

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

ELECTRONIC PRIVACY INFORMATION
CENTER,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY
COMMISSION ON ELECTION
INTEGRITY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 1:17-cv-1320 (CKK)

**DEFENDANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF
REGARDING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

In response to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (which has not been served in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4), ECF No. 21, and in compliance with this Court's Order, ECF No. 22, Defendants respectfully submit that the entry of a temporary restraining order against the Department of Defense ("DOD") would be improper:

1. Defendants respectfully update the Court of two factual developments since the July 7, 2017 hearing.
 - a. In order not to impact the ability of other customers to use the DOD Safe Access File Exchange ("SAFE") site, the Commission the Commission has decided to use alternative means for transmitting the requested data. Third Kobach Decl. ¶ 1. The Commission no longer intends to use the DOD SAFE system to receive information from the states, and instead intends to use

alternative means of receiving the information requested in the June 28, 2017, letter *Id.* Director of White House Information Technology is repurposing an existing system that regularly accepts personally identifiable information through a secure, encrypted computer application within the White House Information Technology enterprise. *Id.* The system is anticipated to be fully functional by 6:00 pm EDT today. *Id.*

- b. Today, July 10, 2017, the Commission also sent the states a follow-up communication requesting the states not submit any data until this Court rules on plaintiff's TRO motion. *Id.* ¶ 2. Furthermore, the Commission will not send further instructions about how to use the new system pending this Court's resolution of the TRO motion. *Id.*
 - c. The Commission will not download the data that Arkansas already transmitted to SAFE and this data will be deleted from this site. *Id.* ¶ 3.
2. In light of these factual developments, any relief against DOD would be inappropriate because DOD systems will not be used by the Commission, and thus an order against DOD would not redress EPIC's supposed injury. *See, e.g., Gerber Prods. Co. v. Vilsack*, No. 16-1696-APM, 2016 WL 4734357, at *5 (D.D.C. Sept. 9, 2016) ("No order directed against [defendants] alone could cure the harm claimed by Plaintiff.").
 3. Furthermore, DOD was not the subject of Plaintiff's motion for a TRO. While Plaintiff is entitled to amend its complaint as a matter of right, *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(1)(A), it must also amend and serve its TRO motion making clear what relief it seeks against DOD and why it is entitled to such relief. *See* LCvR 65(a). DOD, in

turn, should be given the opportunity to respond before any order is entered against it, including the opportunity to articulate what harm could be caused by the entry of a restraining order.

Dated: July 10, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

CHAD A. READLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

BRETT A. SHUMATE
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

ELIZABETH J. SHAPIRO
Deputy Director

/s/ Joseph E. Borson
CAROL FEDERIGHI
Senior Trial Counsel
JOSEPH E. BORSON
Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
P.O. Box 883
Washington, DC 20044
Phone: (202) 514-1944
Email: joseph.borson@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendants