

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF COLE COUNTY, MISSOURI

MISSOURI ROUNDTABLE FOR LIFE,)
TODD S. JONES, and)
FREDERIC N. SAUER,)

Plaintiffs,)

vs.)

ROBIN CARNAHAN, in her official)
capacity as Missouri Secretary of State,)

Serve at:)
Office of the Secretary of State)
State Capitol, Room 208)
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101)

and)

SUSAN MONTEE, in her official capacity)
as Missouri State Auditor,)

Serve at:)
Office of the State Auditor)
301 West High Street, Office 880)
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102)

and)

JEREMIAH W. (JAY) NIXON, in his official)
capacity as Missouri Attorney General,)

Serve at:)
Supreme Court Building)
207 W. High Street)
Jefferson City, Missouri 65102)

Defendants.)

Cause No. _____

Division _____

**PETITION CHALLENGING
OFFICIAL BALLOT TITLE, FISCAL NOTE, AND FISCAL NOTE SUMMARY
PURSUANT TO RSMO. §116.190 AND FOR OTHER RELIEF**

Plaintiffs Missouri Roundtable for Life, Todd S. Jones, and Frederic N. Sauer, for their Petition against Defendants Robin Carnahan, Susan Montee, and Jay Nixon state as follows:

Introduction

1. In this action, Plaintiffs seek to overturn the actions of Missouri Secretary of State Robin Carnahan and Missouri State Auditor Susan Montee in unlawfully and inaccurately manipulating initiative petition language so as to mislead and confuse Missouri voters and to create prejudice against a proposed constitutional amendment. That proposed constitutional amendment would restore legislative control over appropriations relating to stem cell research. The summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note prepared by the Defendants are misleading, insufficient and unfair. They violate Missouri law, the Missouri Constitution, and the United States Constitution.

2. Plaintiffs, who include Missouri registered voters and proponents of the initiative, ask this Court to certify a new, accurate summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note to the Secretary. By so doing, the Court will protect the fundamental rights of Missouri citizens to petition for changes to their constitution and communicate accurately and freely about their political proposals without being obstructed and impeded by the biased and prejudicial influence of state officials.

The Parties

3. Plaintiff Missouri Roundtable for Life (“MRFL”) is a non-profit corporation organized and existing under Missouri law and pays various taxes to the State of Missouri.

4. Plaintiff Todd S. Jones (“Jones”) is an individual, a Missouri registered voter, a taxpayer, and the Executive Director of MRFL. He resides in the City of St. Louis, Missouri.

5. Plaintiff Frederic N. Sauer (“Sauer”) is an individual, a Missouri registered voter, a taxpayer, and the President and a Director of MRFL. He resides in St. Louis County, Missouri.

6. Defendant Robin Carnahan (the “Secretary”) is, and at all relevant times has been, the duly elected, qualified, and acting Secretary of the State of Missouri. As such, she is charged by law with implementing the provisions of the Missouri Constitution and Chapter 116, RSMo., relating to initiative petitions. She is charged with upholding and complying with the Missouri Constitution in the discharge of her statutory duties.

7. Defendant Susan Montee (the “Auditor”) is, and at all relevant times has been, the duly elected, qualified, and acting Auditor of the State of Missouri. As such, she is charged by law with implementing the provisions of Chapter 116, RSMo., relating to fiscal notes and fiscal note summaries for initiative petitions. She is charged with upholding and complying with the Missouri Constitution in the discharge of her statutory duties.

8. Defendant Jay Nixon (the “Attorney General”) is, and at all relevant times has been, the duly elected, qualified, and acting Attorney General of the State of

Missouri. As such, he is charged by law with implementing the provisions of Chapter 116, RSMo., relating to initiative petitions. He is charged with upholding and complying with the Missouri Constitution in the discharge of his statutory duties.

Jurisdiction and Venue

9. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter, and venue is proper in Cole County, pursuant to RSMo. §116.190. This action is timely filed within the ten day period provided for in RSMo. § 116.190.1. This Court also has general jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' additional claims.

General Allegations

10. On March 19, 2008 on behalf of himself and MRFL, pursuant to RSMo. §116.332, Jones submitted to the Secretary a sample petition page for an amendment to the Missouri Constitution that would restore to the Missouri general assembly the power to appropriate, eliminate, reduce, deny, or withhold public funds as to stem cell and other research (the "Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment"). The sample petition page includes the proposed form of the petition as it would actually be circulated to Missouri voters to obtain their signatures. In addition to signature blanks and certain language required by statute, the petition page also includes the actual language sought to be added to the Missouri Constitution. A copy of the sample petition is attached hereto as **Exhibit A.**

11. The Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment seeks to add the following language to the Missouri constitution to restore legislative control over public funding of research purportedly permitted by Section 38(d) of the Constitution:

One new section is adopted by adding one new section to be known as section 38(e) of Article III to read as follows:

Section 38(e). Nothing in Section 38(d) of Article III of the Missouri Constitution shall be construed as limiting in any way the powers of the Missouri general assembly to appropriate, eliminate, reduce, deny, or withhold any public funds.

See **Exhibit A**.

12. Along with the sample petition, MRFL and Jones submitted a proposed ballot title that substantially tracks the language of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment as follows:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended so that nothing in Section 38 (d) of Article 3 of the Missouri Constitution shall be construed as limiting in any way the powers of the Missouri general assembly to appropriate, eliminate, reduce, deny, or withhold any public funds?

See letter dated March 19, 2008 from MRFL and Todd S. Jones to Hon. Robin Carnahan, an accurate copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

13. After receiving the sample petition page, the Secretary transmitted it to Attorney General Jeremiah “Jay” Nixon for review as to form. The Attorney General did review it as to form, approved it, and gave notice of his approval to the Secretary by letter dated March 28, 2008, an accurate copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit C**.

14. By letter dated March 31, 2008, the Secretary gave final approval to the form of the petition for circulation. An accurate copy of the Secretary’s letter dated March 31, 2008 is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.

15. The Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment itself consists of 38 words, including articles and citations.

16. The language of the ballot title proposed by MRFL and Jones is nearly identical to the language of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment and consists of 45 words, including articles and citations. See **Exhibits A and B**.

Secretary Provides a Summary Statement

17. After certifying the form of the petition, the Secretary provided a summary statement consisting of 91 words, including articles and citations. Missouri law requires the Secretary to draft a “concise statement not exceeding one hundred words.” RSMo. § 116.334. The statement must use language “neither intentionally argumentative nor likely to create prejudice either for or against the proposed measure.” *Id.*

18. It is unknown what role the Secretary (and her staff) actually played in preparing the summary statement and discovery is necessary to determine who actually drafted, and who participated in the drafting of, the summary statement provided by the Secretary.

19. By letter dated April 10, 2008, the Secretary transmitted the proposed summary statement to the Attorney General for review.

20. By letter dated April 18, 2008, the Attorney General approved the legal content and form of the Secretary’s proposed summary statement. An accurate copy of that letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit E**.

21. On April 22, 2008, the Secretary certified the following 91 word summary statement:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended to repeal current provisions approved by voters in 2006 which guaranteed Missouri patients access to stem cell therapies and cures and permitted researchers to conduct stem cell research in accordance with federal law by:

- allowing the Missouri legislature or state officials to eliminate, reduce or deny access to state funds for institutions involved in stem cell research, therapies and cures; and
- allowing the Missouri legislature or state officials to ban or limit the access of Missourians to stem cell research, therapies and cures?

See letter dated April 22, 2008 from Michael Bushman, Deputy Secretary for Elections, to Todd S. Jones, an accurate copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit F**.

Auditor Provides a Fiscal Note and Fiscal Note Summary

22. The Secretary forwarded the sample petition page concerning the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment to the Auditor and requested a fiscal note and fiscal note summary. By letter dated April 9, 2008, the Auditor forwarded to the Attorney General a fiscal note and fiscal note summary. A copy of the Auditor's letter and enclosed fiscal note are attached hereto as **Exhibit G**.

23. It is unknown what role the Auditor (and her staff) actually played in preparing the fiscal note and fiscal note summary and discovery is necessary to determine who actually drafted, and who participated in the drafting of, the fiscal note and fiscal note summary provided by the Auditor.

24. The Auditor's 40 word fiscal note summary states as follows:

This proposal could have a significant negative fiscal impact on state and local governmental entities if state funds for certain research activities are eliminated, reduced, denied, or withheld. However, the total costs to state and local governmental entities are unknown.

See **Exhibit G**.

25. In violation of her statutory duties under RSMo. § 116.175.1, the Auditor accepted and considered comments, which purported to be "statements of fiscal impact" estimating the costs of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, but those comments did not comply with the statutory requirement that such proposed statements be "in a manner consistent with the standards of the government accounting standards board and section 23.140, RSMo., [.]" RSMo. § 116.175.1.

26. More specifically, the Auditor considered and included various purported "statements of fiscal impact" that contain no indicia of compliance with the "standards of the governmental accounting standards board" or with § 23.140, RSMo., and instead

appear to be regurgitations of information submitted in opposition to various other proposed constitutional amendments, including without limitation other amendments proposed by MRFL and Jones as well as other, unrelated, proposed amendments submitted by other, unrelated, groups and/or individuals. Those purported “statements of fiscal impact” that the Auditor included and considered include, without limitation, the following:

- a. Comments from “Officials from the Department of Economic Development” that are identical to comments submitted by those Officials in connection with two other proposed amendments submitted by MRFL and Jones and submitted by those officials in connection with a proposed amendment submitted by an unrelated group;
- b. Comments from the Department of Corrections relating to the potential fiscal impact from the “penalty provision component of the bill...for up to fifteen years imprisonment.” The Department states that it “is unable to determine the number of people who would be convicted under the provisions of this bill...” See **Exhibit G**. Contrary to the Department of Corrections’ assertion, the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment is not a “bill” and does not contain a “penalty provision” of any nature, much less any potential penalties of imprisonment;
- c. Comments from the City of St. Louis stating that the “new initiative petition...purports to ban ‘human cloning’” when the

Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment contains no such purported ban whatsoever. See **Exhibit G**. The City of St. Louis' voluminous comments are identical to the comments submitted by the City of St. Louis in opposition to other, unrelated initiative petitions;

- d. The University of Missouri commented that the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment would “allow the legislature to *punish* universities and hospitals for conducting stem cell research by *withholding* or *reducing* funding for *other* programs....” See **Exhibit G** (emphasis added). The University, however, provides no substantiation for its assertion that restoring legislative control over appropriations amounts to the power to “punish” state universities, such assertions being entirely unprecedented in that the Missouri Constitution expressly grants control over appropriations to the legislature; and
- e. Comments submitted by Mr. Brad Ketcher of the Ketcher Law Firm, LLC, which contains speculative and unsubstantiated assertions of alleged fiscal impact, which are identical to submissions by Mr. Ketcher in opposition to unrelated proposed amendments.

27. By letter dated April 18, 2008, Attorney General Nixon approved the sufficiency of the form of Auditor's fiscal note and fiscal note summary. An accurate copy of that letter is attached hereto as **Exhibit H**.

28. By Certification of Official Ballot Title dated April 22, 2008, the Secretary certified the summary statement and fiscal note summary, and delivered copies of the official ballot title and fiscal note and fiscal note summary to Jones. An accurate copy of the Secretary's Certification of Official Ballot Title dated April 22, 2008 is attached hereto as **Exhibit I**.

COUNT I

Challenge Pursuant to RSMo. § 116.190 to Secretary's Official Ballot Title and Summary Statement

29. Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through 28.

30. The Secretary's official ballot title and summary statement as set forth in the Certification of Official Ballot Title dated April 22, 2008 (**Exhibit I**) (the "Rewritten Ballot Title") is both insufficient and unfair, is in direct violation of the requirements of Chapter 116, RSMo., and is unlawful.

31. The Rewritten Ballot Title is both insufficient as a matter of fact and law. It does not accurately, adequately, or competently summarize what the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment says or does, and it would mislead and confuse Missouri voters as to the plain, simple, and clear meaning of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, which is to restore control over taxpayer and state funds to the elected representatives of the Missouri voters.

32. The Rewritten Ballot Title also is insufficient and unfair in that its language objectively and patently reflects the Secretary's bias and prejudice against the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, and her concomitant favoritism toward the proponents of human cloning and stem cell research on human embryos, who oppose

any form of legislative control over the appropriation of taxpayers' money or state money for such human cloning or embryonic stem cell research.

33. The Secretary's actions constitute an unlawful interference by the Secretary with Missouri citizens' constitutional rights to seek constitutional amendments by the initiative process and to communicate with their fellow citizens about the need to restore legislative control over taxpayers' money and state money.

34. The Secretary's summary statement is insufficient or unfair in at least the following respects:

- a. It falsely, deceptively, and with evident bias and prejudice states that the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment will "limit the access of Missourians to stem cell research, therapies and cures" as follows: i) the language falsely states or implies that Missouri patients have "access" to any stem cell research, therapies, or cures that would be prohibited by the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment. In fact, the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment would not affect any access to such purported research or "cures." It is not true that Missourians currently enjoy "access" to embryonic cloning research because of Amendment 2; ii) it is speculative and highly argumentative to claim that such embryonic cloning research will be conducted in Missouri, that it will lead to therapies and cures, and that Missourians "will have access" to such therapies and cures; and iii) this language unnecessarily includes surplusage regarding

“approv[al] by voters in November 2006,” which is unprecedented language in an initiative petition (other than in ballot summaries provided by this Secretary with respect to proposed amendments involving restrictions on human cloning or embryonic stem cell research) and not germane to the content of the currently proposed Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment and is an unprecedented, improper, and argumentative attempt to create prejudice and promote Amendment No. 2 of 2006. Taken as a whole, this language is misleading, false, deceptive, and biased because rather than summarizing the effect of the language – how and why the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment will restore legislative control over the use of taxpayer monies and state monies for human cloning and embryonic stem cell research, not over whether or how such research could or should be conducted using private funds — it makes predictions about “limit[ing] access” to nonexistent research, therapies, and cures, and improperly focuses on past voter approval of other measures while ignoring past legislative approval of restrictions on such research and the use of taxpayer or state monies therefor;

- b. It falsely and or deceptively states that the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment would “repeal current provisions approved by voters in 2006 which guaranteed Missouri patients access to stem cell therapies and cures and permitted researchers to

conduct stem cell research in accordance with Federal law....”

The Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment would not repeal any provision which purportedly “guaranteed” Missouri patients “access to stem cell therapies and cures...,” because the proposed amendment merely seeks to restore legislative control over the use of taxpayers and state funds for human cloning and embryonic stem cell research. The Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment does not in any way alter, penalize, suppress, or interfere in any way with private funding of such research; it merely restores the right of Missouri citizens to have their elected officials determine whether any taxpayer or state monies should be used for human cloning or embryonic stem cell research.

- c. It falsely and/or deceptively states and implies that researchers would no longer be able to “conduct stem cell research in accordance with Federal law” when on its face, the restoration of legislative control amendment contains no such express or implied restrictions;
- d. In stating that the proposed amendment would allow “the Missouri legislature or state officials to eliminate, reduce or deny access to state funds for institutions involved in stem cell research, therapies and cures [],” it i) improperly and inaccurately states that “state officials” other than the elected officials of the Missouri General Assembly, would somehow have control or authority with respect

to whether to fund human cloning or embryonic stem cell research with taxpayer monies or state monies; and ii) inaccurately and misleadingly omits the word “appropriate” that appears in the express language of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, thereby incorrectly and misleadingly implying that the Amendment would only permit the legislature to “eliminate, reduce or deny access to state funds” when the Amendment expressly permits the legislature to “appropriate” state funds;

- e. The language of the second bullet: i) is redundant of and/or subsumed by the language of the first bullet; ii) improperly and misleadingly focuses only on a *portion* of legislative control over funding (i.e. specifically focusing only on allowing the legislature “or state officials” to “ban or limit” funding) without in any way mentioning, implying, or suggesting that the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment expressly permits the legislature to “appropriate” funds for such research; and iii) improperly states that “state officials” other than the legislature somehow would have authority under the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment to “ban or limit the access” to human cloning or other embryonic stem cell research; and
- f. Even leaving each of these specific inaccuracies, fallacies, deceptions, prejudices, and biases aside, and even if in isolation specific phrases are not deemed insufficient or unfair, the summary

statement is prejudicial when the phrases are considered in combination and as a whole. The summary statement as a whole is insufficient and unfair and infused and with bias, prejudice, deception, and/or favoritism because it focuses almost entirely on purported limitations or bans on funding for “patients’ access to...therapies, and cures,” without any mention of the express language authorizing the legislature to control decisions on whether to “appropriate” taxpayer monies and state monies for human cloning or embryonic stem cell research. A Missouri petition signer or voter reading this summary statement would never know the express fact that the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment permits the legislature to appropriate funds for such research if the legislature – the peoples’ elected representatives – deems it advisable to do so. As noted, it is unknown whether the summary statement was drafted by the Secretary (or her staff) or in whole or in part by proponents of human cloning and embryonic stem cell research. In sum, the statement fails to summarize the meaning of the proposed amendment in “language neither argumentative nor likely to create prejudice either for or against the proposed measure.” RSMo. § 116.334.

35. The Secretary's summary statement therefore is insufficient and unfair and is intentionally argumentative and likely to create prejudice against the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment.

36. The Court accordingly should strike the Secretary's summary statement and certify the following as the Summary Statement portion of the official ballot title:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended so that nothing in Section 38(d) of Article III of the Missouri Constitution shall be construed as limiting in any way the powers of the Missouri General Assembly to appropriate, eliminate, reduce, deny, or withhold any public funds?

37. This 45 word summary statement is sufficient and fair and is not intentionally argumentative or likely to create prejudice either for or against the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment and closely tracks the actual language of the proposed amendment. Further, this proposed language succinctly summarizes the legal effect of the proposed amendment without injecting policy arguments for or against it, without completely re-writing the proposed language of the amendment, and adopts the summary statement language proposed by the persons submitting the proposed initiative petition, as has been the consistent past practice of this Secretary and her predecessors with respect to initiative petitions, other than this Secretary's multiple recent attempts to re-write in insufficient, unfair language proposed amendments that would affect Amendment No. 2 of 2006.

38. The Court has inherent power to permit discovery as provided by the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for a judgment from this Court:

(A) Finding and declaring that the Summary Statement certified by the Secretary with respect to the Restoration of Legislative Control

Amendment is insufficient, unfair, intentionally argumentative and/or likely to create prejudice against the proposed amendment;

- (B) Permitting Plaintiffs to take discovery on the sources, drafters, drafting, origins, comments, proposed language, and the like of the summary statement certified by the Secretary, and all communications pertaining to the same;
- (C) Certifying the following summary statement to the Secretary with respect to the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment:

Shall the Missouri Constitution be amended so that nothing in Section 38(d) of Article III of the Missouri Constitution shall be construed as limiting in any way the powers of the Missouri General Assembly to appropriate, eliminate, reduce, deny, or withhold any public funds?;

- (D) Awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees, expenses and costs;
- (E) Granting Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT II

Challenge Pursuant to RSMo. §116.190 of Auditor's Fiscal Note Summary

- 39. Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through 38.
- 40. The Auditor's fiscal note summary provides as follows:

This proposal could have a significant negative fiscal impact on State and local governmental entities if State funds for certain research activities are eliminated, reduced, denied or withheld. However, the total costs to State and local governmental entities are unknown.

See **Exhibit G**.

41. The Auditor's fiscal note summary violates the provisions of Chapter 116, RSMo., and is insufficient and unfair and therefore unlawful.

42. The Auditor's fiscal note summary is written in language that is both argumentative and highly likely to create prejudice against the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment.

43. The Auditor's fiscal note summary is insufficient and unfair because it improperly and with absolutely no evidence: a) assumes that because of the passage of Section 38(d) to the Missouri Constitution, and absent the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, substantial taxpayer monies and state monies are flowing and will continue to flow through the coffers of state and local governments; b) assumes that the passage of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment will force the termination of this source of revenue in future years, causing a revenue "loss;" c) claims that the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment could have a "significant negative fiscal impact" and that the "total costs" are unknown. However, the public is not apprised of the key assumptions underlying this highly speculative and argumentative claim, including without limitation: (i) research allowed by the passage of Section 38(d) is generating or will generate new tax revenues for the state; (ii) it is the passage of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, and not other factors, which will have or have had a negative effect on new tax revenues; and (iii) tax revenues from new research will outstrip government spending that would be required under Section 38(d); d) disregards the express language of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment that expressly authorizes the legislature to "appropriate" taxpayer monies and/or state monies for human cloning and/or embryonic stem cell research; and e) relies on comments, which purport to

be “statements of fiscal impact” estimating the alleged costs of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment that the Auditor improperly accepted and considered when such purported comments failed to comply with the statutory requirement that the same be “in a manner consistent with the standards of the government accounting standards board and section 23.140 RSMo.” RSMo. § 116.175.1.

44. The Auditor cannot claim with any degree of certainty whether the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment will cause tax revenues to decrease or increase. She also cannot claim with any degree of certainty that if tax revenues do decrease, it will be due to the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment instead of the expressed concerns and objections of both Missouri legislators and Missouri citizens toward human cloning and research that creates and destroys human embryos in order to “harvest” human embryonic stem cells for uncertain medical experimentation and research. The Auditor likewise failed to assess the potential *positive* fiscal impacts of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, contrary to RSMo. § 116.175.1, which expressly requires the Auditor to “assess *the* fiscal impact of the proposed measure.” RSMo § 116.175.1 (emphasis added). Instead, the Auditor focused solely on potential *negative* fiscal impacts without any apparent consideration of potential positive fiscal impacts. While § 116.175.1 grants the Auditor the authority to consult with various agencies and entities, it does not limit the Auditor to those agencies and entities and expressly requires the Auditor to assess both negative and positive fiscal impacts. RSMo § 116.175.1.

45. Further, the Auditor has not undertaken any study of what government outlays will be required to fund embryonic stem cell research under Section 38(d), and

how much money will be saved by restoring legislative control over such outlays and entitlements by the proposed amendment. Without at least including in the fiscal note summary some assessment of state and local savings from the proposed amendment, the fiscal note summary's argument regarding potentially "significant negative" net costs lacks any indicia of reliability, objectivity, sufficiency, or fairness.

46. For all of these reasons, the Auditor's fiscal note summary is insufficient, unfair, infused and tainted with bias, prejudice, deception, and/or favoritism and should be stricken in its entirety. This language improperly and inaccurately raises the specter of substantial and unpredictable losses. Given the facts, the only fair statement the Auditor can make is that the fiscal impact on state and local government is unknown.

47. As noted above, the Auditor failed to assess the fiscal impact of the proposed measure and improperly considered purported "statements of fiscal impact" that failed to comply with Governmental Accounting Standards Board standards and Section 23.140, RSMo. Further, it is unknown what role the Auditor (and her staff) actually played in preparing the fiscal note and fiscal note summary and discovery is necessary to determine who actually drafted, and who participated in the drafting of, the fiscal note and fiscal note summary provided by the Auditor.

48. The Court has inherent power to order discovery pursuant to the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for a judgment of this Court:

(A) Declaring that the fiscal note summary certified by the Secretary and prepared by the Auditor with respect to the Restoration of Legislative

Control Amendment is insufficient, unfair, argumentative, and likely to create prejudice against the proposed Amendment and therefore stricken;

- (B) Permitting Plaintiffs to take discovery on the role that the Auditor (and her staff) and any other person or entity actually played in drafting or preparing the fiscal note summary and related matters;
- (C) Remanding to the Auditor this matter for a proper assessment of the fiscal impact of the proposed measure, including all potential positive fiscal impacts, and retaining continuing jurisdiction over both the Auditor's performance of her statutory duties and the resulting language submitted by the Auditor and certified by the Secretary;
- (D) Granting Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees, expenses and costs;
- (E) Granting Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT III

Challenge Pursuant to RSMo. § 116.190 of Auditor's Fiscal Note

49. Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 1 through 48.

50. The Auditor's fiscal note violates the provisions of Chapter 116, RSMo., and is insufficient and unfair, and therefore unlawful.

51. The Auditor's fiscal note is both argumentative and likely to create prejudice against the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment.

52. Every agency or entity that predicted a "negative fiscal impact" submitted comments that were contrary to the standards of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board and Section 23.140, RSMo. Such statements, which the Auditor improperly considered in violation of RSMo. § 116.175.1, reflect the political biases and arguments

of the reporting agencies and entities. The Auditor's reliance on these statements, most of which are regurgitated statements submitted in opposition to other, unrelated, proposed Amendments submitted by other, unrelated, groups, was contrary to her statutory duties.

53. For all of the reasons stated above, the Auditor lacked any statutory basis for including such statements that failed to comply with the standards of the Governmental Accounting Standards Board and Section 23.140, RSMo. in her fiscal note.

54. The inclusion of such statements, which fail to comply with the "standards of the governmental accounting standards board and Section 23.140, RSMo.," (RSMo. § 116.175.1) directly violates the Auditor's statutory duties under RSMo. § 116.175.1.

55. The Auditor prepared the fiscal note in direct contravention of RSMo. § 116.175.3, which requires that the fiscal note "shall state the measure's estimated costs **or savings....**" (emphasis added).

56. Contrary to his statutory duties under RSMo. § 116.175.4, the Attorney General, upon information and belief, failed to determine whether the Auditor complied with RSMo. § 116.175.1 and RSMo. § 116.175.3.

57. The Court has inherent authority to permit discovery pursuant to the Missouri Rules of Civil Procedure.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for judgment from this Court:

(A) Declaring that the fiscal note summary certified by the Secretary and prepared by the Auditor with respect to the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment is insufficient, unfair, argumentative, and likely to create prejudice against the proposed Amendment and therefore stricken;

- (B) Permitting Plaintiffs to take discovery on the role that the Auditor (and her staff) and any other person or entity actually played in drafting or preparing the fiscal note summary and related matters;
- (C) Remanding to the Auditor this matter for a proper assessment of the fiscal impact of the proposed measure, including all potential positive fiscal impacts, and retaining continuing jurisdiction over both the Auditor's performance of her statutory duties and the resulting language submitted by the Auditor and certified by the Secretary;
- (D) Granting Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees, expenses and costs; and
- (E) Granting Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT IV

Conspiracy

58. Plaintiffs restate Paragraphs 3 through 28, 33 through 34, 43 through 47, 52 through 53, and 56.

59. In violation of the Missouri Constitution, their statutory duties, and Missouri common law, the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General conspired with each other and with others to deprive Plaintiffs of their Constitutional, statutory, and common law rights to avail themselves of an unbiased, unprejudiced, impartial process for the preparation of the official ballot title and the fiscal note and fiscal note summary for the proposed Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment.

60. Upon information and belief, and subject to discovery, the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General conspired with others, whose identities will be revealed through discovery, to deprive Plaintiffs of their Constitutional, statutory, and

common law rights to avail themselves of an unbiased, unprejudiced, impartial process for the preparation of the official ballot title and the fiscal note and fiscal note summary for the proposed Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment.

61. Given the recent, repeated violations of the Missouri Constitution, Missouri statutes, and Missouri common law committed by the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General with respect to initiative petitions submitted not only by MRFL and Jones, but also by others, Court intervention and continuing court supervision are necessary to ensure the access of Plaintiffs and other Missourians to an initiative petition process that is free from bias, prejudice, and partiality.

62. Further, as a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid conspiracy and/or conspiracies, Plaintiffs have been damaged.

63. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and reckless.

64. Additionally, the aforesaid conspiracy and/or conspiracies violate the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and constitutes State action under 42 U.S.C. §1983.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for judgment from this Court:

- (A) Restraining and enjoining the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General and all those in active concert or participation with them, from violating the Missouri Constitution, Missouri statutes, and Missouri common law with respect to initiative petitions;
- (B) Restraining and enjoining the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General and all those in active concert or participation with them, from

violating the United States Constitution and United States statutes with respect to Plaintiffs' initiative petition rights;

- (C) Requiring the continuing supervision of this Court over all actions of the Secretary, Auditor, Attorney General, and all those in active concert or participation with them, with respect to initiative petitions, including without limitation the analysis, review, and preparation of ballot titles, summary statements, fiscal notes, and fiscal note summary statements;
- (D) Awarding Plaintiffs such actual damages as are proven at trial;
- (E) Awarding Plaintiffs such punitive damages as are fair and reasonable and sufficient to deter Defendants, and those in active concert or participation with them, from committing such violations in the future;
- (F) Awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;
- (G) Granting Plaintiffs their expenses and costs; and
- (H) Granting Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT V

Claims for Violation of the Missouri Constitution Article I, § 2; Art. I, § 3; Art. I, § 8; Art. I, § 25; Art. 3, § 49

65. Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 3 through 28, 33 through 34, 43 through 47, 52 through 53, and 56.

66. Defendants' conduct in drafting, reviewing, approving, certifying, transmitting, and publishing the summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note violates Plaintiffs' and Missouri voters' rights under the Missouri Constitution, Article I, § 2; Art. I, § 3; Art. I, § 8; Art. I, § 25; and Art. 3, § 49. Defendants have performed their

duties under the Missouri Constitution and Chapter 116, RSMo. in an arbitrary, capricious, discriminatory, biased, partial, and unconstitutional manner.

67. Article 1, Section 3 of the Missouri Constitution grants to “the people of this state...the inherent, sole and exclusive right to regulate the internal government and police thereof, and to alter and abolish their Constitution and form of government whenever they may deem it necessary.” Defendants’ conduct in drafting, reviewing, approving, certifying, transmitting, and publishing the summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note violates this provision because it obstructs and frustrates Plaintiffs’ ability to seek to “alter . . . their Constitution.”

68. For the reasons set forth above, Defendants’ summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note present an inaccurate, incomplete, unfair, prejudicial, and biased argument regarding the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, but purport to carry their objective, fair, and unbiased imprimatur as state officials and purport to be free from the influence of special interests. The Defendants’ conduct therefore improperly obstructs and delays Plaintiffs’ efforts to amend the Missouri Constitution and further requires Plaintiffs to undertake substantially more expensive and extensive efforts to communicate the true effects of the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment.

69. Article 3, Section 49 of the Missouri Constitution reserves to “the people [the] power to propose and enact or reject laws and amendments to the Constitution by the Initiative, independent of the General Assembly....” Defendants’ conduct in drafting, reviewing, approving, certifying, transmitting, and publishing the summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note violates Plaintiffs’ rights under this provision.

70. Article 1, Section 25 of the Missouri Constitution provides that “all elections shall be free and open; and no power, civil or military, shall at any time interfere to prevent the free exercise of the right of suffrage.” The right of suffrage applies to ballot measure elections as well as to candidate elections. By improperly impairing and impeding Plaintiffs’ right to amend the Constitution by the initiative process, as set forth above, Defendants will deprive Plaintiffs and other Missouri citizens of their rights under Article I, Section 25.

71. Article 1, Section 8 of the Missouri Constitution provides that “no law shall be passed impairing the freedom of speech, no matter by what means communicated....” This includes the right to engage in political speech and association for purposes of gathering support for legislative and political change, which are core protected speech. By their conduct as set forth above, Defendants have unduly burdened Plaintiffs’ free speech rights without any compelling governmental interest and instead have acted to further their own personal, political, and pecuniary interests.

72. Article 1, Section 2 of the Missouri Constitution provides that “all persons are created equal and are entitled to equal rights and opportunities under the law; that to give security to these things is the principal office of government, and that when government does not confer this security, it fails in its chief design.” By their conduct as set forth above, Defendants acted with the intent to produce and publish to Missouri voters inaccurate, incomplete, unfair, prejudicial, and biased arguments in an effort to burden and frustrate Plaintiffs’ fundamental rights to engage in political speech, association, petition the government, and amend the Missouri Constitution, and instead

have acted to further their personal, political, and pecuniary interests. Defendants' unequal treatment of Plaintiffs is not based on any rational basis.

73. Defendants' actions as set forth above have imposed tremendous unconstitutional and otherwise illegal burdens and costs upon Plaintiffs' attempts to exercise their rights under the Missouri Constitution and have made it much more expensive and difficult for Plaintiffs to attempt to assert those rights.

74. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and reckless.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for a judgment from this Court:

- (A) Restraining and enjoining the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General and all those in active concert or participation with them, from violating the Missouri Constitution, Missouri statutes, and Missouri common law with respect to initiative petitions;
- (B) Restraining and enjoining the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General and all those in active concert or participation with them, from violating the United States Constitution and United States statutes with respect to Plaintiffs' initiative petition rights;
- (C) Requiring the continuing supervision of this Court over all actions of the Secretary, Auditor, Attorney General, and all those in active concert or participation with them, with respect to initiative petitions, including without limitation the analysis, review, and preparation of ballot titles, summary statements, fiscal notes, and fiscal note summary statements;
- (D) Awarding Plaintiffs such actual damages as are proven at trial;

- (E) Awarding Plaintiffs such punitive damages as are fair and reasonable and sufficient to deter Defendants, and those in active concert or participation with them, from committing such violations in the future;
- (F) Awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;
- (G) Granting Plaintiffs their expenses and costs; and
- (H) Granting Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT VI

Claims for Violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution 42 U.S.C. §1983

75. Plaintiffs restate paragraphs 3 through 28, 33 through 34, 43 through 47, 52 through 53, and 56.

76. Defendants acted under color of state law and in their official capacities in drafting, reviewing, approving, certifying, transmitting, and publishing the summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note with respect to the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment.

77. Plaintiffs have a First Amendment right to engage with their supporters and with Missouri voters in political speech and association regarding their proposal to amend the Missouri Constitution. Speaking to one's supporters and the public at large regarding an initiative petition is conduct that lies at the core of the freedom of speech. By using the summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note to present an inaccurate, incomplete, unfair, prejudicial, and biased argument regarding the Restoration of Legislative Control Amendment, the Defendants have deprived Plaintiffs of their First Amendment rights.

78. The conduct of Defendants as set forth above violated and, without relief from this Court, will continue to violate and unduly burden Plaintiffs' exercise of their First Amendment rights.

79. The conduct of Defendants as set forth in above violated and, without relief from this Court, will continue to violate Plaintiffs' right of equal protection under the law, which is guaranteed against official action by the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution.

80. For the reasons set forth above, Defendants' summary statement, fiscal note summary, and fiscal note present an inaccurate, incomplete, unfair, prejudicial, and biased argument regarding Plaintiffs' proposal, but purport to be unbiased and fair and carry the imprimatur of the state. Defendants' unequal treatment of Plaintiffs is based on Defendants' political viewpoint and attempts to further their own personal, political, and pecuniary interests and is not based on any rational basis.

81. Defendants' unequal treatment of Plaintiffs has damaged and will damage them. Defendants' conduct violates Plaintiffs' Fourteenth Amendment right to equal protection under the law.

82. Defendants' conduct was intentional, willful, wanton, and reckless.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully pray for a judgment from this Court:

(A) Restraining and enjoining the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General and all those in active concert or participation with them, from violating the Missouri Constitution, Missouri statutes, and Missouri common law with respect to initiative petitions;

- (B) Restraining and enjoining the Secretary, the Auditor, and the Attorney General and all those in active concert or participation with them, from violating the United States Constitution and United States statutes with respect to Plaintiffs' initiative petition rights;
- (C) Requiring the continuing supervision of this Court over all actions of the Secretary, Auditor, Attorney General, and all those in active concert or participation with them, with respect to initiative petitions, including without limitation the analysis, review, and preparation of ballot titles, summary statements, fiscal notes, and fiscal note summary statements;
- (D) Awarding Plaintiffs such actual damages as are proven at trial;
- (E) Awarding Plaintiffs such punitive damages as are fair and reasonable and sufficient to deter Defendants, and those in active concert or participation with them, from committing such violations in the future;
- (F) Awarding Plaintiffs their attorneys' fees pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988;
- (G) Granting Plaintiffs their expenses and costs; and
- (H) Granting Plaintiffs such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: April ____, 2008

BELZ & HEARNE, LLC

By: _____

Matt H. Hearne #43482
7711 Bonhomme Ave.
Suite 330
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Phone: (314) 863-0200

Fax: (314) 863-4247

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS