Case 2:10-cv-01413-SRB Document 53 Filed 07/19/10 Page 1 of 6

1	Donald M. Peters 005929 Kristin Mackin 023985 LaSOTA & PETERS, PLC 722 East Osborn Road, Suite 100			
2				
3	Phoenix, AZ 85014 Telephone: (602) 248-2900			
4	Facsimile: (602) 248-2999 dpeters@lasotapeters.com			
5	Jeffrey T. Murray			
6	MOYES SELLERS & SIMS 1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1100			
7	Phoenix, AZ 85004 Telephone: (602)604-2169 Facsimile: (602)274-9135			
8	jtmurray@lawms.com			
9	Attorneys for Arizona Municipal Risk Retention Pool			
10				
11	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
12	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA			
13		N- 2:10 01/12 CDD		
14	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	No. 2:10-cv-01413-SRB		
15	Plaintiff,	AMICUS CURIAE		
16	vs.	MEMORANDUM OF ARIZONA MUNICIPAL RISK RETENTION		
17		POOL		
18	THE STATE OF ARIZONA, et al.,			
19	Defendants.			
20				
21				
22	The Arizona Municipal Risk Retention Pool ("the Insurance Pool") takes			
23	no position as to whether S.B. 1070 is constitutional or whether it is preempted by			
24	federal law. The cities and towns that comprise the Insurance Pool's membership			
25	do not have a common view of S.B. 1070. Some support the measure. Some			
26	oppose it.			
27	11			

Case 2:10-cv-01413-SRB Document 53 Filed 07/19/10 Page 2 of 6

The Insurance Pool's members do not, however, want to divert any more taxpayer dollars than necessary to paying civil judgments. Because of that concern, the Insurance Pool submits that one sentence of the new law should be preliminarily enjoined pending a ruling on the merits.

The sentence with which the Insurance Pool is concerned is found in the amended version of A.R.S. § 11-1051(B): "Any person who is arrested shall have the person's immigration status determined before the person is released." The Insurance Pool will refer to this provision as the mandatory-detention provision. Until this Court determines whether S.B. 1070 is valid, the mandatory-detention provision creates an insoluble dilemma for Arizona's cities and towns, including the seventy-four cities and towns that are members of the Insurance Pool.

If the Insurance Pool's members abide by the mandatory-detention provision while this litigation is pending and this Court ultimately finds that the provision is invalid, the Insurance Pool's members may face large liabilities.

Individuals who are detained pursuant to the provision may well bring civil actions if the provision is ultimately ruled invalid. S.B. 1070 requires the Insurance Pool's members to indemnify law enforcement officials for any liabilities incurred as a result of its provisions. *See* A.R.S. § 11-1051(K).

If the Insurance Pool's members do not enforce the mandatory-detention provision while this litigation is pending, they will still face the prospect of significant liabilities. S.B. 1070 authorizes any legal resident of Arizona to sue cities, towns and their officials if the immigration laws are not enforced to the full

Case 2:10-cv-01413-SRB Document 53 Filed 07/19/10 Page 3 of 6

extent allowed by law. *See* A.R.S. § 11-1051(H). The measure requires that the courts impose significant financial penalties on any city or town that is determined to be under-enforcing the law. *Id*.

In short, Arizona's cities and towns are caught between Scylla and Charybdis. No matter what they do while the validity of the law is being adjudicated, they face the prospect of large liabilities for damages, civil penalties and attorneys' fees. The Insurance Pool's members will also incur significant costs for transporting and caring for any individuals who are detained.

The Court can take judicial notice that many Arizona municipalities are already experiencing severe financial difficulties. The limited resources they have available are acutely needed to provide municipal services. Those resources should not be diverted to paying unnecessary and avoidable civil judgments if that prospect can be avoided.

In this instance, it can be avoided. Arizona's cities and towns should not be required to enforce the mandatory-detention provision until this Court determines whether the provision is valid. It must be reiterated that the Insurance Pool takes no position on the validity of the mandatory-detention provision or any other provision of S.B. 1070. The Insurance Pool's concern is with not wasting taxpayer dollars while the validity of the law is being decided.

Case 2:10-cv-01413-SRB Document 53 Filed 07/19/10 Page 4 of 6

1		
2	July 19, 2010.	
3		L COTA & DETERGRIC
4		LaSOTA & PETERS PLC
5	D	/s/Donald M. Peters
6	By:	/s/Donaid W. Peters
7		Donald M. Peters Kristin Mackin
8		722 East Osborn Road, Suite #100
9		Phoenix, Arizona 85014
10		Jeffrey T. Murray MOYES SELLERS & SIMS
11		1850 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1100
12		Phoenix, AZ 85004
13		Attorneys for Arizona Municipal Risk Retention Pool
14		
15		
16	Original of the foregoing electronically filed this 19th day of July, 2010 with:	
17	Clerk of the United States District Court	
18	For the District of Arizona 401 W. Washington Street	
19	Phoenix, AZ 85003	
20	Copy of the foregoing hand-delivered this	
21	19th day of July, 2010, to:	
22	The Honorable Susan R. Bolton	
23	United States District Court For the District of Arizona 401 W. Washington Street Phoenix, AZ 85003	
24		
25	Thomas, The obout	
26		
27		

2	Copy of the foregoing mailed and emailed this 19 th day of July, 2010 to:
3	Joshua Wilkenfeld
4	U.S. Department of Justice
5	Civil Division – Federal Programs Branch 20 Massachusetts Avenue Washington, DC 20530
6	, using ton, 20 2000
7	Varu Chilakamarri U.S. Department of Justice
8	20 Massachusetts Avenue NW Washington, DC 20001
9	
10	John J. Bouma Joseph G. Adams
11	Robert Arthur Henry Snell & Wilmer LLP
12	1 Arizona Center
13	400 E. Van Buren Phoenix, AZ 85004
14	Jacob Andrew War Fald
15	Joseph Andrew Kanefield Office of Governor Janice K. Brewer
16	1700 W. Washington Street, 9 th Floor Phoenix, AZ 85007
17	
18	Anne Milgram Center for the Administration of Criminal Law
19	139 MacDougal Street, Suite 307 New York, NY 10012
20	Anthony S. Barkow
21	Center for the Administration of Criminal Law
22	139 MacDougal Street, Suite 307 New York, NY 10012
23	Ellen London
24	Jessica Alexandra Murzyn
25	Friedman Kaplan Seiler & Adelman LLP 1633 Broadway, 46 th Floor
26	New York, NY 10019

Case 2:10-cv-01413-SRB Document 53 Filed 07/19/10 Page 6 of 6

1	Ricardo Solano, Jr. Friedman Kaplan Seiler & Adelman
2	Friedman Kaplan Seiler & Adelman 1 Gateway Ctr., 25 th Floor Newark, NJ 07102
3 Newark, NJ 0/102	Newark, NJ 0/102
4	By: /s/ Toni Vanchieri
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	