

1 THE O'MARA LAW FIRM, P.C.
2 David C. O'Mara, Esq., (NV Bar 08599)
3 311 E. Liberty Street
4 Reno, Nevada 89501
5 775.323.1321
6 david@omaralaw.net
7 *Local Counsel for Petitioners*

8 J. Christian Adams*
9 Joseph M. Nixon*
10 Kaylan L. Phillips*
11 Public Interest Legal Foundation
12 107 S. West Street, Suite 700
13 Alexandria, VA 22314
14 (703) 745-5870
15 adams@publicinterestlegal.org
16 jnixon@publicinterestlegal.org
17 kphillips@publicinterestlegal.org
18 *Counsel for Petitioners*
19 **Pro Hac Vice motions forthcoming*

20 **IN THE SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA IN**
21 **AND FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHOE**

22 FRED KRAUS, PUBLIC INTEREST
23 LEGAL FOUNDATION,

24 *Petitioners,*

25 v.

26 CARRIE-ANN BURGESS, in her official
27 capacity as Washoe County Interim
28 Registrar of Voters,

Respondent.

Case No.: cv-24-01051

Dept. No.: 4

**RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO
MOTION TO INTERVENE AS
RESPONDENTS**

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

INTRODUCTION 1

ARGUMENT 2

I. The Court Should Deny Intervention as of Right 2

 A. Movants Have No “Significantly Protectable Interest” in the Subject Matter of this
 Litigation..... 3

 B. Movants’ Stated Interest Will Not Be Impaired by the Disposition of this
 Action..... 6

 C. Movants Have Not Overcome the Presumption of Adequate Representation..... 8

II. The Court Should Deny Permissive Intervention 10

 A. Movants Do Not Have a Separate Claim or Defense 10

 B. Movants Will Duplicate Efforts, Add to the Parties’ Burdens, and Cause Undue
 Delay and Expense if Permitted to Intervene..... 11

CONCLUSION.....11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Am. Ass’n of People with Disabilities v. Herrera</i> , 257 F.R.D. 236 (D.N.M. 2008).....	8
<i>Am. Home Assurance. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. ex rel. County of Clark</i> , 147 P.3d 1120 (Nev. 2006).....	Passim
<i>Arakaki v. Cayeto</i> , 324 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 2003)	9
<i>Diamond v. Charles</i> , 476 U.S. 54 (1986).....	10, 11
<i>Hairr v. First Jud. Dist. Ct.</i> , 368 P.3d 1198 (Nev. 2016).....	9, 10
<i>Lundberg v. Koontz</i> , 418 P.2d 808 (Nev. 1966).....	10
<i>Perry v. Proposition 8 Off. Proponents</i> , 587 F.3d 947 (9th Cir. 2009)	3
<i>Pub. Int. Legal Found. v. Benson</i> , No. 1:21-cv-929, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 246223 (W.D. Mich. Aug. 25, 2022)	5
<i>S. Cal. Edison Co. v. Lynch</i> , 307 F.3d 794 (9th Cir. 2002)	3, 4, 6
<i>Sierra Club v. EPA</i> , 995 F.2d 1478 (9th Cir. 1993)	8
<i>United States v. Alisal Water Corp.</i> , 370 F.3d 915 (9th Cir. 2004)	3, 7
Statutes	
NRS 239B.030	12
NRS 293.486(1)	7
Rules	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 24(a)(2).....	3
Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(a).....	3, 8
Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(B).....	10
Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3)	10, 11
Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 24.....	2, 3
Other Authorities	
7C Charles Alan Wright et al., Federal Practice and Procedure § 1909 (3d ed. 2007).....	9

1 Mr. Kraus and Public Interest Legal Foundation (“Petitioners”) respond to the Motion to
2 Intervene filed by Rise Action Fund (“Rise”); Institute for a Progressive Nevada (“IPN”); and
3 Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans (“Alliance”) (Mot. Intervene as Resp’t) and request
4 denial of the motion.

6 INTRODUCTION

7 Movants seek to disrupt this litigation based on a flawed understanding and huge
8 mischaracterization of what the Petitioners seek for a remedy. Movants’ arguments suggest they
9 have either failed to carefully read the petition or they are intentionally misleading the Court. To
10 be clear, the Petitioners seek “a writ of mandamus compelling Respondent Burgess to investigate
11 known commercial addresses listed as residences on the voter roll.” Petition 45:25-26. That is the
12 only relief requested – an investigation of forty-eight commercial addresses.

13 All three Proposed Intervenors incorrectly claim the Petitioners seek removal of voters
14 from the registration rolls and based their Motion on this incorrect assumption. Rise claims its
15 interest in intervention relates to “attempts of the Petitioner and others to abruptly remove voters
16 from the rolls in the months ahead of a major general election.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 9:15-16.
17 IPN claims “Petitioners are seeking to enable any third party across the state to seek a rushed
18 purge of voters in advance of an election, threatening to remove ineligible voters from the rolls or
19 have them moved to inactive status.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t. 10:12-14. Finally, Nevada
20 Alliance for Retired Americans (“The Alliance”) claims “[i]f Petitioners succeed those who
21 move, and travel will be at an increased risk of wrongful deregistration.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t
22 11:10-11. Petitioners have neither pleaded for, nor even impliedly requested any voter to be
23 removed from the rolls.
24
25

26 The motion to intervene should be denied for at least four reasons. **First**, Movants do not
27 claim any of their members are registered at any of the forty-eight (48) commercial addresses
28

1 identified nor can they name a single constituent of Washoe County who would be affected by an
2 investigation into known commercial addresses listed as residences on the voter roll.

3 **Second**, Movants have no “significantly protectable interest” in the subject matter of this
4 case. Movants claim they have an interest in preventing voter roll “purges.” *See* Mot. Intervene as
5 Resp’t 11:15-16; Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 9:15-16; Mot. Intervene as Resp’t. 10:12-14. A voter
6 roll purge is not in the crosshairs of this lawsuit. Simply put, the Movants do not represent a
7 single voter who would be impacted by this litigation requesting an investigation into known
8 commercial addresses listed on the voter roll.

9
10 **Third**, Movants have not demonstrated that the Respondent will not adequately protect
11 their interests. As Respondent has not yet answered, there is no indication that she will not
12 vigorously defend this case and follow the law.

13
14 **Fourth**, Movants do not have a separate claim or defense. Their fears are imaginary. They
15 are fighting against a case which does not exist and against relief which is not pleaded.
16 Intervention, and the resulting tilting at windmills, will cause burden, undue delay, unnecessary
17 expense, and duplicative efforts. Allowing Movants to intervene is not in the interest of justice or
18 efficiency.¹

19 **ARGUMENT**

20 **I. The Court Should Deny Intervention as of Right.**

21 Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure 24 sets out the requirement for intervention.

- 22
23 (a) Intervention of Right. On timely motion, the court must permit anyone to
24 intervene who:
25 (1) is given an unconditional right to intervene by a federal statute; or
26 (2) claims an interest relating to the property or transaction that is the subject
27 of the action, and is so situated that disposing of the action may as a

28 ¹ Movants are free to file *amici curiae* briefs to offer their concerns without causing the delay, complication, and prejudice to the parties.

1 practical matter impair or impede the movant’s ability to protect its
2 interest, unless existing parties adequately represent that interest.

3 Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(a).

4 In applying Nev. R. Civ. P. 24, the Nevada Supreme Court articulates that intervention as of
5 right requires the establishment of four elements:

6 (1) That it has a sufficient interest in the litigation’s subject matter; (2) that it could suffer
7 an impairment of its ability to protect that interest if it does not intervene; (3) that its
8 interest is not adequately represented by existing parties; and (4) that the application is
9 timely. Determination of whether an applicant has met these four requirements is “within
10 the district court’s discretion.”

11 *Am. Home Assurance. v. Eighth Jud. Dist. Ct. ex rel. County of Clark*, 147 P.3d 1120, 1126
12 (Nev. 2006). If Movants fail to establish any one of these factors, the Court may stop its analysis,
13 and their motion must be denied. *See Perry v. Proposition 8 Off. Proponents*, 587 F.3d 947, 950
14 (9th Cir. 2009) (holding that “[f]ailure to satisfy any one of the requirements is fatal to the
15 application, and [the court] need not reach the remaining elements if one of the elements is not
16 satisfied”).

17 **A. Movants Have No “Significantly Protectable Interest” in the Subject Matter
18 of this Litigation.**

19 To intervene as of right, the Movants “must claim ‘an interest relating to the property or
20 transaction which is the subject of the action and [that] the applicant is so situated that the
21 disposition of the action may as a practical matter impair or impede the applicant’s ability to
22 protect that interest, unless the applicant’s interest is adequately represented by existing parties.’”

23 *United States v. Alisal Water Corp.*, 370 F.3d 915, 919 (9th Cir. 2004) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P.
24 24(a)(2)). To demonstrate a sufficient interest in the litigation’s subject matter, the Movant must
25 show “‘a significantly protectable interest.’” *Am. Home Assurance Co.*, 147 P.3d at 1127 (citations
26 omitted.). A “significant protectable interest” is defined by the courts “as one that is protected
27 under the law and bears a relationship to the plaintiff’s claim.” *Id.* (citing *S. Cal. Edison Co. v.*
28

1 *Lynch*, 307 F.3d 794 (9th Cir. 2002).) Further the court in *S. Cal. Edison Co.* held that an interest
2 is related to the case if “the resolution of the plaintiff’s claims actually will affect” the
3 intervenors. *S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 307 F.3d at 803 (citations omitted). The court in *Am. Home*
4 *Assurance Co.* stated, “[a] general, indirect, contingent, or insubstantial interest is insufficient,
5 however. Instead, an applicant must show a ‘significantly protectable interest.’” *Am. Home*
6 *Assurance Co.*, 147 P.3d at 1127.
7

8 Petitioners have identified 48 commercial addresses at which it appears no one lives. A
9 representative of the Petitioners visited each address. Each commercial address is specifically
10 identified and a photograph of it is in the Petition. *See* Petition ¶ 20. The Movants have not
11 alleged that a single member of any of their three organizations is registered at any of those 48
12 addresses. The Court’s analysis should end here. The Movants have no justiciable interest in this
13 case.
14

15 Movants claim two significant interests in the lawsuit. Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 13:24.
16 First, they claim their interests rest in “ensuring that their members and constituents are able to
17 register to vote, email register to vote and in active status, and successful participate in future
18 elections.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 13: 24-26. Second, Movants claim their interests rests in
19 future obligation for other clerks “to investigate voter eligibility based on unsourced, unsworn
20 third party information offered outside the voter challenge” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 14: 24-
21 27. There is no evidence in the record that either of these interests are at risk with the pending
22 litigation before this court.
23

24 Instead of articulating an interest based on relief Petitioners seek, Movants try to articulate
25 a justiciable interest by claiming Petitioners seek doomsday relief not sought. Instead of
26 draconian relief, the Petitioners seek a writ of mandamus “compelling Respondent Burgess to
27 investigate known 48 commercial addresses listed as residences on the voter roll.” Petition 45:25-
28

1 26. That’s it — “please look into the forty-eight commercial addresses.”

2 Rise, however, claims their interest in litigation relates to, specifically, “attempts of the
3 Petitioner and others to abruptly remove voters from the rolls in the months ahead of a major
4 general election.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 9:15-16.

5 IPN claims “[p]etitioners are seeking to enable any third party across the state to seek a
6 rushed purge of voters in advance of an election, threatening to remove ineligible voters from the
7 rolls or have them moved to inactive status.”

8 Finally, The Alliance claims “[i]f Petitioners succeed those, who move, and travel will be
9 at an increased risk of wrongful deregistration.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 11:10-11.

10 None of this feared relief is being sought by Petitioners. The question is whether Movants
11 have a *significant protectable interest* in *this* matter. They do not.²

12 The interests articulated by the Movants do not demonstrate any protectable interest in this
13 mandamus action. Movants “concerns” and “fears” are generalized, speculative, and do not rise to
14 the level of a legally protectable interest in the outcome of this case because the basis of their
15 fears does not exist. The Nevada Supreme Court held, “[a] general, indirect, contingent, or
16 insubstantial interest is insufficient, however. Indeed, the Nevada courts have required a showing
17 of a “significant[] protectable interest.” *Am. Home Assurance Co.*, 147 P.3d at 1127. Not only are
18 the Movant’s injuries imaginary and speculative, the contingency for the injury (*i.e.*, that the
19
20
21

22 ² Movants notes two examples of cases where intervention was allowed. Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 14:9-23.
23 Importantly, neither case is “analogous” to the present case. *Id.* Both cases involved different parties and different
24 claims than this case. Further, Movants fail to note the instances where intervention has been denied, including a
25 recent case involving a motion to intervene by the Michigan Alliance for Retired Americans and Rise Inc. *Pub.*
26 *Interest Legal Found. v. Benson*, No. 1:21-cv-929, 2022 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 246223 (W.D. Mich. Aug. 25, 2022).
27 There, the movants argued “the following two significant protectable interests in this litigation: (1) ‘should [PILF]
28 succeed, it would increase the risk that Proposed Intervenor’s members or constituents may be improperly purged
from Michigan’s voter rolls due to error-prone or highly questionable database matching efforts’; and (2) ‘should the
Court grant PILF’s requested relief, Proposed Intervenor’s will be required to divert resources to minimize the risk
that their members and constituents will be disenfranchised while the relief is implemented, and to assist any
wrongfully purged voters to re-register” *Id.* at *30. “On the facts at bar, the Court is not convinced that the interests
the Proposed Intervenor’s claim, which turn on some amount of increased risk of future disenfranchisement, constitute
a substantial legal interest.” *Id.* at *32.

1 Petitioners are seeking the removal of any voters from the rolls) is non-existent. Movants are well
2 aware the only relief sought by the Petitioners is an investigation of commercial addresses and
3 appropriate corrections as required by law. *See* Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 8:10-12.

4 Granting intervention based on general and indefinite interests poses real risks to parties
5 and judicial resources. Movants do not claim a relationship with any individual who is registered
6 to vote at the identified 48 locations in question. Nor can Movants show that a single member of
7 their organizations faces any threat of unlawful or lawful removal. Movant Rise claims, “the
8 lawsuit threatens the ability of Rise’s constituency – students and younger people – to vote in the
9 2024 general election.” Declaration of Christian Solomon at 2:28-3:1. Rise offers no support that
10 any of the 48 locations in question will be used by one of their potential student voter
11 registrations in the fall or that any university housing is even at issue. Movant’s interests are no
12 different from the general public’s interest in ensuring that election laws are followed, which is
13 insufficient to support intervention, and is an interest adequately protected by the Petitioners and
14 Respondent. *See United States v. Alabama*, No. 2:06-cv-392-WKW, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
15 55305, at *13-15 (M.D. Ala. Aug. 8, 2006) (holding “the alleged interest could be claimed by any
16 voter, the interest is only of a general – not direct and substantial – concern”).

17
18
19 **B. Movants’ Stated Interest Will Not Be Impaired by the Disposition of this**
20 **Action.**

21 Movants must show that impairment of its ability to protect its legal interest is possible if
22 intervention is denied. *See Am. Home Assurance.*, 147 P.3d at 1126. Movant’s claim “[s]uch
23 relief would severely harm Proposed Intervenors by threatening their members’ and constituents’
24 voting rights and requiring Proposed Intervenors to expand substantial resources to educate voters
25 and protect them from baseless attacks on their eligibility.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 3:19-21.
26 Yet, Movant’s do not explain how an investigation “actually will affect” anything they do. *See S.*
27 *Cal. Edison*, 307 F.3d at 803. An “economic interest” must be “non-speculative,” “concrete,” and
28

1 “related to the underlying subject matter of the action.” *Alisal Water*, 370 F.3d at 919-20 (internal
2 citations omitted).

3 Rise claims “[the relief sought] will significantly disrupt Rise’s pre-election planning and
4 also come at the expense of work on its other mission-critical goals.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t
5 9:18-20. Further, Movants claims “Rise expects that it will have to focus its volunteer phone
6 banking efforts on educating students and informing them how to confirm their registration
7 status.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 9:21-22. Movants, however, already claim this is part of the
8 work they do prior to the lawsuit. See Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 9:2-3. Rise “is planning extensive
9 efforts to register students on campus and to ensure students *stay* registered” and “Rise plans to
10 make organizing and educating its student constituents about the 2024 general election a major
11 priority.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 8:27-9:1-2. This alleged “economic interest” cannot possibly
12 “relate to the underlying subject matter of the action” if the organization had already planned to
13 expend resources for these precise goals regardless of this lawsuit.
14

15
16 IPN alleges “it would have to retool its voter guide to educate the public about the purge
17 and add material informing voters how to confirm their registration” if Petitioners are successful.
18 Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 10:15-16. Aside from the fact there is no “purge” forthcoming by this
19 mandamus, this type of interest IPN alleges will be impaired without intervention is one that the
20 organization is already doing prior to this litigation. IPN admits “[i]ts core mission is to ensure
21 that every Nevadan knows how to vote and how to do so confidently and successfully” Mot.
22 Intervene as Resp’t 9:26-10:1.³ Further, IPN boasts it has done this type of work for fifteen years.
23 See Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 10:1-2. Movants cannot claim an impairment based on the efforts
24 the organization already undertakes as part of its core mission and everyday tasks.⁴ Further, IPN
25
26

27 ³ Surely IPN currently instructs its members not to register at commercial addresses in accordance with Nevada law.
28 NRS 293.486(1).

⁴ IPN claims it “would have to refocus its limited advertising to spread awareness about the need for voters to check

1 fails to explain how the relief sought, simply an investigation into the voter roll maintenance
2 status or the identity of the 48 locations in question, have any relation to its mission.

3 The Alliance claims “Alliance members are disproportionately vulnerable when voting
4 rolls are purged.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 11:6. This allegation suggests the Alliance does not
5 fully understand the relief sought by the Petitioners. This is evident by Movant’s claim “if
6 Petitioners succeed, those who move and travel will be at an increased risk of wrongful
7 deregistration.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 11:10-11. Finally, Alliance has not identified a single
8 member of their organization who resides at one of the 48 commercial addresses. Yet, the
9 Alliance claims “Alliance leadership and volunteers would also need to assist any members who
10 were deregistered.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 11:22-23. This claimed injury is speculative at best
11 and does not correlate with the relief sought by Petitioners.
12

13
14 Accordingly, none of the Proposed Intervenors have identified a protectable interest in this
15 litigation concurrent with the relief sought by Petitioners. The Ninth Circuit has held “[w]here no
16 protectable interest is present, there can be no impairment to protect it.” *Am. Ass’n of People with*
17 *Disabilities v. Herrera*, 257 F.R.D. 236, 252 (D.N.M. 2008); *see also Sierra Club v. EPA*, 995
18 F.2d 1478, 1486 (9th Cir. 1993). None of the Movants have explained how the relief sought, an
19 investigation into the commercial addresses in question, impairs a protectable interest.⁵
20

21 **C. Movants Have Not Overcome the Presumption of Adequate Representation.**

22 As of filing this response, Respondent has not yet answered. It is absurd for the Movants
23 to suggest that Respondent is not going to adequately represent all voters’ interest, including the
24 voters represented by the Movants. The Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(a) denies intervention where an
25

26 their registration” yet, claim “its core mission is to ensure that every Nevadan knows how to vote and how to do so
confidently and successfully.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 9:26-27; Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 10:17-18.

27 ⁵ Movants boldly claim that “cancellation must be the goal” of the Petitioners “based on their contention that
‘[a]ction is needed prior to mailing out ballots for the June primary election,’ Pet. Ex. A at 1 (emphasis omitted)—
28 would (sic) make no sense.” Mot. Intervene as Resp’t 16:26-28. Such a statement demonstrates Movants’ lack of
awareness or concern regarding the importance of correct addresses when mailing ballots.

1 intervenor’s rights are already adequately represented. Intervention is not appropriate when a
2 petitioner’s “interest is adequately represented by real party interest Dan Schwartz, Nevada
3 treasurer, in his official capacity.” *Hairr v. First Jud. Dist. Ct.*, 368 P.3d 1198, 1199 (Nev. 2016).
4 There, the State of Nevada (through the official, Dan Schwartz, in his official capacity as Nevada
5 treasurer) in defending S.B. 302’s constitutionality, was “presumed to be adequately representing
6 the interests of citizens who support the bill, including petitioners.” *Id.* The petitioners “failed to
7 overcome the presumption when they could not show any conflict of interests with the State’s
8 position or cite an argument they would make that the State would not.” *Id.*

10 Here, Movants claim they will make arguments that the State would not make. That
11 assertion cannot, at this stage, be true as Respondent has not yet made any argument. The court in
12 *Hairr* further held “[t]he most important factor in determining the adequacy of representation is
13 how the interest compares with the interest of existing parties . . . [and] when an applicant for
14 intervention and an existing party have the same ultimate objective, a presumption of adequacy of
15 representation arises.” *Id.* at 1201 (citing *Arakaki v. Cayeto*, 324 F.3d 1078, 1086 (9th Cir.
17 2003)). In their motion, Movants conveniently cite the first half of a sentence in *Hairr*, “[t]he
18 burden on proposed intervenors in showing inadequate representation is minimal, and would be
19 satisfied if they could demonstrate that representation of their interest ‘may be’ inadequate”, Mot.
20 Intervene as Resp’t 16:10-12, but fail to finish the sentence, “[the Ninth Circuit] also recognized
21 that there is an ‘assumption of adequacy when the government is acting on behalf of a
22 constituency it represents,’ and ‘[i]n the absence of a “very compelling showing to the contrary,”
23 it will be presumed that the state adequately represents its citizens when the applicant shares the
24 same interests.” *Hairr*, 368 P.3d at 1201 (citing *Arakaki*, 324 F.3d at 1086; quoting 7C Charles
25 Alan Wright et al., *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1909 (3d ed. 2007).

27 Ultimately, the court in *Hairr* stated, “[u]nless the applicant ‘can show that the [existing
28

1 party] has a different objective, adverse to its interest,’ or can show that the existing party ‘may
2 not adequately represent their shared interest, the [existing party’s representation is assumed to be
3 adequate.” *Hairr*, 368 P.3d at 1201(quoting *Am. Home Assurance Co.*,147 P.3d at 1129). In
4 *Hairr*, like here, the Movants and the State “have the same ultimate objective” and “[movants]
5 did not identify any conflicting interest or point to any arguments that the State was refusing to
6 make...” *Hairr*, 368 P.3d at 1201.

8 The Nevada Supreme Court in *Lundberg v. Koontz* also denied a similar motion to
9 intervene of right on the basis that the interests of the potential intervenors were adequately
10 represented by the State, “because the single issue raised was an issue of law on which the
11 applicants and the State sought the same outcome.” *Id.* (citing *Lundberg v. Koontz*, 418 P.2d 808,
12 809 (Nev. 1966)). Movants do not state an interest which will not be already adequately
13 represented by Respondent Burgess in her official capacity as Washoe County Interim Registrar
14 of Voters. Movants have not attempted to demonstrate adversity of interest, collusion, or
15 nonfeasance, as there is none. Therefore, the presumption remains that Respondent adequately
16 represents any interests of the proposed intervenors.

18 **II. The Court Should Deny Permissive Intervention.**

19 This Court “may permit” a timely motion to intervene where the proposed intervenor
20 “[h]as a claim or defense that shares with the main action a common question of law or fact.”
21 Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(1)(B). However, the court, in exercising its discretion, “must consider
22 whether the intervention will unduly delay or prejudice the adjudication of the original parties’
23 rights.” Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3).

25 **A. Movants Do Not Have a Separate Claim or Defense.**

26 “[T]he words ‘claim or defense’ manifestly refer to the kinds of claims or defenses that
27 can be raised in courts of law as part of an actual or impending lawsuit.” *Diamond v. Charles*, 476
28

1 U.S. 54, 76 (1986) (O'Connor, J., concurring). Though permissive intervention does not require a
2 "direct personal or pecuniary interest in the subject of the litigation...it plainly does require an
3 interest sufficient to support a legal claim or defense which is 'founded upon [that] interest.'" *Id.*
4 at 77 (citation omitted). Here, for the reasons above, Movants have made no such claim or
5 defense premised on the actual relief sought by Petitioners.
6

7 **B. Movants Will Duplicate Efforts, Add to the Parties' Burdens, and Cause**
8 **Undue Delay and Expense if Permitted to Intervene.**

9 Adding more parties would unnecessarily prolong litigation, burden the parties, duplicate
10 arguments and add expense without adding any benefit to the present parties or the Court. Under
11 the Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3) the Court "must consider whether the intervention will unduly delay
12 or prejudice the adjudication of the original parties' rights." Nev. R. Civ. P. 24(b)(3). The
13 Movants have not pointed to any unique arguments that Respondent Burgess will not raise and
14 provide no reason to believe their participation would help the Court resolve the matter at hand.
15 Indeed, based on their Motion to Intervene, Movants intend to raise concerns that are wholly
16 speculative and unrelated to the Petition at hand. For these reasons, permissive intervention is not
17 appropriate.
18

19 **CONCLUSION**

20 For the foregoing reasons, this Court should deny the motion to intervene.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **AFFIRMATION**
2 (Pursuant to NRS 239B.030)

3 The undersigned does hereby affirm that the preceding document filed in the above
4 referenced matter does not contain the social security number of any person.

5 Dated: June 11, 2024.
6 Respectfully submitted,

THE O'MARA LAW FIRM, P.C.

7 /s/ David C. O'Mara
8 David C. O'Mara, Esq., (NV Bar 08599)
9 311 E. Liberty Street
10 Reno, Nevada 89501
11 775.323.1321
david@omaralaw.net
Local Counsel for Plaintiff

12 J. Christian Adams*
13 Joseph Nixon*
14 Kaylan Phillips*
15 Public Interest Legal Foundation
16 107 S. West Street, Suite 700
17 Alexandria, VA 22314
703.745.5870
adams@publicinterestlegal.org
nixon@pubicinterestlegal.org
kphillips@publicinterestlegal.org

18 * *Pro Hac Vice motions forthcoming*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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 on this 11th day of June, 2024, a true and correct copy of **RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO INTERVENE AS RESPONDENTS** was served by electronically filing with the Clerk of the Court using the Odyssey eFileNV system and serving all parties with an email-address on record, pursuant to Administrative Order 14-2 and Rule 9 of the N.E.F.C.R.

Dated: June 11, 2024

By: /s/ David C. O'Mara
David C. O'Mara, Esq.,
Counsel for Petitioners