

**IMPG ADVOCATES, INC.**

316 HILL STREET  
MOUNTVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA 17554  
717.615.2030  
Direct Dial: 717.961.8978  
[Paul-Rossi@comcast.net](mailto:Paul-Rossi@comcast.net)

*Civil Rights • International Law • Antitrust • Election Law • Complex Litigation*

September 30, 2018

**Via CM/ECF Electronic Filing System**

Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk of the Court  
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

**Re: *Roque “Rocky” De La Fuente v. Padilla et al.*, Case No. 17-56668  
Appellant Roque De La Fuente’s Second Rule 28(j) Citation to  
Supplemental Authority:  
*Graveline v. Johnson, et al.*, Case No. 18-1992 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. September 6, 2018),  
Slip Opinion Attached**

Dear Clerk:

The Sixth Circuit’s rejection of Defendants-Appellants’ appeal of the district court’s refusal to stay its preliminary injunction of Michigan’s requirement that independent candidates collect 30,000 signatures within 180 days supports Appellant’s showing that California’s challenged statutes are unconstitutional and the lower court erred granting Appellees’ summary judgment motion. Michigan requires just 1% of prior vote collected in 180 days in contrast to California’s more onerous 1% of all registered voters collected in just 105 days. Slip Op. at 7; Appellant’s Br. at 1,3-5.

The Sixth Circuit preliminarily joins the Third and Eleventh Circuits affirming judgments that excessive signature requirements in combination with other ballot access rules which historically block independent candidates from the ballot are unconstitutional. Affirming the lower court’s judgment will trigger a severe circuit split.

Applying the *Anderson-Burdick* framework, the Sixth Circuit ruled the district court did not abuse its discretion ruling that Plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits that Michigan’s requirement that independent candidates collect 30,000 signatures in 180 days to access the ballot imposed a severe burden on independent candidates and

unconstitutional where no independent candidate had qualified for the ballot since the challenged laws went into effect in 1988. Slip Op. at 6-10; Appellant’s Br. at 15-20,28-33. Citing *Storer v. Brown*, the Court explained that: “the fact that no independent candidate for statewide office has appeared on the ballot in thirty years indicates that a reasonably diligent candidate could not meet the signature requirements.” Slip Op. at 9-10. While *Anderson-Burdick* requires the articulation of “precise” interests, the Court found Michigan’s laws were not narrowly drawn to protect the “generalized” interests of election integrity, preventing voter confusion and frivolous candidates. Slip Op. at 6,11; Appellant’s Br. at 22-23.

Citing *Anderson* and the Eleventh Circuit’s *Green Party of Georgia v. Kemp*, the Court explained higher signature requirements upheld under *Jeness v. Fortson*, applied “a less stringent framework than that required by *Anderson* and *Burdick*.” Slip Op. at 9-10. The Court found the district court’s 5,000 signature remedy (supported by Richard Winger’s expert testimony) “within its equitable discretion.” Slip Op. at 12-13; Appellant’s Br. at 10,23-25.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Paul Rossi

Paul A. Rossi  
IMPG Advocates, Inc.  
*Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellant*  
316 Hill Street  
Mountville, PA 17554  
717.961.8978  
[Paul-Rossi@comcast.net](mailto:Paul-Rossi@comcast.net)

Attachment

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on September 30, 2018, I electronically filed the foregoing citation to supplemental authority with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit through the appellate CM/ECF system.

I further certify that all participants in this appeal are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be automatically accomplished on all participants via this Court's appellate CM/ECF system.

Dated: September 30, 2018

/s/ Paul Rossi  
Paul A. Rossi, Esquire  
*Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellant*

**CERTIFICATION**

I hereby certify that the foregoing citation to supplemental authority complies with the word-count limitation of Local Rule of Appellant Procedure 28(j). The body of the foregoing document contains 350 words based on the word-count function of Microsoft Word.

Dated: September 30, 2018

/s/ Paul Rossi  
Paul A. Rossi, Esquire  
*Counsel for Plaintiff-Appellant*