EXHIBIT 19

36-301 - Definitions

36-301. Definitions

In this chapter, unless the context otherwise requires:



- 1. "Administrative order" means a written decision issued by an administrative law judge or quasi-judicial entity.
- 2. "Amend" means to make a change, other than a correction, to a registered certificate by adding, deleting or substituting information on that certificate.
- 3. "Birth" or "live birth" means the complete expulsion or extraction of an unborn child from the child's mother, irrespective of the duration of the pregnancy, that shows evidence of life, with or without a cut umbilical cord or an attached placenta, such as breathing, heartbeat, umbilical cord pulsation or definite voluntary muscle movement after expulsion or extraction of the unborn child.
- 4. "Certificate" means a record that documents a birth or death.
- 5. "Certified copy" means a written reproduction of a registered certificate that a local registrar, a deputy local registrar or the state registrar has authenticated as a true and exact written reproduction of a registered certificate.
- 6. "Correction" means a change made to a registered certificate because of a typographical error, including misspelling and missing or transposed letters or numbers.
- 7. "Court order" means a written decision issued by:
- (a) The superior court, an appellate court or the supreme court or an equivalent court in another state.
- (b) A commissioner or judicial hearing officer of the superior court.
- (c) A judge of a tribal court in this state.
- 8. "Current care" means that a health care provider has examined, treated or provided care for a person for a chronic or acute condition within eighteen months preceding that person's death. Current care does not include services provided in connection with a single event of emergency or urgent care. For the purposes of this paragraph, "treated" includes prescribing medication.
- 9. "Custody" means legal authority to act on behalf of a child.
- 10. "Department" means the department of health services.
- 11. "Electronic" means technology that has electrical, digital, magnetic, wireless, optical or electromagnetic capabilities or technology with similar capabilities.
- 12. "Evidentiary document" means written information used to prove the fact for which the document is presented.
- 13. "Family member" means:
- (a) A person's spouse, natural or adopted offspring, father, mother, grandparent, grandchild to any degree, brother, sister, aunt, uncle or first or second cousin.
- (b) The natural or adopted offspring, father, mother, grandparent, grandchild to any degree, brother, sister, aunt, uncle or first or second cousin of the person's spouse.
- 14. "Fetal death" means the cessation of life before the complete expulsion or extraction of an unborn child from the child's mother that is evidenced by the absence of breathing, heartbeat, umbilical cord pulsation or definite

4/7/23, 2:25 PM

36-301 - Definitions

voluntary muscle movement after expulsion or extraction.

- 15. "Final disposition" means the interment, cremation, removal from this state or other disposition of human remains.
- 16. "Foundling" means:
- (a) A newborn infant left with a safe haven provider pursuant to section 13-3623.01.
- (b) A child whose father and mother cannot be determined.
- 17. "Funeral establishment" has the same meaning prescribed in section 32-1301.
- 18. "Health care institution" has the same meaning prescribed in section 36-401.
- 19. "Health care provider" means:
- (a) A physician licensed pursuant to title 32, chapter 13 or 17.
- (b) A doctor of naturopathic medicine licensed pursuant to title 32, chapter 14.
- (c) A midwife licensed pursuant to chapter 6, article 7 of this title.
- (d) A nurse midwife certified pursuant to title 32, chapter 15.
- (e) A nurse practitioner licensed and certified pursuant to title 32, chapter 15.
- (f) A physician assistant licensed pursuant to title 32, chapter 25.
- (g) A health care provider who is licensed or certified by another state or jurisdiction of the United States and who works in a federal health care facility.
- 20. "Human remains" means a lifeless human body or parts of a human body that permit a reasonable inference that death occurred.
- 21. "Issue" means:
- (a) To provide a copy of a registered certificate.
- (b) An action taken by a court of competent jurisdiction, administrative law judge or quasi-judicial entity.
- 22. "Legal age" means a person who is at least eighteen years of age or who is emancipated by a court order.
- 23. "Medical certification of death" means the opinion of the health care provider who signs the certificate of probable or presumed cause of death that complies with rules adopted by the state registrar of vital records and that is based on any of the following that is reasonably available:
- (a) Personal examination.
- (b) Medical history.
- (c) Medical records.
- (d) Other reasonable forms of evidence.
- 24. "Medical examiner" means a medical examiner or alternate medical examiner as defined in section 11-591.

4/7/23, 2:25 PM 36-301 - Definitions

- 25. "Name" means a designation that identifies a person, including a first name, middle name, last name or suffix.
- 26. "Natural causes" means those causes that are due solely or nearly entirely to disease or the aging process.
- 27. "Presumptive death" means a determination by a court that a death has occurred or is presumed to have occurred but the human remains have not been located or recovered.
- 28. "Register" means to assign an official state number and to incorporate into the state registrar's official records.
- 29. "Responsible person" means a person listed in section 36-831.
- 30. "Seal" means to bar from access.
- 31. "Submit" means to present, physically or electronically, a certificate, evidentiary document or form provided for in this chapter to a local registrar, a deputy local registrar or the state registrar.
- 32. "System of public health statistics" means the processes and procedures for:
- (a) Tabulating, analyzing and publishing public health information derived from vital records data and other sources authorized pursuant to section 36-125.05 or section 36-132, subsection A, paragraph 3.
- (b) Performing other activities related to public health information.
- 33. "System of vital records" means the statewide processes and procedures for:
- (a) Electronically or physically collecting, creating, registering, maintaining, copying and preserving vital records.
- (b) Preparing and issuing certified and noncertified copies of vital records.
- (c) Performing other activities related to vital records.
- 34. "Unborn child" has the same meaning prescribed in section 36-2151.
- 35. "Vital record" means a registered birth certificate or a registered death certificate.

EXHIBIT 20

1	MARK BRNOVICH			
2	ARIZONA ATTORNEY GENERAL Firm State Bar #14000			
3	Patricia Cracchiolo LaMagna, Bar #021880 Aubrey Joy Corcoran, Bar #025423			
4				
5	2005 N. Central Avenue Phoenix, Arizona 85004			
6				
7	EducationHealth@azag.gov			
8	STRUCK LOVE BOJANOWSKI & ACEDO, PLO Daniel P. Struck, Bar #012377	C		
9	Nicholas D. Acedo, Bar #021644			
10				
11	Tel.: (480) 420-1600 dstruck@strucklove.com			
12	nacedo@strucklove.com dkeene@strucklove.com			
13	Attorneys for Defendant			
14		SEDICE COLDE		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
16	DISTRICT OF A	ARIZONA		
17	Helen Roe, a minor, by and through her parent and next friend Megan Roe, et al.,	NO. 4:20-cv-00484-JAS		
18	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT'S DESDONSES TO		
19	v.	DEFENDANT'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF		
20	Don Herrington, in his official capacity as	REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION		
21	Interim State Registrar of Vital Records and Interim Director of the Arizona Department of Health Services,			
22	Defendant.			
23	Defendant.			
24	Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 34, Defendant Don Herrington			
25	("Defendant"), through counsel, hereby responds to Plaintiffs' First Set of Requests for			
26	Production as follows. Defendant reserves the right to supplement these responses as			
27	necessary and as discovery continues.			
	necessary and as discovery continues.			
28	necessary and as discovery continues.			

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

27

28

given that Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint is devoid of allegations regarding conduct and/or events that occurred before approximately 2019 and none of the named minor Plaintiffs were born before 2011. Defendant objects to the extent any documents responsive to this Request were destroyed pursuant to ADHS's three-year document retention policy. Defendant also objects to the extent this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, and/or any other applicable privilege. Defendant objects to this Request as it seeks production of ESI which can only be discovered through an email or system search and where the parties have not conferred or attempted to reach an agreement on a search protocol, including appropriate search terms and queries, file type and date restrictions, data sources, and custodians. Defendant further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, and not proportional to the needs of this case because "all" documents and communications concerning "considering, developing, drafting, adopting, or otherwise creating subsections (O) or (P) of Arizona Administrative Code section R9-19-208, or when considering, developing, drafting, adopting, or otherwise creating any CHANGES to those subsections" is not reasonably limited in scope.

Without waiving these objections, *see* A.R.S. § 36-301, A.R.S. § 36-337, and A.A.C. § R9-19-208, as well as prior versions of A.A.C. Title 9, Chapter 19, which are on file with the Arizona Secretary of State. *See also* National Association for Public Health Statistics and Information Systems ("NAPHSIS") Model State Vital Statistics Regulations, 1992 Revision produced as ADHS000180 – ADHS000219 and 2011 Revision produced as ADHS000220 – ADHS000286. Defendant will supplement this response with any non-privileged rulemaking documents that might exist. Defendant has not conducted a search of available ESI but will do so once the parties have agreed to a search protocol.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:

All DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING the term "sex

change operation" as used in subsection (A)(3) of Arizona Revised Statutes section 36-337.

RESPONSE:

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

27

28

Objection: Overbroad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant as to the time period between January 1, 2004 to the present because Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint is devoid of allegations pertaining to conduct and/or events that occurred before approximately 2019 and none of the named minor Plaintiffs were born before 2011, and therefore this Request is not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant objects to the extent any documents responsive to this Request were destroyed pursuant to ADHS's three-year document retention policy. Defendant further objects that this Request is overbroad, unduly burdensome, irrelevant, and not proportional to the needs of this case because "all" documents and communications "concerning" the term "sex change operation" is not reasonably limited in scope. Defendant objects to the extent this Request seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, the deliberative process privilege, and/or any other applicable privilege. Defendant further objects to the Request as it seeks production of ESI which can only be discovered through an email or system search and where the parties have not conferred or attempted to reach an agreement on a search protocol, including appropriate search terms and queries, file type and date restrictions, data sources, and custodians.

Without waiving these objections, when interpreting and implementing statutes to draft administrative rules, ADHS follows general rules of statutory construction, including but not limited to those that are stated in A.R.S. Title 1, Chapter 2, Article 2. The term "sex change operation" is not defined in any applicable statute, regulation, or administrative rule, and Defendant is not in possession of any document that defines this term. Defendant has not conducted a search of available ESI but will do so once the parties have agreed to a search protocol.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:

All DOCUMENTS and COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING any POLICY of

Case 4:20-cv-00484-JAS Document 233-10 Filed 11/17/23 Page 9 of 34

1	responsive to this Request aside from what has already been produced by all parties.	
2		
3	DATED this 6 th day of December 2021.	
4	STRUCK LOVE BOJANOWSKI & ACEDO, PLC	
5	9 6	
6	By Nam M. Daniel P. Struck	
7	Nicholas D. Acedo Dana M. Keene	
8	3100 West Ray Road, Suite 300 Chandler, Arizona 85226	
9	MARK BRNOVICH	
10	ATTORNEY GENERAL Patricia Cracchiolo LaMagna	
11	Aubrey Joy Corcoran 1275 W Washington St.	
12	Phoenix, AZ 85007	
13	Attorneys for Defendant	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
2324		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1	The foregoing was emailed this 6th day
2	of December 2021 to:
3	Mary O'Grady (011434)
4	Colin Proksel (034133) Payslie Bowman (035418)
5	OSBORN MALEDON, P.A.
6	2929 North Central Avenue, 21st Floor Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2793
7	Email:mogrady@omlaw.com
8	Email: cproksel@omlaw.com Email: pbowman@omlaw.com
9	Asaf Orr (admitted Pro Hac Vice)
10	NATIONAL CENTER FOR LESBIAN RIGHTS
100 040	870 Market Street, Suite 370
11	San Francisco, California 94102
12	Email: aorr@nclrights.org
13	Patrick Gunn (admitted Pro Hac Vice)
14	COOLEY LLP 101 California Street, 5th Floor
15	San Francisco, California 94111-5800
16	Email: pgunn@cooley.com
17	Barrett J. Anderson (admitted Pro Hac Vice) COOLEY LLP
18	4401 Eastgate Mall
19	San Diego, California 92121-1909
20	Email: banderson@cooley.com
21	Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Proposed Class
22	Lu 11 w
23	Ma Hamilta
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

EXHIBIT 21

From:

To:

Thomas Salow

Subject: Date: Gender Transition Approvals/Denials Friday, August 9, 2019 11:01:02 AM

Attachments:

Gender Transition.docx

Arizona Department of Health Services 150 North 18th Ave, Phoenix, AZ 85007

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This e-mail is the property of the Arizona Department of Health Services and contains information that may be PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, or otherwise exempt from disclosure by applicable law. It is intended only for the person(s) to whom it is addressed. If you have received this communication in error, please do not retain or distribute it. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail at the address shown above and delete the original message. Thank you.



Accepted:

- "Female to Male Gender Reassignment Surgery"
- · "Sex Reassignment Surgery"
- "I have doctor/patient relationship"
- "Have reviewed/evaluated the patient's medical history and they have has appropriate medical treatment for transition to the new sex" (male/female)
- "Appropriate clinical treatment for gender transition to the new gender (male/female), including both hormone therapy and sex reassignment surgery"
- "Irreversible Reassignment Surgery"

Denied:

- "Confirmation Chest Masculinization Surgery" –without any statement of Reassignment Surgery
- · Where the surgery was performed/what it is in compliance with
- "Appropriate clinical treatment for gender transition"
- "Sex Reassignment Surgery was not medically necessary"
- · Listing any surgeries without any statement of Reassignment Surgery

EXHIBIT 22

Casses 4: 2020 vc 0004848-JAISASD 6000 mm emetr 23330-450 FFilted 1111/2121/223 FRagger 71.5 for f 33.4

FILED
TONI L. HELLON
CLERK, SUPERIOR COURT

2/15/2017 1:09:48 PM

BY: ALAN WALKER DEPUTY

T	MARK BRNOVICH		
2	Attorney General		
	Firm Bar No. 14000		
3			
	Patricia LaMagna (#021880)		
4	Molly Bonsall (#032477)		
5	Assistant Attorneys General		
	Education Health Section		
6	1275 West Washington Street		
7	Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2926		
7	Telephone: (602) 542-8854		
8	Fax: (602) 364-0700		
92355 10750	E-mail: EducationHealth@azag.gov		
9	Attorneys for Arizona Department of Health Services,		
10	Bureau of Vital Records		
10			
11	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA		
10	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF PIMA		
12			
13	In re the Matter of:		
22 15		A CIT THE C C	
14	, a minor,	Arizona Department of Health Services'	
15	A	Objection to Order to Amend Applicant's	
10	Applicant	Registered Birth Certificate	
16		(11 11	
17		(Honorable	
1/			
18	The Arizona Department of I	Health Services, Bureau of Vital Records	
10	(5D 4 42) 1 1.1 1.4 1		
19	("Department"), by and through its undersigned attorney, responds to the		
20	Order issued by of the Pima County Superior Court ("Order"), to		
21			
21	amend the sex on Applicant's registered birth certificate. The Department informs this		
22	Court, Petitioner, and Applicant that the Order is not sufficient to permit the		
23	Department to amend the sex on Applicant's Arizona birth certificate pursuant to		
24			
25			
26			

Arizona Revised Statutes ("A.R.S.") § 36-337, due to lack of jurisdiction and the failure of Petitioner to exhaust administrative remedies.

MEMORANDUM OF FACTS AND LAW

I. Statutory Authority of the Department to Amend Birth Certificates

The statutes that established the Arizona vital records system give the authority to the Department to adopt rules and implement a statewide system of vital records. More specifically, A.R.S. § 36-323(A) provides that the state registrar shall amend a registered certificate (birth or death) pursuant to Chapter 3 of Title 36 and the rules adopted by the Department. The pertinent rules are found at Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.) Title 9, Chapter 19. The rules establish the procedures and standards for correcting and amending birth certificates. See A.A.C. R9-19-207 and -208. This process requires a request for a change or amendment be submitted to the Department, together with required evidentiary documents supporting the correction or amendment. Id. That application is reviewed regarding the established standards to determine whether the requested amendment may be approved. Due process rights attach if an application is denied; an administrative hearing is provided, if requested; and ultimately, a final decision of the Department follows. A.R.S. § 41-1092, et seq. A final decision of the Department is then subject to the appellate jurisdiction of the Superior Courts pursuant to the Administrative Review Act. See A.R.S. Title 12, Chapter 7, Article 6. While the Courts do have some original jurisdiction to order birth certificate changes, e.g. adoption, paternity and name change, under the existing

24

25

26

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

²³

¹ Accordingly, the Department recognizes and respects that A.R.S. § 12-601 gives specific jurisdiction to this Court to hear a petition for a name change and issue the appropriate order allowing this amendment to a birth certificate.

statutory scheme for vital records, all other changes must first be submitted to the Department, with Court jurisdiction only upon appeal.

II. Superior Courts Have Limited Jurisdiction to Order Amendments to Birth Certificates.

The Courts are not the proper venue for a person to initiate just any amendment to a vital record. As explained above, for most changes, the request must be initiated by filing a request for the amendment with the Department. Absent specific authority, the Court lacks original jurisdiction to amend or correct birth certificates. And where this specific authority does exist, the courts are limited in the changes they are able to order to birth and death certificates. Specifically, these areas are limited to determinations of maternity and paternity under A.R.S. § 25-801 et seq., adoptions pursuant to A.R.S. 80-§ 8-101 et seq., and name changes under A.R.S. § 12-601 et seq. However, the superior courts have appellate jurisdiction over all final decisions of the Department regarding applications to amend or correct birth certificates pursuant to the Administrative Review Act. See A.R.S. Title 12, Chapter 7, Article 6.

The Department believes the language at A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(4) that provides that the Department "shall amend the birth certificate for a person born in this state when the state registrar receives . . . [a] court order ordering an amendment to a birth certificate" does not endow the courts with original jurisdiction to correct all errors or omissions in birth certificates. It is the Department's position that the language found in (A)(4) is a "catchall" provision, in that it follows three enumerated circumstances under which the Department shall amend a birth certificate. Rather than creating a broad grant to the courts to amend birth certificates that would circumvent the procedures and standards established by the Department for amendments and corrections, the Department believes the provision only acknowledges that there may be

1 ot ce 3 A: de 5 sp

other provisions in law under which courts may have authority to amend birth certificates and requires the Department to comply when presented with such orders. An example of this is an order issued by the Superior Court to remove the "unknown" designation from the "father" field in the case of a child conceived through anonymous sperm.

A review of constitutional and statutory provisions regarding the jurisdiction of the superior courts does not otherwise disclose a statement of original jurisdiction over all requests by petitioners to amend or correct birth certificates. The existing statutory scheme for vital records and the attendant rules adopted by the Department require that requests to amend or correct birth certificates ordinarily be initiated by filing a request with the Department.

III. Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

A person desiring to make an amendment or correction to a birth certificate must submit an application and provide the required documentary evidence in compliance with A.R.S. Title 36, Chapter 3 and A.A.C. R9-19-207 and -208, unless otherwise provided by law. In the present matter, the Petitioner must initiate the request to change the sex on the birth certificate by filing an application to the Department requesting this change, in order that they exhaust the administrative remedies allotted by means of statute and rule.

In Coconino County v. Antco, Inc., 214 Ariz. 82 (App. 2006), the Court of Appeals stated:

The purpose of the exhaustion of remedies doctrine is "to allow an administrative agency to perform functions within its special competence-to make a factual record, to apply its expertise, and to correct its own errors so as to moot judicial controversies." In this way, the exhaustion of remedies doctrine promotes judicial economy as well as

administrative agency autonomy, preventing "premature judicial intervention in inchoate administrative proceedings."

Id. at 86, ¶9(citing Moulton v. Napolitano, 205 Ariz. 506, 511, ¶10 (App.2003). The Court also stated that when a statute grants an administrative agency original jurisdiction over a dispute, the exhaustion of remedies doctrine requires the parties to utilize all available administrative processes before seeking the aid of a court. Id. at 86, ¶8. The Court pointed out that the doctrine does not apply "when the administrative remedy prescribed by statute is merely permissive, when the jurisdiction of the agency is being contested, when the agency's expertise is unnecessary, or when exhausting administrative remedies would cause irreparable harm or be futile." Id.

The administrative process and remedy provided in the State's vital records statutes and rules and the Uniform Administrative Hearing Procedures are not permissive, the Department's expertise is essential; and, there will be no irreparable harm to the Petitioner and no futility in following the required procedures. Petitioner must exhaust available administrative remedies regarding his request to amend or correct a birth certificate before seeking relief from the Court.

According to A.R.S. § 36-337(A), the Department shall amend a registered certificate when the Department receives the proper court order or documents to support the amendment. Specifically, in order to amend the sex on a registered certificate "[f]or a person who has undergone a sex change operation or has a different chromosomal count that establishes their sex as different than the sex identified on the registered birth certificate," the Department must receive a written request from the registrant, or a parent or legal guardian of a minor, and "[a] written statement by a physician that verifies the sex change operation or chromosomal count." *Id*.

The Department's position in accordance with amending the sex on a registered certificate is to require the registrant, or their parent or guardian, to initially apply directly with the Department and present the physician's written statement as required in A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(3)(b).² The Department has historically recognized that the Arizona Legislature placed this very specific requirement in section (A)(3)(b) to ensure that this particular type of amendment is accurately documented. This aligns directly with A.R.S. § 36-337(G) which directs the following: "If the state registrar amends a registered birth certificate, the state registrar shall seal the previously registered birth certificate and the evidentiary documents provided to amend the registered birth certificate." The Application and Denial IV. (Petitioner), mother of (Applicant), petitioned the Court to issue an Order Correcting Documents to reflect

Applicant's gender identity. Finding good cause to grant the petition, the Court issued the Order requiring Applicant's name be changed and "that a birth certificate be issued showing Applicant's new name and gender identity: male." Order at 1:20-24. Further, the Order stated that "Petitioner and Applicant may correct the gender designation on Applicant's birth certificate...to reflect his correct gender identity." *Id.* at 1:25-2:1.

, Petitioner filed an Affidavit to Correct or Amend a Birth On Certificate with the Department to change Applicant's name and sex, along with a

amendments-birth-certificate.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

²⁴ ² Indeed, Petitioner may still apply directly with the Department. The application is available at http://www.azdhs.gov/licensing/vital-records/index.php#corrections-25

request for a copy of the new birth certificate.³ Due to the statutory limitations 1 2 referenced above, the Department could not comply with the Order or with Petitioner's 3 request regarding the amendment of registrant's sex from female to male. 4 While the Department has amended the birth certificate to reflect the name as 5 they have not, and cannot, amend the sex as requested. 6 Petitioner has been notified of this fact as of the date of this Objection. As noted, supra, the Petitioner has been informed in writing of their rights to appeal the denial of the 7 8 amendment and have a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge pursuant to A.R.S. 9 § 41-1092 et seq. 10 Conclusion 11 Based on the foregoing, the Department will not amend the birth certificate for 12 the registrant and objects to the portion of this Court's order regarding that amendment. 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 ³ The Department is acting on the application filed by Petitioner to amend the sex of the 23 Applicant's birth certificate. However, in addition to the legal requirements of A.R.S. § 24 36-337(A)(3), an Arizona birth certificate requires the "sex" of the registrant, pursuant to A.A.C. R9-19-201(A)(3). There is no field on an Arizona birth records regarding 25 'gender" or "gender identity" of the registrant.

DATED this 15th day of February, 2017. MARK BRNOVICH Arizona Attorney General /s/ Molly Bonsall Patricia LaMagna Molly Bonsall Assistant Attorneys General Attorneys for Arizona Department of Health Services/Bureau of Vital Records

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I certify that on this 15th day of January, 2017, I electronically transmitted a 2 3 PDF version of this document to the Office of the Clerk of the Superior Court, Pima County, using the Arizona Turbo Court ECF System. 4 5 COPY of the foregoing mailed this 15th day of February, 2017, to: 6 7 8 9 10 COPY of the foregoing emailed this 15th day of February, 2017, to: 11 12 Clerk of the Department Arizona Department of Health Services 13 ACR@azdhs.gov 14 Bureau of Vital Records 15 Krystal Colburn Bureau Chief 16 Robin Rodriguez 17 Operations Office Chief Arizona Department of Health Services 18 Krystal.Colburn@azdhs.gov Robin.Rodriguez@azdhs.gov 19 20 21 By: /s/ Natasha Culbertson Natasha Culbertson, Legal Secretary II 22 Doc: #5543667 23 24 25

EXHIBIT 23

- 7 8

- Colby Bower, former Assistant Director of Licensing Services and former Assistant Director for Policy and Intergovernmental Affairs, ADHS
- Robert Lane, Chief Administrative Counsel, ADHS
- Krystal Colburn, Bureau Chief and Assistant State Registrar, ADHS
- Thomas Salow, former Deputy Assistant Director of Licensing and Branch Chief, and Interim Assistant Director of Licensing Services, ADHS
- Robin Rodriguez, former Operations Chief and Fraud Manager, BVR,
 ADHS
- Toni Miller, Policy Manager and Community Partner Liaison, BVR, ADHS

INTERROGATORY NO. 9:

Describe and explain YOUR purported governmental interest(s) or other justification(s) under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution for denying transgender individuals who have not undergone a "sex change operation" the ability to CHANGE the sex listed on their BIRTH RECORDS under subsection (A)(3) of Arizona Revised Statute section 36-337.

RESPONSE:

Objection: Vague and ambiguous as to "purported governmental interest(s)" and "other justification(s)." Defendant objects to this interrogatory as improper because it requires Defendant to respond with a legal argument and an ultimate legal conclusion, and improperly seeks the mental impressions and legal conclusions of counsel for Defendant, which is protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product doctrine. This interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, confusing, irrelevant, and overbroad as to "BIRTH RECORD," as Plaintiffs' definition of "BIRTH RECORD" is virtually unlimited in time and scope and encompasses documentation and/or information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses in this lawsuit and is therefore unduly burdensome and not proportional to the needs of this case. Defendant also objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information concerning a "CHANGE," as Plaintiffs' definition of "CHANGE" is vague, confusing, irrelevant, and overbroad, and includes information

related to "corrections" to registered birth certificates defined in A.R.S. § 36-301(6), which are not "amendments" governed by A.R.S. § 36-337 and are therefore not at issue in this case. Defendant objects to this interrogatory as overbroad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant as to the timeframe from January 1, 2004 to the present, which encompasses information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses in this lawsuit or proportional to the needs of this case given that Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint is devoid of allegations regarding conduct and/or events that occurred before approximately 2019 and none of the named minor Plaintiffs were born before 2011.

Moreover, a response to this interrogatory requires an assumption that Plaintiffs' equal protection rights have been violated when they have not. In addition, Defendant denies that transgender individuals who have not undergone a "sex change operation" are prevented, excluded, or otherwise barred from amending the sex marker listed on their registered birth certificates. All transgender individuals in the State of Arizona have the opportunity to amend the sex listed on their registered birth certificates by seeking a court order pursuant to A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(4).

Finally, this interrogatory seeks information regarding legislative intent, and the creation, construction, and adoption of relevant Arizona statutes, as a "governmental interest" and/or "other justification" could only have been considered by the Arizona Legislature prior to the adoption of or any revision to A.R.S. § 36-337. The creation, construction, and adoption of Arizona statutes is not a function of ADHS, and neither ADHS, nor Defendant, were involved in or have ever been involved in this process. Accordingly, this interrogatory is more appropriately suited for the Arizona Legislature and cannot be answered by Defendant.

Without waiving any objection, in 1967 the Arizona Legislature passed House Bill 137 into law. Upon information and belief, the 1967 law contained an early iteration of A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(3), in that it created a process whereby intersex individuals could seek an amendment of their birth certificates by providing documentation from a physician attesting that the individual was intersex.

In 1988, the Arizona Legislature enacted A.R.S. § 36-326. A.R.S. § 36-326(A)(4) states in relevant part: "The state registrar shall establish a new certificate of birth for a person born in this state when he receives any of the following:...(4) A sworn statement from a licensed physician in good standing that he has performed a surgical operation or a chromosomal count on a person and that by reason of this operation or count the sex of the person has been established as different from that in the original document. The state registrar may reserve the right to require further proof if deemed necessary, or to seek independent professional evaluation of the evidence offered before creating a new certificate." A.R.S. § 36-326(A)(4). Upon information and belief, the language contained in the 1988 statute was largely replicated from the 1967 statute.

In 2004, Arizona State Legislators Cheryl Chase, Amanda Aguirre, and Deb Gullett introduced and sponsored a bipartisan bill, House Bill 2200 ("HB2200"). HB2200's purpose was to reorganize, clarify, and amend vital statistics statutes, and it contained the current version of A.R.S. § 36-337. Numerous persons from various entities and medical associations supported HB2200, including Eleanor Eisenberg, Executive Director of the Arizona Civil Liberties Union (AzCLU). HB2200 was passed in April 2004, and A.R.S. § 36-337 was enacted.

Thus, given that HB2200 was supported by the Executive Director of the AzCLU, paired with its legislative history, the purpose of this statute was altruistic, and enacted for transgender and/or intersex people who had undergone a sex change operation by allowing them to bypass the court order process in (A)(4)—since evidence of a sex change operation is sufficient to ensure accurate and complete reporting—to make it easier for them to seek an amendment of their birth certificates. The purpose of HB2200 (and A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(3)) was not to discriminate against those individuals who had not undergone a sex change operation, as all other individuals—including those involved in adoptions, paternity determinations, name changes, and transgender individuals who have not undergone a sex change operation—are required to obtain a court order to seek an amendment pursuant to A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(4).

Moreover, the court order requirement in Subsection (A)(4) complied with the Model State Vital Statistics Act and Regulations (1992) promulgated by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Center for Health Statistics in effect at the time. (See ADHS000198.) The model regulations do not contain a provision similar to (A)(3), which bolsters Defendant's position that (A)(3) was indeed meant to make it easier for those individuals who had obtained a sex change operation—not to discriminate against those who had not.

Defendant did not create, enact, or adopt this legislation. Defendant and ADHS are required to apply statutes as written and follow general rules of statutory construction, including but not limited to those that are stated in A.R.S. Title 1, Chapter 2, Article 2. Defendant is required to comply with the laws that the Legislature has enacted by implementing and following the statute. He cannot choose not to implement this statute and must comply with the statute's plain language.

Defendant and ADHS have a governmental interest in maintaining and ensuring the truthfulness, completeness, and correctness of information in vital records and statistics. A.R.S. § 36-321 requires that persons who submit a certificate for registration must make a reasonable effort to ensure that information on the certificate is correct and accurate. Many forms of identification (e.g., social security card, driver's license, passport) require a birth certificate, which are in turn required for a variety of things (e.g., financial transactions, program participation, taxation, and benefits). An individual's identification is also necessary to maintain accurate records, including judicial records. If a birth certificate or form of identification is not accurate, it opens the door to fraud and other forms of abuse/crimes.

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(4), Defendant, ADHS, and BVR (and ADHS and BVR employees) cannot partake in discretionary decision-making in determining who can or cannot be permitted to amend their birth certificates. They do not have authority to amend birth certificates in a manner that the Legislature has not specifically allowed. They are not fact finders and they do not weigh evidence. The Legislature specifically

reserved discretionary decision-making for Arizona State Courts under Subsection In doing so, the Arizona Legislature ensured that certain safeguarding procedures are in place to prevent inaccurate and/or incomplete reporting by Arizona citizens seeking to abuse the birth certificate amendment process. A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(4) provides Arizona State Courts with discretion in determining whether an amendment should be provided to a particular individual based on the individual circumstances and facts presented to the court. This provides necessary oversight and safeguarding and protects individuals—particularly minors—from an abuse of this process. As stated above, individuals who have undergone a sex change operation and can provide a physician's note indicating that they have are exempt from the court order process because proof of a sex change operation is sufficient and concrete evidence that the individual has taken permanent and irreversible steps to change their gender and remains who they say they are. Thus, Defendant has a governmental interest and justification for implementing A.R.S. § 36-337 to ensure the accuracy and completeness of birth certificates, and to ensure the safeguarding against abuse of this process by requiring courts orders for those who have not undergone a sex change

By responding to this Interrogatory as worded, Defendant does not concede that he has denied any transgender individual who has not undergone a sex change operation the ability to amend the sex listed on their birth certificate as that avenue is made available to them through A.R.S. § 36-337(A)(4) and the A.A.C. R9-19-208(B), (P) administrative process. Defendant denies that he has violated Plaintiffs' or any transgender individual's purported rights under the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Defendant will continue to supplement this response as it acquires additional information.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10:

State all facts supporting YOUR response to Interrogatory No. 9.

RESPONSE:

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

1 relevant to the claims or defenses in this lawsuit or proportional to the needs of this case 2 given that Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint is devoid of allegations regarding conduct 3 and/or events that occurred before approximately 2019, and none of the named minor 4 Plaintiffs were born prior to 2011. Defendant further objects that information responsive 5 this interrogatory, if any, is irrelevant to the claims or defenses in this case. 6 Without waiving these objections, pursuant to A.R.S. § 36-322(A), when a state 7 registrar amends an individual's registered birth certificate, the state registrar is required 8 to seal the original birth certificate and any evidentiary documents used to support the 9 amendment. Under A.R.S. § 36-322(B), the state registrar shall not issue a copy of a 10 sealed certificate or other record unless required by court order and except as provided in 11 § 36-340 (concerning adoptions). 12 DATED this 17th day of October, 2022. 13 STRUCK LOVE BOJANOWSKI & ACEDO, PLC 14 15 Dana M. Keene By16 Daniel P. Struck Nicholas D. Acedo 17 Dana M. Keene 3100 West Ray Road, Suite 300 18 Chandler, Arizona 85226 19 MARK BRNOVICH ATTORNEY GENERAL 20 Patricia Cracchiolo LaMagna Aubrey Joy Corcoran 21 1275 W Washington St. Phoenix, AZ 85007 22 Attorneys for Defendant 23 24 25 26 27

Exhibit 24 FILED UNDER SEAL

Exhibit 25 FILED UNDER SEAL

Exhibit 26 FILED UNDER SEAL