

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**MARK BRNOVICH**  
**ATTORNEY GENERAL**  
(Firm State Bar No. 14000)

Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 15838)  
Brunn (Beau) W. Roysden III (No. 28698)  
Drew C. Ensign (No. 25463)  
Robert J. Makar (No. 33579)  
2005 N. Central Ave  
Phoenix, AZ 85004-1592  
Phone: (602) 542-8958  
[Joe.Kanefield@azag.gov](mailto:Joe.Kanefield@azag.gov)  
[Beau.Roysden@azag.gov](mailto:Beau.Roysden@azag.gov)  
[Drew.Ensign@azag.gov](mailto:Drew.Ensign@azag.gov)  
[Robert.Makar@azag.gov](mailto:Robert.Makar@azag.gov)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff State of Arizona*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

STATE OF ARIZONA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JANET YELLEN, in her official capacity  
as Secretary of the Treasury, et al.;  
Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-00514-DJH

**MOTION FOR CONSOLIDATION  
UNDER RULE 65(A)(2)**

1 **MOTION**

2 The State of Arizona (“State”) respectfully moves for consolidation of trial on the  
3 merits with the upcoming June 22 hearing on the State’s motion for a preliminary  
4 injunction (Doc. 11). Good cause supports this request for four reasons.<sup>1</sup>

5 *First*, consolidation will serve the interests of judicial economy. The issues  
6 presented here are almost exclusively legal and no facts appear to be genuinely contested.  
7 Moreover, the issues for preliminary and permanent injunctive relief are nearly identical:  
8 “The standard for a preliminary injunction is essentially the same as for a permanent  
9 injunction with the exception that the plaintiff must show a likelihood of success on the  
10 merits rather than actual success.” *Amoco Prod. Co. v. Village of Gambell, AK*, 480 U.S.  
11 531, 546, n.12 (1987).

12 Conversely, a second round of briefing and hearings would needlessly waste the  
13 resources of the parties and this Court. If this Court wishes to have supplemental briefing  
14 on particular issues following the June 22 hearing, the State would be happy to submit  
15 such briefing. But simple repetition of existing arguments for permanent injunctive relief  
16 is completely avoidable, and should be avoided here.

17 *Second*, no actual trial should be required here so the granting this motion would  
18 merely consolidate consideration of all legal issues into a single hearing. None of the  
19 material factual issues appear to be disputed. Indeed, Federal Defendants did not submit  
20 even a scintilla of evidence in connection with their opposition to the State’s preliminary  
21 injunction motion, *see* Doc. 31—not one declaration, document, or other piece of  
22 evidence. It is thus far from clear that the Federal Defendants have even preserved the  
23 right to present live testimony and trial evidence without making the slightest evidentiary  
24 proffer in opposing the State’s motion for a preliminary injunction.

25 *Third*, the unfolding of the *Ohio v. Yellen* litigation demonstrates the wisdom of  
26 consolidation here. Without such consolidation, the parties filed a total of four separate  
27 briefs totaling nearly 100 pages regarding permanent injunctive relief—which

28 

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal Defendants have indicated that they “will file a response [the State’s] your motion after [the State has] filed it with the Court.”

1 substantially overlapped with the prior preliminary injunction briefing. Such duplicative  
2 briefing should be avoided here.

3 Moreover, the Federal Defendants specifically *consented* to resolution of  
4 *permanent* injunctive relief issues on the briefs alone. As set forth in the *Ohio* court's  
5 May 12 minute order:

6 "The parties agreed to a briefing schedule. Plaintiff to file Motion for  
7 Permanent Injunction of not more than 30 pages by 5/19/21; Defendants to  
8 file their combined Response to the Motion for Permanent Injunction and  
9 Motion to Dismiss of not more than 30 pages by 6/2/21; Plaintiff to file  
10 their combined Reply in Support of the Motion for Permanent Injunction  
and Response to the Motion to Dismiss of not more than 20 pages by  
6/7/21; Defendants to file their Reply in Support of the Motion to Dismiss  
of not more than 20 pages by 6/11/21."

11 There is no reason why the resolution of permanent injunctive relief on briefs alone that  
12 the Federal Defendants agreed to in *Ohio v. Yellen* is any less appropriate here in this  
13 case, which presents virtually identical issues.

14 *Fourth*, consolidation under Rule 65(a)(2) would obviate any need to resolve  
15 issues of the relative effectiveness of preliminary injunctive relief relative to permanent  
16 relief, which this Court identified in its June 11 Order, and which the *Ohio* court found  
17 significant in its May 12 order and opinion. Consolidation would thus simplify the issues  
18 presented, obviate the need for repetitive briefing, and prejudice no one.

### 19 CONCLUSION

20 For the foregoing reasons, the State's motion under Rule 65(a)(2) to consolidate  
21 trial on the merits with the June 22 preliminary injunction hearing should be granted.

22  
23 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 15th day of June, 2021.

24 **MARK BRNOVICH**  
25 **ATTORNEY GENERAL**

26 By s/ Drew C. Ensign

27 Joseph A. Kanefield (No. 15838)  
28 Brunn W. Roysden III (No. 28698)  
Drew C. Ensign (No. 25463)  
Robert J. Makar (No. 33579)

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Arizona*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 15th day of June, 2021, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the District of Arizona using the CM/ECF filing system. Counsel for all parties are registered CM/ECF users and will be served by the CM/ECF system pursuant to the notice of electronic filing.

s/ Drew C. Ensign  
*Attorney for the State of Arizona*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

STATE OF ARIZONA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JANET YELLEN, in her official capacity  
as Secretary of the Treasury et al.;  
Defendants.

No. 2:21-cv-00514-DJH  
**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Having considered the State’s Motion for Consolidation Under Rule 65(a)(2), **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED GRANTING** the Motion.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a)(2), trial on the merits in this matter is advanced to and consolidated with the hearing scheduled for June 22, 2021.

Dated this \_\_\_\_ day of June, 2021.