

# EXHIBIT A

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF WRIGHT

TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type 14: Other Civil

---

Sara Hippert, Dave Greer, Linda Markowitz, Dee  
Dee Larson, Ben Maas, Gregg Peppin, Randy  
Penrod and Charles Roulet, individually and on  
behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Court File No. 86-CV-11-433

Plaintiffs,

**NOTICE OF INTERVENTION**

v.

Mark Ritchie, Secretary of State of Minnesota; and  
Robert Hiivala, Wright County Auditor,  
individually and on behalf of all Minnesota county  
chief election officers,

Defendants,

and

Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien,  
Irene Peralez, Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark  
Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and  
on behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs in Intervention.

---

TO: Sara Hippert, Dave Greer, Linda Markowitz, Dee Dee Larson, Ben Maas, Gregg Pippen,  
Randy Penrod and Charles Roulet, by and through their counsel Tony P. Trimble, 10201  
Wayzata Blvd., Ste. 130, Minnetonka MN 55305; Robert Hiivala, Wright County  
Auditor, by and through his counsel Thomas N. Kelly, Wright County Attorney's Office,  
Wright County Government Center, 10 2nd Street N.W., Room 400, Buffalo, MN 55313,  
and Mark Ritchie, Secretary of State, by and through his counsel Alan I. Gilbert,  
Minnesota Attorney General's Office, 445 Minnesota St., Ste 1100, St Paul, MN 55101-  
2128.

Pursuant to Rule 24.03 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure, the undersigned counsel hereby informs the Court and the parties of their intention to intervene in the above-entitled matter on behalf of Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien, Irene Peralez, Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, residing in the State of Minnesota, individually and on behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly situated. Intervention is sought for the reasons described in the Complaint in Intervention served with this Notice.

Plaintiffs in Intervention claim an interest relating to the legislative and congressional reapportionments that are the subject of this action, and are so situated that this action's disposition may as a practical matter impair or impede their ability to protect that interest. As such, they are entitled to intervene as of right under Rule 24.01 or, alternatively, by permission under Rule 24.02 of the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure.

In the absence of objections by any existing party to this matter within 30 days after service hereof, such intervention shall be deemed to have been accomplished pursuant to Rule 24.03.

Dated: May 23, 2011



---

David L. Lillehaug (#63186)  
Christopher A. Stafford (#387971)  
**FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.**  
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425  
Telephone: (612) 492-7000  
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

Marc E. Elias (DC Bar #442007)  
*(pro hac vice pending)*  
Kevin Hamilton (Wash. Bar #15648)  
*(pro hac vice pending)*  
Perkins Coie LLP  
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3960  
Telephone: (202) 654-6200

**ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENORS**

4913774\_1.DOC

## EXHIBIT B

STATE OF MINNESOTA  
COUNTY OF WRIGHT

DISTRICT COURT  
TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type 14: Other Civil

---

Sara Hippert, Dave Greer, Linda Markowitz, Dee  
Dee Larson, Ben Maas, Gregg Peppin, Randy  
Penrod and Charles Roulet, individually and on  
behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Court File No. 86-CV-11-433

Plaintiffs,

**COMPLAINT IN INTERVENTION**

v.

Mark Ritchie, Secretary of State of Minnesota; and  
Robert Hiivala, Wright County Auditor,  
individually and on behalf of all Minnesota county  
chief election officers,

Defendants,

and

Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien,  
Irene Peralez, Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark  
Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and  
on behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs in Intervention.

---

Plaintiffs in Intervention Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien, Irene Peralez,  
Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and on behalf of  
all citizens of Minnesota similarly situated, for their Complaint in Intervention, state and allege  
as follows:

## PARTIES

1. Plaintiffs in Intervention are citizens and qualified voters of the United States of America and the State of Minnesota residing in various counties, legislative districts, and congressional districts in the state of Minnesota, as follows:

Name	County	Leg. Dist.	Congr. Dist.
Kenneth Martin	Dakota	38A	2
Lynn Wilson	Olmsted	29B	1
Timothy O'Brien	Hennepin	41A	3
Irene Peralez	Ramsey	55B	4
Josie Johnson	Hennepin	60A	5
Jane Krentz	Washington	52B	6
Mark Altenburg	Kittson	09A	7
Debra Hasskamp	Crow Wing	12A	8

2. Existing Plaintiffs have brought this action individually and on behalf of themselves and all other citizens and voters of the United States of America who reside in Minnesota who are similarly situated as having been denied due process and equal protection of the laws as further stated in the Complaint. Existing Plaintiffs contend that the class is so situated as to make joinder impossible or impractical; there are common questions of law and fact which predominate over individual questions of law and fact; the claims of the named individuals are typical of the claims of the members of this class; that Plaintiffs will fully and adequately represent and protect the interests of this class; that the prosecution of separate actions by individual members of the class would create a risk of inconsistency or varying adjudications which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for the named Defendants; and that the common questions of law which predominate are the constitutionality of the current plan of legislative districts and congressional districts established by the Minnesota Special Redistricting Panel in *Zachman v. Kiffmeyer*, No. C0-01-0160 (Order dated March 19,

2002) (hereinafter *Zachman*), which is being enforced by the Defendants. To the extent the Court certifies one or more Plaintiff classes, Plaintiffs in Intervention request to be class representatives.

3. Defendants are each citizens of the United States of America and the State of Minnesota, residing in the State of Minnesota.

4. Defendant Mark Ritchie is the duly elected, qualified and acting Secretary of State for the State of Minnesota. Under the provisions of Minnesota Statutes 2010, Chapters 200 through 212 inclusive, he is charged in his official capacity with the duty of keeping records of state elections, giving notice of state elections, preparing ballots and instructions for voters, receiving the filings of candidates for state elective offices, distributing copies of the election laws of the State of Minnesota, receiving election returns, furnishing blank election ballots and forms to the several county auditors, furnishing certificates of election to successful legislative candidates in multi-county districts and to successful candidates for election to the United States Congress, serving on the State Canvassing Board, conducting recounts, and various other election duties.

5. Defendant Robert Hiivala is the duly elected County Auditor and chief election officer for Wright County, Minnesota, and as such is charged with the duties of keeping records of state elections, giving notice of such elections, receiving filings for office, preparing ballots and instructions to voters, distributing election laws, receiving election returns, furnishing blank election ballots and forms, and furnishing certificates of elections in Wright County legislative districts and congressional districts.

6. Existing Plaintiffs brought this action against Robert Hiivala individually and as representative of all other county auditors and/or chief election officers similarly situated in the

State of Minnesota. To the extent the Court certifies a Defendant class, Plaintiffs in Intervention assert their rights as against such class.

### **JURISDICTION**

7. This Court has authority as a court of general jurisdiction to redress the claims of Plaintiffs in Intervention of violations of the Minnesota State Constitution and authority to grant declaratory relief under Minn. Stat. §§ 555.01 *et seq.*

8. This Court has jurisdiction under 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1988 to redress the claims of Plaintiffs in Intervention of violations of the United States Constitution.

### **CLAIM OF ENTITLEMENT TO INTERVENE**

9. Plaintiffs in Intervention claim an interest relating to the legislative and congressional reapportionments that are the subject of this action, and are so situated that this action's disposition may as a practical matter impair or impede their ability to protect that interest.

10. The existing Plaintiffs do not adequately represent the interest of the Plaintiffs in Intervention. Each Plaintiff in Intervention is a member of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota, a "major political party" within the meaning of Minnesota election law. On information and belief, each existing Plaintiff is a member of a competing major political party, the Republican Party of Minnesota, and Plaintiffs do not represent the interests of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota nor the interests of the citizens of Minnesota as a whole.

11. The claims herein share common questions of law and fact with the original action, namely the constitutionality of the current plan of legislative districts and congressional

districts established by the Minnesota Special Redistricting Panel in *Zachman*, which is being enforced by the Defendants.

12. Governor Mark Dayton has vetoed the unfair redistricting plan passed by the Minnesota Legislature. It is probable that the rights of Plaintiffs in Intervention will not be resolved politically. Plaintiffs in Intervention have sought intervention early in this action and are thus timely.

13. Plaintiffs in Intervention accordingly claim an entitlement to intervention in each claim asserted by the Plaintiffs who commenced this action in their Complaint of January 21, 2011, of the same nature and to the same extent asserted by the Plaintiffs who commenced this action.

## COUNT I

### LEGISLATIVE APPORTIONMENT

14. This claim arises under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which provides in Section 1:

No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

15. The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution further provides:

No person shall be...deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

16. This claim also arises under the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 2, which provides:

The number of members who compose the senate and house of representatives shall be prescribed by law. The representation in both houses shall be apportioned equally throughout the different sections of the state in proportion to the population thereof.

17. The Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3, further provides:

At its first session after each enumeration of the inhabitants of this state made by the authority of the United States, the legislature shall have the power to prescribe the bounds of congressional and legislative districts. Senators shall be chosen by single districts of convenient contiguous territory. No representative district shall be divided in the formation of a senate district. The senate districts shall be numbered in a regular series.

18. The provisions of the Fourteenth and Fifth Amendments guarantee to the citizens of the United States in each state the right to vote in state and federal elections and guarantee that the vote of each shall be as equally effective as any other vote cast in such elections. These provisions further guarantee that state legislative representation shall be equally apportioned throughout a state in districts of equal population.

19. The above-referenced provisions of Article IV of the Minnesota Constitution guarantee to the residents of Minnesota that the vote of each shall be as equally effective as any other vote cast in an election for members of the Minnesota Legislature. These provisions further require that the members of the Minnesota Legislature be elected by the people of the State of Minnesota on a basis of equal representation of the individual citizens of the state.

20. The United States took a census pursuant to Art. I, Sec. 2, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, enumerating 5,303,925 inhabitants of Minnesota as of April 1, 2010 (the "2010 Census"). Based on the 2010 Census, the ideal population of a Minnesota State Senate District is 79,163, and the ideal population of a Minnesota State House of Representatives District is 39,582.

21. The 2010 Census shows that the Minnesota legislative apportionment system established by the five member Special Redistricting Panel in *Zachman* effects a legislative apportionment which discriminates against citizens in the most highly populous legislative districts and prefers other citizens in the least populous legislative districts in violation of Art. IV

of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

22. Certain Plaintiffs in Intervention reside and vote in disproportionately highly populated legislative districts as follows:

Name	District	Population	% Deviation
Mark Altenburg	9A	42,418 (+2,836)	7.16%
Debra Hasselkamp	12A	40,691 (+1,109)	2.80%
Jane Krentz	52B	42,649 (+3,067)	7.75%

Plaintiffs in Intervention thus have diminished electoral power relative to less populated legislative districts, in violation of Art. IV of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

23. The 2010 Census shows that the state legislative districts as established by *Zachman* are unequally apportioned, and the present apportionment of the state legislative districts is arbitrary and capricious in violation of Art. IV of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

24. As citizens of the United States and of the State of Minnesota, Plaintiffs in Intervention have the right under the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution to have the entire membership of the Minnesota Legislature apportioned and elected on the basis of the 2010 Federal Census.

25. The Minnesota Legislature has not yet apportioned legislative representation pursuant to the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3, as a result of the 2010 Census.

26. Unless and until the Minnesota Legislature constitutionally apportions legislative representation as a result of the census taken in 2000, on information and belief the Defendants must hold elections for the Legislature according to the legislative districts ordered in *Zachman*, in violation of Art. IV of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

27. Plaintiffs in Intervention further allege that they intend to vote in the 2012 Minnesota primary and general elections and thereafter for candidates for the Minnesota Legislature, and that any elections conducted in accordance with *Zachman* will continue to deprive Plaintiffs in Intervention of their rights under Art. IV of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

28. The relief sought against Defendants in their official capacities relates to their respective jurisdictions in carrying out all matters related to the election of members of the Minnesota Legislature.

29. In the absence of any reapportionment of the legislative districts of the State of Minnesota in conformity with the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution, any action of Defendants in conducting an election for members of the Minnesota Legislature in accordance with the districts in *Zachman* has deprived and will continue to deprive Plaintiffs in Intervention of their constitutional rights in that:

- a. They are and will be arbitrarily deprived of liberty and property without Due Process of Law, and are and will be arbitrarily deprived of Equal Protection of the Law, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;

- b. They are and will be, in substantial measure, disenfranchised and deprived of their rights and privileges, all in violation of Article I, Section 2 of the Minnesota Constitution;
- c. They are and will be deprived of equally apportioned legislative districts of the Minnesota Legislature as guaranteed by Article IV, Sections 2 and 3 of the Minnesota Constitution; and
- d. Their right to vote, as guaranteed by Article VII, Section 1 of the Minnesota Constitution, is and will continue to be abridged, diluted and infringed

30. By the failure to date of the Minnesota Legislature to apportion the legislative districts of the State of Minnesota in conformity with the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution, the Minnesota Legislature has and will continue to cause Defendants to violate the constitutional rights of Plaintiffs in Intervention and all other similarly-situated residents of Minnesota.

31. The Plaintiffs in Intervention are entitled to an equal and timely apportionment among the legislative districts by the Legislature pursuant to the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3.

32. If the Legislature does not equally or timely apportion the legislative districts pursuant to the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3, then Plaintiffs in Intervention are entitled to a judicial remedy equally apportioning those districts.

## COUNT II

### CONGRESSIONAL REDISTRICTING

33. This claim arises under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, which provides in Section 1:

No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Fourteenth Amendment further provides in Section 2:

Representatives shall be apportioned among the several States according to their respective numbers.

34. The Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution further provides:

No person shall be...deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

35. This claim also arises under the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3, which provides:

At its first session after each enumeration of the inhabitants of this state made by the authority of the United States, the legislature shall have the power to prescribe the bounds of congressional and legislative districts.

36. The provisions of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments guarantee to the citizens of the United States in each state the right to vote in state and federal elections and guarantee that the vote of each shall be as equally effective as any other vote cast in such elections. These provisions further guarantee that congressional representation shall be equally apportioned throughout a state in districts in equal population.

37. The United States took a census pursuant to Art. I, Sec. 2, clause 3 of the United States Constitution, enumerating 5,303,925 inhabitants of Minnesota as of April 1, 2010 (the

“2010 Census”). Based on the 2010 census, the ideal population of a congressional district in Minnesota is 662,991.

38. The 2010 Census shows that the congressional districts established by the five member Special Redistricting Panel in *Zachman* discriminate against citizens in the most highly populous congressional districts and prefer other citizens in the least populous congressional districts in violation of Art. IV of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

39. Certain Plaintiffs in Intervention reside and vote in disproportionately highly populated congressional districts as follows:

Name	District	Population	% Deviation
Kenneth Martin	2	5,373,449 (+69,524)	10.49%
Jane Krentz	6	5,400,412 (+96,487)	14.55%

Plaintiffs in Intervention thus have diminished electoral power relative to less populated congressional districts, in violation of Art. IV of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

40. The 2010 Census shows that the congressional districts as established by *Zachman* are unequally apportioned, and the present apportionment of the state legislative districts is arbitrary and capricious in violation of Art. IV of the Minnesota Constitution and the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

41. As citizens of the United States and of the State of Minnesota, Plaintiffs in Intervention have the right under the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution to have congressional representation apportioned and elected on the basis of the 2010 Federal Census.

42. The Minnesota Legislature has not yet reapportioned the state's congressional districts pursuant to the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3, as a result of the 2010 Census.

43. Unless and until the Minnesota Legislature constitutionally reapportions the state's congressional districts as a result of the census taken in 2000, on information and belief the Defendants must hold elections for Representatives in Congress according to the congressional districts ordered in *Zachman*, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

44. Plaintiffs in Intervention further allege that they intend to vote in the 2012 Minnesota primary and general elections and thereafter for candidates for Representatives in Congress, and that any elections conducted in accordance with *Zachman* will continue to deprive Plaintiffs in Intervention of their rights under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution.

45. The relief sought against Defendants in their official capacities relates to their respective jurisdictions in carrying out all matters related to the election of Representatives to Congress.

46. In the absence of any reapportionment of the congressional districts of the State of Minnesota in conformity with the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution, any action of Defendants in conducting an election for Representatives in Congress in accordance with the districts in *Zachman* has deprived and will continue to deprive Plaintiffs in Intervention of their constitutional rights in that:

- a. They are and will be arbitrarily deprived of liberty and property without Due Process of Law, and are and will be arbitrarily deprived of Equal

Protection of the Law, in violation of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution;

- b. They are and will be, in substantial measure, disenfranchised and deprived of their rights and privileges, all in violation of Article I, Section 2 of the Minnesota Constitution;
- c. They are and will be deprived of equally apportioned congressional districts of the Minnesota Legislature as guaranteed by Article IV, Section 3 of the Minnesota Constitution; and
- d. Their right to vote, as guaranteed by Article VII, Section 1 of the Minnesota Constitution, is and will continue to be abridged, diluted and infringed

47. By the failure to date of the Minnesota Legislature to equally apportion the congressional districts of the State of Minnesota in conformity with the United States Constitution and the Minnesota Constitution, the Minnesota Legislature has and will continue to cause Defendants to violate the constitutional rights of Plaintiffs in Intervention and all other similarly-situated residents of Minnesota.

48. The Plaintiffs in Intervention are entitled to an equal and timely apportionment among congressional districts by the Legislature pursuant to the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3.

49. If the Legislature does not equally or timely apportion congressional districts pursuant to the Minnesota Constitution, Art. IV Sec. 3, then Plaintiffs in Intervention are entitled to a judicial remedy equally apportioning those districts.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs in Intervention pray for the following relief:

1. That this Court declare pursuant to Minn. Stat. §§ 555.01 *et seq.*:
  - a. That the present legislative apportionment of the State of Minnesota violates the rights of Plaintiffs in Intervention and the class they represent of their rights of equal representation and equal apportionment of legislative districts mandated by the Minnesota Constitution;
  - b. That the present legislative apportionment of the State of Minnesota violates the rights of Plaintiffs in Intervention and the class they represent of Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of the Law in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution;
  - c. That the present congressional apportionment of the State of Minnesota violates the rights of Plaintiffs in Intervention and the class they represent of Due Process of Law and Equal Protection of the Law in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution;
2. The Court permanently restrain Defendants and the class of persons they represent from taking any actions necessary to the holding of general or primary elections for members of the Minnesota Legislature and members of the United States House of Representatives in the legislative and congressional districts set out and described in *Zachman v. Kiffmeyer*.
3. That this Court notify the Governor and Legislature of the State of Minnesota that it will retain jurisdiction of this action and, upon the failure of the State of Minnesota to adopt constitutionally valid plans of congressional redistricting and legislative reapportionment, the Court will consider evidence, determine and order a proper plan for congressional redistricting and legislative reapportionment.
4. Granting Plaintiffs in Intervention their attorneys' fees and costs, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988 and Minn. Stat. § 555.08; and

5. For such other and further relief as is just and equitable.

Dated: May 23, 2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David L. Lillehaug (#63186)  
Christopher A. Stafford (#387971)  
**FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.**  
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425  
Telephone: (612) 492-7000  
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

Marc E. Elias (DC Bar #442007)  
*(pro hac vice pending)*  
Kevin Hamilton (Wash. Bar #15648)  
*(pro hac vice pending)*  
Perkins Coie LLP  
607 Fourteenth Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20005-2011  
Telephone: (202) 628-6600

**ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENORS**

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

Intervenors acknowledge that sanctions may be imposed under Minn. Stat. §549.211.

Dated: May 23, 2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David L. Lillehaug (#63186)  
Christopher A. Stafford (#387971)  
**FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.**  
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425  
Telephone: (612) 492-7000  
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

Marc E. Elias (DC Bar #442007)  
*(pro hac vice pending)*  
Kevin Hamilton (Wash. Bar #15648)  
*(pro hac vice pending)*  
Lisa Marshall Manheim (Wash. Bar #40198)  
*(pro hac vice pending)*  
Perkins Coie LLP  
700 Thirteenth Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3960  
Telephone: (202) 654-6200

**ATTORNEYS FOR INTERVENORS**

4913777\_1.DOC

# EXHIBIT C

## REGISTER OF ACTIONS

CASE NO. 86-CV-11-433

Sara Hippert, Dave Greer, Linda Markowitz, Dee Dee Larson, §  
 Ben Maas et. al. vs Robert Hiivala, Wright County Auditor, Mark §  
 Ritchie, Secretary of State of Minnesota §  
 §  
 §  
 §

Case Type: **Civil Other/Misc.**  
 Date Filed: **01/21/2011**  
 Location: **Wright**  
 Judicial Officer: **Davis, Michele A.**

**PARTY INFORMATION**

		<b>Lead Attorneys</b>
<b>Defendant</b>	<b>Hiivala, Robert</b> Wright County Auditor Buffalo, MN 55313	<b>THOMAS N KELLY</b>  <i>Retained</i>  763-682-7340(W)
<b>Defendant</b>	<b>Ritchie, Mark</b> Secretary of State of Minnesota St. Paul, MN 55155	<b>ALAN I GILBERT</b>  <i>Retained</i>  612-296-9412(W)
<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Greer, Dave</b>	<b>TONY P TRIMBLE</b>  <i>Retained</i>  952-797-7477(W)
<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Hippert, Sara</b>	<b>TONY P TRIMBLE</b>  <i>Retained</i>  952-797-7477(W)
<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Larson, Dee Dee</b>	<b>TONY P TRIMBLE</b>  <i>Retained</i>  952-797-7477(W)
<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Maas, Ben</b>	<b>TONY P TRIMBLE</b>  <i>Retained</i>  952-797-7477(W)
<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Markowitz, Linda</b>	<b>TONY P TRIMBLE</b>  <i>Retained</i>  952-797-7477(W)
<b>Plaintiff</b>	<b>Penrod, Randy</b>	<b>TONY P TRIMBLE</b>  <i>Retained</i>

952-797-7477(W)

Plaintiff Peppin, Gregg

TONY P TRIMBLE

Retained

952-797-7477(W)

Plaintiff Roulet, Charles

TONY P TRIMBLE

Retained

952-797-7477(W)

EVENTS & ORDERS OF THE COURT

OTHER EVENTS AND HEARINGS

01/21/2011	Summons and Complaint		
01/21/2011	Certificate of Representation		
01/25/2011	Summons		
	Hiivala, Robert	Served	01/21/2011
	Ritchie, Mark	Served	01/21/2011
01/25/2011	Notice of Case Filing		
01/25/2011	Schedule Pre-Trial		
01/26/2011	Notice of Case Assignment		
01/27/2011	Affidavit of Service		
01/27/2011	Affidavit of Service		
01/28/2011	Correspondence		
01/28/2011	Petition-Other		
01/31/2011	Notice of Case Filing		
02/14/2011	Order-Other (Judicial Officer: Gildea, Lorie S. )		
02/17/2011	Notice of Filing of Order		
02/17/2011	Answer		
02/17/2011	Affidavit of Mailing		
05/23/2011	Complaint-Civil		
05/23/2011	Notice-Other		
05/23/2011	Motion		
05/23/2011	Affidavit-Other		
05/23/2011	Affidavit-Other		
06/01/2011	Notice-Other		
06/01/2011	Order-Other (Judicial Officer: Gildea, Lorie S. )		
06/07/2011	Answer		
06/07/2011	Affidavit of Mailing		
06/16/2011	Notice-Other		
06/16/2011	Affidavit of Mailing		
07/19/2011	Scheduling Order (Judicial Officer: Wright, Wilhelmina M. )		
07/19/2011	Request for Trial Court Record-Appellate Court		

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

	Defendant Hiivala, Robert		
	Total Financial Assessment		320.00
	Total Payments and Credits		320.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/07/2011	Transaction Assessment		320.00
06/07/2011	Mail Payment	Receipt # 0086-2011-06912	Wright County Treasurer (320.00)

	<b>Intervenor</b> Aitenburg, Mark		
	Total Financial Assessment		520.00
	Total Payments and Credits		520.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		520.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(520.00)
	<b>Intervenor</b> Hasskamp, Debra		
	Total Financial Assessment		520.00
	Total Payments and Credits		520.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		520.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(520.00)
	<b>Intervenor</b> Johnson, Josie		
	Total Financial Assessment		520.00
	Total Payments and Credits		520.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		320.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(320.00)
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		200.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(200.00)
	<b>Intervenor</b> Krentz, Jane		
	Total Financial Assessment		520.00
	Total Payments and Credits		520.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		520.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(520.00)
	<b>Intervenor</b> Martin, Kenneth		
	Total Financial Assessment		545.00
	Total Payments and Credits		545.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
05/25/2011	Transaction Assessment		545.00
05/25/2011	Mail Payment	Receipt # 0086-2011-06357	LILLEHAUG, DAVID L
			(545.00)
	<b>Intervenor</b> O'Brien, Timothy		
	Total Financial Assessment		520.00
	Total Payments and Credits		520.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		320.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(320.00)
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		200.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(200.00)

	<b>Intervenor</b> Peralez, Irene		
	Total Financial Assessment		520.00
	Total Payments and Credits		520.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		320.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(320.00)
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		200.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(200.00)

	<b>Intervenor</b> Wilson, Lynn		
	Total Financial Assessment		520.00
	Total Payments and Credits		520.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		320.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(320.00)
06/01/2011	Transaction Assessment		200.00
06/01/2011	Credit-Joint Filing		(200.00)

	<b>Plaintiff</b> Hippert, Sara		
	Total Financial Assessment		322.00
	Total Payments and Credits		322.00
	<b>Balance Due as of 07/29/2011</b>		<b>0.00</b>
01/21/2011	Transaction Assessment		322.00
01/21/2011	Counter Payment	Receipt # 0086-2011-00857	(322.00)
		REpublican Party of Minnesota	

## EXHIBIT D

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF WRIGHT

TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type 14: Other Civil

---

Sara Hippert, Dave Greer, Linda Markowitz, Dee  
Dee Larson, Ben Maas, Gregg Peppin, Randy  
Penrod and Charles Roulet, individually and on  
behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Court File No. 86-CV-11-433

Plaintiffs,

**PLAINTIFFS' IN INTERVENTION  
MOTION FOR ADMISSION PRO  
HAC VICE OF MARC E. ELIAS AND  
KEVIN J. HAMILTON**

v.

Mark Ritchie, Secretary of State of Minnesota; and  
Robert Hiivala, Wright County Auditor,  
individually and on behalf of all Minnesota county  
chief election officers,

Defendants,

and

Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien,  
Irene Peralez, Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark  
Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and  
on behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs in Intervention.

---

Plaintiffs in Intervention Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien, Irene Peralez,  
Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, hereby move for permission  
for Marc E. Elias and Kevin J. Hamilton, attorneys with Perkins Coie LLP, to practice before this  
Court *pro hac vice* in this matter. This Motion is based upon Rule 5 of the General Rules of  
Practice for the District Courts, the accompanying affidavits of Marc E. Elias, Kevin J. Hamilton  
and the files and proceedings herein.

Dated: May 23, 2011



---

David L. Lillehaug (#63186)  
Christopher A. Stafford (#387971)  
**FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.**  
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425  
Telephone: (612) 492-7000  
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

4913964\_1.DOC

STATE OF MINNESOTA

DISTRICT COURT

COUNTY OF WRIGHT

TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type 14: Other Civil

---

Sara Hippert, Dave Greer, Linda Markowitz, Dee  
Dee Larson, Ben Maas, Gregg Peppin, Randy  
Penrod and Charles Roulet, individually and on  
behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Court File No. 86-CV-11-433

Plaintiffs,

**AFFIDAVIT FOR ADMISSION PRO  
HAC VICE OF MARC E. ELIAS**

v.

Mark Ritchie, Secretary of State of Minnesota; and  
Robert Hiivala, Wright County Auditor,  
individually and on behalf of all Minnesota county  
chief election officers,

Defendants,

and

Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien,  
Irene Peralez, Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark  
Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and  
on behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs in Intervention.

---

Marc E. Elias, being duly sworn upon oath, deposes and says:

1. I make this affidavit to allow me to appear as counsel *pro hac vice* representing  
Plaintiffs in Intervention Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien, Irene Peralez, Josie  
Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and on behalf of all  
citizens of Minnesota similarly situated, in the above-captioned matter.

2. I am a partner with Perkins Coie, LLP. My office address and telephone number are: 700 Thirteenth Street, NW, Suite 600, Washington, D.C., 20005-3960; telephone number: 202-654-6200.

3. I graduated from the Duke University School of Law in 1993.

4. I am admitted to practice in the District of Columbia. My attorney registration number for the District of Columbia Bar is 442007.

5. I am a member in good standing of the above-named bar, and I have not resigned, been denied admission, been reprimanded, suspended or disbarred from the practice of law by this or any other court, nor do I have any grievances pending against me. I agree to be subject to the disciplinary rules and regulations governing Minnesota lawyers and the jurisdiction of the Minnesota Courts.


6. During the course of this lawsuit, I will be associated with the law firm of Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., 200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402.



Marc E. Elias



Subscribed and sworn to before me  
this 23rd day of May, 2011



Notary Public

**CLAUDETTE B. HENRY**  
Notary Public District of Columbia

4913966\_1.DOC

**My Commission Expires: July 14, 2013**

STATE OF MINNESOTA  
COUNTY OF WRIGHT

DISTRICT COURT  
TENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type 14: Other Civil

---

Sara Hippert, Dave Greer, Linda Markowitz, Dee  
Dee Larson, Ben Maas, Gregg Peppin, Randy  
Penrod and Charles Roulet, individually and on  
behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Court File No. 86-CV-11-433

Plaintiffs,

**AFFIDAVIT FOR ADMISSION PRO  
HAC VICE OF KEVIN J.  
HAMILTON**

v.

Mark Ritchie, Secretary of State of Minnesota; and  
Robert Hiivala, Wright County Auditor,  
individually and on behalf of all Minnesota county  
chief election officers,

Defendants,

and

Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien,  
Irene Peralez, Josie Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark  
Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and  
on behalf of all citizens of Minnesota similarly  
situated,

Plaintiffs in Intervention.

---

Kevin J. Hamilton, being duly sworn upon oath, deposes and says:

1. I make this affidavit to allow me to appear as counsel *pro hac vice* representing  
Plaintiffs in Intervention Kenneth Martin, Lynn Wilson, Timothy O'Brien, Irene Peralez, Josie  
Johnson, Jane Krentz, Mark Altenburg, and Debra Hasskamp, individually and on behalf of all  
citizens of Minnesota similarly situated, in the above-captioned matter.


2. I am an attorney with the law firm of Perkins Coie, LLP. My office address is 1201 Third Avenue South, Suite 4800, Seattle, Washington 98101-3099; my telephone number is (206) 359-8741.

3. I graduated from Georgetown University Law Center in 1985.


4. I am admitted to practice in the courts of the State of Washington. My attorney registration number for the Washington Bar is 15648.

5. I am a member in good standing of the above-named bar, and I have not resigned, been denied admission, been reprimanded, suspended or disbarred from the practice of law by this or any other court, nor do I have any grievances pending against me. I agree to be familiar with and subject to the disciplinary rules and regulations governing Minnesota lawyers and the jurisdiction of the Minnesota Courts.

6. During the course of this lawsuit, I will be associated with the law firm of Fredrikson & Byron, P.A., 200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402.

  
Kevin J. Hamilton

Subscribed and sworn to before me  
this 20th day of May, 2011



Notary Public  
Cynthia M. Anderson



4913965\_1.DOC