

No. __

In the Supreme Court of the United States

BEVERLY CLARNO, Oregon Secretary of State,

Applicant,

v.

PEOPLE NOT POLITICIANS OREGON; COMMON CAUSE; LEAGUE OF
WOMEN VOTERS OF OREGON; NAACP OF EUGENE/SPRINGFIELD;
INDEPENDENT PARTY OF OREGON; C. NORMAN TURRILL,

Respondents.

APPENDIX B
to Application for Stay

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
Order July 23, 2020

ELLEN F. ROSENBLUM
Attorney General
BENJAMIN GUTMAN*
Solicitor General
1162 Court St. NE
Salem, Oregon 97301-4096
Telephone: (503) 378-4402
benjamin.gutman@doj.state.or.us
Attorneys for Applicant

*Counsel of Record

July 29, 2020

1b

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUL 23 2020

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE NOT POLITICIANS OREGON; et
al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees,

v.

BEVERLY CLARNO, Oregon Secretary of
State,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 20-35630

D.C. No. 6:20-cv-01053-MC
District of Oregon,
Eugene

ORDER

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, SCHROEDER and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Dissent by Judge CALLAHAN

Appellant's motion (Docket Entry No. 2) to stay the district court's July 13, 2020 order pending appeal is denied. *See Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 425–26 (2009).

2b

CALLAHAN, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

I again dissent from the Court’s denial of a motion to stay a preliminary injunction altering state election laws on the eve of an election.¹ The Appellant has demonstrated that a stay is warranted. *See Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 425–26 (2009).

The Appellant has made a strong showing that adherence to Oregon’s constitutionally mandated signature threshold for ballot initiatives either does not implicate the First Amendment at all or does not do so in a way that runs afoul of the Appellees’ rights. *Cf. Angle v. Miller*, 673 F.3d 1122, 1127, 1132–35 (9th Cir. 2012) (acknowledging that “[a] state may decline to grant a right to legislate through ballot initiatives” and holding that state’s geographic signature requirement did not impermissibly burden core political speech (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The remaining factors also support a stay. *See Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305, 2324 (2018) (explaining that absent a constitutional violation, an injunction

¹ I similarly dissented from the denial of a stay motion in *Reclaim Idaho v. Little*, 20-35584. *See Reclaim Idaho v. Little*, 20-35584, CM/ECF Docket Entry No. 14 (July 9, 2020). Local press incorrectly reported that the Court’s denial in that case was unanimous. *See Nathan Brown, Reclaim Idaho to resume signature gathering on school funding initiative*, POST REGISTER (July 9, 2020), https://www.postregister.com/news/education/reclaim-idaho-to-resume-signature-gathering-on-school-funding-initiative/article_b548b864-aaf5-5702-a5ea-f6769621fd17.html.

3b

barring a state from conducting its election pursuant to its laws “would seriously and irreparably harm the State”); *Purcell v. Gonzalez*, 549 U.S. 1, 4 (2006) (“A State indisputably has a compelling interest in preserving the integrity of its election process.”).

I would grant the Appellant’s motion and stay the preliminary injunction pending resolution of the appeal.