

1
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

**STATE OF WASHINGTON
KING COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT**

EL CENTRO DE LA RAZA, a Washington non-profit corporation; LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF WASHINGTON, a Washington non-profit corporation; WASHINGTON ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, a Washington non-profit corporation; WASHINGTON EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, a Washington non-profit corporation; INTERNATIONAL UNION OF OPERATING ENGINEERS 609; AEROSPACE MACHINISTS UNION, IAM&AW DL 751; WASHINGTON STATE LABOR COUNCIL, AFL-CIO; UNITED FOOD AND COMMERCIAL WORKERS UNION 21; WASHINGTON FEDERATION OF STATE EMPLOYEES; AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS WASHINGTON; TEAMSTERS JOINT COUNCIL NO. 28; WAYNE AU, PH.D., on his own behalf and on behalf of his minor child; PAT BRAMAN, on her own behalf; and DONNA BOYER, on her own behalf and on behalf of her minor children,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF WASHINGTON,

Defendant.

NO. 16-2-18527-4 SEA

DEFENDANT STATE OF
WASHINGTON'S REPLY IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO
INTERVENE

1 **I. RELIEF REQUESTED**

2 The State asks the Court to grant the Motion to Intervene.

3 **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

4 On August 3, 2016, several months after the Legislature adopted the Charter Schools
5 Act, Plaintiffs filed a Complaint raising seven challenges to the constitutionality of the new
6 Charter Schools Act. On August 23, 2016, Intervenors filed a Motion to Intervene and
7 simultaneously filed a Motion to Dismiss. The State has also filed a Motion to Dismiss, which
8 is noted for November 4, 2016.

9 **III. STATEMENT OF ISSUES**

10 Whether the Motion to Intervene should be granted.

11 **IV. EVIDENCE RELIED UPON**

12 The State relies on the pleadings and records on file with the Court.

13 **V. AUTHORITY AND ARGUMENT**

14 Defendant, State of Washington, supports the Motion to Intervene filed on August 23,
15 2016. The seven allegations in Plaintiffs' Complaint present complex legal issues that require
16 nuanced interpretation of the Charter Schools Act and multiple constitutional provisions.
17 Proposed Intervenors can provide this Court with a valuable legal perspective that will ensure
18 that the Court will have the benefit of all relevant legal arguments. The Court need only to
19 consider Intervenors' Motion to Dismiss, filed at the same time as their Motion to Intervene,
20 in order to discern that intervention will not delay the case and will ensure that the Court
21 receives that benefit of the full vetting of the legal issues informed by the unique perspectives
22 of each party. As such, the State does not agree that intervention will delay the case.
23 Intervention is appropriate under CR 24.

24 The State does not object to an adjustment of Plaintiffs' briefing page limits should
25 intervention be granted.

1 **VI. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, the State respectfully requests that the Motion to Intervene
3 be granted.

4 DATED this 29th day of August 2016.

5 Respectfully submitted,

6 **ROBERT W. FERGUSON**
7 Attorney General

8 s/
9 Aileen B. Miller, WSBA 27943
10 Assistant Attorney General
11 AileenM@atg.wa.gov

12 Rebecca Glasgow, WSBA 32886
13 Deputy Solicitor General
14 RebeccaG@atg.wa.gov

15 David A. Stolier, WSBA 24071
16 Senior Assistant Attorney General
17 DaveS@atg.wa.gov

18 Attorneys for the State of Washington
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26