

RECEIVED, 12/29/2022 07:21:21 PM, Clerk, First District Court of Appeal

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
FIRST DISTRICT, STATE OF FLORIDA**

SENATOR RAY
RODRIGUES, et al.,

Non-Parties-Appellants,

v.

BLACK VOTERS MATTER
CAPACITY BUILDING
INSTITUTE, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs-Appellees.

Case No.: 1D22-3834
L.T. No.: 2022-ca-000666

**APPENDIX OF APPELLEES TO MOTION TO DISMISS
FOR LACK OF JURISDICTION**

Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111
Thomas A. Zehnder
Florida Bar No. 0063274
Quinn B. Ritter
Florida Bar No. 1018135
King, Blackwell, Zehnder
& Wermuth, P.A.
P.O. Box 1631
Orlando, Florida 32802
Telephone: (407) 422-2472
Facsimile: (407) 648-0161
fwermuth@kbzwlaw.com
tzehnder@kbzwlaw.com
qritter@kbzwlaw.com

Christina A. Ford
Florida Bar No. 1011634
Elias Law Group LLP
250 Massachusetts Ave NW
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 968-4490
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498
cford@elias.law

Counsel for Appellees

INDEX OF APPENDIX

<u>Document Description</u>	<u>Page</u>

Amended Notice of Withdrawal and Cancellation with Prejudice of Subpoenas to and Notices of Deposition of Legislators and Legislative Staff dated December 14, 2022.....	5-7
Appellants' Notice of Withdrawal of Suggestion for Pass-Through Certification dated December 15, 2022.....	8-18
Email from Christina Ford to Andy Bardos and Dan Nordby dated December 11, 2022	19
Email from Joseph Posimato to Andy Bardos and Dan Nordby dated December 28, 2022.....	20-21
Order on Motion for Protective Order Preventing Depositions of Individual Legislators and Staff dated October 27, 2022	22-29
Order on Governor and J. Alex Kelly's Motion to Quash and for Protection from Subpoenas Duces Tecum for Deposition dated October 27, 2022	30-40

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on December 29, 2022 I electronically filed the foregoing using the State of Florida ePortal Filing System, which will serve an electronic copy to counsel in the Service List below.

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth
Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111

Counsel for Appellees

SERVICE LIST

Andy Bardos, Esq.
GrayRobinson, P.A.
301 S. Bronough Street, Suite 600
Tallahassee, FL 32302
andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com

*Counsel Chris Sprowls and Thomas
J. Leek*

Bradley R. McVay
Ashley Davis
Florida Department of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
brad.mcvay@dos.myflorida.com
ashley.davis@dos.myflorida.com
stephanie.buse@dos.myflorida.com

*Counsel for Defendant
Secretary of State*

Daniel E. Nordby
Shutts & Bowen LLP
215 S. Monroe Street, Suite 804
Tallahassee, FL 32301
ndordby@shutts.com

*Counsel for Florida Senate, Ray
Rodrigues, and Wilton Simpson*

Mohammad O. Jazil
Gary V. Perko
Michael Beato
Holtzman Vogel Baran
Torchinsky Josefiak LLC
119 South Monroe Street
Suite 500
Tallahassee, FL 32301
mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com
gperko@holtzmanvogel.com
mbeato@holtzmanvogel.com
zbennington@holtzmanvogel.com

*Counsel for Defendant
Secretary of State*

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY

BLACK VOTERS MATTER CAPACITY
BUILDING INSTITUTE, INC., et al.

Case No. 2022-ca-000666

Plaintiffs,

v.

CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as
Florida Secretary of State, et al.,

Defendants.

**AMENDED¹ NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL AND CANCELLATION WITH
PREJUDICE OF SUBPOENAS TO AND NOTICES OF DEPOSITION
OF LEGISLATORS AND LEGISLATIVE STAFF**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs hereby withdraw and cancel—with prejudice—the Subpoenas to and Notices of Deposition of former Senators Ray Rodrigues and Aaron Bean; Senator Jennifer Bradley; former speaker Chris Sprowls; Representatives Thomas Leek and Tyler Sirois; and legislative staff Leda Kelly, Jason Poreda, Jay Ferrin, Thomas Justin Eichermuller, and Mat Bahl.

Dated: December 14, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth

Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111
Thomas A. Zehnder
Florida Bar No. 0063274
**KING, BLACKWELL, ZEHNDER
& WERMUTH, P.A.**

P.O. Box 1631
Orlando, Florida 32802
Telephone: (407) 422-2472
Facsimile: (407) 648-0161

Abha Khanna*

ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 656-0177
Facsimile: (206) 656-0180
akhanna@elias.law

¹ Plaintiffs file this Amended Notice to correct a scrivener's error omitting Leda Kelly from the list of legislative staff whom they no longer seek to depose.

fwerthemuth@kbzwlaw.com
tzehtnder@kbzwlaw.com

Christina A. Ford
Florida Bar No. 1011634
Joseph N. Posimato*
Graham W. White*
Harleen K. Gambhir*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G Street NE, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20002
Phone: (202) 968-4490
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498
cford@elias.law
jposimato@elias.law
gwhite@elias.law
hgambhir@elias.law

Counsel for Plaintiffs

**Admitted pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on December 14, 2022 I electronically filed the foregoing using the State of Florida ePortal Filing System, which will serve an electronic copy to counsel in the Service List below.

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth
Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111

Counsel for Plaintiffs

SERVICE LIST

Bradley R. McVay
Ashley Davis
Florida Department of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
brad.mcvay@dos.myflorida.com
ashley.davis@dos.myflorida.com

Mohammed O. Jazil

Daniel E. Nordby
Shutts & Bowen LLP
215 S. Monroe Street
Suite 804
Tallahassee, FL 32301
ndordby@shutts.com

Counsel for Florida Senate

Michael Beato
Holtzman Vogel Baran Torchinsky
& Josefiak, PLLC
119 S. Monroe Street, Suite 500
Tallahassee, FL 32301
mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com
mbeato@holtzmanvogel.com

Counsel for Florida Secretary of State

Andy Bardos, Esq.
GrayRobinson, P.A.
301 S. Bronough Street
Suite 600
Tallahassee, FL 32302
andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com

Counsel for the Florida House of Representatives

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL
FOR THE FIRST DISTRICT, STATE OF FLORIDA**

SENATOR RAY RODRIGUES,
et al.,

Non-Parties-Appellants,

v.

Case No. 1D22-3834
L.T. Case No. 2022-CA-000666

BLACK VOTERS MATTER
CAPACITY BUILDING INSTITUTE,
INC., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs-Appellees.

_____/

**NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF SUGGESTION
FOR PASS-THROUGH CERTIFICATION**

Appellants, former Senators Ray Rodrigues and Aaron Bean, Senator Jennifer Bradley, former Speaker of the Florida House of Representatives Chris Sprowls, Representatives Thomas Leek and Tyler Sirois, and Mat Bahl, Leda Kelly, Jason Poreda, Jay Ferrin, and Thomas Justin Eichermuller, respectfully withdraw their Suggestion for Pass-Through Certification, dated December 5, 2022.

1. On October 27, 2022, the court below entered an order permitting Plaintiffs in this redistricting case to depose the non-party Appellants—eleven current and former legislators and legislative staff members—regarding matters within the scope of their legislative duties.

2. Appellants appealed that order and, on December 5, 2022, filed a Suggestion for Pass-Through Certification. In the Suggestion, Appellants requested this Court to certify the trial court’s order for immediate resolution by the Florida Supreme Court. Art. V, § 3(b)(5), Fla. Const.

3. On December 12, 2022, Plaintiffs withdrew and canceled “with prejudice” all subpoenas issued to and notices of deposition of Appellants. Plaintiffs filed an amended notice two days later to correct an inadvertent omission. Ex. A. Plaintiffs also stipulated that they will not depose any other legislators or legislative staff members who claim the legislative privilege.

4. Because Plaintiffs have agreed not to depose any legislator or legislative staff member who claims the legislative privilege, Appellants no longer seek an “immediate resolution” of this appeal. *See* Art. V, § 3(b)(5), Fla. Const.

5. Instead, Appellants will pursue this appeal initially in this Court. Appellants do not waive any right of appellate review separate and apart from their withdrawal of the Suggestion for Pass-Through Certification filed on December 5, 2022.

Respectfully submitted this fifteenth day of December 2022.

/s/ Andy Bardos

ANDY BARDOS (FBN 822671)

GRAYROBINSON, P.A.

301 South Bronough Street,
Suite 600

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

(850) 577-9090

andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com

*vanessa.reichel@gray-
robinson.com*

*Counsel for Speaker Chris
Sprowls, Representative Thomas
Leek, Representative Tyler Sirois,
Mat Bahl, Leda Kelly, and Jason
Poreda*

/s/ Daniel E. Nordby

DANIEL E. NORDBY (FBN 14588)

GEORGE N. MEROS, JR. (FBN
263321)

TARA R. PRICE (FBN 98073)

SHUTTS & BOWEN LLP

215 South Monroe Street,
Suite 804

Tallahassee, Florida 32301
(850) 241-1717

DNordby@shutts.com

GMeros@shutts.com

TPrice@shutts.com

MMontanaro@shutts.com

CHill@shutts.com

CARLOS REY (FBN 11648)
FLORIDA SENATE
404 South Monroe Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399
(850) 487-5855
Rey.Carlos@flsenate.gov

*Counsel for Senator Ray
Rodrigues, Senator Aaron Bean,
Senator Jennifer Bradley, Jay
Ferrin, and Thomas Justin
Eichermuller*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on December 15, 2022, a copy of the foregoing was filed via electronic means through the Florida Courts E-Filing portal and was served via electronic mail on the parties identified on the service list that follows.

/s/ Andy Bardos
Andy Bardos (FBN 822671)
GrayRobinson, P.A.

SERVICE LIST

Frederick S. Wermuth

Thomas A. Zehnder

King, Blackwell, Zehnder
& Wermuth, P.A.

P.O. Box 1631

Orlando, Florida 32802

fweremuth@kbzwlaw.com

tzehnder@kbzwlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Christina A. Ford

Joseph N. Posimato

Graham W. White

Harleen K. Gambhir

Elias Law Group LLP

10 G Street N.E., Suite
600

Washington, D.C. 20002

cford@elias.law

jposimato@elias.law

gwhite@elias.law

hgambhir@elias.law

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Abha Khanna

Jonathan P. Hawley

Elias Law Group LLP

1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100

Seattle, Washington 98101

akhanna@elias.law

jhawley@elias.law

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Bradley R. McVay

Ashley Davis

Florida Department of State

R.A. Gray Building

500 South Bronough Street

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

brad.mcvay@dos.myflorida.com

ashley.davis@dos.myflorida.com

stephanie.buse@dos.myflorida.com

*Attorneys for Defendant, Secretary of
State*

Mohammad O. Jazil

Gary V. Perko

Michael Beato

Holtzman Vogel Baran Torchinsky &
Josefiak LLC

119 South Monroe Street, Suite 500

Tallahassee, Florida 32301

mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com

gperko@holtzmanvogel.com

mbeato@holtzmanvogel.com

zbennington@holtzmanvogel.com

*Attorneys for Defendant, Secretary of
State*

Exhibit A

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY

BLACK VOTERS MATTER CAPACITY
BUILDING INSTITUTE, INC., et al.

Plaintiffs,

v.

CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as
Florida Secretary of State, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2022-ca-000666

**AMENDED¹ NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL AND CANCELLATION WITH
PREJUDICE OF SUBPOENAS TO AND NOTICES OF DEPOSITION
OF LEGISLATORS AND LEGISLATIVE STAFF**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs hereby withdraw and cancel—with prejudice—the Subpoenas to and Notices of Deposition of former Senators Ray Rodrigues and Aaron Bean; Senator Jennifer Bradley; former speaker Chris Sprowls; Representatives Thomas Leek and Tyler Sirois; and legislative staff Leda Kelly, Jason Poreda, Jay Ferrin, Thomas Justin Eichermuller, and Mat Bahl.

Dated: December 14, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth
Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111
Thomas A. Zehnder
Florida Bar No. 0063274
**KING, BLACKWELL, ZEHNDER
& WERMUTH, P.A.**
P.O. Box 1631
Orlando, Florida 32802
Telephone: (407) 422-2472
Facsimile: (407) 648-0161

Abha Khanna*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
1700 Seventh Avenue, Suite 2100
Seattle, Washington 98101
Telephone: (206) 656-0177
Facsimile: (206) 656-0180
akhanna@elias.law

¹ Plaintiffs file this Amended Notice to correct a scrivener's error omitting Leda Kelly from the list of legislative staff whom they no longer seek to depose.

fwerimuth@kbzwlaw.com
tzehnder@kbzwlaw.com

Christina A. Ford
Florida Bar No. 1011634
Joseph N. Posimato*
Graham W. White*
Harleen K. Gambhir*
ELIAS LAW GROUP LLP
10 G Street NE, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20002
Phone: (202) 968-4490
Facsimile: (202) 968-4498
cford@elias.law
jposimato@elias.law
gwhite@elias.law
hgambhir@elias.law

Counsel for Plaintiffs

**Admitted pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on December 14, 2022 I electronically filed the foregoing using the State of Florida ePortal Filing System, which will serve an electronic copy to counsel in the Service List below.

/s/ Frederick S. Wermuth
Frederick S. Wermuth
Florida Bar No. 0184111

Counsel for Plaintiffs

SERVICE LIST

Bradley R. McVay
Ashley Davis
Florida Department of State
R.A. Gray Building
500 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
brad.mcvay@dos.myflorida.com
ashley.davis@dos.myflorida.com

Mohammed O. Jazil

Daniel E. Nordby
Shutts & Bowen LLP
215 S. Monroe Street
Suite 804
Tallahassee, FL 32301
ndordby@shutts.com

Counsel for Florida Senate

Michael Beato
Holtzman Vogel Baran Torchinsky
& Josefiak, PLLC
119 S. Monroe Street, Suite 500
Tallahassee, FL 32301
mjazil@holtzmanvogel.com
mbeato@holtzmanvogel.com

Counsel for Florida Secretary of State

Andy Bardos, Esq.
GrayRobinson, P.A.
301 S. Bronough Street
Suite 600
Tallahassee, FL 32302
andy.bardos@gray-robinson.com

Counsel for the Florida House of Representatives

From: [Christina Ford](#)
To: [Andy Bardos](#); [Daniel E. Nordby](#)
Cc: [George N. Meros, Jr.](#); [Tara R. Price](#); [Rey, Carlos](#); akhanna@elias.law; [Fritz Wermuth](#); [Thomas Zehnder](#); jposimato@elias.law; hgambhir@elias.law; gwhite@elias.law; jzuckerbrod@elias.law
Subject: BVM v Byrd Legislator Appeal and Certification
Date: Sunday, December 11, 2022 11:49:50 AM

Andy and Dan,

I hope you have both been well.

I'm writing to discuss the certification motion the legislators and staff filed this week. Because plaintiffs had offered to withdraw all legislator and staff depositions, we were surprised to see the motion and the representation to the court that the issue was urgent or needed immediate resolution.

To the extent your clients had any concern about us following through on our offer, we now withdraw, with prejudice, our deposition notices to the legislators and staff. We can also represent to you that we will not depose any other legislators or staff who claim legislative privilege. In light of our shared interest in proceeding with this litigation as efficiently as possible and avoiding the "unnecessary delays" you mention in your motion in advance of our April discovery deadline, we think it makes sense to avoid unnecessary trips to the Florida Supreme Court.

Given this withdrawal, we see no urgency at all to this appeal (and in fact, no need for an appeal at all), and we would ask that you withdraw your certification motion and your appeal. If you disagree and think the issue still requires immediate resolution, or is still live, please let us know the basis for that belief so that we can address it appropriately in our response to the Court.

Thank you,

Christina

Christina Ford
Elias Law Group LLP
10 G St NE Ste 600
Washington DC 20002
202-968-4558

CONFIDENTIAL: This email may contain privileged or confidential information and is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use or disclosure of this communication is prohibited. If you believe that you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system.

From: Joseph Posimato
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2022 2:15 PM
To: Daniel E. Nordby
Cc: George N. Meros, Jr.; Tara R. Price; Rey, Carlos; Abha Khanna; Fritz Wermuth; Christina Ford; Thomas Zehnder; Harleen Gambhir; Graham White; Julie Zuckerbrod; Andy Bardos
Subject: RE: BVM v Byrd - 1st DCA Appeal

Thanks, Dan.

Plaintiffs intend to move to dismiss the appeal for mootness. In addition to dismissing with prejudice the depositions of all legislators and staff members who invoke legislative privilege, which we have already done, we represent that we will not seek to compel the deposition of any legislator or member of the legislative staff who invokes the privilege and will not move to compel any discovery that the House or Senate has objected to on legislative privilege grounds. We also intend to make these representations to the court in our motion.

Please let us know by noon tomorrow whether you intend to oppose the motion.

Thanks,
Joe

Joseph Posimato
Elias Law Group
10 G St NE Ste 600
Washington DC 20002
631-375-7792
jposimato@elias.law

From: Daniel E. Nordby <DNordby@shutts.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2022 12:43 PM
To: Christina Ford <cford@elias.law>; Andy Bardos <Andy.Bardos@gray-robinson.com>
Cc: George N. Meros, Jr. <GMeros@shutts.com>; Tara R. Price <TPrice@shutts.com>; Rey, Carlos <Rey.Carlos@flsenate.gov>; Abha Khanna <akhanna@elias.law>; Fritz Wermuth <FWermuth@kbzwlaw.com>; Thomas Zehnder <TZehnder@kbzwlaw.com>; Joseph Posimato <jposimato@elias.law>; Harleen Gambhir <hgambhir@elias.law>; Graham White <gwhite@elias.law>; Julie Zuckerbrod <jzuckerbrod@elias.law>
Subject: RE: BVM v Byrd - 1st DCA Appeal

Good afternoon, Christina. Thank you for your email, but we are not interested in dismissing our appeal on those terms.

Best regards,

Daniel E. Nordby
Partner, Board Certified: Appellate Practice, State & Federal Government & Administrative Practice | Shutts & Bowen LLP
Tel: (850) 241-1725
215 South Monroe Street, Ste. 804, Tallahassee, FL 32301
[Bio](#) | [E-Mail](#) | [vCard](#) | www.shutts.com



From: Christina Ford <cford@elias.law>

Sent: Tuesday, December 27, 2022 10:14 AM

To: Andy Bardos <Andy.Bardos@gray-robinson.com>; Daniel E. Nordby <DNordby@shutts.com>

Cc: George N. Meros, Jr. <GMeros@shutts.com>; Tara R. Price <TPrice@shutts.com>; Rey, Carlos <Rey.Carlos@flsenate.gov>; Abha Khanna <akhanna@elias.law>; Fritz Wermuth <FWermuth@kbzwlaw.com>; Thomas Zehnder <TZehnder@kbzwlaw.com>; Joseph Posimato <jposimato@elias.law>; Harleen Gambhir <hgambhir@elias.law>; Graham White <gwhite@elias.law>; Julie Zuckerbrod <jzuckerbrod@elias.law>

Subject: BVM v Byrd - 1st DCA Appeal

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the SHUTTS email system. Do not respond, click any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dan and Andy,

We wanted to touch base on the status of the appeal the legislators and staff have filed in BVM v. Byrd.

As you know, Plaintiffs have dismissed with prejudice the depositions of all legislators and staff who invoke legislative privilege. We appreciate that the legislators and staff withdrew the certification motion in light of that dismissal.

Our client is still interested in resolving this case as expeditiously and cost-effectively as possible. To that end, if your clients agree to dismiss the appeal in its entirety, Plaintiffs will agree that they will not move to compel any discovery that the House or Senate have objected to on legislative privilege grounds.

Because we otherwise need to respond to the 1st DCA on the form of the appeal later this week, please let us know if you accept our offer by COB on Wednesday, December 28.

Thank you,

Christina

Christina Ford

Elias Law Group LLP

10 G St NE Ste 600
Washington DC 20002
202-968-4558

CONFIDENTIAL: This email may contain privileged or confidential information and is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use or disclosure of this communication is prohibited. If you believe that you have received this email in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system.

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA**

BLACK VOTERS MATTER CAPACITY
BUILDING INSTITUTE, INC., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 2022-CA-000666

v.

CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as
Florida Secretary of State, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER ON MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER PREVENTING
DEPOSITIONS OF INDIVIDUAL LEGISLATORS AND STAFF**

This case came on for hearing on October 20, 2022, on a motion for protective order filed on behalf of six legislators¹ and five current and former legislative staff members² (the “Individual Legislators and Staff”), all non-parties who have been noticed by Plaintiffs for videotaped depositions. Upon consideration of the Motion, responses, replies, and the presentations by counsel, the Court hereby finds as follows:

In this case, Plaintiffs bring constitutional challenges to the congressional district map passed by the Legislature as Senate Bill 2-C on April 21, 2022, and signed by the Governor on April 22, 2022. Ch. 2022-265, Laws of Fla. As part of their discovery, Plaintiffs are seeking to depose the Individual Legislators and Staff to gain insight into the drawing of the

¹ Speaker Chris Sprowls; Representatives Thomas Leek and Tyler Sirois; and Senators Ray Rodrigues, Aaron Bean, and Jennifer Bradley

² Mathew Bahl (Chief of Staff to Speaker Sprowls), Leda Kelly (former Staff Director, House Redistricting Committee), Jason Poreda (Chief Map Drawer, House Redistricting Committee), Jay Ferrin (Staff Director, Senate Committee on Reapportionment), and Thomas Justin Eichermuller (Legislative Analyst, Senate Committee on Reapportionment)

congressional district map. The Individual Legislators and Staff seek a protective order preventing their deposition in this case under the legislative privilege³ and the apex doctrine (Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(h)).

Legislative Privilege

In *League of Women Voters of Fla. v. Fla. House of Representatives*, 132 So. 3d 135, 138 (Fla. 2013) (“*Apportionment IV*”), the Florida Supreme Court “decide[d] for the first time that Florida should recognize a legislative privilege founded on the constitutional principle of separation of powers” in a case arising from last decade’s redistricting. The Court found the privilege exists but is “not absolute and may yield to a compelling, competing interest.” *Id.* at 143. The Court also found that the “compelling interest in [that] case [was] ensuring compliance with article III, section 20(a), which specifically outlaws improper legislative ‘intent’ in the congressional reapportionment process.” *Id.* at 147. It also held that the case presented “a compelling competing interest against application of an absolute legislative privilege.” *Id.* at 150. Finally, the trial court’s balancing approach that the “legislators and legislative staff members may assert a claim of legislative privilege at this stage of the litigation only as to any questions... revealing their thoughts or impressions or the thoughts or impressions shared with legislators by staff or other legislators, but may not refuse to

³ *League of Women Voters of Fla. v. Fla. House of Representatives*, 132 So. 3d 135, 138 (Fla. 2013) (“*Apportionment IV*”). The parties agreed at the hearing that this Court is bound by the majority ruling in *Apportionment IV* (to the extent that it may apply in this case), and that the language used in the Individual Legislators and Staff’s motion and argument regarding any alleged errors in that opinion are solely to preserve the issue for appeal.

testify...concerning any other information or communications pertaining to the...reapportionment process” was adopted by the Court. *Id.* at 154.

In this case, Plaintiffs have alleged that the Governor (through his staff) drew the congressional district map that was ultimately enacted into law. *Compl. at ¶ 74-76. See also, Pl.’s Opp’n to Third-Parties’ Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 6.* They have alleged that the map violates the Fair Districts Amendment. *See, Fla. Const. art III sect. 20.* Accordingly, they seek to depose the Individual Legislators and Staff about the reapportionment map-drawing process as was done under *Apportionment IV*. The Individual Legislators and Staff argue that this case differs from the trial posture seen in *Apportionment IV* in that Plaintiffs have conducted no 3rd party discovery to date.⁴ This Court will note the only real difference between this case and the trial posture addressed in *Apportionment IV* is that the Office of the Governor is now alleged to be the conduit through which the alleged partisan political organizations and political consultants are reaching the legislators. *See, e.g. Pl.’s Notice of Supplemental Ex. 9., Pl.’s Opp’n to Third-Parties’ Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 6., and Compl. at ¶ 77.* Any directed sequence of discovery appears to give this Court unfettered discretion in controlling the application of the privilege. While this Court has great concerns about allowing Plaintiffs to intrude into the internal processes of a separate co-equal branch of government, the binding precedent of *Apportionment IV* provides little relief to the Individual Legislators and Staff other than

⁴ Plaintiffs are seeking to depose a member of the Governor’s staff which is subject to a separate motion in this case. *See, Governor and J. Alex Kelly’s Mot. to Quash & for Protection from Subpoena Duces Tecum for Dep.*

protection from revealing their thoughts or impressions or the thoughts or impressions shared with legislators by staff or other legislators.⁵

Apex Doctrine

Several of the Individual Legislators and Staff have also asserted that the apex doctrine shields them from deposition. See, Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(h). These individuals include Speaker of the House Chris Sprowls, President Pro Tempore of the Florida Senate Aaron Bean, Chair of the Select Committee on Congressional Reapportionment Senator Jennifer Bradley, Chair of the House Congressional Redistricting Subcommittee Tyler Sirois, Chair of the House Redistricting Committee Thomas J. Leek, Chair of the Committee on Reapportionment Senator Ray Rodrigues, and Chief of Staff to the Speaker of the House Mathew Bahl. Each of them has submitted an affidavit attesting to the fact that each lack unique, personal knowledge of the issues being litigated. Each generally reiterate that they hold leadership positions within the Legislature and fulfill leadership duties, relying on the expertise of legislative staff and, as it relates to the drawing of the map at issue in this case, the expertise of members of the Governor's staff. During the hearing on this matter, the Court took judicial notice of the fact that Senator Rodrigues actually sponsored Senate Bill 2-C that created the congressional districts in this case. See also, Pl.'s Opp'n to Third-Parties' Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 6.

⁵ The Court notes that *Apportionment IV* allows legislators to be questioned regarding the reapportionment process despite recognition of a legislative privilege. This Court, in fashioning relief in this case, attempts to set "objective rules that can be applied without the suggestion that the coordinate branch's privilege is subject to diminishment or abrogation through the unfettered discretion of judges." *Apportionment IV*, 132 So. 3d at 160 (Canady, J., dissenting).

Apportionment IV does not address the apex doctrine as applied under the common law. The apex doctrine has since been codified as part of Fla Rule of Civ. Pro. 1.280(h). *In re Amend. to Fla. Rule of Civ. Pro. 1.280*, 324 So. 3d 459, 461 (Fla. 2021). In this case, each of the individuals asserting the apex doctrine, save one, have shown the doctrine applies as to the internal process by which the legislation moved from introduction to enrollment. Senator Rodrigues, by contrast, has shown the apex doctrine only applies as to his function as chair of the Committee on Reapportionment. However, the Court cannot find the apex doctrine to shield him from questioning regarding the introduction of the bill. Nor can this Court, in light of the holding of *Apportionment IV*, find that the apex doctrine shields any individual legislator as to information he or she received prior to voting. Whereas this Court respects the role of each constitutionally elected legislator, it cannot find all 160 legislators to be an apex officer not subject to deposition as to legislation they introduce or vote on. That notion is not supported by the text of the Constitution itself which says that “Each house...shall biennially choose its officers.” Fla. Const. art. III sect. 2. The Constitution also specifies that “On the fourteenth day following each general election the legislature shall convene for the exclusive purpose of organization and selection of officers.” Fla. Const. art. III sect. 3. There is no requirement that a legislator be an officer to introduce legislation, nor to vote.

The affidavits of each legislator asserting the apex doctrine show a reliance on information provided by staff members and the Governor's Office as to the map drawing. Because this Court is constrained by the holding in *Apportionment IV* as to legislators being deposed regarding map-making, this Court finds that the apex doctrine shields Chief of Staff Bahl and each legislator from questions regarding the process by which the bill moved through each respective chamber. The apex doctrine does not protect any individual legislator or Chief of Staff Bahl from information he or she received related to the drafting of the bill or drawing of the map.

Relief

This Court finds the balancing test applied in *Apportionment IV* not to be directly applicable in this case. In *Apportionment IV*, "the challengers uncovered communications between the Legislature and partisan political organizations and political consultants" and the use of that information in map-drawing. 132 So. 3d at 141. In this case, based on the affidavits already submitted, the information regarding redistricting and map-drawing came from the Governor's office. Therefore, drawing the line between "thoughts or impressions of legislators" and "'objective' information and communications" within the respective chamber is unnecessary and does not strike the proper balance between the privilege and the compelling competing interest. The appropriate line in this case is where the doors to the House and Senate meet the outside world. Accordingly, each legislator and legislative staff member may be questioned regarding any matter

already part of the public record and information received from anyone not elected to the Legislature, their direct staff members, or the staff of the legislative bodies themselves. They may not be questioned as to information internal to each Legislative Body that is not already public record (e.g., their thoughts or opinions or those of other legislators).

For the foregoing reasons, the Motion for Protective Order Preventing Depositions of Individual Legislators and Staff is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.** The motion for protective order as to all Individual Legislators and Staff is granted to the extent that they may not be questioned as to information internal to each Legislative Body that is not already public record (e.g., their thoughts or opinions or those of other legislators). The motion is denied in that they may be questioned only as to any matter already part of the public record and information received from anyone not elected to the Legislature, their direct staff members, or the staff of the legislative bodies themselves. This includes the identity of or sources of information outside of the groups identified in this paragraph.

DONE AND ORDERED in Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida, this Thursday, October 27, 2022.

2022-CA-000

Lee Marsh
37-2022-CA-00

J. LEE MARSH
CIRCUIT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

All Counsel of Record

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE SECOND JUDICIAL CIRCUIT,
IN AND FOR LEON COUNTY, FLORIDA**

BLACK VOTERS MATTER CAPACITY
BUILDING INSTITUTE, INC., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 2022-CA-000666

v.

CORD BYRD, in his official capacity as
Florida Secretary of State, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER ON GOVERNOR AND J. ALEX KELLY'S MOTION TO QUASH &
FOR PROTECTION FROM SUBPOENAS DUCES TECUM FOR
DEPOSITION**

This case came on for hearing on October 20, 2022, on a motion to quash and for protective order filed on behalf of Governor Ron DeSantis and deputy chief of staff J. Alex Kelly, both non-parties who have been noticed by Plaintiffs for subpoena duces tecum for videotaped depositions. Upon consideration of the Motion, responses, replies, and the presentations by counsel, the Court hereby finds as follows:

In this case, Plaintiffs bring constitutional challenges to the congressional district map passed by the Legislature as Senate Bill 2-C on April 21, 2022, and signed by the Governor on April 22, 2022. Ch. 2022-265, Laws of Fla. As part of their discovery, Plaintiffs are seeking to depose the Governor¹ and Mr. Kelly to gain insight into the drawing of the congressional

¹ The Plaintiffs acknowledge that the subpoena to the Governor is only to receive documents and that the Governor has properly raised the apex doctrine. At the hearing, Plaintiffs indicated they will not go forward to enforce the subpoena against the Governor. Plaintiffs further acknowledge the information they seek can be discovered through Mr. Kelly. Accordingly, the Court will only address the subpoena as it relates to Mr. Kelly and the Executive Office of the Governor.

district map. Mr. Kelly seeks an order quashing the subpoena and for a protective order preventing his deposition in this case under the legislative privilege², the executive privilege³, and attorney-client privilege and attorney work-product.⁴

Legislative Privilege

In *League of Women Voters of Fla. v. Fla. House of Representatives*, 132 So. 3d 135, 138 (Fla. 2013) ("*Apportionment IV*"), the Florida Supreme Court "decide[d] for the first time that Florida should recognize a legislative privilege founded on the constitutional principle of separation of powers" in a case arising from last decade's redistricting. The Court found the privilege exists but is "not absolute and may yield to a compelling, competing interest." *Id.* at 143. The Court also found that the "compelling interest in [that] case [was] ensuring compliance with article III, section 20(a), which specifically outlaws improper legislative 'intent' in the congressional reapportionment process." *Id.* at 147. It also held that the case presented "a compelling competing interest against application of an absolute legislative privilege." *Id.* at 150. Finally, the trial court's balancing approach that the "legislators and legislative staff members may assert a claim of legislative privilege at this stage of the litigation only as to any questions...

² *League of Women Voters of Fla. v. Fla. House of Representatives*, 132 So. 3d 135, 138 (Fla. 2013) ("*Apportionment IV*"). The parties agreed at the hearing that this Court is bound by the majority ruling in *Apportionment IV* (to the extent that it may apply in this case), and that the language used in the Governor and Mr. J. Alex Kelly's motion and argument regarding any alleged errors in that opinion are solely to preserve the issue for appeal.

³ The Governor and Mr. Kelly note that an executive privilege has "not yet been specifically recognized in Florida." Mot. to Quash & for Protection from Subpoenas Duces Tecum for Dep. at 8.

⁴ The request for protection under the attorney-client privilege and work-product doctrines is not specifically noted in the motion but is cited in Attachment 2 to the motion in response to each item.

revealing their thoughts or impressions or the thoughts or impressions shared with legislators by staff or other legislators, but may not refuse to testify...concerning any other information or communications pertaining to the...reapportionment process” was adopted by the Court. *Id.* at 154.

In this case, Plaintiffs have alleged that the Governor (through his staff) drew the congressional district map that was ultimately enacted into law. *Compl. at ¶ 74-76. See also, Pl.’s Opp’n to Third-Parties’ Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 4 & 6.* They have alleged that the map violates the Fair Districts Amendment. *See, Fla. Const. art III sect. 20.* Accordingly, they seek to depose Mr. Kelly about the reapportionment map-drawing process as was done under *Apportionment IV*. Mr. Kelly, as a staff member to Governor Ron DeSantis, has claimed that the Governor is acting in a legislative capacity in the passage of Senate Bill 2-C⁵. Specifically, he cites *In re: Hubbard*, 803 F. 3d 1298, 1308 (11th Cir. 2015) for the principle that governors (and their staff members) are protected by legislative privilege “in the proposal, formulation, and passage of legislation.”

One of the authorities relied upon in *Hubbard* is *Women’s Emergency Network v. Bush*, 323 F.3d 937, 950 (11th Cir. 2003). In that case, the circuit court recognized the governor’s legislative immunity for “signing a bill into law.” The actions in this case go much further than just signing Senate Bill 2-C into law. The actions extend to allegedly drafting the maps at issue in this case. Accordingly, this case is more akin to that of another case cited by

⁵ This Court also notes that the Governor has advanced to the Florida Supreme Court the position that his duties in this case are executive in nature. *See, Pl.’s Opp’n to Third Parties’ Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 7 at 2.* This Court will address that position under the executive privilege section of this Order.

Hubbard, the case of *Baraka v. McGreevey*, 481 F. 3d 187 (3rd Cir. 2007). In that case, the petitioner brought suit against the governor of New Jersey and another executive branch official for “advocat[ing] and orchestrat[ing] the legislation that abolished the position of poet laureate.” *Id.* at 197. The petitioner “contend[ed] legislative immunity does not apply because they are not legislators and because these are political, not legislative, activities.” *Id.* at 196. The Court found that the actions “are properly characterized as legislative,” *id.* at 197, citing a provision in the New Jersey Const. art V sect. 1. The New Jersey provision is almost identical to the provision in Fla. Const. art IV sect. 1. Accordingly, this Court finds the actions of the Governor and Mr. Kelly are legislative and are properly covered under the legislative privilege.

This Court, having found the actions of the Governor and Mr. Kelly to fall under the scope of the legislative privilege recognized in *Apportionment IV*, 132 So. 3d at 138, must next determine whether the purpose of the privilege is outweighed by a compelling, competing interest. The Court, in *Apportionment IV*, has already found that the “compelling interest in [that] case [was] ensuring compliance with article III, section 20(a), which specifically outlaws improper legislative ‘intent’ in the congressional reapportionment process.” *Id.* at 147. It also held that the case presented “a compelling competing interest against application of an absolute legislative privilege.” *Id.* at 150. This case is no different. In fact, Mr. Kelly submitted the proposed map in this case, (Pl.’s Opp’n to Third-Parties’ Mot.

for Protective Order Ex. 4.) and presented it to the Senate. Pl.'s Opp'n to Mot. to Quash Dep. of Legislators and Staff Ex. 10. Mr. Kelly's map submission differed from that of others in that he was not required to submit the name of every person and group or organization he collaborated with on his map (see, Pl.'s Opp'n to Third-Parties' Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 4.) as was required by the Senate. See, Pl.'s Opp'n to Third-Parties' Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 6. Oddly, Mr. Kelly was allowed to submit his map without this information despite earlier admonition by Committee Chairman, Senator Rodrigues, against this very practice by a staff attorney at the ACLU. See, Pl.'s Opp'n to Third-Parties' Mot. for Protective Order Ex. 5. Therefore, this Court must conduct a balancing approach to fashion a relief. *Apportionment IV*, 132 So. 3d at 143. While this Court has great concerns about allowing Plaintiffs to intrude into the internal processes of a separate co-equal branch of government, the binding precedent of *Apportionment IV* provides little relief to Mr. Kelly other than protection from revealing his thoughts or impressions or the thoughts or impressions shared with the Governor by staff.⁶

Executive Privilege

Mr. Kelly argues that he should be protected from subpoena under an executive privilege that has not been specifically recognized in Florida. This Court need not determine if such a privilege exists, because the actions

⁶ The Court notes that *Apportionment IV* allows legislators to be questioned regarding the reapportionment process despite recognition of a legislative privilege. This Court, in fashioning relief in this case, attempts to set "objective rules that can be applied without the suggestion that the coordinate branch's privilege is subject to diminishment or abrogation through the unfettered discretion of judges." *Apportionment IV*, 132 So. 3d at 160 (Canady, J., dissenting).

taken by Mr. Kelly and the Governor in this case were not executive actions. As noted above, the actions were legislative.

Mr. Kelly, in arguing the legislative nature of the governor's actions properly cited to *State ex rel. Boyd v. Deal*, 24 Fla. 293, 4 So. 899 (Fla 1888). The Court specifically noted that the Governor's "participation in the making of laws...is expressly provided for as an exception to the general prohibition of the...constitution against any person properly belonging to one department of the government exercising power appertaining to another department." *Id.* at 307. However, the Court's holding was further explained in its citation to its own correspondence with the Governor in an opinion, *In re Executive Communication Concerning Powers of Legislature*, 23 Fla 297 (Fla. 1887). In that opinion, Chief Justice McWhorter informed the Governor,

Hon. Edward A. Perry, governor of the State of Florida-Sir: Your communication was received to-day, and has been considered by us. The question asked by you involves the construction of section 13, art. 4, of the constitution. The section is as follows: 'The governor may at any time require the opinion of the justices of the supreme court as to the interpretation of any portion of this constitution upon any question affecting his executive powers and duties, and the justices shall render such opinion in writing.' Unlike the constitutions of some of the other states of the Union, which authorize the governor, or either branch of the legislature, to require to opinion of the justices of the supreme court, our constitution restricts such right to the governor alone. It further restricts the right of the governor to require such opinions on questions 'affecting his executive powers and duties.' Is the opinion you desire one relating to your 'executive powers and duties?' The exact legal meaning of the word 'executive' has been many times authoritatively fixed and defined. It means a duty appertaining to the execution of the laws as they exist. It would follow that the law must be enacted according to all the terms prescribed by the constitution, before the duty of executing it can exist. *Any duty imposed by the constitution on the governor with reference to a bill, before it becomes*

a law, is not an executive duty. The enactment of laws is a legislative duty, and, when your excellency is required by the constitution to do any act which is an essential prerequisite thereto, such act is legislative, and is performed by you as a part of the lawmaking power, and not as the law-executing power. We are of the opinion that the question affects a legislative duty imposed by the constitution; and, believing that a compliance on our part with your request is unauthorized by the constitution, we, with great respect for your excellency, beg to be excused from expressing opinions on the question submitted.

Very respectfully,

'GEO. G. McWHORTER, Chief Justice. *Id* at 298 (emphasis added).

As noted by the Chief Justice, the Governor's executive duties relating to legislation arise after the enactment of the legislation. While Florida's Constitution has been amended since Chief Justice McWhorter's opinion, the operative provisions remain virtually unchanged. Therefore, the opinion still controls. See, Fla. Const. art. IV, sect. 9 (1885) and Fla. Const. art. IV, sect. 1(e). Accordingly, the actions in this case cannot be deemed executive actions but instead, legislative. The executive privilege, if one exists, would provide no relief in this case.

Attorney Work-Product and Attorney-Client Privilege

Governor DeSantis and the Executive Office of the Governor have asserted that some of the documents that are to be produced under the subpoena duces tecum are subject to attorney-client privilege and the attorney work-product doctrine. Mot. to Quash & for Protection from Subpoenas Duces Tecum for Dep. Ex. 2. The parties agreed at the hearing that to the extent the Court were to require production of documents, those subject to a privilege claim would require *in camera* inspection. See, e.g., *Hett v. Barron-Lunde*, 290 So.3d 565, 573 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2020).

Non-Privileged Document Objections

The Executive Office of the Governor has objected to the scope of the discovery sought by Plaintiffs. As to Instruction E of the subpoena duces tecum, the Court finds that the period relevant to this case begins on the date requested on the subpoena and ends on April 22, 2022, the day that Governor DeSantis signed Senate Bill 2-C into law. Any alleged intent on the part of drafters is complete once the legislation is enacted. As to Instruction H, non-parties are not required to submit a privilege log. Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.280(b)(6).

Relief

This Court finds the balancing test applied in *Apportionment IV* not to be directly applicable in this case. In *Apportionment IV*, “the challengers uncovered communications between the Legislature and partisan political organizations and political consultants” and the use of that information in map-drawing. 132 So. 3d at 141. In this case, based on the affidavits already submitted, the information regarding redistricting and map-drawing came from the Governor’s office. Therefore, drawing the line between “thoughts or impressions of [the Governor and his staff]” and “‘objective’ information and communications” within the Executive Office of the Governor is unnecessary and does not strike the proper balance between the privilege and the compelling competing interest. The appropriate line in this case is where the doors to the Governor’s Office meet the Legislative Chambers and the outside world. Accordingly, Mr. Kelly may be questioned

regarding any matter already part of the public record and information received from anyone not part of the Governor's Office. He may not be questioned as to information internal to the Governor's Office that is not already public record (e.g., the thoughts or opinions of staff or those of the Governor). He shall produce the requested documents, subject to the attorney-client privilege and attorney work-product provisions below. The executive privilege objection is overruled.

The Court having found that the legislative privilege applies, and that Mr. Kelly has properly raised the attorney-client privilege and attorney work-product doctrine, this Court must view the materials *in camera* to determine the applicability of each privilege claim. Accordingly, Mr. Kelly and the Executive Office of the Governor shall segregate all responsive materials in which they claim a legislative privilege and contain information which is solely internal to the Governor's Office or materials in which they claim an attorney-client privilege or attorney-work product protection. Those materials are to be submitted to this Court's Judicial Chambers, under seal, for *in camera* inspection **within 30 days** of the date of this order. Mr. Kelly and the Executive Office of the Governor shall prepare an index of each item, Bates stamp the documents, categorize each into groups (legislative privilege, attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product), and highlight in yellow highlighter the alleged privileged/work-product portions. Data files or other digital media submitted need not be highlighted if not feasible. Mr. Kelly and the Executive Office of the Governor may submit affidavits, also for

in camera inspection under seal, in support of the attorney-client privilege and attorney work-product claims. Responsive documents in which there is no claim of privilege or that privilege is not recognized by this order (e.g. materials containing information to/from outside the Governor's Office) must be produced as part of the subpoena duces tecum.

For the foregoing reasons, the Motion To Quash & For Protection From Subpoenas Duces Tecum For Deposition is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part, and deferred in part pending *in camera* review**. The motion for protective order as to Mr. Kelly and the Executive Office of the Governor is granted to the extent that he may not be questioned as to information internal to the Governor's Office that is not already public record (e.g., the thoughts or opinions of staff or those of the Governor). The motion is denied in that he may be questioned regarding any matter already part of the public record and information received from anyone not part of the Governor's Office. This includes the identity of or sources of information outside of the groups identified in this paragraph. Deposition attorney-client privilege objections shall be made in accordance with Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.310 (c). The motion is denied to the extent that Mr. Kelly and the Executive Office of the Governor seek protection of legislative privileged material that does not contain internal communication. The motion is deferred pending *in camera* review as to attorney-client privilege, attorney work-product, and legislative privilege containing internal communication claims.

DONE AND ORDERED in Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida, this
Thursday, October 27, 2022.

2022-CA-000

Lee Marsh
37-2022-CA-00

J. LEE MARSH
CIRCUIT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:

All Counsel of Record