

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

THE WISCONSIN ASSEMBLY DEMOCRATIC
CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 18-cv-763-jdp

BEVERLY R. GILL, et al.,

Defendants.

PARTIES' JOINT RULE 26(f) REPORT

The parties, by their undersigned counsel, held a conference pursuant to Rule 26(f) on October 11, 2018. The parties hereby jointly submit the following report consistent with Rules 16 and 26 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This case involves a challenge to the Wisconsin State Assembly districts enacted following the 2010 census. The plaintiff is The Wisconsin Assembly Democratic Campaign Committee. The defendants are members and officials of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, in their official capacity, who are responsible for administering Wisconsin election law.

RELATED CASES

The case of *Whitford, et al., v. Gill, et al.*, 15-cv-421-jdp, is a related case. This case was consolidated with 15-cv-421-jdp by an order of the court that stated "for the limited

purpose of scheduling” and “[a]fter the October 16, 2018 preliminary pretrial conference report, the court will revisit the issue of consolidation if it becomes apparent that individual issues predominate or if consolidation is otherwise impractical.”

(Dkt. 212)

ISSUES PRESENTED

The Wisconsin Assembly Democratic Campaign Committee (“ADCC”) brings a claim about whether, and to what extent, the Assembly map as a whole, that was considered by the court in 15-cv-421-jdp and about which the court made findings of fact, burdens its associational rights and how the associational burden imposed by a partisan gerrymander should be evaluated when the plaintiff is a partisan entity rather than a group of individual voters.

Defendants contend in this case and in the companion case in 15-cv-421-jdp that the primary issue is whether there is a judicially manageable and/or judicially discernible legal standard for deciding the plaintiff’s claims. As of now, there is no legal standard for measuring an allegedly unconstitutional diluting of a plaintiff’s vote in a legislative election or how the districting plan for one house of a state legislature burdens the First Amendment right to associate for expressive purposes. Defendants disagree that the Supreme Court’s vacatur of this Court’s earlier decision in 15-cv-421-jdp somehow approved of this Court’s factual findings and legal conclusions or even left them intact. The issue in the First Amendment claim would be whether a districting plan for one house of a state legislature even implicates the First Amendment right to associate for expressive activities and, if so, whether Act 43

violates the plaintiff's right to associate under this yet-to-be determined standard.

AMENDMENTS TO PLEADINGS AND NEW PARTIES

The parties do not expect there to be any further amendments to the pleadings or additional parties.

DISCOVERY PLAN

(A) The ADCC served its initial disclosures in 18-cv-763-jdp in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A) on the same date. The parties are in agreement that the defendants' supplemental disclosures in 15-cv-421-jdp shall satisfy the defendants' initial disclosure obligations under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(A) in 18-cv-763-jdp.

(B) Topics of discovery.

Given the voluminous evidence developed by the parties and admitted by the Court in the trial of 15-cv-421-jdp in May 2016, and the substantial record already before the Court in the remand of that action, at this time, assuming that the cases continue to be consolidated, the ADCC does not anticipate seeking any discovery from the defendants in 18-cv-763-jdp.

Additional discovery by the defendants in 18-cv-763-jdp will be necessary, as the complaint in 18-cv-763-jdp alleges organization-based harm and alludes to financial and other data that will be the subject of written discovery and depositions, along with other factual allegations made in that complaint.

(C) ESI. The parties will cooperate in arranging the exchange of documents, experts' reports, analyses, and data in appropriate formats, consistent with the parties' previous practices to date in this action.

(D) The parties do not anticipate any issues regarding claims of privilege or trial-preparation materials beyond those normally encountered that would be handled as addressed in the Federal Rules.

(E) The parties agree that the defendants are permitted to depose and serve 25 interrogatories on each plaintiff without leave of Court. In addition to the depositions and written discovery of the plaintiffs in both actions, the parties anticipate taking no more than five depositions of non-parties for each side (five for plaintiffs in both 15-cv-421-jdp and 18-cv-763-jdp as a group, and five for defendants in the same actions as a group). The parties have agreed that they will work cooperatively to accommodate any party's reasonable need for additional non-party depositions beyond the five for each side as a group.

ESTIMATED TRIAL LENGTH

The parties estimate that a consolidated trial of both actions will take four trial days.

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

Plaintiffs' counsel believes that a trial should occur no later than March 2019 so that the Court may issue an opinion that will allow an appeal to be heard by the United States Supreme Court in its 2019-2020 term. Plaintiffs believe this is reasonable given the scope of the mandate on remand.

Defendants request a trial date no sooner than mid-June 2019, with a summary judgment date three months in advance of the trial date. Especially in light of the second lawsuit, 18-cv-763-jdp, containing technical allegations and what appears to be a

new legal associational theory, defendants request 60 days to disclose an expert after receiving plaintiffs' report, and that discovery be left open until 30 days before a trial in June 2019 or later, to allow for written discovery and likely dozens or more depositions of the plaintiffs and the representatives of the organization in the new lawsuit.

The parties propose the following schedules:

Event	Plaintiffs' Proposed Date	Defendants' Proposed Date
Deadline to Amend Pleadings	Filed September 14, 2018	Filed September 14, 2018
Rule 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures	Filed September 28, 2018	Filed September 28, 2018
Plaintiffs' expert report deadline	October 15, 2018	October 15, 2018
Defendants' expert report deadline	December 3, 2018	December 17, 2018
Plaintiffs' Rebuttal report deadline	December 31, 2018	January 15, 2019
Defendants' rebuttal report	January 22, 2019	February 5, 2019
Dispositive motion filing deadline	January 31, 2019	March 15, 2019
Fact Discovery Cut-Off	January 31, 2019	May 15, 2019
Commencement of additional trial days	March 4, 2019	June 17, 2019

PINES BACH LLP

Dated: October 11, 2018

By: /s/ Lester A. Pines

Lester A. Pines
 State Bar No. 1016543
 122 W. Washington Ave., Ste. 900
 Madison, WI 53703
 (608) 251-0101
 lpines@pinesbach.com

*One of the Attorneys for Plaintiff in
 Case No. 18-cv-763-jdp*

BRAD D. SCHIMEL
Wisconsin Attorney General

Dated: October 11, 2018

By:

/s/ Brian P. Keenan

Assistant Attorney General

State Bar No. 1056525

Wisconsin Department of Justice

Post Office Box 7857

Madison WI 53707

(608) 266-0020

keenanbp@doj.state.wi.us

One of the Attorney for Defendants