E

OCT 1 3 2011

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

BRIAN EGOLF, HAKIM BELLAMY, MEL HOLGUIN, MAURILIO CASTRO, and ROXANE SPRUCE BLY,

Plaintiff-Petitioners,

v.

DIANA J. DURAN, in her official capacity as

New Mexico Secretary of State,

SUSANA MARTINEZ, in her official capacity as

New Mexico Governor,

JOHN A. SANCHEZ, in his official capacity as

New Mexico Lieutenant Governor and presiding officer

of the New Mexico Senate, TIMOTHY Z. JENNINGS, in his

official capacity as President Pro-Tempore of the New Mexico

Senate, and BEN LUJAN, JR., in his official capacity as Speaker

of the New Mexico House of Representatives,

Defendant-Respondents.

JONATHAN SENA, DON BRATTON, CARROLL LEAVELL and GAY KERNAN,

Plaintiffs-Real-Parties-in-Interest,

Defendants-Real-Parties-in-Interest.

v.

DIANA DURAN, in her official capacity as Secretary of State for the State of New Mexico and SUSANA MARTINEZ, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of New Mexico,

D-506-CV-201100913 County of Lea Fifth Judicial District Court

NMSC No. 1133239 CC: LG3
D101-CV-2011-02942 Scanned to
D101-CV-2011-02944
D101-CV-2011-02945

REPRESENTATIVE CONRAD JAMES, DEVON DAY, MARGE TEAGUE, MONICA YOUNGBLOOD, JUDY McKINNEY and SENATOR JOHN RYAN,

Plaintiffs-Real-Parties-in-Interest,

v.

D-202-CV-2011-09600 County of Bernalillo Second Judicial District Court

DIANA J. DURAN, in her official capacity as Secretary of State of the State of New Mexico and SUSANA MARTINEZ, in her official capacity as Governor of the State of New Mexico,

Defendants-Real-Parties-in-Interest.

RESPONDENTS/REAL-PARTIES-IN-INTEREST (JONATHAN SENA, DON BRATTON, CARROLL LEAVELL AND GAY KERNAN) RESPONSE TO EMERGENCY PETITION FOR WRIT OF SUPERINTENDING CONTROL AND APPLICATION FOR RELIEF

Pursuant to the Court's September 30, 2011 Order, Jonathan Sena, Don Bratton, Carroll Leavell and Gay Kernan ("the Sena Plaintiffs"), Plaintiffs in Cause No. CV-2011-00913 respond to the Petitioners' Emergency Petition for Writ of Superintending Control and Application for Relief, filed in the Fifth Judicial District Court.

Judicial economy and avoiding the possibility of inconsistent determinations are important goals. For these reasons the Sena Plaintiffs do not oppose consolidation by this Court of the five actions that are the subject of the Petition. The Sena Plaintiffs concur that this Court has authority to order such consolidation. However, venue of the consolidated actions should rest in Lovington, the Fifth Judicial District, or the Second Judicial District (as the first filed) and not in Santa Fe as the Petitioners propose. The Fifth Judicial District should consolidate the First and Second Judicial District actions into the Fifth Judicial District action. If the Court rejects a consolidation in the Fifth Judicial District, the Sena Plaintiffs would urge the Court to consolidate the cases in the Second Judicial District, not the First Judicial District. As to the

determination of a judge to hear the consolidated cases, of course, the Judge should be determined in accordance with the present procedural rules that apply to all cases.

A. The Fifth Judicial District Is the Appropriate Venue for the Consolidated Actions.

For several reasons, the Petitioners' argument to place the venue of the consolidated actions in the First Judicial District should fail. The Petitioners' three First Judicial District actions were filed on September 26, 2011. The Fifth Judicial District action was filed on September 26 as well (after Petitioners' Cause No. CV-2011-2942 but before First District Cause Nos. CV-2011-2944 and CV-2011-2945). The Second Judicial District proceeding was filed first, on September 25, 2011. As a general rule, when actions are consolidated, the latter-filed action is consolidated into the first-filed action. *See*, *e.g.*, NMRA 2011, LR1-105(A) and LR2-203(E). Because the Fifth Judicial District action was filed before the bulk of the First Judicial District cases, and notably because several Plaintiffs in the First Judicial District action apparently reside in Doña Ana County, Lovington would be much more convenient for many of the parties.

Petitioners Petition at page 10 asserts that the only proper venue for actions against state officers in Santa Fe County. NMSA 1978, § 38-3-1(G), however, authorizes actions against state officers "in the county where a plaintiff, or any one of them in case there is more than one, resides. . . ." Proceeding in the Fifth Judicial District is proper and more convenient for many of the parties.

In their complaints, which are attached to the Petition as Exhibits A, B and C, the Petitioners state that two of them are residents of Doña Ana County, two of them reside in Bernalillo County; only the fifth, Brian Egolf, resides in Santa Fe County. Four of the five

defendant state officials reside in Santa Fe County, but the fifth resides in Chaves County. Thus, more parties reside south of Albuquerque than reside in Santa Fe County.

With the exception of three of the petitioners' seven counsel and two of the three counsel for the plaintiffs in the Laguna Pueblo action, all counsel in these actions reside and practice in, or south or west of, Albuquerque. The First Judicial District is the most inconvenient and the district with essentially no claim to a filing priority. If the Fifth District is not the venue, the Sena Plaintiffs would urge the Court to select the Second Judicial District, not the First Judicial District.

B. This Court Should Decline Petitioners' Request That It Choose a Judge to Preside Over the Consolidated Actions.

Petitioners' request that this Court select a judge to preside over these actions is inconsistent with the Rules of Civil Procedure. Judges are determined in accordance with the procedures established by NMRA 2011, Rule 1-088. Petitioners' claim that a writ of superintending control "is the only plain, speedy, and adequate remedy available," Petition at 7, is inconsistent with the existing Rules and should be rejected.

C. Conclusion.

The Sena Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court to consolidate the First and Second Judicial District actions into the Fifth Judicial District action, and deny the balance of the Petition that seeks to avoid the existing rules concerning the appointment of a judge to preside over the consolidated actions. In the alternative, if the Fifth Judicial District is not selected for the consolidated actions, the Second Judicial District is clearly preferable to the First Judicial District for almost all concerned.

MODRALL, SPERLING, ROEHL, HARRIS & SISK, P.A.

By:

Patrick J. Rogers

Bank of America Centre, Suite 1000

P.O. Box 2168

Albuquerque, NM 87103-2168

Telephone:

(505) 848-1800

Fax:

(505) 848-1891

E-mail:

pjr@modrall.com

WE HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing pleading was served via U.S. First Class Mail to the following counsel of record this 11th day of October, 2011:

Ray M. Vargas, II David P. Garcia Erin B. O'Connell Garcia & Vargas, LLC 303 Paseo de Peralta Santa Fe, NM 87501-1860

Joseph Goldberg
John W. Boyd
David H. Urias
Sara K. Berger
Freedman Boyd Hollander Goldberg Ives
& Duncan, P.A.
20 First Plaza Ctr., NW, #700 (87102-5802)
P.O. Box 25326
Albuquerque, NM 87125-0326
Attorneys for Plaintiff-Petitioners

Jessica Hernandez Matthew J. Stackpole Office of the Governor 490 Old Santa Fe Trail Santa Fe, NM 87501-2704 Paul John Kennedy Kennedy & Han, P.C. 201 Twelfth Street, NW Albuquerque, NM 87102-1815

Luis G. Stelzner
Sara N. Sanchez
Stelzner, Winter, Warburton, Flores,
Sanchez & Dawes, P.A.
P.O. Box 528
Albuquerque, NM 87103-0528

Richard E. Olson
Jennifer M. Heim
Hinkle, Hensley, Shanor & Martin, LLP
P.O. Box 10
Roswell, NM 88202-0010
Attorneys for Timothy Z. Jennings,
President Pro-Tempore of the New Mexico
Senate and Ben Lujan, Speaker of the
New Mexico House of Representatives

Henry M. Bohnhoff Rodey Dickason Sloan Akin & Robb P.A. P.O. Box 1888 Albuquerque, NM 87103-1888 Christopher T. Saucedo Saucedo Chavez, P.C. 100 Gold Avenue SW, Suite 206 Albuquerque, NM 87102-3476 Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Real-Parties-in-Interest David A. Garcia
David A. Garcia, LLC
1905 Wyoming Boulevard, NE
Albuquerque, NM 87112-2865
Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Real-Parties-in-Interest

MODRALL, SPERLING, ROEHL, HARRIS & SISK, P.A.

Bv

Patrick J. Rogers

Attorneys for Jonathan Sena, Don Bratton, Carroll Leavell and

Gay Kernan, Plaintiffs-Real-Parties-in-Interest

K:\dox\client\90000\40\W1566080,DOCX

MEMORY TRANSMISSION REPORT

PAGE

: 001

TIME

: 10-11-2011 02:18PM

Modrail Sperling Roehl Harris & Sisk, P.A. Bank of America Centre 500 Fourth Street NW Suite 1000

New Mexico 87103-2168

Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

PO Box 2168 Albuquerque,

TEL NUMBER1: 505-848-1891

TEL NUMBER2:

NAME

: Modrall Sperling

FILE NUMBER

469

DATE

10-11 02:16PM

T0

: 2##06115058274178

DOCUMENT PAGES

007

START TIME

10-11 02:16PM

END TIME

10-11 02:18PM

SENT PAGES

007

STATUS

: OK

FILE NUMBER

: 469

*** SUCCESSFUL TX NOTICE ***



Fax Transmittal Cover Sheet

Page 1 of 7

Date: October 7, 2011

Please deliver the following pages to:

Name:

Court Clerk

City;

Santa Fe, NM 505-827-4178

Fax no. of reciplent: From:

Patrick J. Rogers

NM Supreme Court

Comments:

NMSC No. 1133239 Egolf et al. v. Duran et al.

Attached for filing:

Response to Emergency Petition for Writ of Superintending Control and Application for Relief

Thank you. Norma Lockhart

(505) 848-1800 Ext. 1609 Secretary to Patrick J. Rogers

If you have any problems receiving our telecopy, please phone: 505.848.1800, Ext: d1609

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN IMPORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONTEDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipier, and the intended recipier of the intended recipier of the intended recipier, you are horeby notified the message to the intended recipier, you are horeby notified the message to the intended recipier, you are horeby notified the message to the intended recipier, you are horeby notified the message to the intended recipier, you are horeby notified the message to the intended recipier of the provided of the communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication is provided the confidence of the provided that the original message to us at the address above via the U.S. Postal Service.

IRS Circular 230 Discipsure: To comply with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained herein (including any attachments), unless specifically stated otherwise, is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purposes of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter herein. Thank you.



Fax Transmittal **Cover Sheet**

Modrall Sperling Roehl Harris & Sisk, P.A.

Bank of America Centre 500 Fourth Street NW Suite 1000 Albuquerque,

New Mexico 87102

PO Box 2168 Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103-2168

Page 1 of 7

Date: October 7, 2011

Please deliver the following pages to:

Name:

Court Clerk

NM Supreme Court

City:

Santa Fe, NM

Fax no. of recipient:

505-827-4178

From:

Patrick J. Rogers

Comments:

NMSC No. 1133239

Egolf et al. v. Duran et al.

Attached for filing:

Response to Emergency Petition for Writ of Superintending Control and Application for Relief

Thank you.

Norma Lockhart

(505) 848-1800 Ext. 1609

Secretary to Patrick J. Rogers

If you have any problems receiving our telecopy, please phone: 505.848.1800, Ext: d1609

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone, and return the original message to us at the address above via the U.S. Postal Service.

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure: To comply with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained herein (including any attachments), unless specifically stated otherwise, is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purposes of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter herein. Thank you.