

preparing or considering a map, “[t]he ‘cat’s paw’ theory has no application to legislative bodies,” *Brnovich v. Democratic Nat’l Comm.*, 141 S. Ct. 2321, 2350 (2021); “determining the intent of the legislature is a problematic and near-impossible challenge,” *Greater Birmingham Ministries v. Sec’y of State for State of Alabama*, 992 F.3d 1299, 1324 (11th Cir. 2021); and “the good faith of a state legislature must be presumed,” *Miller v. Johnson*, 515 U.S. 900, 915 (1995).

By answering these interrogatories without objection to whether any individual interrogatory is properly counted as more than one interrogatory, the Chairs do not waive their right to object—in response to further interrogatories, if any—to Plaintiffs surpassing the limit on the number of interrogatories that may be served in this proceeding. The Chairs specifically reserve the right to lodge such an objection.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. The Chairs object to each of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information protected by the attorney client privilege, the work product doctrine, the joint defense or common interest privilege, or any other applicable privilege, exemption, or immunity.

2. The Chairs object to Plaintiffs’ Definitions and Instructions to the extent that they purport to impose any requirements or obligations different from those contained in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the local Rules of this Court, applicable orders of the Court, and/or related agreements.

3. The Chairs object to the extensive overbreadth of the Interrogatories, especially when read in combination with the Definitions. The Chairs further object to

Plaintiffs' use of boilerplate Definitions and Instructions which are not tailored to this litigation or to these requests.

4. The Chairs object to the Interrogatories, including the Definitions and Instructions, to the extent they seek to impose any meaning or interpretation onto the requests other than that evident from the plain and ordinary meaning of the words used therein.

5. The Chairs object to each of the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information that is not relevant to any claim or defense presently before the Court and thus are not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. FED. R. CIV. P. 26(b).

6. The Chairs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek to discover the mental impressions, conclusions, opinions, legal strategies, or legal theories of attorneys for or his non-attorney employees working under their supervision. Such information is privileged as attorney work-product. See *Hickman v. Taylor*, 329 U.S. 495 (1947).

7. The Chairs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek information already in the possession, custody, or control of the Plaintiffs, or otherwise equally available to the Plaintiffs.

8. By answering or otherwise responding to these discovery requests, Rep. Pringle or Sen. Livingston do not concede the relevance or materiality of the information requested or the subject matter to which the request for production refers. Rather, the responses are made expressly subject to, and without in any way waiving or intending to waive, any question or objection as to the competency, relevance, privilege, or admissibility as evidence, of any of the matters referred to in the responses

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Describe in detail the steps taken during the 2023 special session redistricting process to effectuate the Legislature's stated intent to comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as identified in the Legislative Statement to Senate Bill 5.

RESPONSE: The Chairs object to this interrogatory to the extent that it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product, information subject to the legislative privilege, or any other information protected from disclosure by an applicable privilege or immunity. The Chairs object to this interrogatory to the extent that it is overly broad and seeks irrelevant information that is not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. The Chairs object to the use of the word "effectuate" as too vague to allow them to respond. The Chairs further object to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information beyond the Chairs' knowledge.

Subject to and without waiving these or the General Objections, and understanding this interrogatory as a demand for facts within the actual knowledge of the Reapportionment Committee, the Chairs respond that the Reapportionment Committee does not pass legislation to draw redistricting plans and does not know "in detail the steps taken during the 2023 special session redistricting process to effectuate the Legislature's stated intent to comply with the Voting Rights Act of 1965."

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Describe in detail how the communities of interest recognized in the Legislative Statement to Senate Bill 5 were determined, including but not limited to: (1) who was involved in identifying these communities; (2) the basis for determining that each was a community of interest; (3) the reason for including each community in the Legislative Statement; and (4) whether there were other communities of interest identified but not included in the Legislative Statement.

RESPONSE: The Chairs object to this interrogatory to the extent that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and seeks irrelevant information that is not likely to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence as well as attorney work-product, attorney-client communications, information subject to the legislative privilege, or any other information protected from disclosure by an applicable privilege or immunity. The Chairs further object to the extent that this interrogatory seeks information about communities of interest that are beyond the Chairs' knowledge.

Subject to and without waiving these or the General Objections, and understanding this interrogatory as a demand for facts within the actual knowledge of the Reapportionment Committee, the Chairs respond that the Reapportionment Committee does not pass legislation to draw redistricting plans and does not know how the communities of interest recognized in the Legislative Statement to Senate Bill 5 were determined.