVADA	
22	SECRETARY OF STATE, a political subdivision	
23	of the state of Nevada; NEVADA ATTORNEY GENERAL; a political subdivision of the state of	
24	Nevada; AARON FORD, individually and in his	
	capacity as Nevada Attorney General; DOES I	
25	through X; and ROE BUSINESS ENTITIES I	
26	through X, inclusive,	
	Defendants.	
27		
28		
	1	

COMES NOW, Plaintiff LILITH BARAN, by and through her counsel of record, Mark H.
 Hutchings, Esq. and John B. Lanning, Esq. of the law firm Hutchings Law Group, and hereby moves
 this Court for a Temporary Restraining Order preventing Defendants Cari Ann Burgess, Mikki
 Huntsman, City of Reno, Washoe County Registrar of Voters, Eric Brown, Alexis Hill, Washoe
 County, Francisco Aguilar, Nevada Secretary of State, Nevada Attorney General, and Aaron Ford, and
 any of them, from conducting the recount of votes requested by Plaintiff prior to a ruling from this
 Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

8 This Motion is made and based upon the attached Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the
9 Declaration of John B. Lanning, Esq., the attached exhibits, and such argument and evidence as may
10 be presented at the hearing on this Motion.

11 Dated: June 27, 2024.

HUTCHINGS LAW GROUP 400 SOUTH 4TH STREET, SUITE 550 LAS VEGAS, NV 89101

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HUTCHINGS LAW GROUP

/s/ John B. Lanning

By:

Mark H. Hutchings, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 12783 John B. Lanning, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 15585 400 South 4th Street, Suite 550 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101 Telephone: (702) 660-7700 <u>Mhutchings@HutchingsLawGroup.com</u> <u>John@HutchingsLawGroup.com</u> *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

<u>AFFIDAVIT OF JOHN B. LANNING, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF</u> <u>PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER ON AN</u> <u>ORDER SHORTENING TIME</u>

I, John B. Lanning, Esq., being first duly sworn, on his oath, deposes and says as follows:

1. I am over the age of 18, an attorney licensed to practice before all of the courts of the State of Nevada, and an associate attorney with Hutchings Law Group.

6

2.

1

2

3

4

5

I represent the Plaintiff in the above-captioned matter, Lilith Baran.

7 3. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below based upon my review of the
8 publicly recorded documents in this matter, except for those factual statements expressly made upon
9 information and belief, and as to those facts, I believe them to be true, and I am competent to testify.

10 4. I make this declaration in support of Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* Motion for a Temporary
11 Restraining Order on an Order Shortening Time.

5. This Motion seeks to Restrain Defendants CARI ANN BURGESS, MIKKI
 HUNTSMAN, CITY OF RENO, WASHOE COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS, ERIC BROWN,
 ALEXIS HILL, WASHOE COUNTY, FRANCISCO AGUILAR, NEVADA SECRETARY OF
 STATE, NEVADA ATTORNEY GENERAL, and AARON FORD (hereinafter collectively referred
 to as "Defendants") from conducting the recount of votes cast in the June 11, 2024 Primary Election
 prior to a ruling from this Court on Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for a Preliminary Injunction on Order
 Shortening Time.

19 6. My office received an email correspondence from counsel for Defendant Cari Ann 20 Burgess stating that the Washoe County Registrar of Voters intends to conduct the recount Sunday, June 30, 2024. See Exhibit 1 (Emails with Washoe County DA) ("The observation room will be 21 22 opened at 7 a.m. Sunday, June 30, 2024, and the recount will then commence"). Additionally, news reports claim to have received statements from Defendant Cari Ann Burgess that the recounts the 23 Registrar "will finish weekend." 24 begin the recounts Friday and over the https://mynews4.com/news/local/primary-not-over-yet-3-recounts-election-contest-filed-in-washoe-25 26 county-whats-next.

27 7. Plaintiff has filed the required demand for recount and paid the estimated costs of the28 recount pursuant to NRS 293.403.

	1	8. This Order Shortening Time is necessary, given the fact that Defendants intend to			
	2	conduct the recount prior to a ruling from this Court on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction which			
	3	seeks clarification from this Court on the method by which said recount is to be conducted. There is a			
	4	legitimate question about the method by which the recount must be conducted. See Complaint;			
	5	Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Preliminary Injunction on Order Shortening Time. This Motion must			
	6	be heard as soon as possible to restrain Defendants from conducting the Recount prior to hearing on			
	7	Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Accordingly, an Order shortening time is necessary.			
	8	9. Declarant makes this request in good faith and without intent to delay. Further, there is			
	9	no risk of material prejudice to Defendants.			
	10	I declare under penalties of perjury under the laws of the State of Nevada that the foregoing is			
ď	11	true and correct.			
W GROUP 1, SUITE 550 89101	12	FURTHER AFFIANT SAY NAUGHT.			
AW G ET, SUIT V 89101	13				
H STREH GAS, N	14	JOHN B. LANNING, ESQ. HUTCHINGS LAW GROUP			
DUTH 4 ⁰ LAS VE	15	400 S. 4th Street, Suite 550 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101			
HUTCHINGS LAW GRC 400 SOUTH 4 TH STREET, SUITE 550 LAS VEGAS, NV 89101	16	Subscribed and sworn to before me, this 27 th day of June, 2024.			
IH	17 18	[Notary Seal]			
	19	An 16 Proven			
	20	[Signature of Notary] ANNA VEVERKA NOTARY PUBLIC			
	21	Ang Viverka My Commission Expires: 02-10-26			
	22	[Printed Name of Notary] NOTARY PUBLIC			
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				
	28				
		5 PLAINTIFF'S <i>EX PARTE</i> MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER			
		TEAM ON THE SEATTING TO			

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

1

2

Plaintiff ran in the primary election conducted in Washoe County on June 11, 2024. The 3 4 results of this election were certified by the Washoe Board of Commissioners on June 21, 2024. 5 Plaintiff sought to demand a recount. On June 25, 2024, Plaintiff demanded a recount as required by NRS 293.403 and the next day paid the required estimated costs of the recount. On June 25, 2024 6 Plaintiff, through counsel, reached out to Defendant Cari Ann Burgess and informed her that Plaintiff 7 8 sought to demand a recount of the primary election results. See Exhibit 1. Plaintiff also requested 9 that Defendant Burgess stipulated to performing the recount by hand instead of via machine, as a 10 physical inspection of the ballots is required under NRS 293.404. See id. Defendant Burgess, through 11 counsel, refused to stipulate to Plaintiff's demand and informed Plaintiff the recount would be 12 conducted with machines. Id.

Based on Defendant Burgess' refusal to stipulate, Plaintiff filed his Complaint in the Second
Judicial District Court, seeking declaratory relief concerning the method and procedure for the
recount. Plaintiff also filed an Ex Parte Motion for Preliminary Injunction on Order Shortening Time
seeking clarification from this Court on the method of the recount and NRS 293.404 prior to the
commencement of the recount. Defendants have been served on June 27, 2024 with copies of the
Complaint and Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

19 Despite the fact that Plaintiff has sought clarification from this Court, Defendants have made 20 clear their intention to conduct and conclude the recount prior to any ruling from this Court. In email 21 correspondence, Defendant Burgess through counsel informed the undersigned that the recount would 22 commence on Sunday June 30, 2024. Exhibit 1. Additionally, Defendant Burgess has also made 23 statements to the media stating that the recount would begin on Friday and be completed over the 24 weekend. https://mynews4.com/news/local/primary-not-over-yet-3-recounts-election-contest-filed-inwashoe-county-whats-next. Based on these statements, Plaintiff now believes that Defendants are 25 26 seeking to conduct the recount in a manner that conflicts with the applicable Nevada Revised Statutes 27 prior to ruling from this Court on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction. This Motion follows to restrain and prevent the Defendants from commencing the recount until such time as this Court can 28

6

1 rule on Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for a Preliminary Injunction on Order Shortening Time.

II. LAW & ARGUMENT

2

3 NRS 33.010 provides that an injunction, including a temporary restraining order, may be 4 granted, "[w]hen it shall appear by the complaint or affidavit that the commission or continuance of 5 some act, during the litigation, would produce great or irreparable injury to the plaintiff' or "[w]hen it 6 shall appear, during the litigation, that the defendant is doing or threatens, or is about to do, or is 7 procuring or suffering to be done, some act in violation of the plaintiff's rights respecting the subject of the action, and tending to render the judgment ineffectual." NRCP 65(b) further grants this Court 8 9 authority to "... issue a temporary restraining order without written or oral notice to the adverse party or its attorney only if . . . specific facts in an affidavit or a verified complaint clearly show that 10 11 immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party 12 can be heard in opposition; and . . . the movant's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required." The decision regarding whether to grant a 13 14 temporary restraining order is in the sound discretion of the court and will only be overturned on appeal 15 upon a showing of an abuse of discretion or reliance on an erroneous legal standard. See, e.g., Coronet Homes v. Mylan, 84 Nev. 435, 437, 442 P.2d 901, 902 (1968)(citing Thorn v. Sweeney, 12 Nev. 251 16 17 (1877)); see also Univ. & Cmty. Coll. Sys. of Nev. v. Nevadans for Sound Gov't, 120 Nev. 712, 721, 18 100 P.3d 179, 187 (2004).

19 NRCP 65(b)(2) provides that:

Every temporary restraining order issued without notice must state the date and hour it was issued; describe the injury and state why it is irreparable; state why the order was issued without notice; and be promptly filed in the clerk's office and entered in the record. The order expires at the time after entry — not to exceed 14 days — that the court sets

- **23** Further, NRCP 65(b)(3) provides that:
- If the order is issued without notice, the motion for a preliminary injunction must be set for hearing at the earliest possible time, taking precedence over all other matters except hearings on older matters of the same character.
- **26** Finally, NRCP 65(c) provides that
- 27 The court may issue a . . . temporary restraining order only if the movant gives security in an amount that the court considers proper to pay the costs and damages sustained by any party found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained.

PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

A. Plaintiff Will Suffer Immediate, Irreparable Harm Absent a TRO

2 Here, Plaintiff is seeking a Temporary Restraining Order prohibiting Defendants from 3 commencing with the recount until this Court can resolve the dispute between the parties concerning 4 the method and manner of that recount. Absent a Temporary Restraining Order, Plaintiff will imminent, irreparable harm for which compensatory damages will not be an appropriate remedy. A 5 temporary restraining order to preserve the *status quo* is available where the movant shows that, "... 6 7 immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party 8 can be heard in opposition. NRCP 65(b)(1)(A); see also State ex rel. Friedman v. Eighth Judicial Dist. 9 Court, 81 Nev. 131, 134, 399 P.2d 632, 633 (1965). Here, the immediate and irreparable harm is the fact that Defendants will proceed with their race to the finish line to complete the recount prior to any 10 11 ruling from this Court.

12 Absent a Temporary Restraining Order, Defendants will, as they have expressed their intent to do, complete the recount over the weekend. See Exhibit 1; https://mynews4.com/news/local/primary-13 not-over-yet-3-recounts-election-contest-filed-in-washoe-county-whats-next. This will result in 14 15 immediate, irreparable harm to Plaintiff who will be deprived of a recount by the means prescribed by NRS 293.404. Defendants are aware of Plaintiff's Complaint and Motion for Preliminary Injunction. 16 17 Instead of waiting for direction from this Court on the manner and method of recount, Defendants are 18 seeking to subvert Plaintiff's Complaint and complete the recount prior to intervention from this Court 19 and any ruling on the Preliminary Injunction. Accordingly, a Temporary Restraining Order is 20 necessary to restrain Defendants and prevent them from conducting the Recount until such a time as the Court can hear Plaintiff's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction and issue an order on the method 21 22 and manner of the recount.

23

B. There is a High Likelihood of Success on the Merits of Plaintiff's Claims

Here, the analysis for the likelihood of success on the merits of Plaintiff's claims is the same
analysis put forth in Subsection II.B of Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for a Preliminary Injunction on
Order Shortening Time. *See* Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Preliminary Injunction on Order
Shortening Time at p.10 line 2 through page 14 line 23. As set forth therein and incorporated herein
by reference, Plaintiff's likelihood of success on the merits is strong and is based primarily on the

clearly articulated requirements of NRS Chapter 293. In sum, a justiciable controversy exists between 1 the parties concerning the requirements of NRS 293.404(3). Defendants have taken the position that 2 despite the requirement for an "inspection of the ballots," the recount need only be conducted via a 3 machine recount. Plaintiff takes the position that an inspection of the ballots requires a hand recount. 4 5 Furthermore, there is significant reason to doubt the accuracy of the results certified on June 21, 2024. Accordingly, Plaintiff enjoys a high likelihood of success on his claim for declaratory relief. A more 6 in-depth analysis of Plaintiff's likelihood of success is included in Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for 7 8 Preliminary Injunction on Order Shortening Time at p.10 line 2 through page 14 line 23, which has 9 been omitted herein for the sake of brevity.

10

HUTCHINGS LAW GROUP 400 SOUTH 4TH STREET, SUITE 550 LAS VEGAS, NV 89101

C. The TRO Sought by Plaintiff is Warranted, With Minimal Bond

11 NRCP 65(c) requires Plaintiff to post security "in such sum as the court deems proper, for the 12 payment of such costs and damages as may be incurred or suffered by any party who is found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained." Here, the restraint of Defendants ability to conduct the 13 recount pending a hearing on Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, even if it were ultimately 14 15 found wrongful, would not result in any damage beyond *de minimus* inconvenience to Defendants. As noted previously, Plaintiff has already furnished Defendants with the full estimated cost of the recount, 16 17 as required by statute. As such, a minimal bond in the amount of \$100 is appropriate for issuance of 18 the temporary restraining order sought hereby.

19 /// 20 111 21 111 22 /// 23 /// 24 | | | 25 /// 26 /// 27 /// 28 ///

1 III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein, and the facts set forth in the affidavit of John B. Lanning, Esq.
attached hereto and the Verified Complaint on file in this matter, Plaintiff's *Ex Parte* Motion for
Temporary Restraining Order should be granted pending a hearing on Plaintiffs Motion for Preliminary
Injunction pursuant to NRCP 65(b)(3).

6 Dated: June 27, 2024.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

HUTCHINGS LAW GROUP

/s/ John B. Lanning

By:

Mark H. Hutchings, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 12783 John B. Lanning, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 15585 400 South 4th Street, Suite 550 Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: (702) 660-7700 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

HUTCHINGS LAW GROUP 400 SOUTH 4TH STREET, SUITE 550 LAS VEGAS, NV 89101