Richard K. Walker, SBN 004159 **WALKER & PESKIND, PLLC** 16100 N. 71<sup>st</sup> Street, Suite 140 Scottsdale, Arizona 85254-2236

rkw@azlawpartner.com Phone: (480) 483-6336

1

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

Facsimile: (480) 483-6337

Counsel for Defendant Maricopa County, Arizona

### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR

### THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Manuel de Jesus Ortega Melendres, et al, Plaintiffs,

VS.

Joseph M. Arpaio, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:07-CV-02513-GMS

DEFENDANT MARICOPA COUNTY'S NOTICE OF ITS POSITION RE PENDING MOTION FOR RECUSAL OR DISQUALIFICATION

[Assigned to Judge G. Murray Snow]

At the status conference in this matter held on May 22, 2015, the parties and the Court were apprised of the filing, on behalf of certain Defendants and non-party alleged contemnor Gerard Sheridan, of a Motion for Recusal or Disqualification of District Court Judge G. Murray Snow. Having not seen the motion as filed, undersigned counsel advised the Court that he would need to seek direction from the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors ("Board") as to the response to the motion, if any, to be filed on behalf of Defendant Maricopa County ("County"). Counsel further informed the Court that he

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Maricopa County" and "the County," as used herein, are intended to refer to that portion of the government of Maricopa County embodied in the Maricopa County Board

### Case 2:07-cv-02513-GMS Document 1129 Filed 05/27/15 Page 2 of 3

WALKER & PESKIND, PLLC

Attorneys and Counselors 16100 North 71st Street, Suite 140 Scottsdale, AZ 85254

Telephone: (480) 483-6336

2.7

anticipated meeting with the Board to obtain such direction this week. The Court then requested that counsel inform it after his meeting with the Board as to whether the County would like the opportunity to respond and, if so, how long it would take for the County's response to be prepared and filed.

The meeting with the Board counsel had anticipated occurred earlier today. As the Court is aware, the County has advanced arguments to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit to the effect that that court's decision issued April 15, 2015, ordering that the County be made a party litigant in this action was, in that respect, erroneous and should be reversed. *See* Doc. 1116. In light of those arguments, the Board has determined that it would not be appropriate for the County to take a position on the pending Motion for Recusal or Disqualification.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 27<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2015.

WALKER & PESKIND, PLLC

By: /s/ Richard K. Walker
Richard K. Walker
16100 N. 71<sup>st</sup> Street, Suite 140
Scottsdale, Arizona 85254-2236
Attorneys for Defendant Maricopa County, Arizona

of Supervisors, the Maricopa County Manager, and those appointed officials and employees of the County who serve under the supervision and direction of the foregoing. The phrase is not intended, and should not be construed, to refer to any other Maricopa County officer whose office is filled by the electoral process as provided in the Arizona Constitution (Constitutional Officers), or to any of the officials and other employees of the County who serve under the supervision and direction of such Constitutional Officers.

# Attorneys and Counselors 16100 North 71st Street, Suite 140 Scottsdale, AZ 85254

1	l
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

## NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING AND CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on May 27, 2015, I electronically filed the Defendant Maricopa County's Notice of its Position re Pending Motion for Recusal or Disqualification with the Clerk of the Court for filing and uploading to the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all parties of record.

### /s/ Michelle Giordano