**IAFRATE & ASSOCIATES** 1 649 North Second Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85003 (602) 234-9775 3 Michele M. lafrate, #015115 miafrate@iafratelaw.com 4 Attorneys for **Defendants Joseph M. Arpaio and** 5 Maricopa County Sheriff's Office IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA 7 ) NO. CV07-02513-PHX-GMS 8 Manuel de Jesus Ortega Melendres, et al. 9 Plaintiffs, **DEFENDANTS JOSEPH M.** ARPAIO AND MARICOPA 10 VS. **COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE'S OBJECTION TO PROCEDURE** 11 Joseph M. Arpaio, et al., **SET FORTH BY COURT** 12 Defendants. 13 Defendants object to the procedure set forth in the Court's Amended Notice re 14 Document Request by the U.S. Department of Justice (Doc. 1134). 15 THE COURT'S AUTHORITY TO ISSUE ORDERS IS STAYED. 16 On May 22, 2015, Defendants filed a Motion for Recusal or Disgualification. 17 (Doc. 1117). During a status conference immediately following the filing, the Judge 18 acknowledged that the proceedings must be stayed until the issues in the Motion 19 were ruled upon. (Doc. 1130, p. 10). Further Plaintiffs' counsel agreed that "a stay 20 21 in the proceedings is appropriate while this motion is adjudicated". (Doc. 1130, p. 22 10:13-15). Following the conference, the Judge issued an Order indicating that "The 23 court shall issue no further orders until the Motion is fully briefed and/or a ruling has

been issued." (Doc. 1120). Despite staying the proceedings, on May 29, 2015, the

24

Court issued a Notice and Amended Notice (Docs. 1133 and 1134) directing procedures in the case. Due to the pending Motion, the Court exceeded its authority while the case is stayed.

## II. DEFENDANTS HAVE NOT SEEN THE REQUEST.

The Court states that the Court-appointed Monitor "received a request" from the U.S. Department of Justice. (Doc. 1134). Defendants are forced to respond to a proposed procedure by the Court without the opportunity to review the request.

Defendants are parties to this case. They should be afforded the ability to review the request and object or consent as appropriate.

## III. THE COURT IS AWARE OF A POTENTIAL INTELLECTUAL AND PRIVATE PROPERTY CLAIM.

On May 13, 2015, Dennis Montgomery filed his Supplemental Motion to Intervene, stating that the property in question (and now requested by the Department of Justice) is his property. (Doc. 1081). The Court is aware of this claim; therefore, at the least, Mr. Montgomery should be given the request and an opportunity to assert his property interest.

## IV. A NON-PARTY DOES NOT HAVE AUTHORITY TO REQUEST THESE DOCUMENTS.

The United States Department of Justice is not a party in this case. Without having seen the request for documents, it is unclear under what authority they assert a right to the documents.

The monitors were provided with a copy of the documents and drive.

However due to privacy concerns, the Court issued a protective order and before

1 their disclosure to others, the Court ordered the "monitor to coordinate with Ms. 2 lafrate in terms of attempting to characterize the documents." (Doc. 1086, pp. 3 33:21-34:5). This task has not occurred; however, the Court now orders the 4 documents disclosed to a non-party. Defendants object. 5 ٧. CONCLUSION 6 Based on the Court's Amended Notice, undersigned counsel objects to the 7 request and the procedure set forth. (Doc. 1134). 8 **DATED** this 29th day of May, 2015 9 **IAFRATE & ASSOCIATES** 10 11 By: <u>s/Michele M. lafrate</u> 12 Michele M. lafrate Attorney for **Defendants Joseph M.** 13 **Arpaio and Maricopa County Sheriff's** 14 Office 15 16 NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING AND CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 17 I certify that on May 29, 2015, I electronically filed Defendants Joseph M. 18 Arpaio and Maricopa County Sheriff's Office's Objection to Procedure Set Forth by 19 Court, with the Clerk of the Court for filing and uploading to the CM/ECF system 20 which will send notification of such filing to all parties of record. 21 22 23 By: s/Jill Lafornara 24